people in our country and Members of the Senate will welcome their judgment.

But on this day, Mr. President, I call upon the Energy and Natural Resources Committee to immediately commence hearings on the important Puerto Rico self-determination bill. I join with Senator GRAHAM and Senator CRAIG in offering this legislation. I hope the people of Puerto Rico can be proud that this Senate will await their judgment and will offer them this opportunity.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

## EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the previous order, the Senator from Ohio and I be permitted to proceed in morning business for 15 additional minutes.

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

Ms. COLLINS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

(The remarks of Ms. COLLINS and Mr. DEWINE pertaining to the introduction of S. 1724 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

## INTERMODAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EFFICIENCY ACT OF 1997

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I will send an amendment to the desk. I will not ask for its immediate consideration. This is an amendment that would require the Secretary of Transportation to reduce the amounts made available under the ISTEA of 1998 for the fiscal year 1998 by the amounts made available under the extension that we did last fall, the so-called 6-month extension bill.

Now, last year, Mr. President, as you recall, the Senate passed a 6-month extension bill which allowed the States to use their unobligated balances to fund eligible transportation projects. The bill also allocated an additional $5.5 billion in new money to the States.

As you remember, the ISTEA I expired on September 30 so we knew we were not going to be able to enact a new ISTEA bill— indeed we have not enacted it yet—and that carried us over to May 1 of this year. In it we provided not only that States could use their unobtained balances but there was also allocated an additional $5.5 billion.

The Senate agreed to provide this new $5.5 billion on the condition that the amounts allocated under ISTEA II in fiscal year 1998 would be reduced by the amount each State received under the 6-month extension. In other words, yes, we gave them additional money to carry them through during this extension, but when we enact a final bill, as I hope we will do next week, then the amounts that the States would have received would be deducted from the amounts that we provide for them for the fiscal year 1998.

For example, the amount each State will receive in the surface transportation program, so-called STP funds, under ISTEA II will be reduced by their portion of the more than $1 billion provided in STP funds under the 6-month extension.

Now, there are several reasons why this extension reduction is necessary. First of all, ISTEA II provides money for each fiscal year 1998 through 2003. It does not provide a half-year amount for 1998. If this reduction is not required, States would be receiving one-and-a-half times as much as they should for 1998. In other words, we give them the entire 1998 money in the bill, and we have also previously given them half of that so it doesn't make sense for them to have one-and-a-half times as much money for 1998 as required. Indeed, our bill would be subject to a point of order.

Second, a reduction ensures that each State will receive money based on the new formula provided in ISTEA II instead of the old formula or amounts received in the past. We worked hard to bring this new formula up to date in order to make it fairer, and we believe we have achieved that.

So, Mr. President, this technical and noncontroversial amendment has been cleared by both sides. We want to make sure that this amendment is available for any of the States who would choose to review it. They can get in touch with me and we will give them a copy, obviously.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1719

(Purpose: To include the enhancement of safety at at-grade railway-highway crossings and the achievement of national transportation safety goals in the purpose of the intelligent transportation system program)

Mr. BAUCUS. 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 Mr. Montana [Mr. BAUCUS], for Mr. KERREY, proposes an amendment numbered 1719.

Mr. BAUCUS. 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 385, strike lines 13 and 14 and insert the following: creasing the number and severity of collisions;

''(14) to encourage the use of intelligent transportation systems to promote the achievement of national transportation safety goals, including safety at at-grade Railway-highway crossings; and

''(15) to accommodate the needs of all users of''.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, this amendment that I am offering on behalf of Senator KERREY from Nebraska adds another goal to the intelligent transportation system's research program in the underlying bill. It would add the achievement of national transportation safety goals, including at-grade railway-highway crossings to the ITS, intelligence transportation system program.

I think it is a good idea to enhance the ITS program. We all know the problems of rail crossings. There are a lot of accidents and deaths, regrettably, at railway-highway crossings. This added language will help in the development of the ITS to try to find ways to minimize these types of things.

I urge that we agree to this amendment.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, this amendment is acceptable to this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1719) was agreed to.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1720 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1676

(Purpose: To include the development of techniques to eliminate at-grade railway-highway crossings in the goals of the innovative bridge research and construction program)

Mr. BAUCUS. 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 Montana [Mr. BAUCUS], for Mr. KERREY, proposes an amendment numbered 1720.

Mr. BAUCUS. 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 371, strike lines 6 and 7 and insert the following:

''in highway bridges and structures;

''(5) the development of cost-effective and innovative techniques to separate vehicle and pedestrian traffic from railroad traffic and

''(6) the development of highway bridges and''.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, this amendment would add to the types of works the Secretary should undertake with regard to innovative bridge research. The Secretary would have the flexibility to look at innovative techniques to separate vehicle and pedestrian traffic from railroad traffic. It is

designed, obviously, to deal with the problems of congestion, deaths and accidents on bridges.

I urge its adoption.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, this is acceptable to this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1720) was agreed to.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1721 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1676

(Purpose: To ensure that there is adequate opportunity for public participation in the certification of transportation planning processes of metropolitan areas)

Mr. BAUCUS. 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 Montana [Mr. BAUCUS], for Mr. WELLSTONE, proposes an amendment numbered 1721.

