



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 147

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 31, 2001

No. 148

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COOKSEY).

### DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
October 31, 2001.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN COOKSEY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### PRAYER

The Reverend Kathleene Card, Associate Pastor, Trinity United Methodist Church, McLean, Virginia, offered the following prayer:

Dear God, You are the Sovereign Lord of our Nation, and we thank You for Your eternal blessings. We are confident that nothing can separate us from You. That even in the face of recent challenges, You are always with us.

So, in humble surrender to Your direction, we come to You from many faith traditions, yet we come united as one truly ecumenical body, aware that we are vulnerable alone.

We need You, God; we need each other. We seek Your direction for the Members of this House of Representatives and those who work with them as they seek to represent all the people of the United States of America. We know that You care personally for each of us.

And so we pause at the beginning of this session to ask You to open our hearts and our minds so we can discern Your will for our Nation in this time of tremendous national grief and loss. Please deepen our ability to love and understand each other. Let us see this remarkable world of Yours without fear.

We come also seeking Your sacred intercession for all the men and women who have been placed in harm's way while serving to defend and protect our Nation.

For those who serve You here in this House, let them be wise leaders, Lord. Let them be led by You.

And may all honor and glory be Yours, our God. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

MR. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. RYUN of Kansas led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Repub-

lic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING THE REVEREND KATHLEENE CARD, TRINITY UNITED METHODIST CHURCH, McLEAN, VIRGINIA

(Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased today to rise and recognize today's guest chaplain, the Reverend Kathleene Card of Trinity United Methodist Church of McLean, Virginia. Kathy and her family have been longtime friends with my family, and she has distinguished herself as a true community leader with whom I am proud to serve in Northern Virginia.

Kathy and her husband, Andrew Card, the current Chief of Staff of the White House, have a common passion for public service. Kathy's career has spanned the teaching profession, senior government assignments, to now her service as a minister, all while dedicated to her three wonderful children and devoted husband of 33 years.

I have had the pleasure of working with one of Kathy's daughters, Tabatha, as she worked in my various offices as Chairman of the County Board of Supervisors in Fairfax and a Member of Congress, and her other daughter, Rachel, previously served in the Office of Chief Administrative Officer in the House of Representatives.

We are all pleased that Kathy was able to join us, and we want to express our thanks and best wishes to her and her family.

### SUPPORT PRESIDENT ON AIRLINE SECURITY MEASURE

(Mr. FOLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H7531

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has asked us to pass an airline security measure tomorrow on this House floor. What our Commander in Chief and President has asked for is flexibility to hire people at airports to ensure the security of the traveling public.

Plain and simple: President Bush is not going to risk the lives of Americans by buying on the cheap, so let us not get tied up in how or where they are employed or if they are called Federal employees. That seems to be the call from the other side of the aisle, that unless they are given a Federal ID Card, they will not adequately protect the traveling public.

I suggest that we follow the guidelines laid out by President Bush. I must say, he has done a phenomenal job with our Nation in Afghanistan. He went to the Yankees game last night and stood on the mound and pitched the ball, showing he is not frightened to show up in a major stadium, and now he is asking for a tool to protect the American public as they travel.

I urge this body not to get tied up in partisan politics of who hires and where they are hired and what union they belong to, but instead ensure that when you get on an aircraft you have been properly and thoroughly searched, that you are safely going to arrive at your destination.

Support the President on this issue. It is important for travel and tourism in this country.

#### DOMESTIC VIOLENCE MONTH

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

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about domestic violence. I was pleased that President Bush proclaimed this month of October as National Domestic Violence Awareness Month. However, people should be aware of domestic violence every day. Domestic violence is an offense against our institutional values. One incident of domestic violence is one incident too much.

Throughout my tenure in Congress, I have been a strong supporter of domestic violence awareness. In 1999 I was proud to include in the fiscal year 2000 defense authorization language the Defense Task Force on Domestic Violence. The task force was established to review and evaluate current programs and policies associated with domestic violence in the Department of Defense. It reinforces the importance of preventing domestic violence because deterrence is key. However, when violence does occur, we must protect the victims while holding the offenders accountable.

I am confident that the task force will provide the Secretary of Defense with a comprehensive report and a plan

that augments our current efforts to eliminate domestic violence within the military. Furthermore, the task force findings will help in our national efforts to address domestic violence in our own communities.

#### ENSURING SAFETY AND SECURITY OF EVERY TRAVELER

(Mr. RYUN of Kansas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, as Americans start flying again, they deserve the peace of mind that can only come from knowing that strict security measures are in place for their protection. The stories we hear about baggage screeners with criminal records are appalling, but the answer is not merely placing these same people on the Federal payroll.

The Federal Government should provide standards and provisions. The private sector should provide hard work and ingenuity in order to update and manage the security measures. We must allow airports to think creatively and act decisively, but always under the watchful eye of the Federal Government.

Most importantly, we should give the President the flexibility to implement the measures by rejecting a one-size-fits-all approach and treating each airport as an individual unit.

I urge my colleagues to support the Young-Mica bill, and ensure that traveling people have the safety and security they are entitled to.

#### CONTINUE BOMBING DURING RAMADAN

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, there are those in America that say that we should stop the bombing of the Taliban during the holy month of Ramadan. I disagree. Hitler did not stop on Yom Kippur, Japan did not stop on Christmas or Easter. In fact, Egypt and Syria attacked Israel on Yom Kippur during the holy month of Ramadan, folks.

Let us get real: This is war. This is not a coffee break nor do or should we take sabbaticals. It is time to root these terrorists out. Keep the heat on.

I yield back the fact that giving this Taliban regime 30 days, they will simply reorganize and kill many more Americans.

#### PRESENT A FAIR AND BALANCED AVIATION SAFETY BILL

(Mr. EHLERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I take four airplane flights a week. As many

Members of Congress do, I fly home every weekend, two segments each time. So I am very familiar with security requirements and that what we have had has not worked.

Our purpose now is to make sure, number one, that we centralize responsibility; number two, that we have one play book that applies to all the rules, and that that play book works and is kept up-to-date. That means that we should put all the responsibility in one location for all modes of transportation.

We need something that is flexible, that is innovative, that can be changed and modified to meet circumstances as they change.

We want something that is non-partisan. We are sorry that the Senate bill became a partisan bill by advocating just one particular position. The House bill will allow the President to choose whether these should be Federal employees or whether these should be contracted out.

I just want to say, I believe the bill that will be before us tomorrow is a fair and good way to approach the issue of aviation security. It will get away from partisan wrangling. It will ensure that the traveling public will be safe and secure.

#### PROFESSIONALIZE SECURITY AT AMERICA'S AIRPORTS

(Mr. RODRIGUEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, the security of America should be our first priority and it should not be turned into politics. Politics should not be part of this debate.

We use over 450 airports and over 3,000 employees to transport people across this country. The size and complexity of our system requires a Federal workforce that is professional, well-trained, and well-paid, not contracted employees making less than fast food wages.

If we are to restore public confidence in air travel, we must make real attempts to address the security problems. We cannot guarantee safety with a system that leaves national security in the hands of private companies that contract to the lowest bidder.

We stand a fighting chance against terror in the skies only if we have professionalism in the law enforcement function, where we can feel confident that they are well-trained, they are competent and they will be able to protect our citizens.

We should not privatize our national security. We do not privatize the Department of Defense, we do not privatize the FBI, we do not privatize security services. We must do the right thing.

#### COMMENDING THOSE WHO DEVELOP READING SKILLS

(Mr. WATKINS of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to address

the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WATKINS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend First Lady Laura Bush and our Nation's teachers who are helping our children develop their reading skills.

Reading is a path to successful life. I have personal knowledge of the role of special teachers and am very thankful for my good friend Dr. Ann Dugger at Will Rogers Elementary School in Stillwater, who spent many hours with our grandson Bradley learning to read.

My nephew, Josh Rogers, is a student in Mrs. Trish Fellers' third grade class at Derby Hills Elementary School in Derby, Kansas. The class read Jeff Brown's book "Flat Stanley," in which Stanley is flattened by a bulletin board and mails himself to visit friends in California.

□ 1015

My nephew, Josh, mailed "Flat Josh" to my wife and me to stay for a month. "Flat Josh" came to Washington, D.C. to visit his own Congressman, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT), so "Flat Josh" is with us today.

I am grateful for First Lady Laura Bush, Dr. Ann Dugger, and Mrs. Trish Fellers and many other teachers like them, and I encourage all of us to read to our children and our grandchildren.

#### U.S. NEEDS FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AT AIRPORTS

(Mr. DEFAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, it has been 7 weeks and 1 day since the terrorist attacks and more than 2 weeks since the Senate passed legislation 100 to 0, which was just referred to by one of my colleagues as a partisan bill. I thought the Senate had 49 Republicans and 51 Democrats. How could a 100 to 0 vote be partisan? We are still waiting in the House for needed legislation for aviation security because of one objection raised by a couple of the Republican leaders.

The Federal law enforcement officers would provide screening for passengers and baggage. Guess what? When it comes to security for Members of Congress, for those same Members of Congress objecting to this, private security is not good enough. We have uniformed Federal law enforcement officers, but when it comes to the traveling public, it has to be the private, for-profit sector, that has been failing miserably. The largest in the country, Argenbright, is under criminal indictment for the second time in 2 years for hiring and maintaining known felons on staff and falsifying documents; and they say, Oh, well, the Federal Government will regulate these firms.

We have been trying to regulate them. We are prosecuting them in Federal court. We are fining them millions

of dollars. It cannot work. We need Federal law enforcement at the airports.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOKSEY). The Chair would remind the Members that it is improper in debate to characterize Senate actions.

#### AVIATION SECURITY

(Mr. HORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, today we must address and correct the security aspects of our total transportation system. Since the tragic events of September 11, we have focused solely on improving aviation security. We are all too aware of what the weaknesses of that system are: minimal standards, poor management, low morale, and little accountability. We must make security a priority for each mode of transportation. The next attack could be on an airline, a bus, a train, or even a cruise ship.

Operating within the Department of Transportation, a strong Under Secretary for Security will provide much-needed management and accountability. The Secure Transportation for America Act, of which I am a cosponsor, designates the Department of Transportation to provide the leadership for security. I urge my colleagues to support this vital legislation. The people want it.

#### HEAVEN HELP THIS HOUSE

(Mr. INSLEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues should be aware that when they get on their planes to go home to their districts this weekend, they should know that 90 to 95 percent of the bags that will go into the belly of their airplanes will not be screened for explosive devices. This is an enormous hole in our security system, and we applaud the efforts of the Secretary of Transportation and we applaud the efforts of the Congress, as we are going to do everything we can to take nail clippers away from passengers, but it does not do any good if they can put 40 pounds of C-4 high explosives in bags in the belly of our airplanes.

Mr. Speaker, the bill that the majority party is bringing to the floor of the House is not going to solve that problem. It will have some nice rhetorical flourish language that some day, at some unspecified date, by some unspecified means, we are going to check these bags, but that is not good enough.

We have offered an amendment, and I hope the majority party will allow this

House to vote on our amendment, which will assure by a specific date through a specific authorization that 100 percent of the bags that go in each jet airplane get screened to keep bombs out of them. And if we do not do that, heaven help this House.

#### TIME TO DO WHAT WORKS FOR AIRPORT SECURITY

(Mr. TERRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we have the opportunity to change the way security is done at our airports for the better. Until now, airlines have been in charge of security at our airports. They, in turn, for the lowest bid, hire companies like Argenbright and I.T.S. and others who provide minimal training, low pay, and even falsified background checks. The result of airlines in charge is 100 percent turnover and weapons making it past security points. We can no longer allow the airlines to be in charge, nor allow businesses like Argenbright and I.T.S. to remain in our airports.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3150 puts the responsibility for day-to-day airport security with the Transportation Security Administration. It also gives this department flexibility in its mixture of Federal employees and private-sector folks under their direct supervision to do the job right; not a one-size-fits-all of all-private or all-Federal, but what works.

#### SENSE OF CONGRESS RESOLUTION PROVIDING \$5 MILLION REWARD FOR ARREST AND CONVICTION OF ANTHRAX TERRORISTS

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

Ms. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, this House, ordinarily the United States Congress, passes what they call a Sense of Congress resolution. I am proposing a Sense of Congress resolution which I believe is a good-sense resolution in behalf of the United States Congress.

What it says is very simple, that the United States Government will pay \$5 million to any person who supplies information leading to the arrest and conviction of the person or persons who are responsible for placing anthrax spores in the United States mail system through to the United States Government mails, which have worked their way into the United States Government offices and into the lives of people in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I was appalled, as I am sure other Members were, to learn that we have lost yet another citizen, a lady out of New York who has now expired at 1 o'clock this morning because she had inadvertently inhaled anthrax.

It is the right approach for the United States Government because of

the assault against the United States Government to post a \$5 million reward for those who are responsible for this vicious, vicious act.

**SUPPORT H.R. 3150, THE AIRLINE SECURITY ACT**

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, as someone who spent 17 years as an airline pilot, a commercial airline pilot for major airlines, I believe I have as much experience as anyone here spending time in and out of our airports; and I want to assure my colleagues that I come today to show my support for H.R. 3150, the Airline Security Act, which we will deal with tomorrow.

A few weeks ago I was watching a news program on television, and on this particular program they tested the inadequacy of airport security. Sadly, this test was no television production. Poor airport security has become a reality. The events of September 11 have shown us that airport security needs a dramatic and drastic overhaul.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3150 is the right solution to improving our aviation safety in the skies over America, and in order to make flying safer and our airports more secure, we must federalize our airport security standards. H.R. 3150 puts to good use more than \$500 million that will bolster the front lines of airport security. It will place more air marshals in the skies and in our airlines. It will mandate fortified cockpit doors and give flexibility when it comes to hiring either Federal security personnel or federally certified security contractors. Support H.R. 3150.

**FEDERALIZED SYSTEM PROVIDES UNIFORMITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY**

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, everybody knows we are in a recession. What America knows is that this body is deepening that recession by the delay in our airline security bill. There is a new fear of flying and there are enormous disincentives to flying that are having an atrocious effect on our economy.

What will it take to make the pictures of September 11 and the Twin Towers recede? People want something close to a guarantee that it will not happen again, guarantees we cannot give them.

What we can give them is a uniform system of public accountability for screening and airline safety. By definition, private contractors are not uniform. That, indeed, is one of their advantages. They give us diversity. It is not diversity we need when it comes to screening and airline safety.

What the public is demanding in order to get them back in the air is that we maximize uniformity and that we maximize accountability. The only way to do that is to federalize in the air the way law enforcement operates on the ground.

**NO INTERRUPTIONS IN WAR ON TERRORISM**

(Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of our military's ongoing efforts in the war against terrorism. In the last 25 days, the military campaign has succeeded in weakening the power, influence, and warfighting capability of the Taliban regime and the al-Qaeda network.

Now, as the hardest of Afghanistan's winter months set in, we are provided with an excellent opportunity to increase the pressure on the Taliban through the continuation of our military campaign.

Mr. Speaker, we stood before the American people and the international community and declared the war on terrorism to be a war with many fronts. It is imperative that this war's military front continue to be fought without interruption.

Mr. Speaker, the decision to postpone military action under any circumstance plays directly into the hands of those who seek to destroy us. Despite the intentions of our decision, each day we remain idle is a day for the Taliban and al-Qaeda to resupply and disperse assets at a time when the radical Islamic militia could be most vulnerable.

**GRAND IMAM OF EGYPT DENOUNCES TERRORISM**

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, since September 11, we in Congress have joined the President in making clear that this is not a war between the West and the East or a war against Islam. This is not a war between America and Afghanistan. In fact, we are doing as much as we can right now to help the people of Afghanistan. This is a war between all civilized nations and the barbaric terrorists and those who harbor them.

Just a few days ago, the Grand Imam of Al-Azhar, the highest and most respected Islamic authority in the world, who resides in Egypt, also made this clear. The Grand Imam said that the Koran specifically forbids the kinds of things the Taliban and al-Qaeda are guilty of. He said the jihad Osama bin Laden has called for against America is invalid and not binding on Muslims. He said that "Islam rejects all of these acts." He called terrorism un-Islamic. In fact, he says, "Killing innocent ci-

vilians is a horrific, hideous act that no religion can approve."

Mr. Speaker, this war may take a long time to win, but we will win it and the world will remain united against terrorism and removing evil terrorists like Osama bin Laden from the caves where they hide.

**PASS TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY**

(Mr. KNOLLENBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, we have to pass trade promotion authority now. If we do not, we will let down America's world-class workers, farmers and businesses.

The global marketplace is increasingly competitive. Without TPA, America will lag behind. Our foreign competitors have negotiated some 130 preferential agreements while we, absent TPA, have negotiated exactly three. We need to get back in the game.

International trade is an essential and growing source of economic expansion. Exports accounted for over 25 percent of all U.S. economic growth over the last decade and support an estimated 12 million jobs. If we do not pass TPA, we risk losing our competitive edge to other nations who will continue to negotiate deals while we sit on the sidelines. With trade promotion authority, we can level the playing field.

Mr. Speaker, U.S. companies, workers, and farmers are second to none. We need TPA to make sure the rules are fair. The companies, the workers and the farmers will do the rest.

□ 1030

**CONGRATULATING MIAMI CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL**

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, American children are learning the value of charity by helping the Afghan children, and adults are learning that educating our children and keeping them healthy are ways to contribute to the rebuilding of our Nation.

That is why I congratulate today Miami Children's Hospital, whose motto is "We are here for our children." This hospital is always seeking innovative ways to better serve the children of south Florida.

Miami Children's Hospital held a groundbreaking to further expand and renovate its medical campus. A radiology expansion, an ambulatory care building, a helistop, and a hurricane-proof encapsulation comprise the projects.

Miami Children's Hospital is indeed "building on a dream," the name it has labeled its new projects, and it is demonstrating a never ending commitment

to kids. Since 1950, Miami Children's Hospital has been the leader in pediatric care, and I offer my congratulations for its many achievements.

#### WORLD WAR II VETERAN DIPLOMAS

(Mr. GUTKNECHT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, Rex Arnold Pettis and Mike Pelach are two men among many who interrupted their high school educations to respond to the call of duty by serving our country during World War II, Rex on a submarine in the Pacific sinking Japanese ships, and Mike as a medic in New Guinea.

While not in the classroom, World War II vets continued their education through experience: Geography, foreign languages, science, strategic planning, all essential in their battle to succeed.

