

said, reflecting on her famous father, who died in 2002 at age 90.

"He was very humble and unassuming. He's been a tremendous inspiration to me my whole life," she said.

Clark County, too, has assembled some of Cannon's photographs and memorabilia for its Cannon Aviation Museum.

"Had we not had the paratroopers, it was highly likely the invasion would not have been successful," said Mark Hall-Patton, administrator of the Clark County Museum on Boulder Highway in Henderson.

"And to have somebody who later was the local DA and Nevada senator who was copilot of the lead plane is huge," he said.

"He was the one who, among other things, deregulated the airlines and played a key role in passage of the Civil Rights Act. He was a Democrat who was able to bring the Republicans in and get that passed for (President Lyndon B.) Johnson," Hall-Patton said.

After his death in 2002, a Review-Journal editorial recognized his political savvy. "The senator would never tell what deal President Lyndon Johnson offered him for his role in ending the Southern filibuster which would otherwise have prevented the Civil Rights Act from coming to a vote in 1964."

Cannon served 24 years as one of Nevada's U.S. senators, from 1959 to 1983. As a member of the Armed Services and Commerce, Science and Transportation committees and chairman of the Tactical Air Power, Military Construction and Stockpiles subcommittees, he helped secure funding and upgrades for Nellis Air Force Base.

Born in St. George, Utah, in 1912, he became intrigued by the budding aviation industry while attending Dixie Junior College in the 1930s.

"I admit I was more than just a little impressed by the glamour of flying in those days," he said in an interview for the December 1971 edition of *Air Line Pilot* magazine. "Lindbergh had recently made his epic ocean-crossing flight, and that added to the pilot mystique that dominated that era."

As a second lieutenant in the Utah National Guard, he was called to active duty in 1941 and promoted to first lieutenant in charge of a combat engineers unit. He was assigned to the 40th Division in San Luis Obispo, Calif., when Japanese warplanes attacked Pearl Harbor on Dec. 7, 1941. Responding to the need for experienced pilots, he joined the Army Air Corps and graduated from light aircraft and glider school in New Mexico as a captain.

In his biography that Downey helped him write, Cannon described the historic D-Day flight. "Anti-aircraft fire at us as we passed the Channel Islands but we were too low and out of range from them. . . . As we approached the target, we let down through the stuff and broke out at 700 feet over the green fields of France."

He saw one of the U.S. planes explode as his C-47 powered toward the drop zone. "Many positions firing tracers," he wrote. "Many of them had me flinching. Over target—green light—there go the troops. Time 0140 (1:40 a.m.) 6 June 1944."

His awards and decorations included a Purple Heart, a Distinguished Flying Cross, a presidential citation, and the French Croix de Guerre.

On Sept. 17, 1944, Cannon and Krebs were again flying paratroopers behind enemy lines. This time it was for the allied invasion of the Netherlands for Operation Market Garden. After they had dropped the troops, their plane was hit by anti-aircraft flak, forcing them to bail out. What followed was a 42-day odyssey during which they evaded their captors with the help of Dutch civilians.

"When I parachuted into Holland, I felt I was nothing—someone small and unimportant—a speck in the universe leaving a disabled plane," he told *Air Line Pilot* magazine. "When I left Holland, I sensed I had accomplished far more than our original mission. I had learned from the 'defeated' the true meaning of freedom and how we must never give up fighting for it."

## AMTRAK

(Ms. BROWN of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as a member for 22 years on the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and supporter of rail, my heart goes out to the families and individuals who suffered in the wake of the Amtrak derailment in Philadelphia.

The Republican leadership in Washington continues its long-term failure to adequately fund transportation infrastructure in this country, and starving Amtrak from the funds that it truly needs to operate a national system is one example of the failure of this House. It is sad that the Republicans, on the day that seven or eight people died and 200 were injured, voted to cut funding for Amtrak.

It is a shame that in the people's House—the people's House—that the people who represent the people are stuck on stupid. We need a comprehensive transportation system, and we need to stop starving Amtrak.

It is amazing that this House voted the day of the accident to cut Amtrak. It is unacceptable. This is the people's House, and the people should be in charge. To whom God has given much, much is expected, and they expect more from the people's House than what happened yesterday in this House of Representatives.

[From the New York Times, May 13, 2015]

## AMTRAK CRASH AND AMERICA'S DECLINING CONSTRUCTION SPENDING

(By David Leonhardt)

Investigators into the Amtrak crash in Philadelphia are focusing on excess speed, but there is a related issue: the overall condition of Amtrak and the nation's infrastructure. One of the reasons that American trains should not travel 100 miles an hour in many places is that the state of our rail system—like the state of our bridges, highways and airports—is not good.

Many airports here look dilapidated relative to those in Asia and Europe. Roads are choked with traffic. The fastest train from Boston to Washington takes about six and a half hours. The fastest train from Paris to Marseille—a slightly longer distance—takes just over three hours.

The train that derailed on Tuesday was thought to be traveling at least 100 miles an hour—twice the speed limit on that section of track. That is about half the French train's average speed on the trip from Paris to Marseille. (Reuters has also reported that the section of the track where the crash occurred lacked advanced braking technology designed to prevent derailments.)

