

that when we look at the numbers of applications that will be coming in, I have to tell you that there will not be nearly enough resources to do them all. I hope that, in the fullness of time, we will be able to get a better allocation for mass transit generally. I think we are being very, very myopic as it relates to the manner in which we are allocating resources nationwide. It is easy to put money in and justify for highways. It has a very strong base of support. That is undeniable. But something that is even more important, or equally as important, is when we look at our major urban centers throughout this country, we are going to begin to find in those fast-developing areas in the South and far West, as people migrate, you are going to have incredible problems, whether it be in Atlanta, Denver, Memphis, et cetera. As these areas build and develop, we are going to want to be able to move these people. Unless we provide the resources, it's not going to happen. So we have had a rather unbalanced—I think the last time we provided any moneys was in the legislation that I authored, and I had a tremendous battle, back in 1982. It authorized 1 penny out of the nickel to be set aside from gasoline for mass transit.

Let me say this to you. If it sounds like I am self-aggrandizing, I don't mean to. But, thank God, we were able to get those moneys set aside. I have heard more people complaining about that. What a myopic view. Where would some of the systems in their States be? They have come on rather recently, and they have applications for more, and I am talking about large States that have to move large numbers of people. Their representatives are complaining about that 1 penny set-aside. Well, what would you have then in terms of any type of new start or mass transportation? We would not be having this debate and we would not be having a mass transit bill.

Some people say, oh, we don't care, we don't need it, we don't want it. That is a rather narrow-minded point of view. So I have to say, thank God, we are at this point where at least we have limited resources that have been provided as a result of the 1 penny set-aside as opposed to no resources that we would have. We would not have any. So maybe we are lucky that the Senator, at this point in time, can come to the floor and say, "Listen, we want a better allocation on that." I don't fault him for that. I think he has real merit in his position of saying, "There is this need, so can't we do better?" I say to the Senator that I want to try to do better under these. I hope we can come to the floor some day, sooner rather than later, because the expressed, absolute need—by the way, we save lives. When you get people out of the automobiles in congested areas where sometimes they are stuck 30 minutes when coming through a bridge or tunnel, whatever, and put them on a modern system that moves them back and

forth, you take out tons and tons of pollution.

We have one project that we are looking at in terms of removing 1 million trucks a year off of the roads between New York and New Jersey. It is a tunnel project. It is not part of this bill. They estimate that we will be able, as a result of this one tunnel, to save in the New York City region 3,000 lives annually—3,000 people who otherwise would be dying. That is not to talk about the incredible hospital costs that go into it, the hundreds of millions of dollars in terms of asthmatics, et cetera. That is just one little project.

We are talking about another one for moving 100,000 people a day who now have to make a cross-town transfer. They come into New York City on one side of the city and then have to transfer and go all the way over to the other side to get to their job, and then come all the way over again. They are talking about eliminating 12,000 taxicab rides a day. They are talking about saving \$900 a year for 100,000 people who have to pay then to go back and forth. In terms of hours, it's about an hour a day for each one of these 100,000 people. So the man-hours can be saved.

The pollution that would result will be cut down, and the quality of life will be enhanced. These are the kinds of things that can and should be available to us. There is an underlying problem in this bill—a big one: we don't provide sufficient resources. We can't, unfortunately. There are the budget constraints. So, I think we all have to recognize that there has to be a little give and take on this thing. This is not going to be good for us if we have to make changes in terms of a parochial sense to take less. I think the Senator from Maryland stated it well. We get back a smaller percentage as it relates to the highway that we received previously. But we had to recognize that there are expanding areas and they need some money. I am willing to recognize that here. But I need some help in arriving at that, because there is an underlying deficiency. I might say to those colleagues who are going to say we need more, then help us and support us when it comes to providing additional resources for all of mass transit, so that we can see that rural America and urban America are not in conflict and we can make those needs.

