

the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1915

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1950

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1950.

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

There was no objection.

ENRON EMPLOYEES PROVIDED SEVERANCE BENEFITS

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, just a few months ago in Houston, Texas, Enron filed bankruptcy. Hours after the bankruptcy filing occurred, 5,000 fellow Houstonians, many of whom were my constituents, were fired, terminated, with no relief and no benefits.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to announce that a tentative settlement has been agreed to, yet to be approved by the court, to provide the ex-Enron employees with their needed and with their deserved and with their old severance pay.

Let me acknowledge the work of the AFL-CIO and Rainbow/PUSH Coalition and Reverend Jesse Jackson, working in a collaborative effort to encourage the employees not to be silent.

We made history today, Mr. Speaker. For the first time in a bankruptcy court proceeding, unsecured creditors were able to receive funding before any proceedings were to go forth. These employees, who basically have no standing in a bankruptcy proceeding, now with the creditors' committee, now with the lawyers, now with Enron as it presently stands, have agreed to provide this severance pay.

I think this is a historic day. But it gives the Congress the opportunity to change the Bankruptcy Code, and the bankruptcy laws as well, to ensure that employees who are victimized and not at fault will have the opportunity to receive their benefits.

I look forward to this Congress acting immediately. I would like to thank the minority leader, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), and, of course, the leader of the other body for their help.

PRIVATIZATION OF AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS

(Mr. BACA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, the administration decided last week to privatize our air traffic controllers by executive order. So why are we spending millions on transportation security, federalizing baggage screeners, if we are going to commit ourselves to unsafe air travel?

Our Nation's air travel problems were on the ground with the security screeners, not in the air with the traffic controllers. Why are we penalizing them? These men and women take pride every day in keeping their fellow citizens safe as they travel America's skies.

On September 11, the controllers landed 5,000 planes in less than 2 hours without an operational error. My question is, Where is the problem? Why are we privatizing it?

The President's recent steps toward privatizing air controllers is a step towards disaster, and I state, towards disaster, literally. On September 11, we quickly realized that using private companies to handle airport security was a mistake. We federalized airport security because private contractors could not do the job. Why would we lock the windows, only to open the doors to potential disaster?

Privatizing has proven to be a mistake in most prominent nations. I say this is wrong. Let us not privatize our system. Let us allow the controllers to do the job, to keep our airlines safe.

PROTECT THE CONSTITUTION

(Mr. KUCINICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, this morning I, along with 30 other Members of the House, filed a lawsuit in Federal District Court to block the President from withdrawing from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty of 1972.

The President, by withdrawing from this particular treaty, insists that he has the authority to terminate any treaty and can do so without the consent of Congress. But according to article VI, clause 2 of the Constitution, treaties constitute the supreme law of the land and the President does not have the authority to repeal laws.

Article I, section 1 empowers the Congress to create laws and charges the President only with carrying out these laws. Thus, the President's termination of the ABM Treaty represents an unconstitutional repeal of a law duly enacted by Congress.

The world's geopolitical trash bin is already littered with treaties and agreements unilaterally discarded by the United States under this administration. It is critical that we reassert congressional authority and end this pattern.

AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL PRIVATIZATION

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. air traffic control system is the largest and most complex in the world, and it is the safest. President Bush issued an executive order last week stripping aircraft traffic control of its inherently governmental designation. This is the first step in his plan to privatize our air traffic control system.

Privatization has failed in other countries. Canada's air traffic controllers face 6-day work weeks, mandatory overtime and a contract that expired in March. Air traffic controllers on September 11 landed 5,000 planes in the span of 2 hours without an operational error. Yet President Bush wants to privatize the air traffic control system. He wants to privatize Social Security; that will not work. He wants to privatize Medicare; that will not work. Now he wants to privatize our air traffic control system, and that will not work.

Air traffic controllers should remain under the direct supervision of the FAA, which is doing a good job to maintain the necessary levels of training, of personnel, and of common experience.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 96, PROPOSING A TAX LIMITATION AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-503) on the resolution (H. Res. 439) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 96) proposing a tax limitation amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4019, PERMANENT MARRIAGE PENALTY RELIEF ACT OF 2002

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-504) on the resolution (H. Res. 440) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4019) to provide that the marriage penalty relief provisions of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 shall be permanent, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

IMPORTANCE OF PASSENGER RAIL AND FUTURE OF AMTRAK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the important issue of passenger rail in America and the future of Amtrak.

The passenger rail system suffers from gross neglect of our investment. We have actively engaged in financing and developing and preserving the infrastructure of all other modes of transportation, whether it be bailing out the airlines, federally funding and fixing the State highway system, or subsidizing airport construction. However, we continue to be faced with the possibility that Amtrak may suddenly have to cease operations. Recently, Amtrak president David Young said that if Amtrak did not receive a \$200 million loan in the next 3 weeks, it would have to begin shutting down operations.

Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that we build a world-class passenger railroad system in the United States. We cannot wait for highways and airports to become so overwhelmed that they can no longer operate, and we cannot continue to hold the millions of Americans who rely on rail service in limbo while we refuse to provide Amtrak with adequate funding. We must engage in long-term planning.

The terrorist attacks of September 11 and the aftermath that followed exposed the vulnerability of our society, our economy when transportation choices are limited and our mobility is diminished.