Much of the problem of crumbling infrastructure has existed for years. There is, however, a new development that has made

things worse. The combined money that federal, state and local governments spend on construction has dropped significantly, relative to the size of the economy, in the last five years. And only part of the decline stems from the end of the stimulus program, which temporarily lifted infrastructure spending.

Such spending now represents about 1.5 percent of total economic activity, down from about 1.8 percent on average from 1993 through 2008. It's at its lowest level in at least 22 years. (A hat-tip to Joe Weisenthal, of Business Insider, who calculated this statistic in 2013, after the collapse of a bridge near Seattle.)

Lawrence Summers, the former Treasury secretary and Harvard president, sent an email to us today making an argument similar to Mr. Weisenthal's. More infrastructure spending would both make accidents less likely and bring economic benefits.

"Projections for the first half of this year now almost universally suggest the U.S. economy will have grown at an annual rate of well under 1 percent," Mr. Summers wrote. "If this isn't stagnation, I wonder what would be."

He added: "A major infrastructure investment program would reduce long-run deferred maintenance liabilities, raise demand and G.D.P., put construction workers back to work and raise investment. Interest rates may not always be as low as they are now, so it's high time to get started."

Other Democrats have begun making similar arguments today. Many congressional Republicans have historically supported infrastructure spending as well, but have been more reluctant recently.

The Upshot provides news, analysis and graphics about politics, policy and everyday life. Follow us on Facebook and Twitter. Sign up for our weekly newsletter.

[From the New York Times, May 13, 2015]

## ONE DAY AFTER WRECK, INCREASED FUNDING FOR AMTRAK FAILS IN A HOUSE PANEL

(By Michael D. Shear and Jad Mouawad)

WASHINGTON.—The bodies had not yet been fully recovered from the Amtrak derailment in Philadelphia before Capitol Hill erupted hours later into its usual partisan clash over how much money to spend on the long-struggling national rail service.

As investigators picked through the rubble on Wednesday morning, Democratic lawmakers in Washington angrily demanded an increase in Amtrak funding, calling Tuesday night's accident a result of congressional failure to support the rail system. Republicans refused, defeating the request in a morning committee hearing and accusing Democrats of using a tragedy for political reasons.

"It was beneath you," Representative Mike Simpson, Republican of Idaho, snapped at a Democratic colleague after the funding increase was defeated in a 30-to-21 vote.

The scene in the hearing room was a replay of the swirling politics that have threatened to consume Amtrak in the four decades since it was nationalized by the United States government. Like the rest of the country's crumbling public infrastructure, its aging rail beds and decades-old trains are sagging under increased use, especially in the Northeast, where nearly three-quarters of all travel takes place on the trains, not on planes.

And the immediate political rancor foreshadowed another fight to come soon: whether Congress will delay a mandate to install equipment that would have automatically reduced the speed of Northeast Regional train No. 188. The deadline for installing the system, called positive train control, is the end of 2015, but Congress is considering extending the deadline to 2020 at the urging of

freight, and passenger rail systems that say the costs could rise to \$10 billion.

Senator Richard Blumenthal, Democrat of Connecticut, said in a statement on Wednesday that delaying the technology “only leads to preventable and predictable tragedy.”

Investigators said they were examining the speed of the derailed Amtrak train, which they said was going 106 miles an hour on a stretch of track where the speed limit was half that. But they said no firm conclusion had been reached on what caused the derailment.

Edward G. Rendell, the Democratic former governor of Pennsylvania, lashed out at Republican lawmakers on Wednesday for refusing to increase Amtrak funding. He said the requested increase of \$251 million over the Republican budget of \$1.14 billion could significantly improve safety by upgrading tracks and installing positive train control systems in the busiest part of the system. “It is absolutely stunning to me,” Mr. Rendell said of the funding vote. “It shows that ideology trumps reality, and it shows that cowardice reigns in Washington. The callousness and disregard was shockingly contemporaneous.”

Representative Steve Israel, Democrat of New York, also criticized his Republican colleagues, saying they should have used the aftermath of the Amtrak accident “as an opportunity to do the right thing, instead of sticking to their ideology.”

The Northeast Corridor is the nation’s busiest rail corridor and accounts for more than a third of Amtrak’s ridership. It is also the most profitable part of its national network. But some bridges, like the Portal Bridge near New York, for instance, are more than a century old and in desperate need of replacement. Trains come to a crawl when they travel through Baltimore’s 100-year-old tunnel. Some parts of the tracks still have wooden ties.

Meanwhile, the Acela—Amtrak’s high-speed train that runs between Washington and Boston—can reach its top speed only in a handful of places. On a 30-mile stretch near Cranston, R.I., for example, the Acela speeds up to 150 m.p.h. About five minutes later, it needs to slow down.

“These trains have to be thought of as a national asset,” said Rosabeth Moss Kanter, a professor at the Harvard Business School. “Amtrak is a political whipping boy for Congress. But how much is it going to take to wake up Congress that this stuff has to be invested in? It is aging, it is not properly maintained.”

