o'clock this evening, and so we will try to let everybody know by then what the schedule will be. Hopefully, it will not be too heavy. It depends on how this bill comes out.

I will let Senators know in a few minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH] would vote ''yea.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 81, nays 18, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 268 Leg.]

YEAS—81

Abraham	Feinstein	Lott
Akaka	Ford	Lugar
Ashcroft	Frist	Mack
Baucus	Glenn	McConnell
Bennett	Gorton	Mikulski
Biden	Gramm	Moseley-Braun
Bond	Grams	Murkowski
Bradley	Grassley	Murray
Breaux	Gregg	Nickles
Brown	Harkin	Nunn
Bryan	Hatfield	Pell
Burns	Heflin	Pressler
Campbell	Helms	Robb
Chafee	Hollings	Rockefeller
Coats	Hutchison	Roth
Cochran	Inhofe	Santorum
Cohen	Inouye	Sarbanes
Coverdell	Jeffords	Shelby
Craig	Johnston	Simpson
D'Amato	Kassebaum	Smith
Daschle	Kempthorne	Snowe
DeWine	Kennedy	Specter
Dodd	Kerry	Stevens
Dole	Kohl	Thomas
Domenici	Kyl	Thompson
Exon	Lautenberg	Thurmond
Faircloth	Levin	Warner

NAYS—18

Bingaman	Feingold	Moynihan
Boxer	Graham	Packwood
Bumpers	Kerrey	Pryor
Byrd	Leahy	Reid
Conrad	Lieberman	Simon
Dorgan	McCain	Wellstone

NOT VOTING—1

Hatch

So the bill (S. 652), as amended, was passed.

(The text of S. 652, as passed, will appear in a future edition of the RECORD.)

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I thank everybody involved. I thank the majority leader and minority leader. I have already thanked the staff. I am feeling like this Chamber was almost a funeral parlor this afternoon, we had so many good words said about everybody.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, let me indicate, as I did earlier, that this is a tremendous vote—81 to 18. It is a very significant piece of legislation that has passed this Chamber, largely through the efforts of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER].

It is not a perfect bill. I understand that almost everybody finds something wrong with it, which probably means it is not that bad; it is probably a very good bill. I think it is a very important piece of legislation. I thank all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their cooperation.

I do not think we took too much time. On a bill of this magnitude, it takes a little longer on the Senate side, and it probably should, as the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON] said earlier today.

I thank the Democratic leader, Senator DASCHLE, for his cooperation throughout the debate.

Mr. President, I have had a discussion with the Senator from South Dakota, [Mr. DASCHLE], the Democratic leader, and I outlined to him what I would like to do. First, I will ask unanimous consent that we go to S. 440—I will not ask it now—and I understand there will be an objection. Then I will move to the consideration of S. 440, and I understand the Senator from Massachusetts, [Mr. KENNEDY], and others will at that point discuss the motion to proceed.

If that would be the case, there would be no votes tonight and no votes tomorrow. Then we would try to work out something to accommodate our colleagues on Monday.

So I do not want to make the request until the Senator from South Dakota indicates it is all right to do so.

Mr. DASCHLE. If the majority leader will yield. Let me just speak very briefly, because I know there are other Members that need to conduct business. I share the sentiment expressed by the distinguished majority leader about the bill just passed. It may not be everything we all want, but it represents a real achievement.

I commend the distinguished Senator from South Dakota and certainly the ranking member, the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, for all of the effort he has put forth in the last seven days to accomplish what we have now. A number of people had a lot to do with bringing us to this point. It represents a balance between providing new opportunities and communications to provide the flexibility and the freedom to go out and do what we must to build the information superhighway. But it also represents a desire on the part of many to protect consumers as we conduct that construction.

So I hope very much that we can move this legislation through the remaining parts of the legislative process here and accommodate all Senators as we attempt to pass this very significant piece of legislation.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DOLE. I failed to announce no more votes this evening, and no votes tomorrow. For Monday, I will make that announcement before I leave here tonight, so Members will know what the schedule will be on Monday. I need to discuss that with the Senator from South Dakota, Senator DASCHLE.

EXPRESSING GRATITUDE TO SHEILA P. BURKE FOR HER SERVICE AS SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 134, submitted by myself and Senator DASCHLE.

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

The clerk will report the resolution.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 134) expressing the Senate's gratitude to Sheila P. Burke for her service as Secretary of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, that the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements on the resolution be placed in the appropriate place in the RECORD.

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

So the resolution (S. Res. 134) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, is as follows:

S. RES. 134

Whereas Sheila P. Burke faithfully served the Senate of the United States as Secretary of the Senate from January 4, 1995 to June 8, 1995, and discharged the difficult duties and responsibilities of that office with unfailing devotion and a high degree of efficiency; and

Whereas since May 26, 1977 Sheila P. Burke has ably and faithfully upheld the high standards and traditions of the staff of the Senate of the United States for a period that includes 10 Congresses, and she continues to demonstrate outstanding dedication to duty as an employee of the Senate; and

Whereas through her exceptional service and professional integrity as an officer and employee of the Senate of the United States, Sheila P. Burke has gained the esteem, confidence and trust of her associates and the Members of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate recognizes the notable contributions of Sheila P. Burke to the Senate and to her country and expresses to her its appreciation and gratitude for her long, faithful and continuing service.

SEC.2. The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit a copy of this resolution to Sheila P. Burke.

NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM DESIGNATION ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now turn to consideration of S. 440, the highway bill.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is noted.

Mr. DOLE. I move to proceed to the consideration of S. 440.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does any Senator wish to debate the motion?

Mr. DOLE. I will yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, a few weeks ago, we in the Labor Committee held a single hearing on Senator KASSEBAUM's legislation to repeal outright Davis-Bacon, which has been in law for over 60 years.

Last year, we worked long and hard on an alternative Davis-Bacon reform bill on which there had been bipartisan support. That was a responsible effort to deal with this issue and update the law.