Many of these brave men and women never had the chance to return to the classroom to complete their diplomas. Ray Alvin Pettis, twin brother of Rex, died on the battlefield in France. Fifty years later, Mr. Pettis and Mr. Pelach are receiving their high school diplomas.

For the third year, Independent School District 192 in Farmington, Minnesota, and the Farmington Veterans of Foreign Wars and the American Legion are honoring these World War II vets in a special graduation ceremony. Mr. James Robert Borman, who passed away just last week, and Mr. Ray Alvin Pettis, will also be honored posthumously for their service in the Air Force and Army, respectively.

It is only proper that we honor these who honor the call to duty, sacrificing important years of their lives for the benefit of all. I am grateful to these men for their valor and sacrifices, and I congratulate ISD 192, the American Legion, and the VFW in Farmington for honoring them with a graduation ceremony and high school diplomas.

#### AMERICAN AGRICULTURE NEEDS TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

(Mr. CALVERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, American agriculture needs trade promotion authority. Without granting the President the authority to negotiate preferential trade agreements, this industry is guaranteed to face dark days. Ninety-six percent of agricultural growers' potential market is outside of the United States. It is a business there for taking, but if we do not give our farmers and ranchers the tools they need to compete in the world market, other countries will gladly fill the gap.

Today, of the 133 preferential trade agreements worldwide, the U.S. par-

ticipates in only two. Compare that to the European Union, who participates in 27. Furthermore, the European Union also outspends us almost four to one on subsidies. Granting Presidential trade authority is our only weapon of combat on the uneven playing field of world agriculture.

We cannot continue to stand idly by while other nations improve trading opportunities for themselves. Our agriculture industry is the most productive in the world. It is an honor and status that should be rewarded, and the best reward we can give our agricultural growers for their efforts, and to keep our country prosperous, is to pass trade promotion authority.

#### SUPPORT FOR THE PRESIDENT'S VISION OF A FLEXIBLE, VERSATILE AIRPORT SECURITY SYSTEM

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I am new to this body, having spent all 42 years of my life in the State of Indiana, where common sense and common values are the order of the day. So as I approach the debate over airport security, I find myself a little befuddled, Mr. Speaker.

Other than policy wonks at think tanks around Washington, D.C., I think there are very few people that I serve who care how we make airports safer. They just want us to do it, and they want us to do it now.

For my part, I believe the light we should follow at this point is the experience of nations who have dealt with terrorism in the recent past, and we should follow a President who has earned the right to be followed, and earned our trust.

I support President Bush's vision for a flexible, versatile system for airport security. That is what the Republican bill in the House is all about. It builds on the experience of European countries and even of Israel, who have wrestled with this menace of terrorism for decades.

When it comes to airport security, let us give the President and the people we serve what we know works.

#### URGING SUPPORT FOR THE AIR- LINE SECURITY BILL AND OPPO- SITION TO THE DEMOCRAT SUB- STITUTE

(Mr. DOOLITTLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House will take up the airline security bill. This is a good bill. It gives the President the flexibility he needs to protect Americans as they fly. I would urge support of this legislation and defeat of the Democrat substitute.

The heart of the Democrat substitute is a mandate to make the security

checkers all Federal employees. Europe has gone down that road and has rejected it.

Let me just quote out of the Washington Post what the chairman of the Europe-wide Task Force on Aviation Security had to say regarding contract employees versus government employees:

"'It is harder to do quality control on our government people,' said Frank Durinckx, director of Belgium's Aviation Inspectorate and chairman of Europe-wide Task Force on Aviation Security. 'Government agencies do not like to criticize themselves or one another, and civil servants are hard to get rid of if they are not performing well. If we give the work to a private contractor, we have control over them,' Durinckx said. 'If we are not pleased with a screener, we can withdraw their license.'"

Let us support President Bush. Support the House aviation security bill tomorrow and defeat the Democrat substitute.

#### WE NEED HIGH-QUALITY U.S. CITIZENS AS AIRPORT SCREENERS

(Mr. KIRK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, U.S. citizens should protect U.S. citizens at airports. Over 90 percent of the screeners who let terrorists board at Dulles Airport were not Americans. Some of them were illegal aliens.

The Young-Mica bill requires that all screeners be Americans. The Senate bill has no such requirement. The Young-Mica bill also requires that all screeners be deputized, badged, and uniformed Federal transportation security officers.

Like the successful U.S. Marshals Court Security Officers Program, we will deploy Federal transportation security officers who are well-trained and paid, but with key flexibility. Flexibility. It means that we will not protect nationalized employers who incompetently screen weapons or explosives aboard aircraft, killing more Americans. Flexibility means we can fire screeners who fail to protect us.

We need high quality screeners who will ensure that when we fly, we fly safe.

#### AIRPORT SECURITY

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to talk a little bit about this airport security issue, because it seems that the Democrat Party, in a split from the presidency and the nonpartisan spirit that we have been having in Washington, is hung up on trying to unionize and create a new Federal bureaucracy in the name of airport security.

There are pros and cons with that. We all know that. There are good employees and bad employees that are with the unions. It is a little more difficult to work with. But the issue is not creating a new government bureaucracy, the issue is protecting my children, my family, my loved ones, and your business associates and loved ones, when they travel.

I believe we need to do what is best for airport security and not what is best for a particular political party. I support the President's plan. The President's plan calls for strict Federal Government oversight on hiring and background checks, but it does not just stop at the gate; it says who is going to work on the plane. What about the maintenance people who clean the plane? What about the people who have access to the parts of the airplane in the airport itself? It is a much broader approach to airport security.

Mr. Speaker, this debate is about security, not about new government bureaucracies. I support the President's position. I hope that the Democrats will come on board and do so as well.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report accompanying H.R. 2590, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOKSEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2590, TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the previous order of the House, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2590) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, October 30, 2001, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 26, 2001, at page H7337.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK).

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present the Fiscal Year 2002 conference agree-

ment for the Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government. This conference agreement provides \$17.1 billion in funding for programs under the jurisdiction of this subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

That represents, Mr. Speaker, an increase of 6 percent above the fiscal year 2001 enacted levels and 2 percent above the President's request. It is especially important to have this funding in place because of the increased demands of national security and homeland security from the events of September 11.

One of the little known facts about this particular bill is that it supports over 40 percent of all Federal law enforcement through the Customs Service, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms, the Secret Service, the Criminal Investigations Division of the Internal Revenue Service, and the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center.

I want to highlight that, Mr. Speaker, because of the current role these agencies are playing in ensuring homeland security, and also because, whether we are at war or peace, it is important to understand the tools that our Nation possesses to defeat our enemies, to ensure an environment that encourages trade and commercial growth, and the normal, everyday activity in conducting the business of America, and to provide for the safety and stability in the daily routines of all Americans.

I am also pleased, Mr. Speaker, that the new Office of Homeland Security, headed by former Pennsylvania Governor Tom Ridge, is within the Executive Office of the President, another portion under the jurisdiction of this subcommittee and its funding.

Historically, law enforcement officials in the U.S. Department of Treasury have fulfilled their role quietly, without fanfare, without drawing the attention of the American people. Yet, the oldest law enforcement agency in the United States Government is the Customs Service of Treasury. It was established in 1789, one of the very first acts enacted by the First Congress of the United States after adoption of the Constitution.

The evolving threats to our country are making special demands upon this, America's first law enforcement agency, the one that defends our borders, as well as the other law enforcement functions that come under the Treasury Department and within this bill.

We need to focus the support and attention of Congress and the Administration and of the American people to determine appropriate, coordinated strategies and provide the funding levels for Treasury law enforcement bureaus to enable them to fully carry out their missions.

Mr. Speaker, the conference agreement before us recognizes that there are additional resources that are going to be necessary because of the September 11 terrorist attacks. This bill begins to address those requirements.

We will have within a few day's time a supplemental appropriations that will deal with further law enforcement needs and other Federal law enforcement agencies, as well as other aspects of our military and the national government.

There is within this bill some \$5.7 billion for law enforcement efforts under our jurisdiction. It is an increase of almost 12 percent, \$593 million above the current year. That is even before we factor in the necessary increases that will be part of the upcoming supplemental.

Specifically, in terms of supporting Federal law enforcement, this conference report provides an increase of \$402 million for the Customs Service, of which some \$33 million is devoted to border inspection technology; \$28 million for additional inspectors and agents along the northern border, which has not received the increase in recent years that the southern border has; and \$170 million is added for customs automation modernization, which includes an amount not less than \$300 million, for the automated commercial environment. This system will tie together some 50-odd Federal agencies that have jurisdiction over products that are coming into the United States, part of the cargo which must be inspected by the Customs Service. Because of the manpower shortages, Mr. Speaker, customs is able to inspect only 1 or 2 percent of the entering cargo, a ratio which we intend to increase.

□ 1045

We also expand the funding for Customs for its efforts to halt trade and goods that are produced by forced child labor; also providing funding for the protection of intellectual property. Some of the smuggling that happens across our borders is not just illegal drugs. It is not just contraband shipments of alcohol or tobacco. It is not only knock-offs of American products which people are trying to pass off cheaply-produced goods overseas that have the appearance but not the quality and certainly not the original manufacture of American goods. We are also protecting intellectual property because smuggling, whether it be DVD software, compact disk recordings, whatever it may be, there is a severe organized criminal assault against the intellectual property that is produced by American artists, scientists, engineers, computer programmers and others, which is part of the great commerce and the great advantage that this Nation enjoys technologically. That intellectual property is protected by Customs just as it protects us from other illicit cargo.

We also have an increase of \$45 million for Secret Service recruitment and retention. These are men and women who protect not only the President but protect our currency against counterfeiting who are in charge of the special security arrangements at the upcoming

Winter Olympics to be held in Salt Lake City, Utah. These men and women have been working drastic amounts of overtime, and we want to make sure that we do not work into the ground the people that are in charge of protecting our country and key parts of America.

We also have increases for the Federal Law Enforcement Training facilities that support the basic training of border inspection agents and a great multitude of the people that are involved in Federal law enforcement, working through the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center in Glynco, Georgia.

We also provide \$1 million for a canine detection program sponsored by Customs to use dogs to detect chemical and biological agents.

We have some \$20 million to increase the efforts of the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas program, bringing that account up to a total of \$226 million to coordinate between the State and local government entities and the Federal Government in efforts to combat illegal drugs and the immense problems that they bring upon our society.

I should mention that we also have within this budget the Office of National Drug Control Policy. Key portions of the drug enforcement efforts are handled through the funding of this bill, not just through Customs but also through ONDCP, the so-called drug czar, and these high-intensity drug trafficking efforts and the promotional efforts such as the Drug Free Communities Act.

I am pleased to note that the conference report includes some \$18 million for constructing seven border stations, including four along the northern border, again part of beefing up the borders for our border security and our homeland security.

It also includes a number of courthouse constructions to make sure the criminal justice system continues to be able to handle the load that is being placed upon it.

We also have an increase for the Internal Revenue Service, including \$320 million for critical information technology investments so that when my colleagues or I or anybody else, Mr. Speaker, calls the IRS having a problem with how our taxes are being handled, that they have the information readily accessible, that they can be responsive to the public, and we are continuing the efforts through funding and mechanisms in this bill to make the IRS more responsive, more user-friendly, more customer and taxpayer oriented in what it does.

Mr. Speaker, the bill also includes several legislative provisions. It provides parity for Federal employee health benefits. It retains the current law prohibiting the use of Federal funds to pay for an abortion, and it also has the requirement that prescription contraceptives would be covered under certain circumstances and exceptions as conscience clause protections for those that have an objection of conscience, Mr. Speaker.

This bill includes a pay increase for Federal civil employees of 4.6 percent, as authorized by the Congress. It extends the authorization of the breast cancer semi-postal stamp until December 31, 2003, which provides additional funding for efforts to research and combat breast cancer. It authorizes the September 11 hero stamp to continue until December 31, 2004, honoring the men and women who were the responders or the victims of the tragic events of the World Trade Center and the Pentagon on September 11, people who we wish to honor. It also authorizes the semi-postal stamp on stamping out domestic violence, which would be a program that would continue until December 31, 2006.

Mr. Speaker, I would finally note that this conference report takes out language that had been in the House version of the bill regarding travel to Cuba. We feel that this is not the time to be addressing that particular sensitive issue in this environment, including the war on terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished ranking member of the subcommittee. We have had an excellent bipartisan spirit and cooperation as this bill worked through the legislative process. His personal staff member, Scott Nance, and the full committee's minority member, Rob Nabors, toiled long and hard in working things through, and without their assistance we would not be able to bring this bill up in the collegial fashion that I believe it is being brought up today.

I especially want to thank the chief clerk of our subcommittee, Michelle Mrdeza, for her persistent and tireless efforts on this, as well as the great expertise, insight and counsel of the other staff members of our subcommittee, Jeff Ashford, Kurt Dodd and Tammy Hughes plus Chris Stanley, who is a detailee on a fellowship from the Secret Service, which is his normal workplace. I would also thank a member of our committee staff that worked through my office, John Albaugh, who functions also as my Chief of Staff, and

frankly, Mr. Speaker, keeps things going in a very important way, for which I am grateful.

I do want to single out our congressional fellow Chris Stanley, an agent of the United States Secret Service, who will be heading to his next assignment as special agent. He has served not only on the subcommittee staff but also worked a year in my personal office, and his experience, working last year on the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, this year on the Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service and General Government, has brought tremendous insight regarding law enforcement, has added a lot of benefit, a lot of professionalism, with a very strong background in the technical issues which we sometimes must address.

Combining his professionalism with his law enforcement skills, his paramedic skills and frankly his cool head and enjoyable good nature have been a great asset to us. We are going to be sorry to see Chris leave to go back to his regular assignments, but we know that the Secret Service has a great need for his direct expertise, and we hope that what he has learned here in Congress will be of benefit to the Secret Service and the jobs that they perform.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to mention as part of noting the key involvement of the Customs Service and law enforcement that we were notified that yesterday a U.S. customs inspector died in the line of duty at the port of Gramercy in Louisiana. Customs Inspector Thomas Murray lost his life during an examination of the hold of a vessel in which evidently there were toxic fumes present. That is an illustration of the dangers that many Customs agents accept as part of their job.

I have personally visited some of the vessels that they have to inspect and have seen what they have to do to find the hidden compartments that are used to smuggle drugs or other contraband, all in the name of protecting our Nation. So I want to commend Customs Inspector Thomas Murray and express our gratitude for the efforts that he put in for some 31 years with the Customs Service.

We want to express our sympathy to his family, to his co-workers in the Customs Service, and thank the late Thomas Murray for his efforts in being part of the front line of defense for the United States of America and our homeland security.

## H.R. 2590 - Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 2002

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2001 Enacted	FY 2002 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
<b>TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY</b>						
Departmental Offices .....	222,337	181,768	174,219	187,322	177,142	-45,195
Department-wide systems and capital investments programs .....	62,150	70,828	68,828	69,028	68,828	+6,678
Office of Inspector General.....	32,827	35,150	35,508	35,150	35,424	+2,597
Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration.....	118,166	122,342	123,474	123,799	123,746	+5,580
Treasury Building and Annex Repair and Restoration .....	30,932	32,932	30,932	32,932	28,932	-2,000
Expanded Access to Financial Services.....	9,978		10,000		2,000	-7,978
Rescission.....				-8,000		
Financial Crimes Enforcement Network.....	37,493	45,155	45,837	45,702	45,837	+8,344
Counterterrorism Fund.....	54,879	44,879	36,879	44,879	40,000	-14,879
Federal Law Enforcement Training Center:						
Salaries and Expenses .....	99,264	100,707	102,132	106,317	105,680	+6,416
Acquisition, Construction, Improvements, & Related Expenses.....	54,086	21,895	27,534	33,434	33,434	-20,652
Total .....	153,350	122,602	129,666	139,751	139,114	-14,236
Interagency Law Enforcement:						
Interagency crime and drug enforcement.....	103,248	106,487	107,576	106,965	107,576	+4,328
Financial Management Service.....	255,972	211,594	213,211	212,316	212,850	-43,122
Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms .....	771,143	803,521	806,816	805,421	810,316	+39,173
GREAT grants .....			10,000	16,000	13,000	+13,000
Total .....	771,143	803,521	816,816	821,421	823,316	+52,173
United States Customs Service:						
Salaries and Expenses .....	1,878,557	1,961,764	2,056,604	2,022,453	2,079,357	+200,800
Harbor Maintenance Fee Collection .....	2,993	2,993	2,993	3,000	3,000	+7
Operation, Maintenance and Procurement, Air and Marine Interdiction Programs .....	132,934	162,637	181,860	172,637	177,860	+44,926
Miscellaneous appropriations (P.L. 106-554).....	6,985					-6,985
Automation modernization:						
Automated Commercial System.....	122,443	122,432	122,432	122,432	122,432	-11
International Trade Data System .....	5,389	5,400	5,400	5,400	5,400	+11
Automated Commercial Environment .....	130,000	130,000	300,000	230,000	300,000	+170,000
Subtotal.....	257,832	257,832	427,832	357,832	427,832	+170,000
Customs Services at Small Airports (to be derived from fees collected) .....	1,993	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	+1,007
Offsetting receipts.....	-2,000	-3,000	-3,000	-3,000	-3,000	-1,000
Total .....	2,279,294	2,385,226	2,669,289	2,555,922	2,688,049	+408,755
Bureau of the Public Debt .....	182,699	185,370	187,927	187,318	186,953	+4,254
Payment of government losses in shipment.....	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	
Internal Revenue Service:						
Processing, Assistance, and Management.....	3,661,166	3,783,347	3,808,434	3,786,347	3,797,890	+136,724
Tax Law Enforcement .....	3,366,380	3,533,198	3,538,347	3,535,198	3,538,347	+171,967
Earned Income Tax Credit Compliance Initiative.....	144,681	146,000	146,000	146,000	146,000	+1,319
Information Systems.....	1,522,416	1,563,249	1,573,065	1,563,249	1,563,249	+40,833
Business systems modernization.....	71,593	396,593	391,593	419,593	391,593	+320,000
Staffing tax administration for balance and equity .....	140,690					-140,690
Rescissions (H.R. 2216).....	-18,000					+18,000
Total (net).....	8,888,926	9,422,387	9,457,439	9,450,387	9,437,079	+548,153
United States Secret Service:						
Salaries and Expenses .....	824,885	857,117	920,112	899,615	920,615	+95,730
Acquisition, Construction, Improvements, & Related Expenses.....	8,921	3,352	3,457	3,352	3,457	-5,464
Total .....	833,806	860,469	923,569	902,967	924,072	+90,266
Total, title I, Department of the Treasury.....	14,038,200	14,631,710	15,032,170	14,908,859	15,041,918	+1,003,718
Appropriations .....	(14,056,200)	(14,631,710)	(15,032,170)	(14,916,859)	(15,041,918)	(+985,718)
Rescissions .....	(-18,000)			(-8,000)		(+18,000)
<b>TITLE II - POSTAL SERVICE</b>						
Payment to the Postal Service Fund .....	28,936	76,619	29,000	76,619	29,000	+64
Advance appropriation, FY 2002.....	66,952	67,093	67,093	67,093	67,093	+141
Advance appropriation, FY 2003.....			47,619		47,619	+47,619
Total .....	95,888	143,712	143,712	143,712	143,712	+47,824

