

me authority to take 3 minutes of leader time to respond, and I think just in fairness we ought to be permitted to do that.

Mr. CHAFEE. Well, if you want 3 minutes, go to it. But, please, no more than that because we are anxious. We did promise the Senator from New Mexico we would deal with three quick amendments by unanimous consent that we can dispose of very, very quickly, and then I do want to go to these votes. Senators have made an effort to be over here. Why do you not proceed for 3 minutes, then we'll do the Bingham amendments quickly, and then go to the vote—which should not be more than 5 minutes from now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from North Dakota.

THE CREDIBILITY OF THE PRESIDENT ON THE BUDGET

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, questions have been raised about the credibility of this President on the budget. If anybody in this town has credibility on the budget, it is this President. When he came to office, the deficit was \$290 billion, and under the plan that was passed in 1993, the deficit is now down, on a unified basis, to zero or very close to that. That has been a dramatic improvement and a dramatic record of deficit reduction by this President.

Now they raise questions about a new CBO score of the President's budget. The President did not have that available to him when he submitted his budget. He submitted his budget based on the Office of Management and Budget projections. By the way, both OMB and CBO have been overly conservative with respect to their projections. Neither of them have been close to right in projecting the dramatic decline in the deficit. The President used the numbers in his budget that were available to him at the time he submitted his budget, and his budget projections have proved to be far more accurate in terms of deficit reduction than some others.

So I just say with respect to credibility on the budget, this President has a demonstrated record. He has done the heavy lifting. He has gotten the results that have put this country in such a strong position.

Now we have a question of a difference of projections. Both of the projections of OMB and CBO have been off the mark. They have underestimated what a good job we have done in reducing the deficit. So when the President's credibility is called into question, I think in fairness we ought to say he based his budget on the projections that were available to him at the time he submitted his budget and he has a record and the record stands clearly as one that has produced the most dramatic deficit reduction we have ever seen.

I hope when we start talking about people's credibility, we do not do it in

a loose fashion on the floor of the Senate.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

INTERMODAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EFFICIENCY ACT OF 1997

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. CHAFEE. I thank the Senator from North Dakota. Now the Bingham amendments, if we could deal with those quickly?

AMENDMENTS NOS. 1699, 1700 AND 1701, EN BLOC, TO AMENDMENT NO. 1676

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I send three amendments to the desk and ask for their immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN), for himself and Mr. DOMENICI, proposes amendments numbered 1699, 1700 and 1701, en bloc, to amendment No. 1676.

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

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

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1699 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1676

(Purpose: To clarify that Federal laboratories are eligible to receive grants or to enter into contracts, cooperative agreements, or other transactions)

On page 310, strike lines 9 through 17, and insert the following:

"§ 5211. Transactional authority

"To further the objectives of this chapter, the Secretary may make grants to, and enter into contracts, cooperative agreements, and other transactions with—

- "(1) any person or any agency or instrumentality of the United States;
- "(2) any unit of State or local government;
- "(3) any educational institution;
- "(4) any Federal laboratory; and
- "(5) any other entity.

AMENDMENT NO. 1700 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1676

(Purpose: To clarify that information on transportation-related research and development activities at Federal laboratories shall be included in the general exchange of information being promoted by the Secretary of Transportation)

On page 312, strike line 20 and all that follows through page 313, line 2, and insert the following:

"(B) to promote the exchange of information on transportation-related research and development activities among the operating elements of the Department, other Federal departments and agencies, Federal laboratories, State and local governments, colleges and universities, industry, and other private and public sector organizations engaged in the activities;"

AMENDMENT NO. 1701 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1676

(Purpose: To clarify that innovative research performed by Federal laboratories shall be identified and applied to the intermodal and multimodal transportation research, development, and deployments needs of the Department and the transportation enterprise of the United States)

On page 317, strike lines 1 through 6, and insert the following:

"(2) identify and apply innovative research performed by the Federal Government, Federal laboratories, academia, and the private sector to the intermodal and multimodal transportation research, development, and deployment needs of the Department and the transportation enterprise of the United States;"

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I offer these on behalf of myself and Senator DOMENICI. They are very simple, conforming amendments to make it clear that the research activities that the Department of Transportation is engaged in are ones where they can call upon all of the scientific capability in our country, our Federal laboratories as well as our educational institutions, to get that research done. I do not think there is any opposition. I appreciate the chairman's allowing me to offer them at this time, and I urge Senators to support them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. CHAFEE. These amendments are acceptable on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. We have also reviewed the amendments and find them acceptable.

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

The amendments (Nos. 1699, 1700 and 1701) were agreed to en bloc.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1697

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the Dorgan amendment, amendment No. 1697.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the Dorgan amendment, amendment No. 1697. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MCCAIN (when his name was called). Present.

The result was announced, yeas 52, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 21 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Akaka	Faircloth	Moseley-Braun
Biden	Feinstein	Moynihan
Bingaman	Glenn	Murkowski
Boxer	Gorton	Murray
Bryan	Harkin	Reed
Bumpers	Hatch	Reid
Byrd	Hollings	Robb
Chafee	Inouye	Rockefeller
Cleland	Johnson	Sarbanes
Coats	Kennedy	Smith (OR)
Conrad	Kerrey	Specter
D'Amato	Kerry	Stevens
Daschle	Kohl	Torricelli
DeWine	Lautenberg	Warner
Dodd	Levin	Wellstone
Domenici	Lieberman	Wyden
Dorgan	Lugar	
Durbin	Mikulski	

NAYS—47

Abraham	Baucus	Breaux
Allard	Bennett	Brownback
Ashcroft	Bond	Burns

Campbell	Gregg	McConnell
Cochran	Hagel	Nickles
Collins	Helms	Roberts
Coverdell	Hutchinson	Roth
Craig	Hutchison	Santorum
Enzi	Inhofe	Sessions
Feingold	Jeffords	Shelby
Ford	Kempthorne	Smith (NH)
Frist	Kyl	Snowe
Graham	Landrieu	Thomas
Gramm	Leahy	Thompson
Grams	Lott	Thurmond
Grassley	Mack	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

McCain

The amendment (No. 1697) was agreed to.

