

al Highway Administration. That report made three critical findings:

(T)he principle finding is that dramatic improvement over the current formula is not likely to be achieved.

In short, no compelling case could be made for endorsing any specific change in the current formula at this time."

"Statewide fuel consumption does not necessarily reflect interstate use. Often diesel bought in one State is used by trucks traveling through another State." "Reporting systems are not uniform among States (for determining fuel usage)" and "statewide consumption of gasoline does not necessarily reflect use, condition or need."

Secretary Dole stated similar concerns with the gasoline and diesel fuel factors in a letter dated September 10, 1985. It is clear that the conditions have not changed markedly since the release of the 1983 study and it would be unwise to effect a change in the formula at this time. The current formula is equitable and should be retained.

While the rest of the bill is good and necessary and should be passed, I am hopeful that before this important legislation is approved by the Congress section 107 will be changed so the current allocation formula can be maintained.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the attention of the gentleman from New Jersey for the purpose of entering into a colloquy.

Mr. HOWARD, I am deeply concerned about section 107 of this legislation which revises the formula for the distribution of funds for restoration, resurfacing, rehabilitating, and reconstructing the Interstate System. My State and 28 others will lose a significant amount of funding under this change. We strongly oppose this revision. But, I recognize that the votes are not favorable in the House to changing this provision. However, I also note that the Senate bill makes no change in the 4R formula. Is that the gentleman's understanding?

Mr. HOWARD. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman from Utah is correct. The bill reported from the Senate committee does not change the formula.

Mr. MONSON. I would ask the gentleman if he would look favorably on the Senate approach when this bill goes to conference?

Mr. HOWARD. We know that compromise is always necessary in the legislative process. I assure the gentleman we will look at his concerns.

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

Mr. MONSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I would say that while our committee strongly supported the formula change, we recognize there is going to have to be compromise with the other body, and we will approach this issue in the spirit of compromise.

Mr. MONSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I appreciate very much their willingness to consider this important matter, because it does affect so many States in our country and their ability to maintain the interstate highway system.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to discuss with the chairman of the Subcommittee on Surface Transportation and the ranking member a matter involving the study required in section 153 of the Surface Transportation Act, for a study of the bridge formula.

I just want to make it clear that as the Transportation Research Board goes forward with the study required under this legislation, that the board will consult with truck manufacturers in a very important matter that our Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight has had under review for some time, and that is the location of the front steering axle.

I feel it is very important, and I hope the chairman and the ranking member will concur, that the report should address whether there are influences restricting vehicle maneuverability, ride quality of the truck, safe entry and exit access by operators and other related matters, rideability, and so forth.

Would it be the chairman's view that the Transportation Research Board should consult, should bring those factors into this report, so that they could be fully evaluated by the Public Works and Transportation Committee at the appropriate time.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, in listening to the gentleman's remarks and the notes I have here on the gentleman's remarks, it is certainly a possibility, what the gentleman is suggesting. I suppose I could almost say yes, but it is surely a possibility.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I certainly concur with my good friend, the gentleman from Minnesota.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. PETRI

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Chairman, I offer several amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. PETRI: Page 223, line 9, strike out "architectural".

Page 223, line 10, strike out "and" and insert in lieu thereof ", or architectural".

Page 148, strike out line 20 and all that follows through line 13 on page 149.

Redesignate the subsequent sections of title I accordingly. Conform the table of contents accordingly.

Page 34, line 11, strike out "architectural".

Page 34, line 12, strike out "and" and insert in lieu thereof ", or architectural".

Mr. PETRI (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered as read and printed in the RECORD, and that they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I would simply say that these are simply technical amendments which bring the bill in conformity, correcting some typographical errors. I understand there is no problem with them.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw by reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Chairman, these are technical amendments, and I believe they are acceptable to both sides.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, we accept the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. PETRI].

The amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WAXMAN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WAXMAN: Page 240, strike line 8 and all that follows through line 3 on page 241 and insert:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall not enter into any contract with the Southern California Rapid Transit District to fund construction of the Minimum Operable Segment-1 until completion of a supplemental environmental impact statement for the entire Downtown Los Angeles to the San Fernando Valley Metro Rail Project and until such construction is authorized by an Act of Congress enacted after the date of enactment of this Act.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, I have a very unusual request to make. I am offering an amendment to strike the funds for a Metrorail subway system that is 90 percent within my district.

I come to you as a former supporter of this system, because I know that a city like Los Angeles, with all the congestion and traffic we have, needs something other than relying on automobiles to get us around. We need a rapid transit system.

But I supported this subway system until one day an explosion took place in the Fairfax area of Los Angeles. And when the city looked at the

reason for that explosion, they said there was a methane gas pocket, and when the methane gas got to a certain level, it became explosive.

We turned to the Metrorail people and said, how can you plan a tunnel through a methane gas area? They came back and said they thought they could do it safely.

We set up a commission to look at the problems in one part of the system. We looked at the problems in others. There are some experts who say do not worry. A lot of technicians will say, we can handle it. Some of the technical people have said to us, this whole system is fraught with peril.

Now the Metrorail system in Los Angeles has taken on a life of its own. People are not asking is it safe. They want to assume it is safe because they want to get started. What they are asking to do is to get started by the end of this year on the first segment, the first 4 miles of the subway. They want to start tunneling, notwithstanding they may tunnel into an earthquake fault, a methane gas pocket, an abandoned oil well, and kill the workers on that project. They want to get started.

Why do they want to get started? They want to get started so that they can come back and say, "We have already started. Continue to put money into the system."

□ 1440

That does not strike me as a responsible way for the rapid transit people in Los Angeles to act or for Members of Congress in supporting the needed authorization and appropriation for money for the project.

What we are seeking to do is to have UMTA stop moving forward with this system. It does not make sense to start a system when we do not know where it is going; they have not even completed the route. They have not done the environmental impact statement on the rest of the route. They are looking at several options.

We insisted, by the way, in the appropriations bill last year that they avoid that area where there was the explosion. So now they are avoiding that area, but they are planning to tunnel through areas that are equally as dangerous as that area. Three of the four routes they are looking at would tunnel through earthquake faults, methane gas pockets, et cetera.

Let us not throw a billion dollars into this thing and start a construction that will then take on even more of a life of its own until we have established that they have done all the environmental studies, that the whole thing makes sense and that it is going to be economically feasible.

My concerns at first were about the safety because of the explosion. Because of the earthquake faults and the methane gas. But I must tell you I have very deep misgivings about the whole system and whether they ought to go forward at all on the route they

have selected in their transportation patterns, whether they are going to have the ridership to justify it.

I want to point out this system they envision is the most expensive subway system in the world. There is nothing that has been built that is as expensive as this one is projected to be. I also want to point out there has never been a subway system in as dangerous an area as they would have us tunnel if they can get these funds to go forward.

We have appropriated money for the first segment; they can continue doing their research on alternative routes; they can continue to look for safer ways and safer alternatives to what they are planning. But this bill would mandate that there must be a contract between the Urban Mass Transit Authority and the LA people, not after their environmental impact study has been approved, but only after it is filed. Six months later, no matter what the circumstances were, we would have to have a contract already signed. This bill would insist upon it and demand it of the Urban Mass Transit Authority.

I think this is premature to have a contract for the remaining part of this subway and they have not even figured out where they are going. My message to the Members is: Do not spend a billion dollars digging a hole for a subway system where we do not know where it is going, we do not know if it is going to make any sense when it is completed, and we may end up blowing up the workers and the riders in the subway system.

Many of my friends, good friends, in the Los Angeles delegation are going to come here and oppose this amendment because they are committed to it; we have a difference of views. But I do want to point out that this subway system, except for that first segment, which is Congressman ROYBAL's district, is 90 percent in my congressional district. The people in my district are telling me: "Do not do it. Do not start it." They do not have confidence in the RTD and they do not have confidence in this metro system itself. They do not want to have the communities and neighborhoods disrupted and they are urging me to urge the Members not to start something until we know it makes sense to go forward and finish.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, Los Angeles is the only city of its size in the world that does not have a rail transit system. Yet this city has a demonstrated need for efficient rail transit.