H.R. 2590 - Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 2002

— continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2001 Enacted	FY 2002 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
<b>TITLE III - EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT AND FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT</b>						
Executive Office of the President.....		237,775	139,255			
Compensation of the President and the White House Office						
Compensation of the President.....	390			450	450	+60
Salaries and Expenses.....	53,171			54,165	54,651	+1,480
Executive Residence at the White House:						
Operating Expenses.....	10,878			11,914	11,695	+819
White House Repair and Restoration.....	966			8,625	8,625	+7,659
Special Assistance to the President and the Official Residence of the Vice President:						
Salaries and Expenses.....	3,665			3,896	3,925	+260
Operating expenses.....	353			314	318	-35
Council of Economic Advisers.....	4,101		4,211	4,192	4,211	+110
Office of Policy Development.....	4,023			4,119	4,142	+119
National Security Council.....	7,149			7,447	7,494	+345
Office of Administration.....	43,641			46,032	46,955	+3,314
Office of Management and Budget.....	68,635		70,752	70,519	70,752	+2,117
Office of National Drug Control Policy:						
Salaries and expenses.....	24,705		25,267	25,096	25,263	+558
Counterdrug Technology Assessment Center.....	35,974	40,000	40,000	42,000	42,300	+6,326
Total.....	60,679	40,000	65,267	67,096	67,563	+6,884
Federal Drug Control Programs:						
High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program.....	206,046	206,350	233,882	226,350	226,350	+20,304
Special Forfeiture Fund.....	233,086	247,600	238,600	249,400	239,400	+6,314
Unanticipated Needs.....	998			1,000	1,000	+2
Elections Commission of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.....	2,494					-2,494
Total, title III, Executive Office of the President and Funds Appropriated to the President.....	700,273	731,725	751,967	755,519	747,531	+47,258
<b>TITLE IV - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES</b>						
Committee for Purchase from People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled.....	4,149	4,498	4,629	4,498	4,629	+480
Federal Election Commission.....	40,411	41,411	43,689	43,993	43,689	+3,278
Federal Labor Relations Authority.....	25,003	26,378	26,524	26,378	26,524	+1,521
General Services Administration:						
Federal Buildings Fund:						
Appropriations.....	476,523	276,400	276,400	276,400	284,400	-192,123
Advance appropriation, FY 2002-2004.....	(276,400)					(-276,400)
Limitations on availability of revenue:						
Construction and acquisition of facilities.....	(477,676)	(386,289)	(348,816)	(477,544)	(386,280)	(-91,396)
Repairs and alterations.....	(681,613)	(826,676)	(826,676)	(844,880)	(826,676)	(+145,063)
Installment acquisition payments.....	(185,369)	(186,427)	(186,427)	(186,427)	(186,427)	(+1,058)
Rental of space.....	(2,943,854)	(2,959,550)	(2,959,550)	(2,959,550)	(2,952,050)	(+8,196)
Building Operations.....	(1,624,771)	(1,748,949)	(1,750,669)	(1,748,949)	(1,748,949)	(+124,178)
Subtotal.....	(5,913,283)	(6,107,891)	(6,072,138)	(6,217,350)	(6,100,382)	(+187,099)
Repayment of Debt.....	(70,595)	(72,000)	(72,000)	(72,000)	(72,000)	(+1,405)
Total, Federal Buildings Fund.....	476,523	276,400	276,400	276,400	284,400	-192,123
(Limitations).....	(5,983,878)	(6,179,891)	(6,144,138)	(6,289,350)	(6,172,382)	(+188,504)
Policy and Operations.....	137,406	138,499	137,947	145,749	143,139	+5,733
Office of Inspector General.....	34,444	36,025	36,478	36,025	36,346	+1,902
Electronic Government (E-Gov) Fund.....		20,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	+5,000
Allowances and Office Staff for Former Presidents.....	2,511	3,552	3,196	3,376	3,196	+685
Expenses, Presidential transition.....	7,084					-7,084
Total, General Services Administration.....	657,968	474,476	459,021	466,550	472,081	-185,887
Merit Systems Protection Board:						
Salaries and Expenses.....	29,372	30,375	30,555	30,375	30,555	+1,183
Limitation on administrative expenses.....	2,424	2,520	2,520	2,520	2,520	+96
Morris K. Udall Foundation:						
Morris K. Udall scholarship.....	1,996	1,746				-1,996
Native Nations Institute.....		250				
Morris K. Udall Trust Fund.....			2,500	1,996	1,996	+1,996
Environmental Dispute Resolution Fund.....	1,248	1,309	1,309	1,309	1,309	+61

**H.R. 2590 - Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 2002**

— continued

(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2001 Enacted	FY 2002 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
<b>National Archives and Records Administration:</b>						
Operating expenses .....	208,946	244,247	244,247	244,247	244,247	+35,301
Reduction of debt .....	-6,084	-6,612	-6,612	-6,612	-6,612	-528
Repairs and Restoration .....	101,536	10,643	24,643	41,143	39,143	-62,393
<b>National Historical Publications and Records Commission:</b>						
Grants program .....	6,436	4,436	10,000	6,436	6,436	.....
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>310,834</b>	<b>252,714</b>	<b>272,278</b>	<b>285,214</b>	<b>283,214</b>	<b>-27,620</b>
Office of Government Ethics .....	9,663	10,060	10,117	10,060	10,117	+454
<b>Office of Personnel Management:</b>						
Salaries and Expenses .....	93,888	99,036	99,636	99,036	99,636	+5,748
Limitation on administrative expenses .....	101,762	115,928	115,928	115,928	115,928	+14,166
Office of Inspector General .....	1,357	1,398	1,498	1,398	1,498	+141
Limitation on administrative expenses .....	9,724	10,016	10,016	10,016	10,016	+292
Government Payment for Annuitants, Employees Health Benefits .....	5,427,166	6,145,000	6,145,000	6,145,000	6,145,000	+717,834
Government Payment for Annuitants, Employee Life Insurance .....	35,000	33,000	33,000	33,000	33,000	-2,000
Payment to Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund .....	8,940,051	9,229,000	9,229,000	9,229,000	9,229,000	+288,949
<b>Total, Office of Personnel Management .....</b>	<b>14,608,948</b>	<b>15,633,378</b>	<b>15,634,078</b>	<b>15,633,378</b>	<b>15,634,078</b>	<b>+1,025,130</b>
Office of Special Counsel .....	11,122	11,784	11,891	11,784	11,891	+769
United States Tax Court .....	37,223	37,305	37,809	37,305	37,305	+82
<b>Total, title IV, Independent Agencies .....</b>	<b>15,740,361</b>	<b>16,528,204</b>	<b>16,536,920</b>	<b>16,555,360</b>	<b>16,559,908</b>	<b>+819,547</b>
<b>Grand total (net) .....</b>	<b>30,574,722</b>	<b>32,035,351</b>	<b>32,464,769</b>	<b>32,363,450</b>	<b>32,493,069</b>	<b>+1,918,347</b>
Current year, FY 2002 .....	30,507,770	31,968,258	32,350,057	32,296,357	32,378,357	+1,870,587
Appropriations .....	(30,525,770)	(31,968,258)	(32,350,057)	(32,304,357)	(32,378,357)	(+1,852,587)
Rescissions .....	(-18,000)	.....	.....	(-8,000)	.....	(+18,000)
Advance appropriations, FY 2002 / FY 2003 .....	66,952	67,093	114,712	67,093	114,712	+47,760
(Limitations) .....	(5,983,878)	(6,179,891)	(6,144,138)	(6,289,350)	(6,172,382)	(+188,504)
<b>CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RECAP</b>						
<b>Scorekeeping adjustments:</b>						
Bureau of The Public Debt (Permanent) .....	145,000	148,000	148,000	148,000	148,000	+3,000
Federal Reserve Bank reimbursement fund .....	131,000	134,000	134,000	134,000	134,000	+3,000
US Mint revolving fund .....	13,960	22,000	17,000	22,000	17,000	+3,040
Sallie Mae .....	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	.....
Federal buildings fund .....	-74,000	31,000	-5,000	140,000	14,000	+88,000
<b>Advance appropriations:</b>						
Postal service, FY 2001/2002 .....	64,436	.....	.....	.....	.....	-64,436
Postal service, FY 2002/2003 .....	-66,952	.....	-47,619	.....	-47,619	+19,333
Across the board cut (0.22%) .....	-47,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	+47,000
OMB/CBO adjustment .....	35,491	.....	.....	.....	.....	-35,491
<b>Compensation of the President:</b>						
Mandatory .....	.....	450	450	.....	.....	.....
Discretionary .....	.....	-450	-450	.....	.....	.....
U.S. - China Security Review Commission (HR 2216) .....	1,700	.....	.....	.....	.....	-1,700
<b>Total, scorekeeping adjustments .....</b>	<b>204,635</b>	<b>336,000</b>	<b>247,381</b>	<b>445,000</b>	<b>266,381</b>	<b>+61,746</b>
<b>Total mandatory and discretionary .....</b>	<b>30,779,357</b>	<b>32,371,351</b>	<b>32,712,150</b>	<b>32,808,450</b>	<b>32,759,450</b>	<b>+1,980,093</b>
Mandatory .....	14,679,607	15,690,450	15,690,450	15,690,450	15,690,450	+1,010,843
Discretionary .....	16,099,750	16,680,901	17,021,700	17,118,000	17,069,000	+969,250

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I first want to rise and join the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK), the chairman of this subcommittee, in expressing our deep sorrow at the death of Thomas Murray, a long-time employee of the Customs Service, killed in the line of duty, killed while trying to defend this country from the importation and introduction into our borders of materials which are either illegal or dangerous.

Every day Customs agents, INS agents, DEA agents, FBI, Secret Service, ATF, IRS and Federal employees who are not perceived to be in law enforcement or tax enforcement are themselves, because of the very fact that they work for the Federal Government, at risk, and it is important that we remember them and that we appreciate them. We thank them for the contribution they make to making America free and great.

This bill does that in part by assuring that they will receive a comparability adjustment, which does not get them to comparability but an adjustment which will move them further towards their private sector counterparts. I thank the chairman for his support of that effort.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report provides a total discretionary funding level of nearly \$17.1 billion in discretionary dollars; that is, dollars over which we make a decision. That includes 969 million above last year's level and 388 million above the President's suggestion.

I want to mention a few important items. To some degree this will be repetitive, but I think it is important for both sides to mention these issues.

For Treasury law enforcement, which as the chairman pointed out makes up nearly 40 percent of all Federal law enforcement, we have provided 4.8 billion, 400 million above the President's request. Very frankly, that number will go up in supplementals to provide for better security and a better ability to meet the threat that now confronts this great Nation.

Important additions in this bill to the President's law enforcement request include the following: 170 million to modernize the Customs Service import processing system, for a total of 300 million in fiscal year 2002; 33 million for the Customs Service to purchase nonintrusive inspection technology.

We had the opportunity of talking to Secretary O'Neill last night about that issue, critically important to our Nation and to our commerce. Safety and commerce come together on that particular issue.

Twenty-five million for additional Customs inspectors on the northern border. Forty-five million above the President's request for the Secret Service to complete its work for its balancing initiative. Critically important

if we are going to have Secret Service agents work for hours that do not tax their effectiveness and efficiency.

We include 10.6 million for new facilities at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center in Glencoe, Georgia, and Artesia, New Mexico, critically important as we confront the beefing up of our law enforcement capability in this country and on our borders.

The funding level also includes 226.4 million for the HIDTAs, the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Program. 20.3 million above last year's level. Mr. Speaker, I have been a long time enthusiastic and strong supporter of the HIDTA program. The HIDTA program has significant dollars in it, now almost a quarter of a billion dollars, but it is a most important contribution, and a contribution which will become even more important in these days and the days ahead is the coordination it provides between Federal, State and local law enforcement and public safety agencies.

□ 1100

Tom Ridge, the new director of our homeland security effort, spoke to the Democratic Caucus this morning and talked about the necessity for coordination. HIDTA is a perfect example of that kind of coordination.

Mr. Speaker, I continue to be concerned with the level of support the Treasury law enforcement agencies receive from this administration, and I might say, from previous administrations. The emergency supplemental request sent to Congress underfunds the Customs Service. The Customs Service is on the front line protecting our borders. As we have just seen, Mr. Murray was on the front lines. He lost his life. If we are to enhance homeland defense capabilities, the Customs Service will require more support from the administration and from Congress.

This funding agreement includes \$2 million in addition to our law enforcement accounts for a program called First Accounts. This is on top of the \$10 million enacted last year and will give to Treasury \$12 million to provide a very important service for Americans who are unbanked: They have no checking account, they have no credit cards, they have no ATM card obviously, because they have no checking account.

The gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) has championed this program, which is intended to establish affordable, electronic banking accounts for low-income families, and increase the availability of ATM machines in low-income neighborhoods as well. It will also serve to educate low-income Americans about the benefits of having a bank account and managing their finances. It will protect them hopefully against being ripped off every payday by those who want to charge them exorbitant rates for cashing checks or making short-term carry-over loans.

For the IRS, Mr. Speaker, \$9.4 billion is provided. \$548.2 million above fiscal

2001. This includes an additional \$320 million to continue modernizing its business systems. It is appropriate that we mention the work of Charles Rossotti, the Commissioner of the IRS, who has done an extraordinary job as a manager, bringing the IRS into a position of carrying out the Internal Revenue Service Reform Act and making sure that we get the most efficient operation of our tax collection enterprise as is possible.

The conference agreement, Mr. Speaker, also provides \$280.6 million for court house construction. That is essential in my opinion and, in fact, could be more. We are obviously still within fiscal constraints, but it does move further than was originally proposed. The amount provided surpasses the amount requested by the President by almost \$64 million.

Also included in the budget of the General Services Administration is \$19 million for the Food and Drug Administration consolidation. This will save large sums of money and provide for much more efficient administration of the Food and Drug Administration. That could not be more timely in light of the threat that we have to our food supply in the context of terrorism.

This is an ongoing, multiyear project that will replace abysmal facilities that are scattered across the metropolitan area, and provide FDA employees with state-of-the-art technology to do their jobs even better; and they do an excellent job now of protecting Americans and protecting our food supply and our drug integrity.

For Federal employees, the bill, as I said, includes several important provisions. I want to highlight just a few. First, as the chairman has pointed out, it includes the 4.6 percent pay raise, which will not get them to where they need to be, but will move them further along the road of becoming comparable with their private-sector counterparts. In addition, it makes permanent a provision that allows Federal agencies to improve the affordability of child care for lower-income Federal workers, which is a critical need. And it continues a provision that allows Federal employees to receive contraceptive coverage, as the chairman has pointed out.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the issue of election reform. I believe most Members of Congress are committed to addressing the issues facing our election system. Although dramatic examples of those shortcomings in our election system were found in Florida, we soon found that the same problems which existed in Florida existed in many other States throughout this Nation, very frankly including my own in Maryland.

As the ranking member on the Committee on House Administration, I am continuing to work with the chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY), on broad-based legislation to address these issues. That legislation, which hopefully we will pass out of the Committee on House Administration in the

next few weeks, will require significant resources; and I plan to address this need with the committee at the appropriate time. The reforms that will be effected ultimately will be under the jurisdiction of this committee, and I have discussed this with the chairman. He and I have both discussed it with Chairman Young; and this matter, although not addressed in this bill, will have to be addressed in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, as I wrap up my remarks, I want to join the chairman in congratulating the staff of this committee. First of all, I want to mention an extraordinary staffer, Michelle Mrdeza. Miss Mrdeza is the Chief Clerk of our committee. "Clerk" is a word that implies to some a job of ministerial importance as opposed to policy importance. Now, Miss Mrdeza would be the first to say that she does not enter into policy, it is we Members who do so, but frankly, the advice and counsel she gives to both sides of the aisle is invaluable as we consider this bill. She has institutional knowledge that is helpful to each and every member of the committee, and we thank her for her leadership of the staff and for her critical assistance as we mark up this bill.

I also want to mention Jeff Ashford, who does an outstanding job; Kurt Dodd, Tammy Hughes, both of whom are of great assistance to Members on both sides of the aisle. I also want to mention John Albaugh, who works for the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK), as does Scott Nance, who works for us personally, but who is very much involved in the committee's consideration of this legislation.

Also, of course, I want to mention Rob Nabors. Rob Nabors is our committee staffer on the minority side and he does an extraordinary job. He is new, but not new to the budget process. He comes from OMB and is extraordinarily knowledgeable and has been a valuable asset to not only our side of the aisle but, I think, to the committee as a whole.

Lastly, I want to join the chairman in thanking Chris Stanley for his contributions to the committee.

We get some outstanding talent from the various Federal agencies. We get the talent and their personnel get the experience of how this process works. We think both sides are advantaged by that exchange program. So I want to thank all the members of the staff.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. We ought to pass it and we ought to pass it overwhelmingly.

I thank the chairman for working with us in a bipartisan fashion. We have not always agreed, but we have worked in a bipartisan, open fashion, so that all sides knew what the issues were and they could be addressed in an open, democratic way, and I thank him for that.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michi-

gan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), a fellow member of our committee.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. I thank the chairman for yielding me this time. I will be somewhat brief, but I do want to rise, Mr. Speaker, in strong support of the Treasury, Postal Appropriations conference report.

I want to commend Chairman Istook for his work, and also the ranking member, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), for their teamwork on this whole issue and on this whole bill.

In particular, let me salute the chairman for his work in securing some \$28 million-plus for a northern border hiring initiative for Customs officers. This is a significant increase over what the House or the Senate passed in their versions of the bill. The new Customs officers will help alleviate the long delays that have occurred at the U.S.-Canada border in the wake of the September 11 terrorist attacks.

