percent of United States trade with Mexico is land-based. Because of geography, economic development, and commerce on both sides of the border, Texas is the funnel through which the majority of land-based United States-Mexico trade must pass.

More than 50 percent of that traffic crosses the border at the Rio Grande Valley and Laredo; that number is expected to increase to almost 75 percent over the next decade. This amendment would give the growing traffic on the high-priority corridor system convenient access to the entire United States-Mexico border.

Currently there are 9 existing border crossings in the lower Rio Grande Valley, with a total of 30 lanes. In 1994, they handled approximately 28.3 million crossings. Given the number of existing and planned bridges, the lower Rio Grande Valley is an increasingly significant center for cross-border commerce.

Extending corridor 18 to the lower Rio Grande Valley will provide a direct link for the eight States along the I–69 corridor—which accounted for $50.6 billion or 38 percent of the dollar value of United States trade with Mexico and Canada in 1993.

It will maximize the use of our border crossings. It will create a first-rate extended route that will distribute border traffic over several entry points, allowing for cost-efficient cross-border movement of goods.

Extending corridor 18 to the lower Rio Grande will create an infrastructure that will enable the United States to maximize economic development through all of the States that I have just mentioned, as well as our ability to move goods and better capitalize on international trade.

Finally, the development of corridor 18 to the lower Rio Grande Valley will link up with infrastructure development in Mexico. Currently, the Mexican State of Tamaulipas is advancing plans to construct a gulf highway corridor from the industrial center of Mexico City to the Rio Grande Valley.

I want to say how much I appreciate the assistance of the chairman, the ranking minority member of the Environmental and Public Works Committee, and the distinguished Senator, the chairman of the subcommittee, from Virginia, in this matter and say that this is truly going to enhance our ability to capitalize on NAFTA. It will affect all of the States that are going to have the ability to have the traffic and increase the trade between Mexico and the United States and Canada. This is a win for everyone.

Mr. President, I appreciate the cooperation of the Senator from Virginia, the Senator from Rhode Island, and the Senator from Montana, in allowing me to put forward these amendments that I think will increase the economic benefit to all three countries that are participating in NAFTA.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, may I say to the distinguished Senator from Texas that we indeed commend the Senator for diligently looking after the interest of the State of Texas as it relates to the interstate highway system.

These are two very important changes. They do not involve new NHS miles. However, they are essential for the purpose of the use of this system in your State.

I commend the Senator for bringing them to the attention of the Senate. I urge the adoption of the amendments presented by the Senator from Texas. They are agreed to by the managers on both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate? The question is on agreeing to the amendment numbered 1425.

The amendment (No. 1425) was agreed to.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1424

Mr. WARNER. Now, may we proceed to the second amendment, and I urge its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment numbered 1424.

The amendment (No. 1424) was agreed to.

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

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. WARNER. We thank the Senator from Texas and we appreciate the participation of all Senators in moving along this legislation.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I would like to join in the commendation to the Senator from Texas for the vigor with which she has handled this. She certainly is a strong proponent for her State, rightfully so, and she does an excellent job. I congratulate her.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I did not know the Senator from Rhode Island had come back to the floor. I had mentioned him before, but I could not have asked for more cooperation in getting these two amendments through than I have seen from the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Rhode Island. He is doing a terrific job in shepherding this very important bill through.

This bill actually is going to enhance our infrastructure in this country. It is going to create jobs. It is going to lower costs and increase productivity. It will improve air quality. There are so many side effects for this bill that are going to be good for everyone. I do appreciate the leadership of the Senator from Rhode Island in getting it through.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to proceed for up to 7 minutes as in morning business.

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

BOSNIA

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I noted a short while ago that three or four of my colleagues were addressing themselves to the most recent events in the former Yugoslavia. I myself wanted to take this occasion to do the same, because the events there, which have been heartbreaking, tragic, frustrating, and infuriating in various degrees for the last 3 years, seem to only get more so.

I rise today, as I have on numerous occasions over the past years to talk about the tragedy which continues to unfold in Bosnia. There seems to be no end to the suffering of innocent people in that war-torn land. No end to the senseless murder of women and children in once-beautiful cities like Sarajevo. I saw a news clip this weekend; in the midst of the firing on the city that went on, the flowers come up—remembrances of times that were better there. Even today, as people have to go to rivers running through the town to try to get some water with which to wash themselves, perhaps to boil it for drinking water or for cooking. No end to the outrageous, illegal, and fundamentally immoral conduct of international outlaws who are operating under the banner of the Bosnian Serbs from their headquarters in Pale. No end to the humiliation of the United Nations and to the brave soldiers wearing the blue hats of UNPROFOR who are beleaguered in every spot where they have been stationed in Bosnia. No end to the chaos, confusion, and indecisiveness of the international community which has allowed this situation to deteriorate to its current, tragic, pathetic low point. Regrettably, U.S. policy has been part of this sad story.