Los Angeles, has an urbanized population of 9.4 million and is the second most populous urban area in the country. Population projections indicate that it will increase by another 2 to 3.5 million people by the year 2000. So, if

you take the city of Houston, and set it on top of what we already have in Los Angeles, you'd have an idea of what the Los Angeles area is going to look like in 15 years. And a large proportion of the growing population is composed of elderly people and minority groups who are generally transit-dependent.

The Wilshire corridor, where the 18.6 mile Metrorail project is to be constructed, is the most densely developed corridor west of New York City in the United States. New York City has over 200 miles of subway to service its densely developed areas. L.A., however, has no rail transit. And future growth in the corridor will increase densities considerably. The 15 to 20 million square feet of commercial development that is scheduled for completion by 1990 alone will bring an additional 120,000 people downtown everyday.

This concentration of population and employment has produced such severe congestion that during peak commuter periods traffic on freeways signed at 55 miles per hour travels at 15 to 25 miles per hour. By the year 2000 these speeds will be reduced to between 5 to 10 miles per hour. Three 8-lane highways would be required to handle the amount of travel that has been projected.

Phenomenal increases in the use of public transportation over the last 10 years reflect a strong demand for transit service and a willingness on the part of people to use public transportation. Annual increases of between 30,000 to 40,000 additional daily riders in recent years have resulted in a total of 200,000 daily transit riders in the Wilshire corridor today.

The L.A. Metrorail project provides one part of the only realistic solution to the serious transportation problems in this corridor and the demand that exists for transit service. Once metrorail is constructed 100,000 fewer cars will be required on the streets of the Wilshire corridor. The rail system will provide 275,000 rides a day with a means of transportation.

The metrorail project has consistently been judged by the administration to be the most cost-effective rail project in the entire nation. The project meets all the rigorous transportation and financial standards established by administration transit experts. In terms of ridership, local fiscal commitment and private sector participation, the metrorail is superior to every other project in the country.

The consistent and widespread support that the L.A. Metrorail has received over the years, and throughout the continued and detailed scrutiny that it has undergone, cannot and should not be ignored. The Governor of California, George Deukmejian (see attached telegram), supports the project and remains strong in his commitment of \$400 million in State funds for it. Senator CRANSTON, Senator

WILSON, Mayor Tom Bradley, and most of us in our very diverse congressional delegation enthusiastically support the metrorail.

And the people in the area showed their support by voting for a special one-half cent increase in the county sales tax, a portion of which was dedicated to funding a rail transit system. Even the Reagan administration recognizes the merits of this project. On July 11 the Department of Transportation announced that an agreement had been reached to sign a full funding contract with SCRTD to begin construction of this first segment of metrorail.

Can we ignore the support of so many and well-informed groups and individuals? I urge defeat of the amendment.

Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment. As my colleagues will recall, over the past 4 years or so I have been coming to the floor with similar amendments to oppose this project. Initially I was alone; there was no other local public official who supported my position. But the reason that I opposed it was because I had studied the route, I had taken a look at the Department of Interior maps, I had seen the underground oil wells and methane pockets, I had taken a look at the studies regarding the numbers of people that were going to be riding this route and determined along with a number of independent experts who specialize in this field that this project simply should not be built.

□ 1450

Now, initially we are talking about a project that supposedly, for an 18½-mile system, was going to cost \$1.1 billion. Even though construction has not even started, over the past few years that estimate has changed radically. Today we are told the first 4 miles will cost \$1.1 billion, and who knows what the balance of it is going to cost, because, very frankly, nobody knows where the system is going.

That is part of the reason why the supporters of this system believe they have got to ramrod this thing through. They have got to guarantee that millions of taxpayer dollars are being funneled into this system because they do not know what they are going to actually end up having and whether or not they are actually going to be able to persuade logical Members of the House who have to make decisions based upon Gramm-Rudman in the fiscal reality of today to support it. So they are trying to jam the entire project through, forcing approval of environmental impact reports, because they do not even have any idea of where it is going to go.

There has been some discussion about some of the additional costs that would occur as a result of the safety recommendations of the special

investigative study done by a panel of experts which was put together not before the project was approved by the Congress but after the methane gas explosion, which injured 22 people. The question was asked as to what the cost of these construction changes was going to be, and I would like to quote from a colloquy that went on between one of my colleagues, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN], in committee and the general manager of the RTD who was responding to a question about what some of these costs may be, and he said this: "The total estimated cost is not more than \$5 to \$6 million." Now, we are talking about major structural requirements.

He is saying that it is only going to cost \$5 to \$6 million, and that it could be less than that.

I continue to quote: "The difficulty is we don't know exactly what the cost of some of the construction ones are until we get into it."

In response to that, I talked with one of the experts who served on the panel because that seemed like an extremely low level of expenditure given the enormous challenge since they were going to go from a plastic liner to perhaps a steel liner to try to prevent any penetration of gas while the tunneling and subsequent operation of the subway was taking place.

And he said this: "While we were prohibited by mandate from discussing any questions of subway cost * * *"—they did not have the courage to let the discussion of the actual costs go on in this committee because they knew they would be prohibitive; now, they go on to say, and I quote:

Our attention was directed to the issue of expense a number of times because of the recognition by individual committee members that our recommendations as well as those of the in house committee would have a substantial impact on the overall cost of the project, if they were implemented in the serious way we contemplated.

It is therefore with some sense of surprise and chagrin that I have been informed that John Dyer, general manager of the SCRTD, testified before your committee that complete implementation of all recommendations would not exceed \$6 million.

That figure indicates that either the SCRTD does not take seriously our findings or that they have no intention of implementing these findings in the manner contemplated. The committee findings include several items which could affect the entire project.

In addition to that, the President has consistently opposed this project and recently was quoted on the air saying this:

Let's face it, there's a ton of fat in this trillion dollar government. I'm talking about government spending over \$2 billion for a Los Angeles transit system, about as much as government collects in revenues from all the individual income taxpayers from the State of Mississippi alone.

As far as the route itself is concerned, not only is there not agreement on where they are headed, but in the Los Angeles Times recently, on

May 21, they talked about what kind of a route might go from one end of this 4-mile system to the other, and the Times heads a statement in the newspaper: "Favored Metro Rail path most attacked."

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. TRAXLER). The time of the gentlewoman from California [Ms. FIEDLER] has expired.

(On request of Mr. WAXMAN, and by unanimous consent, Ms. FIEDLER was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Chairman, in addition to these points, there is the fact that they do not know where they are going, and they do not really know what it is going to cost if they do not know where they are going because they are talking about its being possibly underground for part of the way and possibly above ground for part of the way, and they will find out when they get there.

In addition to that, they have already begun to waste some of our taxpayers' money on this project. I reference another article in the Los Angeles Times this week about the Metrorail system. Now, remember, this project has not been finally funded and an agreement has not been made. They are talking about spending a half million dollars alone on art work for the subway system. It seems to me that if they cannot figure out what the cost is going to be for the actual construction and safety requirements that have been suggested by the special technical committee but they can spend their time figuring out how to waste a half million dollars on art work, they are really running in the wrong direction and it would be very unwise of this House to approve this system today without adopting the Waxman amendment, which, I believe, will provide the necessary protections for future approval if the House should deem it necessary.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield to me?

Ms. FIEDLER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WAXMAN. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

The gentlewoman does speak correctly when she indicates that she alone opposed this Metrorail system several years ago and the rest of us supported it. I am pleased now that she is supporting my amendment, and perhaps she is pleased that I have come to agree with her.

Ms. FIEDLER. Absolutely.

Mr. WAXMAN. We are in agreement that there are serious questions about this whole system, enough so that we ought not to go forward.

We had a technical committee look at the first 4.4 miles. They are ready to start digging for that first 4.4 miles. The technical committee talked about abandoned oil wells. There used to be a lot of oil in the Los Angeles area. They had a lot of oil wells, and the oil

was pumped out. They asked what would happen if they would hit an oil well. Well, there would be a potential explosion.

So they said, "Well, they have got to get some sensing devices."

There is no such thing as a sensing device that will alert them until they hit one of those abandoned oil wells. They are going to have to feel their way through, put bells and whistles on all the equipment and hope that they are lucky.

It is a tenet of my liberal faith to be for rapid transit, and I speak to my Democratic colleagues who heard the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] talk about why Los Angeles needs rapid transit.