This is no small matter for my congressional district, nor for the State of Michigan, or for that matter, for the Middle West. More than \$1 billion worth of goods and services cross the northern border every day. This constitutes the largest bilateral flow of goods, services and capital between any two countries anywhere in the world, and four of the seven busiest ports of entry between the U.S. and Canada are between the Michigan-Canada border.

Immediately after the attacks, the wait time for cars and trucks to cross the border reached a staggering 14 hours. The ripple effects of this were severe. Manufacturers in Michigan, for example, and across the country, cut costs "with just-in-time deliveries," but when those deliveries cannot be made "just in time," it causes economic hardship for manufacturers throughout my home State and the Midwest. We actually saw plants close down temporarily in September because of supply disruptions. And if the wait time continues to be longer than usual, we risk extended economic difficulty. Funding this northern border hiring initiative is a step in the right direction towards preventing further disruptions.

There is more to do, particularly with technology and infrastructure needs, and I look forward to working with Chairman ISTOOK to ensure that the country is secure and that our economy remains strong.

Once again I thank the chairman for yielding me this time, and I thank him for his help and urge all my colleagues to support this conference report.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), another member of our committee.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I thank him and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for all the good work they have done on this bill. I know it is very difficult to balance all the requests of Members.

I have a particular interest in this bill, in that it provides the funding for

the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, which is partially headquartered in the District that I represent. As my colleagues know, FLETC, as we call it, has grown under the gentleman's leadership; and I wanted to ask a question about the issue of Federal sky marshals. We are interested in getting them involved in some of the training down in Brunswick, Georgia.

As the gentleman knows, right now there are 250 different classes for law enforcement training, and some 71 different law enforcement groups or agencies are training there right now. We believe the facilities are up and running that would help tremendously in this need to get some trained air marshals.

I was wondering if the chairman could comment on that.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINGSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ISTOOK. The gentleman is correct that we are trying to make sure the resources are there at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC) in Georgia.

As much as possible, we try to consolidate Federal law enforcement training that is generalized through this facility. Then, when they have specific needs, for example the Secret Service has protective detail needs, the air marshals have some specific needs for specialized training that is done in New Jersey and at Fort Dix and so forth, but for the generalized law enforcement training needs, especially for example someone coming into the air marshal program that does not have a law enforcement training, they might be coming out of the military and such, their initial weeks of training are to be at FLETC.

The number of people in that program is being kept classified, so I am not going to detail the numbers, but we are certainly making sure that, as part of the expansion of homeland security, we are utilizing the facility that we have at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center. And I want to make sure that we continue to use that as the best way to apply the taxpayers' dollars towards how we handle these national homeland security issues.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman, because as he knows, there is a complete law enforcement facility there.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for his support and his visits down there, and extend to the chairman that the door is open. When his very busy schedule allows him the chance to come to Georgia, we would love to host him.

Mr. ISTOOK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and I salute him and I salute

the ranking member for bringing together this conference report of Treasury, Postal, which I hope every Member of this body will strongly support.

This bill came about through true bipartisanship, and the makeup of the bill demonstrates that. I also want to pick up on thanking the staff that helped to craft the legislation that came up before us today. It is consistent with the bipartisan budget agreement reached with the President, and it recognizes that there may be additional resource requirements associated with the September 11 terrorist attacks.

□ 1115

One of the provisions of the bill that I am especially pleased to acknowledge is the requirement that the FEHBP providers include coverage for prescription contraceptive services. This provision has widespread support, adds no significant cost to the FEHBP, and deserves to be a permanent part of the Federal Employees Health Benefit Program.

I am also delighted to see that pay parity between military personnel and Federal civilian employees has once again been achieved. H.R. 2590 establishes a pay increase for Federal civilian employees at 4.6 percent, which is the least we can do for our civil servants.

The events of September 11 have demonstrated what many of us who have a predominant number of Federal employees already knew, our Civil Service is absolutely essential to the well-being of this country. Increasing their salaries shows that we in Congress recognize the sacrifices that they make by choosing to be public servants.

Finally, I am most proud we have chosen to make permanent the existing authority to provide day-care in Federal facilities. For the last several years, we had authorized agencies, only on a yearly basis, to use funds from their salary and expense accounts to help lower income employees pay for child care. But because we had never made that authority permanent, many agencies were reluctant to spend money to set up child care centers if their authority might be taken away the following year.

I am the sponsor of the bill that made the authority permanent, and I am delighted to see that we have now recognized the need for quality child care to be available for our low income Federal employees. In some Federal child care facilities, families are charged up to \$10,000 or more per child per year. Many Federal employees simply cannot afford quality child care; so by allowing agencies that flexibility to help their workers meet their child care needs, we encourage family friendly workplaces and higher productivity.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has many other excellent provisions. I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, especially to someone who rises in opposition to the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, in July by a vote of 240 to 186, the House approved the Flake amendment to lift the travel ban on Americans traveling to Cuba. This marked the second consecutive year this travel ban was lifted by the House. Regardless of that fact, it is the second consecutive year that it has been stripped from the bill. It is time that we change our approach.

Mr. Speaker, the travel restrictions to Cuba have outlived their usefulness. For 40 years we have tried to isolate Cuba and to change that Communist country by not allowing Americans to travel there. It has not worked. Fidel Castro is still entrenched in power.

I was able to travel to Cuba just a month or so ago and was able to see firsthand the mess that Fidel Castro has made of that country. Why we would deny Americans who cannot get a travel waiver to go there, why we should deny them the ability to go and see for themselves is beyond me.

We want to change China. We want to change North Korea. But in doing so, we do not deny Americans the ability to travel there. That is simply un-American. I hope that we will move beyond this policy. We have better things to do with our time and our money and our resources at the Department of Treasury than to deny the travel ability or to enforce restrictions and impose fines on school teachers, for example, who want to take a trip to Cuba and do a bike tour there with their Canadian friends. We should not be doing this any more. We had a chance in this bill to lift that restriction, and we failed to do so.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLAKE. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his statement. The chairman of the conference committee from the Senate was very strongly in favor of the gentleman's provision. Very frankly, I was in favor of the gentleman's provision. I agree with the premise the gentleman has stated, but the President indicated he would veto the bill if the gentleman's provision was kept in. It proved to be an insurmountable obstacle to us in doing that, but I think the gentleman's comments are well taken.

I will tell the gentleman that I believe next year, assuming that provision is in this bill, I do not know whether the Senate can get the same provision in, it is a little difficult for the Senate to accede to the House's provision, but they want to do that if the House does not hold to its position. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. We will be back next year, and I believe we will have the same margin, or even greater margins next year.

There are other reasons to oppose the bill as well. The bill is \$1.129 billion over last year. That is a 7.1 percent increase. It is \$388 million above the President's request. It is \$48 million above the House passed bill. I think that we need to spend our time and resources differently. For that reason, I oppose the bill.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say to my friend from Arizona, I agree with his first proposition and strongly disagree with his second proposition. The gentleman points out that this bill is almost exactly at the dollar level, \$48 million is a lot of money, but we are talking about a bill that is close to \$30 billion for both mandatory and discretionary spending. Essentially they are very close, the Senate and the House bills.

I think this is a bill worthy of support as it passed the House. It continues to be worthy as a conference report from the conference committee. I hope that Members would support the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as I have mentioned, this bill tries to meet the needs of Federal law enforcement and border security, although not totally so because there are greater needs that we hope to meet in further legislation coming forward. I think it is important to mention that of the numbers mentioned by my colleague from Arizona, there has been coupled in that mandatory spending from previous Congresses for things such as the insurance and retirement benefits for Federal employees that are not under the control of this subcommittee.

We have control over certain accounts and we have sought to be very responsible making sure that it is the Federal law enforcement, such as through Customs, that has the 12 percent increase that makes some other numbers look higher in this bill than they actually are.

We know that, at our borders, only 1 to 2 percent of the cargo that comes through is currently inspected. Why? Because we have neither enough manpower nor technology to examine these things for the safety of the American people, to be looking for things that may be chemical, they could be biological, they could be nuclear. We know the threats are out there. We are trying to improve the security of our homeland. We cannot do it without providing the resources.

We are trying to prosecute the war on terrorism with the troops that we see on land, at sea and in the air in the Middle East, in Afghanistan right now. We have to pay for those things.

We have an economy that is suffering from the impact of the attacks that were made. Part of the response to

that, for example, dealing with the airlines, comes under the U.S. Department of Treasury, which is the chief agency that we address in this bill.

The Office of Homeland Security, an extension of the White House and the Executive Office of the President, comes under our jurisdiction through this bill.

We have sought to put the focus on homeland security. Yes, I know some people say that does not count, "I want people to travel to Cuba." We have seen some significant changes between who were allies and who were antagonistic and enemies in past years. It is well beyond the lessons from World War II in the differences in our relationships with Japan and Germany today.

We find that with Pakistan, sanctions are being lifted and a new spirit of cooperation has come in. We find that of all nations, Iran holds promise of cooperating with the United States. Afghanistan, which was an afterthought in so many people's consideration of foreign policy before, assumes extra importance. There are critical and fragile negotiations going on around the globe on what do we do to link together changes in our policy toward a nation with their cooperation in the fight against global terror.

Cuba has a history as a bad actor when it comes to sponsoring terrorism. If we are going to have a change in our policy towards Cuba, it should be part of what is coordinated with the administration, with the Secretary of State, with bringing them on board into compliance with many things that meet the security needs of the United States of America and the global security in our war against terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, it should not be just because some people say it is time to end it. It ought to be done as part of a coordinated change that involves other significant changes with Cuba if we are going to change that travel policy. It is for reasons such as this that the Administration said they would veto this bill if it contained the language that was sponsored by Members of this House and put in this bill on the House floor.

Let us not bury our heads in the sand. Let us recognize that paying for security does cost. We acknowledge that cost, and are trying to do it in the most responsible manner possible. I urge every Member to support this bill.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Conference Report for the FY 2002 Treasury Postal Appropriations Bill. This is a good bill, one that is a tremendous improvement over the President's original request. It uses the available resources wisely.

I want to commend Chairman ISTOOK and our outstanding Ranking Member STENY HOYER, and all of the majority and minority staff, especially Michelle Mrdeza, Rob Nabors and Scott Nance, for the hard work, care and attention that went into this bill and report. It certainly shows. I also want to thank Chairman BILL YOUNG and Ranking Member DAVID OBEY

for providing the Subcommittee with a realistic and responsible 302(b) allocation that recognized the importance of the functions addressed through this bill and made it possible to meet many of the agencies' needs.

At the same time, I think it is essential for all of us to heed Chairman YOUNG's reminder that he gave us at the meeting of the Conference Committee and recognize that this bill is a pre-September 11th bill. There are huge unmet needs with respect to seaport security and border security not addressed in this bill that we must address as part of the Homeland Security effort to win the war against terrorism.

This bill does not address the needs for additional seaport security. While the bill provides some funding for additional Customs inspectors on the Northern border with Canada, the Customs Service will need significantly more resources to meet its mission on all of our borders. I urge the Administration to move immediately to address these omissions and give Customs the resources it needs.

Now let me mention a few of the items in the Bill and Report that I particularly like.

I am very pleased that the bill provides \$15 million for the Miami Federal Courthouse, the remaining funds required to build the new Federal Courthouse in Miami, a project that is desperately needed by our Federal courts, the busiest in the country.

I am pleased with the significant steps that we take in this bill to improve our support for Treasury law enforcement, particularly with respect to Customs and the Secret Service.

The \$300 million investment that the bill funds for ACE, the customs modernization project, \$170 million more than the Administration proposed, is urgently needed. This money will help the trade community and law enforcement tremendously. It certainly will be enormously helpful in Miami. If we continue to fund this program appropriately, we will make the transition to ACE on a realistic timetable that will enable us to meet the expanding needs of the trade community and law enforcement, not have a 13 or 14 year project.

At the same time, however, we need to be doing more for Customs. As I have repeatedly discussed before the Appropriations Committee, South Florida urgently needs more Customs employees at Miami International Airport (MIA) and the Miami Seaport. The House bill provided \$15 million expressly to hire additional Customs inspectors where the need was greatest. Unfortunately, this provision did not survive the Conference. I urge the Administration to revisit this issue as when it considers what additional resources Customs may need to fight the war against terrorism and provide for Homeland Security.

I am very pleased that the bill funds pay parity between civilian and military personnel by providing a 4.6 percent pay increase to civilian employees; and that it continues contraceptive coverage for Federal employees in the Federal Employees Health Benefits program (FEHBP).

The bill provides \$2 million in FY 2002 funding for the First Accounts initiative, a program that I have championed to increase the access of low and moderate income persons to financial services, such funds to become available upon authorization of the First Accounts program. The First Accounts Initiative is a demonstration program. It is designed to help end check cashing ripoffs by improving the access of low and moderate income Americans to

basic financial services that most of us take for granted—such as bank accounts and ATMs. It is one of the few programs in the Treasury Postal bill that is specifically geared to helping low-income Americans.

Mr. Speaker, it is estimated that 8.4 million low income American families—22 percent of all such families—do not have bank accounts. Families without bank accounts frequently resort to check-cashing services to pay bills and cash checks. Some estimate that low-income families could pay over \$15,000 in fees over a lifetime to pay bills and cash checks in this way. Many such families also resort to payday lenders and are subject to the enormous, often predatory fees that such services charge.

We know that providing "unbanked" families with low-cost access to financial services will increase the likelihood that they will begin a savings program and accumulate some assets. It also will significantly decrease their reliance upon high-cost check cashing services and payday lenders. Such a program has tremendous potential to improve the net worth of low-income Americans.

All of us should want to provide the "unbanked" with an alternative to the check-cashing services and payday lenders. By continuing to fund First Accounts, we can have a fair test of whether the program is able to achieve its intended objective of increasing the access of low and moderate income persons to basic financial services.

I urge the authorizing committees to authorize the "First Accounts" program at the earliest opportunity. I will be working with the Administration and the Treasury Department to ensure that they promptly develop and implement a plan to optimize the use of available "First Accounts" funding.

It is also very satisfying to note that this bill funds the workforce initiative at the Secret Service to reduce agent overtime to more manageable proportions. The \$45 million that we give the Secret Service for recruitment and retention is very important. Secret Service Director Stafford told us that an average of 55 Secret Service agents were now leaving the force each year, 6 times the rate only 7 years ago. He indicated that the amount of overtime required of agents contributed significantly to the exodus.

Director Stafford also noted the irreplaceable loss to the Secret Service skills base when experienced agents leave and are replaced by newcomers. We spend about \$240,000 to train each Secret Service agent. Keeping them longer through more humane personnel policies is fiscally prudent. More importantly, giving these agents a manageable life is the right thing to do.

While I wish that we could have preserved the increase provided in the House bill, I am pleased that we have maintained funding at the FY 2001 level for the National Historical Preservation Records Commission at the National Archives. The \$2 million cut that the Administration proposed for FY 2002, a 31 percent reduction in grant funding from the FY 2001 level of \$6.436 million was extremely ill-considered.

The NHPRC grant programs provide outstanding support to state and local archivists, and other organizations and institutions that deal with the identification, preservation and use of historically significant records and documents. Many of these grants support projects

relating to historically underdocumented groups, such as African Americans, Hispanic Americans, Native Americans and American Women.

Finally, while this bill does not fund election reform initiatives, the conference report confirms the intention of the Committee to address and appropriately fund election reform as soon as the authorizing committees have acted. Mr. Speaker, election reform is an issue that affects all America, not just Florida, and a problem that we must address as soon as possible.

Now is not the time or place to discuss the particulars of all that we need to achieve election reform, and no doubt there will be differences among Members as to whether we should have uniform federal standards for election reform, but one thing is clear: All of our efforts to pursue election reform must be guided by the simple principle that all legally qualified voters have the same opportunity to vote and to have their vote counted. That didn't happen in the election last November and we must ensure that it never happens again.

I know that my good friend, Mr. HOYER, and Chairman NEY of the House Administration Committee are working diligently on legislation to authorize substantial funding on an ongoing basis to assist state and local election officials in making changes to their technology and their voting processes. I urge the Appropriations Committee to fund election reform as soon as authorizing legislation is passed.

Mr. Speaker, again, I thank Mr. ISTOOK and Mr. HOYER for all of their efforts. I urge all of my Colleagues to support this Conference Report.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOKSEY). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON  
H.R. 2299, DEPARTMENT OF  
TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED  
AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS  
ACT, 2002

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2299) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. SABO

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SABO moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 2299, be instructed to insist on inclusion of the highest possible level of transportation security funding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XX, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO).

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this motion to instruct is very straightforward. It is a motion to instruct the House conferees to insist on the highest possible level of funding for transportation security.

□ 1130

As the conference on the differences between the House and Senate versions of the fiscal year 2002 Transportation Appropriations bill begins, we now have an opportunity, in light of the tragic events of September 11, to provide additional transportation security resources.

Funding in the Senate bill for aviation security is over \$14 million higher than funding in the House bill. The Senate bill funds civil aviation security at \$150.2 million and the House bill funds it at \$135.9 million. Likewise, funding in the Senate bill for Coast Guard operating expenses is \$45 million above the House bill. While not all of this funding is directly related to increased transportation security, much of it is because Coast Guard operations are multimissioned.

Currently Coast Guard homeland security missions have increased substantially while other missions, such as drug interdiction, have decreased. In context, I must say that the Senate also had a higher 302(b) allocation for total resources available than the House did.

Accordingly, this motion to instruct directs the House conferees to agree to the Senate funding levels for transportation security programs.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I have no problem with this motion to instruct. As the gentleman from Minnesota knows, the House-passed bill included reductions in the FAA's operating expenses for their civil aviation security program. We made those reductions out of total frustration at that time with the FAA's delays and mismanagement of airport-airline security.

We are beginning to get back on track, but at the time we passed the bill, that was the situation. We wanted to get their attention, using the power of the purse, to compel them to make these long-needed improvements. We read in this morning's edition of the

Washington Post the Secretary of Transportation is saying the problems continue even to this day in airport-airline security beyond what we had been promised and told.

The House is scheduled tomorrow to debate an airport-airline security bill which would remove those functions of security from the FAA and transfer them to a new agency which has transportation security as a whole as its function, not just airline security but pipelines and trucks, barges, trains, whatever, security for transportation in general. There would be a new agency within the Department of Transportation to which the FAA's heretofore obligations on airport security would be transferred, and the FAA would no longer have those responsibilities nor the need for the funds for that purpose. So in all probability then, after tomorrow when the House acts, the Senate acts, those activities would be handled not by the FAA but by a new agency within the Department of Transportation, hopefully.