Mr. CHAFEE. I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBERTS). The pending business before the Senate is the Bingham amendment, as modified.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1696, AS MODIFIED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment No. 1696, as modified. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. MCCAIN (when his name was called). Present.

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 56, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 22 Leg.]

YEAS—43

Akaka	Durbin	Mikulski
Biden	Feinstein	Moseley-Braun
Bingaman	Glenn	Moynihan
Boxer	Harkin	Murray
Bumpers	Hatch	Robb
Byrd	Hollings	Rockefeller
Cleland	Inouye	Sarbanes
Coats	Johnson	Smith (OR)
Conrad	Kennedy	Specter
D'Amato	Kerrey	Torricelli
Daschle	Kerry	Warner
DeWine	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Dodd	Levin	Wyden
Domenici	Lieberman	
Dorgan	Lugar	

NAYS—56

Abraham	Ford	Lott
Allard	Frist	Mack
Ashcroft	Gorton	McConnell
Baucus	Graham	Murkowski
Bennett	Gramm	Nickles
Bond	Grams	Reed
Breaux	Grassley	Reid
Brownback	Gregg	Roberts
Bryan	Hagel	Roth
Burns	Helms	Santorum
Campbell	Hutchinson	Sessions
Chafee	Hutchison	Shelby
Cochran	Inhofe	Smith (NH)
Collins	Jeffords	Snowe
Coverdell	Kempthorne	Stevens
Craig	Kohl	Thomas
Enzi	Kyl	Thompson
Faircloth	Landrieu	Thurmond
Feingold	Leahy	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

McCain

The amendment (No. 1696), as modified, was rejected.

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

Mr. STEVENS. I move to lay it on the table.

The motion to lay the amendment on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Rhode Island.

AMENDMENT NO. 1684 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1676

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 1684, which is the Chafee amendment, the financial amendment, be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and the amendment be considered as original text for the purpose of further amendment.

I want to stress that it will be part of the bill. It can be amended. People can bring up their amendments to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. STEVENS. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I just want to take a few minutes here, and I won't object in a few minutes to that request, but I think some consideration has to be given to some aspects of the highway and mass transportation problem. It has been very difficult for some of us to deal with. Neither my colleague nor I serve on any of the committees dealing with this subject. I do call attention to the fact that I will be chairing the committee that will deal with it later.

I am a little disturbed about what is happening in terms of small States—in particular, my State. I brought for Members to look at a comparison of my State and the whole United States and the delineation of the highways that exist in my State now. Those little gold dots are the villages and communities in my State that are not served by a highway or road yet. We have been a State now for 40 years and what do we find? If you look at the southeastern part, it looks like a panhandle on the right-hand side of this chart. That is the area of the marine highway system. We now are told we can't build any roads through the Forest Service land, and that is all Forest Service land down there except for a few communities and small areas of Native lands.

We are not considered a part of the mass transportation system although we haul about 2 million of your constituents per year through that area on our ferries. When we built those ferries 30 years ago, the price of them was a lot less than it is now. Today, the cheapest boats that you can buy of this type—they have to be ocean-going ferries—are built overseas, except we can't buy those because the Jones Act says we can't use foreign-built vessels from port to port in the United States. So, we can't use the land to build roads, we have to build our own ferries, and now we have to pay five times as much for those ferries than if we could buy them overseas. Now, it is mass transportation but this bill doesn't rec-

ognize ferries of this size as being any part of mass transportation.

I have some concerns that I have mentioned to my great friend from West Virginia about where the money is coming from when we do get to the process of financing that. I know he has some comments. I hope he won't get into that right now. We will work that out, I'm sure. But I want to point out to the Senate that we are going to have to work out a lot of things to finance this bill. This Senator wants to be a little happier with this bill. Right now I'm unhappy with the bill.

Take, for instance, the border money that is in this bill. We have analyzed that Border States Road Program. Our State at the present time has 1,538 miles of border with our neighbor, 20 percent of the total border of the United States, and we figure we are not even included in this. If you want to know why, it is because, for instance, money is made available for contract authority to grant States to improve international gateways, but, by definition, the gateways are groupings of border stations. Well, if you go along our border, you will find one border station; there is no grouping.

We have \$18 million in this amendment for States for multistate corridor analysis. Well, we don't share the border with any other State, so obviously we are not involved in that allocation of money either.

Then there is \$750 million authorized to be awarded by the Secretary, based upon commercial traffic volume, comparison of other traffic volume. Our State has a volume in just 4 months of the year. We can't compare with anyone for 12 months of the year in terms of traffic volume.

Mr. President, I don't have any objection to this; we are increasing the amount of money in a substantial way. As we do so, it seems that people are forgetting there are some places that don't have roads yet. In this bill, the whole philosophy here is, how do you improve existing roads or how do you really find a way to handle more traffic on the existing corridors that serve our country? I have no problem about that, but what is it going to do for a State like mine? Those roads that we need—we need to connect some of the villages to share schools, so we can share all of the services available from the State, local, and Federal Government. We are told now we can't go through parks, wildlife refuges, and other lands that are owned by the Federal Government. So in order to build them, we have to build longer roads to connect them.

I argued last year about RS 2477, and we lost that battle. We cannot use the original rights-of-way. Along the Kuskokwim and Yukon, in order to build the roads, instead of using the rights-of-way that traditionally have been used the last 100 years, we have to go far inland and build the roads back and then come back to the river again. You can't follow the traditional roads because RS 2477 rights-of-way are no

longer valid. Do we have any recognition for the increased costs of building roads where Federal policy prohibits us from using Federal lands in Alaska that would be available in any other State, particularly any other Western State? No, we don't have any.

We do believe we have to have some analysis on a national basis. Other States use ferries. I went over with my good friend from Hawaii, Senator INOUE, and traveled on one of their brand-new ferries. It was a wonderful experience. I urge every Member of the Senate to do it. They have some ferries that are based on a new concept of suspension, and we were traveling 35 knots in a 6- to 7-foot sea. That is really very good. But those increased island ferries won't do any good for us. We have to comply with the Federal and international laws concerning safety of life at sea. We have to build enormous vessels in order to cross the Gulf of Alaska.

Now, again, the concept of ferries and of the marine highway system, of recognizing that my State is not going to build roads across land, it will use ferries and it will use the marine highway system for our connections, has to be thought about in terms of this bill. So far, I've not been able to get that consideration. I want to see what we can do about dealing with that.