Mr. BAUCUS. 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:

Beginning on page 265, strike line 15 and all that follows through page 266, line 1 and insert the following:

''(B) REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTIFICATION.—The Secretary may make the certification under subparagraph (A) if—

''(i) the transportation planning process complies with the requirements of this section and other applicable requirements of Federal law;

''(ii) there is a transportation improvement program for the area that has been approved by the metropolitan planning organization and the Governor;

''(iii) the public has been given adequate opportunity during the certification process to comment on—

''(I) the public participation process conducted by the metropolitan planning organization; and

''(II) the extent to which the transportation improvement program for the metropolitan area takes into account the needs of the entire metropolitan area, including the needs of low and moderate income residents, and the requirement of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act; and

''(iv) public comments are—

''(I) included in the documentation supporting the metropolitan planning organization's request for certification; and

''(II) made publicly available.

''(C) EFFECT OF FAILURE TO CERTIFY.—''.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, this amendment would ensure that the public has an adequate opportunity to comment on the certification process in transportation management areas.

I urge its adoption.

Mr. CHAFEE. This amendment is agreeable to this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1721) was agreed to.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Timothy Hess, a fellow in the office of Senator BOB GRAHAM, be given floor privileges during the ISTEA debate.

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1722 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1676

(Purpose: To add the projected increase in commercial traffic to the factors that the Secretary of Transportation is required to consider in selecting recipients of grants for trade corridors and border infrastructure safety and congestion relief)

Mr. CHAFEE. 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 Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE], for Mr. DOMENICI, proposes an amendment numbered 1722.

Mr. CHAFEE. 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 98, line 13, insert '', and is projected to grow in the future,'' after ''103–182)''.

On page 98, line 17, insert '', and is projected to grow,'' after ''grown''.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, this amendment is a modification to the border crossing and trade corridor program. It is for the Secretary to consider an area's future growth while awarding grant funds.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, we have reviewed the amendment and think it is fine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1722) was agreed to.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. CHAFEE. 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. BURNS. 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. BURNS. Mr. President, it might be a faulty assumption on my part; are we in a period of morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are currently considering S. 1173, the highway bill.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed as in morning business for no more than 5 minutes.

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

Mr. BURNS. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. BURNS pertaining to the introduction of S. 1725 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I will be really very brief.

I have been involved in negotiations, as all of us are, on this legislation, all of us trying to use our leverage to fight for what we think is right. I have been very focused on a sense-of-the-Senate resolution amendment which I think will command widespread support from both Democrats and Republicans.

I know, for example, that this resolution was initially something I did with Senator MACK, who still strongly supports it—Senator HUTCHINSON, and many, I hope the Chair.

This is just a sense-of-the-Senate resolution—could be amendment; I hope it would be a separate resolution, but one way or the other—that, basically, strongly urges the President, acting through the permanent representatives of the United States—and I am just looking at this; I will quote his record—''to make all efforts necessary to pass a resolution criticizing the People's Republic of China for its human rights abuses in China, Tibet at the annual meeting of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights.''

Mr. President, the point is that I am not going to get into any sharp debate or attack people who are not here right now, but I think the point of this resolution, the amendment, is to make sure that we take some action before the United Nations Commission on Human Rights convenes in Geneva, which would be on March 16.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee will take up this resolution, I think, on Thursday, but my concern, as a U.S. Senator who feels strongly about this, about human rights questions and has worked closely with a number of really great people in these human rights organizations—and I tell you, in some ways, one of the biggest

thrills of my life has been to have a chance to work with Wei Jingsheng, who was just in the office and who is very focused in on this.

In any case, what I wanted to make sure of is—and I think many Republicans agree with us—that the Foreign Relations Committee meets, but that still does not guarantee that we have a resolution or amendment on the floor by the end of next week or as soon as possible. And really next week is the critical timeframe that we are talking about.

We have gone back and forth on other resolutions that were going to be introduced. I know Senator SPECTER has one he wants to do on Iraq. My position is, well, then there ought to be one on China.

In any case, I think it is no longer necessary for me to do anything on the floor of the Senate. I have a commitment by the Senate majority leader, Senator LOTT. It is a personal commitment, not an official, formal commitment. I think it is all I need. I think most of us know, if he gives his word, his word is good.

So, I feel very confident that we, indeed, will be able to deal with this resolution in this timeframe, which is so important that really the voice of the Senate be heard, the voice of the Congress be heard. And certainly I hope the voice of the President and the administration will be heard before the Human Rights Commission convenes in Geneva.

So I thank colleagues for working with me. I certainly thank the majority leader for being sensitive and working this out.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I have a managers' amendment, which I will soon send to the desk.

It is a package of technical and noncontroversial changes to S. 1173. A number of changes included in the amendment were recommended by the Department of Transportation to improve and clarify provisions in the bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the full descriptions of the amendments be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF THE PROVISIONS IN THE MANAGER'S AMENDMENT TO S. 1173

The manager's amendment includes a number of technical and noncontroversial changes to S. 1173. The paragraphs below summarize the items included in the managers amendment that improve the bill.

On page 5, strike lines 15 through 20 and insert the following: Makes a technical change to authorization levels for the Interstate and National Highway System program for fiscal year 1998 through 2001, and 2003.

