

(i) With respect to reviewing the study described in subparagraph (B)(i), States and political subdivisions of States (including municipalities and counties) in the region of the border between the United States and Mexico.

(ii) The heads of other Federal agencies (including the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Housing, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Secretary of Transportation, and the Secretary of Commerce) and with respect to reviewing the study described in subparagraph (B)(i), equivalent officials of the Government of Mexico.

(F) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—On completion of the studies under this paragraph, the Administrator shall, not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, submit to the appropriate committees of Congress reports that summarize the findings of the studies and propose methods by which solid waste border traffic may be tracked, from source to destination, on an annual basis.

(G) BORDER STUDY DELAY.—The conduct of the study described in subparagraph (B)(ii) shall not delay or otherwise affect completion of the study described in subparagraph (B)(i).

(H) FUNDING.—If any funding needed to conduct the studies required by this paragraph is not otherwise available, the president may transfer to the administrator, for use in conducting the studies, any funds that have been appropriated to the president under section 533 of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 3473) that are in excess of the amount needed to carry out that section. States that wish to participate in study will be asked to contribute to the costs of the study. The terms of the cost share shall be negotiated between the Environmental Protection Agency and the State.

(2) STUDY OF INTERSTATE HAZARDOUS WASTE TRANSPORT.—

(A) DEFINITION OF HAZARDOUS WASTE.—In this paragraph, the term "hazardous waste" has the meaning provided in section 1004 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6903).

(B) STUDY.—not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this act, the administrator of the environmental protection agency shall conduct a study, and report to congress on the results of the study, to determine—

(i) the quantity of hazardous waste that is being transported across state lines; and

(ii) the ultimate disposition of the transported waste.

(3) STUDY OF INTERSTATE SLUDGE TRANSPORT.—

(A) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

(i) SEWAGE SLUDGE.—The term "sewage sludge"—

(I) means solid, semisolid, or liquid residue generated during the treatment of domestic sewage in a treatment works; and

(II) includes—

(i) domestic septage;

(ii) scum or a solid removed in a primary, secondary, or advanced wastewater treatment process; and

(iii) material derived from sewage sludge (as otherwise defined in this clause); but

(III) does not include—

(i) ash generated during the firing of sewage sludge (as otherwise defined in this clause) in a sewage sludge incinerator; or

(ii) grit or screenings generated during preliminary treatment of domestic sewage in a treatment works.

(ii) SLUDGE.—The term "sludge" has the meaning provided in section 1004 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6903).

(B) STUDY.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this act, the administrator of the environmental protection agency shall conduct a study, and report to congress on the results of the study, to determine—

(i) the quantity of sludge (including sewage sludge) that is being transported across state lines; and

(ii) the ultimate disposition of the transported sludge.

SEC. 510. SENSE OF SENATE REGARDING UNITED STATES SEMICONDUCTOR TRADE AGREEMENT.

(a) FINDINGS.—

(1) The United States-Japan Semiconductor Trade Agreement is set to expire on July 31, 1996;

(2) The Governments of the United States and Japan are currently engaged in negotiations over the terms of a new United States-Japan agreement on semiconductors;

(3) The President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Japan agreed at the G-7 Summit in June that their two governments should conclude a mutually acceptable outcome of the semiconductor dispute by July 31, 1996, and that there should be a continuing role for the two governments in the new agreement;

(4) The current United States-Japan Semiconductor Trade Agreement has put in place both government-to-government and industry-to-industry mechanisms which have played a vital role in allowing cooperation to replace conflict in this important high technology sector such as by providing for joint calculation of foreign market share in Japan, deterrence of dumping, and promotion of industrial cooperation in the design-in of foreign semiconductor devices;

(5) Despite the increased foreign share of the Japanese semiconductor market since 1986, a gap still remains between the share United States and other foreign semiconductor makers are able to capture in the world market outside of Japan through their competitiveness and the sales of these suppliers in the Japanese market, and that gap is consistent across the full range of semiconductor products as well as a full range of end-use applications;

(6) The competitiveness and health of the United States semiconductor industry is of critical importance to the United States' overall economic well-being as well as the nation's high technology defense capabilities;

(7) The economic interests of both the United States and Japan are best served by well-functioning, open markets and deterrence of dumping in all sectors, including semiconductors;