We need something desperately. We have congestion, we have too much traffic and we have too much pollution from automobiles, but because we want something does not mean that this is what we ought to vote for and ram through when it does not make sense. We have got to reevaluate it even though the RTD people are not willing to step back and reevaluate their own mistakes.

I just want to point out to my colleagues that there have been times when we have voted for things that did not turn out to be what the most optimistic supporters indicated they should be. We should not repeat the mistakes of other cities.

New York City is just completing a \$1 billion subway tunnel that has a leaking roof and no connection points to the subway system. Pittsburgh suffered through many years of embarrassment with a multimillion dollar bridge that went nowhere.

We do not need a tunnel in Los Angeles that is going to explode and is going to cost more money than we can afford.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from California [Ms. FIEDLER] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Miss FIEDLER was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Miss FIEDLER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond to a couple of the arguments that were made earlier by the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON]. He talked about this city being the largest city in the entire world without a rapid mass transit system.

If you take a look at some of the projections for this particular project—and remember those projections indicated that they were going to go along a specific 18½-mile route, and we do not have that 18½-mile route any longer—you will see that they expect to have a ridership 25 percent higher than New York City. Now, right now in New York they have about 50 percent of the population using public transportation. In Los Angeles they expect to have now 2½ percent of the population using public transit and an increase of one-half of 1 percent as a result of this subway

system. So they are not going to take masses of people off the road, even if every single person they project rides on the system, so I believe that the estimates are grossly inaccurate.

As far as the support of the Governor is concerned, we received in our office just today a letter from the Governor talking about this bill, and it listed about 4 provisions of this bill that the Governor thought were important. However, there was no mention whatsoever of the subway in this particular memorandum which just came in today dealing with this particular bill, which I think shows that there is not the kind of enthusiastic support from the State leadership that they are trying to project.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Miss FIEDLER. Yes, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to ask the gentlewoman if she believes that because the Governor did not have the subject mentioned in that interoffice memorandum, he is no longer supporting the system?

Miss FIEDLER. No; I do not mean to say that he is no longer supporting it, but I do recall that there was an article in the Daily News which indicated that he did have some questions about the economic aspects of it.

□ 1500

I know from the beginning he has not been overly enthusiastic because of the economic implications. I am not trying to speak for him. I am simply mentioning the fact in a memorandum sent to us today on this particular bill that they do not deem the Metrorail system to be sufficiently important to them from that standpoint.

Mr. DREIER of California. Was this a memorandum that he distributed?

Miss FIEDLER. No; this was sent by Karen Spencer. Her father is one of the lobbyists on the Metrorail, so it was rather unusual that it was not mentioned, given the amount of efforts that her family had put into it, but she is representing the administration's concern at the gubernatorial level and it was not mentioned in this memo.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlelady yield?

Miss FIEDLER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentlelady earlier asked me to yield about the Governor's office. The Governor's office today, contacted us and reassured us that they fully support this project. That is just today from the Governor's office.

Miss FIEDLER. Well, I am glad the gentleman received that communication from the Governor's office, because I, too, had communication with an important office, that of the OMB and spoke to the director, Mr. Miller,

on the issue, and they continue to strongly oppose it, as the administration has consistently, in spite of the fact that they have been pushed by the House committees to come to an agreement based upon the legislative effort of the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from California has again expired.

(At the request of Mr. WAXMAN, and by unanimous consent, Ms. FIEDLER was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. WAXMAN. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Miss FIEDLER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out that while my Democratic friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] appeals to the position of Republican Governor Deukmejian, I will appeal on the basis of the statement of the President of the United States when he singled this program out as one of the biggest wastes of money that he could imagine, and in one of his radio addresses condemned the whole idea of the L.A. Metrorail system.

Look, many people supported this thing, as did I, and locked themselves into it, and they are not in a position to reevaluate it.

I would be here supporting it, except for the fact that through a real explosion I started to pay attention to the matter to look at some of the details and the more I looked at some of these details, the more I am convinced that you cannot write a blank check for the RTD people in Los Angeles and tell them to go forward, here is \$1 billion, add some more to it, get started. I think that is a naive way for us to proceed.

I have lost confidence in this and I urge you if you have any doubts to hold back on funding this thing until we find out and we can decide whether the whole thing makes sense for us to fund in the future.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Miss FIEDLER. I am happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I was not really clear whether the memo the gentlewoman mentioned is from the Governor or is an internal memo of the office and is the opinion of some of the Governor's staff. I wonder if the gentlewoman could clarify that.

Miss FIEDLER. No; I said very specifically that it was a memo from Karen Spencer to the California delegation.

Mr. DIXON. To the gentlewoman's knowledge, does she know if the Governor has a position on this matter?

Miss FIEDLER. Well, I would not imagine that his staff would be taking a position on specific issues; without his authority. I do not know if he is aware of it.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield further?

Ms. FIEDLER. Not at this moment, I would like to respond to the gentleman.

Mr. DIXON. The gentlewoman does not know whether the Governor has a position on this or not?

Ms. FIEDLER. No; I do understand that the Governor does have a position in support of the project, but the point that I was making, is not that he did not support it, the point I was making was that he did not deem it sufficiently important, nor did his staff deem it sufficiently important, to mention it as one or four important areas in this bill to support.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to assure the Members of the House that no one wants to force this project through. I have heard that statement made several times. No one wants to force this project through because we want the project to continue because of the great need we find in Los Angeles and the surrounding areas.

We also want to make it clear that no one wants to proceed with a project that is not safe. That is as clear as it possibly can be.

The truth of the matter is just yesterday a letter was received by the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] and others that says in part:

Certainly the studies conducted in response to the March 1985, explosion and fire in the Wilshire-Fairfax area provide new information pertinent to the project. While this information prompted our careful review or reevaluation of the environmental record, it is not so significant that would find it necessary to invoke the more formal procedures associated with the filing of a supplemental EIS.

Now, let us say that is not correct. Let us go along with the request that the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] is making, but there is no need to go to the point where we delete all the funds for this project.

The truth of the matter is that the moneys that are now available for the construction of MOS-1 are moneys that will be spent for a project that is all in my district, not in the district of the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] or anyone else's district. All of that is in the district that I represent.

Now, if after that is done they do not want it to go west, I will support that contention. I will present to this House later on an amendment that will definitely, if it does pass, make it possible for a survey to be made to find out whether or not it is practical to extend this program to the east. In the eastern section of the city, we find a tremendous population that is unserved by mass transportation or any transportation at all practically, a group of people who come into the city of Los Angeles almost on a daily basis, who drive from 40 to 50 miles a day, that would need something like

this. That I will do, but to strike out these funds I believe is irresponsible.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ROYBAL. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The first segment is 4.4 miles. The whole system is supposed to be 18 miles. After the first 4.4 miles, which is in the district of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL], the present plan is to have it all go through my district for the remainder.

Now, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL] indicated that he is going to offer an amendment in a few minutes, after this one is disposed of, that would have them do a feasibility study by going east. Now, I am going to support that amendment, because one of the reasons we need rapid transit in Los Angeles is to get some of the people from the minority communities to work; but this whole system is not going through some of the communities that need the transportation the most.

I do not know whether it makes sense or not, but we ought to look at it.

The point I would make is this. We may not have anything more than a 4.4-mile subway system, at the cost of millions of dollars, and someone will pull to the east and someone else will pull to the west and we may decide to do nothing. Well, that is a tremendous waste of money to do that without knowing where the rest of it is going. If we decide to go east, that will be the decision. Then we will go with the money and then fund the whole system.

Mr. ROYBAL. The gentleman is drawing a conclusion that is not based on fact and is not based on study. The gentleman is asking for a study to the west and then deleting the money, regardless of which way that study goes.

Now, if that money is kept in place and a study is made, then whatever decision is made would be made on fact, not on fantasy. What I hear today are just merely opinions of individuals who have been against this project, no matter how good it was.

We need that project, I say to the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] in Los Angeles. The gentleman himself said that the city of Los Angeles needs transportation. Let us give it a chance. Let us leave the money in there and let us have an opportunity to get the survey the gentleman wants and have it done and then reach a conclusion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

(At the request of Mr. WAXMAN, and by unanimous consent, Mr. ROYBAL was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

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

Mr. ROYBAL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I think we need a rapid transit system in Los Angeles. I once supported this system until I saw that there are so many problems inherent in terms of safety, feasibility, and whether it makes financial sense to go forward with it.