On page 7, strike 16 through 20.—Eliminates the duplicative authorization of funds for the Cooperative Federal Lands Transportation Program, as funding for this program was authorized in two places in S. 1173.

On page 8, line 20, after ''139(a)'', insert the following: Adds language to 104(b) to clarify that the reference to 139(a) was to reflect 139(a) before enactment of ISTEA II.

On page 9, line 16, after ''139(a)'', insert the following: Adds language to 104(b) to clarify that the reference to 139(a) was to reflect 139(a) before enactment of ISTEA II.

On page 10, line 9, insert ''and for the purposes specified in subparagraph—Clarifies the flexibility allowed in spending the Interstate maintenance component and the Interstate bridges component funds on either category.

On page 43, line 12, strike ''and''.—Facilitates the following amendment.

On page 43, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following: Provides full obligation authority for operation lifesaver and railway-highway crossing hazard elimination in high speed rail corridors.

On page 43, line 13, strike ''(xi)'' and insert ''(xii)''.—Facilitates the previous amendment.

On page 44, strike line 6 and insert the following: Provides an obligation limitation for administrative expenses deducted under Section 104(a). Similar limitations are included in annual appropriations Acts for the Federal Highway Administration. The obligation limitation totals $301,725,000 for fiscal year 1999; $302,055,000 for fiscal year 2000; $303,480,000 for fiscal year 2001; $310,470,000 for fiscal year 2002; and $320,595,000 for fiscal year 2003.

On page 85, line 10, strike ''sections 103 and'' and insert ''section''.—Makes a technical correction to the section on studies and reports. The reference to section 103 is stricken from the list of sections for which the Secretary must annually report rates of obligation. National Highway System funds are not apportioned under section 103, but must be tracked under this section as they are apportioned under section 104 of title 23.

Beginning on page 91, strike line 24 and all that follow through page 92, line 4.—Strikes the definition for ''border region,'' as this term is not used within S. 1173.

On page 92, line 5, . . .

On page 92, line 11, . . .

On page 92, line 17, . . .

On page 93, line 3, . . .

On page 93, line 6, . . . Provides technical corrections (renumbering) to facilitate the above amendment.

On page 130, line 6, insert: Clarifies that Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement funds are tied to areas classified as marginal or worse for ozone or carbon monoxide in the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments.

On page 159, line 21, strike ''selection'' and insert ''bidding''.—Makes a technical correction to section 1225, replacing the word ''selection'' with ''bidding,'' as the term ''competitive bidding'' is a defined term in title 23, United States Code.

On page 159, line 22, before the period, insert: See amendment description below—line 160, between lines 16 and 17.

On page 160, line 16, strike the quotation marks and—Technical amendment to facilitate the following amendment.

On page 160, between lines 16 and 17—Requires the States that choose to use the design-build process to either use procedure specified in State statute or selection procedures in legislation already adopted by the U.S. Congress and signed into law for use by civilian and military agencies as part of the Federal Acquisition Reform Act of 1996, Public Law 104–106. Section 4105 of the Act established uniform Federal standards for the acquisition of design-build contracts for the first time.

On page 161, line 14, strike ''selection''.—Makes a technical correction to section 1225, replacing the word ''selection'' with ''competitive bidding,'' as the term ''competitive bidding'' is a defined term in title 23, United States Code.

On page 219, line 13, strike ''authorized to be appropriated'' and insert ''made available''.—Technical change to make this section's language parallel to the rest of the bill.

On page 250, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following: Clarifies that a metropolitan planning organization designation shall remain in effect until that MPO is redesignated.

On page 290, line 24, strike ''agencies'' and insert ''departments''.—Makes a technical correction to section 1701, replacing the word ''agencies'' with ''departments'', as the term ''transportation department is a defined term in title 23, United States Code.

On page 294, lines 12 and 13 strike: Clarifies the eligibility of INHS funds for use on Interstate highways.

On page 340, line 4, strike ''subsection'' and

On page 343, line 4, strike ''subsection'' and—Provides a technical correction.

On page 403, strike lines 11 through 13 and insert the following: Provides language to clarify that the primary use of funds under commercial vehicle intelligent transportation system infrastructure shall include the improvement of inspection and crash data electronic processing.

On page 413, line 1, strike ''that'' and insert ''only if the technologies''.—Provides clarifying language.

On page 415, line 14, strike: Provides a reduction to contract authority for the fiscal year 2002 from $110 million to $109 million to stay within the Committee's allocation.

AMENDMENT NO. 1723 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1676

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE] proposes an amendment numbered 1723.

Mr. CHAFEE. 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 5, strike lines 15 through 20 and insert the following:

title $11,977,000,000 for fiscal year 1998, $11,949,000,000 for fiscal year 1999, $11,922,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, $11,950,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, $12,242,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, and $12,659,000,000 for fiscal year 2003, of which—

On page 7, strike lines 16 through 20.

On page 8, line 20, after ''139(a)'', insert the following: ''(as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1997)''.

On page 9, line 16, after ''139(a)'', insert the following: ''(as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1997)''.

On page 10, line 9, insert ''and for the purposes specified in subparagraph (A),'' before ''in the ratio''.

