Our Florida Governor signed this measure into law just a few weeks ago, on June 1.

The State of Florida has now taken action to authorize and commit $1.5 million in State funds for high speed rail, and we respectfully ask the subcommittee’s support and assistance and consideration in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) will be able to work with my colleagues in the Florida delegation and help us identify and secure funding for this project, which also has been authorized under one of the high speed rail corridors.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICA. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Mica) for offering his comment. We would be pleased to work with the gentleman as this transportation bill moves through the appropriation process, especially as the gentleman is the chairman of a very important subcommittee over there on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I prepared an amendment to earmark funds for fiscal year 2002 funds for the Florida project, but I will not offer that amendment today. I want to thank the chairman for his intention to work with us on this project. It is most important to the people of Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON) assumed the chair.

Mr. CAMP, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2299) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. YOUNG of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, I wanted to announce to the membership that it is my intention to file the fiscal year 2002 energy and water development appropriations bill this afternoon, which we will do following this colloquy; that the Committee on Rules has agreed to meet this afternoon at 5:00 to receive testimony to grant a rule on that bill. The House would then consider the energy and water appropriations bill sometime midday tomorrow; and I say midday because in the morning two subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations will mark up their bills. It will be midday before we could get to the energy and water bill.

With respect to the agriculture bill, it is my intention not to file the fiscal year 2002 agriculture, rural development, Food and Drug Administration and related agencies appropriation bill until the apples issue is resolved. If an agreement can be reached on apples, I would expect to file the agriculture appropriations bill tomorrow.

The Committee on Rules would then meet tomorrow evening to report the rule, and the House could work into the evening on Thursday night, hoping to complete that bill before adjourning for the July 4 recess.

I share the ewers’ desire to finish the agriculture bill by midnight Thursday or earlier if possible. In order for us to meet this ambitious schedule, it will require the cooperation of all of our colleagues in the House, and, of course, the cooperation of the Committee on Rules, which is always cooperative.

In order for the House to complete action on the agriculture bill, I would expect that the gentleman from Wisconsin and his leadership would be prepared to enter into time agreements, as we have on previous appropriations bills, and limitations on amendments to be offered on the agriculture appropriations bill. Since we all would like to get home to our districts for the 4th of July holiday, we desire not to have a hard drive into the wee hours of the morning Friday to finish the work. Rather, if necessary, we could complete the work on the agriculture bill when we return in July.

Mr. EMERSON. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I think that the Members will appreciate the information.

REPORT ON H.R. 2311, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

Mr. CALLAHAN, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107–112) on the bill (H.R. 2311) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Pursuant to clause 1 of rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Pursuant to House Resolution 78 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2299.
IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the Hag of the United States for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2299) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes with Mr. Camp in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the bill was open for amendment to page 53 line 12, through page 53 line 17.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word to engage the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation in a colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, I note that the subcommittee’s recommendation for the New Starts program does not include any funding for the Second Avenue Subway in New York City. This is an important transportation investment planned in the metropolitan area, and it is vitally necessary to ensure fluid transit in an already over-congested metropolitan area. The project received $3 million for continued analysis and design in fiscal year 2001.

I understand that the subcommittee’s recommendation provides funding for only those projects that have full funding grant agreements in place, are likely to have full funding grant agreements in place in the very near future, or are in final design. While the Second Avenue Subway does not meet this criteria, it is important that the analysis and design continue on this important project. The MTA assures me that the project will be in preliminary design by the end of fiscal year 2001.

The State and the MTA have made a major commitment for the project and have included $1.05 billion in the MTA’s capital budget.

I ask the chairman that if the Senate were to include an appropriation for the Second Avenue Subway in its fiscal year 2002 Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations bill, that the subcommittee accommodate to the greatest extent possible to ensure that Federal funding for this project is continued in fiscal year 2002.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky for Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman’s commitment to this project, and her observations about the criteria the subcommittee used in developing its recommendation. According to the subcommittee had an enormous number of requests for new light rail transit systems that we simply could not accommodate. We did not have the money. Unfortunately, we had to say “sorry” quite a bit this year.

I can assure the gentlewoman that should the Senate include funding for the subway in its version of the bill, that we will give it every consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 330. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for engineering work related to an additional runway at New Orleans International Airport.

SEC. 331. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used to propose or issue rules, regulations, decrees, or orders for the purpose of implementation, or in preparation for implementation, of the Kyoto Protocol which was adopted on December 11, 1997, in Kyoto, Japan at the Third Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, which has not been submitted to the Senate for advice and consent to ratification pursuant to article II, section 2, of the United States Constitution, and which has not entered into force pursuant to article 25 of the Protocol.

Amendment offered by Mr. OLVER.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OLVER: Page 54, line 7, insert before the period at the end the following: “; except that this limitation does not apply to activities related to the Kyoto Protocol that are otherwise authorized by law (including those activities authorized by the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change in respect to which the Senate gave its advice and consent to ratification in October 1992)”.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise reluctantly, because this bill is an excellent bill, and I respect very much the work of the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), as well as my ranking member on the subcommittee, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), but I do take exception to the language of section 331.

The language in section 331 is language which has been included several times over the last few years, at a time when it was legitimately believed by the majority that the President in charge of the executive departments would have conducted the very actions which are prescribed by section 331 in the present legislation.

On the other hand, President Bush has made it clear that he has no intention of implementing the Kyoto Protocol as it has been worked out, and has even used much stronger language, that the Kyoto Protocol is “dead.” So, at the very least, the language is unnecessary and shows perhaps a disbelief in the President’s intentions and the President’s word, which I am sure the majority does not mean to show.

I would like to point out that just slightly more than 1 month ago, that this House adopted in the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, which was passed on May 16, a sense of the Congress section relating to global warming, and that sense of Congress pointed out that global climate change poses a significant threat to national security; that most of the observed warming over the past 50 years is attributable to human activities; that global average surface temperatures have risen since 1861; that in the last 40 years the global average sea level has risen, ocean heat content increased, and snow cover and ice extent have decreased, which threatens to inundate low-lying Pacific Island nations and coastal regions throughout the world; and pointed out at that time that the United States has ratified the United Nations framework on climate change, which framework, ratified in 1992 by the Senate, was proposed for ratification by then President George Herbert Walker Bush to be ratified and was ratified by the Senate and took effect in 1994, that quoting from that, “the parties to the convention are to implement policies with the aim of returning to their 1990 levels of anthropogenic emissions of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases,” and, to continue, “that developed country parties should take the lead in combatting climate change and the adverse effects thereof.”

So, in that sense, we already have adopted by this Congress the language that I have offered in the amendment, which is a clarifying amendment, the amendment merely saying that the limiting language should not relate, should not apply, to activities that are otherwise authorized by law, nor to those activities that are authorized by the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change with respect to which the Senate gave its advice and consent; and we have a full ratification of that treaty, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.

So my amendment suggests that the activities that are related to that framework convention as ratified in 1992 are in no way proscribed by the language of section 331. So it is additional language to limit the States to or to explain that limitation.

