

S. Res. 212. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that at the upcoming United States-China summit the President should demand the release of all persons remaining imprisoned in China and Tibet for political or religious reasons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. LOTT (for Mr. HELMS (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, Mr. KEMPTHORNE, Mr. WARNER, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. ROBB, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. ASHCROFT, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. CLELAND, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. COATS, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. BYRD, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. LOTT, Mr. GLENN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. KOHL, and Mr. STEVENS)):

S. Res. 213. A resolution congratulating the United States Army Reserve on its 90th anniversary and recognizing the important contributions of Strom Thurmond, the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, who served with distinction in the United States Army Reserve for 36 years; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CONRAD (for himself, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. COVERDELL, Mr. HAGEL, and Mr. MOYNIHAN):

S. Res. 214. A resolution commending the Grand Forks Herald for its public service to the Grand Forks area and receipt of a Pulitzer Prize; considered and agreed to.

#### STATEMENTS OF INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN:

S. 1965. A bill to prohibit the publication of identifying information relating to a minor for criminal sexual purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE INTERNET PREDATOR PREVENTION ACT OF 1998

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce the Internet Predator Prevention Act of 1998. This legislation will give much needed protection to the millions of American families with children.

In the past two decades, the Internet has grown dramatically. In 1981, there were only 213 computers hooked into the Internet. In January of last year, it was estimated that 17,753,266 computers were wired into the Internet. And the number of web sites has also increased significantly in just the last several years: In June of 1993, there were only 130 reported web sites. By January 1996, that number had grown to more than 100,000. The Congressional Research Service reports that studies on the internet have found that 9 million to 47 million people are using the Internet each year.

This enormous new "cyberworld," which crosses state and national boundaries as well as race, gender and age barriers, has created a plethora of new communities, new business opportunities, and unfortunately, new crimes. It seems as if every month, we are hearing stories of children who have been exploited and hurt because of contacts they have made on the Internet.

I am struck by two particular incidents that arose in my home state of

Illinois in just the past year. In August of 1997, I was contacted by the mother of a 9-year-old Joilet girl whose name and number had been posted on a series of web pages, bulletin boards and chat rooms that was designed to attract child molesters. This family only learned of the posting when they began to receive illicit phone calls from strangers at odd times of the night. A second family from Illinois had a similar experience when a stranger began "logging on" using their 10-year-old daughter's name. The child's name and the family's home telephone number was posted on the Internet in a chat room for pedophiles. These parents were lucky enough to learn that their child's name had been posted on one of these sites before their children were placed in greater danger.

Across this nation, there have been numerous other instances in which parents have learned that their children's names, addresses, and phone numbers have been posted on Web pages, bulletin boards, and chat rooms where pedophiles and child molesters lurk.

This ought to be a crime. No one should be allowed to set a child up for a potentially dangerous situation that could have a lasting and irrevocable impact. The Internet should serve as a resource and learning tool, and not a vehicle for exploitation.

Currently, there are very few state laws that exist that address this issue. The few laws that do exist are vague and do not carry the weight needed to prosecute pedophiles for their crimes. The quick growth of the Internet has made it difficult to control Internet postings and, in this case, state and other traditional boundaries cannot and do not apply. Often times, a child and his or her exploiter may live in different states on different sides of the country. The crime taking place, however, is not any less significant than if they were in the same room.

I believe that the Federal government can play an important role in stopping child exploitation on the Internet. The federal government has the ability to regulate interstate activity and federal law has jurisdiction over all 50 states and territories. A federal law will be able to navigate the complexity of the issues the Internet raises regarding interstate commerce and can be used to prosecute criminals regardless of what state the perpetrator lives in.

Today, I am introducing legislation which I believe will address this growing problem. My legislation would make it a crime to post a child's name, address, or telephone number on an Internet web site, chat room or bulletin board in order to make that child available for criminal sexual acts with an adult. This bill uses the least restrictive means of regulating against one of the most offensive acts a human being can commit toward another: the exploitation of a child.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting the quick passage of this legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1965

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Internet Predator Prevention Act of 1998".

#### SEC. 2. PROHIBITION AND PENALTIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 110 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

#### "§2261. Publication of identifying information relating to a minor for criminal sexual purposes

"(a) DEFINITION OF IDENTIFYING INFORMATION RELATING TO A MINOR.—In this section, the term 'identifying information relating to a minor' includes the name, address, telephone number, social security number, or e-mail address of a minor.

"(b) PROHIBITION AND PENALTIES.—Whoever, through the use of any facility in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce (including any interactive computer service) publishes, or causes to be published, any identifying information relating to a minor who has not attained the age of 17 years, for the purpose of soliciting any person to engage in any sexual activity for which the person can be charged with criminal offense under Federal or State law, shall be imprisoned not less than 1 and not more than 5 years, fined under this title, or both."

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 110 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"2261. Publication of identifying information relating to a minor for criminal sexual purposes."

By Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself and Mr. KOHL):

S. 1966. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study whether the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore should be protected as a wilderness area; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

THE GAYLORD NELSON APOSTLE ISLANDS STEWARDSHIP ACT OF 1998

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce "The Gaylord Nelson Apostle Islands Stewardship Act of 1998." I am very pleased that my senior colleague from Wisconsin joins me as an original author of the bill, and also that my colleague in the other body, Congressman OBEY is joining me in introducing the companion legislation as he represents the area of Wisconsin where the Apostle Islands are located.

Mr. President, on this Earth Day, the 29th Earth Day, I have chosen to name this legislation in recognition of the accomplishments of Earth Day's founder, a former member of this body and former Governor of my state, Gaylord Nelson. Many outside Wisconsin may not know that, in addition to founding Earth Day, Senator Nelson was also the primary sponsor of the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore Act. That Act, which passed in 1970—the same year Earth Day was founded, protects

one of Northern Wisconsin's most beautiful areas, and it is a place where every year my family and I spend our favorite vacation.

Though Senator Nelson has received many awards, I know that among his proudest accomplishments are those bills he crafted which have produced real and lasting change in preserving America's lands, such as the Apostle Islands.

The Apostle Islands National Lakeshore includes 21 forested islands and 12 miles of pristine shoreline which are among the Great Lakes' most spectacular scenery. Centuries of wave action, freezing, and thawing have sculpted the shorelines and nature has carved intricate caves into the sandstone which forms the islands. Delicate arches, vaulted chambers, and hidden passageways honeycomb cliffs on the north shore of Devil's Island, Swallow Point on Sand Island, and northeast of Cornucopia on the mainland. The Apostle Islands National Lakeshore includes more lighthouses than any other coastline of similar size in the United States, and is home to diverse wildlife including: black bear, bald eagles and deer. It is an important recreational area as well. Its campgrounds and acres of forest, make the Apostles a favorite destination for hikers, sailors, kayakers, and bikers. The Lakeshore also includes the underwater lakebed as well, and scuba divers register with the National Park Service to view the area's underwater resources.

I also know that Senator Nelson, if he were still a member of this body, would have been wholeheartedly pursuing the full implementation of the ecological vision that Wisconsinites and all Americans share for the Lakeshore. Unfortunately, as do many of the lands managed by the National Park Service, the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore finds itself, now 28 years later, with both some significant financial and legal resource needs. If we are to be true stewards of America's public lands, we need to be willing to make necessary financial investments and management improvements when they are warranted. Thus, I am introducing this legislation in an attempt to resolve the unfinished business that remains at the Lakeshore, as well as to renew our Nation's commitment to this beautiful place.

Mr. President, the legislation has three major sections. First, it directs the Park Service to conduct a wilderness suitability study of the Lakeshore as required by the Wilderness Act. The legislation authorizes \$200,000 for that purpose.

This study mandate is needed to ensure that we have the appropriate level of management at the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore. The Wilderness Act and the National Park Service policies require the Park Service to conduct an evaluation of the lands it manages for possible inclusion in the National Wilderness system. Such a study would result in a recommenda-

tion to Congress about whether any of the federally-owned lands currently within the Lakeshore still retain the characteristics that would make them suitable to be legally designated as wilderness. The Congress would then have an opportunity to review such information. If Congress found that such information indicated that some of the federal lands within the Lakeshore were in need of legal wilderness status, Congress would have to subsequently pass legislation to confer such status.

We need this study, Mr. President because, though 28 years have passed, we are not certain whether we are under- or over-managing the Lakeshore. During the General Management Planning Process for the Lakeshore, which was completed nearly a decade ago in 1989, the need for a formal wilderness study was identified. Although a wilderness study has been identified as a high priority by the Lakeshore, it has never been funded.

Since 1989, most of the Lakeshore, roughly 80 percent of the acreage, is being managed by the Park Service as if it were federally designated wilderness. As a protective measure, all lands which might be suitable for wilderness designation were zoned to protect any wilderness characteristics they may have pending completion of the study. However, we may be managing lands as wilderness in the Lakeshore that might, due to use patterns, no longer be suitable for wilderness designation. Correspondingly, some land area may have become more ecologically sensitive and may need additional legal protection.

Second, this legislation also directs the Park Service to protect the historic Raspberry Island and Outer Island lighthouses. The bill authorizes \$3.9 million for bluff stabilization and other necessary actions. There are six lighthouses in the Apostle Island National Lakeshore—Sand Island, Devil's Island, Raspberry Island, Outer Island, Long Island and Michigan Island. Engineering studies completed for the National Park Service have determined that several of these lighthouses are in danger of structural damage due to the continued erosion of the red clay banks upon which they were built. The situations at Outer Island and Raspberry Island, the two which this legislation addresses, were determined to be in the most jeopardy.

The Raspberry Island situation is most critical. The Raspberry Island lighthouse was completed in 1863 to mark the west channel through the Apostle Islands. The original light was a rectangular frame structure surmounted by a square tower that held a lens 40 feet above the ground.

A fog signal building was added to Raspberry Island in 1902. The red brick structure housed a ten-inch steam whistle and a hoisting engine for a tramway. The need for additional personnel at the station led to a redesign of the lighthouse building in 1906-07. The structure was converted to a du-

plex, housing the keeper and his family in the east half, with the two assistant keepers sharing the west half. A 23-kilowatt, diesel-driven electric generator was installed at the station in 1928. The light was automated in 1947 and then moved to a metal tower in front of the fog signal building in 1952.

Raspberry Island light is now the most frequently visited of Apostle Islands National Lakeshore's lighthouses. Recent erosion is threatening the access tram and the fog signal building.

The Outer Island light station was built in 1874 on a red clay bluff 40 feet above Lake Superior. The lighthouse tower stands 90 feet high and the watchroom is encircled by an outside walkway and topped by the lantern.

Historic architects have indicated to the Park Service that Outer Island lighthouse may already be suffering some structural damage due to its location on the bluff and the situation would be much worse if Lake Superior were exceedingly high.

Engineers believe that preservation of these structures requires protection of the bluff beneath the lighthouses, stabilization of the banks, and dewatering of the area immediately shoreward of the bluffs. Although the projects have in the past been included within the Park Service-wide construction priorities, they have never been funded.

Finally, this legislation adds language to the act which created the Lakeshore allowing the Park Service to enter into cooperative agreements with state, tribal, local governments, universities or other non-profit entities to enlist their assistance in managing the Lakeshore. Some parks have specific language in the act which created the park allowing them to enter into such agreements. Parks have used them for activities such as research, historic preservation, and emergency services. Apostle Islands currently does not have this authority, which this legislation adds.