Mr. ROYBAL. That is on the gentleman's side of the town.

Mr. WAXMAN. But let us not spend money on something until we know that there is going to be a whole system there. The gentleman would have us go to the east. It may make sense, it may not. The RTD people want it to go to the west.

Do we want to dig a hole and spend a billion dollars doing it, while we in Los Angeles decide whether we are going to have a rapid transit system or not and decide whether it is going to go east or west? It seems to me we should wait until we decide that and then spend the money on the system.

Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, I will not yield at this moment, because I think this deserves a response.

What the gentleman is saying again, sticking to his original premise, that what the gentleman wants is to delete the funds and then make a decision.

I say to the gentleman that the prudent and the smart thing to do is to leave the money in there, conduct those plans and studies and then make a recommendation and a finding based on those studies. I think that is the proper thing to do, and I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

(At the request of Ms. FIEDLER, and by unanimous consent, Mr. ROYBAL was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROYBAL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman read initially a letter which had been sent to my colleague and myself regarding the environmental impact study and said that there was not much relevance, given what was stated; but the truth is that from the time the explosion took place, Congressman WAXMAN held hearings regarding it. The concern was so great that they went from a fixed 18.6-mile route to a 4.4-mile route and they do not know where the balance of it is going, so the concern was rather great.

I would like to say also that I think the gentleman is right to ask for a study. The east Los Angeles area as well as other areas of the city have a very high level of need. In fact, I believe a need which is well in excess of the Wilshire quarter and ought to be

first or second, rather than last, which is what is going to happen when this money has funneled down Wilshire Boulevard. It is not going to end up in east LA or in the south-central part where there is the largest group of population that needs transit the most.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to the gentlewoman the thing to do is not to throw out the baby with the bath water, but let it live and breathe. Let us find out whether it has a future.

I do not know whether the route to the east side is feasible, I really do not. It may not be. Let us get a study and base our conclusion on that study.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

(At the request of Mr. DREIER of California, and by unanimous consent, Mr. ROYBAL was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Chairman, with the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROYBAL. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Chairman, just for a final closing comment, you will find I believe as you investigate the possibility of a route into east Los Angeles that there are a large number of above-ground lines in place and that for a relatively small amount of money, comparatively, and I have been told the estimates are about \$8 million a mile, that it is feasible to take a route of that kind. To drain very important public transit resources on a \$300-million-a-mile system is going to take away the resources that could reach a broad segment of the community, instead of funneling it into a very narrow segment with a very tiny population to be served. That is one of the reasons I opposed this project, and also would expect to support the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL] when the time comes.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROYBAL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding.

I think it is important for us to realize that there is no possibility whatsoever that this could only become a 4.4-mile system. The fact of the matter is that there are tremendous packages along the New Century Freeway and other areas where light rail is being installed and it is an integral part of this whole overall package. So some who fear that it might become only a 4.4-mile system, I believe are wrong because of local funding which has continued to proceed.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, just again in conclusion, my position is not set in concrete. I do not say that the only way to go is east. What I say is that a study should be made that would include the study that the gen-

tleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] wants and that a determination be made on those studies.

It could well be that the study will indicate that it is feasible to go both ways, but I do not know. I am not an engineer and I am not an expert in this field at all; however, there are people who are experts who can conduct these studies. We in the Congress who are not experts I think can go along with those experts who make these recommendations.

What I am asking today is that we just do not throw out the entire project simply because we have some misconceived idea that it is no good and that it cannot go any place, but let us do it right, let us do what we can to accommodate the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN], as far as his study is concerned.

Let us do the same thing so far as my recommendations and let us come up with a recommendation, but let us not delete the money that is being deleted by this amendment.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ROYBAL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I do want the Members to know that this amendment provides for environmental impact studies to go on. We would have funds still available for them to do these other activities, to see where they want to go. We are not deleting the funds for that. We are deleting funds for them to start until we know where it is going.

I appreciate the genuine differences that I have with my good friend.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, what the gentleman is doing is deleting all the funds for my district.

Mr. WAXMAN. And the rest of the program as well.

Mr. ROYBAL. No, only my district.

Mr. WAXMAN. No, all of it. The gentleman has already admitted, this is the rest of the bill.

□ 1515

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

Mr. Chairman, it is certainly with great reluctance that I rise in opposition to this amendment, primarily because the gentleman from California, Mr. HENRY WAXMAN, and I have joined a long time ago in political alliances, and in a close friendship. I served with him not only in the Congress but in the State legislature.

But HENRY WAXMAN is wrong on this issue, and he is wrong on this issue because he keeps repeating the same thing to himself, "It is unsafe," and he refuses to acknowledge any expertise in this matter that says that it is safe. That is the reason that he is wrong.

Let me review what happened last year. Some statements have been made here on the floor that we do not know where it is going. We know where it is going. It is going from

downtown Los Angeles to the valley. But there is a gap at the present time, and that is called MOS-2. That gap was brought about by an agreement between JULIAN DIXON and HENRY WAXMAN. What did we do? We acted reasonably. Despite the preponderance of the expert testimony that it was reasonably safe—reasonably safe—to drill through the high-potential area, we said, "HENRY WAXMAN, you have a point. We'll take it out of that area," and we are now investigating three or four alternatives.

We said, "We'll go one further, HENRY WAXMAN. We'll appoint another technical committee. After the State OSHA looked at this, after RTD experts have looked at it, we'll go you one better. We'll appoint a technical committee."

We said, "We'll do better than that. This will be a committee appointed by the transportation chairman of the city council. We'll allow you two experts. Name your two experts."

HENRY WAXMAN named them. Yes, they came back with some recommendations, 12 in nature. About seven of those had already been addressed, but it is always best to dot the "i" and cross the "t" twice. The city council took a look at the recommendation.

What was the recommendation? The recommendation was, "Follow these safety guidelines, and it's safe to build."

So the State of California has looked at it, RTD has looked at it, a number of people have looked at it.

What did Mr. WAXMAN do next?

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

Mr. DIXON. I will yield to the gentleman after I make my entire statement. I will ask for unanimous consent and I will yield to him at that point.

What did Mr. WAXMAN do next? As Mr. ROYBAL says, he wrote and talked to the U.S. Department of Transportation, the Urban Mass Transportation Agency. On August 5, once again he received a letter. Let me read part of it:

In our reevaluation we had the opportunity to consider the expert opinions of two independent panels who examined the safety aspects of this project. As you know—

Meaning Mr. WAXMAN—

these reviews involve both the areas of concern which you noted in your letter and your earlier comments on the environmental documents. It is accurate to say that both panels found ways to improve the project but that they felt the project could be constructed and operated safely if the recommended precautionary measures were followed.

Now what does Mr. WAXMAN say in his "Dear Colleague"? He says that there are uncharted, abandoned oil wells. I assume that he is referring to MOS-1.

There are no uncharted abandoned oil wells in Mr. ROYBAL's district as it relates to the course of MOS-1. There is not one demographic map that

shows any of them in that spot. Even if there were—

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

Mr. DIXON. I explained to the gentleman when I would yield. Then I will be glad to yield to him. I am going to ask unanimous consent for additional time, and at that point in time I will yield to him.

Even if there were abandoned oil wells that we are unaware of that are not on any maps, we now have the technology to discover them before we get to them.

He talks about methane gas.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. TRAXLER). The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON] has expired.

(On request of Mr. DREIER of California and by unanimous consent, Mr. DIXON was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. DIXON. He relates his concern—and a justifiable one—for an explosion that occurred in his district, and there was an explosion at a Ross Dress for Less store. But I submit that the explosion had nothing to do with the building of a subway. The explosion did have something to do with methane gas. In the foundation of that building was a gas leak. It exploded because there was no ventilation to allow the pressure to be removed. It was a lack of knowledge that the gas was leaking and there was no ventilation to allow it to escape.

It is like seeing a major accident at an intersection and saying that the intersection is unsafe. That explosion had nothing to do with technology that is available to tunnel.

The city council of Los Angeles, and in particular the same area that Mr. WAXMAN represents, the city councilman who represents that area supports this. I dare say a large number of the California delegation support it, the State legislature supports it, the mayor supports it, and the Governor supports it.