By the way, Mr. Chairman, it is my intent at the appropriate time to withdraw this amendment. I just wanted to bring it to the attention of the House, that we have a series of activities that we should not be proscribing, that those which are previously authorized by law and those that are part of the already ratified treaty of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change should not be proscribed. So I intend to withdraw the amendment at the appropriate time.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that as we move through the appropriations process, that those of us who have a different opinion about climate change, for whatever reason, and continue to put language in the appropriations
bills that, however you want to describe it, ties agencies’ hands to discussing the issue, implementing policy that might not be related to Kyoto, but something that the United States wants to do. I would hope that Members can sit down at a breakfast, at a dinner, those of us who have different opinions on this issue, and discuss that issue so that we can come to a more friendly agreement on how to proceed and assume and accumulate more knowledge on this issue and understand each other’s positions and why.

Mr. Chairman, this country has not prospered for over 200 years because of gagged restraint on the part of its citizens and its agencies; this country has prospered because of the accumulation of knowledge and wisdom and information and initiative. What I would like to do for the Members present is to just discuss some of the undisputed facts about climate change. One is scientifically sound. Over the last 10,000 years, the planet has warmed 1 degree Fahrenheit in less than 100 years. So there is a dramatic shift in the warming that corresponds to the amount of CO₂ in the atmosphere that covers the earth. That is a tiny fraction of our atmosphere. That makes up about .035 percent of the atmosphere. That is a tiny fraction of our whole atmosphere. Yet that tiny amount has an extraordinary effect on the heat balance of the planet. We are warm in a tiny, thin sheen of atmosphere that covers the earth.

Now, any change in that, which is fairly dramatic that we are seeing, will have an effect on the climate. So basically, human activity, because of what we are doing, is having an effect on the climate and 95 percent of the international scientists and 16 scientists from the U.S. just took up overview of this situation with an international panel on climate change, and 15 out of the 16 said there is no mistake that human activity is having an effect on the climate.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILCHREST. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I love his theory, but one thing I would ask the gentleman. Two years ago I was in New Mexico standing and overlooking a huge ice action and the gentleman with me said, you know, think about it. Congressman, 12 million years ago there was 284 feet of ice where you are standing. I never will ask how the ice got there, but it was there, and that has scientifically been proven.

But I will ask the gentleman from Maryland, what melted that ice all the way back to the North Pole when our activity is less than 4,000 years? So I want to ask the gentleman, what melted it all? Where did it all go? I always intrigue me about the idea of how arrogant we are thinking we are the real problem for all of the problems that occur on this earth.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) has expired.

(On request of Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and by unanimous consent, Mr. GILCHREST was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, the oil that we are going to drill and the gentleman from Maryland is going to help me drill in Alaska if he has any wisdom at all; in fact, when we drill, we do not drill through rock up there, we drill through ferns, tree trunks, elephants, all the way down to the bottom to get to the oil.

Now, if we are to understand the gentleman’s theory and there is not going to be any change and we are the fault of all of it, then why did this always occur in the past? We take a great deal upon ourselves saying it is our fault because of this global warming when, in reality, if we look at the past history of this earth, it was warm at one time, it was very, very cold at one time; and that was before mankind had anything to do with it.

So before we jump off the cliff, let us understand one thing: we may not be as important as the gentleman thinks we are.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, re-claiming my time, if I could just re-respond to the chairman, I am going to go off that cliff in a very gentle way. I am not leaping off that cliff; I am looking to see what is at the bottom.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) has again expired.

(On request of Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and by unanimous consent, Mr. GILCHREST was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, there has been change in the climate ever since we have been a planet and the cycle has run over many millions of years and a quick cycle would be 10,000 years. Human beings have a right to live on the planet and to improve the standard of living as best we can, but we also have a responsibility to understand the nature of our impact on the natural processes so that future generations, which will be our grandchildren and great grandchildren, will not deal with a situation that is more difficult than what we have.

In the last 10,000 years, as a natural consequence of nature, we have warmed about 1 degree centigrade every 1,000 years. But in correspondence to the internal combustion and burning fossil fuels, we have warmed almost that amount in 100 years. So I would like to ask the gentleman from Maryland, for two years, we ought to take a look at that acceleration of that warming rate.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, 2 million cubic meters per second, moving cold water of the ocean from the Arctic all the way down the Atlantic coast of the United States, the south Atlantic, into the Pacific and then circulating back up to the Arctic. That great oceanic circulation current from time to time disappears. The world enters an ice age, and it occurs on regular currents of about 100,000 years.

It also occurs with a tilt of the earth’s axis a half a degree away further from the sun than it does now. That last occurrence made the disappearance of the circulating current was followed by a warming period that ended with the great Ice Age, which itself ended over 10,000 years ago and was followed by the lesser Ice Age, the period of roughly 1,300 to 1,400 in the modern era. And then about 750 years ago we experienced another lesser ice age known as the Younger Dryas.

We are now in a period of extended warming. We are beyond those ice age periods and into a new cycle of climate. As the atmosphere has warmed and as the surface of the waters of the Pacific Ocean have warmed more than a centi-grade degree since the beginning of this century, the ocean waters are expanding. As they warm, they expand, and so
is it happening with the Atlantic waters. And as those waters expand and as the atmosphere is warmer. It holds for every degree of temperature 6 percent more moisture. And with more moisture in the atmosphere, more of a collision of warm and cold forces, we are seeing these violent storms. Fifteen years ago, the did not pay more than $7 billion a year in disaster assistance programs. Within the last 5 years, we have spent over $5 billion a year, and last year with the private insurance and the public funds, expended over $100 billion in response to natural disasters. It is incontrovertible that serious things are happening in our climate. And what has changed is not the forces of nature, but man's application to them.

Mr. Chairman, I want to share with you that the problem of global climate change, is a major mistake. We cannot ignore the relentless movement of forces in the nature, the melting polar ice pack in the Arctic and the ice pack of Antarctica that are increasing the volume of the oceans by warming of the surface temperature of the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans. They are causing warming in the atmosphere and more moisture in the atmosphere, more carbon in the atmosphere; and only we can change it, by slowing down the destruction of the tropical forests, increasing sustainable-yield forestry in the United States, and reducing our use of carbon. We ought to have that study, and we ought to have this debate. Five minutes is no serious time in which to do it.

Mr. Smith of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to share with my colleagues a few facts about climate change that have not gotten much press. The main point is uncertainty. There is still a great deal that we do not know or do not well understand about our global climate. For every study that seems to tell us something, there is another that confounds the previous conclusions. Uncertainty is a normal and maybe important part of the scientific process, but it is a part that we do not communicate to the public and so rarely report on. To its credit, The New York Times ran a piece last week entitled, "Both Sides Now: New Way That Clouds May Cool," which noted that science is uncertain that uncertainty can dramatically change climate models. Clouds have long been a source of uncertainty in climate studies. Certain gases generated by the burning of fossil fuels, such as carbon dioxide, are widely held to play a role in warming the planet. However, aerosols, also produced from fossil fuels, have been found to contribute to the cooling of the planet by affecting the development of clouds that reflect sunlight, and thus it reflects heat away from the planet.

Now, before we pass legislation meant to curb global warming, we need to understand better which human activities affect those and other processes. It seems, and I would suggest, the most important point to take from the recent round of reports is that our climate is a very complex system that is not well understood. As chairman of our Subcommittee on Research of the Committee on Science, we have held several hearings on this subject; and it is almost universally agreed by those testifying before our committee that scientific evidence and knowledge is lacking.

