

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 515, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

□

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report to accompany H.R. 4475, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

□

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4475, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 612, I call up the conference report on 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.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 612, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 5, 2000, at page H8922.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure to present today the conference report on the Department of Transportation and related agencies. In total, the bill provides \$17.8 billion in discretionary budget authority for critical operations of the Department of Transportation, an increase of \$3.5 billion over fiscal year 2000. Much of the increase over last year's level is attributed to mandated increases in the Federal Aviation Administration as a result of the enactment of AIR21. In addition, the increase over last year is a result of additional operational requirements of the U.S. Coast Guard.

Allow me to mention a couple of highlights:

\$4.5 billion for the Coast Guard, of which \$565 million is for drug interdiction;

\$12 billion for the Federal Aviation Administration, a 25 percent increase over last year, consistent with the requirements of AIR21, of which \$3.2 billion is for airport improvement programs;

\$30 billion for the federal-aid highways program, an increase of almost \$2 billion over last year and consistent with TEA21;

\$720 million for the emergency relief highway program to fund the backlog of overdue bills to restore highways damaged in previous natural disasters;

\$6.3 billion for transit program spending, an increase of \$486 million;

\$279 million for the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, more than double last year, to improve truck safety on our Nation's roads;

\$404 million for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, an increase of nearly 10 percent, again safety;

\$725 million for the Federal Railroad Administration, of which \$521 million is for Amtrak;

\$47 million for pipeline safety, which is an increase of over 25 percent.

In addition, the conference agreement contains several items that have been of deep interest to a lot of Members. The agreement before the body contains the following resolutions on rollover, hours-of-service, and .08.

First, on rollover, the agreement permits the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration to move forward with its rollover testing proposal while the National Academy of Sciences studies static versus dynamic testing. Once the study is completed, the administration must propose any appropriate revisions to their testing procedures.

Second, the agreement permits the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration to collect and analyze public comments and data on its proposed hours-of-service rule-making during fiscal year 2001. The administration may also issue a supplemental notice of proposed rule-making once this analysis is complete. However, the agreement prohibits the Federal Motor Carrier Administration from taking any final action on the proposed rule during the year 2001. However, a lot of Members in this body and on the committee will be watching to see the Motor Carrier move ahead, because over 5,000 people a year are killed with regard to trucks every year and a number because of tired truck drivers.

Third, the agreement modifies the Senate provision on .08 but still adopts a national standard for drunk driving. This new provision requires all States to adopt a blood alcohol level of .08 by fiscal year 2004. If States do not adopt this standard, they will lose a portion of their highway funds each year, 2 percent in the year 2004, 4 percent in 2005, 6 percent in 2006, and 8 percent in 2007. However, the highway funding would be restored if a State moves to the lower standard by the end of the year 2007. This is basically in honor and in memory of the moms and dads who have lost loved ones on the road because by doing this, we will save four to 500 lives every year. It is my understanding that the Department of Transportation and the White House

supports all three of these compromises.

Mr. Speaker, the conference agreement also includes a provision relating to the Central Artery project. This provision is the culmination of 6 years of review and scrutiny by this committee and the Department of Transportation's Inspector General on the project. The Central Artery/Tunnel project in Boston, first estimated to cost \$2.5 billion in fiscal year 1985, is now estimated to top \$13.1 billion. This provision contained in the conference agreement codifies a recent agreement with Massachusetts officials and the Federal Highway Administration which limits Federal financial participation in the project to \$8.5 billion, and sets forward other terms and conditions, including the requirement that the Commonwealth of Massachusetts undertake a balanced statewide construction program of \$400 million a year.

Mr. Speaker, this provision is not meant to impugn the administration of, or the recent actions by, the Massachusetts Turnpike Authority. In fact, over the last recent months, the new administration has been forthcoming with details of the cost overruns and the cost to complete the project, something that previous MTA officials withheld from Federal officials. This provision is not to prejudice the current administration of the MTA but rather to ensure that the Federal Highway Administration and the Secretary of Transportation fulfill their fiduciary responsibilities to the American taxpayer.

This conference agreement is a good bill, it is balanced, and it is a bill which will clearly, whether it be on the rollover, whether it be on the .08, whether it be on the trucks and the others and the Coast Guard will save lives. Seldom do we get an opportunity to vote for something that we clearly know will save so many lives. It deserves, hopefully, the body's support. It is my understanding the administration has no serious objections to the bill and will sign it.

Before I close, I would like to thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), the ranking member, and the other members of the subcommittee for the bipartisan spirit which they have shown in helping us to reach an agreement on these issues. This has never been a partisan bill, and I am pleased that this tradition continues. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) have been most gracious and willing to reach compromises needed to move this bill forward to the President.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), our full committee chairman who has done such an outstanding job, has always ensured that this subcommittee's allocation is ample to accommodate the needs of this subcommittee. With that spirit, I think we have a good bill.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to also take a moment to express my deepest

appreciation for the fine work done by the professional staff on the transportation appropriations subcommittee, including John Blazey, Stephanie Gupta, Rich Efford, Linda Muir, Cheryl Smith and the detailee from the Department of Transportation, Chris Porter.

These professionals have been instrumental in bringing together this important bill. They epitomize, and I speak really for staff people on all the committees, the countless committee staffers who work long hours on Capitol Hill with little or many times no recognition. Now, thanks to their efforts, we are sending a bill to the President that will improve the lives of all Americans by helping to ensure that they not only can go where they want to go but can get there safely.

Stephanie Gupta worked tirelessly to include the .08 standard which will make certain that our sons and daughters and moms and dads can return home safely at night. Her perseverance on this issue, in the face of incredible odds, was crucial in the inclusion of .08. Again, 500 lives.

Additionally, Rich Efford diligently worked to guarantee that the FAA was giving adequate attention to the problem of runway incursions and other safety issues that are so important to Members on both sides of this issue. Rich sacrificed time with his own family for the purpose of making sure that air travel is safer for all of our families.

And Linda Muir is the glue that holds it all together in the subcommittee office. Her organizational skills and good humor have made all of our jobs a lot easier.

Cheryl Smith, from the minority side, is a true professional whose knowledge and experience were valuable assets to the committee's work.

I also want to thank Geoff Gleason from my staff for the committee who for 2 decades, first working with Mr. Solomon and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY) and now in my office has been invaluable in our work with our colleagues in bringing this legislation up.

Finally, I would like to thank the staff director, John Blazey, who oversaw the hundreds, and I would say thousands of projects in this bill and is one of the finest professionals on Capitol Hill. I was a staffer on Capitol Hill for a number of years before I had the opportunity to serve and watching John, I can tell you, he is a tribute to the staff that does such a good job on both sides of the aisle. Through his guidance and leadership, we have brought forth an excellent bill which tackles many of the concerns at the heart of transportation in America.

□ 1030

John Blazey knows more about these issues perhaps than anyone else certainly in the Congress, and maybe in the country. I know he will be an asset to the new Bush Administration when they take over in January of next year.

As this will be my last year as chairman of this transportation appropriations bill, I want to extend my heartfelt thanks to the staff, to the Members on both sides, to the leadership and to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) for helping.

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

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, 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. Speaker, let me first share the kind words of the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF for our staff, all the staff he mentioned, along with Marjorie Duske of my staff. They do outstanding work. This is a big and complicated bill to put together, and they do an outstanding job. We owe them our heartfelt thanks for the hours and hours of work they put in producing this bill. They are competent, they are professional, they are fair, and my thanks go to all the staff that works on this bill.

As the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) indicated, this is his last year chairing the Subcommittee on Transportation. I have had the opportunity over the last 4 years to serve as the ranking member on this subcommittee and as a member for the entire 6 years that the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) has chaired the subcommittee. The gentleman has done an outstanding job. He is professional, he is tough, he is fair, and he knows what he is doing, and he works hard. I expect on many issues we come from differing points on view, on many issues that come before this Congress, but in terms of working on this subcommittee, I have always found the gentleman to be totally open, to be fair in dealing with the members of the minority. His commitment to the transportation system in this country, in particular to safety issues, the transportation system is better because of his efforts; but in particular I have to say that his constant attention to safety issues has been simply outstanding.

I would say to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), this House and the whole country owes the gentleman a big thank you for 6 years of an outstanding job.

