

guess most of all I want to thank Senator BYRD and Senator STEVENS as well.

I have been here for 28 years. I have never once come to the floor to threaten to engage in an extended debate on a matter. I did that this morning in our caucus. I am not suggesting my colleagues responded because I did that. I am suggesting that I believed my colleagues who are on their feet felt extremely strongly about what was about to happen; that is, Amtrak cannot make it through the year 2001 and meet the obligation that has been imposed upon it without being brought up to speed, figuratively and literally, in terms of equipment, track, and the like.

When this proposal that had 56 cosponsors and passed in another vehicle with 60-some votes and with 260-some votes in the House was not going to be included in this omnibus bill, I must tell my colleagues, I was very upset.

In light of the fact that the leadership of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate as a whole and of the Commerce Committee, at least on one side of the Commerce Committee, have indicated to me they will introduce and move rapidly, as best they can, funding for Amtrak—I will not take the time to go into what it all does and what it means—then that is good enough for me. I will withdraw any attempt to delay consideration of this final bill.

Also, I know Senator MOYNIHAN and Senator LAUTENBERG are leaving. Senator LAUTENBERG has been Mr. Amtrak. Senator LAUTENBERG, since he has been here, in large part because of his disposition and in no small part because of the particular position of authority he occupied on the Appropriations Committee, has been—I ride a train every day and people say to me: You know, JOE, thanks for defending Amtrak.

I say: No, don't thank me, call Senator LAUTENBERG. I literally say that because it is true.

Also on the floor is a Senator who is Mr. Transportation. He has given us all a lesson, as only he can, for the past 18 years on the necessity of Amtrak not merely in the Northeast corridor, but there is no alternative in this Nation to not have a mass transit interstate system.

I want everybody to understand—again, I will put something in the RECORD; I won't take the time now—this is not just parochially important to the Senators from Delaware, New Jersey, Vermont, Massachusetts, all of whom are on the floor. This is important to Florida; it is important to the Southeast corridor; it is important to Oregon, Washington, Nevada. This is the only alternative we have.

It seems to me, after discussion with the men I have named today—the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, the Senator from Mississippi, the Sen-

ator from North Dakota, and others—that we are all singing from the same hymnal now. There seems to be for the first time in my recollection, I say to my friend from New York who is standing, a genuine acknowledgment that there is no transportation scheme in America that will serve America without a major component of it being a rapid transit interstate system for passengers.

I am looking forward to this being the first bipartisan effort next year. I sincerely hope the incoming President will understand our regional needs.

I conclude by saying I thought federalism was about one section of the Nation helping other sections of the Nation that, in fact, had needs but needed additional assistance. There would be no water flowing in Arizona were it not for the people of Massachusetts, the people of New York, the people of New Jersey, Delaware, and other States subsidizing that water extensively to the tune of probably somewhere above \$16 billion over time, and we should do that.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. The Arizona project.

Mr. BIDEN. We should do that. I get the feeling—maybe because it is the Christmas season and I want to believe it—there is a growing recognition that rail service in our neck of the woods, as well as other parts of the country, are as essential to our interests as water is to the far west. It is as essential.

I thank my colleagues for their commitment and absolutely close by saying to Senator BYRD that I appreciate the fact that he understands, maybe better than anyone in this place, when another colleague cares about an issue that he believes is absolutely indispensable for his region. I thank him for acknowledging that.

I thank him for his—it is no new commitment; he has always been committed to Amtrak—acknowledgment of that and for his continued pledge of commitment to Amtrak. With this combination of the majority leader, the Democratic leader, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, and the ranking member of the Commerce Committee, if we cannot get it done, then shame on us.