On page 43, line 12, strike ''and''.

On page 43, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

''(xi) amounts set aside under section 104(d) for operation lifesaver and railway-highway crossing hazard elimination in high speed rail corridors; and

On page 43, line 13, strike ''(xi)'' and insert ''(xii)''.

On page 44, strike line 6 and insert the following:

(e) LIMITATIONS ON OBLIGATIONS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the total amount of all obligations under section 104(a) of title 23, United States Code, shall not exceed—

(1) $301,725,000 for fiscal year 1999;

(2) $302,055,000 for fiscal year 2000;

(3) $303,480,000 for fiscal year 2001;

(4) $310,470,000 for fiscal year 2002; and

(5) $320,595,000 for fiscal year 2003.

(f) APPLICABILITY OF OBLIGATION LIMITATIONS.—

On page 85, line 10, strike ''sections 103 and'' and insert ''section''.

Beginning on page 91, strike line 24 and all that follows through page 92, line 4.

On page 92, line 5, strike ''(2)'' and insert ''(1)''.

On page 92, line 11, strike ''(3)'' and insert ''(2)''.

On page 92, line 17, strike ''(4)'' and insert ''(3)''.

On page 93, line 3, strike ''(5)'' and insert ''(4)''.

On page 93, line 6, strike ''(6)'' and insert ''(5)''.

On page 130, line 6, insert ''and classified under section 181(a) or 186(a) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7511(a), 7512(a))'' before ''or classified as''.

On page 159, line 21, strike ''selection'' and insert ''bidding''.

On page 159, line 22, before the period, insert the following: ''in accordance with subparagraph (C)''.

On page 160, line 16, strike the quotation marks and the following period.

On page 160, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

''(C) PROCEDURES THAT MAY BE APPROVED.—Under subparagraph (A), the Secretary may approve, for use by a State, only procedures that consist of—

''(i) formal design-build contracting procedures specified in a State statute; or

''(ii) in the case of a State that does not have a statute described in clause (i), the design-build selection procedures authorized under section 303M of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253m).''.

On page 161, line 14, strike ''selection'' and insert ''competitive bidding''.

On page 219, line 13, strike ''authorized to be appropriated'' and insert ''made available''.

On page 250, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

''(6) CONTINUING DESIGNATION.—A designation of a metropolitan planning organization under this subsection or any other provision of law shall remain in effect until the metropolitan planning organization is redesignated under paragraph (2).

On page 290, line 24, strike ''agencies'' and insert ''departments''.

On page 294, lines 12 and 13, strike ''paragraphs (1) and (3) of section 104(b)'' and insert ''section 104(b)(1)''.

On page 340, line 8, strike ''subsection'' and insert ''section''.

On page 343, line 4, strike ''subsection'' and insert ''section''.

On page 403, strike lines 11 through 13 and insert the following:

''(B) electronic processing of registration information, driver licensing information, fuel tax information, inspection and crash data, and other safety information; and

On page 413, line 1, strike ''that'' and insert ''only if the technologies''.

On page 415, line 14, strike ''$110,000,000'' and insert ''$109,000,000''.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, we have reviewed the amendment and they are, indeed, technical corrections. There is nothing here that is not technical. There are grammatical errors, spelling errors, et cetera. We agree the amendment should be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1723) was agreed to.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I have an amendment here on behalf of Senator DEWINE. It is a repeat offenders amendment.

This amendment would strengthen and clarify the repeat drunk-driving offenders section of the bill. The bill, as currently drafted, requires States to enact and support penalties for drunk drivers, who have a blood alcohol concentration of .15 or greater, and who have been convicted of a second or subsequent drunk-driving offense within 5 years. The DeWine-Lautenberg amendment strikes the reference to .15 blood alcohol concentration and allows the State law on blood alcohol concentration to determine what is a repeat offender. The amendment, therefore, clarifies that a person who is arrested for driving with a blood alcohol concentration level lower than .15 still may be classified as a repeat offender.

Mr. President, I know there is a good deal of concern amongst our colleagues about these drunk-driving amendments and the penalties that occur. I will not seek to have this agreed to now. I will only file it. It will be my intention to call this amendment up Monday, thus, giving those who might have concerns an opportunity to review it. I think when they review it, they will find that it gives more power to the States than the underlying bill does. Nonetheless, because of the deep interest in this matter, I think it well for it to lie over.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1725 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1676

(Purpose: To make technical amendments to the bill)

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment that makes a number of technical corrections or revisions to S. 1173, to correct certain grammatical errors, spelling errors, and incorrect references to the law. This amendment has been cleared by both sides. I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE] proposes an amendment numbered 1725 to amendment No. 1676.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 8, lines 5 and 6, strike ''National Highway System'' and insert ''Interstate and National Highway System program''.

On page 50, line 2, strike ''to the pay'' and insert ''to pay''.

On page 62, line 14, strike ''wildernessK'' and insert ''wilderness''.

On page 91, strike lines 3 and 4 and insert the following:

able for use in a national park by this paragraph.

''(d) RIGHTS-OF-WAY ACROSS FEDERAL LAND.—

On page 170, line 3, strike ''(2)'' and insert ''(3)''.