On the bill itself, it is a good bill. I intend to vote for it. I am not going to go through the same detail the Chairman did. Everything the gentleman said is accurate. It is a bill that will make substantial improvement to the transportation systems of this country.

I agree with most everything in the bill, but let me just briefly mention one issue where the Chair and I disagree. He is on the winning side; I am on the losing side. But in the context of our Federal system in this country, there are certain things that the Federal Government has responsibilities for; there are other things that State government has responsibility. Clearly one area where the States have pre-

eminence is creating and enforcing the traffic laws of our country.

One of the most difficult issues for States to deal with is to establish the framework for dealing with drunk drivers. That involves their responsibility not only for creating law, but creating a court system to deal with it, creating the enforcement mechanisms, creating and spending the money for penalties and creating and spending the money for treatment.

There are many components that go into a State having a rational and strong drunk driving law. In my judgment, it is a serious mistake for the Federal Government to move in on one component of a complex and difficult problem and say to the States, you do what we think is right, or we will take your highway money away, or a portion of your highway money away.

It is the type of thing we do too frequently in this institution, not with careful thought, but simply because somebody at some point thinks it is a good idea. We add it as a rider to a bill, and the States have to comply.

It may or may not be the right thing to do. It may vary from State to State. What I am certain of, however, is that setting the blood alcohol content level is only one small part of establishing a comprehensive drunk driving policy for a State; and for us to insert our judgment on simply this one issue, and leaving the States with all the complexity of other things to deal with, to me represents the arrogance at times that we carry in the Federal Government as it relates to State and local government in this country. So I strongly oppose what we are doing on this particular provision.

Nonetheless, I intend to vote for the total bill, because, overall, it is a very good bill for transportation and safety in this country.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service and General Government.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss those provisions of this conference agreement which come under the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service and General Government. These provisions are ones that we hope will allow the conference report, which has been over in the Senate and, unfortunately, has not been successful in passage, to allow that to be brought up again and finally passed. We believe that these represent the final compromises and agreements on the Treasury-Postal legislation, and those changes are incorporated into this bill.

The provisions include more funding for the IRS, and they are items that the administration has indicated that

they need to have in order to fully support the fiscal year 2001 conference report that we passed on September 14.

The conference report includes an additional \$348 million for the programs of the Department of Treasury, the Executive Office of the President, the National Archives, and the General Services Administration. When combined with the amounts that are in H.R. 4985, the fiscal year 2001 conference agreement, it provides \$15.9 billion for agencies under the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service and General Government. That is an increase of \$2.3 billion from fiscal year 2000, or 16.4 percent.

Included in the amount under consideration in the conference report pending before us now are these, among others: \$37.2 million for Treasury-wide efforts to combat terrorism, that is an increase; an increase of \$215 million for the IRS, including \$71.8 million for ongoing efforts related to information systems modernization, \$141 million to support ongoing reform efforts, including staff for customer service and audits, and \$3.1 million for money laundering; an additional \$16.6 million for the Customs Service, to enhance both infrastructure and staffing along the northern border, specifically to counter terrorist threats in that area; an additional \$30 million to establish and operate a metropolitan area law enforcement training center for the Department of Treasury, the U.S. Capitol Police, the Washington, D.C. Metropolitan Police Department and other Federal agencies; \$5 million for the enhanced operation of the Office of National Drug Control's Technology Transfer Program; and \$2.5 million as a transfer to the Elections Commission of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico for objective nonpartisan citizens education for choice by voters on the island's future status.

Let me just say a few words about this latter item, because it proved to be one of the more contentious ones. It is money that is provided for the Puerto Rico referendum on statehood or independence. After many long hours of numerous variations on a theme, we were able to secure a compromise with the administration on the use of these funds.

The funds are provided with the following conditions: they are not available until March 31, 2001; the funds may not be used by the Elections Commission until 45 days after the commission submits to the Committees on Appropriations an expenditure plan developed jointly by the Popular Democratic Party, the New Progressive Party, and the Puerto Rico Independence Party; and the expenditure plan must be approved by the Committees on Appropriations prior to any funds being spent.

I want to pay special tribute to my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER). This has been a difficult bill, to negotiate the final agreements. He and his staff have worked

extremely hard with us, and I believe what we have achieved is good legislation.

I want to thank the staff of my subcommittee, led by the clerk, Michelle Mrdeza, Jeff Ashford, Kurt Dodd, Tammy Hughes, our detailee, Doug Burke, Kevin Messner from any own staff, and, of course, on the other side, Pat Schlueter and Scott Nance, who have played key roles in getting this legislation to where we are today.

I believe we have legislation that can be supported, and I hope that Members will support it.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), ranking member of the full Committee on Appropriations and a member of the Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service and General Government.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to vote for this bill. I think in many ways it is a good bill. This subcommittee is run by a very classy guy. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) has been a very good chairman for this subcommittee, and I think everybody in this institution knows it. And the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) is one of the classiest people who has ever been in this institution, and he has done a fine job as well. But I am going to vote against it, and I want to explain why.

I do not need any lectures from anybody about the dangers of drunk driving. When I was in junior high school, I was knocked off my bicycle by a truck driver who had spent 4 hours in a tavern rather than doing what he was supposed to be doing that day. My grandfather was killed in an accident involving drunk driving. So I have had experience with drunk drivers.

But I have also had experience with seeing people killed or maimed because of bad highways. I used to live on a two-lane highway, Highway 29, in Marathon County, Wisconsin. A car was demolished simply pulling into our driveway because it was a badly engineered road. If that highway had been modernized, those people would not have been mangled. The problem with this bill is that it sacrifices highway safety in one area because of concern in another area, and I think that is wrong.

Now, I do not know what the proper blood alcohol level ought to be, but I do know that if the Federal Government is going to penalize States by taking away highway money that they need to modernize dangerous roads, that then States ought to be judged on the whole array of their laws involving drunk driving, and not just one piece.

I want to give some examples. This proposal originated with a Senator from New Jersey. I want to compare my State's record to New Jersey's.

Virginia has often been cited as a reason why we should lower the blood alcohol level. But I want to point out, Wisconsin, my State, has a prohibition on open containers containing alcohol in motor vehicles; Virginia does not.

On blood alcohol testing, Wisconsin has mandatory testing of all drivers after an accident; New Jersey and Virginia do not.

Wisconsin requires mandatory early assessment of drunk drivers to determine alcohol dependency; and it requires treatment, if needed. Virginia and New Jersey do not have those requirements.

In Wisconsin, the Department of Motor Vehicles can revoke a license for drunk driving; in New Jersey, only a court can revoke a license for drunk driving, and that takes much longer.

In Wisconsin, if you compare the traffic fatality rate between 1975 and 1997, Wisconsin's has improved by 61 percent; New Jersey's has improved by only 45 percent.

Yet Wisconsin is being penalized. It is going to lose money because it does not have a .08 alcohol level, and New Jersey happens to have it.

The most significant reason that Wisconsin has been able to attack successfully drunk driving is because we have an initiative under which we have a broad-based county-by-county supervision program that oversees drunk drivers in all aspects of their lives.

□ 1045

And that has dramatically reduced recidivism. And according to the National Highway Safety Administration, which authorized a study of this, if you have a program like we have, you are 12 times less likely to engage in drunk driving than you are if you do not have that kind of a program.

Mr. Speaker, my objection is very simply this: All of us as human beings want to be judged on the basis of our entire conduct, not on the basis of any one little imperfection that someone happens to see. The same should be true of States. We should not take away precious highway aids from States who have done a far better job overall in dealing with the drunk driving issue, just because they happen to not meet somebody's standard of perfection on one narrow item, and that is why the National Governor's Association, The League of Cities, AAA, the Conference of State Legislatures and the International Association of Chiefs of Police all oppose this narrow approach to this problem.

I am going to vote against this in protest to the way Congress has looked only at one narrow issue, rather than the whole range of issues in determining what a State's level of highway aid ought to be. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) for yielding me the time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), chairman of the full committee.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation for yielding the time to me, and I want to compliment him for working through a difficult conference and producing what I think is a really fine bill.

It meets the needs of America. There are more needs that need to be met, but this bill goes right directly to the heart of some of the hot transportation problems, whether it is surface transportation or whether it is air transportation.