Given this, I do not believe we will have the problems being described this morning in the future. We should give this new agency within the Department of Transportation a fresh start, not hamstringing them with the problems that the FAA has had with airline security; and I wanted to assure my colleague, my helpmate, my soul mate on the floor here, that I will do all I can as chairman of the conference to ensure the highest possible level of funding for transportation security, not necessarily within the FAA.

One other note. We all obviously are concerned that the Coast Guard is not getting all the money that they would like to have. They would like to put into a supplemental bill moneys that we could not fund in the regular bill. If we see in this conference items within the Coast Guard's request that relate to security and the need for improved security, we can address that, but I would hope that we would limit our conversation in that regard to the matters that pertain to security and the need for the Coast Guard to improve their security capability.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, I have no problem with the motion to instruct.

I want to thank the staff and the gentleman from Minnesota and his staff for the cooperation and the hard work that all have shown.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON).

Ms. WATSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I come in support of the Senate bill that will come to the floor on airline security.

I formerly represented Los Angeles Airport, LAX. As I go in there to come back to Washington, D.C., there is not a time that the staff at whatever airline does not approach me to secure the planes that they have to fly and serve on. It is an essential move that we have to make now.

People do not want to fly because they think it is unsafe. We have to have a force checking everyone, checking bags. We have to have them uniformed. We have to renew the spirit of flying in this country. We have to save the industry. We have to encourage the American people that they can feel safe on their airlines. We must pass the bipartisan bill now. We must secure the safety of our planes, our passengers, our airports.

I would encourage everyone to vote "aye" on the compromise bill.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON).

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, lost in all the debate and politics over airline security is the very common-sense idea that the best long-term strategy for improving security is with new technology. I think we cannot increase security at our airports for this 21st century war with technologies from the 1950s.

There is a world of technology from biometric authentications, radio tracking for baggage, and passenger scanning and identification systems that can be deployed as our first line of defense against the terrorist threat. Systems such as electronic fingerprinting, retinal scans, facial geometry and signature scans could present a level of secure access that is not being provided today.

At check-in we can instantly match passengers against terrorist watch lists. For employees, we can better secure the restricted areas of airports and planes by ensuring that entry is tied to biometric identifiers.

Two weeks ago the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA) and I introduced the Aviation Security Technology Enhancement Act so we can find out which technologies work best and what would be the best way to implement these new technologies. Technology will provide better security, more efficiency and eliminate the problem of profiling because it will check everyone.

Mr. Speaker, American innovation is at its best when we face a challenge. We are the Nation that put people on the moon and created the Internet. We must put our technological capacity on the front lines of this new challenge.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON).

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding me this time.

We would not dream of contracting out the protection that our police provide and we would not dream of contracting out the protection our military provides. Why in the world are the leaders of this body attempting to contract out our airport security? Airport security forces must be reliable, standardized and verifiable. There should be no compromise on this.

Following September 11, I have been meeting with thousands of school kids

from my district. Recently I asked them the question, should the security forces that protect our airports be federalized like the police and military? The kids resoundingly answered yes. It is common sense; kids know it, the American public knows it. But my colleagues on the other side of the aisle do not seem to know it.

National defense and security are charges of the Federal Government, and keeping our skies safe is part of that responsibility. It is plain and simple common sense. Ask yourself, who do you want protecting you and your family, a Federal security force or the lowest bidder?

Support this motion to instruct conferees to include more money for airport security.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

This motion to instruct is vital. The House of Representatives in the 7 weeks and 1 day since these terrorist attacks has yet to directly appropriate one dollar for enhanced aviation security or consider one piece of legislation, no matter how minor or major, to enhance the failing system of today.

I feel pretty secure here in the Capitol, and I believe my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who are fighting against a Federal law enforcement work force for aviation security feel pretty secure here, too. We have uniformed Federal law enforcement officers protecting the United States Capitol and protecting us. But somehow when it comes to the safety of the American traveling public, this failing private security business is paramount. They are the best we can do. Security on the cheap.

We have reports 3 feet deep from the GAO over 30 years of the failures of this system, but they say, "Don't worry. We'll have new Federal standards."

Let us talk about the Federal standards. The second largest private security firm in the United States of America, Argenbright, is under criminal indictment for the second time in 6 months. But their bill would keep them in business. That is great. Let us keep them in business. Let us give them a chance. I guess they believe in three-strikes-and-you're-out for the private security firms.

The second time they are under indictment for hiring known felons, maintaining known felons on staff. They have violated their probation by maintaining known felons on staff. They have continued to falsify documents to the Federal Government about training and background checks, but they want to perpetuate that system. They said, "Don't worry, with a little Federal oversight it will get better."

Federal oversight? What could be tougher Federal oversight than the United States Department of Justice, a

Federal judge, a million-dollar fine and probation for a criminal conviction? This system does not work, and it will never provide the security the American traveling public needs and deserves.

They say, "Well, we'll do other things. We'll mandate the wages. We'll mandate the benefits. The Federal Government will do the background checks. The Federal Government will supervise or actually conduct the training. The Federal Government will supervise these people."

What role is left for these failing private security companies except to give campaign contributions to the other side and to turn a little tidy profit? The government would be assuming everything but, in name, the security function under their bill.

Let us just do it straight up. When you go to Hawaii, they inspect your baggage for contraband agricultural goods. The people who inspect your baggage for contraband agricultural goods in Hawaii are uniformed Federal law enforcement officers. In fact, this United States Congress has even deemed that the beagles that sniff your baggage are Federal law enforcement officers. The INS are Federal law enforcement officers. Customs are Federal law enforcement officers. As I pointed out earlier, those who protect the Capitol are Federal law enforcement officers. But somehow when it comes to screening passengers and baggage and carry-on bags and protecting the secure side of the airport, we should continue this failing private system.

No, we can do better. It is time to totally junk that system and adopt a new one that will protect the traveling public.

□ 1145

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let us talk about airline security and the bill coming up tomorrow, since the gentleman would like to talk about it.

What are we talking about when you talk about securing an airplane for the safety of the passengers? Well, you are talking about the baggage that is checked, that goes into the hold of the plane; you are talking about the person, the flier; and you are talking about whatever purses or baggage that that person carries into the cabin of the plane.

Do you need a security expert to look through a purse? I hardly think so. Do you need a technician that is paid \$50,000 a year to look in your briefcase? I do not think so. Do you need a \$50,000 a year person to look at an x-ray screen that is looking at your purse or your briefcase as you go through the checkout line? No, I do not think so.

What you do need, Mr. Speaker, is a Federal agent there, with the proper authority, to receive information from our security agencies, the CIA, the

FBI, the INS, the DEA, all of the Federal agencies that have something to do with learning whether or not you might be dangerous on that airplane. So it is the person that is getting on the plane that is altogether important, and, yes, the Federal Government needs a Federal agent at every check-point checking on the person that wants on the airplane. That is the most important thing. An innocent person, a non-terrorist that carries a machine gun onto the plane is no danger, but a terrorist with a box cutting knife is the most dangerous. So it is the person that needs to be checked.

Now the Federal security agencies do not have input, are not allowed to have input, frankly, and the FAA is not given the data from these agencies to check whether or not you as you try to enter the plane are in fact a suspected terrorist. That is a problem. That needs to be fixed. The only way to fix that is to have a law enforcement officer who has the proper security clearance to receive information from CIA, FBI, and so on, there on the spot checking the passenger list to be sure you are okay. That is important. That is necessary.

But you can hire people to check the bags. That is not a complicated security job. You can get it done more quickly, you can get it done more efficiently, you can get it done for a better expenditure of the Federal taxpayers' dollars, I think, by contracting that out under Federal supervision, under Federal clearances, under Federal regulations and guidelines, so that when the person is hired we know whether or not they have a criminal background, or they will not be hired if they do; that there will be Federal certification required, which is not the case now, before a person is hired for those types of jobs. There would be Federal supervision, Federal training, and dismissal if the person does not fit up to the standards that are required.

Under the Civil Service laws of our land, rightfully so, it is very, very, very difficult to discharge, to fire, a person for incompetence. It is practically impossible. I do not want those kinds of rules applying to the person checking to see whether or not a terrorist is entering my airplane. If that person is not doing the job, fire them right on the spot, just as happened last week in New Orleans where a person was allowed on a plane with a gun. The person, the screener, that allowed that to happen was fired instantaneously by the private contractor. Had that person been a Federal employee, they would still be checking at that gate today.

So, Mr. Speaker, let us understand what we are talking about here. Yes, we need a Federal takeover of security screening of people and items going on planes. Yes, a Federal takeover, Federal agents on the spot 24 hours a day being sure that people and things going on planes are not dangerous. You can deal with the details of that though much more efficiently and more cheap-

ly, frankly, for the taxpayers by contracting out the small items, the things that can be done by untrained, frankly, untrained personnel.

So I hope tomorrow when we have the airline security bill, that we will do what the President wants, what the Secretary of Transportation wants. Norm Mineta we all know. The Secretary of Transportation, Norm Mineta, was a Member of this body. He was chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for a number of years. He is an expert if there is one on airline security. He has advised the President, the President's staff all agrees, the President agrees, the Secretary of Transportation agrees, the FAA agrees, all of them agree that the best way to go is a Federal takeover of airline security, but contract out the mundane details that can be done by just about anybody.

So I hope tomorrow we will exercise good judgment, that we will follow the lead of our former colleague in this great body with high respect on both sides of the aisle, Norm Mineta, Secretary of Transportation, and we will follow the lead of our President. And let us not worry. Let us not get in the way of what this country needs to do right now, and that is to defeat the terrorists. And let us not get bogged down in a detail like this, when I think it is a fairly insignificant detail, and let us stay focused on the big picture.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, let me respond quickly. The gentleman mentioned cheaply. We do now have the cheapest system you can buy. It is failing us miserably. That should not be a consideration before us.

The gentleman talked about insignificant details. Is it an insignificant detail to smuggle a fully assembled, loaded handgun onto a plane, or a hand grenade through security? Because that is what has happened with private security today. The FAA has tested this system, and they have been able to get hand grenades through, fully loaded handguns.

The gentleman mentioned machine guns. I am not sure that happened yet, but it may have. But he said it would be okay if someone brought it on with good intentions. I do not think so.

But, if I could, the gentleman talked about \$50,000 a year people. Well, I am not sure what we pay these Capitol Hill police, but we should pay them \$50,000 a year. And if we think we need \$50,000 a year uniformed Federal law enforcement officers to protect the United States Capitol and the Members of the United States Congress, I will tell you what, no one is going to take the Capitol up off the ground and fly it into a building and kill people, but airplanes go up in the air every day. And the

flight attendants are not feeling good about it, the pilots are not feeling good about it, they are not getting the security they need.

We need better security screening. It is our first line of defense. I do not know if the gentleman is familiar with the CTX-5000. It is a very complicated piece of machinery, and we probably need to pay at least \$50,000 a year for someone to operate it. It sniffs and looks for bombs in baggage. It is a machine that they say you basically have to be a radiologist to analyze, because it is like using a CAT scan. It is very, very complicated. But the gentleman would want to put a minimum wage person operating that machine, because that would be cheaper.

What does it take to operate the machine? Actually it takes an expert to operate that machine. So this is not something you can do on the cheap. But we want to go around the barn and say, well, the Federal Government will have law enforcement officers there, the Federal Government will supervise, the Federal Government will do the background checks, the Federal Government will set the wages and benefits, but these will not be Federal employees because we are worried we cannot fire them.

Actually, if the gentleman read our bill, he would see in the bill it says they do not get protections that are performance-based, they can be fired for lack of performance. This is a better option.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman misrepresented what I said. I, of course, would not say it is okay to take a machine gun on an airplane. I resent that inference.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I do not yield.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Would the gentleman like me to have the words read back?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Cooksey). The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I would appreciate the gentleman responding and respecting my time, as I respected his.

Of course, I did not say that. I would never say something like that. I did not say that it would be minimum wage employees operating expensive equipment. Of course you have to have experts to operate the new CAT scan-type x-ray machines that we are bringing on-line now and paying for in our bills.

If you take a tour of the Rome airport, for example, as the ranking member and I did just a while back, and saw the expensive, highly-paid classified workers out of sight beneath the airport searching all baggage, including searched baggage, you know that it must be done by an expert. Of course it must be.

I am just saying for the routine things, looking in purses, opening up a briefcase looking for something, you do not have to have a highly paid person doing that. But you do, of course, have to have the highly paid Federal workers that are there with security clearances to receive information from our security agencies to check the person, to see if they are on the watch list, to see if they have been involved in problems overseas somewhere, or here. That is the person that needs to be the expert, and that is what I would advocate that we do.

Now, the system as it now is run by the airlines, they have been in the past needing to get by on the cheap, and they have. And no one defends the present system, certainly not me. I have been probably one of the most critical of it there is. But that was done because the airlines have been responsible for security, and their bottom line was important to them, and therefore you had minimum wage employees now doing the screening.

Of course that should be done away with. You do not need to pay these people minimum wage. The Federal Government when it takes over the system will be able to hire the people that the requirements of the position will demand and we will pay whatever the rate is. I am sure it will not be minimum wage.

But the essential point is we need a Federal takeover of airline security. We need Federal agents on the scene at all times, not only just to run the screening process, but the baggage process, and access to the tarmac, to the airfield. That all needs to be controlled under a Federal mandate.

But please give the President some choices, some options here, to do it the best possible way. I hope the gentleman is not telling us that he knows more about this than Secretary Mineta. I do not believe the gentleman will tell us that he knows more about this than people who have devoted their lives to airline security, who are saying to us please give the President options.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman can answer briefly, since the gentleman has admitted the present system is failing, would the gentleman bar the present firms, particularly those who are under criminal indictment and have been criminally convicted, from continuing to provide services under a new privatized system? Would the gentleman accept that? I guess not.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Listen, I am the one who I guess broke the story on one of the companies.

Mr. DEFAZIO. So you would.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. That was under indictment, in fact pled guilty in Philadelphia. So if that company or any other company could qualify under the conditions that we set down, sure. But I have got a feeling, as far as I am concerned, that the standards would prohibit that.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the Young bill, that would not prohibit firms who are criminally convicted of violating existing guidelines from continuing to provide private security. The parent company in Britain has just been found to have committed very, very serious breaches of security in Heathrow Airport. So you have a foreign-owned firm which is on both sides of the ocean failing, and your bill would not prohibit that firm from bidding.

□ 1215

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER), our good friend.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time. I did not realize at what point we were in this debate, and I came over as soon as I knew that it was going on.

I am pleased to see that this motion to instruct has been offered, and I am glad to see that the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) has indicated that he has no problems with the proposal, with the motion to instruct the conferees.

I think it is an entirely appropriate thing that we should be doing here; that is, asking for the highest possible level of transportation security funding. It goes far beyond just security for airports, although that is the area that, because of the horrendous events on September 11, has had the most attention. Clearly, we need better security in our tunnels, on our bridges, in our rail stations, in our subway stations. We will have to get around to that. But we have become focused, at least for the moment, upon airline security and the airports' security.

Since September 11, the economy has been in a steep slide toward recession. There are at least 100,000 direct employees, direct employees of the airline companies, who are out of jobs, and that does not say anything about the many-times-that of other employees, often part-timers and such in the tourism industry, that have been affected by the steep slide in the economy. It comes because air travel is a major portion of our whole economic system. The airports are half-empty. Even in those that are running fairly effectively, we find the confusion that goes on in the security systems that are there. They do not know what to do because they never had any training, never had any standards, never had any real professionalization in the process; and that is still affecting them, even though there are fewer than half the people going through the airports today that were going through earlier,

and we are expecting that we are going to end up with some of our airlines going out of business. Yet, we have had in, now, almost 2 months no law; with all the different things that we have done, nothing on the professionalization of the airport security systems and not a single dollar to establish that kind of professionalization.

Mr. Speaker, we really have to professionalize our airport security system with ultimately the responsibility for that being clearly in the hands of the Federal Government. It can be in terms of very strong management with features that are being talked about in the several bills that are here, but we really have to require a Federal uniform system to protect all passengers, or passengers are not going to return to the airlines and they are not going to return to our airports and our economy will still be in the tank.

We have to expand the air marshal program. We have to develop new methods to modify cabin and cockpit security in our planes. We have to require extensive background checks of security personnel. And we need to maximize the use of explosion detection equipment. But at the bottom of all of that is that we must professionalize the personnel systems that are involved in airline security.

It is more than a month ago already, it was in September, and here we are on the last day of October, that we held a joint hearing of the Senate and House Subcommittees on Transportation of the Committees on Appropriations, where we heard powerful testimony by the Federal Aviation Administration, the General Accounting Office and the Inspector General for Transportation documenting the utterly poor security systems that are operated by the airlines. As they operate in this country, it is the weakest system of any of our major Western countries, as far as I have been able to detect, looking at the systems that are available in Western Europe and in Israel; and ours is very like Canada's at the moment, or has been.

Both the General Accounting Office and the IG extensively tested the security systems and found that screeners frequently failed to detect guns, knives; other threats at security checkpoints the IG reported repeatedly breached, and there has been a long history of that, document after document, stacks of documents showing that to be the case, breached security areas in a large percentage of their tests at major airports.

Once they have breached the secure areas, persons who had gotten through what security systems were there could enter any of the planes. Well, why are those breaches, why were those breaches, so easy?

Well, the GAO and the Inspector General cited specifically the very low wages and benefits of security personnel, little or no training of the screeners, weak to no criminal checks on the screeners, no uniform standards

for screening and, interestingly, extremely rapid turnover which, in the testimony, indicated that the turnover ran from 80 percent at a minimum in the lowest turnover at one of the companies up to 250 percent and, I think, as much as 400 percent turnover. These are people who were working for no more than a couple of months and the minute that they could get out of that job, because there was no kind of standard involved and no morale on the jobs, would go on to something else.

In other words, these were the largely dead-end jobs, the very deadest end of jobs that were being used in protecting the security of American travelers, and yet we have not really done anything formal in that period of, now, almost 2 months to make corrections in it.

So we now are going to deal with that tomorrow with legislation. I think that the Democratic bill is much stronger in what it puts forward, because it does professionalize the security system and put the responsibility directly on the Federal Government to make certain that the security system is one that is reliable; and that may give people the degree of confidence that they need so that they can come back to the business of flying and the business of why they fly, whether it be for tourism or for business itself.

We have had indications that some of the companies have pleaded guilty to criminal violations and yet they are still contracted companies in the system as it operates today. With that happening, with the failure to conduct background checks on employees staffing those security checkpoints, it is highly unlikely that we will get back the confidence of the American people in the air travel systems that we have and get our economy back running.