The marine highway system, by the way, several Congresses ago—and I think my good friend from West Virginia will remember this—we made it part of the National Highway System. We thought that was a great advantage. But the money is in the interstate highway system and in the mass transportation system in this bill. So that is not going to do us much good for our marine highway system. That is not where the money is being increased.

I also call the attention to the Senate of the fact that some of these ferry laws—there is a provision of existing law that deals with the requirements for crew, the requirements for other things that apply to the offshore States—in Alaska and Hawaii are burdensome and increase the cost of ferries. I have talked to the Senator from New York about trying to get some understanding of that.

We also have a problem about the Indian reservation roads, the parkway and park roads, the National Wildlife System roads. All of those are covered by this bill. However, we have 70 percent of the parklands, we have 60 percent of the wildlife refuge lands, we have 50 percent of the Federal lands, and we are getting 4 percent of the money that is involved in those. Do you know why? We are prohibited from building roads through those systems, so we have to build roads around the systems, but we don't get any consideration of that cost as we try to face the cost of building a highway system.

I remember sitting in the gallery once right after we became a State, and one of my predecessors, Senator

Gruening, was here on the floor speaking about roads in Alaska. That was 1959. I have to tell the Members of the Senate, the map he used was this map. We have not been able to build roads in Alaska because of the obstinate position—this is not partisan, it is not this administration—of the Federal Government. We have not been able to get access to build roads to connect our villages, our communities. We have depended until this time on air transportation to even ship bricks and hay.

Now the Postal Service, very wisely, is saying, "Look, the ratepayers pay the subsidy for Alaska transportation and we are not going to do it anymore." Think of that now. Here is another county, as my grandmother used to say; we are hearing from someone else and they are saying, we are not going to continue to subsidize the transportation of goods in Alaska. We should do the same thing, they say, as everyone else—ship it by road. I remember one of them suggested we ought to be able to ship it somehow by Kodiak, by road. It would be an awful long bridge. Anyone that wants to, I would like them to ride that ferry. We call it the Dramamine Express.

When you talk about my State and the way we function under this bill, it's unfortunate. Maybe we should shift our committee assignments just before the highway bill passes so we can be heard in committees. I am becoming aware of the fact that every 5 years I come here to the floor and I complain. This year, I am going to do more than complain. This year, I am going to make some promises. I am not going to insist on carrying out the functions of this bill unless it becomes fairer.

I understand that donor States want back 91 cents out of every dollar their people pay into the road system. We wish we had more roads so we can pay more into the system. We can't increase that payment into the system until we can build some of these roads. Currently, we are using air-cushioned vehicles in some parts of Alaska to deliver mail. Good idea, right? We are getting no assistance whatsoever in any way to prepare the rights of way for air-cushioned vehicles. It would be a lot cheaper than running trucks over that land and cause a lot less environmental damage than running trucks over the land. But guess what. Rights of way for clearance for air-cushioned vehicles is not covered by this bill.

Now, Mr. President, it is not easy for us to come and really represent a State that is so far away. That is why I have developed such a fondness for my friends from Hawaii, because they go almost as far to get home as my colleague Senator MURKOWSKI and I do. What you don't realize is that, after we get home, we travel farther in our State to get from community to community than many of you travel to get home. We want to have some ability to come into the next century with a basic highway system that will at least meet the needs of some of the rural

areas in terms of massing them together, connecting them together, so they can get the advantage of scale in dealing with their problems. That is particularly true of our problem now with regard to schools and villages and communities that are isolated through that vast area we call "the bush."

I could go on a little longer. We are going to go ahead with this bill, and I hope some Members who are working on it will think a little bit about what we are doing. As I said, we have the longest international border in the whole Nation. Under the trade corridor and border-crossing program, we qualify for little or none of the \$775 million that deals with border-crossing problems. At least we should be able to deal with these increases. Again, the donor States problem—we have faced that problem. My good friend from West Virginia, Senator BYRD, has worked out a way of dealing with that in terms of increasing money so that there isn't any damage to the existing allocation.

I congratulate him, Senators GRAMM, CHAFEE, BAUCUS, D'AMATO, all of those who worked on this, so that we can have more money available to deal with the highway problems. The "surface transportation problems" is what we ought to really call this bill, a bill to solve surface transportation problems. My State is at least one-fifth of the land mass of the United States, and it is not recognized in this bill as being a State that needs highways, a State that needs assistance in dealing with the areas where we can't build highways in the marine highway system. Particularly, we need assistance in dealing with how do we get our ferries built under the Federal law that requires them built in this country and recognize them as mass transportation? If you go into the corridors where they are putting money into mass transportation, you will find we are buying rights of way, laying track, building terminals. We are doing a lot of things. Those same people who go to Seattle and then go up to Alaska on our ferries can travel all the way across the country under mass transportation, but when they get on our ferries to go up into Alaska, it's no longer mass transportation. If you ask the people on the ferries, they believe those are part of the mass transportation system, but it is not under this law.

I withdraw my objection to the request of the Senator, but I am going to be around here for a few days until we get some of these issues settled to our satisfaction and know that we can come into the 21st century along with everybody else as far as a new surface transportation program. Thank you very much.

Mr. BAUCUS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I think there is a unanimous consent request pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Is there objection?

Mr. BAUCUS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, I might say to my good friend from Alaska, my State of Montana has the same problem Alaska has, being a thinly populated State. We have very much experienced a lot of these same problems with border crossings and what not. One of the issues the Senator mentioned was the border crossings, and maybe there is a way we can work that out in this bill. The mass transit provisions, though—the ferries, for example—are not within this committee's jurisdiction. That is within the Banking Committee's jurisdiction. We expect to have an amendment soon. The Senator makes a basic, good point. It is similar to one I have made many times. I appreciate his coming to the floor.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I have checked, and since we have become a State, we have built very few new bridges. We have replaced the ones destroyed in the 1964 earthquake, with one exception. The reason we have not built new bridges is we haven't had any new roads.

Mr. President, I will not object.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise to express my support for the changes that have been made to the ISTEA II bill. This legislation is now much more balanced and fair to all states than the original bill last fall. I want to thank the distinguished Chairman of the Committee, Senator CHAFEE, and other Senators involved for their assistance in improving this bill.