Right now, our job becomes impossible to meet all of the needs, due to the lack of resources. That is a fact. And were it not for the incredible work of the Budget Committee, and particularly Senator DOMENICI, in finding available resources, we would not even be at this point, and the inequity and problems would be even greater.

So I thank my colleague, Senator SARBANES. Again, I want to commend the Senator from Colorado for coming forth in a way, hopefully, that will provide additional resources to the people not only in this region but in like regions throughout the country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I wonder if I may have 10 minutes to speak out of order.

Mr. D'AMATO. I have no objection.

(The remarks of Mr. WELLSTONE pertaining to the submission of S. Con. Res. 82 are located in today's RECORD under "Submission of concurrent and Senate Resolutions.")

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be able to move on and talk about one related matter for 5 additional minutes.

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

TIBETAN UPRISING DAY

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, today is the 39th anniversary of the Tibetan Uprising Day. On March 10, 1959, the Tibetans instigated a massive uprising against the Chinese in Lhasa, the Tibetan capital. It was ruthlessly suppressed by military force. An estimated 80,000 Tibetans were killed, and the Dalai Lama was forced to flee, seeking refuge in India. Every year, on March 10, the Tibetans in exile gather to commemorate the anniversary of this unfortunate day and to protest the continued occupation of Tibet.

Mr. President, there are demonstrations all across the country which commemorate this day, March 10, 1959. And I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the meaning of today to the people in Tibet and to make a linkage to what we are doing on the floor—again, with Senator MACK from Florida, with Senator HUTCHINSON from Arkansas, with Senator FEINGOLD from Wisconsin.

By the end of this week, because of the personal commitment of the majority leader, we will have an up-or-down vote on a resolution, or an amendment to a bill, which will call on the President to put the full force of the United States authority behind the resolution which will be critical of or condemn human rights violations in China before the International Commission on Human Rights, which is going to start meeting on March 16.

I have a letter which was translated into English—but I am going to keep this forever, because I think it is such a great thing—from Wei Jingsheng, which he wrote out in my office on Friday. This is an appeal by Wei, who spent 18 years in prison and had the courage to stand up for what he believes in. He will be nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize.

This is the request to the U.S. Senate to please go on record this week, before the International Commission on Human Rights meets, strongly behind a resolution calling on the President to do what the President has promised to do, calling on the administration to do what they promised to do, which is to move forward on a resolution at this Human Rights Commission in Geneva which will be critical of, or condemn,

the human rights in China, including the crushing of the culture and history and the people in Tibet.

Mr. President, silence on our part would be betrayal. It would be unconscionable. Our country is a great country because we support human rights. We support the freedoms of people. We support the idea that people should not be persecuted because of their religious practices. They should not be persecuted because they have the courage to challenge governments if one of those governments is left, or right, or center.

I said it yesterday, but I will say it one more time today. I hope we will work with the President. We are going to get a strong vote for this resolution. I hope the President and the administration will do the right thing. I have myself been calling the State Department. I think Secretary Albright wants to move forward on this. I have not had a chance to talk to her. She is, of course, abroad, working on another very important question about what is happening to people in Kosovo—and rightfully so—trying to lead an international effort and making it clear to Milosevic that Serbia cannot with impunity do this to the people in Kosovo. I believe she is a strong advocate on human rights.

I talked to Strobe Talbott and to Sandy Berger. I have been putting calls in to their offices, and I think it is important that this week the administration come out with a clear position which would be a reasonable position, doing just what the President has said we ought to do. We don't link it to trade agreements, though I think we should. But this is the right place—at this U.N. Human Rights Commission—to be talking about these human rights violations.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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

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

INTERMODAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EFFICIENCY ACT OF 1997

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I believe that we have made substantial progress and, hopefully, we will be able to come to an accommodation that will meet the needs a number of my colleagues have expressed relating to the fixed rail modernization system. We are working on that at the present time. I hope we are going to be able to further deal with the question of New Starts in a way that will be satisfactory to my colleagues.

