

moves to Savannah. It moves to the Waste Isolation Plant, WIPP, where most of this is concentrated, but certainly not all of them.

The point is, the waste has been moving around the country—military waste—for a long period of time. There are no demonstrations, there are no particularly extraordinary methods.

In this photo, you can see the truck hauling the waste. It is in canisters that can withstand fire. At one time, we had the capability of designing a cask that could stand a free fall of 30,000 feet and it would not penetrate the interior. So we have built these casks adequately and safely.

Some have indicated that these waste shipments are only a few. I think it is to the contrary. This chart shows spent fuel shipments regulated by the NRC from 1964 through the year 2000. We have had almost 3,000 shipments. We shipped over 1.7 million miles and we have had zero radiation releases. For low-level radiant waste shipments to WIPP from 1997 to 2001, we have had 896 shipments, and we shipped about 900,000 miles. So we have a total of 3,800 shipments total, 2.6 million miles, with no harmful radiation releases.

We have the technology and, obviously, if we can build reactors to generate power, we certainly have the capability to transfer and transport the energy, the rods that go in the reactors. Nobody seems to say anything or have any great concern about the reactor fueling process itself or how the fuel is shipped across the country. But we have this hue and cry that somehow it is dangerous to move this waste on our highways and railroads. We have that capability. We have responsible people—scientists, engineers—who are competent to move this. Some suggest we should resolve this in a town hall meeting atmosphere. We need experts, engineers, technicians. They are staking their reputation—just as those who develop the nuclear energy industry in this country—on their capability to move this safely.

My point is that it has been done. It is proven. This is military waste, but now we are talking about private waste from our reactors. Some have also said this is a decision being made in haste; that we ought to put it off for more resolve. Nothing could be further from the truth. We have spent 20 years in this process. We have expended over \$4 billion at Yucca drilling into the mountain—I have been there; I have gone in—to determine whether the site is scientifically and technically suitable for development of the repository. This is not a decision that was made in haste. This is a decision that has been made actually over 24 years of extensive study by the world's best scientists.

As a consequence, I am confident in the work done to date by the Department of Energy. But this work will not cease with this recommendation on the resolution. On the contrary, scientific investigation and analysis will con-

tinue for the life of the repository. In sum, I cannot think of any reason except perhaps plain old opposition, which we have a little bit of here, to the fact of the repository itself and the realization of putting off a vote on the resolution, which is the business at hand.

The science is going to continue through the licensing process and well beyond. Transportation matters will be addressed thoroughly in the licensing process by the appropriate agencies. Plus, we already have an excellent record in that area upon which to build. The decision is not being rushed. It is something that has been in the works for over two decades.

As we look at the competence of our nuclear program development, whether it be military, whether it be nuclear submarines that are on patrol constantly, whether it be under our agreement to reduce our nuclear capability by cutting up some of the old submarines, by removing, if you will, the reactors, we have competent people in charge of this operation. Anything less that would suggest we cannot move this waste is simply an excuse for inaction.

Every Member has to reflect on an obligation that after we set up a procedure to take the waste in 1998, certainly the Federal Government should honor the terms and conditions of that contract, and Members should not look for an excuse to simply punt on this issue.

The bottom line is, let's face it, I say to my colleagues, and the simple reality is, nobody wants this waste. Politically, it is dynamite. We have waste stored in Hanford, the State of Washington, Savannah, we have waste stored up and down the east coast. Do we want to leave it there, where it is unprotected, or do we want to move it to one place on which we can agree? Let's recognize the reality. We have expended the funds. We made the commitments. Now it is time to move. We cannot dodge this for another Congress.

I thank the Presiding Officer for recognition and wish him a good day. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in morning business.

AMTRAK

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, it is Friday. The weekend starts for most people today. It looks as if it is going to be a great weekend whether at the Delaware beaches or the New Jersey shore. Next weekend might start a little early for a lot of people in this country, for hundreds of thousands, maybe millions of commuters from Trenton, NJ, to New York, Connecticut, Philadelphia, Wilmington,

Baltimore, Washington, Chicago, and out on the west coast, L.A., and a lot of other places as well because right now it looks as if, starting in the latter part of next week, Amtrak will begin an orderly shutdown of its operations, and there will be a cascading effect that will also lead to disruption of commuter operations in all those cities and many others I did not mention.

Amtrak is running out of operating funds for this fiscal year. They expect to run out of operating funds sometime in early July. The new president of Amtrak has announced his intention to try to negotiate a loan for Amtrak from a consortium of commercial banks, which Amtrak has done any number of times in the past, for operating moneys to bridge a period of time until the new Federal grant comes through or to negotiate money for capital improvements to Amtrak.

Those negotiations were underway in earnest early this week. I understand the auditors for Amtrak were not able to say with conviction that Amtrak was a going concern because, in part, of the announcement of the administration yesterday for the Amtrak restructuring plan, which is really, in my judgment, an Amtrak dismantling plan.

Rather than Amtrak being able to negotiate the bridge loan with private lenders to carry them through the end of the year when our new appropriation might be available, Amtrak faces a cutoff of its operations, again, the impending effect on commuters throughout this country late next week.

The Presiding Officer and I have discussed this situation any number of times in the year and a half we have been here, and we have discussed it more earnestly in the last week or two. I am mindful of the efforts he is making to avert what could be a disaster. They are efforts that are supported by any number of our colleagues.

A week or so ago, 52 of us finished putting our signatures on a letter to the ranking members of the Senate Appropriations Committee voicing our support for a \$1.2 billion appropriation for Amtrak in the next fiscal year. A week or so prior to that, the Senate voted to accept a provision included in the Senate appropriations bill for another \$55 million as part of an emergency supplemental to enable repair work to begin on Amtrak locomotives, passenger cars, and sleeping cars that had been damaged in wrecks around the country, wrecks, frankly, not caused by Amtrak or Amtrak's neglect, but because of trucks that were on the tracks in some places and because of problems with track bed outside the Northeast corridor that led to a derailling.

That money is in the emergency appropriations bill passed by the Senate and is one of the items at issue in the conference. I have been led to believe the President has threatened to veto even those moneys as part of the emergency supplemental if they remain in the bill.

We are looking at a train wreck. It seems to me we look at a train wreck about every year close to this time.

I wish to take a moment this morning to look back over time. I would like for us to go back to 1970. That was when Amtrak was created. Amtrak was created because our Nation's private railroads did not want to continue to carry passengers. They could not make money doing that. They wanted out of the business. Then-President Richard Nixon signed into law legislation creating Amtrak.

The deal was the private railroads would pony up some money to buy Amtrak stock. They agreed to turn over all of their old locomotives, their old passenger cars, their old dining cars, their old sleeper cars. They agreed to turn over their old track bed in the Northeast corridor between Washington and Boston, old overhead wires, old signaling systems, old repair shops around the country, old train stations, and give all that to Amtrak.

Somehow Amtrak, with a little seed money, was to make a go of, and begin turning a profit from, operations that the private sector could not make profitable. It did not happen. We should not be surprised that it did not happen because it has not happened in other countries either.

For those Americans who this summer are going to be traveling to places in Europe—England, France, Spain, Italy, Germany, up into Scandinavia—throughout Europe, they are going to ride on trains that will almost take their breath away, beautiful trains, trains that run at speeds of close to 200 miles an hour, trains where one can sit with a cup of coffee or a cup of tea on the table and it does not even rattle or vibrate.

Americans are going to be traveling to places in Asia this summer, and they will ride trains in Japan and other countries that provide a similar high-quality, fast, dependable service. In those countries, the private sector does not operate that train service. The national governments of those nations have decided it is in their naked self-interest to invest their taxpayers' dollars in national passenger rail service. They do not do it out of some sense of altruism. They do it because they realize that in order to relieve congestion on their highways and in their airports, passenger rail can make a big contribution toward reducing that congestion.

Those countries, those governments, realize that in order to reduce their dependence on foreign oil and to reduce their trade deficits, passenger rail service can make a real contribution.

They have problems with clean air in those countries as well, and they realize, compared to the emissions that come out of their cars, trucks, and vans, that the emissions emitted by passenger trains are far less.

We have similar kinds of concerns in this country. We have congestion around our airports and on our Nation's highways worse by far than we

did in 1970. We have problems with air pollution that are as bad, or maybe worse, than the problems we faced in 1970, certainly with respect to global warming and carbon dioxide in our atmosphere. We have a trade deficit in this country that makes our trade deficit woes of 1970 pale by comparison. Over half of our oil is imported, and that number is growing. In the 1970s, not even a third of our oil was imported.

National passenger rail service will not solve all of these problems for the United States, but it will help us to reduce the size of those problems. We can take a lesson from our neighbors, our sister nations in Europe and in Asia, and we ought to do that.

There are a whole series of things that need to happen this year and next. I want to mention those, and then I will close. We need to pass an emergency appropriations bill that includes at least \$55 million so the work can begin on repairing wrecked trains in order to provide service to people, especially the Auto Train south of Washington to Orlando, FL, where Amtrak actually makes money. We need to keep that money in the supplemental appropriation. It would be great to grow it, but we at least need to keep that money.

The White House has, in my judgment, a moral responsibility. Having acted this week in a way that I believe disrupts Amtrak's ability to negotiate a private sector loan from a consortium of banks for \$200 million to carry them through the end of this fiscal year, the administration should use their discretion, authorized under law, as I understand, through the FRA, to provide a loan guarantee so that Amtrak can obtain the money it needs to avoid the kind of disruption we are going to begin witnessing by next weekend if nothing is done.

We need to take up in the Senate the Amtrak reauthorization bill, which has cleared the Committee on Energy and Commerce by a vote, I think, of 21 to 3. Senator HOLLINGS has been a champion for passenger rail service. He has authored very good legislation. Many of us have cosponsored it. We need to take it up, and we need to pass a motion to proceed and debate it.

If people want to offer amendments to it, that is all well and good. We debate amendments, vote them up or down, and then move on to the bill. Fifty-two of our colleagues in the Senate have said: We believe Amtrak ought to be funded at \$1.2 billion next fiscal year, and we need to go forward. As we take up the appropriations bill, we need to provide that money through the appropriations process in the Senate and work with our colleagues in the House and in the administration.

Finally, we need a good, healthy debate on what the future of passenger rail service should be in this country. I realize that the heydays of passenger rail of the 1800s and the early 1900s are behind us, but there is still a huge need

for the good that passenger rail service can provide us with respect to congestion, air congestion, highway congestion, with respect to reducing the emissions into our air, and with respect to reducing our reliance on foreign oil and trying to curtail, at least a little, our trade deficit.

What should the future passenger rail service be in this country? In my judgment, it ought to include making the Northeast corridor world class. As to the beautiful Acela Express train service that is now available, we are not able to harness the full potential of those trains from Washington to Boston because of the work that can and should be done to the track bed, to the overhead wires, to the signaling system, to enable the trains to go 150 or 160 miles an hour, which is faster than in many places they can now go.

We need to begin developing high-speed rail corridors in other parts of this country, the southeastern United States and Florida, in and out of Atlanta. The Northeast corridor finally should be extended at least into Virginia, maybe as far as Richmond. I know there are people in North Carolina who would like to see the Northeast corridor extended into North Carolina where they are investing in passenger rail service on their own.

There are any number of densely populated corridors such as out of Chicago, Chicago/St. Louis, Chicago/Milwaukee, Chicago/Indianapolis, Chicago/Detroit, where it makes a lot more sense for people to travel on high-speed trains instead of on commuter airlines that are going less than 300 miles.

On the west coast, whether it is L.A. to San Diego or maybe L.A. to Las Vegas, L.A. to San Francisco, Portland, Spokane, Seattle, Portland-Seattle, Seattle-Vancouver, those are areas that are just ripe for high-speed passenger rail. The challenge for us is how to raise the money to put in place the infrastructure, the high-speed rail capability, the track bed, the overhead wires, the signaling, to be able to provide the service where it would be used.

The former chairman of the Amtrak board of directors who succeeded me on the Amtrak board, and preceded me on the Amtrak board, is former Wisconsin Governor Tommy Thompson, now Secretary of Health and Human Services. He and I believe, as do many others, including many in this body, there needs to be a dedicated source of capital for passenger rail service in this country to make world class the Northeast corridor, to begin developing, in conjunction and coordination with the right-of-way of freight railroads, the high-speed corridors in these densely populated areas of America.

I was struck to learn a couple of years ago that 75 percent of the people in America today live within 50 miles of one of our coasts. Think about that. As time goes by, the density of our population, especially in those coastal

areas, will not diminish, it will increase. The potential good that passenger rail service can provide for us will increase as well.

Not everybody wants to ride a train from one end of the country to the other. Some people do, but a lot of people could benefit by riding a train in a densely populated corridor. A lot of people every day ride the longest train in the world, and that is the Auto Train that leaves just south of Washington, DC, down to near Orlando, FL, and back every day.

There are people who ride trains that go through spectacular parts of America. They go along the northern part of America, the Northwest, and the Coast Starlight from the west coast from one end of California up to the Canadian border. People are willing to pay good money to ride those trains.

I think one of the big questions we face is, What do we do with the other long-distance trains where Amtrak is unable to provide service and out of the farebox pay for the full cost of the service? I was always frustrated as Governor that when Delaware received Federal transportation monies, we did not have the discretion to use any of that money to help pay for passenger rail service in our State, which did not make sense.

For example, we could use our Federal congestion mitigation money in my State—other Governors could in their States—for freight railroads. We could use it for roads and highways. We could use that Federal congestion mitigation money for bicycle paths. We could not use it for passenger rail service, even if it made sense for our States. That is foolish. That ought to change. This Senate has tried to change it any number of times. We have not gotten the support we need from the other body. Sometimes we have not gotten the support we need from the administration. We should give Governors and mayors the discretion to use a portion of their money to help underwrite the cost of long-distance trains that are not fully sustainable.

A number of years ago when I was on the Amtrak board, we started an experiment to see if Amtrak might partner with the freight railroads, when operating outside the Northeast corridor, to carry things other than people, such as mail, express packages, but also to carry other commodities, even perishable commodities, that are highly time sensitive in terms of getting where they are needed.

A lot of times, shippers will use trucks because they believe there is a greater reliance in terms of on-time performance, and especially in shorter distances, but a greater ability than trucking to provide on-time performance, and we started an experiment to see if maybe we could carry not only people but commodities as well, and specially designed cars attached to Amtrak trains. If Amtrak were able to make money carrying these commod-

ities on the track bed of a freight railroad, Amtrak would share the profits with the freight railroads. Amtrak would have a way to supplement its costs and to underwrite its costs of the long-distance trains which, frankly, do not make money.

Amtrak has entered into an agreement with, I believe it is the Burlington Northern-Santa Fe Railroad, to be able to do that kind of thing, and it has attempted to negotiate with other freight railroads. That could be part of a solution as well. I am not sure there is consensus in this body as to what the long-term passenger rail system should be in this country. I am not sure we know.

We do know if we do not do something, if the administration does not do something, by next weekend we are going to have a train wreck. Not a literal train wreck but a figurative train wreck. A lot of people who will want to go to work next Thursday or Friday are not going to get to work or they will end up in traffic jams in and around their cities and communities, the likes of which they have not seen for a long time. Maybe on the brighter side, some people who didn't want to go to work next Thursday or Friday will get a long weekend. For them, maybe that is good. For our Nation, this is not good.

We need to address this issue. We need to address it today. The administration has that capability of addressing it today. The administration should use discretion as provided to the Federal Railroad Administration to use the loan guarantee to enable Amtrak to go forward for us to have an orderly debate over this fiscal year to determine the long-term course for passenger rail service in America.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I would like to respond to the comments made yesterday morning by the Secretary of Transportation in regards to Amtrak.

Frankly, I am puzzled by his remarks yesterday, puzzled because many of us in this body have been calling for the administration to take a position on Amtrak's future since last July, when a group of us met with Secretary Mineta and Federal Railroad Administrator Rutter. Earlier this year, when the Commerce Committee prepared to mark-up the National Defense Rail Act, we again sought the administration's input. The administration did not raise any significant objection, and the bill was reported favorably by the committee by an overwhelming margin.

Indeed, the only thing we knew of the administration's feelings toward Amtrak was that the Office of Management and Budget refused to release the \$100 million in funding that the Congress appropriated late last year for improved security on trains and in stations.

After a full year of being AWOL on this issue, the administration suddenly announced that it would like to see massive, but vaguely defined, struc-

tural changes at Amtrak. And Secretary Mineta has said that without these big changes, whatever they may be, the administration will oppose Congressional attempts to increase funding for Amtrak. The Senate should not be cowed by this kind of bullying. The administration could have been a full partner in this process by raising these concerns last year, or even before the committee considered the National Rail Defense Act.

Instead, the administration has chosen to take a position that is diametrically opposed to the goals of the National Defense Rail Act, which now has 35 cosponsors. Rather than give Amtrak the resources it needs to run a forward-looking, national rail system, it seeks to tear down our national rail system and replace it with a model similar to the failed British model of rail privatization. The administration would like to have a regional passenger rail system, based on a model that is universally derided for its inefficiency and its lack of safety. The British experience has shown us that safe, efficient, reliable service cannot be done on the cheap. But that kind of short-sighted penny-pinching is exactly what the President has in mind. This strategy could strip countless communities, including several in Massachusetts, of train service, further reducing transportation alternatives in those parts of our country.

Much as the administration would like to score philosophical points with conservative think tanks, the issue here is not who actually runs the trains and maintains the tracks. The fact is that the most important issue for Amtrak is funding, and whether we want to dedicate the sort of funds that will be necessary to maintain and enhance a national passenger rail network, and whether we want to try to build high-speed rail corridors into that network.

In his remarks yesterday, Secretary Mineta said "The country can ill afford to throw billions of Federal dollars at Amtrak and just hope its problems disappear." He is right about one thing: We cannot wish away Amtrak's problems. But Amtrak's biggest problem is that, for 30 years, we have given it just enough funding to get by, but never enough to be truly viable. In his most recent review of the company's finances, the Department of Transportation's Inspector General mused, "It's amazing that Amtrak has gotten this far." While Amtrak has limped along on insufficient funding, our highways have become choked and our skyways will soon be once again strained beyond their capacity.

Now we hear that Amtrak is prepared to shut down as soon as next week unless it receives immediate financial assistance. This will leave 22.5 million riders without train transportation. Let's be clear: The administration, by virtue of its non-involvement in this issue, will bear the responsibility for this unprecedented blow to our national transportation network. I would

like to know how the administration will handle the immediate extra burden placed on other transportation modes. Rather than put \$200 million into Amtrak, it appears they would prefer to continue to spend billions more on already-clogged highways and skyways.

We must remember that this Nation has spent less than 4 percent of our Nation's transportation budget on inter-city passenger rail over the life of Amtrak. We've spent more than \$300 billion spent on highways, nearly \$200 billion on airports and just \$35 billion on inter-city passenger rail in 32 years.

As Amtrak's ridership has increased despite its financial condition, that is not good enough anymore.

I would also add that Amtrak's place in the \$2-trillion Federal budget is tiny. We spend \$150 billion per year on debt service alone, but just \$521 million on inter-city passenger rail. The Commerce Committee's bill, authorizes full funding for Amtrak's security, operating and capital needs. For the first time in its 30-year history, we would appropriately fund passenger rail.

I think a lot of criticisms frequently raised about Amtrak are indeed warranted. Its management structure is top-heavy and unwieldy. The company's new president has already announced plans to restructure management. That is a positive step, but we can and should reserve judgment on the success of that restructuring until it is fully implemented.

Amtrak is not sufficiently insulated from political pressures. That is also a legitimate concern, and one that must be addressed. Language inserted in the National Rail Defense Act would take a step toward ensuring that decisions about route terminations are made based on objective financial criteria. Still, we must do more to ensure that Congress provides oversight of the company, without unduly burdening it.

Clearly, the company's fiscal problems have been exacerbated by the Congress's unrealistic requirement that Amtrak meet an "operational self-sufficiency." As a result, Amtrak explored a wide variety of revenue options, with varying degrees of success. The new CEO, David Gunn, has expressed a desire to return Amtrak to its fundamental mission of moving people.