I was never happy with the original bill, because it falls way short of addressing New Jersey's growing needs. While the underlying bill recognized the special situation of some states, particularly large, western, low-density states, and those in the Southeast, it did not recognize the unique needs of densely populated, urbanized states with significant passenger, commerce and freight traffic.

Mr. President, last year, the ISTEA II bill that came to the floor was not regionally balanced and did not recognize the special needs of high density, urban states like New Jersey.

This amendment includes a program that I authored which is designed to address the needs of high density, urban states. Called the High Density Transportation Program, this new program addresses the special needs of states where high population density and heavy traffic volume create perpetual bottlenecks in the flow of goods and people through our national transportation system, resulting in tremendous wear and tear on the roads and reduced economic productivity. We can all argue over how much money should go to one region or another, but to deliberately leave out factors that allow for consideration for high density, urban states in a major transportation bill is unacceptable. That's what happened in the original bill.

That's why I am very pleased that the Chairman and Ranking Member of

the Environment and Public Works Committee and the Chairman of the relevant Subcommittee, agreed to include this new High Density program in the new bill. And that's why this is now a more balanced bill.

The High Density Transportation Program is a \$360 million annual program, distributed over five years. New Jersey will be guaranteed \$36 million each year, and will be eligible for more, for projects that reduce congestion, increase mobility, and maintain the infrastructure. Those projects may include construction and maintenance of roads, mass transit, bridges, even bike paths. As long as those projects reduce congestion and improve mobility.

This program, coupled with the increase in apportionments and the funds the Committee included in the Bridge Discretionary account last fall, show a total highway funding increase for New Jersey of approximately \$780 million over the life of the bill. This comes out to an average of about \$130 million a year over six years. This increase is on top of the yearly average of \$532 million a year the original ISTEA II bill included for New Jersey.

Mr. President, this proposal is simple. It gives all states an increase, but also accounts for the needs of states that were not fairly accommodated in the original bill. With this new proposal, New Jerseyans can breathe a sigh of relief, since our needs will begin to be met.

Mr. President, those needs are great. Transportation funding is especially critical in my state. The Garden State is one of the most important links in our nation's transportation system. The most densely populated state in the nation, it also has the highest vehicle density on its roads. Located between two heavily populated metropolitan areas, New Jersey is known as the corridor state, linking commerce and travel to the northeast and the rest of the country. Over 60 billion vehicle miles are traveled on New Jersey's roads annually. The ability of trucks and cars to move freely on New Jersey's roads directly affects New Jersey's economy, as well as the entire region.

Millions of people have traveled along New Jersey's highways. They travel from the South and West to New York City, Boston and New England. And people in New York and New England travel through New Jersey on their way to places like the Jersey shore, Florida or Washington, D.C.

But our roads are used for more than just vacations. Every day, 324,000 tons of goods made in New Jersey are transported on New Jersey's roads by 134,000 trucks.

Many of these trucks are coming from the Ports of Newark and Elizabeth. They are transporting cars and other goods that arrive from countries like South Korea, Great Britain, Germany, Taiwan and Indonesia. The Port of New York and New Jersey is the busiest on the East Coast.

Despite the critical importance of New Jersey's infrastructure to the nation, it is in dismally poor shape, and it is getting worse by the hour. Nearly 20 percent of New Jersey's interstate mileage is in poor or mediocre condition. And more than 45 percent of our bridges are in deficient condition.

Mr. President, New Jersey's roads and bridges take an unbelievable pounding. Our hot summers and harsh winters take a huge toll on its infrastructure. Road salt in the winter and ocean salt year round add to the damage.

In addition, New Jerseyans and those who travel through my state often face untenable congestion. Travelers in both cars and trucks struggle for hours every day with New Jersey's highway stops and starts. And our heavily used roads and bridges are badly in need of additional maintenance.

Mr. President, the status of New Jersey's transportation infrastructure has a direct effect on the state and region's economic vitality and on every resident's quality of life. But, more importantly, it affects the entire nation's economic vitality. And, the future challenges to that infrastructure are ominous. In the next six years, there probably will be more travel on our roads, more cargo coming into our ports and more rapid deterioration of our transportation infrastructure.

Mr. President, I seek to educate my colleagues about my State, because I believe that New Jersey should get its fair share. No more, no less.

Regrettably, last fall's ISTEA bill provided New Jersey with less money in 1998 than it received in 1997. Our transportation needs increase every year, but our funding level went down under the previous ISTEA bill. This was not acceptable.

The last time I took to the floor to discuss S. 1173, I spoke for nearly four hours about the devastating effects this bill will have for New Jersey's transportation infrastructure. Since then there have been important changes which have greatly improved this bill. New funding has enabled the Environment Committee to ease the pain to some states which were hit the hardest by the original Environment Committee apportionment formulas.

New Jersey is the most densely populated state in the nation, and our roads carry more traffic per lane mile than any state in the country. New Jersey is the true corridor state. Ten percent of the nation's total freight either originates, terminates, or passes through New Jersey. These conditions create burdens that have a direct negative impact of the state's transportation infrastructure, the environment, and economic productivity. In addition, our high level of urbanization increases the costs associated with road repair and construction. The High Density Transportation Program is established to address those conditions.

Mr. President, I would like to thank Chairman CHAFEE for his work on this

bill and commend him for his continuing efforts to produce a good and balanced ISTEA reauthorization bill. The Committee's decision to include the High Density program truly improves this bill over last year's. As I said at the Committee mark-up, we may have to nominate Senator CHAFEE for a peace prize by the time this process is over.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank Senator WARNER and Senator BAUCUS for all of their hard work and their leadership on this bill.

I look forward to continuing to work with the Chairman and other Committee members in the coming months as we debate this bill on the Senate floor and in Conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Rhode Island renew his request?

Mr. CHAFEE. I do renew that request.

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

The amendment (No. 1684 to amendment No. 1676) was agreed to.

Mr. CHAFEE. Now, the amendment is adopted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. CHAFEE. The motion to reconsider was part of that and it was laid on the table?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. CHAFEE. That is all going to be original text?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. CHAFEE. I thank the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators MOSELEY-BRAUN and WYDEN be added as original cosponsors to the Chafee amendment.

