

money, so much of their resources into their passenger rail system is not because of nostalgia. They do not pine for the days when people rode the trains from coast to coast. They do it because it is in their naked self-interest to have good passenger rail service.

It is in our naked self-interest to have good passenger rail service as well. As a former Governor, I served on the Amtrak Board appointed by the President, confirmed by the Senate, and I served there as a member of the board of directors for 4 years. There were a number of times during the time I served on the board—and a number of times since—that Amtrak has run short of cash. They negotiated with a consortium of private lenders and got enough money to carry them through their tough patch and when the next Federal appropriation comes through or the ridership peaks in one of the peak ridership periods for the summer or Thanksgiving or Christmas or the other holidays, they pay off the loans.

Amtrak is endeavoring to arrange a bridge loan from a consortium of private banks to carry them through to the end of this fiscal year. Their ability to negotiate that loan fell apart with the announcement of the administration's restructuring plan for Amtrak, which is not so much a restructuring plan for Amtrak but it is, frankly, the end, the demise of Amtrak as we know it.

With that having been done and the inability to negotiate with the private lending consortium, I think in large part because of the announcement of the restructuring plan for Amtrak by the administration, the administration has some responsibility to step to the plate and to provide—as they can under law; they have the discretion under the law—a loan guarantee so Amtrak can go ahead with this negotiation with the private bankers. They ought to do that.

When we get past this very difficult time—and I want to tell you if Amtrak does shut down, it is not because everybody rides Amtrak but because Amtrak is very involved in commuter operations. Amtrak runs the entire Northeast corridor. Electricity is sold to the commuter trains. The commuter trains use Penn Station. Amtrak is involved in the Midwest—we have a colleague here from Chicago—in helping run the commuter operations there, and California. It is not just the Northeast corridor. It is throughout the country. A shutdown, especially a hasty shutdown, will create havoc, not necessarily because of the people who run Amtrak trains but all the people who depend on Amtrak and maybe don't know it. They depend on Amtrak to get to work every day and to get home.

Let me close with this thought, if I could. When we get through this difficult time—and we need to, and I hope the administration steps up to the plate and says we have some responsibility and acts to discharge those responsibilities—when we get through

this, that carries us to the next fiscal year. We need to determine as a country, with a healthy debate with the administration fully engaged, what we are going to do for passenger rail service in America. What will taxpayers support? What will Congress and the administration support? That debate is one in which I look forward to participating.

I think passenger rail going forward will depend, in no small part, on our willingness, and that of the administration, to find a dedicated source of capital funding. Since Amtrak's creation 32 years ago, there has never been adequate capital support for the railroad. There has never been capital support.

We all know that railroading is capital intensive. There needs to be a dedicated source of capital funding. My colleagues will hear me say that more in the months to come. In my judgment, that is the key. If we support passenger rail service, we have to provide the capital to support it.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. KYL. Thank you, Madam President.

If the Senator from New Jersey wishes to speak for any period of time, I will go ahead and take my right. But if he wants only to ask for a unanimous consent, I would be happy to provide that opportunity.

Mr. CORZINE. May I ask the Senator from Arizona how long he intends to speak?

Mr. KYL. I intend to take about 20 or 25 minutes.

Mr. CORZINE. If the Senator from Arizona would consider it, I would talk no more than 5 minutes, and probably a few minutes less.

Mr. KYL. Madam President, in accommodation of my colleague from New Jersey, if he will keep his remarks to 4 minutes, shall we say, I would be happy to provide him the opportunity, and then I will begin after he is finished speaking.

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

The Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. CORZINE. Madam President, my colleague from Arizona is very kind to offer this opportunity.

#### AMTRAK

Mr. CORZINE. Madam President, I rise to reinforce some of the dialog we have had on the floor with regard to Amtrak. This is a major economic issue for our Nation—not just the Northeast corridor.

We have enormous numbers of interconnected elements of our economy which are dependent on the functioning of inner-city rail transportation, and certainly in the Northeast corridor where I come from, the most densely populated State in the Nation. There are almost 300,000 commuters a day

using Amtrak or Amtrak-related facilities that move in and out of Penn Station and the New York metropolitan region. There are 82,000 daily commuters in New Jersey traffic.