On page 170, line 9, strike ''(3)'' and insert ''(4)''.

On page 301, line 11, strike ''program''.

On page 303, between lines 21 and 22, insert the following:

(1) PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION.—Section 142(a)(2) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking ''the the'' and inserting ''the''.

On page 303, line 22, strike ''(l)'' and insert ''(m)''.

On page 304, line 5, strike ''(m)'' and insert ''(n)''.

On page 304, line 13, strike ''(n)'' and insert ''(o)''.

On page 304, line 17, strike ''(o)'' and insert ''(p)''.

On page 357, line 1, strike ''SET ASIDE'' and insert ''SET-ASIDE''.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, let me give you an idea just how technical this is. One of the provisions here is to strike ''wildernessK'' and insert ''wilderness'', page 62, line 14. That was just a typo. Another is to strike the words ''SET ASIDE'' and replace them with ''SET-ASIDE''. That's the nature of this. This is a very technical amendment. I urge its adoption.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1725) was agreed to.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1687

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, while debating my amendment, amendment number 1687, to S. 1173, the ISTEA Reauthorization Act, on Wednesday March 4, I referred to five letters and entered them into the RECORD. Two of those letters were inadvertenly omitted from the RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the letters be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE AND TERRITORIAL AIR POLLUTION PROGRAM ADMINISTRATORS/ ASSOCIATION OF LOCAL AIR POLLUTION CONTROL OFFICIALS,
*Washington, DC, March 3, 1998.*

Hon. JAMES M. INHOFE,
*Chairman, Subcommittee on Clean Air Wetlands, Private Property, and Nuclear Safety, U.S. Senate, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.*

DEAR SENATOR INHOFE: On behalf of the State and Territorial Air Pollution Program Administrators (STAPPA) and the Association of Local Air Pollution Control Officials (ALAPCO), we wish to express our support for a particular provision of your proposed amendment to ISTEA legislation that calls for full federal funding for fine particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$) air monitoring.

STAPPA and ALAPCO are the national associations of state and local air quality agencies in the states and territories and over 165 metropolitan areas across the country. The members of STAPPA and ALAPCO have primary responsibility for implementing our nation's air pollution control laws and regulations. As such, we believe it is essential that EPA provide full funding for the $PM_{2.5}$ monitoring network, as the agency has indicated it would.

In its final $PM_{2.5}$ monitoring regulation (July 18, 1997), EPA estimated that $98.3 million is needed to deploy a national $PM_{2.5}$ monitoring system comprising 1,500 sites (including the purchase of equipment and the costs of operating and maintaining the system and analyzing data). On many occasions, the agency committed to providing full funding over a two-year period for this new program and indicated that this would be new money. Unfortunately, this has not happened.

In FY 1997, EPA allocated $2.7 million for state and local air grants for $PM_{2.5}$ monitoring activities. In FY 1998, EPA earmarked $35.6 million for those activities but, rather than providing full funding, the allocation included only $28.7 million in new money, while the remaining $6.9 million was diverted from other, non-$PM_{2.5}$ monitoring activities that state and local agencies must perform. The proposed FY 1999 budget earmarks $50.7 million for the $PM_{2.5}$ monitoring network. However, this includes only $43.9 million in new funds for $PM_{2.5}$ monitoring activities and again proposes to reprogram funds—$6.8 million—away from other extremely important and grossly underfunded state and local air program activities. Thus, instead of providing $98.3 million over two years to fund the $PM_{2.5}$ monitoring effort, EPA has in fact only allocated $75.3 million in new money, which falls $23 million short of the amount EPA has repeatedly stated is needed and would be provided. Although state and local air agencies remain concerned that $98.3 million may not be sufficient to fully fund the $PM_{2.5}$ monitoring network, we commend your effort to ensure that EPA at least fulfills its commitment.

While we are not commenting on any other provisions of your amendment, we are very pleased with the component of it that calls for full funding under Section 103 of the Clean Air Act for $PM_{2.5}$ monitoring. Moreover, we applaud that the amendment both restores to state and local air grants under Section 105 of the Clean Air Act the $13.7 million that EPA has inappropriately diverted from other important underfunded state and local air quality activities and ensures that the balance of the funds EPA estimated were necessary for the complete fine $PM_{2.5}$ monitoring network is provided with additional monies.

Thank you again for your concern about this important issue. Please contact us if we can answer any questions or provide additional information.

Sincerely,

TIMOTHY J. METHOD,
*President of STAPPA.*
BRUCE S. ANDERSEN,
*President of ALAPCO.*

---

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
*Washington, DC, March 2, 1998.*

Hon. SPENCER ABRAHAM,
*U.S. Senate, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.*

DEAR SENATOR ABRAHAM: Senator James Inhofe will be introducing an amendment to the Senate Highway Bill (ISTEA) on Tuesday, March 2, 1998. The amendment is offered to ISTEA in order to avoid the risk of states' losing highway funds as a sanction under the Clean Air Act for failure to demonstrate attainment. It is also designed to ensure that EPA provides states with the necessary funding to construct and operate a new nationwide PM 2.5 monitoring network that the EPA Administrator says is needed without states having to take funds away from other important state programs.