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

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator COLLINS be added as a cosponsor of the Chafee amendment.

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

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, this is the order.

Senator WYDEN has an amendment that has been agreed to. Actually, it turns out that it is my amendment; I am introducing it. This has been agreed to. We would like to move to the McConnell amendment. That will be a long one. I don't see Senator MCCONNELL here, but I urge him to come because we want to get started on that. There is a time agreement suggested of 3 hours on his side, 2 on our side, and 45 minutes for Senator DOMENICI from New Mexico. We are ready to go.

AMENDMENT NO. 1702

(Purpose: To further clarify the integrated decision-making process for surface transportation projects)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE], for himself, Mr. WYDEN and Mr. GRAHAM, proposes an amendment numbered 1702.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 162, after the end of line 25, insert the following:

"(5) CONCURRENT PROCESSING.—The term, 'concurrent processing' means to the fullest extent practicable, and to the extent otherwise required, agencies shall prepare environmental impact statements and environmental assessments concurrently with and integrated with environmental analyses and related surveys and studies required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. 661 et seq.), the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.), the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) and other environmental review laws and executive orders."

On page 163, lines 10-12, strike "with the requirements" through the end of the sentence, and insert "for surface transportation projects at the earliest possible time, including, to the extent appropriate, at the planning stage with the agreement of the State transportation agencies and the cooperating agencies."

On page 163, lines 17-18, strike "with the planning, predesign stage, and decision making".

On page 164, line 2, strike "initiatives," and insert "initiatives, economic development and transportation initiatives."

On page 164, lines 17-18, strike "with the transportation planning and decisionmaking of the", and insert "for surface transportation projects by".

On page 166, line 2, delete "(rather than sequential)".

On page 167, line 7, insert "and the public on request" after "cooperating agencies".

On page 168, line 11, strike "grant", and insert "take action on".

On page 169, after the end of line 10, insert the following:

"and assure early consideration of alternatives to a proposed project, including alternatives that address transportation demand consistent with 23 U.S.C. 134(i)(3)."

On page 169, strike lines 20 through page 170, line 2.

On page 170, line 15, after "agreement", insert "that has been developed with public involvement".

On page 172, line 3, after "APPROACHES.—" insert "In addition to existing formal public participation opportunities."

On page 172, line 5, after "used", insert "to the extent appropriate."

On page 174, line 19, after "subsection (a)", insert "consistent with Part 1501, et seq., of Title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations."

On page 175, line 6, insert the following new subsection and redesignate the following subsections accordingly:

(c) Section 112 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(g) SELECTION PROCESS.—It shall not be considered to be a conflict of interest, as defined under section 1.33 of title 23, Code of Federal Regulations, for a State to procure, under a single contract, the services of a consultant to prepare any environmental assessments or analyses required, including en-

vironmental impact statements, as well as subsequent engineering and design work on the same project, provided that the State has conducted an independent multi-disciplined review that assesses the objectivity of any analysis, environmental assessment or environmental impact statement prior to its submission to the agency that approves the project.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on behalf of myself and Senators WYDEN and GRAHAM to improve the provisions of ISTEA II that establish an integrated decisionmaking process for surface transportation projects—the so-called NEPA streamlining provisions.

ISTEA II includes a number of provisions designed to better integrate NEPA's requirements into the decisionmaking process for surface transportation projects. The intent was to provide for earlier consideration of environmental impacts under the National Environmental Policy Act and to consolidate the permitting process for highway projects—a goal that we can all share. With the help of the sponsors of the original provisions, Senators GRAHAM and WYDEN, as well as others on the committee, I believe that we have reached agreement on a package of improving amendments to that language that will address concerns that have been raised by both the environmental community and the State transportation agencies.

The amendment will, among other things: allow greater public access to key decision documents relating to surface transportation projects; provide for early consideration of alternatives that address transportation demand alternatives; and clarify that the state transportation planning process does not trigger NEPA.

With these improvements, I believe that we have crafted a process that will indeed improve the decisionmaking process for surface transportation projects.

Mr. President, this is an amendment that has been agreed to. It clarifies the integrated decisionmaking process for surface transportation projects. It has been worked out. It deals, to a degree, with the National Environmental Policy Administration Act provisions. We have all worked on it. I want to thank Senators GRAHAM and WYDEN for their fine work on this. It is a fine amendment. I know the Senator from Oregon is here.

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I will only take 2 or 3 minutes. I thank the Senator from Oregon for letting me impose on him. I want to say that I am very sympathetic to the case that has been made by the distinguished senior Senator from Alaska. I hope we can do something to help him. He is chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and all of us who have anything in this bill at all, who are impacted by this bill, all of us who support this bill, are going to have to look at this chairman

down the road to help us to implement what we are doing here. I hope we will find a way to help him.

I am the only former House Member who is now serving in the U.S. Senate who voted for the addition of Alaska to the Union. I was sworn in with the late Senator Gruening, about whom Mr. STEVENS spoke. That case has been made time and again. I want to say, Mr. President, I have never heard the case made better than Senator STEVENS has made it. I can understand how his people feel. They need help. It seems to me that whatever helps Alaska helps West Virginia. That is the way I look at it. I want to be supportive of finding a positive response to the Senator's needs. I want to help him.

Mr. STEVENS. If the Senator will yield for a moment, I thank the Senator from West Virginia. That help would be meaningful.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Senator and yield the floor.

Mr. WYDEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, the pending business, I believe, is the Chafee-Wyden-Graham amendment. I want to take a few minutes to explain to my colleagues what we are pursuing with this amendment. Before Senator BYRD leaves the floor, I want to express my thanks to him for the very extensive input and help that he has given this Member, both on the entire bill and particularly on the provisions that relate to streamlining of the ISTEA permit process both on the transportation and the environmental side. I thank Senator BYRD.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, another way to describe this amendment, which deals with the transportation and environmental review process that is central to getting these projects on line and dealing with our transportation issues, is the "do-it-right-once" amendment.

