

We lost one of our model citizens—Mr. Scott Townsley Chase—on Easter Sunday, March 27, 2005. I have known the Chase family for several years, and I was saddened to hear of Scott's passing as a result of cancer at the young age of 46 years. He loved his family dearly and will be sorely missed by those he touched and impacted within the Elmhurst community.

Upon graduation from York High School, Scott matriculated to Valparaiso University. After completing the requirements for a Bachelor of Science degree, Scott entered the Valparaiso Law School and graduated with a law degree in 1983. He was proud to be an attorney and thought it was the noblest profession a person could pursue. His family indicated that Scott liked solving people's problems and took pride in providing the best representation for all his clients.

Scott was married to Michelle Chase—an attorney as well—and was the proud father of three wonderful children—Austin, Kelsey, and Morgan. Though Scott's family and friends will dearly miss him, they will always take solace in knowing that Scott has provided a foundation from which all can build upon while living life to the fullest.

---

ADMINISTRATION'S AMTRAK  
REFORM LEGISLATION

**HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, April 20, 2005*

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I join Chairman YOUNG in introducing, by request, the Administration's Amtrak "reform" legislation. It is a common practice for the Chairman and Ranking Member of a Committee to jointly introduce an Administration's bill, regardless of which political party controls the White House or Congress or the specifics of proposed legislation, and I do this as a courtesy to the Administration. However, introducing a bill "by request" should not be interpreted to imply endorsement. In fact, in this instance, I am strongly opposed to the Administration's legislative proposal for Amtrak and the direction this Administration has chosen for intercity passenger rail service in our Nation.

The Administration's proposal is nothing new. It is the same flawed bill that the Administration sent to Congress in 2003. The bill establishes two private for-profit corporations to separately manage and maintain infrastructure and operations, eliminates our Nation's intercity passenger rail network and shifts the cost burden of continuing rail service to the States, separates the Northeast Corridor from the rest of the rail network, divides Amtrak into three separate entities, and eliminates Federal operating support for all intercity passenger trains over a four-year period. As a practical matter, within three years, all long-distance train service is likely to be eliminated. Soon thereafter, the United States entire intercity passenger system could consist of skeletal service along the East and West coasts.

The Administration's trust in the magic of privatization and decentralization to solve Amtrak's problems is astonishing. It shows this Administration's ignorance of the disastrous consequences of privatization and underinvestment in rail. Great Britain's experience

with privatization is a perfect example. In 1994, government-owned British Rail was dissolved and the British government separated intercity passenger rail infrastructure from operations. A private corporation called Railtrack took over ownership of all track, signaling, and stations. Passenger train operators competed with each other to provide service. Unfortunately, the new approach assumed that private sector innovation and discipline would drive down the railway's public funding requirement and drive up quality of service, overcoming recent trends of falling demand. It didn't work, and it led to tragic consequences.

The safety of operations and the quality of service declined steadily. More than 30 people were killed in an accident at Ladbroke Grove in 1999 and four more were killed in an accident at Hatfield in 2000. In 2001, another fatal accident occurred at Potters, just north of London. These accidents were directly traceable to privatization and Britain's long history of under-investment in rail.

Today, the British government is reeling from the legacy left behind by privatization. The government has almost doubled funding for rail, and has taken steps to improve performance and tackle the backlog of maintenance and renewal needs that exploded under privatization. British government officials have described their rail privatization as "an absolute disaster".

Despite the British experience, the Bush Administration's blind faith in the ideology of privatization leads it down the same wrong path. Let us not repeat Britain's mistake. The solution to Amtrak's problems is not privatization. Amtrak's problems have one root cause: money. Lack of adequate investment and the annual threat of elimination have conditioned Amtrak to focus on survival.

Amtrak's opponents are quick to point fingers at Amtrak management, and claim that private corporations could dramatically improve intercity passenger rail service. The truth is that a succession of hardworking and dedicated management teams at Amtrak could not do the impossible—that is, operate our Nation's intercity rail passenger service without a substantial level of investment from the Federal Government. Railroads throughout the world receive some government support to supplement the revenues paid by passengers. But the Administration continues to insist on the impossible.

Yet despite Amtrak's starvation budget, Amtrak has had its successes. Under David Gunn's leadership, Amtrak has improved operations and increased ridership to more than 25 million passengers in 2004: an increase of one million passengers from 2003 and an Amtrak record. In Southern California, Amtrak's Pacific Surfliner has had a 26.3 percent increase in ridership in the past year. In Southern California, Amtrak's Pacific Surfliner has had a 26.3 percent increase in ridership in the past year. Similarly, several Midwest trains, the Pere Marquette (up 22.1 percent), the State House (up 13 percent) and the Illini (up 11.4 percent), experienced the next largest increases in passengers. In the East, regional trains carried more passengers than any other Amtrak service in the country, increasing from 5,760,499 last year to 5,974,806—an increase of 3.7 percent.

Amtrak has also made significant progress in rebuilding infrastructure and rolling stock after years of deferred maintenance. In fiscal

years 2003 and 2004, 256,000 concrete ties were laid; 2,755 bridge ties were replaced; 266 miles of continuous welded rail were installed; 34 miles of signal cable were replaced; and 19 stations and 37 substations were improved.

Amtrak's mechanical department plowed full steam ahead. In 2004, it remanufactured 180 passenger cars, rebuilt 51 wrecked cars and locomotives, and made seven Superliner baggage modifications in passenger cars.

Amtrak sold excess equipment, eliminated unprofitable services, lowered fares on long-distance routes to increase ridership, and, in partnership with the State of California, opened a \$71 million maintenance facility.

In short, Amtrak is making great progress. All of this progress will halt under the Administration's radical Amtrak reform plan.

Therefore, while I join in introducing this bill as a traditional courtesy to the Administration, I want to be clear that I do not support its initiatives. Together with Chairman YOUNG, Subcommittee Chairman LATOURETTE, Subcommittee Ranking Member BROWN, and the other Members of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, I strongly support both H.R. 1630, the Amtrak Reauthorization Act of 2005, and H.R. 1631, the Rail Infrastructure Development and Expansion Act for the 21st Century (RIDE 21). In the 108th Congress, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure reported similar bills with near unanimous bipartisan support. I am very hopeful that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure will again soon consider this bipartisan legislation and begin to provide the necessary investment for our Nation's intercity passenger rail system—that is the "reform" that Amtrak so direly needs.

---

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, April 20, 2005*

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from votes in the House on Tuesday, April 19, due to a previous and unavoidable commitment. Therefore, I was unable to vote on H.R. 683 (rollcall No. 109), H.J. Res. 19 (rollcall No. 110), and H.J. Res. 20 (rollcall No. 111). Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on all three measures considered before the House.

---

HONORING THE DISTINGUISHED  
SERVICE OF BILLY PAUL  
CARNEAL

**HON. BART GORDON**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, April 20, 2005*

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor Billy Paul Carneal, a Springfield, Tennessee, native who has dedicated his life to public service and the past 11½ years as the executive director of the Springfield-Robertson County Chamber of Commerce. Billy Paul has decided to retire from the chamber, and I want to thank him for all he has done for his community, which I have the honor of representing in this esteemed body.