As these changes in the company are implemented, I believe it would be a grave mistake to allow the termination of Amtrak. And make no mistake, that is the road we are headed down. So I urge my colleagues to work toward an appropriation that will allow Amtrak to stand on solid financial ground in the short term, and toward passage of reauthorization legislation that allows our country to develop high-speed rail corridors without sacrificing traditional rail service. Unfortunately, the administration's plan does neither of those things.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

THE PRESIDENTIAL INITIATIVE TO REDUCE AIDS TRANSMISSION

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, Wednesday I was asked by a member of the press about the President's announcement of an initiative to spend \$500 million, including \$200 million Congress has already approved for the current fiscal year, to fight the global AIDS pandemic by targeting the transmission of the disease from mothers to infants.

I applauded the President and his decision. His participation in the bipartisan campaign to combat this international health crisis is welcome and significant.

It is important to understand, however, that the President does not pledge any new resources until 2004. And the overall amount of resources he does commit to, while important, isn't enough.

The human toll this health crisis has already inflicted on this country and the world is staggering.

Every twelve seconds, one person dies due to complications from AIDS. Every minute, one of those people is an infant.

Each day brings 14,000 new infections, with half of those infected under the age of 25.

There are currently 30 million people with HIV in Africa, and the National Intelligence Council estimates that number could double in the next five years.

And, as if these numbers are not tragic enough, there is one more staggering statistic: by the end of this decade forty-four million children will have lost their parents to AIDS.

It is also important to understand that, as these statistics demonstrate, the international community doesn't have the luxury of time in reversing the spread of AIDS worldwide. Good intentions must be matched by commensurate resources if we are to reverse current trends.

Earlier this month, against the backdrop of those horrific—and mounting—numbers, the Senate debated its version of the FY2002 emergency supplemental appropriations bill. Prior to the Senate's consideration of this important legislation, a bipartisan group of Senators urged the Appropriations Committee to provide additional resources in this bill to combat AIDS so that funds to address this problem could be released right away.

The committee responded by including \$100 million to fight AIDS and other diseases in the supplemental. And before the Senate could take up the committee's work, a group of senators—Democratic and Republican—

proposed that this bill not leave the Senate floor with less than \$500 million for this purpose.

Regrettably, according to news stories, the White House feels \$500 million is too much for AIDS this year.

Under pressure from the White House, several Republican Senators withdrew their support for adding \$500 million for AIDS this year, and the effort failed. The Senate was forced to settle for \$200 million.

Just \$200 million to fight a deadly disease that already infects 40 million people and is projected to infect millions more.

So, while I find Wednesday's announcement an encouraging indication of a growing awareness within the administration of the need to engage in the battle against the international AIDS crisis, the resources it is willing to commit to this challenge still fall far short of what is needed. And far short of what I believe this great nation is capable of and should be doing.

As for availability, the President's initiative sets aside \$300 million in fiscal year 2004, 16 months from now.

Based on UN estimates, over those next 16 months, more than 1.1 million babies could contract HIV. The President's plan aims to prevent just 146,000 infections in 5 years.

Again, these resources are welcome, but I cannot help but feel that we have just missed a tremendous opportunity. When we wait to dedicate the resources necessary to fight this battle, we make our eventual victory against this threat harder—and more costly.

Does the administration truly believe that this \$300 million could not be spent wisely and well now? If not, why?

So I come to the floor this afternoon to offer to work with the President and my colleagues to do two things with regard to the new initiative.

First, because the transmission of HIV from mother to child is an area where we know we can reduce the spread of HIV, it is vital that we increase funding in the area of mother-to-child transmission. But it is not enough to keep children from being infected with HIV *in utero*. We should commit to a major effort to treat the mothers and other family members already infected with the deadly virus so that children, free from the virus at birth, will grow up not as orphans, but with the support of their families.

Second, I do not believe we should wait until 2004 to put this initiative fully into action. We should include the full \$200 million in this year's supplemental, and we must find significant, additional resources in the next fiscal year.

On a bipartisan basis during the last two years, Congress has significantly increased the amount of resources the President has sought for the global HIV/AIDS battle. And we must do so again.

In announcing Wednesday's initiative, President Bush said, "The wasted