Our best intentions can very easily produce the wrong outcome. Fredrick Seitz, former president of the National Academy of Sciences, did a piece for the Washington Times last week on this very point. Let me quote from that article entitled "Beyond the Clouds of Fright." Quote: "The science of climate change today does not call for rash action that could wreak havoc with economies worldwide and even cause worse damage to the environment over time." He also cautioned that "researchers shouldn't be pressured by politics or encouraged by publicity to find a particular answer. They should be given the time, the money, and the support to seek and find the truth.

So in conclusion, I would like to urge my colleagues to resist the temptation to jump on the bandwagon of climate change before we better understand the science and better know the consequences of our actions. I understand the ranking member has a perfecting amendment that might help us, help guide us.

Mr. Inslee. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, modest uncertainty is not an excuse for major inaction. When the captain of the Titanic steamed out of the harbor at Southampton at the same speed because he was not sure if there was an iceberg there, because he was uncertain if there was an iceberg there, that was a mistake. And this body, with the language in this bill, which now continues to ignore this problem of global climate change, is a major mistake.

I am just going to ask my friends across the hall, to look at two things that happened today within a quarter mile of this building. Number one, The Washington Post, headline this morning: "Penguins In Major Decline. Fifty percent of these stocks are disappearing in the Antarctic." Why? Because they have had a reduction of ice in the Antarctic, a death of the crill population that penguins rely on and a potential huge collapse in a couple of their populations.

It happened today. I am just going to ask people across the aisle to not adopt the attitude of the ostrich and ignore these facts.

Number two, right now, 200 yards from now, are two fuel-cell-driven cars, one manufactured by the Ford Company, that run on fuel cells and emit water instead of carbon dioxide in their emissions.

We and I mean we, have the potential if we get together to emphasize research in these new technologies, we are going to lead the world, instead of the laughingstock of the world, of the country that refuses to be anything but an ostrich on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask at some point that we work together to lead the world. We did not have to wait for the rest of the world to do a clean air bill. We did not have to wait for the rest of the world to do a clean water bill. We ought to lead the world on global climate change. That is the right approach.

Mr. Chairman, I look forward to the time we can do that on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. Oliver. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. Oliver. Mr. Chairman, I will be very brief this time. In section 331, it refers to a limitation in the use of funds in this legislation to implement in a broad way, in any kind of way, the Kyoto Protocol, which has never been ratified by the Senate of this Nation, nor by any of the other major signatories to the original Protocol for that matter.

My amendment merely says that the limitation which would remain does not include activities related to the Protocol which are otherwise authorized by law, nor activities that are authorized by the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, which is the treaty that was negotiated back in 1991 and 1992, and sent to the Senate for ratification by former President George Herbert Walker Bush, and was ratified by the Senate and has the full force of law.

Mr. Chairman, it merely removes the limitation from otherwise-authorized by-law activities in this area. It is my intent to withdraw the amendment.

Before I do withdraw my amendment, I know that we could probably generate a long discussion here, which
none of us really want, but I would ask the gentleman from Kentucky (Chairman Rogers) if the gentleman would be willing to yield to the gentleman yielding.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I will be happy to consider it as time passes, but I was sort of hoping, can we have some more discussion of this?

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk will read as follows:

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last number 642 in the table contained in section 1602 of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (112 Stat. 276) is amended by striking “Bull Shoals Lake Ferry in Taney County” and inserting “Construction of the Center for Advanced Highway Safety (MOCAHS)”.

The transit station operated by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority located at Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport, and known as the National Airport Station, shall be known and designated as the “Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport Station”.

The point of order is delegated to the rank-and-file Members of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and the CHAIRMAN.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky (Chairman Rogers), who has produced a fine work product.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, the Traficant amendment is a good one. We accept it.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say the worst thing about global warming would be a German transit system in the City of New York that focuses on the violations that occur in the Buy American Act. The language is straightforward.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), the ranking member.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote in the affirmative.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for the $250,000 for the Long Island City Links project and acknowledge the importance of this project and also to express my appreciation.

Mr. Chairman, I include the following:

The amendment was agreed to.
BUSINESS MOVES TO LIC

MetLife brings almost 1,000 jobs to northwest Queens—MetLife recently decided to relocate almost 1,000 employees in about six months to the renovated, six-story Bridge Plaza North. This move is expected to attract more businesses to this area by drawing attention to the convenient 15-minute commute to midtown Manhattan. MetLife plans to add another 550 jobs in the city during the 20-year term of its lease.

The FAA has plans to develop a new Regional Headquarters in the area.

Construction is already underway for a new FDA laboratory.

International Firms such as Citicorp and British Airways already have major operations in the borough as well as Chubb who opened a backup facility in the area for Wall Street brokerage and financial firms.

Established Companies in the area, such as Eagle Electric, Continental Bakersies, and Schick Technologies, are continually growing and expanding.

Recently welcomed retail chains include Home Depot, Tops Appliance City, Costco, Caldor, Kmart, Sears, the Disney Store, Barnes & Noble, Marshall’s, Conway, Ethan Allan, Staples, Circuit City, and Bed, Bath & Beyond with a CompUSA already being planned for the near future.

With this growth in business and the economy in Long Island City it is absolutely vital that we move forward with community enhancements like public parks, transportation enhancements, and quality of life improvements for all residents in the neighborhood.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SABO

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCHIFF:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

Sec. 1. None of the funds in this Act may be used for the planning, design, development, or construction of the California State Route 710 freeway extension project through El Sereno, South Pasadena, and Pasadena, California.

Mr. SCHIFF (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?
The administration has a plan. The DOT will be going to Mexico. For those carriers who want to run trucks into this country, those carriers will be audited for safety, for their record, for training, for all the things that go into whether or not a safe operation of the truck could be made in the United States by that Mexican carrier. If they pass that test, they would be given a temporary permit to drive. In the meantime, we will be inspecting the dickens out of the trucks crossing the border.

If at the end of 18 months that carrier has no record problems, all has gone smoothly, then and only then would they be given, not a conditional permit, but a permanent permit. I think it is a responsible approach. There is money in the bill for that approach. The administration is proceeding. The rulemaking is taking place. Let us not interrupt what they are doing. But please do not vote in this Congress an amendment on to this bill that would be a direct violation of a treaty of the United States of America. Please reject this amendment.

Mr. OBETE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) is up. Mr. ROGERS.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend this amendment so that the language of this amendment will protect Americans from dying by seeing dangerous trucks hit the highway.

I want to remind my colleagues that the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) tried to do is to bring to this House an amendment that will prevent Americans from dying by seeing dangerous trucks hit the highway.

This amendment has no choice but to, for the moment, cut off all Mexican trucks on American highways because the majority party insisted that that was the only option that could be put before this body. So, they blocked the effort that the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) tried to bring to this House, and which would have been fully consistent with NAFTA. That effort would have said you cannot have those trucks running over American highways until we have the proper review process in place to make certain ahead of time that safety standards are being met.

If this amendment technically would become violation of NAFTA, it is because the majority has forced the House into a position where it can consider no amendment except that kind of amendment.

Everybody on this floor knows, if you want to get the bull gravy at the end of the day, this amendment can be fully tweaked in conference so that it is fully consistent with NAFTA and protects the American trucker.