Are there negatives? Are there things you could look for to be against? Of course. In any bill that comes before this House, if my colleagues want to find something to be against, they can find something to be against. There are 435 of us here. I would suspect that there are a lot more than 3 or 4 ideas or positions on any issue.

But I want to specifically compliment the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), the ranking member of the subcommittee.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) mentioned our staff, John Blazey, Rich Efford, Stephanie Gupta and the other members of the staff. These people are professionals. They know what the needs are, and they do the best they can to give us advice so that we can utilize the money available to meet those needs.

I wanted to talk specifically for just a few minutes today about the United States Coast Guard. There are many who believe that the United States Coast Guard, because they are a uniform service, because they carry guns, because they enforce laws, because they go to war when America goes to war or to deployment, as they did in Kosovo or as they did in Bosnia, they are part of the national defense system and get funded through the Defense appropriations bill. That is not the case.

The United States Coast Guard is funded in this bill on transportation. I represent a county in Florida where we are very fortunate to have three Coast Guard stations in that county, Pinellas County, Florida. We have the major Coast Guard air station for the entire system.

We also have a major sea station, and we have a fast boat station for quick access to the Gulf of Mexico to take care of close in problems with people that are boating or fishing or whatever and need the service of the Coast Guard. But the Coast Guard is called upon to be deployed 365 days a year; and for years, the Coast Guard had to squeeze their budget, really squeeze to get by, to keep their operational activities going.

I would like to say to the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF), I thank him so much. In this bill, the gentleman has really met the needs of the United States Coast Guard. I believe that Commandant Loy, who is an outstanding leader, would say to the gentleman, as he has to me, and he probably has to the gentleman, that this bill really makes them feel comfortable.

If my colleagues want to not vote for this bill for any reason like they did not get a new bridge in their districts, or did not get some new highway

money, or did not get some aviation assets in this bill, think of the United States Coast Guard. They not only protect our coast and our harbors, but they risk their own lives in search and rescue missions, where they go into weather situations that other people are running from to save lives and to save property.

In the interdiction of drugs, the United States Coast Guard has an outstanding record. These are the drugs that are trying to be brought into the United States to seriously affect people of this great country, and the Coast Guard just does a great job of preventing this. As I said, they are deployed every day. They risk their lives every day.

And I say to the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) and to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), the ranking member and to the staff of this subcommittee, I just want to say as one Member who has a personal experience with the Coast Guard, my colleagues have done a good job for the United States Coast Guard.

I thank my colleagues for that. I appreciate that, and I will enthusiastically support this bill.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), who is the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service and General Government.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER) for yielding me the time, and I rise in support of this conference report and particularly to discuss the component of this conference report which deals with the Treasury Postal bill, of which I have the honor of being the ranking member and working with the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE).

As the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) indicated in his opening remarks, this has been a difficult bill and difficult for us to come to agreement between ourselves and with the administration, but I believe we have done so.

I believe we have done so in a very responsible fashion, which provides for an additional sum for the IRS, which is critical for the agency to meet the mandates of the Restructuring and Reform Act of 1998. I think there is agreement on that between the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) and myself in our subcommittee.

Without this funding, a successful completion of the 2001 filing season would quite possibly have been at risk. Customer service would have been reduced and audit coverage could have continued to decline. In addition, this legislation continues the modernization of the IRS by upgrading its computer systems and business practices.

All of that was critically important to do, and I am pleased that we are adding a sum sufficient to accomplish those objectives in this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, it also includes more than \$37 million in funding to counter terrorist threats along our northern border, enhances the Federal Government's joint terrorism task force, and to establish a new national terrorist asset tracking center, which was very important to the administration. They had asked for \$50 million. They did not get all \$50 million but they got about \$38 million, and that was a significant step forward in countering terrorism.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the conference for including sums, and this is the transportation conference, so that we might complete the reconstruction of the Wilson Bridge.

Mr. Speaker, I will vote for this conference report, both because the transportation side of it is good, and I think the Treasury Postal side is a very good step forward.

I want to join in the remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Transportation, with reference to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF). FRANK WOLF is a good friend of mine. He is a man of great character, intellect and deep integrity.

He is a fine Member of this body, and he has, as the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) indicated, led this committee for 6 years, in a very, very bipartisan and substantive way. And I join the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) in his complimentary remarks about the leadership of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), who is such an important Member of the Washington metropolitan delegation.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service and General Government, and thank, as he did, the staff: my own staff, Pat Schlueter and Scott Nance who worked very hard on this bill. I thank the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) for his words about them, and then Michelle Mrdeza who is our staff director. She does an extraordinary job trying to keep all the component parts of our bill together.

It has been a very difficult year for her, because, as all of my colleagues know, we have had some problems on the Senate side passing the bill. I also want to thank Jeff Ashford, Kurt Dodd, Doug Burke, and Tammy Hughes for their work on this bill.

As the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) said and as the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) said and as the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) said, we cannot do this work without very conscientiousness, very able, very hard-working staff; and although this has been a difficult process, they have stayed with it, and their effort was a critical component of our success.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, I will support the conference report, which includes the additions which I think will make the Treasury Postal bill a signable bill by the President.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for shepherding a very, very complex bill through a very complicated legislative process.

Most of all, I also want to thank the regional delegation for working together in a bipartisan manner, and the administration and my House leadership for the inclusion of the \$600 million for the Woodrow Wilson bridge. This is a major artery along the North-South expressway. It is in danger of falling into the Potomac River if a new bridge is not completed. This will complete the \$1.5 billion Federal obligation and just my thanks to all concerned.

Finally, to my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), I thank him for his leadership in the last 6 years of this subcommittee. It has meant a lot to this region. It has meant a lot to this country, and it has been just a pleasure to serve with the gentleman in this capacity and the value the gentleman has added to our region, I think is second to anything anybody has ever done. The gentleman has made a huge difference.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my friend from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) and say we see a lot of partisanship, but one of the positive things for me in this Congress is working with the Washington metropolitan delegation which is very bipartisan. It is almost half and half in terms of its makeup, and we work very well together. This was a great success for our region and for our country. I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) and certainly the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) and our four Senators who worked so hard on reaching this objective. I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) for yielding to me.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER). It has been a pleasure working with the gentleman, and I also thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) as well.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to vote for this legislation. I want, first, to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), our ranking member, and the majority and minority staff, John Blazey for the majority and Cheryl SMITH for the minority staff, for the work that they have done; and it is a very fine piece of work on what is a bipartisan bill.

Mr. Speaker, I want particularly to thank the chair and the ranking member and the majority and minority staff for working with me and the

other Members of the Massachusetts delegation to repair the necessary working relationship between the Federal Highway Administration and the Massachusetts Highway Administration, making certain that my State would continue to have or could depend upon a balanced construction program during the final years of the construction of what is the largest and most complex construction project in the history of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to pay tribute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), the chairman, who will move on to some other subcommittee or some other ranking chairmanship position in the next Congress. I want to commend him for what has been the hallmarks of his tenure as chairman which, in my mind, clearly has been both fairness and safety.

□ 1100

Throughout his years he has focused on the safety of the traveling public, whether it was rail, whether it was air travel, whether it was highway travel. In that, I want to commend him for his persistence in his advocacy of what I believe is a carefully and judiciously crafted phase-in of the .08 blood alcohol content requirement.

Remember, here, no one loses any dollars for at least 6 years. I do not in any way doubt that the blood alcohol content provision can be viewed as only one part of a comprehensive program in dealing with driving under the influence. But if adopted, if adhered to, if enforced, this provision can save 500 lives every year, and in so doing, save hundreds and probably thousands of families from the grief of loss that occurs when there is a senseless DUI accident. I commend the chairman for his persistence in his work on that.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), chairman of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, 2 decades ago I had the privilege of being first elected to serve here in the Congress, and one of the greatest members of that class in 1980 was the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), who, as has been pointed out by virtually everyone here, has served extraordinarily well as chairman over the past 6 years of this very important subcommittee.

I listen to my colleagues who are proud to represent this Washington, D.C. metropolitan area, and yet I have to say that the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) has also done an awful lot to help us deal with one of the most pressing problems that we have in my State, especially in the southern part of the State which I am privileged to represent, and that is transportation.