So I am very pleased that the chairman is happy to support the motion to instruct. I hope that when we get finished with this legislation tomorrow that we will have the strongest possible, the strongest possible law in place that will protect the security of the American traveling public.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WATSON of California. Mr. Speaker, when anthrax was discovered on Capitol Hill two weeks ago, the House Leadership acted quickly and prudently to protect Congressional employees from the threat of terrorism. I support that decision. But the speed with which Congress moved to protect itself stands in stark contrast with our failure to provide for the security of the flying public.

Mr. Speaker, it has been fifty days since September 11th, and yet the House of Representatives has still not acted to pass an airline security bill.

It has been forty days since the House of Representatives voted to authorize a fifteen billion dollar bailout for the airlines, and yet the House still has not passed an airline security bill.

It has been twenty days since the other body voted unanimously to provide for airline

security, and still, the House has not yet passed an airline security bill.

You might think that this delay was because our leaders were searching for a novel approach, or a well-calibrated solution. But, in fact, it was because of a partisan dispute about whether the screeners should be Federal employees. This despite that the fact that an overwhelming majority of Americans have said that they want the Federal Government to run airport security.

In the wake of the September 11th attacks, Americans asked for, and received, an outpouring of bipartisan leadership from their elected officials. How sad that the one key thing that Congress must do to safeguard their security has been held up by a partisan dispute. I urge my colleagues to support this motion, and I urge you, Mr. Speaker, to bring the Senate's bipartisan airline security bill to the floor without delay.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO).

The motion to instruct was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees:

Messrs. ROGERS, WOLF, DELAY, CALAHAN, TIAHRT, ADERHOLT, Ms. GRANGER, Mrs. EMERSON, Messrs. SWEENEY, YOUNG of Florida, SABO, OLVER, PASTOR, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Messrs. SERRANO, CLYBURN and OBEY.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2330, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2330) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MS. KAPTUR

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. KAPTUR moves that the manager on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 2330, be instructed to insist on

the highest possible levels of funding permitted for international food activities under P.L. 480, Title II.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XX, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me say to my colleagues and to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA), our esteemed chairman of the subcommittee, that this motion is simple and to the point. It instructs our conferees to agree to the highest possible level of funding for international food programs within the scope of the conference, including the Title II Public Law 480 Food for Peace program.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps never in the history, in the recent history of our great country have we had a greater need to use our food power to build a more peaceful world. Three matters individually and collectively within our purview in this legislation justify the need for the highest possible level of funding. I just wish to mention them and make a few remarks.

The first is the Global Food for Education Initiative.

The second is the ongoing need for an expanding emergency need for food assistance for Afghan refugees and other desperate people in and around that beleaguered country.

Thirdly, to offset the administration's proposal to reduce the section 416 commodity assistance with the resultant increase in dependency on the Public Law 480 Title II program for vitally needed development assistance throughout the world.

It is interesting to think about the conditions which breed revolution and instability, and to observe how often that desperate people living in desperate conditions in the countryside provide the seed bed for political instability. If we think historically, just for a second, back to the middle part of the 20th century, the countryside became the killing fields inside what became the Soviet Union through the forced starvation of millions and millions of people by Joseph Stalin and his consequent success in gaining control over what became the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics. The countryside was dead center in what happened with control of the food supply.

If we think to China and the revolution in 1949 and the role of Mao Tse-tung in moving people back to the countryside, the rural countryside became the seed bed for the revolution and the consequences that followed, and the imposition of will over 1 billion people.

Now, today, in the Middle East, in East Africa, we have witnessed the powerful instability that can grow from food insecurity with little to eat and little to hope for; and it is not just

in Afghanistan where people are at pre-famine levels with millions that have fled that sad state of affairs. If we also think about the madrassas operating inside Pakistan that use the lure of milk to feed hundreds and thousands of little boys who are then systematically taught to hate anyone whose religion is unlike theirs.

Food is being used as a weapon in the conflict that we face with Enduring Freedom.

□ 1215

It is best that we understand it, and that we use the power that we have with our food commodities to help build a more peaceful world.

The Global Food for Education Initiative, the program so strongly supported and developed by Senators Bob Dole and George McGovern, can be an important piece of the solution.

Why can we not think about using the Global Food for Education Program to offset what the madrassas are doing in Pakistan, and to feed children out of our good will, and to provide educational opportunity to both boys and girls, and hopefully produce new political leaders for the future that will embrace the world in a more fair open manner?

This body has said we would like to see the funding for this program continued, and we would like to see permanent authorization as part of the farm bill, the authorizing legislation itself being H.R. 1700.

So we want this motion to instruct to place some responsibility on these conferees to see that the Global Food for Education Initiative, and the hard work that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) and others have done, to make that a permanent authorization and to receive the support it deserves inside this conference.

Secondly, in terms of the starvation and pre-starvation levels that people in Afghanistan and the refugees are facing, there is no question about the ongoing immediate need for expanding emergency food programs for those refugees, whether they be inside the country, if we can find a way to deliver it, or to the adjoining nations, during our Nation's conduct of Enduring Freedom.

We know that the United Nations World Food Program has predicted that we will need to provide a minimum level of assistance for 7.5 million people, and that such aid could last for well over 1 year. Even though the administration has already suggested more resources will be provided, and has done so out of the emergency funding we adopted earlier this year, there is no doubt that more will be needed; and not only direct food, but once stability reigns again, to help people develop their own abilities to raise food so there can be a more permanent chance for development in that region.

Once we complete emergency assistance, we have to look at meaningful development assistance so we can leave the region in a more self-sustaining

condition than it is in, obviously, today.

If we want to change the concerns about poverty, malnutrition, and how people are treated, including women, then we must also have long-term development goals in mind, and that is where food for peace, food for progress, section 416, are answers that make the most sense.

Finally, before yielding time, let me say that the administration's proposal to reduce section 416 commodity assistance may have made sense before September 11. I do not really think it did. But after September 11, it makes absolutely no sense at all, because it will force the resultant increase in dependency on the Public Law 480 title II program, which we need for the type of developmental assistance in the Middle East, in East Africa, and other places where instability reigns.

If we are to have longer programs that will end world hunger, a goal to which our Nation leads the world and has subscribed to throughout our existence, then we have to be sure that any emergency food assistance is followed up with a program of meaningful development assistance, and that is why these programs were invented.

This program benefits American farmers and our States seeking to develop new markets for our commodities as the largest food-producing Nation in the world, as well as the countries receiving the benefit of the program, targeted to those who are hungry in the urban areas and to development in the rural countryside, to stem the instability that we know has bred the revolutions of modern history.

Public Law 480 has a long history of turning former recipients into long-standing customer and into stable political allies.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the esteemed gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), who has been such a leader on these international food programs.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding time to me, and I am very glad to see and strongly support this motion to instruct the conferees to support the highest level of food aid assistance.

I believe that United States food aid programs will play a critical role in averting disaster in Afghanistan and in the Near East. Even before the tragic events of September 11, the United States was the largest contributor of food and humanitarian assistance to the people of Afghanistan through the United Nations World Food Program.

But I also believe that the United States should support these programs worldwide. The United States has long fought to end hunger and poverty, and these programs are a critical part of that development effort. They reflect the compassionate, humanitarian character of the American people.

As my colleagues know, along with the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) and the gentlewoman from Mis-

souri (Mrs. EMERSON) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) and over 100 Members of this House, I support the establishment of the Global Food for Education Initiative that would fund school feeding programs around the world, including Afghanistan, Pakistan, and throughout the Mideast.

This program was inspired by two great leaders of our country, former Senators George McGovern and Bob Dole, and as I said, has enjoyed incredible bipartisan support, not only in the House but in the other body.

School feeding programs accomplish a number of things. First, they get food and nutrition to hungry kids. We all know that hungry children cannot learn.

Second, school feeding programs increase school attendance. In various pilot programs, as in the pilot program of this Global Food for Education Initiative, we have seen school attendance increase dramatically, especially among girls. Education is really a key tool in combatting some of the terrible effects of poverty and ignorance and illiteracy.

We talk about how do we deal with intolerance and hate around the world. Education is the way to do that. So this program would actually get more young people into schools, and I think it is an effective tool in combatting the types of conditions where terrorists tend to seek recruits.

I am pleased that we have been able to get some language in the farm bill in the House, and hopefully the other body will follow suit, but I would call on President Bush to extend this particular program through fiscal year 2002.

I want to thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) again for her incredible leadership on this and so many other food aid issues. I support this motion to instruct conferees to support the highest levels of funding for U.S. food aid programs.

I think this is an important motion. This is an important statement for the Members of this House to make.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts so very much for speaking out again today, and for providing the type of national leadership that we need in order to make this Global Food for Education Program permanent.

I think, if the gentleman might want to engage in a colloquy at this point, I know he has thought a great deal about how our commodities leverage food from other countries, and the participation of other nations in this Global Food for Education Initiative.

Perhaps the gentleman would wish to place some of that on the RECORD at this time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, what we are proposing here is not just a program where the United States goes it alone. What we are trying to do here is inspire other countries around the world to follow suit, and to make a

strong effort to eliminate hunger among the world's children.

We have the ability to do that. Our country, working with other countries around the world, we can eliminate hunger among children. We could eliminate hunger among the entire world if we had the political will to do so.

As Senator McGovern has said time and time again, hunger is a political condition. It is something that we can solve if we have the political will to do so.

Our goal here is to have the United States be a leader in this effort, but to go to other countries around the world, as we have been trying to do, to get them to participate in this program. So it is a worldwide effort, a worldwide effort to combat hunger.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for those comments. I am reminded of the day that we had the special press conference up here in the Capitol with Senators McGovern and Dole, these two dogged World War II veterans who could be doing anything else with their lives at this point, yet they were here on the Global Food for Education Program because they as veterans

understand what it takes to build peace.

What a contribution they are still making, though not legislators or Members of Congress at this point in their lives, to have an influence to do what is good in the world as Americans, regardless of party. We owe them so much. They are giving their great genius to the country, and we owe them such thanks for that, and for making a difference working with us, especially now.

I wait for the day when the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) and I can go into Pakistan and help to distribute maybe some of this milk, and to take a look at what is being taught in private schools that are being established there as we try to help part of the world that so greatly needs greater stability, to use our food programs as the real fulcrum of a better future for millions of children.

Mr. MCGOVERN. As the gentlewoman pointed out earlier, too, this really puts our farmers in the forefront of this effort to make this world a better place.

The food we are talking about, much of it would be grown right here in the United States by American farmers who would also benefit from this program, and I have often felt that we could do more around the world to promote stability and human rights by utilizing this incredible surplus we have in our farm commodities right here in the United States.

Again, there is an incredible need out there, and as the gentlewoman pointed out, we have been engaged in these incredible humanitarian efforts in the past. I think we need to redouble our

efforts, especially in the wake of September 11. We need to bring the world community together. We can make this world a better place. We can eliminate hunger among children. We can promote global education. We can make this world a safer, less violent, more tolerant place. Again, I thank the gentlewoman for her motion.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to place on the RECORD, as we talk about this, if we look at the hijackers here that did such damage to our country, 15 of 19 of them came from what is now Saudi Arabia. If we look at the areas of Saudi Arabia they came from, they came from the rural, southern parts of the nation.

Other nations have been subjected to terrorist attacks, but if we really see where many of the Shiite and Sunni fundamentalists who are committing most of these acts come from, they come from parts of the country that never received support from their own governments. So therefore, these are breeding grounds for the discontent that is destabilizing that part of the world, and now our part of the world.

I know from every single farmer in my region to every single farmer across this country, they know they can be a part of the answer to retooling for peace using food as the fulcrum for a better future. I know the gentleman sees this in his mind's eye, and we can do so much good if we can get even our own government to recognize the power of people who have been fed, and that those who would seek to do harm in their own regions or in others would have less cause for action.

It is too bad that the world has to move to this point, but I will say, in defense of our country, prior to September 11 there was one Nation providing the majority of food commodities inside Afghanistan, and it was the United States of America, through the World Food Program.

So we have tried to make an effort. In some of these other nations, I think it has been more difficult to get the governments to be willing to allow food commodities and assistance to flow to some of these rural areas that may not be looked upon favorably by the central governments. But I think people may and these nations may be rethinking the damage that has been caused by ignoring major segments of the population that then are underdeveloped and underfed, and are prime targets to be lured by those who would want to create harm and instability, and to create a political movement that grows out of the poverty and deprivation of huge segments of the nations of the Middle East and of East Africa.

So I know that we have other Members who are desirous of speaking on this subject. We have been hoping that they would make it to the floor from their committee meetings. They do not appear to be here at the moment, so I think we are going to have to move on with the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Chairman BONILLA) so very much for his leadership on this, and for his support.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion of the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR). I know this has been an issue she has been working on long before the current crisis that exists in Afghanistan, and this program has proven to be very beneficial in this area as we undertake our mission there.

But again, well before this situation arose, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) has been a leader on this issue through her subcommittee work, and well before that, as well. I commend her for her longtime commitment to this issue.

□ 1230

We have no objection and, in fact, we support this motion enthusiastically.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the very able member of our subcommittee, who has been such a leader on not just domestic food programs but world food programs. We thank her for leaving her committee meeting in order to come to the floor to discuss this very important motion to instruct.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for the motion to instruct and I rise in strong support of this motion.

This motion would add vital funds to international aid programs that help both citizens of poor countries and it helps American farmers. Now, more than ever, since the attack of September 11, we must fund these programs at the highest levels possible.

In the last 50 years almost 400 million people worldwide have died from hunger and from being poor. That is three times the number of people killed in all wars fought in the 20th century. Today almost 800 million people, about one-sixth of the population of the world's developing countries, do not have enough food. Two hundred million are children.

U.S. food aid is essential in fighting world hunger. It has been instrumental in averting a famine in the Horn of Africa. It has helped redevelop Bosnia's agricultural sector and feed more than 50,000 children in Haitian schools and hospitals.

Food aid empowers people, families, communities. It enables them to break out of a cycle of hunger and poverty and return to lives of dignity. On a broader scale, food aid helps countries improve their people's health, their incomes, and their living conditions. It helps them progress forward as a nation. And at the same time, the food aid helps our farmers across agricultural sectors, wheat, soybeans, rice,

peas, milk to name a few; in one of the darkest times of our agricultural history. It has helped them to sell more of their products and keep their farms and their families secure. At a time when family farms are struggling day-to-day for existence, international food aid offers them hope.

After the tragic events of September 11, more than ever the United States needs to reach out to our neighbors. Our core principles of justice, liberty and opportunity are what makes this Nation strong. We must continue to live by them and promote them. We must continue to provide assistance, support developing nations. We must let these countries know that despite the unspeakable act of terror against our Nation, we will continue to stand strong with them in their fight to improve the lives of their citizens.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for such an eloquent statement and for her leadership on international food programs as well as our domestic programs like WIC and all of the Food and Drug Administration programs on which you have worked so hard in the subcommittee. We are truly fortunate to have you as a Member of this Congress and Connecticut certainly has made a very good choice in sending you here.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to just mention before calling on our dear able colleague from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON), that it is probably important as we talk about this motion to instruct to acknowledge the courage, the dedication and the patriotism of the workers from the U.S. Agency for International Development and the World Food Program who have been working under extremely difficult conditions, certainly in the Middle East and Central Asia, but in Africa, in Indonesia, in so many other places on our globe.

They do not get a great deal of publicity. Over the years so many have lost their lives. They in my judgment are as important as any person serving our Nation and we want to thank them, and we want to let them know that this Congress understands the heroism of their work and the great humanitarian role that they play in treating all people equally and bringing the bounty of this land to places that most Americans will never see. We wish them to know the depth of our thanks and respect that we hold for the work that they do largely unacknowledged.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON), a very high ranking member of our Committee on Agriculture. If the word is agriculture, if the word is leadership, if the word is development, she is at the front of the line.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). The Chair would announce the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) has 7 minutes remaining.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time. I thank her for her leadership and for the motion to instruct that we will indeed instruct the conferees to go to the higher level for this very important program, Public Law 480.

This is a program that is in place and has been doing good work. It has been doing well for our farmers because indeed our farmers have benefitted from the abundance that we have, an ongoing inventory that we can now use to do very good deeds around the world. So many of our programs have been very effective in relieving hunger. There is the Food for Peace, Food for Development. There are various programs under the Public Law 480. I am very pleased that we are recognizing this as a tool for not only our agricultural expansion but also a tool for our relief.

Earlier this morning I was in a discussion where we were talking about what other things could be done in this whole conflict in terms of terrorism, particularly in Afghanistan and the region. The mere ability to help people to feed themselves was given as a strategy.

Well, guess what? This program can be used and we think that we could expand that. Obviously, they had a program that was going to be modelled a little differently; but there is no reason we cannot use this program to supplement whatever comes out of that initiative in terms of responding to the refugees. I read yesterday about the children of the garbage, they are called, out of Los Angeles, where kids go through scavenging enough products to sell and recycle so they can buy enough food to feed their families.

If we could think of this as one way of stabilizing families who are suffering from hunger, but more than that, it could be used as a tool to bring stability where we are fighting and have a military strategy. This could be a part of our diplomatic approach, is to use our development of agriculture and our U.S. AID.

We pulled AID into our State Department. For what reason? To use it as a tool that we can have as our international policy. So our food programs that we have through the Public Law 480 certainly is a tool I think is underutilized and I want to expand it.

There are many food programs I could mention. The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. Kaptur) mentioned the Global Food Program, which I am very much aware of, and the Global School Lunch Program. We are very pleased that is moving along and my colleague's leadership there has been evident, and we are very pleased Congress is moving in that direction.

I commend this amendment, but more than that, I commend our understanding that we can use food as one of the tools in our arsenal for peace and stability as well as we respond to the hunger and the needs not only in Africa and India but also in the very trou-

bled area that we are involved in, Afghanistan and that whole region.

This is a significant beginning and I hope it leads to it.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) for that very generous statement and strong support and also for her continuing leadership on so many fronts. I know that some of the initiatives that the gentlewoman has taken on for Africa, for example, using these programs will be the first time that farmer to farmer programs and modernization programs will be used for development in rural Africa in areas that so desperately need attention, and I hope that the people of North Carolina understand the genius that they have sent here in allowing the gentlewoman to serve in our Congress, and I thank the gentlewoman so very much for being here with us today.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say, as we look at the range of what America can do in order to promote a more peaceful world, what other programs have such scope as these? We are talking here about emergency assistance for Afghan refugees and food inside Afghanistan.