Other National Park lands and lands which are managed by the Park Service, such as the Lakeshore, have such authority. Adding such authority to the Lakeshore will be a way to make Lakeshore management resources go farther. The Park Service has the opportunity to carry out joint projects with other partners which could contribute to the management of the Lakeshore including: state, local, and tribal governments, universities, and non-profit groups. Such endeavors would have both scientific management and fiscal benefits. In the past, the Lakeshore has had to pass over opportunities because the specific authority has been absent.

In his 1969 book on the environment, entitled *America's Last Chance*, Senator Nelson issued a political challenge: "I have come to the conclusion that the number one domestic problem facing this country is the threatened destruction of our natural resources

and the disaster which would confront mankind should such destruction occur. There is a real question as to whether the nation, which has spent some two hundred years developing an intricate system of local, State and Federal Government to deal with the public's problems, will be bold, imaginative and flexible enough to meet this supreme test."

Though, fortunately, the Apostle Islands are not, because of former Senator Nelson's efforts, "threatened with destruction," I believe that Senator Nelson meant two things by his challenge. Not only did he mean that government must act immediately and decisively to protect resources in crisis, but he also meant that government must be responsible and flexible enough to remain committed to the protection of the areas we wisely seek to preserve under our laws.

Thus, Mr. President, on this Earth Day I am proud to introduce this legislation as a renewal of the federal government's commitment to the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore. I look forward to working with my colleagues on this legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this legislation be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1966

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the "Gaylord Nelson Apostle Islands Stewardship Act of 1998".

**SEC. 2. GAYLORD NELSON APOSTLE ISLANDS.**

(a) DECLARATIONS.—Congress declares that—

(1) the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore is a national and a Wisconsin treasure;

(2) the sesquicentennial year of the State of Wisconsin provides an opportunity to reflect on and act to protect important components of the State's ecological and cultural identity, such as the Lakeshore;

(3) the State of Wisconsin is particularly indebted to former Senator Gaylord Nelson for his leadership in the creation of the Lakeshore;

(4) after 28 years of enjoyment, some issues critical to maintaining the overall ecological, recreational, and cultural vision of the Lakeshore need additional attention;

(5) the general management planning process for the Lakeshore has identified a need for a formal wilderness study;

(6) all lands within the Lakeshore that might be suitable for designation as wilderness are currently zoned and managed to protect wilderness characteristics pending completion of such a study;

(7) several historic lighthouses within the Lakeshore are currently in danger of structural damage due to severe erosion;

(8) the Secretary of the Interior has been unable to take full advantage of cooperative agreements with Federal, State, local, and tribal governmental agencies, institutions of higher education, and other nonprofit organizations that could assist the National Park Service by contributing to the management of the Lakeshore;

(9) because of competing needs in other units of the National Park System, the

standard authorizing and budgetary process has not resulted in updated legislative authority and necessary funding for improvements to the Lakeshore; and

(10) the need for improvements to the Lakeshore and completion of a wilderness study should be accorded a high priority among National Park Service activities.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) LAKESHORE.—The term "Lakeshore" means the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the National Park Service.

(c) WILDERNESS STUDY.—In fulfillment of the responsibilities of the Secretary under the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.) and of applicable agency policy, the Secretary shall evaluate areas of land within the Lakeshore for inclusion in the National Wilderness System.

(d) APOSTLE ISLANDS LIGHTHOUSES.—The Secretary shall undertake appropriate action (including protection of the bluff toe beneath the lighthouses, stabilization of the bank face, and dewatering of the area immediately shoreward of the bluffs) to protect the lighthouse structures at Raspberry Lighthouse and Outer Island Lighthouse within the Lakeshore.

(e) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—Section 6 of Public Law 91-424 (16 U.S.C. 460w-5) is amended—

(1) by striking "SEC. 6. The lakeshore" and inserting the following:

"**SEC. 6. MANAGEMENT.**

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The lakeshore"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(b) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary may enter into a cooperative agreement with a Federal, State, tribal, or local government agency or a nonprofit private entity if the Secretary determines that a cooperative agreement would be beneficial in carrying out section 7."

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated—

(1) \$200,000 to carry out subsection (c); and

(2) \$3,900,000 to carry out subsection (d).

By Mr. SARBANES:

S. 1967. A bill to provide for mass transportation in national parks and related public lands; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

THE TRANSIT IN PARKS ACT

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, today I am introducing new legislation to help ease congestion, protect our nation's natural resources, and improve mobility and accessibility in our national parks and wildlife refuges. The "Transit In Parks Act" or TRIP bill is a new federal transit grant initiative that is designed to provide mass transit and alternative transportation services for our national parks, our wildlife refuges, federal recreational areas, and other public lands managed by three agencies of the Department of the Interior.

When the parks first opened in the second half of the nineteenth century, visitors arrived by stagecoach along dirt roads. Travel through parklands, such as Yosemite or Yellowstone, was difficult and long and costly. Not many people could afford or endure such a trip.

The introduction of the automobile gave every American greater mobility

and freedom, which included the freedom to travel and see some of our nation's great natural wonders. Early in this century landscape architects from the National Park Service and highway engineers from the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads collaborated to produce many feats of road engineering that opened the national park lands to millions of Americans.

Yet greater mobility and easier access now threaten the very environments that the National Park Service is mandated to protect. The on-going tension between preservation and access has always been a challenge for our national park system. Today, record numbers of visitors and cars has resulted in increasing damage to our parks. The Grand Canyon alone has five million visitors a year. It may surprise you to know that the average visitor stay is only three hours. As many as 6,000 vehicles arrive in a single summer day. They compete for 2,000 parking spaces. Between 32,000 and 35,000 tour buses go to the park each year. During the peak summer season, the entrance route becomes a giant parking lot.

In the decade from 1984 to 1994, the number of visits to America's national parks increased 25 percent, rising from 208 million to 269 million a year. This is equal to more than one visit by every man, woman, and child in this country. This has created an overwhelming demand on these areas, resulting in severe traffic congestion, visitor restrictions, and in some instances vacationers being shut-out of the parks altogether. The environmental damage at the Grand Canyon is visible at many other parks: Yosemite, which has more than 4 million visitors a year; Yellowstone, which has more than 3 million visitors a year and experiences such severe traffic congestion that access has to be restricted; Zion; Acadia; Bryce; and many others. We need to solve these problems now or risk permanent damage to our nation's natural, cultural, and historical heritage.

The legislation I am introducing builds upon two previous initiatives to address these problems. First is the study of alternative transportation strategies in our national parks that was mandated by the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991, ISTEA. This study, completed by the National Park Service in May 1994, found that many of our most heavily visited national parks are experiencing the same problems of congestion and pollution that afflict our cities and metropolitan areas. Yet, overwhelmingly, the principal transportation systems that the Federal Government has developed to provide access into our national parks are roads primarily for private automobile access.

Second, last November, Secretary of Transportation Rodney Slater and Secretary of the Interior Bruce Babbitt signed an agreement to work together to address transportation and resource

management needs in and around national parks. The findings in the Memorandum Of Understanding entered into by the two departments are especially revealing:

Congestion in and approaching many National Parks is causing lengthy traffic delays and backups that substantially detract from the visitor experience. Visitors find that many of the National Parks contain significant noise and air pollution, and traffic congestion similar to that found on the city streets they left behind.

In many National Park units, the capacity of parking facilities at interpretive or science areas is well below demand. As a result, visitors park along roadsides, damaging park resources and subjecting people to hazardous safety conditions as they walk near busy roads to access visitor use areas.

On occasion, National Park units must close their gates during high visitation periods and turn away the public because the existing infrastructure and transportation systems are at, or beyond, the capacity for which they were designed.

The challenge for park management is two-fold: to conserve and protect the nation's natural, historical, and cultural resources, while at the same time ensuring visitor access and enjoyment of these sensitive environments.

The Transit in Parks Act will go far to meeting this challenge. The bill's objectives are to develop new and expanded mass transit services throughout the national parks and other public lands to conserve and protect fragile natural, cultural, and historical resources, to prevent adverse impact on those resources, and to reduce pollution and congestion, while at the same time facilitating appropriate visitor access and improving the visitor experience.

This new federal transit grant program will provide funding to three Federal land management agencies in the Department of the Interior—the National Park Service, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Bureau of Land Management—that manage the 375 various parks within the National Park System, including national battlefields, monuments and national seashores, as well as the national wildlife refuges and federal recreational areas. The program will allocate capital funds for transit projects, including rail or clean fuel bus projects, joint development activities, pedestrian and bike paths, or park waterway access, within or adjacent to national park lands. The bill authorizes \$50 million for this new program for each of the fiscal years 1999 through 2003. It is anticipated that other resources—both public and private—will be available to augment these amounts in the initial phase.

The bill formalizes the cooperative arrangement entered into last November between the Secretary of Transportation and the Secretary of the Interior to exchange technical assistance and to develop procedures relating to the planning, selection and funding of transit projects in national park lands.

The projects eligible for funding shall be developed through the ISTEA planning process and selected in consulta-

tion with the Secretary of the Interior. The bill provides funds for planning, research, and technical assistance that can supplement other financial resources available to the Federal land management agencies.

It is anticipated that the Secretary of Transportation shall select projects that are diverse in location and size. While major national parks such as the Grand Canyon or Yellowstone are clearly appropriate candidates for significant transit projects under this section, there are numerous small urban and rural Federal park lands that can benefit enormously from small projects, such as bike paths or improved connections with an urban public transit system. Project selection should include the following criteria: the historical and cultural significance of a project; safety; and the extent to which the project would conserve resources, prevent adverse impact, enhance the environment, improve mobility, and contribute to livable communities.

The bill also identifies projects of regional or national significance that more closely resemble the Federal transit program's New Starts projects. Where the project costs are \$25 million or greater, the projects shall comply with the transit New Starts requirements. No single project shall receive more than 12 percent of the total amount available in any given year. This ensures a diversity of projects selected for assistance.

Finally, the bill directs the Secretary of Transportation, in coordination with the Secretary of the Interior, to undertake a comprehensive study of alternative transportation needs in the national parks and other public lands eligible for assistance under this program. The objective of this study is to better identify those areas with existing and potential problems of congestion and pollution, or which can benefit from mass transportation services, and to identify and estimate the project costs for these sites.

This program can create new opportunities for the Federal land management agency to partner with local transit agencies in gateway communities adjacent to the parks, both through the ISTEA planning process and in developing integrated transportation systems. This will spur new economic development within these communities, as they develop transportation centers for park visitors to connect to transit links into the national parks and other public lands.

The on-going tension between preservation and access has always been a challenge for the National Park Service. Today, that challenge has new dimensions, with overcrowding, pollution, congestion, and resource degradation increasing at many of our national parks. This legislation—the Transit in Parks Act—will give our Federal land management agencies important new tools to improve both preservation and access.

Just as we have found in metropolitan areas, transit is essential to moving large numbers of people in our national parks—quickly, efficiently, at low cost, and without adverse impact. At the same time, transit can enhance the economic development potential of our gateway communities.