(8) The Government of Japan continues to oppose an agreement that (A) ensures continued calculation of foreign market share in Japan according to the formula set forth in the current agreement, and (B) provides for continuation of current measures to deter renewed dumping of semiconductors in the United States and in the third country markets; and

(9) The United States Senate on June 19, 1996, unanimously adopted a sense of the Senate resolution that the President should take all necessary and appropriate actions to ensure the continuation of a government-to-government United States-Japan semiconductor trade agreement before the current agreement expires on July 31, 1996.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that if a new United States-Japan Semiconductor Agreement is not concluded by July 31, 1996, that (1) ensures continued calculation of foreign market share in Japan according to the formula set forth in the current agreement, and (2) provides for continuation of current measures to deter renewed dumping of semiconductors in the United States and in third country markets, the President shall—

(A) Direct the Office of the United States Trade Representative and the Department of Commerce to establish a system to provide for unilateral United States Government calculation and publication of the foreign share of the Japanese semiconductor market, according to the formula set forth in the current agreement;

(B) Report to the Congress on a quarterly basis regarding the progress, or lack thereof, in increasing foreign market access to the Japanese semiconductor market; and

(C) Take all necessary and appropriate actions to ensure that all United States trade laws

with respect to foreign market access and injurious dumping are expeditiously and vigorously enforced with respect to U.S.-Japan semiconductor trade, as appropriate.

This Act may be cited as the "Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 1997".

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. 1959, the fiscal year 1997 energy and water development appropriations bill, be indefinitely postponed.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses and that the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer (Mr. ASHCROFT) appointed Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. GORTON, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BURNS, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. BYRD, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. REID, Mr. KERREY and Mrs. MURRAY conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I thank the combined staff—the Republican staff and the Democratic staff—for the marvelous job they did. I, most of all, thank all the Senators for being as cooperative as they were. This is a bill that is not singular in purpose but has an awful lot of facets to it. We were able in 2 days to complete it, and that is because we got great cooperation.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now stand in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m. today.

Thereupon, at 12:42 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:15 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. SMITH).

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of H.R. 3754, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3754) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Pending:

Chafee amendment No. 5119, to provide for a limitation on the exclusion copyrights of literary works reproduced or distributed in specialized formats for use by blind or disabled persons.

Mr. MACK addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

AMENDMENT NO. 5119

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I understand that there is a pending amendment before the Senate, which is the Chafee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The pending amendment is the amendment by the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I understand the amendment has been cleared by both sides of the aisle, including the authorizing committee chair and ranking member. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that Senator FORD and Senator FRIST be added as cosponsors to the Chafee amendment and that the amendment be agreed to.

The amendment (No. 5119) was agreed to.

Mrs. MURRAY. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. MACK. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, yesterday Senator MURRAY was good enough to file on my behalf an amendment dealing with a recently adopted rule on the acceptable uses of the Senate Internet Services. I have some very serious concerns about this new rule, concerns that many of my colleagues in the Senate share.

Senator FORD and Senator WARNER have worked closely with me on this issue and I think we have reached a compromise which is very reasonable and accommodating for both the Rules Committee and the Senators who would be affected by the new Internet policy. I would like to thank them for agreeing to take another look at this policy. As a result of that compromise, I have withdrawn my amendment and am looking forward to working with the members of the Rules Committee and other Senators who are interested in the Senate Internet policy over the next 2 months. During that time, implementation of the rule dealing with promotional or commercial links on Senate home pages will be delayed.

I do want to take a moment to inform other Senators who may not have had a chance to read the new Senate Internet policy, about the issue my amendment addressed. On July 22, 1996, the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration adopted a policy for the use of the U.S. Senate Internet Services. Among other things, the rule states that "The use of Senate Internet Services for personal, promotional, commercial, or partisan political campaign purposes is prohibited."

Now most of those restrictions I would agree are appropriate and prudent. But I am concerned about the ambiguity of the terms "promotional" and "commercial". My amendment would have clarified that language by allowing a "home state exemption"—similar to the one that is included

under the gift rule to allow gifts of home State products. Under my amendment, Senators would have been allowed to link to sites, businesses, and organizations in their home State as long as those links are accompanied by a disclaimer stating that the link is not an endorsement of the products, locations, or services they feature.

Like many Senators I have links on my Web page to places and organizations in my home State. My home page is a virtual office for people who may not be able to get to my offices in Montpelier or Burlington. Without the links to Vermont sites it would be a pretty uninviting place—no native Vermont art on the walls, no calendar of events, and no directory of places to go and things to see while you are in the area. That's not the kind of hospitality I like to show people who have taken the time to visit my office.