After the FAA grounded all flights following the terrorist attacks, travelers turned to Amtrak. Whether people had to travel for business, to help with rescue efforts, or just to get home, Amtrak kept our American citizens moving during the time of national emergency. Amtrak's ridership and revenues skyrocketed, led by the northeast corridor, which had a 13.5 percent revenue growth and a 4.6 percent ridership growth in 2001.

The system as a whole, including the corridor, revenue rose 8.2 percent, ridership 4.3 percent. The situation not only proved that Amtrak works but that passenger rail is critical to our transportation infrastructure during national emergencies or a security crisis.

Amtrak provided a critical transportation link, carrying 35,000 passengers along the northeast corridor every day and hundreds of extra carloads of mail for the U.S. Postal Office in the days following 9-11.

Mr. Speaker, it was not until 1956 that the government began heavily promoting highway transportation with the passage of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956. The act established a highway trust fund based upon Federal user taxes in order to finance up to 90 percent of State construction

costs of the \$25 billion plan to pay for new roads and the construction of the Eisenhower National Interstate and Defense Highway System. Similar policies and Federal attention for aviation resulted in the strengthening of the aviation industry.

Amtrak was created as a Federal corporation in order to relieve the railroad industry of unprofitable passenger operations and in the interests of maintaining a national passenger rail service. Per capita spending in America on passenger rail is dismal compared to the other 23 industrialized nations with rail service.

I would like to present, Mr. Speaker, that part as a part of the RECORD for the edification of all those concerns.

The material referred to follows:

NARP—WORLD MAINLINE RAIL SPENDING PER CAPITA

The United States ranks low among industrial nations in terms of its spending on rail spending—both in whole terms and per capita.

Population density is not entirely a determining factor—on the chart below, Norway, Finland, Sweden and Canada all spend more than the U.S. per capita, yet have lower population densities. Estonia is slightly more densely populated than the U.S., yet invests over twice as much in rail per capita. Some states in the U.S. have population densities closer to that of some of the other countries.

Even as a society, you get what you pay for. Is it any wonder that the passenger rail system in the U.S. is so skeletal compared to other countries?

Selected countries, U.S. dollars, 1999—capital and operating support from governments to major national railways

Belgium	834.39
Austria	117.30
Switzerland	162.65
Luxembourg	160.69
France	67.66
Slovenia	46.98
Italy	46.09
Netherlands	44.36
Ireland	43.75
Sweden	39.09
Croatia	37.40
Britain	36.98
Slovakia	26.27
Norway	24.92
Spain	22.76
Hungary	21.06
Czech Republic	20.08
Germany	18.60
Romania	15.75
Yugoslavia	13.83
Estonia	7.67
Finland	5.95
China	5.21
Canada	5.09
United States	3.28
Poland	3.13
South Korea	3.11
Turkey	1.55
Portugal	1.48
Saudi Arabia	0.82
Cameroon	0.23
Algeria	0.20
Senegal	0.17
Chile	0.17
Malaysia	0.16
Taiwan	0.15
Mali	0.02

NOTES

U.S. spending includes 2000 federal appropriations for the Federal Railroad Administration (including for Amtrak and high-speed programs) and state payments to Amtrak.

Canada includes VIA Rail Canada only, for 2000.

Information from 1998 for Sweden and Taiwan.

Information from 1997 for Luxembourg, Cameroon, Mali, Senegal, and Malaysia.

International Union of Railways (UIC), Paris, for spending figures except: United States, from appropriations information; Canada, from Transport Canada; Britain, from Department of Transport, Local Government, and Regions; and China (includes infrastructure spending only), from International Railway Journal.

Time Almanac (2000) for population figures.

Yahoo.com for exchange rates (March 19, 2002; historical information from same source used where available).

While we subsidize the building of roads and highways, Mr. Speaker, with tax dollars, we must ensure the survival of Amtrak. It is a wise use of taxpayer money. It is for the benefit of the American public. It is for the benefit of the transmission of cargo in this country. I would urge Members to sign onto legislation that I have authored which would authorize \$1.5 billion annually for corridor developments. They are needed for the infrastructure, highway-rail grade crossing improvement, acquisition of rolling stock and track and signal equipment.

Mr. Speaker, the rest of my remarks for the benefit of time and the limitation that has been afforded in this 5 minutes will go into a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for further explanation, but I would encourage the Members of this body who believe that America should engage in economic stimulus for the benefit of jobs, for the benefit of the American people, to sign onto my bill that would ensure the continued survival and viability of Amtrak, a very vital, needed service for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the important issue of passenger rail in America, and the future of Amtrak.

The passenger rail system suffers from gross neglect of our investment. We have actively engaged in financing, developing, and preserving the infrastructure of all other modes of transportation. Whether bailing out the airline industry, federally funding and fixing the interstate highway system, or subsidizing airport construction. Finally, it will require an annual independent audit of Amtrak, to be reviewed by the Department of Transportation's Inspector General.

By developing passenger rail as part of a balanced transportation system, this legislation will lead to the creation of jobs in the short run to stimulate our economy. In the long run, high-speed rail corridors will become a key foundation for our national rail passenger transportation system, which is critical to the strong backbone of a prosperous economy.

I understand that this legislation is an ambitious blueprint, but I believe that with the appropriate funding, America's passenger rail can take its appropriate place as the best rail system in the world.

We continue to be faced with the possibility that Amtrak may suddenly have to cease operations. Recently, Amtrak CEO David Gunn said that if Amtrak did not receive a \$200 million loan in the next 3 weeks, it would have to begin shutting down operations.