Today, with little warning, the highway bill is being brought to the floor, which contains a provision to repeal Federal prevailing wage-rate requirements for highway construction, known as the Davis-Bacon law.

This is part of the larger assault on working families, in this case, families of highway construction workers who make between $20,000 to $30,000 a year.

This is central to the Republican agenda, and it is all in the name of deficit reduction—all while we protect the large military contractors, big corporations with huge tax breaks, oil companies, and others who have long been subsidized by the Federal Government.

Today, without any additional hearings or time for reflection or careful consideration of reform alternatives—and my colleague from Massachusetts will be speaking on this in just a moment—we are faced with a bill that would overturn 60 years of labor law related to Federal highway construction in a single moment.

Why is that? Could it have anything to do with the fact that the large trade association of mostly noncontract, nonunion contractors is in town this week? And this measure is suddenly brought to the floor now, simply to fly the flag for anti-Davis-Bacon forces who would try to turn the clock altogether on prevailing fair-wage standards.

I do not know, Mr. President, but I am surprised by how suddenly the Senate's schedule was changed to bring this up. I thought we were going to turn to regulatory reform or Bosnia or welfare reform. Apparently the majority leader has other priorities.

Mr. President, as a Senator from Minnesota, I am opposed to this attempt to slash wages of working families, families who dig our roadbeds, pour our tar, flag us to a stop at construction sites or do any other number of hard and sweaty jobs at construction sites and highway sites across this country.

That is not a priority that I am willing to go along with. I will fight any effort to cut the wages of working families as hard as I can.

I imagine over the next several days, we will have a considerable amount of discussion on this issue. We should be clear. This repeal effort is part of a larger systematic assault on the wages and living standards of working families.

Mr. President, it is a mistake. We have cuts in Medicare, cuts in Medicaid, cuts in job training, cuts in school lunches, education, and now cuts in the wages of working families.

Just name it, the majority has proposed it and are trying to program it through the Congress at a breakneck speed. We intend to slow it down. We intend to oppose it. This highway bill on its own merits ought to be debated and is an important piece of legislation. To try to put this amendment into the highway bill and essentially overturn over 60 years of people's history I think it is a huge mistake. Of course, that is what this debate will be about.

Mr. President, let me just say a few words specifically on Davis-Bacon itself and prevailing wage rates that it requires on certain Federal projects.

Mr. WARNER. Would the Senator allow me to, in the way of a question, make a brief comment about why we did this?

I was the Senator that brought up the amendment in the Committee on Environment and Public Works. I did so in my capacity as chairman of the subcommittee with the responsibility for this piece of legislation.

I say to my good friend, Mr. President, it was in no sense chicanery or subversion. It was done quite openly. This is an issue, Davis-Bacon, on which many who have had the privilege of serving the institution for many years have had a very clear difference of opinion. That difference of opinion is shared widely across this Nation. We will develop that in the course of the debate.

Mr. President, I am delighted to have the opportunity to debate with my good friend from Minnesota, my good friend from Massachusetts, and others who will engage in this very important debate. We should not start out with a characterization that there is any attempt on this side to do so by way of anything other than an absolute clear and full discussion of this issue in full view of everybody. Then it is my hope an up or down vote can be had here in the U.S. Senate on this issue. Each Senator can express for himself or herself their views on this.

I thank my distinguished colleague for allowing me to speak.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I say to my colleague from Virginia, and I thank him for his remarks, that I just want to be clear I am speaking for myself, that I am very interested in this highway bill.

It is an important piece of legislation. We have been working for several years on reform of Davis-Bacon, not repeal. A lot of work has gone into that. But all of a sudden to have this become a part of this piece of legislation, I say to my colleague, I think is a profound mistake.

Speaking just for myself, I would point out that only today did I hear that this was going to be the bill before the U.S. Senate. Before, I thought we were going to go to regulatory reform, then I heard we were going to go to welfare reform, then I heard we might be debating Bosnia.

I know my colleague from Virginia is interested in full debate. That is what we will have and certainly we will make sure that it is not personal or acrimonious. I want to be clear as to why we have objected to the motion to proceed and why we intend to have a very thorough discussion about Davis-Bacon and about this effort not only to repeal Davis-Bacon, but I think it goes beyond that. I think it is an effort to roll back 60 years of hard-earned history that have a lot to do with people being able to have a decent wage, 60 years that have a lot to do with people being able to have jobs that pay them a middle-class wage.

I think the stakes are very high. For that reason, with my colleague from Massachusetts, we intend to have a full discussion on that.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I welcome that full discussion. But somehow in the Senator's remarks, the remarks just given, I got the impression, why on the highway bill? Mr. President, why is it? My projections are $1.3 billion is directly associated with Davis-Bacon over the next 5 years of projected highway construction. Those are scarce dollars in today's economy. Those are dollars that could be translated into actual roads and road improvements were it not for this piece of legislation. And it is time. My distinguished colleague mentioned reform, he has been working on it for several years. Perhaps the time has finally arrived for him to bring out those reforms. They are long overdue.

I simply think the statute has served its purpose. When I see $1.3 billion taken from the highway budgets of our 50 States over the next 5 years, this Senator says the time has come to eliminate it.

Mr. President, I thank my colleague for this opportunity to have a few opening remarks.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I think in a moment I would yield to my colleague from Massachusetts, who will take the lead in this debate. I will be very proud to be a part of it.

Again, let me say in this Congress I think we have had a single hearing on legislation to repeal outright the Davis-Bacon. We will surely have a quarrel about the figures and amount of money lost. And we certainly will have a full discussion about the meaning of prevailing wages and what that means to this country, what that means to this society, what that means to communities across the country. That I think will be the important part of this debate.

There is no reason to argue any longer about the timing of it, but I want to make it crystal clear that we

intend to focus on this effort in this bill. And this bill is an important piece of legislation. But this particular provision to repeal Davis-Bacon is, of course, where we intend to focus our attention.

I will yield to my colleague from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield the floor?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, no, I am not prepared to yield the floor yet.

Mr. CHAFEE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, why do I not go forward with some remarks. But if my colleague has a question, I do not want to interrupt the flow of that.