Under the July 22 rule, I will probably have to eliminate most of the home state links on my Senate Web page or defend my decision to keep those links before the Senate Ethics Committee. However I won't be alone—over half of my colleagues in the Senate have similar links on their Web pages to tourist spots, businesses or event listings in their home States, including most of the members of the Rules Committee itself. Mr. President, I do not believe that is what the committee intended. I do not believe that most Members are aware of this rule and the affect that it will have on the individuality of their home pages.

The Internet is a new milestone in communication which the Senate should be using to the advantage of all States. But it is also a rapidly changing field, and I understand completely the difficulty that Senator FORD, Senator WARNER and the other members of the Rules Committee have had in setting down a policy for Senate use of the Internet. The World Wide Web is uncharted territory when it comes to drawing the line between what is an appropriate use of Senate resources and what is not. But by opening up this dialog between all interested Senators, we can will go a long way toward finding that balance.

This will certainly not be the last time that the Senate grapples with the problem of fitting advances in telecommunications technology to a government body that pre-dates the pony express. However, I hope that the process we are establishing now of open communication between Senators who are deeply interested in this emerging technology and the Rules Committee, will continue as we travel down this road.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

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

The bill was read a third time.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, may I ask what the current business of the Senate is?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from West Virginia is to be recognized for up to 20 minutes, followed immediately by a vote on passage of the bill.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I noted the absence of a quorum and thought perhaps there was a timeframe open here for me to introduce a bill; however, I see the Senator from West Virginia is here and prepared to go ahead.

Under the previous order, I am happy to abide by that and will do this at another time.

Mr. BYRD. How much time did the Senator need to introduce his bill?

Mr. COATS. There is no rush on this. I think we should stick with what was agreed upon.

Mr. BYRD. I probably have more time under the order than I will use.

Mr. COATS. I just want to introduce legislation. I can probably do it in 2 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. I yield the Senator 2 minutes, and I ask unanimous consent that he may speak as in morning business and introduce a bill.

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

The Senator from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I thank the Chair and I thank the Senator from West Virginia.

(The remarks of Mr. COATS pertaining to the introduction of S. 2000 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I rise in support of H.R. 3754, the Fiscal Year 1997 Legislative Appropriations Bill. This is the second year, I believe, that the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. MACK] has chaired the Legislative subcommittee and it is also the second year that the equally distinguished Senator from Washington [Mrs. MURRAY] has served as the ranking member of the subcommittee. Both Senators are to be commended for the efforts that they have made to ensure that the legislative branch of Government does its share in contributing toward deficit reduction.

As has been stated, the pending measure contains funding levels that are below the previous year's budget by a little over \$22 million, or around 1 percent. Further, the proposed fiscal year 1997 funding level, in total, is \$13 million less than what the legislative branch had 6 years ago in fiscal year 1991. So when we consider the cost increases that have occurred over this 6

year period, the legislative branch has taken a significant reduction in funding.

I note that the largest reduction contained in the bill is to the budget of the General Accounting Office, for which a reduction of \$44 million is recommended, as well as a personnel ceiling of 3,500 positions. That reduction fulfills a commitment made by the GAO to reduce its budget by 25 percent over a 2-year period. But for that 44 million-dollar reduction, the pending measure would, in fact, show an increase above fiscal year 1996.

Overall, I believe that this bill recognizes the fact that we have reached the bottom of the barrel as far as further reductions in the legislative branch budget. A large portion of the legislative branch budget is for personnel whose purpose is to assist Members of the House and Senate in carrying out their responsibilities. It is my strongly held belief that we must be very careful in the future to avoid any further arbitrary reductions in the legislative branch. We have reached the point, by making such dramatic reductions in staff throughout the legislative branch, that it is affecting the ability of Members to adequately address issues of national importance which arise in Congress every day and to adequately serve the people who send us here. In fact, let me take this opportunity to congratulate a very commendable group of individuals. Who are they? The United States Senate staff.

Senators like to think of themselves as akin to stars in the heavens, giving off light, and giving off heat, energy and brilliance—separate and distinct suns in orbits all of our own, as it were, creating their very own blinding illumination. In truth our lights would be very dim indeed without the dedicated hard work and unbelievable loyalty of those who labor so long on our behalf and on behalf of our constituents.

