

Creek Addition, which has been reported from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

**SECTION 1. SLATE CREEK ADDITION TO EAGLES NEST WILDERNESS, ARAPAHO AND WHITE RIVER NATIONAL FORESTS, COLORADO.**

(a) SLATE CREEK ADDITION.—If, before December 31, 2000, the United States acquires the parcel of land described in subsection (b)—

(1) on acquisition of the parcel, the parcel shall be included in and managed as part of the Eagles Nest Wilderness designated by Public Law 94-352 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; 90 Stat. 870); and

(2) the boundary of Eagles Nest Wilderness is adjusted to reflect the inclusion of the parcel.

(b) DESCRIPTION OF ADDITION.—The parcel referred to in subsection (a) is the parcel generally depicted on a map entitled "Slate Creek Addition-Eagles Nest Wilderness", dated February 1997, comprising approximately 160 acres in Summit County, Colorado, adjacent to the Eagles Nest Wilderness.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill (S. 588), as amended, was read the third time and passed.

**COLORADO BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT AND LAND CONVEYANCE ACT**

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 589) to provide for a boundary adjustment and land conveyance involving the Raggeds Wilderness, White River National Forest, Colorado, to correct the effects of earlier erroneous land surveys, which had been reported from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

**SECTION 1. BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT AND LAND CONVEYANCE, RAGGEDS WILDERNESS, WHITE RIVER NATIONAL FOREST, COLORADO.**

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) certain landowners in Gunnison County, Colorado who own real property adjacent to the portion of the Raggeds Wilderness in the White River National Forest, Colorado, have occupied or improved their property in good faith and in reliance on erroneous surveys of their properties that the landowners reasonably believed were accurate;

(2) in 1993, a Forest Service resurvey of the Raggeds Wilderness established accurate boundaries between the wilderness area and adjacent private lands; and

(3) the resurvey indicates that a small portion of the Raggeds Wilderness is occupied by adjacent landowners on the basis of the earlier erroneous land surveys.

(b) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this section to remove from the boundaries of the Raggeds Wilderness certain real property so as to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to use the authority of Public Law 97-465 (commonly known as the "Small Tracts Act") (16 U.S.C. 521c et seq.) to convey the property to the landowners who occupied the property on the basis of erroneous land surveys.

(c) BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.—The boundary of the Raggeds Wilderness, Gunnison and White River National Forests, Colorado, as designated by section 102(a)(16) of Public Law 96-560 (94 Stat. 3267; 16 U.S.C. 1132 note), is hereby modified to exclude from the area encompassed by

the wilderness a parcel of real property approximately 0.86-acres in size situated in the SW<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> of the NE<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> of Section 28, Township 11 South, Range 88 West of the 6th Principal Meridian, as depicted on the map entitled "Encroachment-Raggeds Wilderness", dated November 17, 1993.

(d) MAP.—The map described in subsection (c) shall be on file and available for inspection in the appropriate offices of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

(e) CONVEYANCE OF LAND REMOVED FROM WILDERNESS AREA.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall use the authority provided by Public Law 97-465 (commonly known as the "Small Tracts Act") (16 U.S.C. 521c et seq.) to convey all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the real property excluded from the boundaries of the Raggeds Wilderness under subsection (c) to the owners of real property in Gunnison County, Colorado, whose real property adjoins the excluded real property and who have occupied the excluded real property in good faith reliance on an erroneous survey.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill (S. 589), as amended, was read the third time and passed.

**DILLON RANGER DISTRICT TRANSFER ACT**

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 591) to transfer the Dillon Ranger District in the Arapaho National Forest to the White River National Forest in the State of Colorado, which had been reported from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

**SECTION 1. INCLUSION OF DILLON RANGER DISTRICT IN WHITE RIVER NATIONAL FOREST, COLORADO.**

(a) BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENTS.—

(1) WHITE RIVER NATIONAL FOREST.—The boundary of the White River National Forest in the State of Colorado is hereby adjusted to include all National Forest System lands located in Summit County, Colorado, comprising the Dillon Ranger District of the Arapaho National Forest.

(2) ARAPAHO NATIONAL FOREST.—The boundary of the Arapaho National Forest is adjusted to exclude the land transferred to the White River National Forest by paragraph (1).