The rationale against this amendment keeps changing. We were told earlier in the day, oh, you have to block the Sabo amendment under House rules because the Sabo amendment was not passed by the full Committee on Appropriations. Many a time, many a time the Committee on Appropriations has chosen not to follow that logic.

We are also told, oh, we do not have to do this. We do not have to protect American motorists this way because we have got all this money in the bill for these new inspectors.

Well, let me remind my colleagues that money is now gone. It was knocked out on a point of order. So the $56 million for infrastructure improvements at the border, the $14 million for added inspections at the border, the $18 million in the bill for States around the border, all that money is gone.

So your excuse is gone. You have no added protection for American drivers at this point. You know what the problems are. There is no effective oversight. There is no effective oversight on Mexican motor carriers today. There are no motor carrier hours-of-service regulations in effect in Mexico. There is no way to check the driving history of Mexican motor carriers.

In testimony last year, the Department of Transportation Inspector General said this: ‘‘I do not think there is any reasonable person who can say that the border is safe when you have an out-of-service rate for safety reasons in the neighborhood of 40 to 50 percent.”

Now, the majority blocked the Sabo amendment that would have allowed us to deal with this issue the way it needed to be dealt with. Now because they blocked us from offering the right amendment, they are blaming us because the language of this amendment is not pluperfect.

Well, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) is a very smart man. He can easily fix it in conference. We have heard this excuse time and time again. Can fix it in conference. Can fix it in conference. Well, this is one time we are going to say that. We have full confidence in the ability of the gentleman from Kentucky to fix this in conference.

But today, we have only one option if we want to protect American motorists.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBETE) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. OBETE was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. OBETE. Mr. Chairman, the only option we have is to adopt this amendment, because this is the only procedural alternative left to us by a rule that prevented us from offering the
amendment that should have been offered on this subject. So do not blame us for the shortcomings which the majority has used.

I would simply make one other point. We have a choice. We can either insist on having an inspection regimen and a review regimen in place before these trucks are put on the highways, or we can do what the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) says and wait until they are on the highways and then see what happens.

Only one difference between the approaches. There are people who will die under the second approach who will not die under the first. It is just that simple.

So you have got a very clear choice. If you want to do anything at all to protect the safety of American motorists on the highways on this issue, you will either stop what you are doing and you will give the committee the opportunity to do what it has done thousands of times before, which is to weaken the language in conference so that it can satisfy the procedural niceties of this House who eight times out of 10 run a railroad truck over legitimate procedure.

You hide behind procedure when it suits your purpose, and you trample fair procedure the rest of the time. We are not fooled by that. American drivers are not going to be fooled by that. The only people you might be fooling are yourselves.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I have listened with interest to this debate. I do rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

I think that sometimes the rules of the House work to help to show the real issue of what is involved here. I have said all along in the debate in committee and before on this, in the years that it has been before, that this is really an issue about trying to block Mexican trucks coming from the United States. There are interest groups in Mexico that do not want under any circumstances to have Mexican trucks driving on our highways.

Well, today we see that with this amendment. Granted, as the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) says and wait until they are on the highways and then see what happens.

Let us be clear about this. This issue is not about the safety of the truck, it is about paperwork. The issue as was presented today by the gentleman from Minnesota was about paperwork. Of course we want to be sure that all trucks traveling on our highways are safe, but the States along the border, for several years now, have said they are prepared to do that. How come the States that have the responsibility for enforcing this, along with the Department of Transportation, are prepared to do this? We have the regimen in place to check the paperwork as they come across the border, to look at the logs, to look at all these things, to make sure the bonds are there, the licenses are there, the insurance is there, and to do the actual physical inspection of the truck. Because that is after all what we are about, is it not? We want to make sure these trucks are actually safe.

So the most important aspect of truck safety is the observation of the driver and the actual inspection of the truck at the border and along the highway.

The gentleman from Wisconsin said people will die. Yes, people have died in my district. Not very long ago there was a truck driver who was using amphetamines, had not slept for 18 hours, crashed into a car parked along the side of the road and destroyed all the occupants of an entire family because he was violating rules and the law in the United States. We need to inspect for that. We need to have adequate inspection to make sure it is safe in this country.

The trucks coming across the border are all going to be subject to inspection, and the percentage of them that are actually going to be physically inspected is going to be much, much higher. The currently are inspected traveling on our highways. American trucks traveling on our highways. So the paperwork is not the issue. If all my colleague wants to do is check the paperwork, the paperwork can be checked when the truck is down in Guadalajara, but that does not tell us whether the truck is safe.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) has expired.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, let me just say this, and then I really will yield to the gentleman. This really is not about paperwork, in my opinion. It is really about whether or not trucks are going to be allowed to travel on our highways from Mexico.

I say we should treat people equally. In a study, by the way, in California, of trucks coming across the border into that border zone, shows they meet the standards on an equal basis with U.S. trucks. So there is no real difference that is there. So I say we need to treat our neighbors to the south as partners.

Those of us who live along the border understand what this partnership is all about and how important it is economically and politically to the United States, and I believe that we can make this work. It is clear the Department of Transportation is prepared to do it, the States are prepared to do it, and I would urge that we defeat this amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and let me say he is my good friend, but I would like to read something to him and then ask him a question.
The gentleman indicated that he thought that in this case the rules had been used to bring out the true intent of the amendment before this body, implying that the true intent was to have a flat shutoff of Mexican trucks. I flatly dispute that, and I want to read something then ask the gentleman a question.

This is the text of the original Sabo amendment which the majority blocked from consideration in the House today. It reads as follows: “No funding limited in this Act for the review or processing of applications by Mexican motor carriers for conditional authority to operate beyond U.S. municipalities and commercial zones on the U.S.-Mexico border may be obligated unless the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration has adopted and implemented as part of its rule review procedures under 49 U.S.C. 13902 a requirement that each Mexican motor carrier seeking authority to operate beyond U.S. municipalities and commercial zones on the U.S.-Mexico border undergo a new entrant safety compliance review consistent with the safety fitness evaluation procedures set forth in 49 CFR Part 385 and receive a minimum rating of satisfactory thereunder before being granted such conditional operating authority.”

Now, that language is pretty clear. It does not try to shut off Mexican trucks. It says they cannot operate here until they have met these standards. Does not the language of the original amendment in fact indicate what the intention of the original amendment was?

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman asking the question, and I understand what the amendment did do and that this amendment now, as it is offered, is somewhat different. But I believe that the amendment that was offered has the effect of actually stopping any trucks from coming into the United States. That is the intent of it. I believe, to make sure they do not get into the United States.

So now that amendment not having been made in order under the rules, I would say to my good friend from Wisconsin, I think we are seeing the true intent here. It is interest groups. Look at the gentleman from Arizona’s attitude towards the amendment that was offered has the effect of actually stopping any trucks from coming into the United States. That is the intent of it. I believe, to make sure they do not get into the United States.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, as I was saying, I have here a letter from the Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance, which is an association of State, provincial, and Federal official responsible for the administration and enforcement of motor carrier safety laws. They were writing to me to express their strong support for the amendment that I had before the Committee on Rules. They are hardly a self-interest group. Their interest is in enforcing the laws that we pass.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is forgetting one thing. What the Sabo amendment attempted to do is to say that there would be no Mexican trucks on these roads until the safety requirements were met as outlined in the amendment. I think it is blatantly ridiculous for anyone to assert that the intention of a proposal is something other than that which is quite clearly stated in the proposal. It was the majority that blocked us from being able to vote on this proposal.