The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER) just mentioned the focus

on safety, and that, obviously, is a high priority. I want to praise the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for focusing on air traffic safety, which is obviously a very important issue, near and dear to virtually all of us who live outside of the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area who travel by air regularly.

Of course, for those of us who suffered through the horrible delays this past summer, we want to bring about some kind of resolution to ensure that that kind of thing does not, as many have predicted, get worse.

Let me talk briefly about just four specific Southern California priorities that we have.

First and foremost, for years we have worked together to deal with the challenges that have confronted the Metropolitan Transit Authority in Los Angeles. Dealing with the construction there has been difficult, but the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) has regularly been understanding of the very important needs that we have faced there, and the fact that in Southern California, Los Angeles was the largest city on the face of the Earth without a mass transit system. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) has helped us as we have moved ahead to try and address that need.

Specifically, in the area that I represent, there are three particular priorities that we have. That is, number one, when we look at the fact that we live in a global economy, international trade is very, very important for our survival. The ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles are going to be providing an opportunity to expand trade in both directions, to the Pacific Rim and other parts of the world.

A project known as the Alameda Corridor was established to make sure that goods could get to and from the ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles in the Los Angeles area to downtown.

One of the things that we had to realize, though, and it did not come to our attention until a few years ago, is that once things got to downtown Los Angeles, they had to get to the rest of the Nation. So we established a priority known as the Alameda Corridor East so on the east side of Los Angeles, going to the rest of the country, we could deal with grade separations and other problems that existed there that would jeopardize the ability of goods to move in both directions. So there is very important funding here for the Alameda Corridor East, which is important.

The other priority we have in our area, which is a very, very important one and with a great partnership, as the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) knows between the local communities, the private sector, and the Federal Government, has been something known as Foothill Transit. It has had wonderful success.

Again, I believe, as I have testified before, the subcommittee of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) should be a model for the rest of the

country of how we can see disparate levels of government come together, along with the private sector, to proceed with meeting this very, very important need.

Then there is one little item, we in Southern California you may recall suffered fires and ensuing rains which caused mudslides. We have a very important road known as Chantry Flats, which has been wiped out because of those storms. I am very appreciative of the fact that we are going to be able to have the resources in to make sure that we construct that and get it back on track.

So let me just say that along with the priorities that have been outlined by so many, the Coast Guard, which the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) talked about, very important to California, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) is part of that important Maryland, Virginia, and metropolitan Washington D.C. area.

His interest in dealing with national concerns, even those 3,000 miles away, has not gone unnoticed; and I greatly appreciate the time and effort he has put in to addressing our needs.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the ranking member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the authorizing committee.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I join gladly in the praise of the retiring chairman, retiring from the chairmanship, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), for his steadfast advocacy for safety in transportation, which has been very effective and has indeed made our Nation's transportation systems safer.

This may indeed be a good bill, but the manager's report does not measure up to that standard. It includes a listing of 162 airport projects which the managers would like to see funded out of FAA discretionary funds.

In the past, to be sure, there have been listings of projects for specific airports, but without specific dollar amounts and with less prescriptive language, and far fewer projects, only a handful compared to the 162 listed in this manager's report, or in excess of \$300 million.

I know that gold rush did not start in this body, it started with the other body. I would like to clarify the legal situation on these projects.

The law governing aviation discretionary funds requires the FAA to establish, and they have established for decades, a priority system to decide which projects will get these very limited funds. The highest priority goes to projects that will bring airports into compliance with safety standards. Next are projects that allow the airport to accommodate large aircraft. The next is standards, standards that continue with other forms of development in aviation.

Many of the projects listed in this manager's report, I concede, are of sufficient quality in and of themselves, as we have analyzed them, to qualify for funding under these established FAA standards in the regular order. But what I want to point out is that aviation is not like highways. An improvement to a highway project in Boston does not necessarily benefit California, but in the national system of integrated airports, an improvement in one airport, a major hub airport, means potentially a vast improvement for all of aviation.

The FAA should have and does have discretion to fund improvements to increase capacity, to improve safety, to reduce bottlenecks. If next year we have the same kind of delays and problems in aviation that we have had this year and last year, travelers might not feel so comfortable traveling in an aviation system designed by Congress.

I want to make it clear that the language in a report cannot override a priority system established under the governing law. I would like to quote from the decision of the Comptroller General that was found in a report expressing congressional preference.

The Comptroller General found that Congress cannot require the Navy to select a particular aircraft the language in the committee report wanted the Navy to require and to abandon normal procurement procedures.

The Comptroller General wrote: "It is our view that when Congress merely appropriates lump sum amounts without statutorily restricting what can be done with those funds, a clear inference arises that it does not intend to impose legally binding restrictions, and indicia in committee reports and other legislative history as to how the funds should be or are expected to be spent do not establish any legal requirements on Federal agencies."

Accordingly, I believe it is incumbent on FAA to continue to use its priority system to award discretionary funds and assure that those funds will be directed to the greatest safety benefit and not to the specific, narrowly drawn, targeted little projects listed in this manager's report.

As chair of the Subcommittee on Aviation for many years, I steadfastly resisted designating projects in our authorizing bill and have continued, as ranking member of the full committee, to resist such designation. It should not be done in a manager's report of appropriations.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK).

(Ms. KILPATRICK asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), for all his hard work, I thank him very much. As a new member on the subcommittee, I do appreciate the gentleman's diligence, his sincerity, as well as his equal handling of us as we

worked together in a bipartisan way on this committee, and thanks to Mr. John Blazey and his staff for all the work they have done in working with us.

I want to take this opportunity to thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) for his style, grace, and hard work as he works together with all of us to make sure that our transportation needs are met on our side of the aisle; and to Cheryl Smith on the staff, as well.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the transportation bill that we have before us. It is a good bill, but it is not a perfect bill, as many things are not in the world that we live in today.

The bill is good, and I want to make a special point to thank the staff on both sides of the aisle for working with Michigan on our transit concerns. We do have a problem in Michigan, and it is a long problem. I hope as this Congress moves forward in the 107th Congress that we will address that problem.

Our State Department of Transportation must not work around the appropriations process, must not overlook the Members on both sides of the aisle, and must work with us as members of appropriations, both the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) and myself, who represent our State and our entire State delegation.

I thank the staff for their work with us to make sure that all the Members' concerns are addressed. I pledge that I will continue to do that with the Members, and will hope our State Department of Transportation will do the same, and not try to usurp our appropriations authority.

I want to speak briefly on the .08 blood alcohol level. I think it is wonderful and it will save at least 500 lives, as has been mentioned, but we can do more, and not just on this issue, by having further, stronger laws that will save more American lives. The .08 by itself, it will save some, but I think we can do better. We can enforce open container laws. We can have administrators revoking licenses and not waiting for a judicial decision. We can also have mandatory blood testing after accidents to encourage people not to drink. I think all of that must work together if in fact we are going to really address drunk driving in our country. It is a problem. This may be a first step, but we need to do more.

The chairman, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) our ranking member, I thank them for their time, for their insistence that we bring a bill that provides safety for our American citizens and also addresses the nation's highway needs.

Transit in America is still important. Many people in America do not drive cars, so our highways have to be safe, our transit systems have to be adequate, and we have to continue to work together.

I rise in support of the conference report. The process is a little less than

what is desired, but I am happy that we have reached this point. I urge my colleagues to vote for the transportation conference report.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER).

(Ms. GRANGER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

□ 1115

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the fiscal year 2001 Transportation appropriations conference report. Not only does this legislation continue our critical investment in our Nation's infrastructure, it also appropriates \$5 billion to pay down the national debt.

This legislation is consistent with the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century. It provides an increase of almost 7 percent in Federal aid highway spending. Outlays, mostly needed for transportation infrastructure, are up 13.3 percent.

The conference agreement also includes \$720 million for emergency relief for highways to cover the cost of highway repairs resulting from previous disasters. In short, this legislation addresses our Nation's transportation needs.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to serve on the Subcommittee on Transportation of the Committee on Appropriations, and I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) for the outstanding job that he has done as chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank John Blazey, Rich Efford, Stephanie Gupta, and Linda Muir for all their hard work and long hours. I feel fortunate to have the opportunity to work with such an outstanding staff and committee.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Northern Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), my friend and colleague and the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Transportation of the Committee on Appropriations, very much for yielding to me for his leadership on this bill, and I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation for his exemplary leadership.