(b) REFERENCE.—Any reference to the Dillon Ranger District, Arapaho National Forest, in any existing statute, regulation, manual, handbook, or other document shall be deemed to be a reference to the Dillon Ranger District, White River National Forest.

(c) EXISTING RIGHTS.—Nothing in this section affects valid existing rights of persons holding any authorization, permit, option, or other form of contract existing on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) FOREST RECEIPTS.—Notwithstanding the distribution requirements of payments under the sixth paragraph under the heading "FOREST SERVICE" in the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, nineteen hundred and nine", approved May 23, 1908 (35 Stat. 260, chapter 192; 16 U.S.C. 500), the distribution of receipts from the Arapaho National Forest and the White River National Forest to affected county governments shall be based on the national forest boundaries that existed on the day before the date of enactment of this Act.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill (S. 591), as amended, was read the third time and passed.

**AUTHORIZING PRODUCTION OF RECORDS**

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 135, submitted earlier today by Senators LOTT and DASCHLE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 135) to authorize the production of records by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, the Committee on Rules and Administration has received requests from various law enforcement entities for copies of committee records related to the committee's inquiry into the 1996 Louisiana U.S. Senate election. The committee anticipates future similar requests.

In accord with standard Senate practice, this resolution would authorize the Rules Committee to provide committee records in response to these requests.

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

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

The resolution (S. Res. 135) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, and its preamble, is as follows:

**S. RES. 135**

Whereas, federal, state, and local law enforcement officials have requested that the Committee on Rules and Administration provide them with copies of records held by the committee related to the 1996 United States Senate election in Louisiana;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate can, by administrative or judicial process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate;

Whereas, when it appears that documents, papers, and records under the control or in the possession of the Senate may promote the administration of justice, the Senate will take such action as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration, either through formal action or by joint action of the Chairman and Ranking Member, is authorized to provide to federal, state, and local law enforcement officials copies of records held by the committee related to the 1996 United States Senate election in Louisiana.

**MORNING BUSINESS**

(During today's session of the Senate, the following morning business was transacted.)

REGISTRATION OF MASS  
MAILINGS

The filing date for 1997 third quarter mass mailings is October 27, 1997. If your office did no mass mailings during this period, please submit a form that states "none."

Mass mailing registrations, or negative reports, should be submitted to the Senate Office of Public Records, 232 Hart Building, Washington, DC 20510-7116.

The Public Records Office will be open from 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. on the filing date to accept these filings. For further information, please contact the Public Records Office on (202) 224-0322.

## THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Wednesday, October 8, 1997, the Federal debt stood at \$5,412,240,204,620.07. (Five trillion, four hundred twelve billion, two hundred forty million, two hundred four thousand, six hundred twenty dollars and seven cents)

One year ago, October 8, 1996, the Federal debt stood at \$5,221,529,000,000. (Five trillion, two hundred twenty-one billion, five hundred twenty-nine million)

Five years ago, October 8, 1992, the Federal debt stood at \$4,052,485,000,000. (Four trillion, fifty-two billion, four hundred eighty-five million)

Ten years ago, October 8, 1987, the Federal debt stood at \$2,372,340,000,000. (Two trillion, three hundred seventy-two billion, three hundred forty million)

Fifteen years ago, October 8, 1982, the Federal debt stood at \$1,132,671,000,000 (One trillion, one hundred thirty-two billion, six hundred seventy-one million) which reflects a debt increase of more than \$4 trillion—\$4,279,569,204,620.07 (Four trillion, two hundred seventy-nine billion, five hundred sixty-nine million, two hundred four thousand, six hundred twenty dollars and seven cents) during the past 15 years.

## AMTRAK CRISIS

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, Amtrak is at a crisis point. Actually, it faces two crises: a strike and the financial crisis brought about by failure to reform the railroad. Reform is a prerequisite to accessing the much-needed capital Congress provided for the railroad in the Balanced Budget bill. Congress decided when that bill was passed that it did not make sense to provide that money unless the railroad was able to act more like a business. I strongly support intercity passenger rail but believe that reform is essential before putting this major financial commitment in place.

First, and most immediately, Amtrak is facing a possible national shut down because of an impasse between the Brotherhood of Maintenance of

Way Employees (BMWE) and Amtrak over wages and work rules. At question is Amtrak's ability to pay for any increase in wages during the difficult financial times the railroad is currently going through.