I thank all of my colleagues. Sorry to have taken so much time, but as my colleagues said all day, this is a big, big, big, big deal to me personally, to my State, and I think to the Nation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the current situation, the Senator from New Jersey has the floor. He has yielded to the majority leader and the Democratic leader to conduct business. If they are through with their business, the Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, with their indulgence, we do have a couple more

consent requests, plus we may need to modify the earlier agreement.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I am happy to yield to the majority leader for conducting further business provided, of course, that the recognition continues. I thank the Presiding Officer for being so careful in his statement.

---

#### PROVIDING FOR SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT OF THE SECOND SESSION OF THE 106TH CONGRESS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the adjournment resolution calling for a sine die adjournment of the 106th Congress just received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 446) providing for the sine die adjournment of the second session of the One Hundred Sixth Congress.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 446) was agreed to, as follows:

#### H. CON. RES. 446

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring).* That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Friday, December 15, 2000, Saturday, December 16, 2000, or Sunday, December 17, 2000, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it shall stand adjourned sine die, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution; and that when the Senate adjourns on Friday, December 15, 2000, Saturday, December 16, 2000, or Sunday, December 17, 2000, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it shall stand adjourned sine die, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution.

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and Senate, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

---

#### MAKING FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 2001

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the technical continuing resolution, H.J. Res. 133.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the joint resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 133) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be read the third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, all without intervening action, motion, or debate.

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

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 133) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I have one further clarification. It seems there is an objection, notwithstanding the receipt of the papers, that we have a vote and then go to debate, but we are working on an arrangement that will allow us to proceed with debate and get some certainty about how the vote will be dispensed with. We should be able to get that clarified in a few minutes. I would hate to ask the Senator to yield again in a few minutes, but in view of the importance of the issue, I might do that. For now, that is all the business Senator DASCHLE and I have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from New Jersey has the floor.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I thank the Chair. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts, again with it understood that I retain the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Jersey. He is very gracious in doing so. I know he wants to make some important comments that summarize his 18 years of work and commitment on this issue. He is generous to allow us to intervene.

I join in thanking the majority leader and the minority leader, Senator DASCHLE, Senator REID, particularly Senator BYRD and Senator STEVENS for responding to the request of a number of us from our region. I thank Senator BIDEN and Senator LAUTENBERG for their leadership again on this issue.

There was a lot of passion in our caucus earlier this afternoon, and the minority leader listened to all of us very carefully. Our caucus, I must say, was united in its commitment to the notion that those of us who cared about this issue needed to have some kind of response on the floor that indicated where we will go. I am grateful for this response.

The commitment on the floor openly, as it has been given, to proceed as we will proceed, particularly from the distinguished ranking member of the Appropriations Committee and the chair-

man, is as good a commitment as one can get in the Senate.

We have 56 sponsors of this legislation today in the Senate. With the new Senators coming in, I am absolutely confident we will have more than 60 sponsors of this legislation. I look forward to building on the legacy of Senator MOYNIHAN and Senator LAUTENBERG and completing what is absolutely essential for this country, which is a rail system of which the Nation can be proud.

I am very grateful to all those who have made this effort. I particularly say about the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from New York, the two of them will be so missed with respect to their leadership and the vision they have expressed with respect to transportation issues as a whole, but particularly for those of us in the Northeast, what voices they have been in the Senate with respect to their vision for how we can more inexpensively and capably move people from here to there and increase the productivity of our country. I pledge, along with my other colleagues, to build on their example and on that vision. The day will come when we will all have a better transportation network as a consequence of their leadership.

Mr. President, I know that every member of the Congress is anxious to end this session and get back to our states. We all have work to do and families waiting to celebrate the holidays. However, my colleagues Senator LAUTENBERG and Senator BIDEN are right to be angry and frustrated with this legislation.

There is a small but extremely significant item missing from this legislation—the High-Speed Rail Investment Act. The Act would allow Amtrak to sell \$10 billion in bonds over the next decade and provide tax credits to bondholders in lieu of interest payments. Amtrak would use this money to upgrade existing rail lines to high-speed rail capability. The Joint Committee on Taxation estimates that the bill would cost just \$95 million over 2 years. Over 5 years, the bill would still cost only \$762 million.