This bill is balanced. It is fair. It is responsible. It maintains and in fact improves our Nation's entire transportation infrastructure. I urge that it be supported. It also makes our roadways safer by encouraging States to adopt stricter thresholds for drunk driving. It contains a matter of vital importance to the entire mid-Atlantic corridor and to interstate commerce.

As Members may be aware, this metropolitan Washington region suffers from the second worst traffic congestion in the entire country. No place is this problem more critical than at the

Woodrow Wilson Bridge. It was built 40 years ago. It is crumbling before our eyes. Ten lanes of traffic are having to converge into six lanes.

We are told that, if we do not get this bridge rebuilt within 5 to 6 years, we may have to divert 20,000 trucks from being able to cross the bridge. Not only would that be a nightmare scenario for the region, but it would be a severe handicap to this Nation's economy. So the \$600 million that is included in this bridge is critically important.

I would remind any Members that have questions about this, this is a federally owned bridge. It is a Federal responsibility. It will be turned over to the States as soon as it is reconstructed, as soon as we have a new bridge built. The States will pick up the financing from here on this. But this was necessary, and it was necessary now.

I am very appreciative, not only to all the Members of the subcommittee, its leadership, its staff, but also the Members of the regional delegation on the House and Senate side who worked together in a bipartisan constructive manner.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Transportation bill, and I wanted to congratulate both the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), the ranking member. I want to particularly thank the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) for his courageous leadership on the .08 issue. We have been fighting for this a very long time. Without his hard work, we would not be at this point today.

When I first introduced this legislation 3 years ago, I knew that it was going to be an uphill road to victory. I also knew that this was the right thing for the American people.

Quite simply, this is about saving lives. Five hundred to 600 lives will be saved in the United States each year when every State adopts the .08 standard. Tens of thousands of injuries will be avoided. These two statistics are too compelling to ignore.

What we are talking about is not putting our values on someone else. All we are saying is, if one is going to drink, just do not drive. This is the right standard. It is the right time.

We know that the relative risk of a fatality on the road is 11 times greater at BACs between .08 and .09.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) again for his courageous work on this important issue.

I rise today in strong support of the Transportation Appropriations bill. I am also pleased to announce that today, Congress is standing up in defense of safer roads. Congress is poised with this vote to make .08 the law of the land.

I want to thank Chairman WOLF for his courageous leadership on this issue. Without his hard work, we wouldn't be at this point today.

When I first introduced legislation on this issue three years ago, I knew that it was going to be an uphill road to victory. I also knew that this was the right thing for the American people.

Quite simply, this is about saving lives. 500–600 lives will be saved in the U.S. each year when every state adopts the .08 standard. And tens of thousands of injuries will be avoided. These statistics are too compelling to ignore. There are just too many accidents involving .08 drivers for us to stand by. This is the right standard and this is the right time.

We know that the relative risk of a fatality on the road is eleven times greater at BACs between .05 and .09 than with no alcohol in your blood. And the Administration and the Department of Transportation released two reports last month showing that .08 works for states that have already adopted it. In fact, Illinois alone, which adopted .08 in 1997, has seen a 13.7% decline in the number of drunk drivers involved in fatal crashes.

We have fought so hard for this standard over the cries of the restaurant and liquor lobbies. They say that ordinary people who have a glass of wine with dinner will be pulled over and charged with drunk driving. That's simply not true. It takes four drinks in one hour on an empty stomach to get a 170 pound man to .08. No dinner, just drinks. It takes four of them. That's a far cry from a glass of wine with dinner.

We knew this then and we know it now. Drinking and driving do not mix.

Again, I just want to express my great pleasure to announce this important victory today. I urge my colleagues to support this conference report.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), ranking member, for the work they have done on a bill that has very many good things, whether it be the Coast Guard, the .08 blood alcohol level, highway safety and construction, and mass transit.

But I do have two problems with this bill. The first is this bill is indicative of the fact that the budget process in this Congress has become a fallacy. This bill is over the House mark, it is over the Senate mark, and it is over the administration's mark. It is leading us down the path to where we have eroded or evaded the Budget Act and even the Unified Budget Act of 1968. So I think that is a problem in this bill.

Second of all, I have to say this bill includes language which prohibits the Houston Metro from using its share of Federal funds for a light rail project. The Houston Metro is the only agency in the country that has that prohibition. It seems to me this is a case of

Washington knows best, telling the City of Houston and its areas what it is going to do.

They are going to build the rail project anyway with their own money. But Houston will be the only city that is not allowed to use Federal funds. I think this is a mistake, and I think it is a problem in this bill. I would hope in the future we can correct it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) has 1½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership and his excellent efforts with the issue of .08. I think that we will save lives, and I appreciate having the opportunity to vote on this legislation that includes this instructive and positive legislative initiative.

Let me thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), the ranking member, as well for his kindness; and I say that to him on behalf of the constituents of the 18th Congressional District. We appreciate the gentleman's balance and also his interest in our issues, and that of all of our colleagues.

This bill has some very good elements: The ATP program in Houston for \$2.5 million and a connectivity program for \$750,000 that is very important to the residents of the third ward.

The pipeline safety allocation is very important to me, and the transit programs are likewise. I am delighted that we saw fit to ensure that more people in this Nation have rail. I might cite for my colleagues, Atlanta, Baltimore, Canton, Akron, Cleveland, Florida, and a variety of other places.

So my concern is, Mr. Speaker, that here we are in Washington dictating to the citizens of Houston that they cannot have light rail. This is the mayor of the city of Houston, the county judge, the partnership, residents and others who have expressed their desire for light rail.

I would simply say that I applaud this bill. I will support this bill. But I look forward to the needs of the people of Houston being addressed in the next session so that we can move forward on our light rail project.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY).

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), the ranking member, for doing an excellent job with this bill. I am going to vote for this bill.

I have served on this subcommittee every year that I have been on the Committee on Appropriations and have dealt with transportation problems in many different cities as well as transportation issues for the City of Houston and the metroplex around Houston. Up until now, we have had excellent opportunity to work with Houston.

Unfortunately, we have a new mass transit system that has decided to break what I thought was a model for the Nation of different transportation entities working together and sometimes overlapping and being concerned about mobility in Houston. We now have a metro system that has decided that they are going to build a megamulti-billion dollar rail system without the input of the people of Houston, without the people of Houston even gathering the information that would deal with this.

It is the age-old bureaucratic strategy of let us build a little bitty short system, and then when it does not work, we can force the people into building a bigger system.

Now, I have very serious concerns about that. I especially have concerns that, when we have a full-funding agreement on the mass transit monies going to Houston, that they want to come in and undermine that full funding agreement by taking some of that money and putting it into a rail system that has not been designed or considered by everybody in the Houston metroplex.

Therefore, I told the Houston Metro System that, when they get their act together, when they look at congestion studies, when they look at the regional mobility plan, then we can talk about a rail system as part of that overall regional mobility plan.

I have one other issue. I am for .08. Texas has .08. But I have very strong concerns about the Federal Government blackmailing States into doing something that maybe the States have a different idea in how to solve the problem.

But I am going to support this bill, and I urge my colleagues to do so also.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, let me quickly say with great respect to the gentleman from Houston, Texas (Mr. DELAY), that the City of Houston, the County of Harris has a regional mobility plan. In fact, County Judge Echols has sent this multipage document to all Members of Congress. In addition, the Houston Partnership right now is involved in a regional plan, an additional plan.

I know that the Congress needs to move forward on this bill, and we cannot debate local issues. But I hope the Congress realizes this is not a local issue. This is a question of equality and parity when all of the other areas of the Nation are able to get dollars for

light rail. I think, if the community wants light rail and meets the requirement, then this Congress should give them consideration. I look forward in the future Congresses and elsewhere to provide that for my community.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me just comment a little bit on the situation of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY). Nobody has been a stronger advocate in my times on the committee for mass transit in Houston than the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY). He had the subcommittee go down there years ago to look at it, and I understand what he is trying to do. The same thing has happened in other parts of the country. People want to immediately move to rail.