Mr. President, the headlines of today's New York Times highlight the depths to which the policies of the West have fallen—''Captives Free, U.N. Gives Up Effort to Shield Sarajevo.''

So what has happened here? International outlaws—the Serbs—seize U.N. soldiers—peacekeepers, supposedly, wearing the blue helmets, noncombatants—seize them as hostages. And what is their reward? Their reward is that the United Nations ceases to enforce a U.N. resolution which compelled U.N. forces to protect Sarajevo and other safe areas in Bosnia. In other words, internationally, at least in Bosnia, crime does pay. The most outrageous, inhumane crime.

And of course, the seizing of the U.N. personnel was not the worst of it. Capt.

Scott O'Grady has become quite justifiably and, thank God, a national hero for his courage, for his steadfastness, his extraordinary resourcefulness, for the skill of the American marines who came to his aid, for the effectiveness of American technology that, combined with his bravery, created the circumstance in which he could be liberated, could be saved. But, Mr. President, let us not forget what happened. Captain O'Grady, was on a patrolling mission, not a hostile mission. He was on a mission to enforce a U.N. resolution that there be a no fly zone over Bosnia, that fixed-wing aircraft not fly. And he was shot down in a hostile act by Serbian missiles. And even after those days of eating grass and bugs to keep himself alive, covering himself face-down in the dirt so that the Serbian soldiers walking by would not find him, finally he gets the message out, and those two CH–53E Super Stallions come in with the Marines to rescue this American hero, and what happens? They are fired on by the Serbs—really an act of war. The domestic equivalent to this would be, what would happen if criminals in a city in our country seized police who were walking or riding on a routine mission, and then when other police came to take them out, fired on those other police. What would our reaction be? We would go in with all we had to get them out; we would feel that we had an obligation in the interest of law to punish them. What happens here? Nothing. The Serbs got away with it.

So this is the headline, ''Captives Free, U.N. Gives Up Effort to Shield Sarajevo.'' The captives obviously are the U.N. peacekeepers who were held as hostages for these past weeks. While their return marks the end of one more crisis in Bosnia, it also demonstrates all too clearly why the U.N. forces should no longer be on the ground in Bosnia. There is no peace for these supposed peacekeepers to keep. Barely equipped for self-defense and left in positions where they are continuously vulnerable to Serb humiliation and manipulation, these men do not lack for individual courage, but their hands have been tied by Orwellian U.N. policies where appeasement of the Bosnian Serbs is seen as a virtue and self-defense by the United Nations is seen as a vice. And so the last of these so-called peacekeepers have been returned from their illegal and immoral imprisonment. But at what price?

Apparently in exchange for the release of these hostages, the United Nations has now withdrawn from all of the heavy weapons-collection sites around Sarajevo and withdrawn into the city. And now, they too can become targets once again of the wanton Serb artillery, rocket, mortar, and sniper fire that lands on Sarajevo. It is precisely this Serb use of civilians, hospitals, apartment buildings, schools, and playgrounds for target practice which yesterday cost another 7 people their lives and wounded 10 others, I gather, seeking water, at the very time the U.N. hostages were being released. Many of these people were elderly Sarajevans standing in line for water—water that has become ever scarcer as the Serb stranglehold on Sarajevo continues unabated. And what is the understanding that is worked out between the United Nations and the Serb positions from which the artillery came? Only that they allow the water to be turned on again.