Mr. KOLBE. Again reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, more than 2 years ago, down at the border, I went over the whole procedures with the Arizona Department of Transportation and the U.S. Department of Transportation. Everybody was prepared at that time to begin implementing this. So there is no question. We are prepared to inspect. We are prepared to look at these trucks. We are prepared to make sure they are safe. We are prepared to make sure they have their license, their insurance, the bonding that is required, and to do the physical inspection of the truck.

As I pointed out, a far greater percentage of them will be inspected than any of the trucks traveling on our highways. The gentleman must acknowledge that there are accidents occurring on our highways because of trucks not properly inspected or not likely, because the drivers are not following the rules. In fact, there is a very interesting study I just saw the other day that states that 73 percent, I believe was the figure, of all accidents in trucks occur when there is a passenger in the vehicle as opposed to about 23 percent when there is not a passenger. So passengers’ distractions have more to do with it apparently than anything else.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman asked.

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman talks about who supports this amendment, or my earlier amendment. The gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. SABO. As I was saying, I have here a letter from the Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance, which is an association of State, provincial, and Federal officials responsible for the administration and enforcement of motor carrier safety laws. They were writing to me to express their strong support for the amendment that I had before the Committee on Rules. They are hardly a self-interest group. Their interest is in enforcing the laws that we pass.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. SABO. As I was saying, I have here a letter from the Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance, which is an association of State, provincial, and Federal officials responsible for the administration and enforcement of motor carrier safety laws. They were writing to me to express their strong support for the amendment that I had before the Committee on Rules. They are hardly a self-interest group. Their interest is in enforcing the laws that we pass.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what the gentleman is saying, but I would say to the gentleman in response that it is very clear to me that we have the wherewithal to do it, we have the wherewithal to do it, we have the desire on the part of both Federal and State authorities to do this checking, and they are capable of doing this.

Why is this amendment not including Canada? Why are we only including Mexico under this? Canada is a NAFTA partner. Why do we discriminate against the one? That is what makes this violative of NAFTA.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so we can answer that?

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin if I have time here.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, it is very simple.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) has again expired.

(On request of Mr. OBEY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. KOLBE was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. The record for Canadian carriers shows that their highway safety record is virtually every bit as good as our own. The record we respect to the Mexican drivers in question demonstrates quite the opposite.

Mr. KOLBE. And I would say to the gentleman that fair is fair. If we are going to treat people fairly, we need to treat both sides in exactly the same way. With the kind of inspection regimen we are talking about installing here, we should have the same kinds of inspections for trucks coming from Mexico as we are talking about trucks that travel from Canada. Fair is fair. Treat all sides fairly here. That is all that I am saying that we should do.

Why are we singling out our neighbors to the south? Why are we singling out Mexico to say we do not trust you, you cannot do it? Why are we singling out our neighbors to the south? Why are we singling out our neighbors to the south? Why are we only including Mexico under this? Canada is a NAFTA partner. Why do we discriminate against the one? That is what makes this violative of NAFTA.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so we can answer that?

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin if I have time here.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, it is very simple.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) has again expired.

(On request of Mr. OBEY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. KOLBE was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SABO. As I was saying, I have here a letter from the Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance, which is an association of State, provincial, and Federal officials responsible for the administration and enforcement of motor carrier safety laws. They were writing to me to express their strong support for the amendment that I had before the Committee on Rules. They are hardly a self-interest group. Their interest is in enforcing the laws that we pass.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what the gentleman is saying, but I would say to the gentleman in response that it is very clear to me that we have the wherewithal to do it, we have the desire on the part of both Federal and State authorities to do this checking, and they are capable of doing this.

Why is this amendment not including Canada? Why are we only including Mexico under this? Canada is a NAFTA partner. Why do we discriminate against the one? That is what makes this violative of NAFTA.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so we can answer that?

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin if I have time here.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, it is very simple.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) has again expired.

(On request of Mr. OBEY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. KOLBE was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. The record for Canadian carriers shows that their highway safety record is virtually every bit as good as our own. The record we respect to the Mexican drivers in question demonstrates quite the opposite.

Mr. KOLBE. And I would say to the gentleman that fair is fair. If we are going to treat people fairly, we need to treat both sides in exactly the same way. With the kind of inspection regimen we are talking about installing here, we should have the same kinds of inspections for trucks coming from Mexico as we are talking about trucks that travel from Canada. Fair is fair. Treat all sides fairly here. That is all that I am saying that we should do.

Why are we singling out our neighbors to the south? Why are we singling out Mexico to say we do not trust you, you cannot do it? Why are we singling out our neighbors to the south? Why are we only including Mexico under this? Canada is a NAFTA partner. Why do we discriminate against the one? That is what makes this violative of NAFTA.
Let me also say to many of my colleagues who are supporting this amendment, this is an attack on many border communities where we have seen an incredible economic boom as a result of free trade over the last 20 years. To support this amendment stops the progress, stops the jobs from being created in many of the communities close to the border. I do represent almost 800 miles of the Texas-Mexico border and have seen incredible opportunities come to these neighborhoods because of free trade. These people want more opportunity that would come with allowing these trucks to drive through these communities. And we know that they would not be held to any less a standard than an American truck driving through the community.

So let us look at this for what it is. It is discriminatory, a truck against Mexico. It has already been pointed out that no one else is being forced to comply with this standard. No one else would fall under this amendment. Our friends from Canada would not fall under this amendment. This is simply another effort to discriminate against our friends in Mexico who have been good trading partners and have helped create thousands of new jobs in this country. I urge defeat of this amendment for those reasons.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to attempt to bring some rationality to this debate and historical perspective. The issue is not, as previous speakers have tried to make it, no Mexican trucks in the U.S. or sinister special interest forces trying to keep Mexican trucks from entering the United States. That is not the issue. The issue is safe, safe U.S. trucks that can enter from Canada, and safe trucks from Mexico.

In 1982, the Committee on Public Works and Transportation brought to the House legislation to prohibit trucks from Canada and Mexico entering the United States unless the President of the United States would issue a finding lifting that legislatively imposed moratorium on truck entry into the United States. That was 1982. In 1984, President Reagan lifted the moratorium with respect to trucks from Canada but did not lift it with respect to trucks from Mexico. In 1986, 1988 the President again lifted the moratorium on Canadian trucks but not on Mexican trucks because of a finding by the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Office that those trucks did not meet U.S. safety standards.

President Bush, the first, in 1990 and again in 1992 lifted the moratorium on Canadian trucks but not on Mexican trucks. It is true that Canadian trucks met U.S. safety standards and Mexican trucks did not. In fact, as the gentleman from Wisconsin cited a moment ago, the out-of-service rate for Canadian trucks is lower than that of trucks in the United States. Seventeen percent of Canadian trucks are found to be out of compliance with safety standards, while 24 percent of U.S. trucks are found to be out of compliance and 36 percent of Mexican trucks. Mexican trucks, therefore, have a 50 percent higher out-of-service rating than do trucks in the United States, and more than twice as much as Canadians.

