

United States, wherever he or she may be in the world today, should ever be subjected to a risk, which risk can be lessened to some extent by the utilization of other assets possessed by the U.S. military.

The Senator will recall that General Shalakashvili said that some 69,000 missions had been flown successfully without a loss, such as Captain O'Grady, and that this particular mission was a longer route, where there had been—I think I quote him accurately—"no detection of ground-to-air systems," such as to justify the inclusion of other assets. Now, that is something we have to determine, because subsequently there to in those reports and the testimony of the general before the committee on which the Senator from Texas and I sit, came the reports that there had been some collection of signals in another area of our intelligence which lent themselves to the theory that there was present on that particular flight path a ground-to-air system. And in fact there was. So that is one of the things we have to ascertain. Twofold: Was there a breakdown in intelligence if in fact those signals were collected and confirmed? And, second, exactly what policies and procedures does the Department of Defense employ at such time as they put our unformed people in a situation of great risk?

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I will just add to the two points that have been made by the Senator from Virginia that I think we also should inquire about exactly what flights we are going to participate in and if we are going to take some action to make sure that we either take out the missiles which had been suggested by NATO and vetoed by the United Nations earlier in this process, or if we should stop participating in those overflights, over that disputed territory, before we get into a situation where we have another of our young men shot down, as we witnessed.

Thank goodness we had a good result, because we now have Captain O'Grady back safe and sound. But I think these are very important points that the Armed Services Committee should look into before any kind of authorization is given, and I think there are a lot of questions to be asked. I thank the Senator for his leadership in this effort.

The Senator from Virginia has really been a wonderful conscience for this conflict. I appreciate the work he has done on the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Texas for her thoughtful remarks, and indeed I could say the same about the Senator from Texas and her participation in her years on the committee.

NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM DESIGNATION ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I would like to know what the status of floor action is, because I have two amendments that are technical and have been agreed to by both sides, which I would like to propose.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, the matter before the Senate is the underlying bill, am I not correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WARNER. Amendments are now in order, and I note that the distinguished Senator from Texas has several amendments, as reflected on the documents submitted to us. This would be an appropriate time to take those into consideration.

AMENDMENT NO. 1424

(Purpose: To change the description of a rural access project in Texas)

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Texas [Mrs. HUTCHISON] proposes an amendment numbered 1424.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in title I, insert the following:

SEC. 1. RURAL ACCESS PROJECTS.

Item 111 of the table in section 1106(a)(2) of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (Public Law 102-240; 105 Stat. 2042) is amended—

(1) by striking "Parker County" and inserting "Parker and Tarrant Counties"; and
(2) by striking "to four-lane" and inserting "in Tarrant County to freeway standards and in Parker County to a 4-lane".

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, this is indeed a technical amendment. It just adds Tarrant County to the list of what counties may be included in this rural access projects. The reason is because a little bit of work needs to be done in Tarrant County for the Parker County project that was already approved.

ISTEA section 1106(a)—rural access projects—contains a project to upgrade an existing highway to four lane divided highway in Parker County, TX. In order to complete this project as envisioned, some work must be undertaken in neighboring Tarrant County.

However, ISTEA makes no mention of Tarrant County in the project authorization and there is a question at TXDOT as to whether it can complete the project through Tarrant County with the ISTEA-authorized funds since Tarrant is not specifically named in ISTEA by virtue of oversight.

I am offering a technical amendment to ISTEA which extends authorization to complete the project as intended in Tarrant County. This amendment does not authorize any additional funds.

Passage of this language has become critical because work undertaken

under the ISTEA rural access authorization has reached the Tarrant County line and Congress must clarify that it may continue so that the Texas Department of Transportation may complete the project.

The House has included this technical correction in every original legislation in 1991. It also was included in last year's NHS bill and will likely do so again in this year's version. I thank the chairman and ranking minority member of the Environment and Public Works Committee for their support in rectifying this small, but important, problem in Tarrant County.

Mr. WARNER. I understand that amendment is essentially a technical correction to the ISTEA legislation. The managers are prepared to accept it. I would like to await the arrival of my comanager before doing so.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside so that I may offer another amendment.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1425

(Purpose: To change the identification of a high priority corridor on the National Highway System in Texas)

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Texas [Mrs. HUTCHISON] proposes an amendment numbered 1425.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 36, strike lines 2 and 3 and insert the following:

Interstate System";

(2) in paragraph (18)—

(A) by striking "and"; and

(B) by inserting before the period at the end the following: ", and to the Lower Rio Grande Valley at the border between the United States and Mexico"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, this amendment would extend high-priority corridor 18 from where it currently ends in Houston, TX, all the way to the Mexican border in the lower Rio Grande Valley.

Under the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991, corridor 18 now extends from Indianapolis, IN, through Evansville, IN, Memphis, TN, Shreveport/Bossier, LA, terminating in Houston, TX. Corridor 18, along with corridor 20—from Laredo to Houston—are together popularly referred to as I-69.

Extending corridor 18 to the Rio Grande Valley will expedite the shipment of goods traded between Mexico, the United States, and Canada by providing a direct link from the Canadian border to the Mexican border through the heart of the United States. Eighty

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, may I say to the distinguished Senator from

Texas that we indeed commend the Senator for diligently looking after the interest of the State of Texas as it relates to the interstate highway system.

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

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

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

The amendment (No. 1425) was agreed to.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1424

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

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

The amendment (No. 1424) was agreed to.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

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

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

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

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

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

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

BOSNIA

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

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

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

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

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