Further, the amendment will ensure that states collect three full years of fine particulate monitoring data, which the President has called for, before deciding which areas of the country will be subject to new stringent requirements.

The agriculture community continues to be concerned over the accuracy of EPA's fine particulate measurements, especially in regard to agriculture emissions. Testimony has been given in both the Senate and House Agriculture Committees indicating concern that agriculture would be ''misregulated'' due to inaccurate fine particulate measurements. This amendment will allow a comparison of EPA's approved method used to measure fine particulate and the new monitors to find if both adequately eliminate those particles that are larger than 2.5 micrograms in diameter.

The Inhofe amendment will provide states, small business, agriculture and consumers greater certainty that control strategies for particulate matter compliance are based on reliable data. The amendment is consistent with the timelines set forth in the President's Memorandum on Implementation and is a moderate, common sense approach to making sure the necessary PM 2.5 monitoring data is available to EPA in order to make scientifically sound decisions regarding state compliance designations.

Farm Bureau urges you to vote for the Inhofe amendment to ISTEA when it comes to the floor for a vote on Tuesday.

Sincerely,

DEAN KLECKNER,
*President.*

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

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WYDEN. 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. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for up to 15 minutes as in morning business.

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

Mr. WYDEN. Thank you, Mr. President.

(The remarks of Mr. WYDEN pertaining to the introduction of S. 1730 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LOTT. 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. LOTT. Mr. President, I believe we have Senators interested on the floor.

Once again, I regret having to address the Senate regarding the lack of cooperation that we have been getting on the part of some Members with respect to trying to find a way to bring the highway bill to a close. We need to do that. I think Senators have had enough time to analyze what is in the bill and offer amendments during the week. We debated it last year, and even with the cloture vote, we still would have a considerable amount of time next week to consider it and have relevant amendments in order.

Senator DASCHLE, for instance, this morning said:

> This is the time to move this legislation forward. I am hopeful that we can have a good debate on other amendments on Monday and have that vote on cloture on Monday night so that we can complete our work some time by the middle of the week.

That is Senator DASCHLE's comments. I share the sentiment that he expressed and thought all Members were in agreement with regard to the fact that the Senate needs to complete action on this bill as soon as possible in order to go to other pending bills.

In order to achieve that goal, a successful cloture vote must occur in order for the managers to ascertain their remaining work load, what amendments they will have to deal with, and know what time they are talking about.

As I discussed with the minority leader, and with Senator HARKIN, there are two additional issues, however, that the Senate must consider prior to the passage that are vital to the bill. Those are the Banking Committee transit title and the Finance Committee title. It was my understanding we would make other arrangements for consideration of those two issues outside the parameters of rule XXII.

With that in mind, I now propound a unanimous-consent request that is necessary to do that. I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the invoking of cloture on the Chafee substitute the Banking Committee title and the Finance Committee title, and relevant amendments thereto, still be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, I agree with our key distinguished majority leader that action needs to be taken on this bill. There are many of us who have sought to learn the details in the amendment which was filed by the floor managers. We just got that amendment yesterday. I believe it is a complicated amendment. The details, the analysis came in yesterday.

Many of us of the donor State position, for instance, want very much to try to achieve greater fairness in this bill. We are not trying to hold up the bill. We are trying to offer amendments to this bill that make it fairer from the perspective of States that, over the decades, have provided so much more funding to the highway program than has been received back by those States. We want that opportunity to seek greater fairness.

The managers have been talking to us about some possibilities that would be foreclosed by a cloture vote. Relevant amendments that are not technically germane would be foreclosed. This unanimous consent agreement only protects certain items postcloture that are relevant. Clearly, the two committee provisions which the majority leader talks about need to be considered as part of this bill, but so do other relevant provisions which are very important to States that feel they have not gotten a fair opportunity. So because it treats differently relevant amendments, postcloture and the relevant amendments that are so important to donor States, for instance, which are not technically germane are not treated in the same way in this unanimous consent agreement as are the ones that are specified, I must reluctantly object.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, if I could respond to the comments of the Senator from Michigan, first of all, I don't think you can find a Senator more sympathetic to donor States' concerns and desires than this Senator. My State has been very badly underfunded and mistreated over many, many years on a lot of things but on the highway trust fund formula, in particular.

We have been getting much less than an 85 percent return on the dollar here. We are the poorest State in the Nation, a big State, so don't get me started on donor States. I am sympathetic with what the Senator is saying.

I know he will continue to work with the chairman and the ranking member to see if there is a way to work this out without causing a blowout on the other side. This is a very delicately balanced bill. None of us is totally 100 percent happy with it. There are a number of things that came out of the committee that I just detest, but I realize there has to be a balance. There has to be a blend between regions of the country—big States, small States, donor States, donee—and I think they have done about as good as they could to this point.

I know you will work with Senator CHAFEE and Senator BAUCUS to see if your concerns can be worked out, but also I think that most of the amendments that you might want to offer to help solve your problem really would be available. Now, maybe not every one that you can think of—and I know you don't want to give up anything, but I think you also understand, as the majority leader, this tends to make people focus. We kind of gloated all week; the managers are doing the best they can and they made some good progress. The Senate really hasn't been paying attention. Just now they are beginning to say, ''Wait, what does this mean, what exactly do I get—90.07 or do I get 91.2 cents back on a dollar?'' So, by doing what I have done, this tends to make people say, OK, the train is leaving. It also limits the debate. If we get cloture, in 30 hours we are finished with this bill. So I understand what you are doing, and I hope you understand what I am doing. Try to work it out if you can.