In my area, we eventually would like to have rail going out to Dulles Airport. I support that. But our intermediate step is the rapid bus transit which will be for one-tenth of the cost. In some respects, that is really modeled after what has been taking place in Houston. So what the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) is saying is one moves to that and then afterward. So I think he has been a very strong advocate for the entire time.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. I echo the comments of the regional delegation who worked together. The Woodrow Wilson Bridge, it is the whole north-south corridor which, if it ever collapsed or prohibited the use of trucks, it would just devastate the economy of the Northeast.

The Coast Guard, as the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) said, the necessary increase, particularly for the men and women who serve and are risking their lives; the increase for drug interdiction, the increase for the FAA; the .08 which will save so many lives.

So in closing, I urge passage. Again, I want to thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO). I could not have had a better working relationship. God bless. Thank you.

I urge the passage of the bill.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant support of this conference report. I say reluctant because there is a provision in this bill which tramples state rights.

The conference agreement requires states to adopt a .08 blood alcohol law and provides highway sanctions beginning in fiscal year 2004. Reductions in highway funds of 2 percent per year would be phased in, not to exceed 8 percent, for those states that are in noncompliance. Now I strongly support measures to discourage drunk driving. But this provision disregards the right of states to regulate alcohol sales. Such a provision should not be included as a part of this conference report and it should have been rejected.

Unfortunately it was not. And as opposed as I am to this provision I am going to vote for this report. It provides much needed federal funds to increase the capacity and safety of our nation's transportation infrastructure. In total, the bill provides nearly \$17.8 billion in discretionary budget authority, an increase of

\$3.5 billion over the fiscal year 2000 enacted level. Outlays, mostly needed for transportation infrastructure, are up 13.3 percent compared to the fiscal year 2000 enacted level. The conference agreement provides \$12 billion for the Federal Aviation Administration—\$2.5 billion (25 percent) over the fiscal year 2000 enacted level and 7 percent more than the Administration's request. Funding for the airport improvement program is \$3.2 billion, an increase of \$1.25 billion—or 64 percent—over the fiscal year 2000 enacted level. It also includes \$5 billion is provided in the conference report to reduce the public debt.

Thus, despite my misgivings about the impact of this bill on state's rights. I will vote for this bill. However, I will continue to work with my colleagues to overturn this provision or to lessen its impact on state's rights.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to take this opportunity to congratulate all those responsible for bringing to the House Floor a transportation appropriations measure that will be of great benefit to this country. I know a lot of hard work went into the crafting of this conference report and I want everyone who contributed to it to know that they have my thanks.

Assuming this legislation is signed into law, as I surely hope it will be, Americans will benefit in a number of ways.

First, they will be able to travel more quickly and easily thanks to the multitude of highway, rail, airport and mass transit projects that are funded by this measure. With traffic congestion growing on our existing roads and at our airports, that is very important.

Second, they will know that the taxes they have paid to finance highway and airport improvements are being spent for those purposes. In this day and age, when cynicism about government is all too prevalent, it is equally important that money raised for a particular purpose be spent as intended.

And last but not least, they will have reason to believe that the foundation is being laid for a transportation network that will meet people's needs for decades to come. Given the increase in commuting times in many of our metropolitan areas, that is reassuring.

A good example of why people should derive reassurance from this legislation can be found in the transportation infrastructure investments it makes in the Chicago area. Not only does it provide funding for three METRA commuter rail projects in the region, including one in the district I am privileged to represent, but it also funds a pair of Chicago Transit Authority route rehabilitation projects. In addition, and this is very reassuring, the language and the explanation of the conference report pave the way for Full Funding Grant Agreements for all five of those projects, which greatly improves the prospects that they will be completed on schedule.

In addition, the conference report makes several investments in the development of several future-oriented intelligent transportation systems in the Chicagoland, including one for Lake County, Illinois, much of which I am privileged to represent. Also, it funds a study of the possibility of extending METRA's commuter rail service from Chicago all the way to Milwaukee, plus it provides money for bus routes and numerous other transportation improvements.

All of these things bode well for the residents of my district, the people of the Chicago

area and all of those who come to the Chicagoland on vacation or to conduct business. On their behalf, I would like to reiterate my thanks to all those responsible and to urge enactment of this legislation.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4475, the FY 2001 Transportation and Related Agencies Conference Report. This bill includes significant funding for projects that will ease traffic congestion in Northern Virginia which was the dubious distinction of the second worst traffic congestion in the nation. Most importantly, I would like to applaud the inclusion of \$600 million for the replacement of the Woodrow Wilson Bridge. This is money that is desperately needed to fund a vital East Coast Interstate link. Additionally, this bill contains important funding for other Northern Virginia projects including \$50 million for rail out the Dulles Corridor, \$3 million for bus funding in Prince William County, \$500,000 to complete the Fairfax County trail system, \$500,000 for the Fair Lakes League Shuttle, \$500,000 for Potomac River Jet ferry boat funding for ferry service from Prince William County to the Navy Yard and Washington Harbour, and \$5 million for 14th Street Bridge improvements.

Since I first came to Congress in 1995, finding the appropriate solution for replacing and paying for a new Woodrow Wilson Bridge has been one of my top priorities. We face a critical time frame to follow in replacing the old bridge structure in order to avoid regional and eastern seaboard gridlock. The replacement of this rapidly aging structure is urgent and desperately needed. The \$600 million we secured today brings the total federal commitment to \$1.5 billion. This will fulfill our obligation to this project.

For quite some time, the federal government and Virginia and Maryland have known that the bridge needed to be replaced, or truck traffic would have to be rerouted throughout the entire Washington Metropolitan area. However, there has been ongoing debate about the level of commitment the federal government needed to provide to the project. That is because the Woodrow Wilson Bridge is truly a unique circumstance. It is the only federally-owned bridge in the United States, it is the midpoint between Maine and Florida on Interstate 95, it is technically located in Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia, and it links the Capital Beltway at its southern crossing point between Maryland and Virginia. These factors have all combined to significantly shorten the life of the current bridge and create the dire circumstance that our region and the east coast faces.

As the midpoint between Maine and Florida in the Interstate system, it carries an unusually large amount of interstate commerce up and down the east coast. In 1993, it was estimated by the Bureau of Transportation Statistics that 1.3 percent of gross domestic product carried by truck crossed the Wilson Bridge. That is \$58 billion, a figure that I am certain has only increased in the past seven years. Four hundred and fifty miles is the average distance traveled by truck shipments once they have crossed the bridge. It is important to note the many cities that fall within that 450 mile travel shed: Boston, Baltimore, Philadelphia, Norfolk, New York City, Richmond, Raleigh, Newark, Savannah, Hartford, and Trenton. Forty-nine percent of heavy trucks, or 7,000 trucks crossing the bridge go beyond the immediate area.

That means that consumers up and down the east coast would face higher prices for products and services if truck traffic had to be rerouted and delivery of products was slowed.

As the southern crossing point for the Capital Beltway, it has carried more traffic and heavy trucks than it was designed to hold. When the bridge was opened in 1961, it was designed as a lightweight, flexible structure to serve a 4-lane beltway without heavy truck traffic. As early as 1969, the bridge began carrying more traffic than its designed capacity of 75,000 vehicles. In 1975, the decision was made that Interstate 95 should not be routed through Washington, D.C. as originally planned, and the bridge is now the default southern crossing for I-95. To accommodate that change, the beltway was widened to eight lanes but the structural limitations of the bridge meant that it could not be widened. While we may all now agree with the 1975 decision, it had serious implications for the life span of the Woodrow Wilson Bridge. In 1988, the bridge begins to carry 150,000 vehicles daily. This history doomed the original bridge structure to fail much earlier than anticipated and put us in the situation we face today.

In TEA-21, this Committee and the 105th Congress recognized the federal responsibility for the bridge and funded the construction of the bridge at \$900 million. As I have said, now we have come up with the additional \$600 million federal commitment to allow this project to go forward. Virginia and Maryland must now make their funding commitment available so this urgent project goes forward on time.