What we have in this country today is essentially a disjointed process for doing transportation and environmental reviews. In effect, you have one track going down the road trying to address the various requirements essential to OK'ing a project from the transportation side. You then have a separate effort going forward to deal with environmental reviews. Instead of the two efforts being combined at every step of the process, time and money is wasted as these separate undertakings go forward. So what you have is an extraordinary amount of duplication. You have duplication as it relates to the environmental side and as it relates to the transportation side, and you waste an extraordinary amount of time as it relates to getting these projects actually constructed.

I think, as every Senator knows, for transportation projects time is money. Delays in approving transportation projects not only increase the cost of these projects; they also cause lost pro-

ductivity to our economy and added stress for the commuters that are stuck in traffic.

This bill is the result of extensive bipartisan discussion. Senator GRAHAM and I began this in the committee many months ago. Senator SMITH of New Hampshire has been extremely helpful in this effort and, of course, Senators CHAFEE and BYRD have been very extensively involved. We have now forged a comprehensive package that will streamline transportation and environmental reviews and bring much-needed relief for these key projects.

The bill now will increase the funding for critical highway projects that will ensure that this money is better spent, because we will be speeding up the process for getting the projects built.

Let me be very clear to the Senate. We are not talking about changing the environmental laws in any way. I wouldn't support that kind of effort, and my cosponsors of this amendment wouldn't support it either. This effort to streamline transportation environmental reviews, in fact, keeps every one of the environmental laws in place. It simply says that we are going to improve the decisionmaking process by building the consideration of environmental factors into transportation decisions at the front end of the process rather than at the tail end as has so often happens.

So if we were to do nothing else in this bill, nothing else but to say at the beginning of an effort to get a transportation project built we were going to start consulting on environmental issues at that time, I think it would be a worthy endeavor. But this legislation doesn't just streamline the process; it complies with the environmental laws, and it ensures that there is early consideration of all realistic alternatives. In the urban areas, that means looking at transit, at bike paths, and a variety of nontraditional transportation solutions. But we don't require pointless consideration of these approaches in places where they don't make sense.

Today's changes also increase the opportunities for public involvement. Many of our colleagues have been visited by transportation groups, by State officials, by environmental leaders, saying that they wanted public involvement early in the decisionmaking process. This amendment ensures that is done. In my view, it also increases the chance for early public support when the decisions are made rather than, as happens so often today, having public opposition develop later in the process, which can hold things up for many months.

In conclusion, Mr. President, some have argued that you might do even more than this amendment envisages. They say, put transportation officials in charge of everything; put them in charge of transportation and environmental matters. Under that approach, which I think would be a mistake, I

think we are not going to end up saving a lot of time in the review process. More likely, it may lead to questionable environmental decisions and considerable delay when these decisions are challenged in court. There is a better route to improving our transportation system. We can make the process faster, cheaper, and better while complying with all of our environmental laws at the same time.

I see that the chairman of the committee has returned. I want to express my thanks to Chairman CHAFEE. When I and Senator GRAHAM brought him this ISTEA streamlining amendment last summer, he gave us considerable time as we sought then to bring together the industry and environmental groups to support it. Also, the ranking minority member, Senator BAUCUS, who has helped me as a new Senator on a variety of issues, was involved at every step of the way. I thank Senator BAUCUS for that effort.

We are here now as a result of the deliberations that began this summer. This is an amendment that saves time and money and helps strengthen our environmental laws and public support for them at the same time. I urge support of the amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BAUCUS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DEWINE). The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon has brought a very valuable addition to the NEPA process. Most of us, when we deal with the National Environmental Policy Act with respect to projects, believe that the policy is right; that is, that environmental alternatives should be considered fully. But we also experience delays, sometimes so long that we begin to wonder, what is going on here? Is there a better way of doing this? All of us have been there.

This is the very first very serious effort to try to solve that problem; that is, on the one hand, keep the protection of the National Environmental Policy Act, which I think we all want—this Senator certainly does—but, on the other hand, make sure that the process is streamlined so that it doesn't take quite so long, so the decisions can be made, and so there is a little more confidence amongst the public in what these various agencies are attempting to do.

It is simple. It just makes the review process not sequential but concurrent. It should have been concurrent in the first place.

Second, it sets up a schedule of review at the start that the agencies must agree on so each agency knows kind of what it is doing first, if that is the theory, and, beyond that, it sets up a consultation process when there is disagreement among the agencies.

But it is a very good amendment. In fact, I think that this is going to go a lot further—the effect of this amendment—and help many, many more people than is realized. We often have

these grandiose amendments and bills around here, and they sound like they are going to do a lot and end up not doing much at all. This is a little bit the opposite. It is the process; it is streamlining. Some may think that it is not a big deal, but it will be a big deal—a huge deal—certainly if it is implemented in the spirit in which the amendment is intended—and I expect that will be the case. As a consequence, we public servants will be serving our people a little bit better than we would have otherwise.

I compliment the Senator very much on his amendment. It is a very good idea. I thank him for it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment?

Mr. GRAHAM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, it has been a great pleasure to work with the Senator from Oregon over the last several months in the development of this legislation. I share the assessment of the Senator from Montana. It will be seen as one of the most important new ideas in highway transportation planning.

Basically, it is consistent with the evolution that has occurred within the American environmental movement. It wasn't too many years ago that a principal goal of many who described themselves as being environmentalists was to achieve the goal of no growth, no action. It was essentially a negative and defensive posture. As the environmental movement has become a more pervasive part of our society in the way in which we look at our responsibility, it has become a movement which attempts to shape the future in an affirmative way that is sensitive to environmental considerations rather than stagnate in the status quo.

I believe this amendment is part of that evolutionary process, because what it basically says is, let us ask everyone who is a stakeholder in a major Federal participatory transportation project to sit down at the table when the project is in its conceptual form. If there is a problem with this project that is going to render it incapable of ever being permitted, let's put that on the table at the beginning, and, if the project will fundamentally change it, relocate it to a more appropriate site, or whatever is necessary.

If, on the other hand, it is not inherently flawed but there are going to have to be modifications in the design or construction techniques, let's know that at the beginning of the process so that everyone is operating from a position of candor and openness.

Unfortunately, the opposite of what I just described is what happens too often today; that is, that these requirements are not disclosed until the project has been many years in planning and design and millions of dollars spent, and then you find out that there are these flaws, or fatal conditions, or issues that will require a similar in-

vestment of time and money for redesign.