Well, my colleagues cannot make a rational argument that this is an anti-Mexico provision that we are offering on the floor. It is simply a safety issue, not a cross-border issue. And what we are asking for is not, as one speaker indicated, a lot of paperwork. No, no. I know safety from the aviation standpoint, from the rail standpoint, and I have had 10 years of experience from the surface transportation standpoint, trucking issues as well. We do not just look for this or that truck that is out of compliance, we are looking for a system of safety, for a system, a structure of compliance.

That is why we want to have an overall review of the Mexican safety system. Canada clearly complies; Mexico does not.

The dispute resolution mechanism, the arbitration panel that reviewed this issue found "it may not be unreasonable for a NAFTA party to conclude that to ensure compliance with its own local standards by service providers from another NAFTA country, it may be necessary to implement different procedures with respect to such service providers. Thus, to the extent that the inspection and licensing requirements for Mexican carriers wishing to operate in the United States may not be like those in place in the United States, different methods of ensuring compliance with U.S. regulatory regime may be justified. In order to justify its own legitimate safety concerns, if the United States decides to impose requirements on Mexican carriers that differ from those imposed on United States or Canadian carriers, then any such decision must be made in good faith with respect to a legitimate safety concern and fulfill different requirements that fully conform with all relevant NAFTA provisions."

The Sabo amendment, which would have been offered, had it not been struck, would have included tests.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. OBERSTAR was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. Chairman, of course, Mr. Chairman, devalued of an opportunity to offer that amendment, we are reduced to this rather stringent approach. As the gentleman from Wisconsin said earlier, it is an issue that can be tapered in conference and resolved perhaps even to meet the original Sabo-City language.

As for the dire warnings that ipso facto this language will put us in violation of NAFTA, there is a dispute resolution mechanism, an arbitration panel that can resolve such disputes and has shown its ability to do so. We ought to be in the mode of protecting life and addressing the life issues that are at stake.

Every year trucks kill 5,000 people in the United States. Our trucks. Trucks that are 50 percent less safe coming in from another country should not be allowed in the United States until a regime is in place to screen them out and to ensure that all those that do enter under the NAFTA will be in compliance with our safety rules. The Sabo amendment provides that opportunity.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Sabo amendment. I, like my colleagues, regret that the Sabo-Ney amendment was not made in order. However, I do not regret being in strong support of this amendment, because I believe it is very important for this House to have a clear vote on this issue.

This issue in my view is not about NAFTA; it is about truck safety and why we can allow the trucks that are entering the United States. Not too long ago, the Subcommittee on Highways and Transit had a site visit to San Diego and Laredo. At San Diego, we found a very good permanent inspection station. That inspection station looks at all of the trucks and issues a permit that is good for 90 days. If any truck tries to enter the United States and does not have a certificate, it is pulled aside and inspected. We have found that their out-of-service rate is similar to the trucks in the whole of the United States of America, about 24 percent. Too high in my view, but similar to the rest of the country.

When we went to Laredo, Texas, we found a system that virtually does not exist. There is no permanent inspection station in Texas. I do not believe there is one outside of California. The results are pretty obvious. The gentleman from the Texas Department of Public Safety, Major Clayton, had suggested to us that a truck that is not inspected will be neglected. We were there on a Sunday, and we asked what the experience was that day. We were informed that they looked at seven or eight trucks, and took five of those trucks out of service.

I asked, What was the problem with those trucks? Were they minor little details like a light that does not work or turn signals or something of that sort?

He said, No, Congressman, these are brakes that are failing, leaking fuel...
Mr. Chairman, these are the vehicles that are going to be allowed come January 1 to enter the interior of the United States. This is not against NAFTA. If we want to continue allowing trucks to come into the border States, where they are traveling at presumably a very low mile-per-hour rate, if these trucks are allowed into the interior of the United States to travel anywhere in the United States of America with brakes that are failing, leaking fuel lines, cracks in undercarriage, bald tires, there are going to be major accidents in our country.

Mr. Chairman, what happens to NAFTA then? What will be the outcry in our country if a truck that was not inspected and had these kinds of violations and inadequate acetoins? I think that will cause a whole lot more harm to NAFTA than our insisting that Mexican trucks be inspected and inspected properly. California has done a pretty good job. They have set a model for us. They have put up the funds and have permanent inspection stations. There are no other permanent inspection stations along the border, and trucks that are unsafe will be entering our country. I strongly support the Sabo amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and see if we might inquire how many people want to speak on both sides.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. Sabo. Mr. Chairman, we have two additional requests for time on our side. And how many on the gentleman’s side?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Sabo. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, we have one additional speaker.

Mr. Sabo. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that there be 30 minutes of debate, 15 minutes allocated to each side, controlled by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. Rogers) and myself.

The CHAIRMAN. On this amendment and all amendments thereto?

Mr. Sabo. Mr. Chairman, that is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. Sabo. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. Filner).

Mr. Filner. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of my constituents, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for his amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I represent the southern half of San Diego, California, a district which borders Mexico and which has all of the border crossings for California, at least the great majority. Thirty-five to 40 percent of all truck traffic to Mexico from California, that United States crosses my district, so I believe we have some sort of experience and expertise with regard to this matter.

The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee suggested that we ought to wait for experts to decide this question. Mr. Chairman, my constituents are experts. My constituents will tell the gentleman what it is like to be in an accident with a Mexican truck whose brakes have failed; in an accident where the driver did not have adequate insurance; in an accident where the truck driver was a teenager or who had just driven for 20 hours straight.

My constituents are the experts on what happens when we do not have adequate insurance; in an accident where the truck driver was a teenager or who had just driven for 20 hours straight. My constituents are the experts on what happens when we do not have adequate insurance; in an accident where the truck driver was a teenager or who had just driven for 20 hours straight. They have not decided what kind of inspections ought to take place. They have not decided what kind of inspections they want to do. They have not decided what they want to do. They have not decided what kind of inspections they want to do. They have not decided what kind of inspections they want to do.

Mr. Chairman, these are the vehicles that are going to be allowed come January 1 to enter the interior of the United States. This is not against NAFTA. If we want to continue allowing trucks to come into the border States, where they are traveling at presumably a very low mile-per-hour rate, if these trucks are allowed into the interior of the United States to travel anywhere in the United States of America with brakes that are failing, leaking fuel lines, cracks in undercarriage, bald tires, there are going to be major accidents in our country. I strongly support the Sabo amendment and truck safety.

Mr. Sabo. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Rodriguez).

Mr. Rodriguez. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleagues earlier that we were not allowed to have an opportunity to dialogue on. I represent 13 counties in south Texas, two of which are along the Texas-Mexican border and part of the commercial zone already accessible to Mexican trucks. A number of the other counties contain 1–35, a principal trade corridor for truck traffic from Mexico. I recognize the importance and value of expanding trade with Mexico. We need to build upon the trade relationships with Mexico and Canada. I also recognize that the dramatic growth in truck traffic comes with a price. I know from my constituents that that price is often paid on the ground in those counties as we move forward.

The issue is not whether we should have more trade, rather, the challenge is how to protect the public while increasing trade. One should not be pitted against the other. We should just use our common sense. Road maintenance, border infrastructure improvements and border inspection in general have been the responsibility of the counties along the border, some of which are the poorest counties in the Nation. Increased truck traffic without increased inspections is a recipe for disaster.
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firmed that serious discrepancies per-
sist. Mexican trucks tend to be older,

heavier, less complex, and more un-

marked than their U.S. counterparts.