We have bent over three times to give Mr. WAXMAN every consideration on the safety issue, but Mr. WAXMAN does not want to believe any expert except his own. That is his right, but certainly we should move forward on this project.

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

Mr. DIXON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WAXMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I do want to confirm the fact that we have been friends for many years, and I hope that we will continue to be for many years more. We have a difference of opinion on this question, which grieves me, because we have so few differences of opinion in most of the day-to-day activities before the Congress and back home in Los Angeles.

The report of the technical people who looked at this thing said, "This is

a dangerous project, but we think that we can minimize the danger," and they gave 12 recommendations for the first segment to minimize the danger. That minimization is based on bells and whistles with the expectation that people will be alerted to a likely explosion, hopefully before it takes place.

There is a fellow named Wagner, who was not one of my appointees to this technical committee, who talked about the place being filled with abandoned oil wells, oil gas fields. And he said, "If you hit that metal pipe with your boring equipment, I'll guarantee you'll have a big fire down there."

I have seen gas pipes struck by construction equipment a number of times, and it starts right off. It is a point of considerable concern to me.

These people expressed their concern. We were told a year ago by Mr. DIXON, "This is the most studied project ever in terms of safety," and then we had a technical committee come up with 12 major recommendations to minimize the dangers that those people that had studied it never saw before.

One of the members of the technical committee wrote a letter to the Los Angeles Times. Unfortunately it has not yet been printed. But he talked about the tragic *Challenger* flight and compared this subway system to that.

We think in terms of progress, sending people into space, tunneling through the Earth for mass transit systems. But let us also think about the potential risks, and let us minimize those risks and minimize the expenditure of money wastefully by making sure that the project is sound.

That is all that I ask, that we make sure that this is sound in all ways before we start throwing money into it.

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

Mr. DIXON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to follow up on a remark that the gentleman made a while ago about abandoned oil well casings and MOS-1. I wanted to expand on it a little bit.

It is my understanding that there is no direct evidence of any abandoned oil well casings to be encountered in the MOS-1 portion of the Metrorail project. This conclusion results from a review of all available records, including photographs of the affected area from earliest times available.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DIXON was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DIXON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ANDERSON. Nonetheless, recognizing that there could be an unde-

terminated oil well casing in MOS-1 or elsewhere along the alignment, it has been considered prudent to provide for the unexpected. To this end, SCRTD has been studying oil well casing location techniques since 1984. More recently, SCRTD has become knowledgeable of the state-of-the-art in oil fields for locating oil well casings. These techniques have been reviewed in detail and, as a result, a similar procedure was developed to be used in the L.A. Metrorail tunnel construction.

The applied technique will require all tunnel contractors to use a magnetometer survey in advance of tunneling operations. A bored hole will be placed in advance of tunnel excavation and magnetometer readings maintained a minimum of 50 feet in front of the tunnel face to ascertain any anomalies indicating metal. The contractor will be required to mine by hand from a point 5 feet before and until 5 feet after the indicated location of the anomaly, thereby preventing the unexpected penetration of an oil well casing by a tunneling machine. Any casing could then be safely removed and tunneling would resume.

□ 1525

They have taken every precaution and they are studying this further. I think it is probably the most studied, one of the best, and will be the most safely constructed project in the country.

Mr. DIXON. I would agree.

Let me just make two points.

Whatever the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] says about the technical committee, it is a fact that all of them signed the report saying that it would be safe if, in fact, these 12 issues were addressed. RTD addressed some of these issues.

I just want to point to the kind of emotion that the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] uses in this. He talks about whistles and alarms or bells, as he calls them. I am sure that there is nothing in there that says that they are going to use whistles or bells to detect methane, but only that once it is detected by more sophisticated equipment, whistles or bells may be used to send an alarm.

Finally, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL] has handed me a note that he just received from his staff at 3:18 that the Governor's office called and said the Governor is in full support of what you are doing and wanted you to know that.

Ladies and gentleman of this House, I am saying that in this rare instance, the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] is not going to be satisfied with any safety reports by any experts except his own. We have given consideration in every form to reasonable requests of the gentleman. It is time for us to move on, on this issue.

Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Previously the gentleman made the comment that there were no oil wells running through the middle of that area. I asked my staff to bring back to the floor a map which I had brought to the floor on a previous debate which in yellow marks the route, in black marks all of the underground oil wells which have been specifically charted which they know about.

But I would like to make a comment in addition to that from the technical review committee report. It says in the first item:

A rush of methane gas at higher pressures than found during the Ross explosion could be encountered during construction if an abandoned oil well is struck. Neither Metro rail nor Cal-OSHA has adequately planned for drilling into abandoned oil wells along the tunnel path. According to panel members such an event has a high probability of occurring because of the unusual number of uncharted oil wells in the area.

I thank my colleague for yielding.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. (Mr. COLEMAN of Texas). The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DIXON was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. FIEDLER]. This is the kind of expertise that I am talking about. The gentlewoman brings a map onto this floor as if we are experts. The expert reports say that there are no oil wells in MOS-1's path.

As it relates to methane gas, certainly a rush of gas like that in Ross Dress for Less Stores could be a danger, and that is if it is not mitigated. This is 1986. We know there is gas there. We have the technology to mitigate that gas. So there is no question that if that gas went unmitigated, it would cause tremendous damage. We know the gas is there. We know how to correct it, or at least the scientists do, and that is the reason it is safe.

However, we are not going into that area. That was the agreement between the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] and myself.

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

Mr. DIXON. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I just must say the gentleman is incorrect in his statement.

The head of the Office of Occupational safety and Health for the State of California, Mr. Byron Iskanian was asked about this tunneling, and he was asked in the first segment: "Do you expect to hit gas oils, oil wells?"

He replied, "Yes, I think we probably will. Mr. Waggoner addressed the cutting head that's rotating—you are not going to get much warning. I don't know what we will do about that."

All of the members of the Commission signed the report, but two mem-

bers indicated that they were objecting to the general conclusion of the report dealing with the project feasibility in any wording that appeared to give the project an overall stamp of approval from the committee.

The best we can say is that this thing now that has been restudied is still unsafe, and my first concern was when I read what the Metrorail's own engineers said. They said it is unsafe. They thought they could mitigate some of the damage. They thought they could handle it, but they did not look at the alternatives.

Let us make them look at the alternatives. Why should we be committed to something that is not something minor or trivial, but an explosion that could kill people? Why do we have to go forward with that?

I beg you, let us not close our eyes to the fact that there is genuine danger.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, first the gentleman started talking about it was unsafe. He has not proved that. Now he is talking about going to alternatives.

We have given the gentleman every reasonable doubt and more. It is time for us to move on.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment, which would prohibit the Secretary of Transportation from entering into any contract with the Southern California Rapid Transit District until a supplemental EIS is completed.

In last year's continuing resolution, the Congress approved and the President signed into law language directing the Secretary to negotiate a full-funding agreement for the initial minimum operable segment of the Metrorail project. In response to that directive, negotiations were held, and on July 11, Secretary Dole announced that agreement had been reached to proceed with Metrorail construction. Groundbreaking for the project is scheduled for this fall.

Mr. Chairman, this is one of the most cost-beneficial of the various new start transit projects currently under consideration. Approximately 45 percent of Metrorail's cost will come from non-Federal sources—a clear demonstration of the local support for this project.

In 1980, Los Angeles County taxpayers approved a sales tax increase to help fund the Metrorail project. And California Gov. George Deukmejian has pledged \$400 million in State funds toward the completion of this vital transportation link.

Mr. Chairman, this project will allow Los Angeles to begin to address the intolerable traffic congestion and poor air quality that have become common in that city. Clearly when a problem has become so serious that it is the constant subject of comment in Johnny Carson's nightly monolog, something needs to be done.

This project has a long history of widespread, bipartisan support from this House. The various safety issues that were raised by the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] during last year's debate on the transportation appropriation bill, are being addressed by the blue ribbon study panel. Further delays, of the type contemplated by this amendment, would only serve to increase the ultimate cost of completing this project.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of this amendment.

□ 1535

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I think it is important for us to look at the history of this entire issue. Over the past several years, the nearly 6 since I have been here, we have consistently, on the floor of the House of Representatives, been debating this issue.

To me, I am sure many of our colleagues are tired of the continued discussion about the Los Angeles Metro rail. I have to tell you that when I first went to California to go to college, and that was nearly 15 years ago, we had talk about how we were going to address the problem of turning the corner on the transportation crisis that we faced.

Here we are today, 15 years later, still debating that question. I am not one who has consistently believed that every commission that looks into safety questions should be trusted. In fact, there are many examples of that in my district, where I have challenged many so-called authorities on the issue of toxic waste disposal and other items.

There is no doubt in my mind whatsoever that this issue has been discussed and discussed and discussed and studied and studied and studied and, as we have seen, our Governor calling the Democratic cloakroom, there is true bipartisan support for this issue. Now, the Governor is welcome to call us in the Republican cloakroom at any time, too, I would be happy to say, and his name is George Deukmejian.

Mr. Chairman, I also think it is important for us to realize, again, as has been said, this is the most cost-effective use of Federal taxpayer dollars. Fully 45 percent, twice the required amount, happens to be coming from non-Federal sources.

We have discussed this issue. I happen to believe that the air pollution problem which exists in my part of Los Angeles County can be benefited if we begin to get people into this kind of mass transit. It is the only game in town. We are having our taxpayers in California pay a disproportionate share into that highway commission trust fund because we certainly consume a great deal of gasoline in Los Angeles.

So for that reason, this is what we are working on. UMTA has said this project has undergone a more thorough environmental review than any previous project receiving UMTA funds. We have gone back and forth.

There are certainly 12 issues which have been raised, I think. There will continue to be some questions, but that does not mean that we should not proceed; and we have voted on this continually in the House of Representatives and in the other body, and I am convinced that we will be able to defeat the amendment; and I urge my colleagues to join with us in doing just that.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to address the Committee for 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 3 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time because I wanted to discuss the question of safety. In discussing Metrorail's design and construction, I think it is important to note that the subway tunnels we are talking about, will be constructed in relatively short segments.

These tunnels will then connect previously constructed, open station excavations, ranging from 600 to 1,000 feet in length; and similar open excavations that may be dug for construction access. So it is not one long tunnel; it is a series of tunnels.

The construction techniques employed for these open cut excavations would be similar to the construction required for office buildings basements in this area. Remember, there are office building with basements dug into these same areas.

The open excavations will allow the construction managers, the technical engineering and regulatory persons and other experts to examine the ground in the area prior to the start of the tunnel construction, and to identify any gas concentrations at the depth of the tunnels.

The open excavations would also allow for the gas in the surrounding area to vent naturally, thus reducing the potential hazard of fire or explosion.

Mr. Chairman, there is every indication that with the information already known by the SCRDT and its engineers, plus the elaborate mitigation measures to be taken by the district, the project will be built safely. Some of these mitigation measures will include: First, installing probes to measure the gas in the field; second, providing concrete or steel lining for the tunnels; third, providing a membrane or coating to back up the concrete lining; fourth, providing ventilation to dilute and exhaust residual gas; and fifth, providing sensors to monitor gas concentrations in the tunnels.

The concentration in Metrorail tunnels and other underground facilities will involve no unprecedented hazards

for either the general public or those engaged in its construction.

Mr. Chairman, I want to read from a letter written just 2 days ago by UMTA, the administration's transit agency. They said:

"In summary this project"—referring to the one we are talking about there today—"this project has undergone a more thorough environmental review than any previous project receiving UMTA funds."

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from California a question and reaffirm a point that I think he made.

Is the gentleman saying that actually tunneling is going to release the gas which otherwise might explode?

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, there is no question that open excavations will allow natural ventings and we will have precautions and practices in this tunneling where there will be all kinds of sensors to detect latent dangers so if anything comes up even to I think it is one twentieth of the amount where it might explode—

Mr. DREIER of California. So it actually releases—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. Anderson] has expired.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

(Mr. SNYDER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the great California debate has gone on for quite some time here. I think that most of us have enjoyed about all of it that we can stand. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to conclude the debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

I will accept 20 minutes.

Mr. SNYDER. I will take whatever I can get. How about 15 minutes?

Ms. FIEDLER. All right.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto conclude in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California. [Mr. WAXMAN] That amendment would prevent the timely completion of a vitally needed transit system for the greater Los Angeles area.

I understand that the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] may be reacting to some

concerns of his constituents regarding safety. They are, I understand, particularly concerned about methane gas explosions during construction and potential earthquakes after the Metrorail is in operation. It is also my understanding that these concerns may be unwarranted.

The engineers who have been engaged in the design of the Metrorail system have thoroughly investigated both potential problems.

With respect to earthquakes, engineers have examined geologic formations to determine the best design of the system. Underground structures such as subway tunnels are among the safest in an earthquake situation. It is interesting to note that during the recent Mexico City earthquake the subway shut down briefly, but only because the electrical power went off. The tunnels and stations sustained no serious damage from the quake.

The engineers also conducted a survey of available records on oil wells to ensure that the Metrorail construction will not intrude into abandoned oil wells and perhaps cause a catastrophic explosion. Furthermore, they have become knowledgeable in state-of-the-art techniques in oil fields for locating oil well casings. They have developed similar techniques to be used in the L.A. Metrorail construction. These techniques should effectively ensure that unexpected penetration of an oil well casing by a tunneling machine is avoided.

The voters of L.A. County have endorsed this project and, therefore, I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment which would effectively prevent construction from proceeding on this necessary mass transit system.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair desires to advise the Members that the Chair intends to divide the time between the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] for 7½ minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON], the chairman of the subcommittee for 7½ minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the author of the amendment, the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN].

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I think we have heard a lot about this debate already. I just want to conclude with some things that I think are pertinent. We have been told that this is the most studied project ever; and yet when they are under greater scrutiny, they come up with 12 major problems they have never even thought about.

I think there is serious danger in construction of this subway system, and let me just give you one example: You do not have to be an expert to evaluate this.

One of the ways they want to deal with methane gas is to have the cars speeding through, and that will dissipate the accumulation of the methane gas.

Now, furthermore, there are objections to this whole system. We have an Office of Management and Budget evaluation of the cost of this system, and they talk about ridership projections overstated by at least 30 to 50 percent; costs are excessive and likely understated.

Let me point out to my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE], if those costs are excessive and likely understated, it is my taxpayers who are going to pay for it, and they do not want to pay for something that does not add up to a real subway system that is going to be effective for them.

I do not know whether these figures are correct or not; or these conclusions, but I must tell you: They say the demand for Federal funding is excessive, and they have other negative features of the Los Angeles proposal.

From a transportation point of view, from a safety point of view, from a cost point of view, let us hold off before we start digging a hole to find out if the system makes sense.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN].

□ 1545

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, as the ranking member of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee, I certainly have been a strong supporter over the years of mass transportation. I support that for California, and I support it for Los Angeles. But I must say that over the years I have had very serious reservations about this project. Much has been said here about safety but let me just come back to cost-effectiveness for just one moment. Listen to this: these are figures from a couple of years back. Los Angeles has approximately 6,073 persons per square mile. With 6,073 persons per square mile, they project ridership of 15,278 riders per day.

In Washington, DC, with our Metro, we have 12,000 people per square mile, almost twice as many people per square mile as Los Angeles, and yet we only get 9,700 riders per day per mile. So Los Angeles is saying with half the number of people per square mile they are going to get almost twice the ridership per mile. That just is fantasy. That is absolute fantasy. We are taking money that Los Angeles could well use in other areas and putting it into something that is not going to work, it is not going to work.

The gentlewoman from California has for some time and again today called attention to the fact that the ridership projection for this project would call for a higher ridership than in New York City itself with a population density of 70,000 people per square mile. It is saying that Los Angeles, with a population of 6,000 people per square mile, would have a higher ridership on this project than New York City, with 70,000 people per square mile. It defies belief, it defies credibility; it would be a waste of taxpayers money not just in California, not just in Los Angeles but all across the United States.

I support the many new starts in the number of projects that come before us in the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee. I support the

funding for Los Angeles and funding for other cities. But this project is not a good project. On a straight cost basis Los Angeles can take this kind of money and spend it much more efficiently, much better in other forms of transportation.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER].

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I started out with reservations about this project. I have no ax to grind other than my interest in sound transportation, but our committee has looked into this carefully, and we have been very much impressed with two things: first of all, that the safety investigations have been exhausted, and that they have been independent. I am persuaded that indeed, this can be built safely.

Second, I have been very much impressed with the broad range of support in California for this project, ranging from the people voting in favor of a tax to the Los Angeles City Council, to the mayor, to the Governor of the State, to both Senators and to a majority of the Members of Congress from the area.

So looking at the tremendous support and looking at what I believe are satisfactory answers to safety, I have come to the conclusion that we should support this project particularly when the Secretary of Transportation, Elizabeth Dole, announced that the administration has reached agreement on a full-funding contract for the first phase of metroraill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

Mr. DREIER of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we are coming to the close here. I hope very much we will not have to consider this issue on the floor of the Congress any longer after today's debate, Mr. Chairman.

But I think it is important for us to reaffirm a few items which have come out. My friend from California, Mr. DIXON, talked about the fact that Mr. WAXMAN's concerns have been addressed over and over and over again. And I think the best thing for us to realize is the statement made by the Urban Mass Transit Agency that has been said here before: this project has undergone a more thorough environmental review than any previous project receiving UMTA funds. And there are a great many projects which have received UMTA funds which are incredibly safe.

So I can only infer from that that the safety of this, because of this letter, because of the exhaustive studies that they have done, would be greater than any system presently receiving UMTA funds. I think we should proceed with this project as expeditiously as possible, and I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, a moment ago there was a question raised about the cost-effectiveness of this project. I wanted to answer that. UMTA studies, now these are not my studies or JULIAN DIXON's studies, this is UMTA's study, they say this is the single most cost-effective proposed subway in the country. And now if this project is not funded, the money will be spent, according to the administration, obviously then on less cost-effective projects. It is a waste of money if we do not fund this project unless we want to waste taxpayers money. I oppose the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. FIEDLER].

Ms. FIEDLER. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Chairman, there have been a number of statements made here today about the cost effectiveness of this project. When my colleagues reference the cost effectiveness of the project, they are talking about what was to be a 18.6-mile system. We are not talking about the same system today. Today we are talking about a 4.4-mile system that does not have the ridership that is projected for the 18.5-mile system and therefore those comments previously made by the administration do not apply to this specific 4.4-mile system.

As far as the environmental issues are concerned, were it not for the fact that there was an underground explosion along the route of the original 18.6-mile system, there would have no further environmental investigation. The truth is, I raised many of these issues prior to that explosion, during the course of the environmental impact study, and they were simply sloughed off as nonexistent. Unfortunately, 22 people had to be injured before they began to take a second look at it and only after Congressman WAXMAN pressed the issue with a hearing on the safety of the methane gas danger.

As far as the ridership is concerned, if you do not know where the project is going, you cannot predict the ridership. But I would like to leave the Congress with this one thought on the ridership, the same people who predicted the ridership in Miami, 90 percent of the people in the Miami system did not show up, meaning that there was only 10 percent of the ridership that actually was predicted, are the same people making the predictions in the Los Angeles system. And I believe that in Los Angeles, while it might not be 90 percent who do not show up, I think the estimates on the part of a number of important independent experts show that this project's ridership will not be what they have predicted, and they are going to be back here year after year

after year asking for subsidies on the project.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield to me?

Ms. FIEDLER. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN].

Mr. WAXMAN. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I do want to point out to the Members that what is before us is not just that first-four segment but the bill that says notwithstanding any other provision of law after they published the environmental impact statement for the rest of the alignment, which they have not even figured out yet. This would compel UMTA to agree to it and compel us to spend \$110 million for the first segment and \$190 million in each fiscal year 1988, 1989, 1990, and 1991.

Do we want to commit ourselves to that kind of money before we know where this thing is going?

I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. FIEDLER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, it has been repeatedly stated on the floor today that the people of the city and county of Los Angeles voted for this project. That simply is not true. What the people did do was vote to support a half-cent sales tax to be put into a fund for transportation purposes, among them rail projects but not specifically this project. In fact, every effort that I have made to bring it to the voters, through the elected bodies, has been thwarted by those people who are part of the lobby, the million-dollar-plus lobby trying to push this through the Congress.

I hope my colleagues will support the Waxman amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. COLEMAN of Texas). The time of the gentlewoman from California [Ms. FIEDLER] has expired.

The gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentlelady said we were discussing today not an 18-mile but a 4.4-mile section. We are not. We are discussing actually a 9-mile section of what would be connected to a longer light rail system. This is a 9-mile section we are talking about today. And it will eventually be part of an 18-mile system.

But we are talking not about 4.4 miles today but actually 9 miles.

Ms. FIEDLER. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the gentlelady from California.

Ms. FIEDLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Would the gentleman please tell me where those 9 miles are going?

Mr. ANDERSON. From downtown Los Angeles out 9 miles.

Ms. FIEDLER. Where? You have only a 4.4-mile system.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is the first one, we are actually in a sense almost ready for building now.

Ms. FIEDLER. What you are saying is you really do not know where it is going beyond the 4.4 miles.

Mr. ANDERSON. It is going west, we are going west following on Wilshire, yes.

Ms. FIEDLER. You would like to finance it even though you are not certain at this point whether it is going to go east, west, or through the San Fernando Valley.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I think it is important to point out that with local funds, private sector funds, and State funds there is light rail which is going to continue to proceed along the Century Freeway. It is all designed to connect into and throughout the southern part of Los Angeles County. I think it is important for us to remember that the cost effectiveness of this system is only one aspect. But all of the proposed light rail which is going to be built with local funds and State funds and private sector funds feeds into this initial trunk of the tree which is a very important aspect of it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; I want to congratulate the gentleman for focusing on the whole system. That is true, we are hopefully building a system in Los Angeles. I know the gentleman referred to the Century Freeway that is under construction now that will have light rails from almost Orange County, Norwalk actually, all the way to the Los Angeles Airport. The Long Beach/Los Angeles light rail will be going from downtown Los Angeles down to the Long Beach area. So we will have that much.

Hopefully then, we will be at that time connecting to a system, the Metrorail, which will be taking us over the valley and maybe even out west to Santa Monica and someday east, into the area that Ed ROYBAL is talking about and even further than Ed ROYBAL'S district.

We hope to have a system so that someone in Long Beach can get on the rails to go to, say, downtown Los Angeles, transfer to someplace else, and so we will have a real system in Los Angeles. And so this is all part of a big system that we all hope to see built.

Mr. DREIER of California. So what the gentleman is saying is there is in fact an overall plan and we do not have a system, that we do not know where it is going, is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. If the gentleman will come to my office, you will see a nice big map showing the whole system.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN].

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. COLEMAN of Texas). Evidently a quorum is not present. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXIII, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the pending question following the quorum call. Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device.

The following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 303]

Ackerman	Conyers	Gibbons
Akaka	Cooper	Gilman
Alexander	Coughlin	Gingrich
Anderson	Courter	Glickman
Andrews	Coyne	Gonzalez
Annunzio	Craig	Goodling
Anthony	Crane	Gradison
Applegate	Crockett	Gray (IL)
Archer	Daniel	Gray (PA)
Armey	Dannemeyer	Green
Aspin	Darden	Gregg
Atkins	Daschle	Guarini
AuCoin	Daub	Gunderson
Badham	Davis	Hall (OH)
Barnard	de la Garza	Hall, Ralph
Bartlett	DeLay	Hamilton
Barton	Dellums	Hammerschmidt
Bateman	Derrick	Hansen
Bates	DeWine	Hartnett
Bedell	Dickinson	Hatcher
Beilenson	Dicks	Hawkins
Bennett	Dingell	Hayes
Bentley	DioGuardi	Hefner
Bereuter	Dixon	Hendon
Berman	Donnelly	Henry
Bevill	Dorgan (ND)	Hertel
Biaggi	Dornan (CA)	Hiler
Bilirakis	Dowdy	Hopkins
Bliley	Downey	Horton
Boehlert	Dreier	Howard
Boggs	Duncan	Hoyer
Boland	Durbin	Hubbard
Bonior (MI)	Dwyer	Huckaby
Bonker	Dymally	Hughes
Borski	Dyson	Hunter
Boucher	Early	Hutto
Boulter	Eckart (OH)	Hyde
Boxer	Eckert (NY)	Ireland
Brooks	Edwards (CA)	Jacobs
Broomfield	Edwards (OK)	Jeffords
Brown (CO)	Emerson	Jenkins
Bruce	English	Johnson
Bryant	Erdreich	Jones (NC)
Burton (CA)	Evans (IA)	Jones (TN)
Burton (IN)	Evans (IL)	Kanjorski
Bustamante	Fascell	Kaptur
Byron	Fawell	Kasich
Callahan	Fazio	Kastenmeier
Campbell	Feighan	Kemp
Carney	Fiedler	Kennelly
Carper	Fields	Kildee
Carr	Fish	Kindness
Chandler	Flippo	Klecicka
Chapman	Florio	Kolbe
Chappell	Foglietta	Kolter
Chappelle	Foley	Kostmayer
Cheney	Ford (MI)	Kramer
Clay	Frank	LaFalce
Clinger	Franklin	Lagomarsino
Coats	Frenzel	Lantos
Cobey	Frost	Latta
Coble	Fuqua	Leach (IA)
Coelho	Gallo	Leath (TX)
Coleman (MO)	Garcia	Lehman (CA)
Coleman (TX)	Gaydos	Lehman (FL)
Collins	Gejdenson	Leland
Combest	Gekas	Lent
Conte	Gephardt	Levin (MI)