I urge all Senators to vote for cloture so we can begin to move toward bringing this to closure. I think it will put pressure on the other body to act. Remember, funds are going to be running out on May 1. I have made extra efforts and have met with a lot of Senators to try to get this bill done because I don't want to be blamed when May 1 comes. I don't think anybody would want to do that. We better find a way to make this happen.

The cloture vote will occur at 5:30 on Monday. I hope Senators will vote for cloture. I will continue to try to obtain a consent that allows the Senate to consider these two issues in a fair and orderly fashion. And, certainly, on Monday when we are back, we will get right back to this and see if we can move it along.

Mr. LEVIN. If the majority leader will yield, I want to assure him that the so-called ''donor States''—at least, I think I speak for many of those Senators—have been very focused indeed for quite a long time on this issue. It just didn't arise after cloture was filed today. As the majority leader knows, we have worked very hard with the managers. Once we got the analysis of their amendment, we agreed that that amendment would be added as original text. The analysis came in less than 24 hours ago.

I know all the States in the Union feel that they want to do better. We all want a bill. Everybody wants a bill. We are determined to get a bill. Those of us who live in northern States surely would like it before May 1 because we are the ones that a tardy approval of the bill will hurt in terms of getting contracts signed. I know all of my colleagues, whether we are donor States or donee States, will work with the managers to try to come up with something over the weekend if possible.

I thank the majority leader.

Mr. STEVENS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I was in a meeting and I heard a unanimous consent request that I didn't quite understand. Was that granted?

Mr. LOTT. The unanimous consent request was objected to with regard to the Banking and Finance Committee provisions.

Mr. STEVENS. The leader has already set a cloture vote for when?

Mr. LOTT. It is 5:30 on Monday.

Mr. STEVENS. What does that do to the banking provision then? Will everything in the banking amendment then have to be germane?

Mr. LOTT. Unless we get permission for the Banking and Finance Committee provisions to be allowed, and that would be my intent. But Senators who have some concerns with it—with the formula, really, the donor States, see this as a way, speaking candidly, to keep a little pressure on this whole issue. Hopefully, we can work their concerns out, and then we would be able to get permission to add the Banking and Finance Committee provisions at that point. But that might be Wednesday of next week.

Mr. STEVENS. I might say to the leader, I am one of those who is disturbed over this ''donor'' or ''donee'' designation. As I said the other day, my State is in neither circumstance because we don't have the roads yet. I don't know what this does to us as far as the process is concerned.

May I inquire, before this cloture vote, will we have a breakdown and analysis of the bill on what each State would be entitled to? I have been trying to get that, and I have seen several different versions of what each State is entitled to under the bill. But beyond that, I have some questions about what happens to States that don't have roads.

We have the situation in our State where we are trying to build roads. This bill basically deals with the improvement of existing roads. I think this donor/donee thing sort of means maybe we ought to have a referendum to see whether the State of Alaska can become independent rather than Puerto Rico, because we would be much better off with the money we send to the Treasury. We send money to the Treasury in terms of the revenue from 25 percent of the oil that is produced in the United States. We try to get some of that back in terms of highways and find out we can't do it. I find that it's getting a little serious, as far as we are concerned.

Mr. Leader, I looked, and we have increased the number of miles of roads in our State by 1,100 miles in 40 years. But we had none to start with. Alaska is one-fifth the size of the United States. I am afraid what this means, suddenly, is that we are shut out again for another 6 years. The leader may remember that I had a little bit of an argument 5 years ago on this. We are right back there again. I am at a loss as to what this means to us.

Mr. LOTT. In answer to the Senator's question, I might say that I believe an

analysis would be available. I have learned that you can get two different lists, and they might sometimes show a little different analysis or interpretation than what is in the bill.

Would the chairman of the committee like to respond?

Mr. CHAFEE. Well, we certainly have tables and charts that will show what Alaska got under ISTEA I, what Alaska gets under ISTEA II, what Alaska gets under ISTEA II with the added money in the so-called Chafee amendment, what those total dollars are, what the total dollars are in ISTEA II, as amended, compared to ISTEA I. The percentage of the total moneys that are given out, I think, are pretty elaborate—the figures that we have provided. It isn't anything new.

Mr. STEVENS. What I am disturbed about is this concept of 91 percent of the money paid into the Treasury on the gas tax will be returned to each State. How about 91 percent of the money paid into the Treasury from any oil-producing State? We send more money to the Treasury every day than any one of these donor States do. We are not getting it back and we are not getting any roads. I am really getting disturbed.

I must say, Leader, I asked to be notified so I could come and deal with the objection. I understand there is nothing to object to over the cloture vote. But somehow or other, we have to find some way to recognize the plight of States that do not have revenue going into the gas tax fund because they don't have roads. But we are sending more money to the Federal Treasury than any State in the Union with regard to resource production. How about some of that coming back to us? Let us build highways with part of our own tax revenues. Somehow, that has to be worked out. I don't want to be at cross purposes with the leader, but I shall have to vote against cloture once again.