Mexico has not yet developed hours of

service requirements for commercial

drivers. Mexico does not have a labora-
tory certified to U.S. standards to per-

form drug testing. Mexico does not

have a roadside inspection program.

On our side, in Texas alone, I sent a

letter to then Governor Bush when he

was there almost 4 years ago. At that
time we had 17 workers part time doing

the inspection. Now we have 37 part-
time people, yet we have 70 percent of

the traffic. Texas was supposed to hire

171 new commercial vehicle inspectors.

They did not. They did not get the re-
We do inspect U.S. trucks. We do pull them off the roads when they are unsafe. We do require drug and alcohol testing. I went through that debate here on the floor of the House, and I supported that. We do require log books. We do require restrictions on duty time. And we enforce those laws. For the most part those laws do not exist in Mexico, and where they do exist, they are not enforced.

Now, no one has contested that fact. They are saying, oh, that we just do not want to be good neighbors. We do not want to be good neighbors, but we do not want to be good neighbors with people who are endangering the lives of the traveling public.

My district has I-5 running right through the heart of it, and that is where those trucks are going. Now, the gentleman from Texas got up earlier and said, ‘My people have done really well. I have such a long border with Mexico, and we have got so many jobs out of this, and you want to hurt that. No, actually he is arguing to hurt them because if this amendment does not pass, those trucks are going to steam right through his district. Right now all those trucks have to stop in his district, and they have to reload onto safe American trucks. But when this goes into effect, those trucks are going right through his district and right up to mine. They are not going to stop. In fact, he is going to lose many jobs in his district.

I am a bit perplexed by the arguments on the other side of the aisle. For the most part they have been arguing our side, but in a knee-jerk way at the end they are going to come to a conclusion that we have just got to go ahead, that this is about NAFTA and about free trade.

We have a huge trade with Mexico, a huge and growing trade deficit with Mexico under NAFTA, although they promised us surpluses. That is not to be debated here today. That would not be impeded one wit by this amendment, but what would happen is these trucks that we know are heavier, with drivers who are not meeting U.S. standards for safety, for training, for drug testing, for log books, for records of offenses being kept in a central data file, perhaps for insurance, or labeling for hazardous materials. 25 percent of the trucks coming across the border carry hazardous materials; 1 in 14, 7 percent, are labeled. What is going to happen when one of those goes over somewhere on I-5 in California or in a heavily populated part of Oregon or Washington? We will not know what is in it. We will not know how to deal with it. We are going to use it only to put the traveling public at risk, we are going to put communities at risk. We are going to put the firefighters and the first responders at risk.

No, let us have the Mexicans adopt stringent laws for safety, then enforce those laws, and after they do that, then we will be great neighbors, and we will be happy to welcome their fully inspected, safely driven trucks into the United States of America. But until they meet those standards, no, no, no, no, no, no.

This will kill Americans. People will die for profit, and that is not right.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO).

The question was taken; and the record shows that Mr. SABO is entitled to the time taken by Mr. ROGERS.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) was agreed to.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 285, noes 143, not voting 5, as follows:

AYES—285

Cunningham
Crowley
Cramer
Coyne
Condit
Combest
Clyburn
Clay
Cardin
Carson (NV)
Carson (OK)
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Conklin
Coiffier
Costello
Coyle
Cox
Crahan
Crenshaw
Crowley
Crockett
Cummings
Cunningham

Price (NC)
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Rivera
Rodrigues
Roemer
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Sabo
Sancher
Sanders
Sandlin
Traficant
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thune
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Vilsack
Waters
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weber
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westlake
Welford
Woolsey
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

[No Roll 193]

AYE—285

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Balada
eDegette
Barcia
Barrett
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkeley
Berman
Berry
Blair
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagoevich
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bonior
Bono
Bono (ATA)
BoosweIl
Boucher
Bono (FL)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Buender
Caldwell
Camp
Capuano
Cardin
Carnes (IN)
Carnes (OK)
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clark
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Conklin
Coiffier
Costello
Coyle
Cox
Crahan
Crenshaw
Crowley
Crockett
Cummings
Cunningham

Price (NC)
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Rivera
Rodrigues
Roemer
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Sabo
Sancher
Sanders
Sandlin
Traficant
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thune
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Vilsack
Waters
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weber
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westlake
Welford
Woolsey
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE JUNE 26, 2001

Vela´zquez, Mr. Greenwood and Mr. Sabo; for acceding to the request of the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 178, he reported the bill back to the House with further amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en masse.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were yeas 426, nays 1, not voting 6, as follows:

[Nay—1

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were yeas 426, nays 1, not voting 6, as follows:

Yeas—426


NAYS—1

Paul

Not Voting—6

Burton (IN) LaTourette (OH) Platts (NY) Putnam (GA) Sweeney (MA) Woolsey (NY)

NAYS—1

Paul

Not Voting—6

Burton (IN) LaTourette (OH) Platts (NY) Putnam (GA) Sweeney (MA) Woolsey (NY)
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Mr. Wilson, Mrs. Cubin, Ms. Velazquez, Mr. Greenwood and Mr. Bachus changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. Baird, Combest, Buyer, Jefferson, Fossella, Piercing, Hyde, Duncan and Mica changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

Mr. Hinojosa changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. Nadler. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would be remiss if I did not rise to thank the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Young); the ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Obey); the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. Rogers); and the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. Sabo); for acceding to the request made by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. Stays) and myself to include funds in this bill for the environmental impact statement for the New York-New Jersey Cross Harbor Rail Freight Tunnel.

This project was first authorized in TEA-21 and received funds for a Major Investment Study, which was completed last year.

New York City, Long Island, and Westchester and Putnam Counties and the State of Connecticut are virtually cut off from the rest of the country’s rail freight system for lack of any way for rail freight to cross the Hudson River, except at a bridge 140 miles north of New York City.

After examining numerous alternatives, the MIS recommended construction of a rail tunnel under New York Harbor. The benefit to the region will be about $200 million a year and the benefit to cost ratio is 2.3 to 1. The environmental impact will be profound and we will remove 1 million tractor trailers from off the region’s roads a year.

So I am gratified that this was included in the bill. I am disappointed the Second Avenue Subway was not included in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk reads as follows:

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I have some exciting news to share with my colleagues, and I think in a spirit of bipartisanship, we can all agree that this is, in fact, good news, because today the youngest Member of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM) and his wife Melissa became the proud parents of a baby girl.

Mr. Speaker, today Abigail Anna Putnam was born. She weighed 8 pounds and 4 ounces. She is 21 1/2 inches long, and they are still looking for the first sighting of that fire-engine red hair that the gentleman carries around with him here.

Just as a word of history, I want my colleagues to know, first of all, that the mother and the daughter are doing well. The gentleman from Florida is a little shaky, but I think he is going to make it.

Abigail is the sixth generation Putnam to be born in Polk County, Florida, and her great grandfather, who is 92 years old, is so excited that he said he is probably more excited about the gentleman from Florida becoming a father than he was when the gentleman got elected to Congress.