Mr. CHAFEE. I do not have a question. I was prepared to make a statement.

Mr. WELLSTONE. On Davis-Bacon?

Mr. CHAFEE. We will be here quite a while. Everybody will have a chance to say what they want. If the Senator has something to say, go ahead. I will have my say later when he is through.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, why do I not defer to the manager, and I will speak later on, because I have extensive remarks on Davis-Bacon. So I will defer to the manager of the bill and then be back in this debate later on.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I am sorry we cannot proceed on this bill because this is an important bill. What it does, it opens the way to some funds, additional funds in the neighborhood of some $5 billion that we are going to have to—if we want, we are going to have to pass this legislation before October. So now is the time to get with it.

I heard—I would like the Senator from Minnesota's attention if I might. I heard him say how erroneous it was for us to be dealing with legislation that has been on the books, I think he said, for 60 years? Is that the time limit, how long Davis-Bacon has been on?

I have seen the Senator on the floor discuss striker replacement that has been on about the same length of time. He had no hesitancy about dealing with that legislation that has been on the books for a considerable time.

So dealing with legislation that has been on the books for some time, labor legislation, is not unique in this place. It is not unique for the Senator from Minnesota, either.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. CHAFEE. Sure.

Mr. WELLSTONE. As I understand the debate about what was S. 55, which was a ban on permanent replacement of striking workers, I would say to my colleague, it was not an amendment on another piece of legislation. That was a separate bill that went through extensive hearings, that was scheduled for debate, that came up at the time scheduled, and then led to full debate.

So I do think it is a rather different proposition.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, no one who has been in this Chamber very long will find repeal of the Davis-Bacon is something new. We have debated it. There have been hearings. There have been hearings in the committee of the Senator from Kansas, and the Senator from Massachusetts has been through those hearings many times. There is nothing unique.

This is not a creeping up by night with this provision.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAFEE. This is something that has been around. I do not know how many times we voted on it.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAFEE. Yes, I will be glad to.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank my colleague. As always he is very gracious.

My point was not that we have not debated the Davis-Bacon before. We certainly have. My point simply was that this bill was just scheduled to come to the floor—we thought there were going to be any number of other pieces of legislation. It has come to the floor. Unfortunately, as a part of this piece of legislation, there is the provision for repeal of Davis-Bacon. That is why we objected to the motion to proceed. That is why we will have extensive debate. That is my only point.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I would stress that the provision of Davis-Bacon that we have in this National Highway Systems law solely deals with highway construction. It does not deal across the board. It seems to me there is no more appropriate place for it than in this National Highway System legislation.

Let me just say a few words, if I might. First, Congress must approve the National Highway System bill, as I mentioned, by September 1 of this year. If we do not, the States will not receive—I said $5 billion, it is $6.5 billion of their Federal aid highway money. This amount includes $2.9 billion for interstate maintenance and $2.6 billion for the National Highway System.

Mr. President, a few words about the National Highway System. Why are we in this? The National Highway System was established by the so-called ISTEA, Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991. That was a major highway bill that we passed in 1991.

The National Highway System can make a significant contribution to our transportation system. The 159,000 miles of designated National Highway System routes are the roads the States and the localities have chosen as some of their most important roads. These are the roads that provide mobility for our citizens and promote economic development.

The National Highway System, which includes the Interstate System—we are all familiar with the Interstate System—represents 4 percent of the highways of the United States of America, a very small part. But these are the important roads. These roads carry 40 percent of the Nation's highway travel. These are the roads that connect our intermodal and strategic facilities such as our ports and airports and train stations and military bases.

How was the whole thing developed? What is the National Highway System? It was developed by the Department of Transportation through the Federal Highway Administration in cooperation with the States. This was not something drawn up in Washington by a bunch of Federal bureaucrats. This was done in cooperation with the States. The Federal Highway Administration and the States designated the system based on the criteria of efficiency, connectivity, and equity among the States. The mileage distribution among the States and between urban and rural areas was another important element.

The process to designate the National Highway System has worked quite well. There is a high degree of consensus among Federal, State and local officials that the map submitted by the Secretary of Transportation in December of 1993 represents the best effort at identifying the National System.

What has happened is that the Federal Highway Administration has worked with, as I say, the State and local officials, to make changes in this map of 1993 to reflect new information and decisions made at the State and local level. This process will continue. This thing is not carved in stone. People come to us and say: We want to be added. There is a system for adding routes within the various States.

This legislation includes a provision which will permit this process to continue, even after this bill has been enacted into law. So State and local officials with the Secretary of Transportation's approval will have the ability to make changes in this, as long—there is a maximum limit of mileage. That maximum limit is 165,000 miles.

So what I am stressing here is that this is a dynamic, changing system, and it is important that the ability to make these changes is retained.

Because we have this process that involves the local officials, the State officials, and the Federal Government officials—namely, the highway administrator—I think Congress has to be very restrained in making systems; in other words, changes. Somebody will pop up here on the floor and say, ''I want such and such added, I so move.'' Well, maybe that is valid. But we do not know. The managers of this bill, and the others involved here on the floor, do not know whether that particular road meets the criteria. So we have set forth in the legislation a method of making changes. We think it is a fair

method. We want to resist the temptation to add a whole series of other routes. Once we depart from the criteria, we say, ''Well, Senator X has presented a very moving story about this highway he wants added.'' But once we start down the path of not adhering to the criteria or to the system set forth in the legislation, we are opening our way up to a lot of problems.

This bill which was reported out by the Environment and Public Works Committee preserves the important principles of the 1991 surface transportation law. That was a monumental piece of legislation that we passed. It makes changes to provide greater flexibility to the States to resist administrative burdens.

As I mentioned, there are a series of requirements that the States are relieved from, the principal one being the Davis-Bacon Act which brings us here this evening. The bill also provides additional flexibility for design standards for the national highway routes which are not applicable to the Interstate System.

This legislation which is S. 440—we will hear that term quite often this evening; that is the number of this bill—provides the States with additional financing options to address the needs of the transportation systems. It allows the States to credit private sector donations 100 percent to the States' cost share.