So today, as we celebrate Earth Day and throughout this entire week as we mark National Parks Week, I cannot think of a more worthy endeavor to help our environment and preserve our national parks, wildlife refuges, and federal recreational areas than by encouraging alternative transportation in these areas. My bill is strongly supported by the American Public Transit Association, the National Parks and Conservation Association, the Surface Transportation Policy Project, the Natural Resources Defense Council, and the Environmental Defense Fund, and I ask unanimous consent that these letters and additional supporting material be included in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation and to recognize the enormous environmental and economic benefits that transit can bring to our national parks.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following be printed in the RECORD:

Text of the Bill;

Section-by-section summary;

Washington Post November 26, 1997, article: "Strict Limits on Cars set for 3 National Parks"; and

Letters of support; from the American Public Transit Association, from the National Parks and Conservation Association, Surface Transportation Policy Project, Natural Resources Defense Council and Environmental Defense Fund.

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

S. 1967

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the "Transit in Parks (TRIP) Act".

**SEC. 2. MASS TRANSPORTATION IN NATIONAL PARKS AND RELATED PUBLIC LANDS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

**"§ 5339. Mass transportation in national parks and related public lands**

“(a) POLICIES, FINDINGS, AND PURPOSES.—

“(1) DEVELOPMENT OF TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS.—It is in the interest of the United States to encourage and promote the development of transportation systems for the betterment of the national parks and other units of the National Park System, national wildlife refuges, recreational areas, and other public lands in order to conserve natural, historical, and cultural resources and prevent adverse impact, relieve congestion, minimize transportation fuel consumption, reduce pollution (including noise and visual pollution), and enhance visitor mobility and accessibility and the visitor experience.

“(2) GENERAL FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

“(A) section 1050 of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (Public Law 102-240) authorized a study of alternatives for visitor transportation in the National Park System which was released by the National Park Service in May 1994;

“(B) the study found that—

“(i) increasing traffic congestion in the national parks requires alternative transportation strategies to enhance resource protection and the visitor experience and to reduce congestion;

“(ii) visitor use, National Park Service units, and concession facilities require integrated planning; and

“(iii) the transportation problems and visitor services require increased coordination with gateway communities;

“(C) on November 25, 1997, the Department of Transportation and the Department of the Interior entered into a Memorandum of Understanding to address transportation needs within and adjacent to national parks and to enhance cooperation between the departments on park transportation issues;

“(D) to initiate the Memorandum of Understanding, and to implement President Clinton’s ‘Parks for Tomorrow’ initiative, outlined on Earth Day, 1996, the Department of Transportation and the Department of the Interior announced, in December 1997, the intention to implement mass transportation services in the Grand Canyon National Park, Zion National Park, and Yosemite National Park;

“(E) many of the national parks and related public lands are experiencing increased visitation and congestion and degradation of the natural, historical, and cultural resources;

“(F) there is a growing need for new and expanded mass transportation services throughout the national parks and related public lands to conserve and protect fragile natural, historical, and cultural resources, prevent adverse impact on those resources, and reduce pollution and congestion, while at the same time facilitating appropriate visitor mobility and accessibility and improving the visitor experience;

“(G) the Federal Transit Administration, through the Department of Transportation, can assist the Federal land management agencies through financial support and technical assistance and further the achievement of national goals to enhance the environment, improve mobility, create more livable communities, conserve energy, and reduce pollution and congestion in all regions of the country; and

“(H) immediate financial and technical assistance by the Department of Transportation, working with Federal land management agencies and State and local governmental authorities to develop efficient and coordinated mass transportation systems within and adjacent to national parks and related public lands is essential to conserve natural, historical, and cultural resources, relieve congestion, reduce pollution, improve mobility, and enhance visitor accessibility and the visitor experience.

“(3) GENERAL PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section are—

“(A) to develop a cooperative relationship between the Secretary of Transportation and the Secretary of the Interior to carry out this section;

“(B) to encourage the planning and establishment of mass transportation systems and nonmotorized transportation systems needed within and adjacent to national parks and related public lands, located in both urban and rural areas, that enhance resource protection, prevent adverse impacts on those resources, improve visitor mobility and acces-

sibility and the visitor experience, reduce pollution and congestion, conserve energy, and increase coordination with gateway communities.

“(C) to assist Federal land management agencies and State and local governmental authorities in financing areawide mass transportation systems to be operated by public or private mass transportation authorities, as determined by local and regional needs, and to encourage public-private partnerships; and

“(D) to assist in the research and development of improved mass transportation equipment, facilities, techniques, and methods with the cooperation of public and private companies and other entities engaged in the provision of mass transportation services.

“(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘Federal land management agency’ means the National Park Service, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, or the Bureau of Land Management;

“(2) the term ‘national parks and related public lands’ means the national parks and other units of the National Park System, national wildlife refuges, recreational areas, and other public lands managed by the Federal land management agencies;

“(3) the term ‘qualified participant’ means a Federal land management agency, or a State or local governmental authority, acting alone, in partnership, or with another Governmental or nongovernmental participant;

“(4) the term ‘qualified mass transportation project’ means a project—

“(A) that is carried out within or adjacent to national parks and related public lands; and

“(B) that—

“(i) is a capital project, as defined in section 5302(a)(1) (other than preventive maintenance activities);

“(ii) is any activity described in section 5309(a)(1)(A);

“(iii) involves the purchase of rolling stock that incorporates clean fuel technology or the replacement of existing buses with clean fuel vehicles or the deployment of mass transportation vehicles that introduce new technology;

“(iv) relates to the capital costs of coordinating the Federal land management agency mass transportation systems with other mass transportation systems;

“(v) involves nonmotorized transportation systems, including the provision of facilities for pedestrians and bicycles;

“(vi) involves the development of waterborne access within or adjacent to national parks and related public lands, including watercraft, as appropriate to and consistent with the purposes described in subsection (a)(3); or

“(vii) is any transportation project that—

“(I) enhances the environment;

“(II) prevents adverse impact on natural resources;

“(III) improves Federal land management agency resources management;

“(IV) improves visitor mobility and accessibility and the visitor experience;

“(V) reduces congestion and pollution, including noise and visual pollution;

“(VI) conserves natural, historical, and cultural resources (other than through the rehabilitation or restoration of historic buildings); and

“(VII) incorporates private investment; and

“(5) the term ‘Secretary’ means the Secretary of Transportation.

“(c) FEDERAL AGENCY COOPERATIVE ARRANGEMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall develop a cooperative relationship with the

Secretary of the Interior, which shall provide for—

“(A) the exchange of technical assistance;

“(B) interagency and multidisciplinary teams to develop Federal land management agency transportation policy, procedures, and coordination; and

“(C) the development of procedures and criteria relating to the planning, selection, and funding of qualified mass transportation projects, and implementation and oversight of the project plan in accordance with the requirements of this section.

“(2) PROJECT SELECTION.—The Secretary, after consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, shall determine the final selection and funding of projects in accordance with this section.

“(d) TYPES OF ASSISTANCE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may contract for or enter into grants, cooperative agreements, or other agreements with a qualified participant to carry out a qualified mass transportation project under this section.

“(2) OTHER USES.—A grant or cooperative agreement or other agreement for a qualified mass transportation project under this section also is available to finance the leasing of equipment and facilities for use in mass transportation, subject to regulations the Secretary prescribes limiting the grant or cooperative arrangement or other agreement to leasing arrangements that are more cost effective than purchase or construction.

“(e) LIMITATION ON USE OF AVAILABLE AMOUNTS.—The Secretary may not use more than 5 percent of the amount made available for a fiscal year under section 5338(m) to carry out planning, research, and technical assistance under this section, including the development of technology appropriate for use in a qualified mass transportation project. Amounts made available under this subsection are in addition to amounts otherwise available for planning, research, and technical assistance under this title or any other provision of law.

“(f) PLANNING PROCESS.—In undertaking a qualified mass transportation project under this section—

“(1) if the qualified participant is a Federal land management agency—

“(A) the Secretary, in cooperation with the Secretary of the Interior, shall develop transportation planning procedures that are consistent with sections 5303 through 5306; and

“(B) the General Management Plans of the units of the National Park System shall be incorporated into the planning process;

“(2) if the qualified participant is a State or local governmental authority, or more than 1 State or local governmental authority in more than 1 State, the qualified participant shall comply with sections 5303 through 5306;

“(3) if the national parks and related public lands at issue lie in multiple States, there shall be cooperation in the planning process under sections 5303 through 5306, to the maximum extent practicable, as determined by the Secretary, between those States and the Secretary of the Interior; and

“(4) the qualified participant shall comply with the public participation requirements of section 5307(c).

“(g) GOVERNMENT’S SHARE OF COSTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish the Federal Government share of assistance to a qualified participant under this section.

“(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—In establishing the Government’s share of the net costs of a qualified transportation project under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall consider—

“(A) visitation levels and the revenue derived from user fees in the national parks and related public lands at issue;

“(B) the extent to which the qualified participant coordinates with an existing public or private mass transportation authority;

“(C) private investment in the qualified mass transportation project, including the provision of contract services, joint development activities, and the use of innovative financing mechanisms;

“(D) the clear and direct benefit to a qualified participant assisted under this section; and

“(E) any other matters that the Secretary considers appropriate to carry out this section.

“(3) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, Federal funds appropriated to any Federal land management agency may be counted toward the non-Federal share of the costs of any mass transportation project that is eligible for assistance under this section.

“(h) SELECTION OF QUALIFIED MASS TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS.—In awarding assistance for a qualified mass transportation project under this section, the Secretary shall consider—

“(1) project justification, including the extent to which the project would conserve the resources, prevent adverse impact, and enhance the environment;

“(2) the location of the qualified mass transportation project, to assure that the selection of projects—

“(A) is geographically diverse nationwide; and

“(B) encompasses both urban and rural areas;

“(3) the size of the qualified mass transportation project, to assure a balanced distribution;

“(4) historical and cultural significance of a project;

“(5) safety;

“(6) the extent to which the project would enhance livable communities;

“(7) the extent to which the project would reduce pollution, including noise and visual pollution;

“(8) the extent to which the project would reduce congestion and improve the mobility of people in the most efficient manner; and

“(9) any other matters that the Secretary considers appropriate to carry out this section.

“(i) PROJECTS OF REGIONAL OR NATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE.—

“(1) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—In addition to other qualified mass transportation projects, the Secretary may select a qualified mass transportation project that is of regional or national significance, or that has significant visitation, or that can benefit from alternative transportation solutions to problems of resource management, pollution, congestion, mobility, and accessibility. Such projects shall meet the criteria set forth in paragraphs (2) through (5) of section 5309(e), as applicable.

“(2) PROJECT SELECTION CRITERIA.—

“(A) CONSIDERATIONS.—In selecting a qualified mass transportation project described in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall consider, as appropriate, in addition to the considerations set forth in subsection (h)—

“(i) visitation levels;

“(ii) the use of innovative financing or joint development strategies;

“(iii) coordination with the gateway communities; and

“(iv) any other matters that the Secretary considers appropriate to carry out this subsection.

“(B) CERTAIN LOCATIONS.—For fiscal years 1999 through 2003, projects described in para-

graph (1) may include the following locations:

“(i) Grand Canyon National Park.

“(ii) Zion National Park.

“(iii) Yosemite National Park.

“(iv) Acadia National Park.

“(C) LIMIT.—No project assisted under this subsection shall receive more than 12 percent of the total amount made available under this section in any fiscal year.

“(D) FULL FUNDING GRANT AGREEMENTS.—A project assisted under this subsection whose net project cost is greater than \$25,000,000 shall be carried out through a full funding grant agreement in accordance with section 5309(g).