The High-Speed Rail Investment Act has 56 co-sponsors in the Senate. This is not a partisan issue. It is not a regional issue. It is not an urban issue. The High-Speed Rail Investment Act has the support of the National Governors Association, the U.S. Conference of Mayors and the National Conference of State Legislatures. Nineteen newspapers, from the New York Times and Providence Journal, to the Houston Chronicle and Seattle Post Intelligencer, have called for the enactment of this legislation.

Let me explain why so many people and organizations support this legislation:

It is in our national interest to construct a national infrastructure that is

truly intermodal. Rail transportation helps alleviate the stress placed on our environment by air and highway transportation. It is a sad fact that America's rail transportation, and its lack of a national high-speed rail system, lags well behind rail transportation in most other nations—we spend less, per capita, on rail transportation than Estonia, Myanmar, and Botswana.

There is a compelling need to invest in high-speed rail. Our highways and skyways are overburdened. Intercity passenger miles have increased 80 percent since 1988, but only 5.5 percent of that has come from increased rail travel. Meanwhile, our congested skies have become even more crowded. The result, predictably, is that air travel delays are up 58 percent since 1995.

In the air travel industry, bad weather in one part of the country very often results in delays in other parts of the country. There is consumer demand for more flights. But we know that our skyways and air traffic control systems are finite and that the system is overloaded.

Amtrak ridership is on the rise. More than 22.5 million passengers rode Amtrak in Fiscal Year 2000, a million more than the previous year. FY 2000 was the fourth consecutive year that ridership has increased. We should welcome that increased use and support it by giving Amtrak the resources it needs to provide high-quality, dependable service.

High-Speed Rail Investment Act is critical to the future of Amtrak. For half the cost of constructing the new Woodrow Wilson Bridge linking Maryland and Virginia, we can create 10 high-speed rail corridors in 28 states. For the cost of the St. Louis Airport expansion, we can improve intercity transportation in 28 states. In October we passed a \$58 billion transportation appropriations bill for this fiscal year. What we are talking about today is an additional \$95 million over the next two years, which will leverage \$2 billion in funding. This is a sound investment.

There is an alarming misconception among some members of this body and around the country that Amtrak is a money pit, where taxpayer dollars simply disappear. Nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, the federal government has invested \$380 billion in our highways and \$160 billion in airports since Amtrak was created. By contrast, the federal government has spent only \$23 billion on Amtrak. We have spent just 4 percent of our transportation budget on rail transportation in the last 30 years.

Those who criticize Amtrak for not "turning a profit" employ a double standard—a double standard that is misleading, unfair and unwise. Between 1985–1995, this country spent \$17 billion more on federal highways than it raised through the federal gas tax and highway trust fund. During the same

period, the nation spent \$30 billion more on aviation expenditures than it received through the aviation trust fund. By their misguided logic, there can be only one solution: since neither of those trust funds operated at cost, we should eliminate these programs. That's nonsense. So why are we failing to adequately invest in rail transportation?

Mr. President, high-speed rail is a viable transportation alternative. There is a large and growing demand for rail service in the Northeast Corridor. Amtrak captures almost 70 percent of the business rail and air travel market between Washington and New York and 30 percent of the market share between New York and Boston. High-speed rail will undoubtedly increase that market share.

These new trains, like the Acela Express that debuted in the Northeast this year, currently run at an average of only 82 miles per hour, but with track improvements, will run at 130 miles per hour.

As a Nation, we have recognized the importance of having the very best communication system, and ours is the envy of the world. That investment is one of reasons our economy is the strongest in the world. And we should do the same for our transportation system. It should be equally modern and must be fully intermodal. And in order to do that, we must invest in rail transportation, invest in Amtrak and be certain to include this inexpensive legislation in the last bill of the 106th Congress.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, before I yield, and I will continue to do so throughout the night, I say to my friends, my colleagues from Massachusetts and Delaware, that I am grateful for their comments. I am sure we will see, and I am particularly grateful to the majority leader and Democratic leader, an Amtrak bill on the floor early in the next session. I am sorry I will not be here, but in the meanwhile, I will yield to the majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, again I thank the Senator.