These folks are involved in the financial affairs of this Nation. We are going to create havoc in operations in our metropolitan regions of New York City if we have a shutdown of this highway transportation. I think it is absolutely essential that we get long-term Amtrak reform.

What I want to speak about tonight is that we need not create a crisis with a short-term shutdown, which is going to impact an enormous number of innocent bystanders, to get to long-term reform. The President, the Transportation Department, and the Congress need to sit down and put together a long-term plan with regard to how we are going to reform Amtrak.

I don't think it should be done at the expense of a part of our country that is already suffering. It would spread across the country and undermine the confidence of our already shaken economic expansion. We have seen enormous erosion in a whole series of different levels—the stock market being the most obvious reminder, but at levels that are approaching where we were right after September 11. It strikes me that we don't need to throw another log on the fire and undermine the economic security of our Nation.

That is why I think we need to have a short-term solution with loan guarantees, with the administration and Congress working together to implement a solution to keep this railroad running. We don't need a train ride. What we need to do is make sure we are supportive of our economy.

I am very fearful that if we don't move forward with this short-run solution, we may never get to the long-run reform of Amtrak, which will be deteriorating substantially in the interim while it is shut down.

Let me give you two facts. It costs \$50 million to shut this entity down and \$200 million to keep it running for the remainder of the year. It would cost almost \$1 billion to bring Amtrak back and operating if it were shut down. That is on a nationwide basis.

I think that is too much of an investment to make in a risky proposition of getting to reform without the kind of debate we have had. I hope we can do that on a thoughtful, measured basis in the days and weeks ahead in this 107th Congress. I don't think it should be formulated on the basis of a crisis brought about by a temporary shutdown.

I want to make sure that I am registered very strongly for the people of New Jersey, for the people of the metropolitan New York region, and for the Nation in support of our economy by making sure that Amtrak continues to run until we have a thoughtful, long-term solution.

I thank my colleague from Arizona. I appreciate it. I hope I stayed under 4 minutes. I will come back on another day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Arizona is recognized.

#### MISSILE DEFENSE

Mr. KYL. Madam President, by way of introduction, my remarks will primarily be in support of an amendment that will be offered by the distinguished ranking member of the Armed Services Committee, the Senator from Virginia, tomorrow to restore missile defense funding that was cut in the Armed Services Committee.

I wanted to note that this afternoon the President advised both Senator MCCAIN and I that he would be traveling to our home State of Arizona tomorrow—specifically to the town of Show Low which is under threat of this raging wildfire we have all seen and read about—and he graciously offered to allow us to accompany him on that trip. But, obviously, the importance of this Defense authorization bill—specifically, the votes we will have tomorrow, including an effort to restore funding for the missile defense portion of the bill—requires that we remain.

I am going to speak to the issue that will involve his visit to Arizona tomorrow, why these raging wildfires don't need to continue to devastate our country, what we can do about it, and what we need to do about it as a country at the conclusion of my remarks on the Defense bill. I will address my comments first to this bill which is before the Senate, and which we will be considering this week.

It seems to me that there is a strange disconnect between recent developments in the world and some of the contents of the bill that we are considering.

For example, in early May, Iran—newly dubbed by the State Department as the No. 1 terrorist nation in the world—conducted a successful test of its 800-plus-mile-range Shahab III missile. There are some reports that Iran is now set to begin domestic production of the Shahab III which will be able to reach Israel, as well as U.S. troops deployed in the Middle East and South Asia.

On May 7, the Associated Press, citing an administration official, reported that Iran is continuing the development of a longer range missile, the Shahab IV, with an estimated range of 1,200 to 1,800 miles. The Shahab IV will be able to reach deep into Europe.

That means that the fanatical mullahs in Tehran will be able to put a multitude of U.S. allies and our troops within striking distance of their missiles and weapons of mass destruction.

We have also just witnessed one of the scariest standoffs in recent decades with India and Pakistan angrily pointing their nuclear-tipped missiles at each other.

These developments represent a dramatic increase in the worldwide missile threat.

You might think that the United States would therefore want to accel-

erate its effort to build a defense against such weapons. But the bill before us today would seriously hamper our ability to do exactly that. This is not something that the American people will stand for.