The people who open our mail, who read our mail and who answer much of our mail, the people who answer our telephones, and take a great deal of guff in the process on many occasions, the people who research our issues, the people who prepare our press releases, the people who work on the Nation's problems, as well as on the problems of our respective States, the people on the committees who craft legislative language. I doubt that there is a Senator here—there may be one—who personally writes his own bills, the bills that he introduces. The people who intercede on behalf of our constituents when we cannot do so ourselves, the people who toil on the Senate floor, the people who negotiate far into the night, I am talking about our committee staffs in particular here, negotiate far into the night to reconcile intractable differences with Members of the other body sometimes, long after Senators have gone home and gone to bed. All of these individuals unselfishly give countless hours and energies in order to serve Senators and to benefit their country.

Some of those staff members may have certain advantages, this is true. But these are very special people, and they are special people who are mostly unsung and very often unappreciated. Daily, they combine demanding, stressful, and difficult careers with equally demanding private lives. When they leave home in the morning, they often have no idea what time they may return to their loved ones at night. Many of us, Senators, are here in that same boat. We do not know what time we are going to get to go home at night. But certainly those employees do not for the most part. Still they manage to rear children and cook and clean and carry out the hundreds of other chores which must be performed in their personal lives weekly, despite impossible hours.

Every Senator in this body, each and every Member on both sides of the aisle, is deeply in their debt, as are our constituents and the Nation as a whole.

So we are supposed to pay them well, and in many instances, or most instances, I think we do pay them well. But not always, by any means.

That is why I am particularly concerned that this year those same capable, hard-working, largely uncomplaining individuals have been singled out, not for praise, but, at least indirectly, for scorn. It is my understanding that, for the first time in the years in which there have been cost-of-living adjustments, the staff of the U.S. Senate are alone—alone—among all Federal employees in this land in their failure to receive the COLA. Staffers of the House of Representatives have been authorized to receive their COLAS, the entire rest of the Federal work force has already received a cost-of-living adjustment, including the employees who staff the Federal judiciary.

I often wonder. It strikes me as strange that Senators, many Senators, in thinking of reducing personnel and of not increasing salaries of the staff or of Members themselves, do not dare touch the judiciary. They do not want to touch the judiciary.

So staffers of the Federal judiciary have received the cost-of-living adjustment. I do not regret that. I am not complaining about that. But only Senate staffers have been singled out for this special kind of strange and unfair treatment. I cannot fathom any substantive reason for such gross unfairness. I cannot understand why such a situation has been allowed to develop. I am sure it is not intended to be punitive, but in a way it is punitive. When our staffs in the Senate look across at the other end of the Capitol and see the staffs of the House, when they look across the street and see the staffs of the judiciary, and when they look down Pennsylvania Avenue and see the staffs of the executive branch who received their COLA's, how could our staffs, how could our committee staffs, help but wonder, why is this? Why the difference? Why the discrimination?

Unlike most of the Federal work force that normally receives any approved cost-of-living adjustment automatically, Senate staffers may only receive such COLA if their respective Senator approves the increase for each member of his or her staff. Senators do not have to give the COLA to anyone on their staffs or anyone on their committee staffs who is under their jurisdiction if they do not wish to. But, this year even the option for Senators to do so has been effectively taken away from Members.

I would like to at least have the option. I would at least like to be able to pass the COLA's on to the lower paid members of my staff. I would like to make that judgment based on each staff person's merits. But that option I do not have. No other Senator has that option this year.

Do I hear deficit cutting given as a reason for such disparity? If we wanted to make a serious reduction in the deficit through this means, we could prohibit the cost-of-living adjustment for anyone and everyone in the Federal Government in the first place, including the judicial branch. No. Serious deficit reduction is not the issue here. Some sort of misguided symbolism can be the only reason for such an unwarranted slap in the face for our own loyal employees in the Senate on our personal staffs and on committee staffs.

In my opinion, this is a very poor way to thank the hundreds of people who toil to make Senators the celestial heavenly bodies that we sometimes believe we are. It is pretty shabby treatment, if you ask me.

In a city that is as expensive to live in and work in as is Washington, DC, how can any Senator be comfortable knowing that we are treating the very people who help us to serve our constituents in such a fashion?

I thank the managers of the bill. They have included moneys so that the COLA's can be passed on for the coming year. I hope that the leadership will authorize that this be done.