These programs are being used currently in places like Lebanon where for the first time in the history of our country we have taken food commodities such as wheat and soy oil, sold them inside Lebanon, and now we are helping to redevelop villages, very poor, poor villages that did not even have water rights at the Lebanese-Israeli border in order to try to build a more peaceful world.

What other programs do we know that have this kind of range? If we think about the farmer to farmer programs that the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) was talking about in Africa or those that operate in the Caribbean, here we have programs that operate globally, using the bounty of this land being a win-win, helping our farmers and our rural communities bolster their income and yet, in my opinion, being the most important development bank that this country has in place with vast experience in every corner of the world.

So as we vote on this motion to instruct today and ultimately move our agriculture appropriation bill, we certainly would ask for the membership's full support of our international food programs, particularly at this time in our Nation's history being front and center and well understood as providing us a path to a more peaceful future.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, at this time I have no additional speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees:

Messrs. BONILLA, WALSH, KINGSTON, NETHERCUTT, LATHAM, Mrs. EMERSON, Messrs. GOODE, LAHOOD, YOUNG of Florida, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. DELAURO, and Messrs. HINCHEY, FARR of California, BOYD, and OBEY.

There was no objection.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2925. An act to amend the Reclamation Recreation Management Act of 1992 in order to provide for the security of dams, facilities, and resources under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1550

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE) at 3 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.

#### WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2647, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 273 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 273

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2647) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the cus-

tomary 30 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 273 is a standard rule waiving all points of order against the conference report, and provides for consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 2647, the fiscal year 2002 legislative branch appropriations bill.

The conference report provides yet another example of a carefully crafted bill from the Committee on Appropriations that balances fiscal discipline with the true needs of our first branch of government, the legislative branch. This legislation represents a responsible increase in overall spending of 4.6 percent.

I would like to also commend the gentleman from North Carolina (Chairman TAYLOR), the ranking member, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), and other members of the Committee on Appropriations for their hard work on what is truly a noncontroversial conference report, and for maintaining the position established by the House in almost every instance.

Mr. Speaker, the legislative branch appropriations conference report ensures that the diverse funding needs of this institution are met, from legislative work to security to tourism.

Specifically, this bill funds congressional operations for the House of Representatives, including our staffs and employees. It addresses the needs of the United States Capitol Police, and continues to support their efforts to modernize as they perform essential security functions for the protections of not just Members of Congress and our staffs, but for the millions of visitors who come to our seat of government every year.

This bill includes important funding to hire additional new officers, and provides needed funds to bring their salaries in line with other Federal law enforcement agencies.

I would like to take a minute to express my personal gratitude to the men and women of the United States Capitol Police for their tireless efforts during this time of war.

Day after day, regardless of the hour, truly in rain and shine, these men and women faithfully carry out the duties which ensure the safety and security for all of us who live, work and visit our Nation's Capital. Their dedication, professionalism, and seemingly endless hours of service to ensure our security have not gone without notice and are most appreciated.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report also provides for the needs of the Architect of the Capitol, including the various operations and maintenance activities under his jurisdiction for the Capitol, House office buildings and the surrounding grounds, and including an additional \$70 million for needed House and Senate office space at the new Capitol Visitor's Center.

In addition, it funds the needs of the invaluable but often behind-the-scenes

work performed by the Congressional Budget Office, the Government Printing Office, and the General Accounting Office.

The conference agreement also provides funding for the Library of Congress and for the Congressional Research Service, including the employees who collectively help us and our staff make sense of the many complex issues we face every day.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report maintains the House-passed measures aimed to help meet the needs of an ever-changing and dynamic workplace. It helps this institution keep pace as an employer, including a monthly transit benefit, and makes modest infrastructure changes to make cycling to work more appealing; that is, as in riding a bike cycling. These transit benefits will help reduce demand on the already-limited parking, and help reduce traffic congestion.

In addition, the conference report calls for a study of options for a self-sustaining staff fitness center.

Finally, the conference report recognizes our need to become more environmentally friendly and efficient in reusing and recycling our waste by directing a review of the current recycling program, identifying ways to improve the program, establishing criteria for measuring compliance, and setting reasonable milestones for increasing the amount of recycled material.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good conference report and deserves our support. I urge all of my colleagues to support this straightforward rule, as well as the underlying noncontroversial legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this rule allows for the consideration of the conference report on the legislative branch appropriations bill for fiscal year 2002, and it waives all points of order.

The bill appropriates money for the operations of the House and Senate and the maintenance of the Capitol complex. It also funds legislative branch agencies that support Congress, including the Library of Congress, the Congressional Budget Office, and the General Accounting Office.

In the aftermath of September 11, the American people I think have found increased confidence in the Federal Government and Congress in particular, and I believe that the confidence is well-founded.

The men and women who serve as Members of Congress, and I do not speak of myself, but I speak of my colleagues, are an extraordinary group of dedicated individuals. They are served by a corps of talented and hard-working staff, and I am very proud to serve with them.

Representative democracy is never easy, and it is even more difficult in

times of crisis, but I am proud to support this bill, which allows our vital work to continue. I urge the adoption of the rule and of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as we have said here several times, this is a noncontroversial conference report that has been agreed to by the House and that has been agreed to by our conferees.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 11 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the former chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the ranking minority member on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and I would like to say that I think each and every person who serves in this body is a very fortunate human being.

First of all, we have been blessed by having the express confidence of the people we represent. They have entrusted us to deal with matters that deal not only with our own districts but with the Nation as a whole.

□ 1600

And I know each and every one of us feel a profound sense of gratitude for being able to provide that service. We have also had a lot of pressures put upon each and every person who works in this place, not just Members but staff, and those who support this institution and provide for its security.

I think that no one is the recipient of more gratitude than the Capitol Police who are funded in this bill. They have been working overtime since the unfortunate events of September 11 in order to try to provide security, not just for the physical buildings that make up Capitol Hill, but also for each and every human being who works on this Capitol Hill.

We have also been served, I think, tremendously well by the Attending Physician, who has taken on duties that I am sure he never imagined he would have to deal with when he first signed on as the job of the Attending Physician for the Capitol. We have seen a lot of turmoil on the Hill; and, in my judgment, the bill that this rule brings to the floor will prove insufficient in terms of meeting all the expenses attendant in dealing with the new world that we now live in.

I noticed this morning, I saw in one of the Capitol Hill newspapers a story about some of the extraordinary expenses that congressional employees have personally borne to try to make up for the fact that some of our Members at this point are not able to operate out of their own offices. You have had extraordinary arrangements that a number of Members and staff have had to make in order to get back to Wash-

ington after they were, in effect, trapped outside of Washington when all of the airlines were brought down, correctly, by Secretary Mineta in order to prevent further tragedies on September 11. And so we all know that there is a tremendous amount to be done to secure this Capitol and its surrounding environs.

I congratulate the members of the subcommittee who have worked on this bill. I have no basic problems with this bill. But I think it is appropriate during consideration of this bill to recognize that no matter what security measures that are being taken are probably going to have to be, in fact, enhanced. And I have very little doubt that we will be facing a supplemental appropriations for this branch of government and for many other agencies of government as well. But I would like also to caution every Member because I think it is necessary to understand that, in addition to securing buildings like the ones that we work in, we also have an overriding obligation to increase the safety and security of each and every American that we represent.

There are many other public servants also at work today in this country, and some of them have been brought under attack. The postal workers of this country are the ones who first come to mind. I think it is necessary for this Congress to understand that there are so many security vulnerabilities in this very changed world after September 11 that we must think through in fundamental ways the way we approach every single security-related issue in the government.

I think the private sector of our economy is going to have to think through the same things. And that means in my view we are going to have to face up to the fact that in addition to everything that we do in this bill today to deal with the problems of Capitol Hill, we are going to have to deal with a good many other problems around the country, and I would like to walk through what I think some others are that deserve equal attention.

This morning we had Governor Ridge in the Democratic Caucus, and he reported himself very well. I think those who have served with him in the past in this institution understand that he is a first-rate individual who will be doing his very best to provide additional homeland security for the entire country. But when he was in our Caucus this morning, I urged him to recognize that just as we are facing in this bill the obligation to move forward with the number of projects to enhance the security of the people's House, so too must we provide him with additional authority in order to do the same thing for everyone in this Nation.

Among the things I suggested to him was that, in my view, he needs to get control of the budget process because there are a whole range of security actions that need to be taken across the country that, in my view, are not being taken at the same time. And I do not

think any of us want to be in the position where we are taking what we consider to be adequate security measures here on Capitol Hill, if we were not at the same time taking adequate measures to secure the life and safety of each and every American.

Some of the items that need to be considered are as follows: We have laboratories all across the country that are generating dangerous biological and chemical agents. There is no central registry of such agents or the quantity that they are being produced in or the quantity in which they are held. CDC has requested \$10 million simply to begin enforcing existing laws requiring the reporting of the transfer of such agents. So far that has not been funded in the administration request.

We have been told by Secretary Thompson, my good friend, the former governor of Wisconsin, that he is going to be asking for 300 million doses of additional vaccines in order to strengthen our ability to respond to other challenges in the public health field. I applaud that, but it seems to me that we need to move far beyond that.

We need to dramatically beef up the ability of the public health surveillance mechanisms in this country so that we can, in fact, tell if we are in an epidemic when an epidemic begins, not after we are 2 weeks into it.

While the Public Health Service has requested well over half a billion dollars in additional funding, they have so far only had \$65 million of that approved.

We have had a \$500 million request from Amtrak for security of the Rail Passenger Service. So far, on the part of OMB, only 1 percent of that funding has been approved.

The Customs Service has asked for about \$700 million for increasing border inspections, particularly on the Canadian border. To my knowledge, at this point, none of that has been approved by OMB.

The FBI, they have asked for an additional \$1.5 billion. They have huge overtime costs. They have huge additional responsibilities. They are devoting a huge percentage of their investigative forces to the problems of terrorism. Their requests so far have been cut by two-thirds.

So I would simply say that these and many other items I think indicate the fact that we have much work to do in the area of securing the homeland. No matter what we do, there will be vulnerabilities. We understand that, but this bill that will be before us either today or tomorrow takes some minimal steps to add to the security of Capitol Hill. We have many much larger steps that must be taken across the country to attend to the security of the entire Nation, and I hope that this body will be receptive to such efforts in the remaining weeks of this congressional session.

I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) for the time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Members on both sides of the aisle for having put together this legislation, and I will not object and will, in fact, support this rule and the legislation. I think it is at this particular time in our Nation's history important that we spend our resources protecting the symbol of our democracy, our Capitol and all of the Senate and House office buildings associated with it.

In fact, in light of recent revelations, we find that perhaps this capital, if not our entire country, could be the targeted attacks of weapons of mass destruction at the hands of terrorists, and it is that issue which I think is appropriate to discuss during both this debate as well as the debate in a few moments on the Energy and Water appropriations bill.

In particular, I would like to bring to the attention, Mr. Speaker, of Members of this House an article from today's Reuters News Service from its Washington Bureau, and I quote from that article:

The September 11 attacks have increased concerns that extremists would use weapons of mass destruction, including possibly nuclear weapons, against the United States. Undersecretary of State John Bolton said on Wednesday. Answering questions at a breakfast with defense writers, Bolton predicted that if extremists possessed weapons of mass destruction, a term that encompasses nuclear, biological and chemical arms, they will use them.

The article then quotes Secretary Bolton, I am concerned about weapons of mass destruction everywhere, and my concern about weapons of mass destruction everywhere has gone up since, end of quote, the U.S.-led anti-terrorism war began, he said.

The article then says, Bolton, the State Department's top official dealing with arms control and international security affairs, said he was worried, and this is his quote, there will be the use of a weapon of mass destruction. The term encompasses nuclear, chemical and biological arms.

Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, I think this article and Mr. Bolton's comments point out the obvious. Those who would use airplanes as a tool, as a weapon against the United States and our citizens and all we care about and our values, and certainly they would not stop, in fact, would be encouraged to use weapons of mass destruction, be they biological, chemical or nuclear.

While I think it is important in this Legislative Branch bill we do try prudent efforts and steps to protect this Capitol, the symbol of our democracy, I think in further debate today, we are going to find that some of us are deeply disappointed that while we are protecting the Capitol, as we should in this bill, we are not doing what we must do and have responsibility to do

in other legislation to protect American citizens from the threat of nuclear terrorism.

While there will be more discussion on that in a few moments, let me quote Mr. Bolton when he says, basically, that one consequence of the U.S. attacks was a heightened awareness of the interrelationship between non-proliferation and terrorists and that as a result efforts to halt the spread of nuclear, chemical and biological arms will receive more attention in coming months.

Mr. Bolton's comments are correct in regard to biological and chemical weapons. We are already taking action. Yet in other legislation we will debate on this floor today we are actually reducing funding for perhaps the single most effective program designed to keep nuclear weapons and materials out of the hands of terrorists.

This is a good bill, designed to continue forward our democracy and the symbols of our democracy and the operating offices of our democracy, but we must not stop here with this bill. We have an obligation and a moral responsibility to protect the American people from what I think is a serious threat; that is, the threat of nuclear materials getting into the hands of terrorists who would gladly kill millions of American citizens.

□ 1615

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Ohio of the Committee on Rules for yielding me this time, as well as the gentleman from Texas, for bringing up this rule.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good conference agreement. I want to express my appreciation to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR), the members of the Subcommittee on Legislative, who worked closely to craft a good bill and a good final conference agreement. It largely reflects the same legislative branch appropriations bill that got 380 votes in the House earlier this year.

Our objectives have always been to provide the legislative branch with the resources and the guidance that it requires to carry out its mission, even in these most trying of circumstances. The legislative body is the Federal essence of our democratic process, and all of the components of the legislative branch are well treated in this conference agreement.

It prioritizes our capital improvement program, confronting, not deferring, personnel issues, such as an aging work force and retention challenges, and I do not mean the Members, I am referring to many of the staff up here on the Hill, and funding several new technology projects that will allow us

to perform our work more efficiently, to make this work more readily available to the public and to preserve it for posterity.

The Library of Congress, the General Accounting Office, the Government Printing Office, and the Congressional Budget Office will largely receive what they requested. Joint committees and leadership accounts will receive what they will need.

In addition, this bill includes provisions that will help us respond and be better prepared for the new terrorist threat.

Let me stress that security and the need to preserve the ability of this institution to continue to function have been our paramount concerns. This agreement provides the funds to hire an additional 79 police officers, bringing the Capitol Police force to 1,481 full-time equivalents and to fund their benefit increases. Between this agreement and the funding set aside in the fundamentals, this institution should be receiving all the resources it needs to address our security needs.

The bill also includes provisions that address several long-standing problems that should now be resolved.

I want to recognize the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and express my appreciation for the successful effort that he led to end the long-standing practice by the Architect of the Capitol of using temporary workers for long-term projects to get around providing them health and pension benefits. These temporary workers have been employed by the Architect on an average of 4½ years.

Recognition should also be given to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for her efforts to help contract cafeteria employees who have been without pay since the closure of the Ford and the Longworth cafeterias, so that they can be compensated for their lost wages.

I am also pleased to see the conference agreement set aside sufficient funds to enable all offices, be it a Member's office, a committee, or the Congressional Budget Office or the Government Printing Office, to provide their employees with a \$65-per-month employee transit benefit which should increase to \$100 tax free by next year. In light of the terrorist attacks on September 11, this benefit and the effort to reduce the number of parking spaces and cars around the Capitol have taken on even greater importance.

On a related issue, I am pleased the House Administrative Officer will be working on a plan to help more Members, staff, committees, and legislative branch agencies access their computer systems from a remote location. In times of peace, this initiative would have been called teleworking. In times of war, and our experience with the closure of House offices, providing Members access from a remote location, be it from the General Accounting Office or their home computer, has become an essential requirement to preserve the operations of this institution.

I want to be certain we are doing all we can to ensure that we can function effectively no matter what the context, and certainly we have learned from our experience when the House office buildings were shut down.

Over the long term, I believe that the transit benefit, assistance on student loan repayments, and greater teleworking opportunities are good personnel policies that will also help us attract and retain employees and professional staff in all legislative branch agencies.

I do want to say a word about the student loan program. It will apply to the Senate, the CBO, the GAO, but not the House of Representatives; and this inequity is unfortunate and should not have occurred. It is largely due to inaction on the part of the Committee on House Administration and will give the Senate and other legislative branch agencies yet another edge on the House in recruiting qualified employees. The lack of this student loan incentive gives an advantage to the Senate that the House does not have in recruiting qualified employees.

I would hope that the Committee on House Administration will move quickly to recommend criteria and guidelines so that we can set up such a program as soon as possible. I have spoken to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) about this, and I know that he is ready, and has been ready, to work with Chairman NEY to develop the kinds of guidelines that we need to make this student loan repayment program work and provide another incentive to get top-notch staff working for us here on the House side. Unfortunately, we could not do it in time for this conference, but I trust it will be done.

Similarly, the House administration needs to authorize the full transit benefit permitted under current law. With enactment of this agreement, money should no longer be an issue, though. This appropriation provides the money. We still do need authority from the Committee on House Administration. If my colleagues at the Federal executive branch, State and local governments, and the private sector can find the resources to provide their employees transit benefits, assistance repaying student loans, and teleworking options, so can we.

In all, I think we have a good agreement that will go a long way toward addressing the needs and operations of the legislative branch for the balance of this fiscal year, and I urge my colleagues to not only approve the rule but to approve the conference report on the legislative branch appropriations bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I think House Members would be interested in what I consider to be an egregious anomaly in this bill.

Today, administrative assistants in the other body are paid, on average, \$118,000. In this institution they are paid approximately \$22,000 less per person. A legislative director in the other body is paid about \$85,000, on average. That is about \$25,000 more than we pay for similar responsibilities in the House. For a legislative assistant, the gap is about \$15,000 between the pay afforded to a House staffer versus a Senate staffer.

We have another provision in this bill which is going to make it even more difficult for House Members to retain our staff, because it will be much easier for the Senate to entice staffers to come to work for them, all because of a provision in this bill. There is a provision in this bill that enables the employees of the other body and CBO to begin a student loan repayment program.

Now, I have nothing against that, but the problem is that that will not happen in the House of Representatives because we have not had the proper authorizations approved by the committee of jurisdiction in this House. That means that there will be yet another recruiting tool that will enable the Senate to entice our staffers away to work in the Senate. We cannot function as effectively as the People's House ought to function if we are essentially advised by people who have very short tenure in their jobs before they either move over to the Senate to get much better pay or before they go downtown to get much better pay than they can get working in either the Senate or the House.