I know that all my colleagues want to join with me in wishing the gentleman from Florida and his wife Melissa and their new baby Abigail a wonderful life together.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRENSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I want to add my congratulations to the growing congressional family, to Melissa Putnam for putting up with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM), and to the happiness. The knowledge that children are a reward from the Lord is something we are pleased to acknowledge, and we send prayers and best wishes, Mr. Speaker, to all of those who share that sentiment.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRENSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise to extend my congratulations from the Commonwealth of Virginia to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM) and Melissa Putnam on the birth of their baby and wish them much strength through the next couple of months of interrupted sleep.

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107–113) on the resolution (H. Res. 179) providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 172) on the 150th anniversary of the Young Men’s Christian Association (commonly referred to as the YMCA) in the United States.

Whereas 2001 is the 150th anniversary of the Young Men’s Christian Association (commonly referred to as the YMCA) in the United States;

Whereas YMCAs have touched the lives of virtually all people in the United States by pioneering various activities, including camping, public libraries, night schools, group swimming lessons and lifesaving, and teaching English as a second language;

Whereas YMCAs are dedicated to building strong youth, strong families, and strong communities;

Whereas YMCAs serve people of all ages, genders, incomes, and abilities through a wide variety of services designed to meet changing community and societal needs;

Whereas every day the more than 2,400 YMCAs in the United States live their mission through programs that build healthy spirit, mind, and body for all;

Whereas the YMCA invented the sport of volleyball;

Whereas YMCAs are collectively one of the largest providers of social services to the Nation’s families and communities, and YMCA programs serve nearly 18,000,000 people, including 9,000,000 children, in the United States each year;

Whereas YMCAs are collectively the Nation’s largest child care provider, and YMCA programs serve 1 in 10 teenagers in the United States and incorporate the values of caring, honesty, respect, and responsibility;

Whereas each YMCA is volunteer-founded, volunteer-based, and volunteer-led;

Whereas YMCAs have a long history of partnerships with other community organizations, including schools, hospitals, police departments, juvenile courts, and housing authorities;

Whereas YMCAs have provided war relief services since the Civil War, adding millions of soldiers to home and abroad;

Whereas YMCA programs inspire a spirit of adventure and challenge individuals to learn new skills, try new activities, and explore other cultures, while being good citizens of their communities;

WHEREAS Father’s Day in its present form was created at a YMCA;

WHEREAS many organizations began at YMCAs, including the Boy Scouts of America, the Camp Fire Girls, the Negro National Baseball League, the Gideons, and the Toastmasters;

WHEREAS YMCAs helped found the United Service Organization; and

WHEREAS the Peace Corps was patterned on a YMCA program: Now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—

(1) honors the Young Men’s Christian Association (commonly referred to as the YMCA) for 150 years of building strong youth, strong families, and strong communities in the United States; and

(2) expresses support for the continued good work of the YMCA during the next 150 years.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to rule XX, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) each will control 20 minutes.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to file a statement and a printing of any record vote on the postponed question will be taken tomorrow.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE),

WHEREAS 2001 is the 150th anniversary of the Young Men’s Christian Association (commonly referred to as the YMCA) in the United States;

WHEREAS YMCAs have touched the lives of virtually all people in the United States by pioneering various activities, including camping, public libraries, night schools, group swimming lessons and lifesaving, and teaching English as a second language;

WHEREAS YMCAs are dedicated to building strong youth, strong families, and strong communities;

WHEREAS YMCAs serve people of all ages, genders, incomes, and abilities through a wide variety of services designed to meet changing community and societal needs;

WHEREAS every day the more than 2,400 YMCAs in the United States live their mission through programs that build healthy spirit, mind, and body for all;

WHEREAS the YMCA invented the sport of volleyball;

WHEREAS YMCAs are collectively one of the largest providers of social services to the Nation’s families and communities, and YMCA programs serve nearly 18,000,000 people, including 9,000,000 children, in the United States each year;

WHEREAS YMCAs are collectively the Nation’s largest child care provider, and YMCA programs serve 1 in 10 teenagers in the United States and incorporate the values of caring, honesty, respect, and responsibility;

WHEREAS each YMCA is volunteer-founded, volunteer-based, and volunteer-led;

WHEREAS YMCAs have a long history of partnerships with other community organizations, including schools, hospitals, police departments, juvenile courts, and housing authorities;

WHEREAS YMCAs have provided war relief services since the Civil War, adding millions of soldiers to home and abroad;

WHEREAS YMCA programs inspire a spirit of adventure and challenge individuals to learn new skills, try new activities, and explore other cultures, while being good citizens of their communities;

WHEREAS Father’s Day in its present form was created at a YMCA;

WHEREAS many organizations began at YMCAs, including the Boy Scouts of America, the Camp Fire Girls, the Negro National Baseball League, the Gideons, and the Toastmasters;

WHEREAS YMCAs helped found the United Service Organization; and

WHEREAS the Peace Corps was patterned on a YMCA program: Now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—

(1) honors the Young Men’s Christian Association (commonly referred to as the YMCA) for 150 years of building strong youth, strong families, and strong communities in the United States; and

(2) expresses support for the continued good work of the YMCA during the next 150 years.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to rule XX, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) each will control 20 minutes.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to file a statement and a printing of any record vote on the postponed question will be taken tomorrow.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE),

WHEREAS 2001 is the 150th anniversary of the Young Men’s Christian Association (commonly referred to as the YMCA) in the United States;

WHEREAS YMCAs have touched the lives of virtually all people in the United States by pioneering various activities, including camping, public libraries, night schools, group swimming lessons and lifesaving, and teaching English as a second language;

WHEREAS YMCAs are dedicated to building strong youth, strong families, and strong communities;

WHEREAS YMCAs serve people of all ages, genders, incomes, and abilities through a wide variety of services designed to meet changing community and societal needs;

WHEREAS every day the more than 2,400 YMCAs in the United States live their mission through programs that build healthy spirit, mind, and body for all;

WHEREAS the YMCA invented the sport of volleyball;

WHEREAS YMCAs are collectively one of the largest providers of social services to the Nation’s families and communities, and YMCA programs serve nearly 18,000,000 people, including 9,000,000 children, in the United States each year;

WHEREAS YMCAs are collectively the Nation’s largest child care provider, and YMCA programs serve 1 in 10 teenagers in the United States and incorporate the values of caring, honesty, respect, and responsibility;

WHEREAS each YMCA is volunteer-founded, volunteer-based, and volunteer-led;

WHEREAS YMCAs have a long history of partnerships with other community organizations, including schools, hospitals, police departments, juvenile courts, and housing authorities;

WHEREAS YMCAs have provided war relief services since the Civil War, adding millions of soldiers to home and abroad;

WHEREAS YMCA programs inspire a spirit of adventure and challenge individuals to learn new skills, try new activities, and explore other cultures, while being good citizens of their communities;

WHEREAS Father’s Day in its present form was created at a YMCA;

WHEREAS many organizations began at YMCAs, including the Boy Scouts of America, the Camp Fire Girls, the Negro National Baseball League, the Gideons, and the Toastmasters;

WHEREAS YMCAs helped found the United Service Organization; and

WHEREAS the Peace Corps was patterned on a YMCA program: Now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—

(1) honors the Young Men’s Christian Association (commonly referred to as the YMCA) for 150 years of building strong youth, strong families, and strong communities in the United States; and

(2) expresses support for the continued good work of the YMCA during the next 150 years.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to rule XX, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) each will control 20 minutes.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to file a statement and a printing of any record vote on the postponed question will be taken tomorrow.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE),