

Slobodan Milosevic and his supporters. They should use it to demand change, for their own benefit as for the benefit of the victims of aggression in Bosnia-Herzegovina and elsewhere.

As we take this action, we hold no grudge against the Serbian people and the democratic forces among them. As we take this action, we should be prepared to respond when we see real steps toward positive, more democratic change. But we should not respond until we do, whether it takes weeks, months, or years.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, the United States has taken the initiative at the United Nations in calling for a commission that could eventually lead to a war crimes tribunal empowered to bring to justice those who have been responsible for atrocities being committed in former Yugoslavia. Talking points are now being circulated among Security Council members by American diplomats, and movement toward establishing a preliminary commission could come sometime in the next month.

The underlying philosophy should be the same as the post World War II Nuremberg trials: even in the heat of war there are acts that cannot be tolerated. Most especially torture and murder of noncombatants, and mistreating or killing prisoners purely because of their race, religion, or ethnicity must not go uncondemned or unpunished.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support establishing such a U.N.-sponsored tribunal. It would be appropriate not only as a matter of justice for heinous crimes against humanity but also as a means to issue a warning to those who continue to commit these crimes in Bosnia and elsewhere that their actions will not be tolerated by the civilized world community.

Civil wars, by their nature, are bitter and barbarous affairs. The inter-ethnic and communal conflicts we witness today in former Yugoslavia and some other regions of the old Soviet empire are typical in their ferocity and levels of mindless revenge. There is rising evidence that crimes of incredible brutality and viciousness have become almost routine in former Yugoslavia. Forcibly expelling members of one ethnic community by another have provided the atmosphere in which civilian non-combatants have been murdered and mutilated, where prisoners have reportedly been summarily executed or starved to death in notorious detention camps. While none of the three ethnic communities involved in these atrocities is totally innocent, there clearly are individuals whose infamy already cries out for justice.

One of the individuals the U.N. tribunal must consider bringing serious charges against is Zeljko Raznjajlovic, better known by his nom de guerre, Arkan, the leader of an ultranationalist band of Serb para-military irregulars. He operates much like the bank-robbing underworld figure he reportedly was before civil war provided him with an excuse to formalize his brutality.

Credible allegations of murderous crimes has followed Arkan from Vukovar in Croatia last year to the Bosnian cities of Bejeljina in April and Brcko in May. There are also serious charges against Vojislav Soselj, a Deputy in the Serbian Parliament, whose followers have been accused of similar crimes.

The para-military leaders using the terrible violence of a civil war to settle ethnic grievances, whether they are Serb, or non-Serb, must be brought to book. Croatia and Moslem irregulars have apparently been engaged in similar atrocities against Serbs in northeastern Bosnia and in Croatia. These groups and these leaders must know that winning or losing a battle, or a city, or even the civil war itself is no shield against the imposition of human justice after the fighting ceases.

Given the highly charged nature of the civil war in Yugoslavia it is particularly important that the effort to bring those guilty of crimes against humanity to justice focus on credible and solid evidence of crimes, not merely subjective claims and counter claims based on emotion and revenge.

Mr. Speaker, having lived and worked in Yugoslavia during 1959 and 1960, I have tried to keep informed, and visited four of the six republics of former Yugoslavia last year. In addition to the presidents and top government officials of Serbia, Croatia, Macedonia, and Bosnia, I met with a number of political and religious figures, military commanders and ultra-nationalist paramilitary leaders, including Arkan. While at the time I met him I had no idea who Arkan was, or of the allegations against him that already existed, it is ironic that one of the subjects of our discussion was my plea to him for the humane treatment of prisoners and noncombatant civilians. Since that meeting last December, I have seen reports that Arkan and his followers have been directly implicated in what would clearly be described as war crimes against civilians and combatant prisoners.

For nearly 2 years, the policy of the Bush administration toward the impending disintegration of Yugoslavia has been inconsistent and marked by abrupt changes. In my opinion, we have alternately sought to lead world opinion on Yugoslavia and abrogated that leadership to others. The United States can reestablish its moral leadership in this terrible civil war by spearheading the establishment to bring, at last an element of justice to this terrible and inhuman conflict.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill, H.R. 5258.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I have a point of parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, under the rules we established under martial

law the other day, was it not the fact that the conference report must lay on the desk for 2 hours?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Not if it is under a suspension of the rules. This bill was on the list, has been announced, but there is no layover requirement.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1671, WASTE ISOLATION PILOT PLANT LAND WITHDRAWAL ACT

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the conference report on the Senate bill (S. 1671) to withdraw certain public lands and to otherwise provide for the operation of the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in Eddy County, NM, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of today.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

#### POINT OF ORDER

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. BILBRAY. I would ask the Chair, is the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] in opposition?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] opposed to the motion?

Mr. RHODES. No, Mr. Speaker, I am not.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition and demand time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BILBRAY] will be recognized for 20 minutes in opposition to the bill.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous material, on the legislation under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the Members, quickly, this is the conference report on the Waste Isolation Facility in New Mexico to provide for the storage of radioactive waste and the conducting of tests of that facility. It is a con-



ference report that has been worked out with the Committee on the Interior, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and the Committee on Armed Services to provide for tests before the opening of that facility, for review of those tests, and for public comment on those tests and that facility.

If those tests are in fact successful for the opening of this facility, many of the Members have heard now for many years that we have put in over \$1 billion into the construction of this facility, and we believe that it is time to get on with the testing to see whether or not we can use it as a permanent repository for this waste material that is now currently stored in a number of facilities scattered throughout the country.

I want to thank the members of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs who have worked very, very hard on this, and staffs of those committees, to come to this agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the reason I rose in opposition to this bill after a long night with bloodshot eyes, and unshaven, is because the senior Senator from Louisiana has done it again. In section 8 of this particular bill he provides that "certain standards of the EPA will apply to the WIF facility," and that is all right. I understand that.

However, in subsection (b) of that same section he says, "The characterization licensing, construction, operation, or closure of any site required to be characterized under section 13(a) of Public Law 94-425 is exempted." It will not apply to that area.

□ 0950

Well, what is Public Law 97-425? It is the Yucca Mountain site. So the senior Senator from Louisiana again has established that the EPA requirements as promulgated at the WIPP facility will not apply at Yucca Mountain. He stuck it to us in the energy bill, he stuck it to us in the WIPP bill, and that is why I have risen in opposition.

Second, I felt in fairness, this report should have been made available 2 hours ago.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The Chair would tell the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BILBRAY] that he should avoid personal references to Members of the Senate.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I have not said BENNETT JOHNSTON's name once.

But, Mr. Speaker, the fact is it did not lie there for 2 hours. I did not get a copy of this until recently. But with the martial law we had, in fairness to everyone, we should have had an oppor-

tunity to look at this, and that is why I rose in opposition to this particular bill. It is unfair, it is unjust, but that is the way it happens around here.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes en bloc to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES], and ask unanimous consent that he may use that time on debate out of his time.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] is recognized for 5 minutes of the debate time.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD].

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Conference Report on S. 1671, legislation withdrawing land for the Department of Energy's Waste Isolation Pilot Plant. This legislation is necessary for WIPP, as the plant is known, to begin receiving radioactive waste for testing to see if it can serve as a permanent repository for waste generated by the defense nuclear facilities.

Despite my support for this conference report, parts of it concern me. S. 1671 sets up a cumbersome process requiring DOE to obtain EPA approval of its test phase and retrieval plans. I fear that the process will take too long.

Despite my reservations about this conference report I support it for several reasons. For Congress to do nothing would be a huge institutional failure. I also support this conference report because many of my colleagues are sincerely convinced that DOE needs close scrutiny in order to test radioactive waste at WIPP. Finally, I support this conference report because it moves WIPP from the political arena to the regulatory arena.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this conference report.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of the WIPP conference report. The conference report represents the culmination of many years of work by many members, particularly JOE SKEEN in the House and PETE DOMENICI in the Senate.

Well over a year ago the Subcommittee on Energy and the Environment of the Interior Committee, on which I serve as the ranking member, held the first hearing of the 102d Congress on issues related to WIPP in April 1991. So I feel a particular degree of satisfaction that this conference report has reached this stage.

The bill before us is a significant improvement over that which was passed by the House earlier this spring.

I must say, however, that several problems remain, particularly the very strong role of the EPA, including a great number of determinations and certifications which must be made by the agency during the life of the project.

Also there remains no hammer if EPA fails to approve the test and retrieval plans or fails to issue the final disposal standards in the allotted time.

Having said that, however, I believe that given the very clearly stated concerns of the majority in the House regarding the Department of Energy's past conduct at the WIPP site, and the flexibility, albeit reluctantly at times, demonstrated on that side of the aisle during the conference, I am satisfied that this bill is one I can support.

I urge my colleagues to support the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma, [Mr. SYNAR].

Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Speaker, the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant Land Withdrawal Act now before us has several provisions that resulted from negotiations between the House and Senate which are likely to create more problems than they solve.

Earlier this year, the House passed legislation that would have required that the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] promulgate final disposal standards, and a certification by EPA that waste experiments were necessary to demonstrate compliance with those standards, before nuclear waste could be brought to WIPP.

This position would have ensured that no tests would be conducted except those that were truly needed and that this determination would be based on final EPA standards.

These tests which will cost hundreds of millions of dollars and take years to conduct should be based and aimed at demonstrating compliance with environmental standards in a timely manner and the House bill ensured that this would be the case.

Five years of oversight of WIPP convinced me that this requirement among others in the House bill, was essential to the establishment of credible and cost-effective test program.

Unfortunately, the deal struck in this conference report takes a different approach to this problem and simply requires the EPA to issue new regulations within 6 months of enactment and make a determination of suitability of the test plan within 10 months of enactment. If the agency kept to this schedule, there would not be a problem, but under the provisions of the bill the two requirements, stand alone and the test plan could, in fact, be approved in the absence of any standards.

While it is true that testing cannot begin at WIPP until final EPA stand-

ards are in place, the changes made by the conferees at this final hour could result in EPA's certification of the test plan to be a total sham. Clearly, this is not the intent of the conferees.

Earlier, I had supported the companion legislation reported by the House Energy and Commerce Committee and by the House.

I am in favor of solving our Nation's nuclear waste problems, but I am in favor of solving them the right way; with public credibility and accountability.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I support the conference report. I urge my colleagues to do like. This is a good resolution of a very difficult series of questions, and a very, very large number of conflicting interests and concerns. I believe it is fair to the people of the State involved, and I believe it is fair and in the best interests of the people of the country.

I commend my friend, the chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and the other chairmen and members who worked as conferees, and an extraordinarily fine group of staff members who made this possible.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT].

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in full support of this conference agreement. This bill left the House as a product of a compromise of three committees. It was fairly deliberated by the Armed Services Committee, the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and the Energy and Commerce Committee, and went to conference, and was compromised again. But I think it was compromised in favor of the House.

This bill provides that before the actual insertion of waste at the Carlsbad facility can take place, a final rule-making procedure must take place on the disposal standards, regulations for permanent disposal, and also final rule-making procedure ending in the publication of a final rule must take place as to the testing and retrieval provisions.

This has been carefully crafted and well compromised. It is a good bill. I fully support it and urge others to vote for it.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN].

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report. This facility is in my district. It has been ready to go for a number of years.

What we have been exercising is intellectual flagellation in this body over this issue for a long, long time. We are never going to solve this problem of re-

positories for nuclear waste until we get one started.

□ 1000

That facility is ready to go. This conference report at least gives us a date certain and a starting point.

It is time we got on to do it, because we have wasted almost 6 to 8 years in monkeying around with the legislation, making everybody associated with the issue and interested in the issue, giving them an opportunity to prevail and waste a lot of time that we could have been gathering data for the EPA. Because they have none at the present time.

I am strongly for it. I urge your support, because it is time we got on with this thing, because the temporary storage situation that we have going on today is a total waste of time and very dangerous.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KOSTMAYER].

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, in reference to what my friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SYNAR], said, the important point for the membership to remember here is none of this material can be buried at this site until the test standards and the disposal standards have been promulgated. Not one single cubic inch can go into the ground until that is done.

Probably none of this material will be deposited in New Mexico, I suspect, this century. It may be a good decade before it is completed.

We have taken every conceivable environmental precaution we could, and under the leadership of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] and the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], we have won a strong, tough bill, and on most of the environmental issues, the environmentalists and the House have succeeded. It is important that we go ahead and proceed with this.

This really closes the loop in terms of the nuclear cycle, in being able to dispose of waste. If this works, it will be a very important step in the right direction for the industry and for the country in learning how to deal with the disposal of this waste.

Whether we are going to generate more nuclear waste or not is not the question. The question is we have got to get rid of the material we have. This facility will take only 20 percent of all the waste that we have. Still 80 percent will remain unburied. We have to deal with that.

This legislation calls for a plan to be developed. This is a good plan. It can work. I urge its adoption.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, this is a historic agreement for New Mexico

and the Nation with respect to the disposal of transuranic nuclear waste at the waste isolation pilot plan [WIPP]. I want to commend my colleagues on the conference committee for their dedication and hard work to resolve this contentious issue in a manner that provides for fundamental health and safety standards while allowing WIPP to open without significant delay.

The most important aspect of this bill is that there are standards before any testing takes place.

As my colleagues know, I and many concerned New Mexicans have long held the position that WIPP be required to meet the Environmental Protection Agency's standards for radioactive waste disposal before any nuclear waste is emplaced in WIPP. We fought to achieve this standard for many years and finally right here on the floor of the House. Although we did not succeed, we must realize that we all are part of a democratic institution consisting of many ideals—a democratic institution in which by definition a single viewpoint rarely survives unscathed.

It is also important to realize that through this same democratic institution we have successfully implemented many critical health and safety provisions in the final version of the WIPP bill. I can remember during by first terms in Congress when the Department of Energy insisted on bringing upwards of 15 percent of the total waste capacity of WIPP in for the test phase—we have now limited that to one-half of 1 percent. I can remember when the Department of Energy insisted on having self-certification authority—we now have significant independent oversight by the EPA, the Mine Safety and Health Administration, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

I can remember when the Department of Energy insisted on limited public involvement on WIPP activities—we now have significant public involvement throughout the management and operation of WIPP. I can remember when the Department of Energy refused to have NRC certify the waste containers—NRC must now certify the design and quality of the containers. I can remember when the Department of Energy considered any actions taken by the Agency to go uncontested—we now have judicial review. Finally, I can remember when the State of New Mexico had no solid funding commitment to build safe highways and bypasses—we now have \$300 million authorized.

Those of us in New Mexico who have fought so hard to ensure the safety of WIPP have achieved many milestones. We have set up a process in which WIPP activities are reviewed and approved by independent agencies. We have set up a process in which the De-

partment of Energy must take remedial action or retrieve the waste if WIPP is found to be out of compliance with applicable environmental regulations. Finally, we have set up a process which allows for public involvement throughout the operation of WIPP. These are the critical elements of the conference agreement. It is in this respect that I feel confident that the public will be adequately protected.

Although I cannot support the conference report, this is a positive step in the direction of environmental safety.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

I do not intend to ask for a recorded vote on this. I think clearly in the Department of Energy bill that was passed earlier in the day that it was clear what the will of this body is.

It will be cited in the Senate. The two Senators from Nevada are already filibustering the energy bill. They will address this bill on that side until that language is adopted acceptable to those two Senators; let us hope it will not happen.

I think it was unfair, what was done. I think it was deceiving. I think the fact that this conference report was not laid onto the desk for a number of hours so a Member could look at it is unfair. But the fact is unfairness seems to be the matter of the day here today, not fairness.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRUCE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the conference report on the Senate bill, S. 1671.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**AIRPORT AND AIRWAY SAFETY CAPACITY, NOISE IMPROVEMENT, AND INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1992**

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works and Transportation be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6168) to amend the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1993, 1994, and 1995, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRUCE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 6168

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

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.**

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the "Airport and Airway Safety, Capacity, Noise Improvement, and Intermodal Transportation Act of 1992".

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Findings.

**TITLE I—AIRPORT AND AIRWAY IMPROVEMENT ACT AMENDMENTS**

Sec. 101. Declaration of policy.

Sec. 102. Airport improvement program.

Sec. 103. Airway improvement program.

Sec. 104. FAA operations.

Sec. 105. Linkage with passenger facility charges program.

Sec. 106. Apportionments.

Sec. 107. Military airports.

Sec. 108. Airport noise compatibility program.

Sec. 109. Maximum obligation of the United States.

Sec. 110. Terminal development.

Sec. 111. Letters of intent.

Sec. 112. Airport development defined.

Sec. 113. Public access and participation with respect to airports.

Sec. 114. National airway system.

Sec. 115. Definition of passengers enplaned.

Sec. 116. Extension of State block grant pilot program.

Sec. 117. Disadvantaged business enterprise.

Sec. 118. Extension of certain restrictions on contract and grant awards.

Sec. 119. Acquisition or construction of facilities for advanced training of maintenance technicians for air carrier aircraft.

Sec. 120. Air traffic controller staffing.

Sec. 121. Aviation safety inspectors.

Sec. 122. Limitation on privatization of operation of certain airport control towers.

Sec. 123. Effects of airport noise.

Sec. 124. Aviation safety inspectors.

Sec. 125. Aircraft operations in winter conditions.

Sec. 126. Visual flight rule routes for complex terminal airspace areas.

Sec. 127. Study on reflectorization of taxiway and runway markings.

Sec. 128. Options to purchase land.

Sec. 129. Lighting systems for aircraft obstructions and airport runways.

Sec. 130. Economic benefits of airport development projects.

Sec. 131. Soundproofing of certain residential buildings in areas surrounding airports.

Sec. 132. Laredo International Airport, Laredo, Texas.

Sec. 133. Study of small airport runway maintenance.

Sec. 134. Tucson study.

Sec. 135. Air traffic over Grand Canyon.

Sec. 136. Civil Tiltrotor Development Advisory Committee.

Sec. 137. Technical amendments.

**TITLE II—FEDERAL AVIATION ACT AMENDMENTS**

Sec. 201. Procurement reform.

Sec. 202. Aviation security training.

Sec. 203. Hazards to safe and efficient air commerce.

Sec. 204. National commission to promote a strong and competitive airline industry.

Sec. 205. Strengthening of competition.  
 Sec. 206. Slot rule effective date.  
 Sec. 207. Emergency vision equipment.  
 Sec. 208. Technical amendments to civil penalties.

**TITLE III—RESEARCH, ENGINEERING, AND DEVELOPMENT**

Sec. 301. Short title.

Sec. 302. Aviation research authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 303. Deicing study.

Sec. 304. Aircraft noise research program.

Sec. 305. Use of domestic products.

**TITLE IV—AVIATION INSURANCE**

Sec. 401. Insurance for departments and agencies of the United States.

Sec. 402. Extension of program.

Sec. 403. Administration of aviation insurance program.

Sec. 404. Continuation of aviation insurance laws.

**TITLE V—EXTENSION OF AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND**

Sec. 501. Extension of Airport and Airway Trust Fund.

Sec. 502. Clarification of trust fund revenues.

**SEC. 2. FINDINGS.**

Congress finds that—

(1) the Nation's aviation system must be part of an intermodal transportation system consisting of hubs and interconnections with other forms of transportation that will move people and goods in the fastest, most efficient manner;

(2) our Nation's airports are our interconnections with the global economy; expanded flight capacity and greatly improved ground access for passengers and cargo are essential to our Nation's ability to compete in the international marketplace;

(3) without significant additional financial resources, the Nation's airports will be unable to accommodate fully the growing aviation and ground traffic demands of the 1990's;

(4) 27 of the Nation's top 100 airports are now unacceptably congested and the resulting delays in flights are costing our economy billions of dollars a year in lost productivity and undermining the Nation's ability to compete in the global economy;

(5) unless the capacity of our airports is increased substantially, the problem of flight delays will escalate dramatically and, by the year 2000, 40 major airports will be congested and incurring more than 20,000 hours of flight delay a year;

(6) the Nation must undertake an airport improvement and development program costing at least \$7,000,000,000 a year over the next decade just to prevent the problem of airport delay from growing worse in the 21st century;

(7) neither State, local, nor Federal Government can independently finance the needed airport and intermodal development and there must be a combined effort relying on all levels of government;

(8) both the Federal airport improvement program and local passenger facility charge programs are essential to funding the development, as part of an intermodal transportation system, of airports (including necessary ground access eligible for funding under such programs) which meet our Nation's needs;

(9) the Nation's air traffic control system must be modernized with the highest advanced technology to enable it to continue to move traffic safely and efficiently and the necessary development and procurement of capital equipment will cost at least \$18,000,000,000 over the next decade;