Levine (CA) Packard
 Lewis (FL) Panetta
 Lightfoot Parris
 Lipinski Pashayan
 Livingston Pease
 Loeffler Penny
 Lott Pepper
 Lowery (CA) Perkins
 Lowry (WA) Petri
 Lujan Pickle
 Luken Porter
 Lungren Price
 Mack Pursell
 MacKay Quillen
 Madigan Rahall
 Manton Rangel
 Markey Ray
 Marlenee Regula
 Martin (IL) Reid
 Martin (NY) Richardson
 Martinez Ridge
 Matsui Rinaldo
 Mavroules Ritter
 Mazzoli Roberts
 McCain Robinson
 McCandless Rodino
 McCloskey Roe
 McCollum Roemer
 McCurdy Rogers
 McDade Rose
 McEwen Rostenkowski
 McGrath Roth
 McHugh Roukema
 McKernan Rowland (CT)
 McKinney Rowland (GA)
 McMillan Roybal
 Meyers Rudd
 Mica Russo
 Michel Sabo
 Mikulski Savage
 Miller (CA) Saxton
 Miller (OH) Schaefer
 Miller (WA) Scheuer
 Mineta Schneider
 Mitchell Schroeder
 Moakley Schuette
 Molinari Schulze
 Mollohan Schumer
 Monson Seiberling
 Montgomery Sensenbrenner
 Moody Sharp
 Moorhead Shaw
 Morrison (CT) Shelby
 Morrison (WA) Shumway
 Mrazek Shuster
 Murphy Sikorski
 Murtha Siljander
 Myers Sisisky
 Natcher Skeen
 Neal Skelton
 Nelson Slattery
 Nichols Slaughter
 Nielson Smith (FL)
 Nowak Smith (IA)
 Oakar Smith (NE)
 Oberstar Smith (NJ)
 Obey Smith, Denny
 Olin (OR)
 Ortiz Smith, Robert
 Owens (NH)
 Oxley Smith, Robert
 (OR)

□ 1610

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. COLEMAN of Texas). Four hundred and thirteen Members have answered to their names, a quorum is present, and the Committee will resume its business.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] for a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 210, noes 201, answered "present" 1, not voting 19, as follows:

Andrews
 Armye
 Aspin
 Atkins
 AuCoin
 Badham
 Bartlett
 Barton
 Bedell
 Bentley
 Bereuter
 Berman
 Bevill
 Biaggi
 Biliarakis
 Bliley
 Boehlert
 Boggs
 Broomfield
 Brown (CO)
 Bruce
 Bryant
 Burton (IN)
 Campbell
 Carney
 Carper
 Chandler
 Cheney
 Coats
 Cobey
 Coble
 Coleman (MO)
 Combust
 Cooper
 Coughlin
 Courter
 Craig
 Crane
 Daniel
 Daub
 DeWine
 Dickinson
 DioGuardi
 Dorgan (ND)
 Dowdy
 Downey
 Duncan
 Eckart (OH)
 Eckert (NY)
 Edwards (OK)
 Emerson
 English
 Erdreich
 Evans (IA)
 Evans (IL)
 Feighan
 Fiedler
 Florio
 Foglietta
 Frank
 Franklin
 Frenzel
 Gejdenson
 Gekas
 Gibbons
 Gingrich
 Glickman
 Goodling
 Gradison
 Green
 Gregg

Ackerman
 Akaka
 Alexander
 Anderson
 Annunzio
 Anthony
 Applegate
 Archer
 Barnard
 Bateman
 Bates
 Beilenson
 Bennett
 Boland
 Bonior (MI)
 Bonker
 Borski
 Boulter
 Boxer
 Brooks
 Brown (CA)
 Burton (CA)
 Bustamante

[Roll No. 304]

AYES—210

Gunderson
 Hall (OH)
 Hall, Ralph
 Hamilton
 Hansen
 Hendon
 Henry
 Hertel
 Hiler
 Hopkins
 Hubbard
 Huckabee
 Hutto
 Ireland
 Jacobs
 Jeffords
 Johnson
 Jones (OK)
 Kasich
 Kemp
 Kennelly
 Kindness
 Kleczka
 Kostmayer
 Kramer
 Lagomarsino
 Lantos
 Latta
 Leach (IA)
 Levin (MI)
 Levine (CA)
 Lewis (FL)
 Livingston
 Loeffler
 Lott
 Lujan
 Luken
 Lungren
 Mack
 MacKay
 Madigan
 Markey
 Marlenee
 McGuire
 Martinez
 Matsui
 McCain
 McCloskey
 McCurdy
 McDade
 McKernan
 McKinney
 McMillan
 Meyers
 Michel
 Mikulski
 Miller (OH)
 Miller (WA)
 Mineta
 Mitchell
 Moakley
 Molinari
 Mollohan
 Monson
 Montgomery
 Moody
 Moorhead
 Morrison (CT)
 Morrison (WA)
 Mrazek
 Murphy
 Murtha
 Myers
 Natcher
 Neal
 Nelson
 Nichols
 Nielson
 Nowak
 Oakar
 Oberstar
 Obey
 Olin
 Ortiz
 Owens
 Oxley
 Petri

NOES—201

Byron
 Callahan
 Carr
 Chapman
 Chappell
 Chappie
 Clay
 Clinger
 Coelho
 Coleman (TX)
 Collins
 Conte
 Conyers
 Coyne
 Crockett
 Dannemeyer
 Darden
 Daschle
 Davis
 de la Garza
 DeLay
 Dellums
 Derrick

Gaydos
 Gephardt
 Gilman
 Gonzalez
 Gray (IL)
 Gray (PA)
 Guarini
 Hammerschmidt
 Hartnett
 Hatcher
 Hawkins
 Hayes
 Hefner
 Horton
 Howard
 Hoyer
 Hughes
 Hunter
 Hyde
 Jenkins
 Jones (NC)
 Jones (TN)
 Kanjorski
 Kaptur
 Kastenmeier
 Kildee
 Kolbe
 Kolter
 LaFalce
 Leath (TX)
 Lehman (CA)
 Lehman (FL)
 Leland
 Lent
 Lightfoot
 Lipinski
 Lowery (CA)
 Lowry (WA)
 Manton
 Martin (NY)
 Mavroules
 McCandless
 McCollum
 McDade

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1
 Martin (IL)

NOT VOTING—19

Barnes
 Boner (TN)
 Bosco
 Boucher
 Breaux
 Edgar
 Foley
 Ford (TN)
 Fowler
 Gordon
 Groberg
 Hillis
 Holt
 Lewis (CA)
 Lloyd
 Lundine
 Moore
 Solomon

□ 1620

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mrs. Martin of Illinois for, with Mr. Lewis of (California) against.

Messrs. HEFNER, SPENCE, LEHMAN of California, KASTENMEIER, MRAZEK, and FLIPPO changed their votes from "aye" to "no."

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have a live pair with the gentleman from California [Mr. Lewis]. If he were present, he would have voted "no." I voted "aye." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois changed her vote from "aye" to "present."

So the amendment was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1630

Mr. YOUNG of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Surface Transportation engage in a brief colloquy with me?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am pleased to respond to the gentleman from Missouri.