This is why I believe that tomorrow it is incumbent upon the Members of this body to listen to their constituents, to listen to the President of the United States, to look at the events around the world, and to reconnect our policy here in the Senate to the realities of the world around us.

This bill makes very deep and damaging cuts to the President's proposed budget for missile defense. Unless remedied, those cuts will seriously limit our ability to end our current—and let me say our unacceptable—vulnerabilities to ballistic missile attack.

As I noted, the threat from ballistic missiles continues to grow.

In addition to the two examples I mentioned, consider this: Today, there are nearly three dozen countries that either have or are developing ballistic missiles of increasing range and sophistication. That includes Iran's fellow "axis of evil" partners—or members, I should say—Iraq and North Korea, as well as the terrorist regimes of Syria and Libya.

Let us take a look at some of these developments, which, unless indicated otherwise, are taken straight from the December 2001 National Intelligence Estimate on Foreign Ballistic Missiles. That is the estimate of our intelligence community about this threat.

North Korea, despite the moratorium on flight testing that it is supposedly adhering to, continues its development of long-range missiles. According to press accounts and administration officials, North Korea has recently conducted rocket motor tests of these missiles.

In fact, North Korea's Taepo Dong 2 missile, which is capable of reaching the United States with a nuclear-weapon-sized payload, may now be ready for flight testing.

As to Iraq, despite U.N. sanctions, Baghdad has been able to maintain the infrastructure and expertise necessary to develop longer range missiles.

Its Al-Samoud missile, with a 60 to 90-mile range, probably will be deployed soon.

And Iraq retains a covert force of scud-variant missiles, launchers, and conventional, chemical, and biological warheads.

Not to forget about China, the intelligence community assesses that it could begin deploying its 5,000-mile-range DF-31 missile during the first half of this decade. That means essentially any time now. China's even longer range mobile missile, the DF-41, could be deployed in the latter half of the decade.

China also maintains a robust force of medium-range CSS-5 missiles which can reach our troops in Japan and Korea.

Of course, China continues to add to its arsenal of short-range missiles which already number in the several hundreds and are deployed opposite Taiwan.

According to the intelligence community—and I am quoting now—

China's leaders calculate that conventionally armed ballistic missiles add a potent new dimension to Chinese military capabilities, and they are committed to continue fielding them at a rapid pace. Beijing's growing short-range ballistic missile force provides China with a military capability that avoids the political and practical constraints associated with the use of nuclear-armed missiles. The latest Chinese short-range ballistic missiles provide a survivable and effective conventional strike force and expand conventional ballistic missile coverage.

Even the terrorists are getting into the act. According to a variety of news sources, some of which have quoted U.S. and Israeli officials, Iran and Syria have supplied Lebanon's Hezbollah terrorist organization with Fajr-5 missiles, which, at 40 to 50 miles, can reach deeper into Israel than any rockets Hezbollah has fired so far. One press account stated further that Hezbollah is assembling chemical warheads for these missiles.

These developments, among others, led to the following conclusions in the December 2001 National Intelligence Estimate:

One, short- and medium-range ballistic missiles, particularly if armed with weapons of mass destruction, already pose a significant threat overseas to U.S. interests, military forces, and allies.

Two, proliferation of ballistic-missile-related technologies, materials, and expertise—especially by Russian, Chinese, and North Korean entities—has enabled emerging missile states to accelerate development timelines for their missile programs.

In other words, this is making the point that instead of having to always indigenously develop a missile capability, a country can now buy these literally readymade missiles from countries such as China, North Korea, and Russia.

Three, most intelligence community agencies project that, before 2015, the United States most likely will face ICBM threats from North Korea and Iran, and possibly from Iraq, as well as from the existing ICBM forces of China and, of course, Russia.

Four, the probability that a missile with a weapon of mass destruction will be used against U.S. forces or interests is higher today than during most of the cold war, and will continue to grow as the capabilities of potential adversaries mature.

After September 11, we dare not willfully remain vulnerable to these threats. But that is essentially the impact of the partisan cuts that were made to this bill when it was before the Armed Services Committee.

Of course, there are those who suggest that the September 11 attacks demonstrated that the major threat to