“(j) UNDERTAKING PROJECTS IN ADVANCE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may pay the Government's share of the net project cost to a qualified participant that carries out any part of a qualified mass transportation project without assistance under this section, and according to all applicable procedures and requirements, if—

“(A) the qualified participant applies for the payment;

“(B) the Secretary approves the payment; and

“(C) before carrying out that part of the project, the Secretary approves the plans and specifications in the same way as other projects assisted under this chapter.

“(2) INTEREST.—The cost of carrying out a part of a project referred to in paragraph (1) includes the amount of interest earned and payable on bonds issued by the State or local governmental authority, to the extent proceeds of the bond are expended in carrying out that part. However, the amount of interest under this paragraph may not exceed the most favorable interest terms reasonably available for the project at the time of borrowing. The applicant shall certify, in a manner that is satisfactory to the Secretary, that the applicant has shown reasonable diligence in seeking the most favorable financial terms.

“(3) COST CHANGE CONSIDERATIONS.—The Secretary shall consider changes in project cost indices when determining the estimated cost under paragraph (2).

“(k) PROJECT MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT.—The Secretary may use not more than 0.5 percent of amounts made available under this section for a fiscal year to oversee projects and participants in accordance with section 5327.

“(l) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAWS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise specifically provided in this section, but subject to paragraph (2) of this subsection, the Secretary shall require that all grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, or other agreements under this section shall be subject to the requirements of sections 5307(d), 5307(i), and any other terms, conditions, requirements, and provisions that the Secretary determines are necessary or appropriate to carry out this section, including requirements for the distribution of proceeds on disposition of real property and equipment resulting from the project assisted under this section.

“(2) LABOR STANDARDS.—Sections 5323(a)(1)(D) and 5333(b) apply to assistance provided under this section.

“(m) STATE INFRASTRUCTURE BANKS.—A project assisted under this section shall be eligible for funding through a State Infrastructure Bank or other innovative financing mechanism otherwise available to finance an eligible mass transportation project under this chapter.

“(n) ASSET MANAGEMENT.—The Secretary may transfer the Department of Transportation interest in and control over all facilities and equipment acquired under this section to a qualified participant for use and

disposition in accordance with property management rules and regulations of the department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government.

“(o) COORDINATION OF RESEARCH AND DEPLOYMENT OF NEW TECHNOLOGIES.—The Secretary may undertake, or make grants or contracts (including agreements with departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government) or other agreements for research, development, and deployment of new technologies that will conserve resources and prevent adverse environmental impact, improve visitor mobility, accessibility and enjoyment, and reduce pollution, including noise and visual pollution, in the national parks and related public lands. The Secretary may request and receive appropriate information from any source. This subsection does not limit the authority of the Secretary under any other provision of law.

“(p) REPORT.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, shall report annually to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate, on the allocation of amounts to be made available to assist qualified mass transportation projects under this section. Such report shall be included in the report required under section 5309(m)(3).

“(q) STUDY OF TRANSIT NEEDS IN NATIONAL PARKS AND RELATED PUBLIC LANDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in coordination with the Secretary of the Interior, shall undertake a comprehensive study of alternative transportation needs in national parks and related public lands managed by Federal land management agencies. The study shall be submitted to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate not later than January 1, 2000.

“(2) STUDY ELEMENTS.—The study required by paragraph (1) shall—

“(A) identify transportation strategies that improve the management of the national parks and related public lands;

“(B) identify national parks and related public lands with existing and potential problems of adverse impact, high congestion, and pollution, or which can benefit from alternative transportation modes;

“(C) assess the feasibility of alternative transportation modes; and

“(D) identify and estimate the costs of alternative transportation modes for each of the national parks and related public lands referred to in paragraph (1).

“(3) FUNDING.—From amounts made available under section 5338(m), \$500,000 shall be made available in fiscal year 1999 to carry out this subsection.”

(b) AUTHORIZATIONS.—Section 5338 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(m) SECTION 5339.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out section 5339 \$50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

“(2) AVAILABILITY.—Amounts made available under this subsection for any fiscal year shall remain available until expended until the last day of the third fiscal year commencing after the last day of the fiscal year for which the amounts were initially made available under this subsection.”

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“5339. Mass transportation in national parks and related public lands.”

## SECTION-BY-SECTION—TRANSIT IN PARKS ACT

I. Amends Federal Transit laws by adding new section 5339, "Mass Transportation in National Parks and Related Public Lands."

II. Statement of Policies, Findings, and Purposes:

To encourage and promote the development of transportation systems for the betterment of national parks and related public lands and to conserve natural, historical, and cultural resources and prevent adverse impact, relieve congestion, minimize transportation fuel consumption, reduce pollution and enhance visitor mobility and accessibility and the visitor experience.

To that end, this program establishes federal assistance to certain Federal land management agencies and State and local governmental authorities to finance mass transportation capital projects, to encourage public-private partnerships, and to assist in the research and deployment of improved mass transportation equipment and methods.

## III. Definitions:

(1) eligible "Federal land management agencies" are: National Park Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Bureau of Land Management (all under Department of the Interior).

(2) "national parks and related public lands"; eligible areas under the management of these agencies.

(3) "qualified mass transportation project": a capital mass transportation project carried out within or adjacent to national parks and related public lands, including rail projects, clean fuel vehicles, joint development activities, pedestrian and bike paths, waterborne access, or projects that otherwise better protect the national parks and related public lands and increase visitor mobility and accessibility.

IV. Federal Agency Cooperative Arrangements:

Implements the Memorandum of Understanding between the Departments of Transportation and the Interior for the exchange of technical assistance, the development of transportation policy and coordination, and the establishment of criteria for planning, selection and funding of capital projects under this section. The Secretary of Transportation selects the projects, after consultation with Secretary of the Interior.

## V. Assistance:

To be provided through grants, cooperative agreements, or other agreements, including leasing under certain conditions, for an eligible capital project under this section. Not more than 5% of the amounts available can be used for planning, research and technical assistance, and these amounts can be supplemented from other sources.

## VI. Planning Process:

The Departments of Transportation and Interior shall cooperatively develop a planning process consistent with the ISTEA planning process in sections 5305 through 5306 of the Federal Transit laws.

## VII. Government's Share of the Costs:

In determining the Federal Transit Administration share of the project costs, the Secretary of Transportation must consider certain factors, including visitation levels and user fee revenues, the coordination in the project development with a public or private transit authority, private investment, and whether there is a clear and direct financial benefit to the applicant. The intent is to establish criteria for a sliding scale of assistance, with a lower Government share for large projects that can attract outside investment, and a higher Government share for projects that may not have access to such outside resources. In addition, funds from the Federal land management agencies can be counted as the local share.

## VIII. Selection of Projects:

The Secretary shall consider: (1) project justification, including the extent to which the project conserves the resources, prevents adverse impact and enhances the environment; (2) project location to ensure geographic diversity and both rural and urban projects; (3) project size for a balanced distribution; (4) historical and cultural significance; (5) safety; (6) the extent to which the project would enhance livable communities; (7) the reduction of pollution, including noise and visual pollution; (8) the reduction of congestion and the improvement of the mobility of people in the most efficient manner; and (9) any other considerations the Secretary deems appropriate. Projects funded under this section must meet certain transit law requirements.

## IX. Projects of Regional or National Significance

This is a special category that sets forth criteria for special, generally larger, projects or for those areas that may have problems of resource management, pollution, congestion, mobility, and accessibility that can be addressed by this program. Additional project selection criteria include: visitation levels; the use of innovative financing or joint development strategies; coordination with the gateway communities; and any other considerations the Secretary deems appropriate. Projects under this section must meet certain Federal Transit New Starts criteria. This section identifies some locations that may fit these criteria. Any project in this category that is \$25 million or greater in cost will have a full funding grant agreement similar to Federal Transit New Starts projects. No project can receive more than 12% of the total amount available in any given year.

## X. Undertaking Projects in Advance:

This provision applies current transit law to this section, allowing projects to advance prior to receiving Federal funding, but allowing the advance activities to be counted so the local share as long as certain conditions are met.

## IX. Project Management Oversight:

This provision applies current transit law to this section, limiting oversight funds to 0.5% per year of the funds made available for this section.

## XII. Relationship to Other Laws:

This provision applies certain transit laws to all projects funded under this section and permits the Secretary to apply any other terms or conditions he deems appropriate.

## XIII. State Infrastructure Banks:

A project assisted under this section can also use funding from a State Infrastructure Bank or other innovative financing mechanism that funds eligible transit projects.

## XIV. Asset Management:

This provision permits the Secretary of Transportation to transfer control over a transit asset acquired with Federal funds under this section in accord with certain Federal property management rules.

## XV. Coordination of Research and Deployment of New Technologies:

This provision allows grants for research and deployment of new technologies to meet the special needs of the national park lands.

## XVI. Report:

This requires the Secretary of Transportation to submit a report on projects funded under this section to the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and the Senate Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee, to be included in the Department's annual project report.

## XVII. Study of Transit Needs in National Park Lands:

This authorizes \$500,000 for a comprehensive study of alternative transportation needs in national parks and related public

lands to be completed by January 1, 2000, and specifies the study elements.

## XVIII. Authorization:

\$50,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated for the Secretary to carry out this program for each of the fiscal years 1999 through 2003.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 26, 1997]

## STRICT LIMITS ON CARS SET FOR 3 NATIONAL PARKS—RAIL AND BUS SYSTEMS TO EASE TRAFFIC JAMS

(By Joby Warrick)

The Clinton administration is imposing a virtual ban on cars in busy sections of the Grand Canyon and two other national parks as part of a strategy to ease the traffic jams that have tarnished America's most spectacular natural attractions.

Interior Secretary Bruce Babbitt and Transportation Secretary Rodney E. Slater yesterday jointly announced plans for mass transit systems that will dramatically change the way most visitors experience the Grand Canyon, Yosemite National Park in California and Zion National Park in southwestern Utah. The plans call for ripping up roads and dozens of acres of existing parking lots and using buses and trains to ferry tourists into the parks.

The transit systems—which could be introduced in other parks—are designed to relieve the chronic congestion that is one of the most serious challenges facing park administrators. Because of record numbers of visitors, many of the nation's most-beloved tourist destinations are in danger of being "loved to death," Babbitt said.

"The road to [Grand Canyon's] South Rim is now jammed with cars," Babbitt said. "The once fresh and clear air now smells of diesel fumes and asphalt, the stunning view now marred by filling stations and smog, the sound of breeze-rustled pines now drowned by the echo of engines and horns."

Ever-larger crowds forced Yosemite officials to begin turning away visitors on the busiest days. But Babbitt said buses and trains will allow all the parks to "keep the 'Welcome' sign out."

Under the pilot programs announced yesterday, visitors to the parks could be riding trains or buses by 2001. At Grand Canyon National Park, a \$14 million light rail line would carry up to 4,000 riders an hour from a remote parking lot to a new visitor center at the park's South Rim. The center will be paid for with funds from park entry fees, which are not expected to increase.

Once in the park, visitors can travel to destinations using a fleet of clean-burning buses that will run on electricity or natural gas. Overnight guests could continue to use cars to drive to hotels or campsites within the park.

Similar systems using buses will be established at Zion and at Yosemite, which two weeks ago announced a plan designed to cut traffic levels by 50 percent.

The announcement comes a year after President Clinton ordered the agencies to develop alternative transportation strategies to curb overcrowding in the most popular national parks. The administration also has banned some flights at the Grand Canyon.

Park officials applauded details of the new transit plans. Robert Arnberger, superintendent of Grand Canyon National Park, said the park's resources were being "hammered" by a daily onslaught of 6,100 vehicles. Competition among motorists for the park's 2,000 parking spaces have prompted fights, at least one attempted murder charge and "God knows how many divorces."

Environmental groups also praised the decision and urged the administration to push for more aggressive restrictions in air traffic around national parks.

"We want to see the sun reflecting off waterfalls and canyons—not the bumper of the car in front of us," said Bill Meadows, president of The Wilderness Society. "Even in Disney World, cars don't go right to the heart of the park."

AMERICAN PUBLIC  
TRANSIT ASSOCIATION,  
Washington, DC, April 1, 1998.

Hon. PAUL S. SARBANES,  
Ranking Minority Member, Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SARBANES: Thank you for forwarding us a draft copy of the "Transit in Parks (TRIP) Act" which would amend federal transit law at chapter 53, title 49 U.S.C.

The Act would authorize federal assistance to certain federal agencies and state and local entities to finance mass transit projects generally for the purpose of addressing transportation congestion and mobility issues at national parks. Among other things, the bill would implement the recent Memorandum of Understanding between the Department of Transportation and Interior regarding joint efforts of those federal agencies to encourage the use of public transportation at national parks.

In December 1997, I was pleased to write to the Secretaries of Transportation and Interior in support of their MOU, and I am just as pleased to support your efforts to improve mobility in our national parks. Public transportation clearly has much to offer citizens who visit these national treasures, where congestion and pollution are significant—and growing—problems. Moreover, this legislation should broaden the base of support for public transportation, a key principle APTA has been advocating for many years. In that regard, we will be reviewing your bill with APTA's legislative leadership.

I applaud you for introducing the legislation, and look forward to continuing to work with you and your staff.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM W. MILLAR,  
President.

NATIONAL PARKS  
AND CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION,  
April 20, 1998.

Hon. PAUL SARBANES,  
U.S. Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SARBANES: On behalf of the National Parks and Conservation Association and its nearly half a million members, I want to thank you for your foresight and leadership in proposing a bill that would enhance transit options for access to America's national parks.

As you know, from 1975 to 1996, the national parks have experienced a surge in visitation, from 190.4 million to 265.8 million visitors per year. With this increased public interest in these special places has come substantial additional burdens on the resources that have drawn such public acclaim. As more people crowd into our national parks (typically by auto) fragile habitat, endangered plants and animals, unique historical treasures, and nationally recognized symbols of our cultural heritage will become damaged from air and water pollution, noise intrusion, and inappropriate use.

Your bill's establishment of a new program within the Federal Transit Administration, dedicated to enhancing transit options in and adjacent to the national parks, can have a powerful, positive effect on the future integrity of the parks and their resources by reducing the need for access by automobile. Development of transportation centers and auto parking lots outside the parks, and the use of buses, vans, and rail systems would provide much more efficient means of han-

dling the crush of visitation. As a complement to the Federal Lands Highway Program which provides funds principally for park road projects through the Federal Highway Administration, your legislation would properly recognize the critical role that mass transit can play in protecting the parks and enhancing the visitor experience.

In accomplishing its goal, your bill would further the Memorandum of Agreement signed by the U.S. Department of the Interior and the U.S. Department of Transportation last December. This memorandum would boost the role of alternative transportation solutions for national parks, particularly those most heavily impacted by visitation, including Yellowstone, Yosemite, the Grand Canyon, and Zion. Your bill would also provide an excellent opportunity for the National Park Service to enter into public/private partnerships between the federal government and states, localities, and the private sector to provide a fuller range of transportation options than exists today. These partnerships could leverage funds that the National Park Service currently has great difficulty accessing.

NPCA looks upon your bill as a creative new mechanism to fulfill the principal federal mandate governing the national parks, which is "to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein, and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." We look forward to working with you to move this legislation to enactment.

Sincerely,

THOMAS C. KIERNAN,  
President.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION  
POLICY PROJECT,  
April 21, 1998.

Hon. PAUL SARBANES,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SARBANES: On behalf of the Surface Transportation Policy Project, a coalition of over 30 national and 200 local and regional groups that work to make transportation policy contribute to healthy communities and a healthy environment, I would like to commend you for the legislation you are introducing to provide a direct funding source for alternative transportation projects in our national parks. Your leadership in bringing attention to this emerging issue will be a major building block in what we hope will be a broad effort to lessen the environmental impacts of visitation on these most important natural areas.

We believe that public transportation can be the right choice for many parks, particularly those where visitors enter from only one or two major access corridors, and a majority of them visit a small number of popular destinations within the park. In these circumstances, allowing people to leave their cars behind will both enhance the park experience for all visitors, who will not have to negotiate heavy traffic in order to have a quality outdoor experience, and will benefit visitors who will not have to fight for parking spaces at popular attractions.

The STPP coalition appreciates your leadership on this issue. Please let me know if there is anything we can do to help you advance this important piece of legislation.

Sincerely,

ROY KIENITZ,  
Deputy Director.

NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE  
COUNCIL—ENVIRONMENTAL DE-  
FENSE FUND,

April 22, 1998.

Senator PAUL SARBANES,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Dear Senator: On behalf of the Natural Resources Defense Council and the Environmental Defense Fund, we are writing to express our support for your bill, the Transit in Parks Act, which will provide dedicated funding for transit projects in our national parks. Too many of our parks suffer from the consequences of poor transportation systems: traffic congestion, air and water pollution, and disturbance of the natural ecosystem. We believe that increased funding for transit will help mitigate some of these problems. A good working transit system in a number of our national parks will make the park experience not only more enjoyable for the many families that travel there, it will help improve environmental conditions. High ozone (smog) levels that impair peoples breathing and exacerbates asthma, and haze, which can obliterate the views at our parks, will both be abated by a decrease in the number of cars and congestion levels.

We appreciate your leadership on this issue and your dedication to the health of our national parks. We look forward to working with you to move your legislation forward.

Sincerely,

JOHN ADAMS,  
Executive Director, Natural Resources De-  
fense Council.

FRED KRUPP,  
Executive Director, Environmental Defense  
Fund.

By Mr. FORD (for himself, Mr.  
ROCKEFELLER, Mr. DORGAN, Mr.  
HOLLINGS, and Mr. HARKIN):

S. 1968. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to implement a pilot program to improve access to the national transportation system for small communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

THE AIR SERVICE RESTORATION ACT

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, today I am pleased to introduce the Air Service Restoration Act. Over the last several months, there has been a growing debate about the airline industry, competition, slots and service. This Act seeks to reshape this debate by focusing on problems that small communities have with a deregulated aviation system. Deregulation has provided many benefits to many communities. But, as the General Accounting Office has noted, there are many small communities which have been left behind.

Some of these communities, these "pockets of pain" as noted by the GAO, would like nothing better than for the Congress to re-regulate the industry. However, Mr. President, I do not believe that is the answer—and that is not what this bill seeks to do. Rather, our legislation proposes to facilitate public-private actions which focus on developing market opportunities for small communities. In this way, communities can develop air service that fits the needs and desires of the community; rather than Washington regulating service.

This bill is not about competition, but rather the lack of service. As the General Accounting Office noted, since deregulation, communities have seen a decline in the types of service and quality of service. That decline can be attributed to a variety of factors: airports nearby with better, or cheaper, service, the loss of a major employer in the community, or a lack of information about what it takes to create a market.

But, there are ways to reverse these trends. Let me give you an example. One town in Virginia had about 18,000 enplanements annually, but gradually declined to under 10,000. The airport set out very aggressively to find out what happened, and why. Ultimately, the enplanements went back up, and service is now increasing.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, not all our communities have the resources to aggressively pursue or create market needs. The Federal government must play a role in helping our small communities. It can not stand by as communities lose service, or get cut off from the national air transportation system. Travel, tourism and businesses are too dependent on the system, and each of our small communities must be a part of the system.

This legislation brings together the Federal government, local government, airports, air carriers and the business communities in partnership to develop ways to increase the use of our nation's small airports. Without these services, small communities can not attract new jobs. It is that simple. We have too much invested in our small towns to let them simply lose their access to the national air transportation system.

In Owensboro, Kentucky, our airport, in conjunction with community business leaders, is developing an air park: attracting businesses, and creating jobs. That type of activity should be encouraged.

There are a number of carriers that will not like some of the provisions in the bill—for example, the bill gives DOT the authority to require joint fares and interlining. These provisions may be necessary to make sure that a small community has the ability to connect with major hubs. Such authority would only be required in limited circumstances.

Mr. President, we need to begin to look at solutions to the problems faced by our small communities—and the need for these communities to have access to our national aviation transportation system. The economic survival of these communities in a global marketplace depends on the ability to connect to the marketplace. It is my hope and belief that this legislation re-focuses the debate on this issue—connecting America's small communities to the greatest, most efficient, and safest air transportation system in the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1968

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

**SECTION. 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the "Air Service Restoration Act".

**SEC. 2. FINDINGS.**

The Congress finds that—

(1) a national transportation system providing safe, high quality service to all areas of the United States is essential to interstate commerce and the economic well-being of cities and towns throughout the United States;

(2) taxpayers throughout the United States have supported and helped to fund the United States aviation infrastructure and have a right to expect that aviation services will be provided in an equitable and fair manner to every region of the country;

(3) some communities have not benefited from airline deregulation and access to essential airports and air services has been limited;

(4) air service to a number of small communities has suffered since deregulation;

(5) studies by the Department of Transportation have documented that, since the airline industry was deregulated in 1978—

(A) 34 small communities have lost service and many small communities have had jet aircraft service replaced by turboprop aircraft service;

(B) out of a total of 320 small communities, the number of small communities being served by major air carriers declined from 213 in 1978 to 33 in 1995;

(C) the number of small communities receiving service to only one major hub airport increased from 79 in 1978 to 134 in 1995; and

(D) the number of small communities receiving multiple-carrier service decreased from 136 in 1978 to 122 in 1995; and

(6) improving air service to small and medium-sized communities that have not benefited from fare reductions and improved service since deregulation will likely entail a range of Federal, State, regional, local, and private sector initiatives.

**SEC. 3. PURPOSE.**

The purpose of this Act is to facilitate, through a pilot program, incentives and projects that will help communities to improve their access to the essential airport facilities of the national air transportation system through public-private partnerships and to identify and establish ways to overcome the unique policy, economic, geographic, and marketplace factors that may inhibit the availability of quality, affordable air service to small communities.

**SEC. 4. ESTABLISHMENT OF SMALL COMMUNITY AVIATION DEVELOPMENT OFFICE.**

Section 102 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(g) SMALL COMMUNITY AIR SERVICE DEVELOPMENT OFFICE.—

"(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish within the Department of Transportation an Office of Aviation Development. The Office shall be headed by a Director, designated by the Secretary.

"(2) FUNCTIONS.—The Director shall—

"(A) function as a facilitator between small communities and air carriers;

"(B) carry out section 41743 of this title;

"(C) carry out the airline service restoration program under subchapter III of chapter 417 of this title;

"(D) ensure that the Bureau of Transportation Statistics collects data on passenger

information to assess the service needs of small communities;

"(E) work with and coordinate efforts with other Federal, State, and local agencies to increase the viability of service to small communities and the creation of aviation development zones; and

"(F) provide policy recommendations to the Secretary and the Congress that will ensure that small communities have access to quality, affordable air transportation services.

"(3) REPORTS.—The Director shall provide an annual report to the Secretary and the Congress beginning in 1999 that—

"(A) analyzes the availability of air transportation services in small communities, including, but not limited to, an assessment of the air fares charged for air transportation services in small communities compared to air fares charged for air transportation services in larger metropolitan areas and an assessment of the levels of service, measured by types of aircraft used, the availability of seats, and scheduling of flights, provided to small communities;

"(B) identifies the policy, economic, geographic and marketplace factors that inhibit the availability of quality, affordable air transportation services to small communities; and

"(C) provides policy recommendations to address the policy, economic, geographic, and marketplace factors inhibiting the availability of quality, affordable air transportation services to small communities."

**SEC. 5. COMMUNITY-CARRIER AIR SERVICE PROGRAM.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

**"§41743. Air service program for small communities**

"(a) COMMUNITIES PROGRAM.—Under advisory guidelines prescribed by the Secretary of Transportation, a small community or a consortia of small communities or a State may develop an assessment of its air service requirements, in such form as the Director of the Office of Aviation Development may require, and submit the assessment and service proposal to the Office.

"(b) SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS.—In selecting community programs for participation in the communities program under subsection (a), the Director shall apply criteria, including geographical diversity and the presentation of unique circumstances, that will demonstrate the feasibility of the program.

"(c) CARRIERS PROGRAM.—The Director shall invite part 121 air carriers and regional/commuter carriers (as such terms are defined in section 41715(d) of this title) to offer service proposals in response to, or in conjunction with, community aircraft service assessments submitted to the office under subsection (a). A service proposal under this paragraph shall include—

"(1) an assessment of potential daily passenger traffic, revenues, and costs necessary for the carrier to offer the service;

"(2) a forecast of the minimum percentage of that traffic the carrier would require the community to garner in order for the carrier to start up and maintain the service; and

"(3) the costs and benefits of providing jet service by regional or other jet aircraft.

"(d) OFFICE SUPPORT FUNCTION.—The Director shall work with small communities and air carriers, taking into account their proposals and needs, to facilitate the initiation of service. The Director—

"(1) may work with communities to develop innovative means and incentives for the initiation of service;

"(2) may obligate funds available to carry out this subchapter to make up the difference between the carrier's forecast and

the community's ability to generate the necessary percentage of traffic;

"(3) shall continue to work with both the carriers and the communities to develop a combination of community incentives and carrier service levels that—

"(A) are acceptable to communities and carriers; and

"(B) do not conflict with other Federal or State programs to facilitate air transportation to the communities;

"(4) may designate an airport in the program as an Air Service Development Zone and work with the community on means to attract business to the area surrounding the airport, to develop land use options for the area, and provide data, working with the Department of Commerce and other agencies;

"(5) may take such other action under subchapter III of this chapter as may be appropriate.

"(e) LIMITATIONS.—

"(1) COMMUNITY SUPPORT.—The Director may not provide financial assistance under subsection (c)(2) to any community unless the Director determines that—

"(A) a public-private partnership exists at the community level to carry out the community's proposal;

"(B) the community will make a substantial financial contribution that is appropriate for that community's resources;

"(C) the community has established an open process for soliciting air service proposals; and

"(D) the community will accord similar benefits to air carriers that are similarly situated.

"(2) AMOUNT.—The Director may not provide financial assistance under subsection (d)(2) to any community in excess of the lesser of—

"(A) up to 75 percent of the financial contribution made by the community; or

"(B) \$500,000 per year.

"(f) REPORT.—The Director shall report through the Secretary to the Congress annually on the progress made under this section during the preceding year in expanding commercial aviation service to small communities."

"(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The chapter analysis for chapter 417 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 41742 the following:

"41743. Air service program for small communities".

(c) WAIVER OF LOCAL CONTRIBUTION.—Section 41736(b) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

"Paragraph (4) does not apply to any community approved for service under this section during the period beginning October 1, 1991, and ending December 31, 1997."

#### SEC. 6. AIRLINE SERVICE RESTORATION PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 417 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

##### "SUBCHAPTER III. AIRLINE SERVICE RESTORATION

"41761. Pilot program project authority

"41762. Assistance to communities for service

"41763. Additional authority

"41764. Air traffic control services pilot program

##### "§41761. Pilot program project authority

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Office of Aviation Development shall establish a pilot program—

"(1) to assist communities and States with inadequate access to the national transportation system to improve their access to that system; and

"(2) to facilitate better link-ups to support the improved access.

"(b) PROJECT AUTHORITY.—Under the pilot program established pursuant to subsection (a), the Director may—

"(1) provide financial assistance by way of grants to small communities under section 41743; and

"(2) take such other action as may be appropriate.

"(c) OTHER ACTION.—Under the pilot program established pursuant to subsection (a), the Director may facilitate service by—

"(1) working with airports and air carriers to ensure that appropriate facilities are made available at essential airports;

"(2) requiring interline or joint-fare agreements between air carriers for domestic United States service if necessary to facilitate access to essential facilities for participants in the program subject to the right of a carrier being required to enter into such agreements to impose reasonable safety, service, and other obligations on the potential partner;

"(3) collecting data on air carrier service to small communities; and

"(4) providing policy recommendations to the Secretary to stimulate air service and competition to small communities.

##### "§41762. Assistance to communities for service

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Financial assistance provided under section 41743 during any fiscal year as part of the pilot program established under section 41761(a) shall be implemented for not more than—

"(1) 4 communities within any State at any given time; and

"(2) 40 communities in the entire program at any time.

For purposes of this subsection, a consortium of communities shall be treated as a single community.

"(b) ELIGIBILITY.—In order to participate in a pilot project under this subchapter, a State, community, or group of communities shall apply to the Secretary in such form and at such time, and shall supply such information, as the Secretary may require, and shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Secretary that—

"(1) the applicant has an identifiable need for access, or improved access, to the national air transportation system that would benefit the public;

"(2) the pilot project will provide material benefits to a broad section of the travelling public, businesses, educational institutions, and other enterprises whose access to the national air transportation system is limited;

"(3) the pilot project will not impede competition; and

"(4) the applicant has established, or will establish, public-private partnerships in connection with the pilot project to facilitate service to the public.

"(c) COORDINATION WITH SUBCHAPTER II.—The Secretary shall carry out this subchapter in such a manner as to complement action taken under subchapter II of this chapter. To the extent the Secretary determines to be appropriate, the Secretary may adopt criteria for implementation of this subchapter that are the same as, or similar to, the criteria developed under subchapter II for determining which airports are eligible under that subchapter. The Secretary shall also, to the extent possible, provide incentives where no direct, viable, and feasible alternative service exists, taking into account geographical diversity and appropriate market definitions.

"(d) MAXIMIZATION OF PARTICIPATION.—The Secretary shall structure the program established pursuant to section 41761(a) in a way designed to—

"(1) permit the participation of the maximum feasible number of communities and

States over a 5-year period by limiting the number of years of participation or otherwise; and

"(2) obtain the greatest possible leverage from the financial resources available to the Secretary and the applicant by—

"(A) progressively decreasing, on a project-by-project basis, any Federal financial incentives provided under this chapter over the 5-year period; and

"(B) terminating as early as feasible Federal financial incentives for any project determined by the Secretary after its implementation to be—

"(i) viable without further support under this subchapter; or

"(ii) failing to meet the purposes of this chapter or criteria established by the Secretary under the pilot program.

"(e) SUCCESS BONUS.—If Federal financial incentives to a community are terminated under subsection (d)(2)(B) because of the success of the program in that community, then that community may receive a one-time incentive grant to ensure the continued success of that program.

"(f) PROGRAM TO TERMINATE IN 5 YEARS.—No new financial assistance may be provided under this subchapter for any fiscal year beginning more than 5 years after the date of enactment of the Air Service Restoration Act.

##### "§4163. Additional authority

"In carrying out this chapter, the Secretary—

"(1) may provide assistance to States and communities in the design and application phase of any project under this chapter, and oversee the implementation of any such project;

"(2) may assist States and communities in putting together projects under this chapter to utilize private sector resources, other Federal resources, or a combination of public and private resources;

"(3) may accord priority to service by jet aircraft;

"(4) take such action as may be necessary to ensure that financial resources, facilities, and administrative arrangements made under this chapter are used to carry out the purposes of the Air Service Restoration Act; and

"(5) shall work with the Federal Aviation Administration on airport and air traffic control needs of communities in program.

##### "§4164. Air traffic control services pilot program

"(a) IN GENERAL.—To further facilitate the use of, and improve the safety at, small airports, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall establish a pilot program to contract for Level I air traffic control services at 20 facilities not eligible for participation in the Federal Contract Tower Program.

"(b) PROGRAM COMPONENTS.—In carrying out the pilot program established under subsection (a), the Administrator may—

"(1) utilize current, actual, site-specific data, forecast estimates, or airport system plan data provided by a facility owner or operator;

"(2) take into consideration unique aviation safety, weather, strategic national interest, disaster relief, medical and other emergency management relief services, status of regional airline service, and related factors at the facility;

"(3) approve for participation any facility willing to fund a pro rata share of the operating costs used by the Federal Aviation Administration to calculate, and, as necessary, a 1:1 benefit-to-cost ratio, as required for eligibility under the Federal Contract Tower Program; and

"(4) approve for participation any facility willing to fund a pro rata share of construction used by the Federal Aviation Administration to calculate, and, as necessary, a 1:1

benefit-to-cost ratio, as required for eligibility under the Federal Contract Tower Program.

“(c) REPORT.—One year before the pilot program established under subsection (a) terminates, the Administrator shall report to the Congress on the effectiveness of the program, with particular emphasis on the safety and economic benefits provided to program participants and the national air transportation system.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The chapter analysis for chapter 417 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

“SUBCHAPTER III. AIRLINE SERVICE RESTORATION

“41761. Pilot programs  
“41762. Financial assistance to States  
“41763. Additional authority  
“41764. Air traffic control services pilot program”.

**SEC. 7. FUNDING AUTHORITY.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Transportation may obligate not more than \$20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 1999 through 2002 to carry out subchapter III of chapter 417 of title 49, United States Code, out of funds otherwise available for aviation programs other than funds appropriated, obligated, or made available to carry out subchapter II of such chapter.

(b) SUCCESS BONUS.—If the Secretary determines that the program carried out under such subchapter III is successful in providing enhanced air carrier service to small communities, then the Secretary may obligate an additional amount, not in excess of \$5,000,000, for each of fiscal years 2001 and 2002 to carry out that subchapter out of such funds.

**SEC. 8. JOINT FARES AND INTERLINE AGREEMENTS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 417 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

“§4176. Joint fares and interline agreements for domestic transportation

“(a) IN GENERAL.—In order to more effectively facilitate service to small communities, the Secretary of Transportation may, if necessary, require an air carrier that serves an essential airport facility in the United States and an air carrier that offers service in an under-served market within the United States to enter into an agreement with a qualifying air carrier that files a request with the Secretary, in such form and manner and at such time as the Secretary may require.

“(b) SECRETARY MAY COMPEL JOINT FARE STRUCTURE.—If the Secretary determines that it is necessary in order to facilitate service to small communities, the Secretary may require any air carrier to enter into a joint-fare or interline agreement with any qualifying air carrier that serves an under-served market to facilitate air transportation.

“(c) APPLICATION LIMITED TO SERVICE TO COMMUNITIES RECEIVING DOT ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary may not require an air carrier to enter into an agreement under subsection (a) or (b) except to the extent determined by the Secretary to be necessary to the provision of air service to a community receiving financial assistance under section 41761. Nothing in this section provides authority for the Secretary to establish air fares for service to which this section applies.

“(d) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) QUALIFYING AIR CARRIER.—The term ‘qualifying air carrier’ means an air carrier that operates pursuant to a certificate of

public convenience and necessity under chapter 411 of this title.

“(2) UNDER-SERVED MARKET.—The term ‘under-served market’ means a commercial service airport that is a nonhub airport (as defined in section 41731(4) of this title), a small hub airport (as defined in section 41731(5) of this title), or an airport that is smaller than a nonhub or small hub airport.

“(3) ESSENTIAL AIRPORT FACILITY.—The term ‘essential airport facility’ means a hub airport (as defined in section 41731(a)(3) of this title).”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The chapter analysis for chapter 417 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 41715 the following:

“41716. Joint fares and interline agreements for domestic transportation”.

**SEC. 9. REVITALIZATION OF AIR SERVICE TO RURAL AREAS.**

Section 40101(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

“(16) ensuring that consumers in all regions of the United States, including those in small communities and rural and remote areas, have access to affordable, regularly scheduled air service.

“(17) ensuring that any slots given to air carriers to provide small community air service are withdrawn if the carrier fails to provide the service.”

**SEC. 10. MARKETING PRACTICES.**

Section 41712 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by—

“(1) inserting “(a) IN GENERAL.—” before “On”; and

(2) adding at the end thereof the following:

“(b) MARKETING PRACTICES THAT ADVERSELY AFFECT SERVICE TO SMALL OR MEDIUM COMMUNITIES.—Within 180 days after the date of enactment of the Air Service Restoration Act, the Secretary shall review the marketing practices of air carriers that may inhibit the availability of quality, affordable air transportation services to small and medium-sized communities, including—

“(1) marketing arrangements between airlines and travel agents;

“(2) code-sharing partnerships;

“(3) computer reservation system displays;

“(4) gate arrangements at airports; and

“(5) any other marketing practice that may have the same effect.

“(c) REGULATIONS.—If the Secretary finds, after conducting the review required by subsection (b), that marketing practices inhibit the availability of such service to such communities, then, after public notice and an opportunity for a hearing, the Secretary shall promulgate regulations that address the problem.”

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I rise today to join a number of my colleagues, and most especially Senators HOLLINGS, FORD, and DORGAN, in introducing the “Air Service Restoration Act of 1997.” This legislation is the result of many months of effort, first, to understand what has happened to air service in small and rural communities in the last twenty years and, then, to develop a comprehensive strategy for restoring and promoting air service to these areas—many of which have suffered such a dramatic decline in service and increase in fares that the U.S. Department of Transportation refers to them as “pockets of pain.”

By most accounts the 1978 deregulation of the airline industry has been a huge success—with lower fares, better

service, and more competition enjoyed by most of the nation, as well as an airline industry that has reached unprecedented levels of financial success and stability. But for all its successes, airline deregulation has one, potentially fatal, flaw—the creation of an ever-widening gap between the air transportation “haves” and “have-nots”, with small and rural communities across the nation left to choose between high-cost, poor-quality service or no service at all. Clearly we have not and are not meeting our responsibility to foster and maintain a truly national air transportation system.

West Virginia’s communities are unquestionably among the hardest hit in the nation when it comes to air service declines. Prior to deregulation, West Virginia was served by at least five major commercial air carriers. We enjoyed a comprehensive route structure and comfortable levels of jet service at competitive prices. In the twenty years since, every major carrier, with the notable exception of U.S. Airways, abandoned its direct service to West Virginia. Jet service all but disappeared. Three airports—Elkins, Martinsburg, and Wheeling—lost commercial passenger service altogether.

At the same time, West Virginia passengers experienced fare increases of 20-30 percent, in real terms, with service from regional or commuter airlines using smaller, turboprop planes. Some of these are solid airlines and offer good service, and we are thankful that they have stayed with us. But for many years their West Virginia product has been far inferior to that provided other communities—their planes are small, their schedules thin and their prices high. Not surprisingly, West Virginia businesses and passengers have responded by flying less or going elsewhere. At a time when the rest of the nation has experienced a 75 percent increase in air traffic, passenger enplanements in our state have declined at every airport, with a statewide decrease of nearly 40 percent.

My top priority over the past twenty years—the same twenty years as airline deregulation—has been to bring good jobs and opportunity to West Virginia. Whether it’s a specific project or a broad policy issue, from trade to connecting schools to the information highway, most of my work is about creating economic growth in my home state. In the last several years I have begun to see and hear more and more that the lack of convenient and affordable air service is holding us back, stunting economic growth in West Virginia just as it is in small and rural communities across the country. And unless we act now to restore and promote air service to under-served areas, we will never be able to close the economic development gaps in any meaningful and sustained way.

Part of the change that I believe needs to take place can and must occur at the state and local level, where business and community leaders know

what their needs are and can develop a real stake in the future of their airports by educating consumers, attracting air service, and filling airplanes. But aviation is a national issue, with global implications. No small or rural community should be expected to overcome the cumulative effect of twenty years of deregulation on its own. They need help, they've asked for help, and they deserve help.

The legislation that we introduce today is part of what I hope will be a new era in our national aviation policy—an era that builds on the successes of deregulation and takes responsibility for its failures. The centerpiece of the bill is a five-year \$100 million pilot program for up to 40 communities, with grants of up to \$500,000 to each community for local initiatives to attract and promote service. Communities would provide local matching funds of up to 25 percent, and could do so directly or indirectly, through mechanisms such as seat guarantees. The Department of Transportation would have the authority to facilitate links between pilot communities and major airports by requiring joint fares and interline agreements between dominant airlines and new service providers.

To administer the grant program and provide a resource for small communities both in and out of the pilot program, the bill creates a new Office of Small Community Air Service Development at the Department of Transportation dedicated to promoting and restoring air service to small communities. Among other tasks, this office would be responsible for ensuring that accurate and meaningful passenger traffic data is available regarding service to small communities, as it is today for larger communities.

To clarify the priority for small communities in receiving and retaining service to slot-controlled airports, the bill directs the Department to ensure that any slots given to air carriers for small community air service will be withdrawn if the carrier fails to provide the service.

To address a major infrastructure concern of small and rural airports, the bill establishes a pilot program allowing communities that face the loss of an air traffic control tower to instead share the cost of funding the tower, on a contract basis, in proportion to the cost-benefit ratio of the tower.

Finally, the bill calls on the Department to review the airline industry's current marketing practices—practices which many believe are exacerbating the decline in air service to small communities—and, if necessary, promulgate regulations to curb abuses that inhibit market entry.

The legislation we introduce today will begin to afford small and rural community air service the priority they deserve in our national transportation policy. It is my hope and intent to pursue this legislation in the context of the 1998 reauthorization of the Federal Aviation Administration and

Airport Improvement Program, and I look forward to working together with others of my colleagues, several of whom have shown a real commitment to achieving needed solutions in this area.

In the global marketplace of today air service has become perhaps the single most important mode of mass transportation. When it comes to economic growth, there is no substitute for good air service. If we are to ensure that all communities throughout the nation are prepared to compete in the next century, we have no choice but to improve their transportation options.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 1969. A bill to provide health benefits for workers and their families; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

THE HEALTH CARE FOR WORKING FAMILIES ACT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the Health Care for Working Families Act.

Today we resume the battle for health insurance for all Americans.

We face a continuing crisis in health care for millions of workers and their families. Forty-one million Americans are uninsured. The number grew by more than one million last year, and if we do nothing, it will continue to grow at the same alarming rate.

The vast majority—85%—of these uninsured Americans—are workers or members of their families. These citizens work hard—40 hours a week, 52 weeks of the year in most cases—but all their hard work cannot buy them the health insurance they need to protect their families, because they can't afford it and their employers won't provide it.

Every uninsured American is an American tragedy waiting to happen. Infants lose their chance to grow up strong and healthy because they do not get critical prenatal care. A young family loses its livelihood because a breadwinner cannot afford essential medical services. Middle-aged parents see the savings set aside to send their children to college or pay for their retirement swept away by a tidal wave of medical debt.

These conditions should be unacceptable in America today. The time has come to take a simple but important step toward the day when every job carries with it a guarantee of affordable family health care.

Every business is expected to pay a minimum wage, and to obey the child labor laws. Every business is expected to provide safe and healthy working conditions, and to protect against injury on the job through worker's compensation. Every business is expected to contribute to retirement through Social Security, and to the health needs of the elderly through Medicare. It is long past time for businesses also to contribute to the cost of basic health insurance coverage for their workers.

Some small firms have special problems that may call for special solu-

tions. But there can be no excuse for large firms to shirk their responsibility to provide affordable health insurance for their workers.

Under the bill we are introducing today, businesses with 50 or more workers will be required to provide health insurance coverage. Approximately half of all uninsured employees and their families—15 million people—will gain the coverage they need and deserve. This legislation is a giant step toward the day when every American will be guaranteed the fundamental right to health care.

Many—even most—businesses already provide insurance. The vast majority of large business, in particular, fulfill this obligation. But too many others do not. In more and more cases, unfair competition from firms that refuse to provide insurance for their workers is compelling other firms to reduce health benefits or drop coverage altogether.

Health insurance for working Americans does not have to mean complicated regulations or excessive government intervention. The legislation we are introducing today is simple—less than ten pages. It will not cost taxpayers a dime. It includes no specific mandated benefits or burdensome red tape. It simply says that every business with 50 workers or more must offer its employees coverage equal in value to the Blue Cross/Blue Shield Standard Option Plan that is available to every Senator and Representative and must pay at least 72% of the cost—the same proportion that taxpayers contribute for every member of Congress.

The American people deserve health care for their families that is every bit as good as the health care they provide to every member of Congress. The incremental reform enacted in recent years has helped many families, but it is far from sufficient. The time has come for Congress to take a larger step.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1969

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Health Care for Working Families Act".

#### SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) every industrialized country in the world except the United States guarantees the fundamental right to health care to all its citizens;

(2) 41,000,000 Americans are without health insurance coverage;

(3) the number of uninsured Americans is growing every year;

(4) the vast majority of uninsured Americans are workers or dependents of workers;

(5) for more than half a century, Congress has enacted laws to ensure that work is appropriately rewarded, including laws establishing a minimum wage and a 40 hour work week, laws ensuring safe and healthy working conditions, and laws requiring employers to contribute to the cost of retirement security through Social Security and Medicare; and

(6) as the United States approaches the 21st century, it is time to enact requirements guaranteeing that jobs carry with them affordable, adequate health insurance benefits.

**SEC. 3. HEALTH BENEFITS FOR EMPLOYEES AND THEIR FAMILIES.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 201 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

**"TITLE II—HEALTH BENEFITS FOR EMPLOYEES AND THEIR FAMILIES**

**"SEC. 201. HEALTH BENEFITS.**

"(a) OFFER TO ENROLL.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Each large employer, in accordance with this title, shall offer to each of its employees the opportunity to enroll in a qualifying health benefit plan that provides coverage for the employee and the family of the employee.