This legislation addresses something that those of us here in this Senate are pretty familiar with, and that is the Woodrow Wilson Bridge. The replacement of that bridge is essential. Its remaining lifespan is estimated to be only 10 years. The bridge was designed 40 years ago to carry 75,000 vehicles a day. How many vehicles does it carry, 75,000? No. Today the bridge carries 167,000, more than twice what it was designed for as maximum load.

Title II of this legislation authorizes the States of Virginia, Maryland, and the District of Columbia to enter into an interstate agreement or a compact to establish the National Capital Interstate Transportation Authority. I must say sometimes we get long titles here. But that is what this is, the National Capital Interstate Transportation Authority.

The ownership of this bridge is transferred to the authority. The authority has the ability to use various financing provisions, including tolls, to replace the bridge. The bill provides $97 million of Federal funds for completion of the environmental impact statement, for interim repairs to the bridge, and for the preliminary design and engineering of a replacement bridge.

There is one action the committee took which is a great disappointment to me personally; and, that is, there is a change made in the speed limits. I believe the Federal speed limit maximum of 65 miles per hour in rural areas on the interstate has been remarkably successful in reducing fatalities. It has resulted in major savings to the taxpayers of our country. The health care costs of speed-related crashes is currently estimated to be $2 billion a year; the health-related costs of the carnage that comes from excess speeding is currently estimated to be $2 billion a year. The total economic cost to society—not just the health care costs but the property damage, lost work—is estimated to be $24 billion a year.

According to the Department of Transportation, the decision that this Congress made several years ago to allow a maximum of 65 miles an hour just on rural interstates, increased from 55—which was the limit before—jumping from 55 to 65, and has estimated to have cost this country 500 additional deaths.

In my view, it is inevitable that, if the Federal speed limit is repealed, which this bill does—not with my vote, but, nonetheless, the committee chose to do so—States will raise the speed limit, and the cost to everyone, including the Federal Government, would go up dramatically. In other words, what we have said is there are not going to be any Federal limits, no Federal speed limits on these highways. Let the States put on what they want. I suppose the States will say 65 is not enough. Let us try 70. And the competitor will say, ''Well, why have any speed limit?'' And I think that is unfortunate.

I am aware that there are likely to be amendments which will be offered to repeal or weaken other safety laws, particularly the safety belt and motorcycle helmet law requirement. What are those? When we did the ISTEA legislation in 1991, we provided that a State would have a certain amount of time to enact a mandatory seat belt bill and a mandatory motorcycle helmet bill. If the States failed to do that, then a certain amount of that State's highway money would have to go into safety features, including safety education. As a result of that, some 26 States have passed mandatory motorcycle helmet legislation, and the strong seat belt legislation. What has been the result? California passed it. The Governor signed it. And as a result, the number of motorcycle deaths on the California highways has been reduced by 35 percent. Maryland did likewise. As a result of the passage of the motorcycle law, with the mandatory helmet, the number of motorcycle deaths in Maryland decreased by 25 percent.

You might say, ''Well, this is a State problem. What is the Federal Government doing in mandating motorcycles helmets?'' The answer is the following: The Federal Government is in it because we pay the health bills. The Federal Government has to pay the Medicaid costs of those who are in comas in hospitals because they had no helmet and got into a very serious motorcycle accident. I have seen that myself in my own State. We have one individual regrettably in our State hospital who has been there in a coma for 20 years severely injured by a head injury on a motorcycle without a helmet. The helmet would have prevented such an injury. That individual's medical costs have cost the State of Rhode Island and the Federal Government through Medicaid to date $3 million.

So, Mr. President, I hope that this Senate would resist any efforts to reduce the mandatory motorcycle helmet and seat belt laws.

Mr. President, I finally want to commend the chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee of the Environment and Public Works Committee. This bill came from a subcommittee, and that subcommittee was chaired by Senator WARNER. He has done a splendid job on this legislation. When it came up to the full committee, there were no changes, and it passed out of the full committee by a vote of 15 to 1, with Democrats and Republicans voting for this legislation.

So I have had the privilege of working with Senator WARNER on this, and with the ranking member of the full committee, Senator BAUCUS, and with all members of this committee in this legislation. So I am very pleased that the Senator from Virginia has agreed to manage this bill before this full Senate.

I mention Senator BAUCUS being the ranking member of the full committee. But Senator BAUCUS is also the ranking member of the subcommittee likewise. I greatly appreciate the cooperation and assistance that he has given us in this legislation.

So, Mr. President, I hope we can get to this bill. It is important. I know the business about Davis-Bacon is contentious. I would like to see us have a vote on it, and see what happens. But most of all, I would hope at least we could move to the consideration of the legislation.

Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNETT). The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I want to just take a moment of the Senate's time to perhaps bring it up to speed in terms of where we are on the overall issue of consideration of the Davis-Bacon Act because it is not unrelated to the concerns a number of us are expressing this evening and tomorrow and the early part of next week in terms of proceeding to the highway bill. And that is on March 29 of this year, the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee, chaired by Senator KASSEBAUM, after having hearings and after having committee discussion, made a judgment about the Davis-Bacon proposal, which I did not support, but nonetheless reported that measure out, and it is now on the calendar. So that would be legislation that would be applicable to all Federal jurisdiction. And we would have an opportunity when that would be called off the calendar by the majority leader, which is his right and his privilege at any particular time, to get into a debate and discussion on that particular

measure. I think it is important that we do get into a discussion on that particular measure, and I will elaborate on the reasons for that because there has been a great deal that has happened in terms of various recommendations, adjustments, changes, amendments, which would I think be constructive and positive and which I think the Members would welcome and which I think would improve the legislation.

However, we are not afforded that opportunity. We are faced now with a repeal effectively on the highway legislation, and there can be those who suggest, well, this really is not repealing it. The fact of the matter is that up to 40 percent of all Davis-Bacon construction is related to this piece of legislation. So in effect although it is not a repeal of Davis-Bacon, it is its death knell. And those of us who are willing and obviously want to debate the whole issue of Davis-Bacon and its implications thought that the most appropriate way of doing it is the way the Senate generally considers measures, and that is to deal with them on the basis of the legislation itself which would have general application rather than dealing with it piece by piece, on one piece of legislation after another.

This measure, in terms of the Highway Act, is commendable, and I intend to support the underlying legislation. I see no reason why that legislation could not have been completed, even with discussions, tonight or tomorrow. There may be other Members of this body who wanted to address particular provisions in that legislation, but it is the decision and judgment of the committee to insert the provisions repealing the Davis-Bacon Act in here, which should be addressed as we normally address these measures on the piece of legislation which has been reported out of the Labor and Human Resources Committee, and which is on the calendar, and I would have welcomed the opportunity to debate it this evening, tomorrow, or any other time.

But, no, it is said, well, we are going to circumvent the procedures and the process of the Senate, and we are going to repeal it; we are not going to wait for the Senate to debate that measure independently but we are going to tag that on to the highway legislation, and so we are forced into this circumstance. We are not the ones who are delaying the consideration of the highway legislation. It is those who want to circumvent the Senate procedures who are forcing this kind of delay. And so we are quite prepared to make some of our case this evening and tomorrow and the days ahead and welcome that opportunity to do so and to correct some of the comments that have even been made earlier this evening.

I think that is the best way to address the legislation reported out of that committee. And I would say that as recently as today there have been coalitions that have been working on a series of recommendations and changes that are being considered by a number of our colleagues in the Senate on both sides of the aisle. I have not had the chance to review those. It is coincidental that those measures are being circulated today because those that are most involved in those negotiations, to my knowledge, had no awareness that this measure was going to be considered tonight. I think most of us in the Senate understood that we would be debating probably welfare legislation. And as I understood, at least from our side of the aisle, they thought that that would take us through this weekend and perhaps the regulatory reform would take up the early part of next week. And then in the past hours, as is the right of the majority leader, it was decided to move to this legislation.

And so that is why we are in this situation. Those of us who want to speak on Davis-Bacon would urge the Senate to move toward the highway legislation. If this measure were not part of it, we would say all right, we are prepared to see a full debate and a timely debate on this issue and a resolution of the Davis-Bacon issue in a timely way on the measure that was reported out of our committee. That would let the Senate consider a number of the different changes and suggestions and amendments that might come at that time. But we are not given really that opportunity to do so.

So we wanted to address this issue and speak to some of the misunderstandings which have been expressed even earlier this evening on this issue.

I believe the vote on the bill and the provision to waive the application of Davis-Bacon to Federal highway construction is a critical test of whether the Senate will abandon its historic protection of local labor standards. In March, the Committee on Labor and Human Resources voted along party lines to repeal Davis-Bacon altogether. I opposed that legislation. I know other Members of the Senate opposed it, too.

Repealing the Davis-Bacon protections would take this country back to the days when cutthroat competition on wages drove down living standards for construction workers and reduced their families to poverty. I cannot believe that a majority of the Senate wants to return to the harsh employment practices of a half a century ago. The Republican argument for repealing Davis-Bacon is that the Government will save money by paying construction workers less than it does today. The problem is that the argument is not true.

Now, listen to this, Mr. President. In fact, the Government will not save anything by driving down the wages of construction workers on highway projects. According to a recent study, the 13 States with the highest construction wages build their highways at lower cost than the 13 States with the lowest wages.

Let me just repeat that. And we will get back into the studies. We will have time. But I want to make an opening comment about the issues before us. The 13 States with the highest construction wages build their highways at lower cost than the 13 States with the lowest wages.

Mr. CHAFEE. Will the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts be good enough to tell me, one, whose study is that?

Mr. KENNEDY. I will speak just briefly.

Mr. CHAFEE. The Senator can speak all he wants; he will have plenty of time.

Mr. KENNEDY. I intend to put those in the RECORD. I intend to outline this, Mr. President, and then I will spend some time going through the various studies with the Senator.

The average construction wage on a federally assisted highway project in Wisconsin was $15.55 an hour, more than twice the rate on projects in Mississippi, where the workers average $6.69 an hour.

The cost per mile of construction was much lower in Wisconsin, $78,083 versus $95,329 in Mississippi. Cutting wages does not mean cutting costs.

That is taking into consideration the variants in terrain and other kinds of construction. That is using a singular standard, and we will come back to review those studies in detail later this evening if that is the desire.

Even if it were true that we could save money by driving down the wages of construction workers, it would be wrong to do it. This mean-spirited attack on construction workers and their families is unwarranted and unfair.

Mr. President, I have here a chart of what the workers are receiving. For example, this is in heavy construction, for iron workers. It shows the hourly wage and what their annual wage is on heavy construction.

Let us talk about what the income of these workers is in America. The average income is $26,000 a year. That is a lot of money perhaps for a lot of people—and it certainly is—but it is $26,000 a year. We are having, effectively, an assault on these workers that are averaging $26,000. With all the problems that we have in this country, we want to undermine the ability of the average construction worker to make $26,000 a year.

We just passed, less than an hour ago, legislation that is going to mean hundreds of billions of dollars to various financial interest groups in this country, and I supported it. But make no mistake about it, that is going to put hundreds of millions and billions of dollars in the pockets of Americans. Here we are talking about what goes into the pockets and pocketbooks of construction workers.

The average is $26,000 a year. If you are an iron worker in Nashville, TN, you make an $8.41 hourly wage, $12,000 a year under Davis-Bacon—$12,000 a year.

If you are up in Burlington, VT, it is $9.70 an hour, $14,000 a year. If you come up to our part of the country in

Providence, RI, it is $20 an hour, $31,000 a year. Up in Massachusetts, it reaches as high as $33,000 a year.

This is for every construction worker under the Davis-Bacon Act, and I am going to come back as to how you reach Davis-Bacon figures.

The same is true on residential construction; wages are not high. In fact, in residential construction wages are generally much less. For carpenters in Nashville, TN, $6 an hour, $9,000 a year. This is extraordinary. It is a real ripoff of the taxpayer to be paying someone who is going to make $9,000 on Federal construction.

I find it troublesome that there is so much excitement about trying to alter or change Davis-Bacon, to somehow suggest that these men and women are making too much with these annual earnings of $9,000 in residential construction for carpenters in Nashville, or $11,000 in Ohio, or $15,000 in Connecticut, or even $21,000 in Michigan, or $28,000 for carpenters in Illinois, that this is somehow an injustice, that somehow these men and women are ripping off the system because they are making that.

It just does not hold water, Mr. President. These are hard-working men and women. Their annual hours are only 1,500 hours. Some work a little bit more, 1,700 hours, depending on the weather and the economy, but it has been difficult in the construction industry over the period of recent years.

Apparently some Republican Senators believe those construction workers are so overpaid that their wages should be cut. In fact, construction workers are not overpaid. Despite their considerable skills, the danger and physical hardship of their work, and the years of apprenticeship many have served to attain journeyman, their average annual income is about $28,000 a year.

The second most dangerous industry is construction. The second most dangerous industry—construction. We are saying, ''Oh, no, they are doing too well in America,'' in spite of all the studies that show that the working families of this country over the period of the last 12 years have fallen further and further behind in terms of the economy. They are working longer and making less in real income. That has been happening for 15 years, and if you go ahead with the repeal of Davis-Bacon, you are going to accelerate that.

It seems to me that we ought to be speaking for working families. We are not asking for them to get some special boondoggle when they are making $15,000, $16,000, $20,000, or $25,000 a year. That does not seem to me like some boondoggle. There are a lot of boondoggles around here, but this is not one of them.

Republicans like to accuse the Democrats of class warfare when we oppose their tax cuts for the rich, but this is an uglier class warfare conducted by Republicans to keep blue-collar workers down, to keep them out of the middle class. This bill and the repeal of the Davis-Bacon Act for highway construction are part of a larger assault Republicans are mounting on all fronts against America's working families.

What is happening to these families? They are having a hard time making ends meet. They are falling further and further behind in terms of real income and working harder.

What is happening to their kids? If their kids want to go to college and they are eligible for the Stafford loans, under the Republican proposal, they are going to pay $3,500 more for those Stafford loans.

If the kids need summer jobs, they will be lucky to get one. Mr. President, 1,400 jobs were cut in my city of Boston because of the cutback in the Summer Jobs Program.

In terms of support in the school reform programs, even the projection in the Head Start Program, the Republicans are cutting back on the support for the children of these working families.

We are having an assault on the income of working families, and with the Republican program for cuts in the Medicare Program, you are cutting back on the parents of the working families. You cannot get around that, Mr. President; you cannot get around that.

What happens when they get savings under Medicare? They use it for tax cuts, $350 billion in tax cuts for the wealthy individuals in this country, reaffirmed in the last 48 hours over in the House of Representatives by the Republicans.

We should not just treat these one by one, I would not think. Certainly the families do not figure it that way. They just do not look at it as a problem in one particular bill. They are looking at what the impact is totally on them, and that is what is happening.

This goes right to the heart of the dollars and cents that they are able to make working in construction.

Mr. President, in talking about what is happening and the impact on the working families, we will have in just a few days the regulatory reform bill which, effectively, emasculates the OSHA program with a supermandate that provides an entirely different cost-benefit ratio than is used by OSHA at the present time and will put at serious risk the various proposals that have been put out by OSHA to protect the American worker, not just in the construction industry, but in all industries. We will have that out here.

They repeal the Delaney clause, which is going to mean that no longer are you going to be required to keep carcinogens out of the food stream in the United States of America. That came out of the Judiciary Committee. We will be debating that over here.

For years, we talked about changing the Delaney clause to a more responsible risk-benefit ratio, a particularly sensitive issue for children who have an entirely different kind of risk-benefit ratio than adults. We tried to work that out in our committee. Oh, no, the votes were there to repeal the Delaney clause, and the Republicans have done that as well. So it will have an impact on the food stream in this country and greater risks will be out there, Mr. President.

So, what happens with this Davis-Bacon proposal? The highway bill has become the latest battleground in that attack. It contains a provision to repeal Davis-Bacon. It proposes to take $1.1 billion out of the pockets of construction workers over the next 5 years. That is how much the committee's Republicans claim they can save by cutting wages on Federal construction projects.

It is a typical Republican policy: Wage cuts for the workers, tax cuts for the rich. In fact, as the Federal highway construction data indicate, it is highly unlikely that any of these so-called savings will actually be achieved by the taxpayer. If anything, lower wages mean higher construction costs, not lower costs.

The notion that reducing the wages of construction workers on Federal construction projects will result in substantial cost savings for the Federal Government has been examined and categorically rejected by the leading construction industry economist in the country, Dr. John Dunlop, a former Secretary of Labor under President Ford and a professor of economics at Harvard for many years. According to Dr. Dunlop, who is a Republican,

> There is simply no sound basis for gratuitously assuming that lower wage rates in the construction industry generally mean lower costs to the public.

> There is simply no sound basis for gratuitously assuming that lower wage rates in the construction industry generally mean lower costs to the public.

The reason is obvious. You get what you pay for. Lower paid workers are likely to be less skilled workers and, therefore, less productive workers. If wages are lower, but it takes the workers longer to complete the work, there are no cost savings. If their work is inferior in quality, it means higher long-term maintenance and repair costs. So there are no cost savings. And that has not been figured into these cost savings. There are no provisions for the diminution in terms of the experience of workers on the job or for inferior kinds of work or for longer-term maintenance. That is not figured into these figures that are bantered around so easily on the floor this evening.

This kind of attack on construction workers and their families is unjustified. There is nothing unfair about paying the prevailing wage on construction projects. Again and again over the years, we have heard the argument that Davis-Bacon is inflationary and that it mandates artificially high union wages. On the committee, Republicans made this argument in their report on the bill on page 11. They say,

''The existing law protects union laborers at the expense of unskilled workers.'' That simply is not true.

Only 29 percent of the prevailing wage schedules issued by the Labor Department in 1994 reflected union wage rates. Forty-eight percent of the wage schedules reflected nonunion rates, and the rest were mixed. Listen to this. Only 29 percent of the prevailing wage schedules issued by the Labor Department in 1994 reflected union wage rates. Forty-eight percent of the wage schedules reflected nonunion rates. And the rest were mixed.

The Davis-Bacon law does not require contractors to pay union wage rates. The Washington Post recently got this wrong and had to print a correction. So let there be no mistake. The Davis-Bacon Act does not require the payment of union wages or the employment of union workers—two misconceptions that are bantered around here on the floor and were in our committee. It requires the payment of prevailing wages, the going rate in the community. You are basically saying that in any of these communities, if they are paying $6 an hour, they get $6 an hour if they are going to build a Federal project. If you are going to build the highways or build residential construction, or if you are going to build heavy construction, it is a higher rate—whatever is the prevailing wage in the local community. Whether it be union or nonunion, that is the wage rate. So that the Federal Government will not be driving the wages down or artificially inflating them. That is basically the reason for the law.

The goal of the act is not to artificially inflate wages. The goal is to keep Federal projects from being used to drive down local wages and local labor standards. That goal is as valid today as it was in 1931, 64 years ago, when the law was first enacted.

The construction labor market is not a national labor market. There are thousands of local markets, and the wage rate for laborers, for example, varies from one part of the country to another, from the minimum of $4.25 an hour to more than $20 an hour. Carpenter wages vary from less than $6 an hour to more than $25 an hour. The Davis-Bacon Act respects these differences. Those who want to repeal the act ignore those differences. They would let Federal contractors drive wages down as low as they can. Repealing Davis-Bacon or its application to highway construction is an invitation to exploitation, and it ought to be rejected.

Mr. President, the evidence of the harmful effects of a repeal on minorities, as well, is clear. This would have an adverse impact in terms of the employment opportunities for women, as well as minorities. There is a very important study—but I see others who want to speak, so I will get into that later this evening or tomorrow.

A Davis-Bacon repeal is wrong. The legitimate concerns about the act's threshold and unnecessary paperwork can be taken care of through a sensible reform amendment, like the one Senator SIMON offered in our Labor and Human Resources Committee when we considered the issue. The Davis-Bacon Act does need to be updated, but the core principle of the law is as valid today as when it was signed 64 years ago. The Federal Government should not try to save money by cutting the wages of its citizens. The Davis-Bacon Act has not been substantially revised in 64 years, since it was enacted. Reforms are needed. The threshold for coverage needs to be adjusted to reflect inflation. The paperwork requirements for contractors are overly burdensome and need to be cut back.

Clear and more sensible lines should be drawn on what work is covered. Workers who are not receiving the wages they deserve need to have a more effective way to resolve complaints. That is why I am for reform of the Davis-Bacon Act. I have been on record in favor of reform for many years.

But there is a world of difference between reform and repeal. A coalition of nearly 20,000 contractors, all opposed to an outright repeal, are lobbying for reform, not repeal. We stand ready to work with colleagues on both sides of the aisle on any reasonable proposal for reform. We are strongly opposed to the anti-worker scheme that would dismantle basic construction workers' protections in all parts of the Nation. Repeal of Davis-Bacon is an anti-work ideology run amok and should be rejected out of hand by the Senate.

I would be glad to either yield to the Senator from Rhode Island about those reports or to make some general concluding remarks.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I think what we are going to do this evening is this. The Senator from Illinois has something he wants to discuss as in morning business, which will take about 15 minutes. And then it would be my intention—and the leader said we can—to adjourn for the evening. Then we would be here tomorrow morning at whatever time we come in. Then there will be a chance for everybody to discuss this further. I have some questions I would like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts, but obviously he will be here tomorrow. This is what we call a filibuster on the motion to proceed. Rather than wearing everybody out, it would be my suggestion that we adjourn following the comments by the Senator from Illinois, as in morning business.

Mr. KENNEDY. Well, Mr. President, I see my friend from Illinois wanting to talk. I will welcome the opportunity to continue this dialog tomorrow. I will make a final comment on this.

I do want to just underline a point, because I think it is a point worth reiterating—that is, that there is a proposal on the Senate calendar that deals with this generically. Those of us who are speaking about this measure wanted the opportunity to at least debate that measure independently and have a chance to amend it and have the focus and attention of the Senate on it. It has been the desire of the Republicans in the committee to put this measure on a matter that is out of your jurisdiction, quite frankly. Your committee does not have jurisdiction on the Davis-Bacon Act, nonetheless, the Senator made the judgment decision to take that step.

Now, that is something that can be done, but it is not in the jurisdiction of your committee. It is in the jurisdiction of Senator KASSEBAUM's committee. They have taken action, but the Senator has circumvented the procedure and we are faced with this particular issue. We intend to speak to that.

I do think that the point needs to be reiterated, that there is a total array of different Republican activities that are symbolized by this assault on working families that are making $27,000 a year.

It is an assault on Davis-Bacon today. We had that assault on education just 3 weeks ago. We had that assault on Medicare. We still have not had the closing of the billionaires' loophole. It is interesting. We are all debating this issue out here and we still have not found time to debate and close the billionaires' loophole. I do think it is important for the American people to have some understanding of how we are spending our time and how we are spending our energy and what we are doing as a matter of priorities.

We will have a full day, and I always welcome the chance to have this discussion with my friend and colleague. I see the Senator from Illinois here.

Mr. CHAFEE. I wonder if the Senator from Massachusetts mentioned reforms, and I am curious as to what the suggested reforms are.

To suggest we have come out of the blue without any consideration in the respective committee that deals with Davis-Bacon, in our committee, we have trespassed into areas we do not belong in. Davis-Bacon we have had out here on the floor as the Senator from Massachusetts knows, many, many times. And this provision that came from our committee solely applies for the areas that we deal with. I am not willing to concede that it is not within our jurisdiction.