While the Wilson Bridge project will receive a large amount of federal funding, without this commitment for the Bridge, the entire Washington Metropolitan area could face potential gridlock. One of the nation's strongest regional economies and the seat of our federal government could face a grave threat should this bridge project not move forward in a timely manner. As we have seen in the past, a shutdown Wilson Bridge can shut down this region and our Nation's Capital.

I am also proud that we have been able to include an additional \$50 million for rail out the Dulles Corridor. This follows on the \$86 million I was able to secure in the TEA-21 legislation in the 105th Congress and the \$25 million we were able to secure in last year's transportation appropriations bill. This is a critically needed project that will serve the ongoing growth out the Dulles Corridor. Rail to Dulles will significantly ease congestion in the Tysons Corner region and through Reston and Herndon in my Congressional District.

I would also like to note the inclusion of three projects that will help ease congestion in the I-95 corridor and for my constituents in Prince William County. H.R. 4475 provides funding for necessary improvements on the 14th Street Bridge. These improvements will significantly relieve the bottleneck that occurs during the morning and evening rush hours. This bill includes \$3 million for bus funding for Prince William County to replace an aging fleet. Also, it includes \$500,000 for funding for ferry service from Prince William County to the Washington Navy Yard and Washington Harbour. These two items will provide alternatives to those who otherwise face long commutes through the Springfield Interchange replacement project.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, the Woodrow Wilson Bridge serves the people who serve our

government in all three branches of government. Gridlock in the Nation's Capital is one of the gravest threats facing the daily operation of our Republic. I would also like to thank my good friend, Mr. WOLF for his leadership on this important bill and his leadership chairing the Subcommittee on Transportation Appropriations. His commitment to providing the necessary transportation funding for this nation's vital projects is enabling all our communities address the tremendous growth we are undergoing nationwide and ensuring that our families are able to spend less time in traffic and more time at home.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss H.R. 4475, the fiscal year 2001 transportation appropriations bill.

I am pleased that the conference report honors the funding guarantees in TEA-21 and AIR-21, while still providing sufficient funds for other important transportation programs such as the Coast Guard and AMTRAK.

As you know, I have long believed that we could honor the principle of dedicating trust fund revenues to their intended purposes while still maintaining sufficient funding for other important transportation programs, and this bill proves it.

By fully funding TEA-21 and AIR-21, this bill will have far-reaching impacts on the quality of life in our communities, the nation's economy, and our competitiveness in the world marketplace.

The benefits of shortened travel times, increased productivity, and improved safety will affect every American and every business every day.

In particular, the resources provided by this bill are an important first step toward reducing the aviation gridlock that we began to experience last summer.

I am disappointed by the conferees' decision to include many legislative and unauthorized provisions that, had they been included in the House bill, would have violated the rules of the House.

I am particularly concerned by the provision that will penalize each state that does not adopt a legal blood alcohol content limit of .08 percent by reducing that state's federal highway funding.

Congress addressed the problem of drunk driving most recently 2 years ago in TEA-21.

In TEA-21, Congress provided a generous financial incentive to states that adopt .08 BAC laws, as well as incentives for a number of other anti-drunk driving approaches that have proven very effective in targeting the most egregious offenders.

TEA-21 conferees wanted to encourage states to adopt a .08 BAC law, but did not want to do so at the expense of other, more effective programs that the states were employing to reduce drunk driving accidents.

The Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, as the committee of jurisdiction over this provision, will look at the .08 funding sanction very carefully in the next Congress to determine whether or not it is appropriate and effective.

In addition, I am disappointed that the conference report alters the distribution of funds made available by the revenue aligned budget authority provision of TEA-21, which increases or decreases funding based on actual gas tax revenues deposited in the Highway Trust Fund.

In doing so, the conference report alters the distribution of contract authority from the High-

way Trust Fund that was painstakingly arrived at by the TEA-21 conferees.

I am also concerned about the unprecedented earmarking of airport improvement program funds in the report accompanying this bill.

The AIP discretionary funds earmarked by this report are funds that the FAA should be targeting to the highest priority safety, security and capacity enhancing projects.

FAA has its own internal priority system for deciding which airports should get the few discretionary dollars that are available.

This system puts the highest priority on projects that will enhance safety. That is entirely appropriate.

In issuing discretionary AIP grants, I would urge the FAA to stick to its priority system and not be swayed by earmarks in the joint explanatory statement accompanying this conference report, which after all, are not legally binding.

If, nevertheless, the FAA chooses to fund these earmarks, I urge the FAA to look, in the first instance, to the airport's entitlement funds to provide the money.

Finally, I am also disappointed that the conference report includes funding for transit new start projects that were neither authorized in TEA-21 nor cleared by the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Demand for new starts funding already far exceeds available resources. Funding unauthorized projects spreads limited resources too broadly, and will produce a lower return on federal investment.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this conference report and commend the Committee for its hard work.

I am especially pleased and delighted because this Conference Report includes funding for the New Jersey Community Development Center's "Transportation Opportunity Center," which is located in Paterson, New Jersey.

The Transportation Opportunity Center will demonstrate the vital role that transportation and the transportation industry plays in extending economic opportunity to low income individuals—particularly those moving from welfare to work.

The Center is in the heart of Paterson's historic district and will be used to educate low-income citizens about using existing public transportation to access suburban-based jobs.

It is through innovative programs like the Transportation Opportunity Center that we can continue to increase access to transportation for low-income citizens who are striving to participate in this prosperous economy.

These changes are good for our environment, good for our economy, and good for our quality of life.

I have said so many times—and I think you would all agree—that we do not invest in our transportation system merely to improve roads and bridges.

Transportation is not merely about getting from point A to point B. We invest in transportation to improve the very quality of life for our citizens.

That is what this project will do.

Again, I thank the Committee for its hard work, and I urge my colleagues to support this Conference Report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 344, nays 50, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 516]

YEAS—344

Abercrombie	Ehlers	Latham
Aderholt	Ehrlich	LaTourette
Allen	Emerson	Leach
Andrews	Engel	Lee
Armey	English	Levin
Baca	Etheridge	Lewis (CA)
Bachus	Evans	Lewis (KY)
Baird	Everett	Linder
Baldacci	Ewing	Lipinski
Barr	Farr	LoBiondo
Barrett (NE)	Fattah	Lofgren
Bartlett	Filner	Lowey
Bass	Fletcher	Lucas (KY)
Becerra	Foley	Lucas (OK)
Bereuter	Forbes	Luther
Berkley	Ford	Maloney (CT)
Berry	Fossella	Maloney (NY)
Biggert	Fowler	Manzullo
Bilbray	Frank (MA)	Markey
Bilirakis	Frelinghuysen	Martinez
Bishop	Frost	Mascara
Blagojevich	Galleghy	Matsui
Bliley	Ganske	McCarthy (MO)
Blunt	Gejdenson	McCarthy (NY)
Boehlert	Gekas	McCrery
Bonilla	Gephardt	McDermott
Bonior	Gibbons	McGovern
Bono	Gilchrest	McHugh
Borski	Gilman	McInnis
Boswell	Gonzalez	McIntyre
Boucher	Goode	McKeon
Boyd	Goodlatte	McKinney
Brady (PA)	Goodling	McNulty
Brown (FL)	Gordon	Meehan
Brown (OH)	Granger	Menendez
Burr	Greenwood	Mica
Burton	Gutierrez	Millender-
Buyer	Hall (OH)	McDonald
Callahan	Hall (TX)	Miller, Gary
Calvert	Hastings (FL)	Miller, George
Camp	Hastings (WA)	Minge
Canady	Hayes	Mink
Cannon	Hill (IN)	Moakley
Capps	Hill (MT)	Mollohan
Capuano	Hilleary	Moore
Cardin	Hilliard	Moran (KS)
Castle	Hinchey	Moran (VA)
Chambliss	Hinojosa	Morella
Chenoweth-Hage	Hobson	Murtha
Clayton	Hoeffel	Myrick
Clement	Holden	Nadler
Clyburn	Holt	Napolitano
Coble	Hooley	Neal
Collins	Horn	Nethercutt
Combest	Houghton	Ney
Condit	Hoyer	Northup
Conyers	Hulshof	Norwood
Cook	Hunter	Nussle
Cooksey	Hyde	Oberstar
Costello	Inlee	Olver
Coyne	Isakson	Ortiz
Cramer	Istook	Ose
Crane	Jackson (IL)	Owens
Crowley	Jackson-Lee	Packard
Cummings	(TX)	Pallone
Cunningham	Jefferson	Pascrell
Danner	Jenkins	Pastor
Davis (FL)	John	Payne
Davis (IL)	Johnson (CT)	Pease
Davis (VA)	Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi
Deal	Jones (OH)	Peterson (MN)
DeFazio	Kanjorski	Peterson (PA)
DeGette	Kaptur	Phelps
Delahunt	Kelly	Pickering
DeLauro	Kennedy	Pickett
DeLay	Kildee	Pombo
Deutsch	Kilpatrick	Pomeroy
Dickey	Kingston	Porter
Dingell	Knollenberg	Portman
Dixon	Kolbe	Price (NC)
Dooley	Kucinich	Pryce (OH)
Doolittle	Kuykendall	Quinn
Doyle	LaFalce	Radanovich
Dreier	LaHood	Rahall
Duncan	Lampson	Ramstad
Dunn	Lantos	Regula
Edwards	Larson	Reynolds