Last, but not least, it is my hope that we can resolve even the most contentious of points if those who are advocating changes will either meet with our staffs or come to the floor for the purposes of introducing their amendments so we can dispose of this significant portion of the bill, hopefully today. I believe we can, or certainly we can make very significant progress.

If we are not going to have agreement, then I can tell you it is my intent, after negotiations and after deliberations and debate, to move to table those amendments on which we cannot come to an agreement. But I hope we will work to the best of our ability. I think by putting this off we are not going to add to the likelihood of finishing this chapter of the bill today, and that is my hope.

This is an important piece of legislation which I believe the Senate, and I know Senator LOTT, our majority leader, is anxious to dispose of. That means the difference between States doing nothing and States beginning their highway projects in an orderly fashion, undertaking the necessary work to get their transit systems going and improving them. There are contracts that have to be let out. It takes time.

So, the sooner we get this done the more likely that some of the programs that otherwise will not continue, or start, this spring, will get started. We have to give the States assurance that there is going to be an orderly flow of funds. So I urge my colleagues if they have provisions or have statements they want to make, between now and 12:15 they can certainly come down. That would be a good time to make those statements. If there is legislation that they seek, now is the time to make it known to the committee, to the staff, and seek either an accommodation or action on their legislation. Certainly between now and 12:15, if anyone wants to come down to speak to these issues, or 12:30 when we go out—or thereafter, when we reconvene at 2:15—we are ready, willing and able to deal with whatever ramifications my colleagues might have or whatever legislative solution they might look for. We are willing to discuss and entertain their legislative proposals, again, by way of staff work directly, or the Senator meeting with his colleagues and/or Senators offering legislation. We can attempt to dispose of their legislative proposals one way or the other.

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. SARBANES. 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. SARBANES. Mr. President, I just want to make a few points about the importance of transit as we are considering this amendment.

First of all, when we had the energy crisis, there was a tremendous focus at the time on transit, which in a sense faded from the scene because we no longer confront an energy crisis. But it is very important to underscore how energy efficient mass transit is in terms of moving people and goods. We have developed and, of course, even improved technology with respect to low emissions on clean-fuel buses, clean technology for light rail systems and for heavy rail systems.

People have to understand that means it is just that much less oil we have to import. So we are able to decrease our dependence on foreign oil by developing transit systems. And, of course, we are able to, as a consequence, improve our balance of payments situation. We often lose sight of that. We do not talk about that very much nowadays because energy isn't seen as a critical issue. But I simply want to remind people that at the time when we had the oil embargoes and everything, there was a tremendous emphasis on transit and its importance.

Secondly, the importance of transit for improving the environment I think is indisputable. It is estimated that over 40 percent, between 40 and 50 percent, of all Americans live in areas with unhealthy air, according to the EPA. In many communities, transit investments are a cornerstone of the strategies to achieve air quality standards. A failure to develop transit capacity will undermine our efforts to give millions of Americans cleaner air to breathe. So we have to recognize that transit is important for environmental purposes as well.

Thirdly, traffic congestion in our Nation's largest 50 cities is estimated to cost travelers over \$50 billion annually, just from the bottlenecks and the gridlocks. These delays translate directly into added cost to businesses and to individuals. Transit carries the equivalent of 5 million additional automobiles per year. People need to sort of envision what would happen if we did not have these transit systems. You would have utter chaos.

So we have to address this congestion and delay cost for millions of American motorists. And it is interesting to note, transit is used disproportionately during peak periods, peak-period commuting, which is exactly the same time when the roads are at their most congested. So, obviously, it serves a very important purpose in limiting or diminishing the amount of congestion that would otherwise occur on the highways.

Now, not only does it eliminate or decrease the amount of congestion, transit also provides essential access for people to jobs and shopping and medical services. It is estimated there are about 80 million or above Americans who do not drive, in other words, people who, to get around independently, are totally dependent on transit.

Transit is also essential now as we focus on moving people from welfare to