So I think this is an amendment that will advance the modern approach to environmentalism and reduce the legitimate public anger and frustration when they see millions of dollars and years of time being discarded because of issues raised at the end of the process, and it will build a new level of confidence and a higher level of environmental sensitivity in our transportation planning.

So I am strongly supportive of this amendment. I appreciate the leadership that so many Members of this Chamber have given to this. I particularly commend my friend and colleague from Oregon and urge that the full Senate join in support of this and that we see when this bill is negotiated with the House of Representatives that the provision will be included in any final legislation that is sent to the President for his signature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment?

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, we are ready to vote.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I apologize. I neglected to mention the hard work of the Senator from Florida. He spoke earlier. I know both he and Senator WYDEN from Oregon worked very hard on this, as did Senator SMITH, who is not on the floor with us. But the three of them worked together to put this together.

I might say it is another example of the cooperation and compromise. Often Senators stand up on the floor, and, I might say, speak rhetorically, knowing that they are not going to get the results but trying to score points back home. These are Senators that worked together to accomplish something solid. And it is worthwhile. I compliment the three of them for being cooperative in compromising and getting the work done.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I want to salute the Senators who worked so hard on this: Senator WYDEN and Senator GRAHAM. We are very proud that they are Members of the Environment Committee. They are very valuable members of that committee. And Senator SMITH worked very hard, and is likewise.

So we are ready to go to a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the Chafee-Wyden-Graham-Baucus-Smith amendment No. 1702.

The amendment (No. 1702) was agreed to.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas would like to talk on an amendment that we have agreed to and then is going to discuss another subject.

I guess we have not moved to reconsider this.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, could I ask the Senator from Rhode Island a question? I have a unanimous consent request to ask a member of my staff to be on the floor.

Mr. CHAFEE. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that David Lee from the Florida Department of Transportation be given floor privileges throughout the consideration of ISTEA II.

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

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed shortly, following the Senator from Texas having the floor, to the consideration of Senator MCCONNELL's amendment regarding contract preferences, and that there be 8 hours of debate, equally divided between Senator MCCONNELL and Senators CHAFEE and BAUCUS, prior to the motion to table, with an additional 45 minutes under the control of Senator DOMENICI. I further ask unanimous consent that, following the expiration or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote on or in relation to the amendment and that no other amendments be in order prior to the vote.

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

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, let me, if I could, ask the chairman a question. Does he want me to introduce the amendment that is agreed to and get that taken care of?

Mr. CHAFEE. I think now is a good time, I say to the Senator from Texas. She has an amendment that has been agreed to. Why don't we present that and dispose of that?

AMENDMENT NO. 1703 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1676

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, this just reiterates the importance of the cooperation between the Department of Transportation and the transportation research projects now being done by the Department of Transportation through several universities in my State of Texas, as well as California, Minnesota, and the State of Washington. They are doing very valuable research on relieving congestion. Through transportation and computer systems, they are able to determine how you can relieve congestion in our major cities.

I appreciate the fact that both sides have agreed to this amendment.

I offer it for consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) proposes an amendment numbered 1703.

At the end of line 16, page 397 insert:

“(3) CONTINUATION OF PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary shall continue through to completion public/private partnership agreements previously executed to

promote the integration of surface transportation management systems, including the integration of highway, transit, railroad and emergency management systems."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, now I would like to see if there could be an amendment—Senator ABRAHAM wants to offer a short amendment. I am told it will take only a couple of minutes. I am willing to let him do that if it is acceptable to the Senator from Rhode Island, but it would change the unanimous consent.

Mr. CHAFEE. Why do we not adopt the Senator's amendment, unless you want more time on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, parliamentary procedure, please. Where are we?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is the Hutchison amendment.

Mr. BAUCUS. We have reviewed it. It is fine on our side.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1703) was agreed to.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I seek unanimous consent to introduce an amendment at this time, after which the Senator from Texas would then be able to resume the floor for the purpose of the remarks she had previously been approved to make.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a right to offer his amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 1704 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1676
(Purpose: To make access to the Ambassador Bridge, Detroit, Michigan, eligible for funding).

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. ABRAHAM], for himself and Mr. LEVIN, proposes an amendment numbered 1704 to amendment No. 1676.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 136, after line 22, add the following:

SEC. 11 . AMBASSADOR BRIDGE ACCESS, DETROIT, MICHIGAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 129 of title 23, United States Code, or any other provision of law, improvements to ac-

cess roads and construction of access roads, approaches, and related facilities (such as signs, lights, and signal) necessary to connect the Ambassador Bridge in Detroit, Michigan, to the Interstate System shall be eligible for funds apportioned under paragraphs (1)(C) and (3) of section 104(b) of that title.

(b) USE OF FUNDS.—Funds described in subsection (a) shall not be used for any improvement to, or construction of, the bridge itself.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, the Ambassador Bridge is the single greatest border crossing in the United States. Almost 10 million vehicles cross the bridge each year; almost 3 million commercial vehicles, as many as 10,000 trucks per day. It constitutes, in terms of business activity, almost \$350 billion a year in trade for the United States. In fact, 26 percent of all United States-Canada trade traverses the Ambassador Bridge. That trade is expected to increase by 180 percent by the year 2015, which would translate into almost 5.4 million commercial vehicles a year.

This major trade artery is not connected directly to any of the nearby interstates however. That requires commercial vehicles to traverse local roads to get to the freeways and interstates. In these times of "just in time" deliveries, these delays are totally unjustified for such a major trade route. However, even though it is privately owned, it is part and parcel of our National Highway System. However, because it is privately owned, the Federal Highway Administration has determined that the State of Michigan may not use any of its Federal funds to improve the approaches to the bridge. This amendment will allow the State to spend its funds for these projects, if it wishes.

No State will lose any funds with this amendment. It simply will allow Michigan to use the funds it already receives through the independently-derived allocations on these approaches. Furthermore, no funds will actually be spent on the privately-owned portion of the bridge, only on the publicly-owned approaches.

Finally, the bridge authority is providing the Michigan Department of Transportation with toll credit information. This may provide up to all of Michigan's 20 percent matching share requirement.

Mr. President, I offer the amendment on behalf of myself as well as, I know, Senator LEVIN.

I believe the amendment has been cleared on both sides. I hope we can agree to it at this time.