I think the extreme matter should be rectified immediately for this year and should not be repeated in 1997. Why? Because common decency and fairness demand it.

Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MACK addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on passage of H.R. 3754, the legislative branch appropriations bill, occur at 3 p.m. today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MACK. I ask for the yeas and nays on final passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MACK. I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I call for the regular order.

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

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mrs. FRAHM] is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 93, nays 6, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 254 Leg.]

YEAS—93

Abraham	Ford	Mack
Akaka	Frist	McCain
Ashcroft	Glenn	McConnell
Baucus	Gorton	Mikulski
Bennett	Graham	Moseley-Braun
Biden	Grams	Moynihan
Bingaman	Grassley	Murkowski
Bond	Gregg	Murray
Boxer	Harkin	Nickles
Bradley	Hatch	Nunn
Breaux	Hatfield	Pell
Bryan	Helms	Pressler
Bumpers	Hollings	Pryor
Burns	Hutchison	Reid
Byrd	Inhofe	Robb
Campbell	Inouye	Rockefeller
Chafee	Jeffords	Roth
Coats	Johnston	Santorum
Cochran	Kassebaum	Sarbanes
Cohen	Kempthorne	Shelby
Coverdell	Kennedy	Simon
Craig	Kerrey	Simpson
D'Amato	Kerry	Smith
Daschle	Kohl	Snowe
DeWine	Kyl	Specter
Dodd	Lautenberg	Stevens
Domenici	Leahy	Thomas
Dorgan	Levin	Thompson
Exon	Lieberman	Thurmond
Feingold	Lott	Warner
Feinstein	Lugar	Wyden

NAYS—6

Brown	Faircloth	Heflin
Conrad	Gramm	Wellstone

NOT VOTING—1

Frahm

The bill (H.R. 3754), as amended, was passed.

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

Mr. MACK. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MACK addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments to the bill, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes thereon, and that the Chair ap-

point conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MACK, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. HATFIELD, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mr. BYRD conferees on the part of the Senate.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Nebraska be allowed to proceed as in morning business for not exceeding 2 minutes the purpose of introducing legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

(The remarks of Mr. EXON pertaining to the introduction of S. 2003 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to consideration of calendar order 504, H.R. 3675, the transportation appropriations bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3675) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments; as follows:

(The parts of the bill intended to be stricken are shown in boldface brackets and the parts of the bill intended to be inserted are shown in italic.)

H.R. 3675

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

That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary, **[\$53,816,000]** *\$53,376,000*, of which not to exceed \$40,000 shall be available as the Secretary may determine for allocation within the Department for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, there may be credited to this appropriation up to \$1,000,000 in funds received in user fees established to support the electronic tariff filing system: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in this Act or otherwise made available may be used to maintain custody of airline tariffs that are already available for public and departmental access at no cost; to secure them against detection, alteration, or tampering; and open to inspection by the Department.

OFFICE OF CIVIL RIGHTS

For necessary expenses of the Office of Civil Rights, **\$5,574,000**.

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses for conducting transportation planning, research, systems development, and development activities, to remain available until expended, **[\$3,000,000]** *\$4,158,000*.

TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICE CENTER

Necessary expenses for operating costs and capital outlays of the Transportation Administrative Service Center, not to exceed \$124,812,000, shall be paid from appropriations made available to the Department of Transportation: *Provided*, That such services shall be provided on a competitive basis to entities within the Department of Transportation: *Provided further*, That the above limitation on operating expenses shall not apply to non-DOT entities: *Provided further*, That no funds appropriated in this Act to an agency of the Department shall be transferred to the Transportation Administrative Service Center without the approval of the agency modal administrator: *Provided further*, That no assessments may be levied against any program, budget activity, subactivity or project funded by this Act unless notice of such assessments and the basis therefor are presented to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and are approved by such Committees.

PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)
(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)
(INCLUDING RESCISSION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For liquidation of obligations incurred for payments to air carriers of so much of the compensation fixed and determined under subchapter II of chapter 417 of title 49, United States Code, as is payable by the Department of Transportation, **[\$10,000,000]** *\$25,900,000*, to remain available until expended and to be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund: *Provided*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the implementation or execution of programs in excess of **[\$10,000,000]** *\$25,900,000* for the Payments to Air Carriers program in fiscal year 1997: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be used by the Secretary of Transportation to make payment of compensation under subchapter II of