However, I am curious as to what the suggestions are, and I do not need them in great detail, but roughly, what is the Senator talking about? The Davis-Bacon now applies to any contract over $2,000. In other words, it applies to everything.

What is the general trend, if I might ask the Senator from Massachusetts, of these reforms?

Mr. KENNEDY. I see my colleague who offered the reform proposal which I supported in the committee. I wonder if the Senator from Illinois would like to take a few moments and go through the different provisions with regard to

raising the thresholds and with regard to other features such as the paperwork provisions—the range of different areas which have been raised as matters of concern.

The Senator from Illinois has a very comprehensive program. I see the Senator on the floor now. I will let him comment on that. I look forward to adding to it tomorrow.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I would like to deal with this tomorrow. I would say to the Senator from Rhode Island that what we do is raise the ceiling. We also deal with the problems that contractors say they have with Davis-Bacon. I think it is a practical bill that answers the fundamental problems.

Mr. CHAFEE. What does the ceiling go to?

Mr. SIMON. The ceiling would go, as I recall, to $100,000. I will have the full information on this tomorrow.

We offered this in committee. We checked this out with a number of contractors. We think the proposal that we have makes a great deal of sense. I will have a chance to discuss that tomorrow.

Mr. KENNEDY. I say to the Senator it is $100,000 for new construction; $25,000 for alteration, repair, renovation, rehabilitation.

The second part deals with contract splitting. There is a whole provision in here affecting the reporting requirements, to allow inspection of payrolls by interested parties.

This was an important issue to determine which workers are actually being covered.

We will have an opportunity to discuss the compliance provision, the definition of various employees.

Mr. SIMON. If my colleague will yield, we also reduced the reporting by contractors very significantly. I think that the average contractor would be pleased.

Now, a contractor wants to depress wages, they probably will not be pleased.

Mr. CHAFEE. I am not prepared to concede that every contractor that does not like Davis-Bacon is out to depress wages. We will have time to discuss that further.

I am not sure what has been done. It has been raised to $100,000. If the Senator will show me the building or any job that is less than $100,000 that the Federal Government goes out and contracts for, I will be surprised.

Never mind. We will have all day tomorrow to discuss that. I would say that one of the things I would appreciate the Senator addressing, in my experience, in my State, I have discovered that Davis-Bacon is an anti-small business law.

In other words, the small businessman cannot qualify to do Davis-Bacon jobs. They do not have the record built up, or the recordkeeping machinery, the capabilities. It is a bad move for small businesses.

Mr. SIMON. If the Senator will support the Simon-Kennedy amendment, the Senator will find that it helps small business people.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I would be happy if that were so.

Why do we not proceed as in morning business?

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed as in morning business for 15 minutes.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, it would then be my thought that we would wind up here and adjourn for the evening.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. SIMON pertaining to the introduction of S. 933 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Larry Dwyer, detailed from the Federal Highway Administration, be granted floor privileges during the duration of the Senate's debate on S. 440.

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

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I have been handed a note by the staff.

On behalf of Senator KENNEDY, I ask unanimous consent that Ross Eisenbrey, a fellow on the staff of the Labor Committee, be granted floor privileges during the pendency of this matter.

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

USE OF THE CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR AN EXHIBITION

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Rules Committee be immediately discharged from further consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 17; and, further, that the Senate now proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 17) authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the exhibition of the RAH–66 Comanche helicopter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid on the table, and that any statements relating to the concurrent resolution appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

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

So the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 17) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, with its preamble, is as follows:

S. CON. RES. 17

Whereas the RAH–66 Comanche is the new reconnaissance helicopter of the Army;

Whereas the Comanche will save the lives of military aviators acting in the defense of the Nation;

Whereas the technologies employed in the Comanche make it a revolutionary, highly effective, and survivable helicopter;

Whereas the Comanche development program is on budget, on schedule, and encompasses the latest concepts of design and testing to drastically reduce performance risk and ensure ease of manufacturing and maintenance; and

Whereas many members of Congress have expressed support for the Comanche and an interest in seeing the Comanche and learning more about its technology: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR THE EXHIBITION OF THE COMANCHE HELICOPTER AND ASSOCIATED TECHNOLOGIES.

The Boeing Company and United Technologies Corporation Joint Venture (hereinafter in this resolution referred to as the ''Joint Venture''), acting in cooperation with the Secretary of the Army, shall be permitted to sponsor a public event featuring the first flying prototype of the RAH–66 Comanche helicopter on the East Front Plaza of the Capitol Grounds on June 21, 1995, or on such other date as the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives may jointly designate.

SEC. 2. CONDITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The event to be carried out under this resolution shall be free of admission charge to the public and arranged not to interfere with the needs of Congress, under conditions to be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board; except that the Joint Venture shall assume full responsibility for all expenses and liabilities incident to all activities associated with the event.

(b) FLYING PROHIBITION.—The Comanche helicopter referred to in section 1 shall be transported by truck to and from the event to be carried out under this resolution and shall not be flown as part of the event.

SEC. 3. STRUCTURES AND EQUIPMENT.

For the purposes of this resolution, the Joint Venture is authorized to erect upon the Capitol Grounds, subject to the approval of the Architect of the Capitol, a portable shelter, sound amplification devices, and such other equipment as may be required for the event to be carried out under this resolution. The portable shelter shall be approximately 60 feet by 65 feet in size to cover the Comanche helicopter referred to in section 1 and to provide shelter for the public and the technology displays and video presentations associated with the event.

SEC. 4. EVENT PREPARATIONS.

The Joint Venture is authorized to conduct the event to be carried out under this resolution from 8 a.m. to 3 p.m. on June 21, 1995, or on such other date as may be designated under section 1. Preparations for the event may begin at 1 p.m. on the day before the event and removal of the displays, shelter, and Comanche helicopter referred to in section 1 shall be completed by 6 a.m. on the day following the event.

SEC. 5. ADDITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS.

The Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board are authorized to make any such additional arrangements that may be