Amtrak has its passionate supporters, including Vice President Joseph R. Biden Jr., who often joins many lawmakers who race to Union Station for a quick trip home. But the rail system also has many detractors, who say its annual losses are a drain on the public treasury. Many argue that privatization of the rail lines would improve service, cut costs and create innovation that could rival the gleaming train systems in Japan, China and across Europe.

Representative John L. Mica, Republican of Florida, is pushing a plan to privatize the improvement of Amtrak’s system in the Northeast region. He said that the rail system needed money for improvements, but that lawmakers did not trust Amtrak to spend it well.

“What they own is poorly maintained and outdated infrastructure,” Mr. Mica said. But he added, “They don’t have the trust of Congress to get substantial money because they’ve not spent the money well that they’ve gotten.”

“When you give them money, they squander it,” he said.

In the meantime, however, Amtrak’s funding is failing to catch up to its ridership,

which peaked at 32 million last year, up nearly 50 percent since 2000. In 2014, its latest fiscal year, Amtrak lost \$1 billion with revenue of \$3.2 billion.

“Amtrak has really suffered from congressional schizophrenia over funding levels,” said Ray LaHood, the Republican former member of Congress who served as President Obama’s first secretary of transportation.

Mr. LaHood said much of the blame rested with lawmakers who came to Washington from states where Amtrak does not run. “They think Amtrak is just the easy place to cut,” he said, adding that he had little optimism that anything would change without pressure from voters during election time.

“All Americans should be concerned that there is no vision,” Mr. LaHood said. “There is no plan. There is no courage for taking up what needs to be done in terms of fully funding infrastructure. We are limping along.”

Since the passage of the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970, the National Railroad Passenger Corporation, as Amtrak is officially called, is the only provider of national passenger rail service in the country.

Successive Amtrak chief executives—there have been six since 2002—contend with a dual mandate: to provide a public service while also trying to make money, which has proved an impossible task, Ms. Kanter said. Her latest book, “Move: Putting America’s Infrastructure Back in the Lead,” addresses the importance of investing in transportation infrastructure.

“We have to do something big instead of just repairing. We need to repair, of course, but we have to reinvent, too, because the whole model is broken,” she said. “We don’t want to be stuck with the same crummy, shabby system after we fix Philadelphia. We have to do something more, and better.”

#### IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT REVIEW ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) until 10 p.m.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it has been quite an eventful week. We have taken up many things, and I couldn’t be more proud of my friend from Texas, Chairman THORNBERRY.

He has done tremendous work on the National Defense Authorization and is to be applauded for trying to prevent the military from being weakened further than the sequester has already made it.

One of the bills that we took up and passed today was the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act, and I am anal enough I will get these bills and read them, so that is what I did.

Amazingly, the first paragraph—of course, this bill came to us from the Senate as the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act, and many of us had concerns about it, but I didn’t realize that the actual title of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act was—and this is the opening paragraph of the bill:

Resolved, That the bill from the House of Representatives, H.R. 1191, entitled “An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act,” do pass with the following.

That is what it is. It is an IRS bill to adjust the Affordable Care Act, and it is hard for me to use those words “Affordable Care Act” because it is anything but affordable. It has cost people their insurance, their doctors, their health, their health insurance. It is laughable to call it affordable.

Nonetheless, this is a bill to attempt to amend the Affordable Care Act; and, Mr. Speaker, you might wonder, wait a minute, I thought you said this was the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act—well, exactly. It is an IRS bill to fix this exception for emergency services volunteers that they not be considered under the Affordable Care Act.

Then we go to the Senate bill. This is like the Affordable Care Act because they take a House bill that is intended for one purpose, delete, beginning with line 1, page 1, delete everything in it, and then make it the Iran Nuclear Review Act—talk about democracy in action, really impressive. They strip out everything to do with making the ObamaCare bill better and, instead, replace it with the Iran Nuclear Review Act.

There were a few dozen of us that had major concerns about it. First of all, we had already heard that this bill was going to turn the Constitution upside down. The constitutional requirements for a treaty—what is a treaty? It is an agreement between one country and another. The President has authority to negotiate those agreements.

Then, under the Constitution, if we still care about the Constitution, then that treaty has to go before the Senate and get two-thirds of the votes of the Senators; otherwise, that treaty means nothing, and it is not binding.

It doesn’t matter what the President or the executive branch or the Secretary of State call that agreement, that treaty; it is a treaty between one country and another. For purposes of the Constitution, it should go before the Senate for ratification.

But Congress has gotten so used to this President just ignoring it, so used to the Justice Department saying: We don’t care what you are requesting. We are not going to give you any of those documents or any of the information.

We have gotten so used to that, we said, okay, we will pass a bill that will force the administration to let Congress know what is going on, even though we are going to flip the Constitution upside down and go from requiring, as the Constitution does, a vote of 67 Senators in order to ratify a treaty, or agreement, with a foreign country, and we are going to go with requiring 67 Senators to vote it down, completely reversing the constitutional requirement, but we will make it better because we will add a requirement that the House has to have two-thirds vote, get 290 votes, to vote it down, but at least this way, Congress gets to be a player and gets to know what is going on.

What is it that is in this bill that will teach the executive branch a lesson