And so the ultimatum which the United Nations issued early last year to protect the people of Sarajevo has now gone the way of all of the United Nations' efforts in Bosnia—it has been trampled under the heel of the Serbian indifference, the Serbian flouting, the Serbian disregard—I cannot find a noun strong enough for what I feel—of the rule of law and the conduct of civilized States at the end of the 20th century. This follows aggression. This follows genocidal acts against people singled out only because of religion, in this case Moslem. Two hundred thousand dead, two million refugees taken from their homes, increasingly under the cover of a U.N. mission that was supposed to bring peace, but has not brought any of it and has, unfortunately, increased the suffering. The top U.N. official in Bosnia, Yasushi Akashi, has now declared that UNPROFOR will adhere strictly to peacekeeping principles; thus, the use of force will, apparently, no longer be considered by the United Nations. In fact, Mr. Akashi indicated last week, 10 days ago, that the United Nations would only act when they had Serb permission to do so. Mr. Akashi, I say to you that it is time to wake up and look around at the ashes of what once was a multiethnic society in Bosnia—there is no peace to keep. Why is UNPROFOR remaining in Bosnia to perform a mission which by definition cannot be performed there? It is as if these courageous, but ill-fated soldiers wearing the U.N. uniform had been thrown in by the nations that control the United Nations as a kind of stop-gap measure to answer the question, ''What are you doing to stop the aggression and slaughter and genocide in Bosnia?'' And so the peacekeepers have been thrown in, where there is no peace, without the capacity to defend themselves, bringing humiliation on the United Nations and on the rule of law and civility in international relations. It is time for the U.N. leadership and the heads of the countries with forces in the UNPROFOR to acknowledge that in spite of everything else that has gone on, it is time for UNPROFOR to get out. The UNPROFOR mission should be terminated de jure as well as de facto, because de facto, it is over, it does not stand for anything, it is not helping anyone, as the events of the past week coming right down to yesterday, show. With the withdrawal of UNPROFOR, the international community will again have the opportunity to act to lift the immoral arms embargo of Bosnia and Herzegovina, an embargo that has left one side with heavy weapons, the other side ill prepared to defend families and country. If other countries will not go along with what is perhaps the last, best hope not only for the people of Bosnia but for the rule of law, for the standards of international opposition to aggression and genocide, then the United States, I hope, will lift it unilaterally, without delay. But, of course, if the United Nations is out, the traditional excuse, rationalization of our allies in NATO for not supporting a lifting of the embargo, which is that it might lead to the seizing of hostages, will be eliminated. Hostages have been taken. With the United Nations out, there will be no more hostages to take. To deny the legitimate Government of Bosnia the right to defend its sovereignty and the lives of its people is simply wrong.

Mr. President, last week Prime Minister Silajdzic of Bosnia and Herzegovina was in Washington. Many of us had the chance to hear him, to meet with him. I must say, I have seen him several times here in Washington. I have never seen him so grim. I have never seen him so frustrated. I have never seen him so deeply concerned, depressed about the suffering which his people continue to endure without hope of that assistance that they continue to feel and pray for is just around the corner, particularly from the United States of America, the last, best hope for people who suffer as the Bosnians have.

I have also never seen Prime Minister Silajdzic so determined that Bosnia will continue to fight for its rights as a sovereign state. Because no one else will come to their aid. If they are not for themselves, literally, who else will be? And if not now, when? The Prime Minister made clear once again that he does not want American soldiers on Bosnian soil. He wants to have the ability—the weaponry—for the brave Bosnians to fight their own fight. What they seek is the right to obtain those weapons which will enable them to defend themselves against those who have committed aggression and genocide against them.

Time has been running out for the people of Bosnia for too long now. The United Nations has not been willing or able to stop the bloodshed. It is time for the United Nations to step aside. What is left is for the people of Bosnia to fight their own fight with our assistance: at least with us untying their hands, which we have tied behind their backs by the continued imposition of this embargo, which originated at a time when the State of Bosnia did not exist, as an attempt to avoid the expansion of war by keeping arms out of the area. But it is the Serbs in Belgrade who control most of the war-fighting industrial capacity that was Yugoslavia's. It is the Bosnians who are left to fight tanks with light arms.

Mr. President, the grotesque advantages that have been given to the aggressor here, as we continue to declare a kind of neutrality which amounts to immorality, defies all standards of decency and international law. The time is at hand for us finally to answer the call for help which has been coming, but has been unanswered, from Bosnia for too long. I hope that my colleagues in both parties in this chamber will be able to play a leadership role in supporting, encouraging, as rapidly as possible, the withdrawal of the U.N. forces from Bosnia, the lifting of the arms embargo, and the selective use of Allied air power to protect not just the sovereignty of a nation, Bosnia, that has been invaded by a neighbor, but to protect the rule of law, in Europe and throughout the world. In that, we here continue to have a vital national interest.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAMM). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM DESIGNATION ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the Senate's consideration of S. 440, the highway bill, the following amendments be the only first-degree amendments in order, that they be subject to relevant second-degree amendments, and that no second-degree amendments be in order prior to a failed motion to table, unless the amendment is described only as relevant, in which case, second-degree amendments would be in order prior to a motion to table.

This agreement has been agreed to by the Democratic side.