---

UNANIMOUS CONSENT  
AGREEMENT VITIATED

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the earliest unanimous consent which was agreed to with regard to the time for handling the appropriations conference report be vitiated.

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

---

UNANIMOUS CONSENT  
AGREEMENT

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the receipt of the papers, the Senate now proceed to the debate relative to

the appropriations conference report and that there be up to 40 minutes for explanation to be divided between the two leaders, with 45 additional minutes under the control of Senator GRAHAM of Florida, an additional 20 minutes under the control of Senator BYRD, and an additional 10 minutes under the control of Senator SPECTER. I further ask unanimous consent that once the Senate receives the conference report, the conference report be considered agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, all this immediately after the remarks of the Senator from New Jersey, Mr. LAUTENBERG.

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

Mr. LOTT. I thank Senator LAUTENBERG. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to yield up to 5 minutes to the Senator from New York.

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

---

AMTRAK

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I will not require more than a few moments to thank my friend from New Jersey and express confidence in the Senators from Massachusetts and Delaware who have just spoken, to thank the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee and my revered friend, the ranking member, the Senator from West Virginia, and the majority leader.

May I say, sir—something we often lose sight of—this is a national issue and ought to be addressed by the Congress. We are the only major industrial state in the world that has not sought to recreate and revivify its rail system in the last generation.

The Committee on Environment and Public Works in the last 20 years has turned to this. In 1989, we passed the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act, calling for just such measures—later the Transportation Efficiency Act. We created financial instruments and the possibility of investments to be involved.

We can do this. We are on the verge of it. To miss it at this moment would be to miss a moment in history for which I think we will not be happy. But I am so confident, from what I have heard today, that I leave the Senate yet more proud of having been here 24 years, thanking all—thanking particularly the Presiding Officer for his friendship and leadership in so many important matters.

I yield the floor with great satisfaction of what has just transpired. If this is the kind of mode we enter into in January, there is much to expect from the 107th.

Thanks to my friend from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New York.

The majority leader made a private statement to me, which I will state publicly. He said, as we ready for my departure, bipartisanship is breaking out all over. And I am not quite sure how that is meant. But I yield up to 3 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania, with the understanding I retain the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Jersey for yielding to me. I compliment him for his leadership on Amtrak generally and especially on this current plan for financing.

I support Amtrak and believe the proposal to provide this additional funding is very much in the national interest. I think it is a very salutary thing, as some have already commented, that we have people extending their hands across the aisle on a matter of great national importance.

The Senator from Delaware, I think, characterized the situation very aptly when he talked about federalism; and that is, one region helping another region.

There is no doubt that those of us who live in the eastern corridor—and I am a beneficiary of Amtrak. It is 1 hour and 37 civilized minutes from Washington, DC, to 30th Street Station in Philadelphia. But it is more than my convenience; it is the infrastructure of the country.

I think this is very good for the country that we are going to be moving ahead with this legislation next year, and a very good sign for the 107th Congress that hands are being extended across the aisle to show bipartisanship. If this carries forward in the next year generally, it will be very good for the American people.

I, again, thank my colleague from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for not only his comments but for his help. He is someone we counted on to work so closely with us, to bring seriously a bipartisan aspect to the protection that we are looking for to make sure that Amtrak—the national goal for railroading all across this country—will be able to continue.

It is obvious to me, as we have listened to the comments, that unless these investments are made now, or very soon, we will be unable to fulfill the objectives of having Amtrak as a self-sufficient entity operating with its operating budget met by the revenues that it derives. The funds that we will be able to get from this proposed bond issue will enable it to make the capital investment it so desperately needs.