I don't like to do that with the leadership, but it seems to me that there ought to be some way to work out this donor/donee business with relationship to how much money is the State paying into the Treasury from its activities.

These are State lands, Mr. President. We own the lands that the oil is produced from. We send 25 percent of the domestically produced oil to the United States. We could sell it in the world market for a lot more money. But it is getting to be a great problem to me to figure out how to deal with the future for my State. If we can't build roads, we are no longer going to be able to get subsidies for mail transportation, and we have many more of our communities becoming totally isolated now because of the Federal policies that forbid us from building roads across Federal lands in the first place.

Mr. LOTT. Let me say, Mr. President, if I could reclaim my time, I certainly understand what the Senator is saying. I am sympathetic to his concerns. Certainly, he is not getting into cross purposes with me. I am trying to bring this to a conclusion. I understand why he will vote the way he will. By the way, if you want to keep more of that oil and gas revenue in Alaska, put me down, I will be with you. We need to find more ways to leave more money with the people in the States anyway.

Mr. STEVENS. The leader has always been with us. But I have to find a way out of this hole we are in right now, both on building ferries and building roads. I don't have that answer yet. I will be here again and again, Mr. President. Thank you very much.

## MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each.

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

## THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Thursday, March 5, 1998, the federal debt stood at $5,528,529,698,719.50 (Five trillion, five hundred twenty-eight billion, five hundred twenty-nine million, six hundred ninety-eight thousand, seven hundred nineteen dollars and fifty cents).

One year ago, March 5, 1997, the federal debt stood at $5,359,515,000,000 (Five trillion, three hundred fifty-nine billion, five hundred fifteen million).

Five years ago, March 5, 1993, the federal debt stood at $4,211,535,000,000 (Four trillion, two hundred eleven billion, five hundred thirty-five million).

Twenty-five years ago, March 5, 1973, the federal debt stood at $451,246,000,000 (Four hundred fifty-one billion, two hundred forty-six million) which reflects a debt increase of more than $5 trillion—$5,077,283,698,719.50 (Five trillion, seventy-seven billion, two hundred eighty-three million, six hundred ninety-eight thousand, seven hundred nineteen dollars and fifty cents) during the past 25 years.

## U.S. FOREIGN OIL CONSUMPTION FOR WEEK ENDING FEBRUARY 27TH

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the American Petroleum Institute reports that for the week ending February 27, the U.S. imported 7,649,000 barrels of oil each day, 544,000 barrels more than the 7,105,000 imported each day during the same week a year ago.

Americans relied on foreign oil for 54.7 percent of their needs last week, and there are no signs that the upward spiral will abate. Before the Persian Gulf War, the United States obtained approximately 45 percent of its oil supply from foreign countries. During the Arab oil embargo in the 1970s, foreign oil accounted for only 35 percent of America's oil supply.

Anybody else interested in restoring domestic production of oil? By U.S. producers using American workers?

Politicians had better ponder the economic calamity sure to occur in America if and when foreign producers shut off our supply—or double the already enormous cost of imported oil flowing into the U.S.—now 7,649,000 barrels a day.

## THE SITUATION IN KOSOVO

Mr. BIDEN. I rise today to condemn the murderous attacks carried out by Serbian paramilitary units against civilians in the province of Kosovo.

Mr. President, the immediate cause of the violence was an attack several days ago by units of the so-called Kosovo Liberation Army, which killed four Serbian police. The fundamental cause, however, is the Serbian government s brutal repression of the ethnic Albanians, who make up more than ninety percent of Kosovo s population.

In 1989, Slobodan Milosevic, as part of his demogogic policy of whipping up Serb ultra-nationalism, abolished the autonomous status of Kosovo, granted by the Yugoslav Constitution of 1974.

Flooding the province with Yugoslav military units, special police forces, and nationalist militias, Milosevic set up a police state that has prevented the ethnic Albanians from exercising their basic political and cultural rights.

To their credit, Kosovo s Albanian leadership, led by Ibrahim Rugova, opted for a non-violent approach in their struggle for independence. They established alternative institutions, including a shadow parliament with various political parties, independent schools, and trade unions.

For eight years Mr. Rugova was able to keep the lid on a potentially explosive situation. Inevitably, however, the weight of Serbian repression had its effect, particularly on younger Kosovars, as the ethnic Albanians of Kosovo are called.

A so-called Kosovo Liberation Army was formed, and last year began an armed campaign against Serbian officials and ethnic Serb civilians. While this development is understandable, Mr. President, it is regrettable. Aside from causing casualties and deaths, the armed resistance has provided Milosevic the pretext for his brutal crack-down.

The violence in Kosovo could provide the spark to ignite the Balkan tinderbox into full-scale regional war, which, in the worst case, could bring in neighboring Albania, Macedonia—and perhaps even Bulgaria, Greece, and Turkey.

Immediate action is necessary. Already the Administration is consulting with our NATO allies about an appropriate response. One immediate step should be to extend the mandate of the NATO-led UNPREDEP, the U.N. preventive deployment force in neighboring Macedonia which includes several