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

The list of amendments is as follows:

Baucus: CMAQ eligibility.
Baucus: Managers' amendment.
Baucus: Relevant.
Baucus: Strike Section 117.
Biden: State flexibility (w/Roth).
Biden: Amtrak.
Bond: Relevant.
Boxer: ISTEA project demonstration.
Bumpers: NHS connector route.
Byrd: Relevant.
Byrd: Relevant.
Campbell/Snowe: Helmets.
Chafee/Warner: Managers' amendment.
Cohen: Labor provisions of 13C.
Conrad: Relevant.
Daschle: Metric requirements.
Daschle: Relevant.
Dole: Relevant.
Dorgan: Open container/drunk driving.
Exon: High risk drivers.
Exon: Railroad crossings.
Exon: Truck lengths.
Faircloth: Relevant.
Feingold: Relevant.
Frist: CMAQ funding.
Graham: Relevant.
Graham: Relevant.
Graham: Relevant.
Grams: Private property.
Gregg: Relevant.
Gregg: Relevant.
Hatfield: Authorization of 15 in Oregon.
Inhofe: Single audits.
Inouye: Relevant.
Jeffords: Project review.
Kohl: Grandfathering size/weight trucks Wisconsin route.
Lautenberg: Restore speed limit requirements.
Leahy: Non-interstate NHS routes project review.
Leahy: Relevant.
Levin: Relevant.
Lott: NHS route designation.
Mack: NHS maps.
McCain: Highway demo projects $ out of state allocation.
McCain: Highway demo projects.
McConnell: Tolls.
Moseley-Braun: Motorcycle helmets (w/Snowe).
Murkowski: Designation of Dalton Highway.
Reid: Trucks/speed limit.
Roth: States flexibility to Amtrak funding.
Roth: States flexibility to Amtrak funding.
Roth: States flexibility to Amtrak funding.
Simon: Date of bridge.
Smith: Helmets/seatbelts.
Smith: Helmets/seatbelts.
Stevens: Dalton Highway designations.
Stevens: Right of way designations.
Thurmond: High priority corridors.
Thurmond: High priority corridors.
Thurmond: High priority corridors.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that no amendment dealing with affirmative action be in order during the pendency of S. 440.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I rise today to offer my support for the national highway bill. I believe it is a good bill. But I believe there is one provision of the bill that, quite frankly, needs to be changed. So tomorrow, Senator LAUTENBERG and I will be offering an amendment to retain the current maximum national speed limit.

The bill as it is currently written totally repeals this law. I believe this action of repealing this law clearly flies in the face of reality, commonsense, logic, and history because I believe that on this issue the facts are in and they are conclusive.

Let us talk a little history. In 1973, 55,000 people died in car-related fatalities in this country. In 1974, the next year, Congress established the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit.

That is very same year highway fatalities dropped by 16-percent—a 16 percent reduction the very next year after Congress imposed the 55-mile-per-hour speed limit. Fatalities that year dropped from 55,000—in 1973—to 46,000 in 1974.

Mr. President, according to the National Academy of Sciences, the national speed limit law saves somewhere between 2,000 and 4,000 lives every year. So there have been as many as 80,000 lives saved in this country because of this law since 1974.

Mr. President, another historical fact moving forward to 1987: When the mandatory speed limit was amended in 1987 to allow the 65-mile-per-hour speed limit on some of the rural interstates in this country, the fatalities on those highways went up 30 percent more than had been expected. Increasing the speed limit to 65 miles per hour on rural interstates cost 500 lives per year. Those highways are among the safest roads in America. What happens when we totally repeal that law, totally repeal the 55 miles per hour, not just on the rural interstates but in the urban interstates as well? I think we will continue to see it go up, and it will go up at a much faster rate—the fatalities.

If we were to see just the same increase—30 percent—that we saw on the rural highways in the rest of the interstate system because of this particular law, the Department of Transportation estimates an additional 4,750 people would die every single year.

I think that is clearly not the direction we need to go in in the area of highway safety. I believe that we need to go in the opposite direction because there are obviously far too many Americans dying on the highways of this country every year.

In my home State of Ohio in 1993 a total of 1,482 people were killed in car accidents. Over 20 percent of those accidents were speed related. Nationwide, excessive speed is a factor in one-third of all fatal crashes.

Mr. President, I believe the old adage got it exactly right. Speed does kill. And even if interstate highways were designed for 70-mile-per-hour travel, people are not. People are not designed to survive crashes at that speed. As speed increases, driver reaction time decreases. The distance the driver needs, if he is trying to stop, increases. When speed goes above 55 miles per hour, every 10-mile-per-hour increase doubles—doubles—the force of the injury-causing impact. This means that at a 65-mile-per-hour speed, a crash is twice as severe as a crash at 55 miles per hour. A crash at 75 miles per hour is four times more severe.

A speed limit of over 55 is a known killer. Let us face that fact and do the right thing right here as part of this bill. That means I believe voting ''aye'' on the amendment which Senator LAUTENBERG and I will propose tomorrow.