"(2) QUALIFYING HEALTH BENEFIT PLAN.—For purposes of this title, the term 'qualifying health benefit plan' means a plan that provides benefits for health care items and services that are actuarially equivalent or greater in value than the benefits offered as of January 1, 1998 under the Blue Cross/Blue Shield Standard Plan provided under the Federal Employees Health Benefit Program under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, and that meets the requirements of title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act applicable to the plan.

"(b) CONTRIBUTION AND WITHHOLDING.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Each large employer, in accordance with this title, shall—

"(A) contribute to the cost of any qualifying health benefit plan offered to its employees under subsection (a); and

"(B) withhold from the wages of an employee, the employee share of the premium assessed for coverage under the qualifying health benefit plan.

"(2) REQUIRED CONTRIBUTION.—Except as provided in paragraphs (3) and (4), the portion of the total premium to be paid by a large employer under paragraph (1)(A) shall not be less than the portion of the total premium that the Federal Government contributes under the Blue Cross/Blue Shield Standard Plan provided under the Federal Employees Health Benefit Program under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code.

"(3) PART-TIME EMPLOYEES.—With respect to an employee who works less than 30 hours per week, the employer contribution required under paragraph (2) shall be equal to the product of—

"(A) the contribution required under paragraph (2); and

"(B) the ratio of number of hours worked by the employee in a typical week to 30 hours.

"(4) LIMITATION.—No employer contribution shall be required under this subsection with respect to an employer who works less than 10 hours per week.

"(c) EMPLOYEE OBLIGATION UNDER CERTAIN PROGRAMS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—With respect to an employee covered under a Federal health insurance program (as defined in paragraph (3)), such employee shall accept an offer of health insurance coverage under subsection (a) and agree to the appropriate payroll

withholdings under subsection (b)(1)(B) for such coverage or provide for the payment of the employee share of premiums under paragraph (2), except that this subsection shall not apply—

"(A) with respect to an employee who is otherwise covered under an employment-based qualified health benefit plan; or

"(B) with respect to the coverage of a family member of an employee if the employee does not elect coverage for such family member and the family member is otherwise covered under an employment-based qualified health benefit plan.

"(2) PAYMENT OF PREMIUMS.—At the request of an employee to which paragraph (1) applies, the relevant Federal administrator of the Federal health insurance program involved shall provide for the payment of the employee share of the premium assessed for coverage under the qualifying health benefit plan involved. For purposes of title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.), the requirement of this paragraph shall be deemed to be a requirement under the appropriate State plan under such title XIX.

"(3) FEDERAL HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM.—As used in this subsection, the term 'Federal health insurance program' means—

"(A) the medicare or medicaid program under title XVIII or XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 or 1396 et seq.);

"(B) the Federal employee health benefit program under chapter 89 of title V, United States Code; or

"(C) the Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services (CHAMPUS), as defined in section 1073(4) of title 10, United States Code.

"(d) LARGE EMPLOYERS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The provisions of this title shall only apply to large employers.

"(2) DEFINITION.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—As used in paragraph (1), the term 'large employer' means, with respect to a calendar year and plan year, an employer that employed an average of at least 50 full-time employees on business days during the preceding calendar year and who employs not less than 50 employees on the first day of the plan year.

"(B) EXCEPTION.—The provisions of this title shall apply with respect to an employer that is not a large employer under subparagraph (A) if the majority of the services performed by such employer consist of services performed on behalf of a single large employer.

"(3) CONTRACT WORKERS.—For purposes of this title, a contract worker of an employer shall be considered to be an employee of the employer.

**"SEC. 202. REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO TIMING OF COVERAGE AND WITHHOLDING.**

"(a) DATE OF INITIAL COVERAGE.—In the case of an employee enrolled under a qualifying health benefit plan provided by a large employer, the coverage under the plan must begin not later than 30 days after the day on which the employee first performs an hour of service as an employee of that employer.

"(b) WITHHOLDING PERMITTED.—No provision of State law shall prevent an employer of an employee enrolled under a qualifying health benefit plan established under this title from withholding the amount of any premium due by the employee from the payroll of the employee.

**"SEC. 203. ENFORCEMENT.**

"(a) CIVIL MONEY PENALTY AGAINST PRIVATE EMPLOYERS.—The provisions of section 502—

"(1) relating to the commencement of civil actions by the Secretary under subsection (a) of such section;

"(2) relating to civil money penalties under subsection (c)(2) of such section; and

"(3) relating to the procedures for assessing, collecting and the judicial review of such civil money penalties;

shall apply with respect to any large employer that does not comply with this title.

"(b) INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.—The provisions of section 17 shall apply with respect to violations of this title.

**"SEC. 204. PREEMPTION.**

"Nothing in this title shall be construed to prevent a State from establishing, implementing, or continuing in effect standards and requirements relating to employer provided health insurance coverage unless such standards and requirements prevent the application of a requirements of this title.

**"SEC. 205. DEFINITION AND EFFECTIVE DATE.**

"(a) DEFINITION.—In this title the terms 'family' and 'family member' mean, with respect to an employee, the spouse and children (including adopted children) of the employee.

"(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), this title shall apply with respect to employers on January 1, 1999.

"(2) COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENTS.—This title shall apply with respect to employees covered under a collective bargaining agreement on the first day of the first plan year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, or January 1, 1999, whichever occurs later."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 is amended by striking out the first section and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

**"SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

"This Act may be cited as the 'Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938'.

**"TITLE I—WAGES AND HOURS".**

(2) The Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 is amended by striking out "this Act" each place it occurs and inserting in lieu thereof "this title".

(3) Section 17 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 217) is amended by inserting "or violations of title II" before the period.

**SEC. 4. AMENDMENT TO PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT.**

Title II of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 202 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

**"SEC. 247. REQUIREMENT FOR HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE.**

"A health insurance issuer (as defined in section 2791(a)) that offers health insurance coverage (as defined in section 2791(a)) to an employer on behalf of the employees of such employer shall ensure that such coverage complies with the requirements of title II of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938."

By Mr. ABRAHAM for himself and Mr. DASCHLE:

S. 1970. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to establish a program to provide assistance in the conservation of neotropical migratory birds; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

THE NEOTROPICAL MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION ACT OF 1998

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the "Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act of 1998." This legislation, which I am introducing today with my distinguished colleague, Senator DASCHLE, is designed to protect over 90 endangered species of bird spending certain seasons in the United States and other seasons

in other nations of the Western Hemisphere. I think it is fitting that we introduce this legislation on Earth Day, that day we have dedicated to increasing awareness of environmental issues.

Every year, approximately 25 million Americans travel to observe birds, and 60 million American adults watch and feed birds at home. Birdwatching is a source of great pleasure to many Americans, as well as a source of important revenue to states, like my own state of Michigan, which attract tourists to their scenes of natural beauty. Birdwatching and feeding generates fully \$20 billion every year in revenue across America.

Birdwatching is a popular activity in Michigan, and its increased popularity is reflected by an increase in tourist dollars being spent in small, rural communities. Healthy bird populations also prevent hundreds of millions of dollars in economic losses each year to farming and timber interests. They help control insect populations, thereby preventing crop failures and infestations.

Despite the enormous benefits we derive from our bird populations, many of them are struggling to survive. Ninety species are listed as endangered or threatened in the United States. Another 124 species are of high conservation concern. The primary reason for these declines is the degradation and loss of bird habitat.

What makes this all the more troubling is that efforts in the United States to protect these birds' habitats can only be of limited utility. Among bird watches' favorites, many neotropical birds are endangered or of high conservation concern. And several of the most popular neotropical species, including bluebirds, robins, goldfinches, and orioles, migrate to and from the Caribbean and Latin America.

Because neotropical migratory birds range across a number of international borders every year, we must work to establish safeguards at both ends of their migration routes, as well as at critical stopover areas along their way. Only in this way can conservation efforts prove successful.

Mr. President, that is why Senator DASHLE and I have introduced the "Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act." This legislation will protect bird habitats across international boundaries by establishing partnerships between the business community, nongovernmental organizations and foreign nations. By teaming businesses with international organizations concerned to protect the environment we can combine capital with know-how. By partnering these entities with local organizations in countries where bird habitat is endangered we can see to it that local people receive the training they need to preserve this habitat and maintain this critical natural resource.

This act establishes a three year demonstration project providing \$4 million each year to help establish programs in Latin America and the Carib-

bean. These programs will manage and conserve neotropical migratory bird populations. Those eligible to participate will include national and international nongovernmental organizations and business interests, as well as U.S. government entities.

The key to this act is cooperation among nongovernmental organizations. The federal share of each project's cost is never to exceed 33 percent, and half the nonfederal contribution must be in cash, not in-kind contributions.

The approach taken by this legislation differs from that of current programs in that it is proactive and, by avoiding a crisis management approach, will prove significantly more cost effective. In addition, this legislation does not call for complicated and expensive bureaucratic structures such as councils, commissions or multi-tiered oversight structures. Further, this legislation will bring needed attention and expertise to areas now receiving relatively little attention in the area of environmental degradation.

This legislation has the support of the National Audobon Society, the American Bird Conservancy and the Ornithological Council. These organizations agree with Senator DASCHLE and I that, by establishing partnerships between business, government and nongovernmental organizations both here and abroad we can greatly enhance the protection of migratory bird habitat.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, it is my pleasure today to join Senator Spencer ABRAHAM to introduce the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act.

First, let me commend my colleague, Senator ABRAHAM, for all of his work to develop this legislation. This bill addresses some of the critical threats to wildlife habitat and species diversity and demonstrates his commitment, which I strongly share, to solving the many challenges we face in this regard.

The Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act will help to ensure that some of our most valuable and beautiful species of birds—those that most of us take for granted, including bluebirds, goldfinches, robins and orioles—may overcome the challenges posed by habitat destruction and thrive for generations to come. It is not widely recognized that many North American bird species once considered common are in decline. In fact, a total of 90 species of migratory birds are listed as endangered or threatened in the United States, and another 124 species are considered to be of high conservation concern.

The main cause of this decline is the loss of critical habitat throughout our hemisphere. Because these birds range across international borders, it is essential that we work with nations in Latin America and the Caribbean to establish protected stopover areas during their migrations. This bill achieves that goal by fostering partnerships be-

tween businesses, nongovernmental organizations and other nations to bring together the capital and expertise needed to preserve habitat throughout our hemisphere.

As we celebrate Earth Day, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. It has been endorsed by the National Audobon Society, the American Bird Conservancy and the Ornithological Council. I believe that it will substantially improve upon our ability to maintain critical habitat in our hemisphere and help to halt the decline of these important species.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 82

At the request of Mr. KOHL, the name of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] was added as a cosponsor of S. 82, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit against tax for employers who provide child care assistance for dependents of their employees, and for other purposes.

S. 320

At the request of Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, the name of the Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 320, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide comprehensive pension protection for women.

S. 332

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 332, a bill to prohibit the importation of goods produced abroad with child labor, and for other purposes.

S. 496

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the name of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BRYAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 496, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit against income tax to individuals who rehabilitate historic homes or who are the first purchasers of rehabilitated historic homes for use as a principal residence.

S. 497

At the request of Mr. COVERDELL, the name of the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] was added as a cosponsor of S. 497, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act and the Railway Labor Act to repeal the provisions of the Acts that require employees to pay union dues or fees as a condition of employment.

S. 617

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 617, a bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act to require that imported meat, and meat food products containing imported meat, bear a label identifying the country of origin.

S. 778

At the request of Mr. LUGAR, the name of the Senator from Nebraska