Mr. CHAFEE. Yes; the amendment has been cleared on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan, Senator LEVIN, also would like to be a cosponsor of the amendment.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I'm pleased to join my colleagues from

Michigan in offering an amendment which I understand the committee will accept. I thank the managers.

The first amendment allows improvements and construction on the United States approaches to the Ambassador Bridge from Detroit to Windsor, Canada, to be eligible for federal funding. As my colleagues may know, the Detroit-Windsor border crossing sees one of the largest, if not largest, volumes of international trade in the world. As such, the corresponding volume of traffic is tremendous, particularly truck traffic. The amendment does not allocate funds to repair the years of wear and tear, simply allows currently publicly owned streets and facilities to compete for federal funding. This amendment is important to the city of Detroit, the State of Michigan, and the country because of the significant volume of international trade moving across the bridge.

Mr. BAUCUS. We accept the amendment. I think it is important to clarify that, as a result of this, there is no new money for Michigan but that Michigan will be able to use its own money, particularly its NHS funds, for this access road, basically, to the bridge. With that understanding, we accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1704) was agreed to.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized, under the previous order.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, are we speaking as in morning business for this time period, so that I can introduce a bill? If not, I ask unanimous consent to do so.

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

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I thank the Chair. (The remarks of Mrs. HUTCHISON and Mr. GRAMS pertaining to the introduction of S. 1711 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. CHAFEE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I say to the distinguished Senator from Texas that we have a little time here if she has anything further she would like to discuss on this important measure that she presented.

The program now is for Senator MCCONNELL to come over and present his amendment. He said he would be here at 12:30. We have extra time should the Senator want it. Apparently not, so I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following members of the Joint Committee on Taxation staff be given the privilege of the floor during the ISTE debate: Lindy Paull, Ben Hartley, Tom Barthold, Judy Owens, Steve Arkin, Joe Nega, Carolyn Smith and Maxine Terry.

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

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, we have two amendments that have been cleared on both sides. I will start with the Inhofe amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 1705 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1676

(Purpose: To improve the provisions relating to contracting for engineering and design services)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE] for Mr. INHOFE, proposes an amendment numbered 1705 to amendment No. 1676.

The text of the amendment follows:

On page 135, strikes lines 2 through 5 and insert the following: "aid highway funds, or reasonably expected or intended to be part of 1 or more such projects, shall be performed under a contract awarded in accordance with subparagraph (A) unless the simplified acquisition procedures of the Federal Acquisition Regulations apply."

On page 135, line 7, insert ", or salary limitation inconsistent with the Federal Acquisition Regulations," after "restriction".

On page 135, line 15, strike "cost principles" and insert "procedures, cost principles," after "the".

On page 135, line 24, strike "process, contracting based on" and insert "procedures of".

On page 136, line 12, strike "process" and insert "procedure".

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, this amendment deals with contracting for engineering and design services. It would ensure that the engineering- and design-related aspects of a project promote competition, foster the use of innovative technologies and ensure consistency in the pricing of engineering and design contracts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate? If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1705) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1706 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1676

(Purpose: To allow funding under the surface transportation program for programs to reduce motor vehicle emissions caused by extreme cold start conditions)

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I have an amendment on behalf of Senator ABRAHAM. I send it to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE] for Mr. ABRAHAM, for himself, and Mr. LEVIN, proposes an amendment numbered 1706 to amendment No. 1676.

The text of the amendment follows:

On page 183, at the end of line 23 insert the following:

(5) in subsection (b)(9), by striking "section 108(f)(1)(A) (other than clauses (xii) and (xvi)) of the Clean Air Act" and inserting "section 108(f)(1)(A) (other than clause (xvi)) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7408(f)(1)(A))";

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, this amendment would allow funds that are allocated under the Surface Transportation Program to be used for programs to reduce motor vehicle emissions caused by extreme cold-start conditions.

The problem is that in the northern States when cold weather comes, the starting of an engine is the highest emission point from the engine. Ninety percent of engine wear happens when the car is started. The engine wear in cold climate conditions is twice this amount.

This amendment has been cleared by both sides. What it will do is permit these funds to be used for some kind of heaters that might be installed to warm up the catalytic converter or other aspects of the engine so that when it is started, it will not start cold and will not have the heavy emissions that occur absent some warming techniques.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, we reviewed the amendment, and we think it is a good idea.

I also ask unanimous consent that Senator LEVIN be added as a cosponsor.

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

Is there further debate? If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1706) was agreed to.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the votes by which these two amendments were agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that John Hemphill and Michael Ling, fellows on the Environment and Public Works Committee, be given the privilege of the floor during debate on S. 1173.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, we are operating under an agreement that the Senator from Kentucky was to begin debating his amendment at 12:30. That was 35 minutes ago. I know that the chairman of the committee, Senator CHAFEE, and myself very much want to help the Senator from Kentucky by finding time for him to debate this amendment—offer it and debate it. We reached this agreement with the Senator from Kentucky some time ago, over an hour ago, that he would be here at 12:30 to offer the amendment. The chairman has been so very gracious in accommodating Senators right and left and from all parts of the country to exercise their rights. I inquire as to where might our tardy Senator be, or when is he going to be here?

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I don't know where our errant brother is. We are ready. I think the ranking member makes a good point. We have been waiting. The agreement was that we were going to start at 12:30. In the famous words of the Senate, the Senator has been described as being "on his way" for the last 45 minutes. So I hope he will be here soon. I must say that I am thinking of, at quarter past, getting up and proposing—and that's 7 minutes from now—that all time after that be deducted from the proponents' side. Let's wait and see. I am going to make an effort to round up the Senator from Kentucky and see if we can't get started.

Mr. BAUCUS. In fact, I agree with the chairman and say that if he is not here by 1:45, it would only be fair to the rest of the Senate that time be charged against him.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed in morning business for 10 minutes.

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

CALLING FOR A VOTE ON JAMES HORMEL

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, last week, President Clinton called upon the Senate to use but one principal criteria when considering nominations for ambassadors to the United States. In his words, that criteria simply stated is: "Will he or will he not be a good ambassador?"

Over 30 years ago, the Senate was confronted with a similar situation to one before us today. This body was asked to assess whether Patricia Harris