Riley	Skeen	Traficant
Rivers	Skelton	Turner
Rodriguez	Slaughter	Udall (CO)
Roemer	Smith (MI)	Udall (NM)
Rogan	Smith (NJ)	Upton
Rogers	Smith (WA)	Visclosky
Ros-Lehtinen	Snyder	Vitter
Rothman	Souder	Walden
Roukema	Spratt	Walsh
Roybal-Allard	Stabenow	Wamp
Rush	Stark	Watkins
Sabo	Stenholm	Watt (NC)
Sanchez	Stupak	Watts (OK)
Sanders	Sununu	Weiner
Sandlin	Sweeney	Weldon (FL)
Sawyer	Tancredo	Weller
Saxton	Tanner	Wexler
Scarborough	Tauscher	Weygand
Schakowsky	Tauzin	Whitfield
Scott	Taylor (NC)	Wicker
Serrano	Terry	Wilson
Shaw	Thomas	Wolf
Shays	Thompson (CA)	Woolsey
Sherman	Thompson (MS)	Wu
Sherwood	Thune	Wynn
Shimkus	Thurman	Young (AK)
Shows	Tiahrt	Young (FL)
Simpson	Tierney	
Sisisky	Towns	

NAYS—50

Archer	Green (TX)	Rohrabacher
Baldwin	Green (WI)	Royce
Barcia	Gutknecht	Ryan (WI)
Barrett (WI)	Hayworth	Ryun (KS)
Barton	Herger	Salmon
Bentsen	Hoekstra	Sanford
Boehner	Hostettler	Schaffer
Brady (TX)	Johnson, Sam	Sensenbrenner
Bryant	Jones (NC)	Sessions
Chabot	Kasich	Shadegg
Coburn	Kind (WI)	Stearns
Cox	Kleccka	Stump
Cubin	Largent	Taylor (MS)
DeMint	Obey	Thornberry
Doggett	Oxley	Toomey
Gillmor	Petri	Velazquez
Graham	Pitts	

NOT VOTING—39

Ackerman	Hansen	Paul
Baker	Hefley	Rangel
Ballenger	Hutchinson	Reyes
Berman	King (NY)	Shuster
Blumenauer	Klink	Smith (TX)
Campbell	Lazio	Spence
Carson	Lewis (GA)	Strickland
Clay	McCollum	Talent
Diaz-Balart	McIntosh	Vento
Dicks	Meek (FL)	Waters
Eshoo	Meeks (NY)	Waxman
Franks (NJ)	Metcalf	Weldon (PA)
Goss	Miller (FL)	Wise

□ 1150

Messrs. BENTSEN and HERGER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. LUTHER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 1509. An act to authorize the Disabled Veterans' LIFE Memorial Foundation to establish a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs to honor veterans who became disabled while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States.

H.R. 2496. An act to reauthorize the Junior Duck Stamp Conservation and Design Program Act of 1994.

H.R. 2641. An act to make technical corrections to title X of the Energy Policy Act of 1992.

H.R. 2778. An act to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the Taunton River in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for study for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2833. An act to establish the Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area.

H.R. 3201. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating the Carter G. Woodson Home in the District of Columbia as a National Historic Site, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3632. An act to revise the boundaries of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3676. An act to establish the Santa Rosa and San Jacinto Mountains National Monument in the State of California.

H.R. 3745. An act to authorize the addition of certain parcels to the Effigy Mounds National Monument, Iowa.

H.R. 3817. An act to dedicate the Big South Trail in the Comanche Peak Wilderness Area of Roosevelt National Forest in Colorado to the legacy of Jaryd Atadero.

H.R. 4063. An act to establish the Rosie the Riveter/World War II Home Front National Historical Park in the State of California, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4226. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell or exchange all or part of certain administrative sites and other land in the Black Hills National Forest and to use funds derived from the sale or exchange to acquire replacement sites and to acquire or construct administrative improvements in connection with the Black Hills National Forest.

H.R. 4275. An act to establish the Colorado Canyons National Conservation Area and the Black Ridge Canyons Wilderness, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4285. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain administrative sites for National Forest System lands in the State of Texas, to convey certain National Forest System land to the New Waverly Gulf Coast Trades Center, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4286. An act to provide for the establishment of the Cahaba River National Wildlife Refuge in Bibb County, Alabama.

H.R. 4435. An act to clarify certain boundaries on the map relating to Unit NC-01 of the Coastal Barrier Resources System.

H.R. 4444. An act to authorize extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to the People's Republic of China, and to establish a framework for relations between the United States and the People's Republic of China.

H.R. 4613. An act to amend the National Historic Preservation Act for purposes of establishing a national historic lighthouse preservation program.

H.R. 5036. An act to amend the Dayton Aviation Heritage preservation act of 1992 to clarify the areas included in the Dayton Aviation Heritage National Historical Park and to authorize appropriations for that park.

H. Con. Res. 89. Concurrent resolution recognizing the Hermann Monument and Hermann Heights Park in New Ulm, Minnesota, as a national symbol of the contributions of Americans of German heritage.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is

requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 34. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to make technical corrections to a map relating to the Coastal Barrier Resources System.

H.R. 209. An act to improve the ability of Federal agencies to license federally owned inventions.

H.R. 468. An act to establish the Saint Helena Island National Scenic Area.

H.R. 1695. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal public lands in the Ivanpah Valley, Nevada, to Clark County, Nevada, for the development of an airport facility, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1725. An act to provide for the conveyance by the Bureau of Land Management to Douglas County, Oregon, of a county park and certain adjacent land.

H.R. 2879. An act to provide for the placement at the Lincoln Memorial of a plaque commemorating the speech of Martin Luther King, Jr., known as the "I Have A Dream" speech.

H.R. 3292. An act to provide for the establishment of the Cat Island National Wildlife Refuge in West Feliciana Parish, Louisiana.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 707) "An Act to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to authorize a program for predisaster mitigation, to streamline the administration of disaster relief, to control the Federal costs of disaster assistance, and for other purposes," with amendment.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills and concurrent resolutions of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 134. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study whether the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore should be protected as a wilderness area.

S. 1367. An act to amend the Act which established the Saint-Gaudens National Historic Site, in the State of New Hampshire, by modifying the boundary and for other purposes.

S. 1670. An act to revise the boundary of Fort Matanzas National Monument, and for other purposes.

S. 1925. An act to promote environmental restoration around the Lake Tahoe basin.

S. 1972. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the town of Dolores, Colorado, the current site of the Joe Rowell Park.

S. 2069. An act to permit the conveyance of certain land in Powell, Wyoming.

S. 2111. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey for fair market value 1.06 acres of land in the San Bernardino National Forest, California, to KATY 101.3 FM, a California corporation.

S. 2273. An act to establish the Black Rock Desert-High Rock Canyon Emigrant Trails National Conservation Area, and for other purposes.

S. 2300. An act to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to increase the maximum acreage of Federal leases for coal that may be held by an entity in any 1 State.

S. 2331. An act to require the Secretary of the Interior to submit the dispute over the franchise fee owed by Fort Sumter Tours, Inc. to binding arbitration.

S. 2345. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study concerning the preservation and public