Using the Railway Labor Act, the President has named a Presidential Emergency Board to recommend a solution to the dispute. It concluded its investigation and made its recommendations. The parties are now in a 30 day "cooling off" period to consider the recommendations. If no agreement is reached by the end of this period, which falls on October 22nd, we could have a strike or a management "lockout of employees". Either action would have the effect of shutting down all commuter operations, as well as other services, across the country. A strike would not be confined to the Northeast Corridor, but would affect all of the passengers in the entire Amtrak system.

Amtrak's largest operations are in the Northeast Corridor, where a large number of commuter authorities between Washington, New York and Boston depend on that infrastructure to operate their railroads.

They include: the MBTA or Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority, CONNDOT, Long Island Railroad, NJ Transit, the SEPTA or Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority, and the two local services, the MARC or Maryland Commuter service and the VRE or Virginia Railway Express. Each one of these commuter authorities use the Northeast Corridor. If Amtrak cannot operate the Corridor, these services come to a halt. In addition, freight carriers such as Conrail who use the Corridor would be seriously affected, because Amtrak operates much of the track on the Northeast corridor.

Mr. President, let me put this in perspective. When a 60-day cooling off period recently expired in California, the San Francisco Bay Area's commuter railroad was shut down by a strike which stranded 270,000 commuters.

Dispatchers at Norfolk Southern, which carries commuters between Manassas, Virginia, and Washington, DC recently called a "wildcat" strike for three hours and the VRE had to cancel one-half of its afternoon trains.

But if Amtrak is shut down, it won't be one commuter authority paralyzed as we saw in San Francisco or Virginia, it will be many. It won't be thousands of commuters, it will be millions.

If this happens, the strike in San Francisco will pale by comparison.

Mr. President, my colleagues need to be aware of this situation, because the Senate needs to address it head-on before we leave in November.

Congress has to act because the future of America's railroad depends on it. Amtrak is simply in a no-win situation. Amtrak cannot afford the terms of the PEB and it cannot afford a strike.

The PEB recommended a package of wage increases recently implemented

by the profitable freight railroads. The freight deal for the BMWE would cost Amtrak \$25 million in FY98. If it were extended to all of Amtrak's employees, it would cost Amtrak \$250 million. I seriously doubt that Congress would appropriate funds for these wages. As it is, the railroad is currently borrowing just to meet existing daily expenses.

Mr. President, my colleagues have to be realistic. I look forward to working with both the Majority Leader and Senate Labor Committee Chairman to find the right solution to this dilemma.

Mr. President, in that spirit, I plan to move forward on Amtrak's reform legislation. I have had extensive discussions with the Majority Leader on this matter and he feels the same way.

Mr. LOTT. The Senator from Texas is correct. Amtrak is an important part of the national transportation system, not just for the Northeast Corridor, but for the entire interstate passenger rail system. This summer, in the Taxpayer Relief Act, Congress provided Amtrak with a secure source of funding for capital assets—some \$2.3 billion for infrastructure. I worked hard for those funds, against considerable opposition, as did the Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee and the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Surface Transportation.

Rail transportation will continue to play a critical role in the American intermodal passenger system through the 21st century. However, rail transportation of passengers cannot be done without federal and state funding. It simply cannot be done. Just as commercial air transportation of passengers would have never gotten off the ground without federal and state assistance, rail transportation of passengers will not progress unless Congress provides infrastructure assistance.

Congress is willing to support Amtrak, on the condition that Amtrak be reformed. That is why we insisted that not one dime of that \$2.3 billion be spent until a reform package is approved by Congress.

If Amtrak is to survive, it is critical that we complete our work on the authorizing legislation. However, the Senate still has some colleagues who are holding up the authorization bill over labor provisions. These provisions are essentially identical to language that labor supported just last year. Now some of our colleagues find them unacceptable. Organized labor has joined the Administration in creating a moving target. If this continues, Amtrak may never get the capital we provided.

Mr. President, there will be no capital, I repeat, no \$2.3 billion in capital funds provided until an authorization is enacted.

I support a national rail system, but I will not support continued inefficient use of taxpayers money.

If Amtrak is ever going to operate like a business, it must have flexibility. It needs freedom from federal laws