I would urge everyone with the appropriate responsibilities in this House to recognize that this provision in this bill today will add to our difficulties in retaining quality staff and attracting quality staff in competition with the other body, and I would urge them to take the appropriate action so that we will be able to compete with the other body on an even footing. I think we owe that to the people we represent and to the people who work for us.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we have had an opportunity to hear several speakers who have talked about some very important aspects of what this legislative appropriations bill does. We have also heard some of the perhaps downsides or fallacies.

I, like the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), wish to express confidence in the men and women who come to Washington, D.C., who work for the legislative branch. They work tirelessly. They are people who are up till late at night. They are people who care deeply about not only the success of the House of Representatives and the people who work here but also the institution. It is my hope that in the coming years we will be able to further

work on issues related to employment, issues related to pay, issues related to student loans.

But I would add an overriding remark, and that is that I believe that this institution and body is well served by the men and women who are here. And we have not only respect for them, but we also give them our gratitude and our thanks; and that goes for all the people who are living through some very difficult times now, when we have some offices closed, when we have some uncertain times that we are dealing with. And I think that they should hear, just as the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) have stated, that we are proud of the men and women who work here, the police who protect us, and the people who day-to-day come into contact with us, including those people who serve in our cafeterias and other avenues to support this institution.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good conference report which we have been discussing. It is one which responds to the critical needs of the first branch of our government, which is the legislative branch. Adopting this rule will allow us to consider this important conference report and send it quickly to the President for his signature. I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and adoption of this must-do piece of legislation.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule for the Legislative Branch Conference Report. I commend the conferees for their work in preparing this report. The report includes important provisions that have a beneficial impact on the entire Washington, D.C. region and improve the quality of life for the thousands of men and women working on Capitol Hill.

I came to Congress to promote more livable communities with the Federal Government being a better partner to make our families safe, healthy and economically secure. An important part of making those communities livable is ensuring that people have choices about where they live, work, and how they travel.

During these troubled times that have fallen upon us since September 11, it is easy to lose sight of the essential daily items that improve quality of life. I commend my colleagues for moving forward on key provisions that will strengthen communities and give employees improved choices on how they live and work.

These livability provisions include the full funding of an increase in the allowable amount to \$65 for Legislative Branch employees participating in the transit benefit program. In addition to this important provision, language is also included to update bike facilities here on the Hill including providing new, more secure bike lockers for those Representatives and staff who bike to work, and to study alternatives for a staff fitness center.

These types of provisions that improve quality of life for employees and the livability of the communities in which they live is an important step in making America stronger and more resilient no matter the disconcerting circumstances at hand.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I

move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

□ 1630

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, and the Chair's prior announcement, the Chair will now put each question on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the following order:

On approving the Journal, de novo; Conference report on H.R. 2590, by the yeas and nays; and

House Resolution 273, de novo. The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for the third electronic vote in this series.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the pending business is the question of the Chair's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

This will be a 15-minute vote followed by a second 15-minute vote followed by a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 374, nays 39, answered "present" 1, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 412]  
YEAS—374

Abercrombie	Bartlett	Blagojevich
Ackerman	Barton	Blumenauer
Akin	Bass	Boehlert
Allen	Becerra	Boehner
Baca	Bentsen	Bonilla
Baker	Bereuter	Bonior
Baldacci	Berkley	Bono
Baldwin	Berman	Boswell
Ballenger	Berry	Boucher
Barcia	Biggert	Boyd
Barr	Bilirakis	Brady (TX)
Barrett	Bishop	Brown (FL)

Brown (SC)	Hastings (WA)	Miller, Dan
Bryant	Hayes	Miller, Gary
Burr	Hayworth	Miller, George
Burton	Heger	Miller, Jeff
Buyer	Hill	Mink
Callahan	Hilleary	Mollohan
Calvert	Hinchey	Moore
Camp	Hinojosa	Moran (VA)
Cannon	Hobson	Morella
Cantor	Hoefel	Murtha
Capito	Hoekstra	Myrick
Capps	Holden	Nadler
Cardin	Honda	Napolitano
Carson (IN)	Hooley	Neal
Carson (OK)	Horn	Nethercutt
Castle	Hostettler	Ney
Chabot	Houghton	Northup
Chambliss	Hoyer	Norwood
Clay	Hulshof	Nussle
Clayton	Hunter	Obey
Clement	Hyde	Olver
Clyburn	Inslee	Ortiz
Coble	Isakson	Osborne
Collins	Israel	Ose
Combest	Issa	Otter
Condit	Istook	Owens
Conyers	Jackson (IL)	Oxley
Cooksey	Jackson-Lee	Pascarell
Coyne	(TX)	Pastor
Cramer	Jefferson	Payne
Crenshaw	Jenkins	Pelosi
Crowley	John	Pence
Culberson	Johnson (CT)	Peterson (PA)
Cummings	Johnson (IL)	Petri
Cunningham	Johnson, E. B.	Phelps
Davis (CA)	Johnson, Sam	Pickering
Davis (FL)	Jones (NC)	Pitts
Davis (IL)	Jones (OH)	Platts
Davis, Jo Ann	Kanjorski	Pombo
Davis, Tom	Kapture	Pomeroy
Deal	Keller	Price (NC)
Delahunt	Kelly	Putnam
DeLauro	Kennedy (MN)	Kennedy (RI)
DeMint	Kerns	Kildee
Deutsch	Kilpatrick	Rahall
Diaz-Balart	Kind (WI)	Rangel
Dicks	King (NY)	Regula
Dingell	Kingston	Rehberg
Doggett	Kirk	Reyes
Dooley	Kleczka	Reynolds
Doolittle	Knollenberg	Riley
Doyle	Kolbe	Rivers
Duncan	LaFalce	Rodriguez
Edwards	LaHood	Roemer
Ehlers	Lampson	Rogers (KY)
Ehrlich	Langevin	Rogers (MI)
Emerson	Largent	Rohrabacher
Engel	Larson (CT)	Ros-Lehtinen
Eshoo	Latham	Ross
Etheridge	LaTourette	Rothman
Evans	Leach	Roukema
Everett	Lee	Roybal-Allard
Farr	Levin	Royce
Fattah	Lewis (CA)	Rush
Ferguson	Lewis (KY)	Ryan (WI)
Flake	Linder	Ryun (KS)
Fletcher	Lipinski	Sanders
Foley	Lofgren	Sandlin
Forbes	Lowe	Sawyer
Ford	Lucas (KY)	Saxton
Fossella	Lucas (OK)	Schakowsky
Frank	Luther	Schiff
Frelinghuysen	Lynch	Schrock
Frost	Maloney (CT)	Scott
Gallegly	Maloney (NY)	Sensenbrenner
Ganske	Manzullo	Serrano
Gekas	Markey	Sessions
Gephardt	Mascara	Shadegg
Gibbons	Matheson	Shaw
Gilchrest	Matsui	Shays
Gillmor	McCarthy (MO)	Sherman
Gilman	McCarthy (NY)	Sherwood
Gonzalez	McCollum	Shimkus
Goode	McGovern	Shoos
Goodlatte	McHugh	Shuster
Gordon	McInnis	Simmons
Goss	McIntyre	Simpson
Graham	McKeon	Skeen
Graves	McKinney	Skelton
Green (TX)	McNulty	Slaughter
Green (WI)	Meehan	Smith (MI)
Greenwood	Meeke (FL)	Smith (NJ)
Grucci	Meeke (NY)	Smith (TX)
Gutierrez	Menendez	Smith (WA)
Hall (OH)	Mica	Snyder
Hall (TX)	Millender-	Solis
Hansen	McDonald	Souder
Harman		Spratt
Hart		

Stark	Tiberi	Waxman
Stearns	Tierney	Weiner
Stenholm	Toomey	Weldon (FL)
Stump	Towns	Weldon (PA)
Sununu	Trafficant	Wexler
Tanner	Turner	Whitfield
Tauscher	Upton	Wilson
Tauzin	Velazquez	Wolf
Taylor (NC)	Vitter	Woolsey
Terry	Walden	Wu
Thomas	Walsh	Wynn
Thornberry	Wamp	Young (AK)
Thune	Watkins (OK)	Young (FL)
Thurman	Watson (CA)	
Tiahrt	Watt (NC)	

NAYS—39

Aderholt	Hefley	Sabo
Baird	Hilliard	Sanchez
Borski	Holt	Schaffer
Brady (PA)	Kucinich	Strickland
Brown (OH)	Larsen (WA)	Stupak
Capuano	Lewis (GA)	Taylor (MS)
Costello	LoBiondo	Thompson (CA)
Crane	McDermott	Udall (CO)
DeFazio	Moran (KS)	Udall (NM)
English	Oberstar	Visclosky
Filner	Pallone	Waters
Gutknecht	Peterson (MN)	Weller
Hastings (FL)	Ramstad	Wicker

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Tancredo

NOT VOTING—18

Andrews	DeGette	McCrery
Armey	DeLay	Portman
Bachus	Dreier	Pryce (OH)
Blunt	Dunn	Sweeney
Cox	Granger	Thompson (MS)
Cubin	Lantos	Watts (OK)

□ 1654

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2590, TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The pending business is the question of agreeing to the conference report on the bill, H.R. 2590, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 339, nays 85, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 413]  
YEAS—339

Abercrombie	Blunt	Castle
Ackerman	Boehlert	Chambliss
Aderholt	Boehner	Clay
Akin	Bonilla	Clayton
Allen	Bonior	Clement
Armey	Bono	Clyburn
Baca	Borski	Collins
Bachus	Boucher	Combest
Baird	Boyd	Condit
Baker	Brady (PA)	Conyers
Baldacci	Brady (TX)	Cooksey
Ballenger	Brown (FL)	Cox
Barr	Brown (SC)	Coyne
Bartlett	Bryant	Cramer
Barton	Burr	Crenshaw
Bass	Burton	Crowley
Becerra	Buyer	Cubin
Bentsen	Callahan	Culberson
Bereuter	Calvert	Cummings
Berman	Camp	Cunningham
Biggert	Cannon	Davis (FL)
Bilirakis	Cantor	Davis (IL)
Bishop	Capito	Davis, Jo Ann
Blagojevich	Cardin	Davis, Tom

Deal  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
DeLay  
DeMint  
Diaz-Balart  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Dooley  
Doolittle  
Doyle  
Dreier  
Edwards  
Ehlers  
Ehrlich  
Emerson  
Engel  
English  
Eshoo  
Farr  
Fattah  
Ferguson  
Filner  
Fletcher  
Foley  
Forbes  
Ford  
Fossella  
Frank  
Frelinghuysen  
Frost  
Gallegly  
Ganske  
Gekas  
Gephardt  
Gibbons  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Gonzalez  
Gordon  
Goss  
Graham  
Green (TX)  
Greenwood  
Grucci  
Gutierrez  
Gutknecht  
Hall (OH)  
Hansen  
Harman  
Hart  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hilliard  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hobson  
Hoeffel  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Horn  
Houghton  
Hoyer  
Hulshof  
Hunter  
Hyde  
Isakson  
Issa  
Istook  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
John  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones (OH)  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Keller  
Kelly  
Kennedy (MN)  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kilpatrick  
King (NY)

Kingston  
Kirk  
Kleczka  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
LaFalce  
LaHood  
Lampson  
Largent  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Leach  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Lofgren  
Lowey  
Lucas (OK)  
Maloney (CT)  
Maloney (NY)  
Manzullo  
Markey  
Mascara  
Matsui  
McCarthy (MO)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Menendez  
Mica  
Millender-  
McDonald  
Miller, Dan  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Miller, Jeff  
Mink  
Mollohan  
Moran (VA)  
Morella  
Murtha  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Neal  
Nethercutt  
Ney  
Northup  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Oliver  
Ortiz  
Osborne  
Ose  
Otter  
Owens  
Oxley  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Pence  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Portman  
Wilson  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Putnam  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Rahall

## NAYS—85

Baldwin  
Barcia  
Barrett  
Berkley  
Berry  
Blumenauer  
Boswell

Brown (OH)  
Capps  
Capuano  
Carson (IN)  
Carson (OK)  
Chabot  
Coble

Rangel  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Reyes  
Reynolds  
Riley  
Rivers  
Rodriguez  
Roemer  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Rothman  
Roukema  
Roybal-Allard  
Rush  
Ryan (WI)  
Sabo  
Sanchez  
Sanders  
Sawyer  
Saxton  
Schakowsky  
Schrock  
Scott  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Sherwood  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simmons  
Simpson  
Skeen  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Solis  
Souder  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stenholm  
Stupak  
Sununu  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Tauzin  
Taylor (NC)  
Terry  
Thomas  
Thompson (CA)  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Towns  
Traffant  
Udall (CO)  
Upton  
Velazquez  
Visclosky  
Vitter  
Walden  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Waters  
Watkins (OK)  
Watson (CA)  
Watt (NC)  
Watts (OK)  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
Wexler  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wilson  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wynn  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

Costello  
Crane  
Davis (CA)  
DeFazio  
Deutsch  
Duncan  
Etheridge

Evans  
Everett  
Flake  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Graves  
Green (WI)  
Hall (TX)  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Herger  
Hill  
Hilleary  
Holt  
Honda  
Hooley  
Hostettler  
Insee  
Israel  
Jenkins  
Jones (NC)  
Kerns

Andrews  
DeGette  
Dunn

Kildee  
Kind (WI)  
Kucinich  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Lucas (KY)  
Luther  
Lynch  
Matheson  
McKinney  
Moore  
Moran (KS)  
Napolitano  
Paul  
Petri  
Phelps  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Platts  
Ramstad  
Rohrabacher  
Ross

## NOT VOTING—8

Granger  
Lantos  
McCreary

□ 1720

Messrs. BLUMENAUER, GRAVES, BARCIA, HONDA, KILDEE and Mrs. CAPPs changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 981

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 981.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida? There was no objection.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for the remaining electronic vote on the remaining question on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

## WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2647, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of agreeing to the resolution, House Resolution 273.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 423, noes 0, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 414]

AYES—423

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Allen  
Armey  
Baca  
Bachus  
Baird  
Baker  
Baldacci  
Baldwin  
Ballenger  
Barcia  
Barr  
Barrett  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bass  
Becerra  
Bentsen  
Bereuter  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Biggert  
Bilirakis  
Bishop  
Blagojevich  
Blumenauer  
Blunt  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bonior  
Bono  
Borski  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boyd  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Brown (FL)  
Brown (OH)  
Brown (SC)  
Bryant  
Burton  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Cannon  
Cantor  
Capito  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardin  
Carson (IN)  
Carson (OK)  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chambliss  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Collins  
Combest  
Condit  
Conyers  
Cooksey  
Costello  
Cox  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Crane  
Crenshaw  
Crowley  
Cubin  
Culberson  
Cummings  
Cunningham  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (FL)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis, Jo Ann  
Davis, Tom  
Deal

DeFazio  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
DeLay  
DeMint  
Deutsch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Dooley  
Doolittle  
Doyle  
Duncan  
Edwards  
Ehlers  
Ehrlich  
Emerson  
Engel  
English  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Evans  
Everett  
Farr  
Fattah  
Ferguson  
Filner  
Flake  
Fletcher  
Foley  
Forbes  
Ford  
Fossella  
Frank  
Frelinghuysen  
Frost  
Gallegly  
Ganske  
Gekas  
Gephardt  
Gibbons  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Gonzalez  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Green (TX)  
Green (WI)  
Greenwood  
Grucci  
Gutierrez  
Gutknecht  
Hall (OH)  
Hall (TX)  
Hansen  
Harman  
Hart  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Herger  
Hill  
Hilleary  
Hilliard  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hobson  
Hoeffel  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hooley  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hoyer  
Hulshof  
Hunter  
Hyde  
Inslee

Isakson  
Israel  
Issa  
Istook  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
Jenkins  
John  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones (OH)  
Jones (NC)  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Keller  
Kelly  
Kennedy (MN)  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kilpatrick  
King (IL)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kirk  
Kleczka  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
Kucinich  
LaFalce  
LaHood  
Lampson  
Langevin  
Largent  
Larson (WA)  
Larsen (CT)  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Leach  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Lofgren  
Lowey  
Lucas (OK)  
Lucas (WA)  
Luther  
Lynch  
Maloney (CT)  
Maloney (NY)  
Manzullo  
Markey  
Mascara  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (MO)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Menendez  
Mica  
Millender-  
McDonald  
Miller, Dan  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Miller, Jeff  
Mink  
Mollohan  
Moore  
Moran (KS)

Moran (VA)	Rodriguez	Strickland
Morella	Roemer	Stump
Murtha	Rogers (KY)	Stupak
Myrick	Rogers (MI)	Sununu
Nadler	Rohrabacher	Tancredo
Napolitano	Ros-Lehtinen	Tanner
Neal	Ross	Tauscher
Nethercutt	Rothman	Tauzin
Ney	Roukema	Taylor (MS)
Northup	Roybal-Allard	Taylor (NC)
Norwood	Royce	Terry
Nussle	Rush	Thomas
Oberstar	Ryan (WI)	Thompson (CA)
Obey	Ryun (KS)	Thornberry
Oliver	Sabo	Thune
Ortiz	Sanchez	Thurman
Osborne	Sanders	Tiahrt
Ose	Sandlin	Tiberi
Otter	Sawyer	Tierney
Owens	Saxton	Toomey
Oxley	Schaffer	Towns
Pallone	Schakowsky	Traficant
Pascarell	Schiff	Turner
Pastor	Schrock	Udall (CO)
Paul	Scott	Udall (NM)
Payne	Sensenbrenner	Upton
Pelosi	Serrano	Velazquez
Pence	Sessions	Visclosky
Peterson (MN)	Shadegg	Vitter
Peterson (PA)	Shaw	Walden
Petri	Shays	Walsh
Phelps	Sherman	Wamp
Pickering	Sherwood	Waters
Pitts	Shimkus	Watkins (OK)
Platts	Shows	Watson (CA)
Pombo	Shuster	Watt (NC)
Pomeroy	Simmons	Watts (OK)
Portman	Simpson	Waxman
Price (NC)	Skeen	Weiner
Pryce (OH)	Skelton	Weldon (FL)
Putnam	Slaughter	Weldon (PA)
Quinn	Smith (MI)	Weller
Radanovich	Smith (NJ)	Wexler
Rahall	Smith (TX)	Whitfield
Ramstad	Smith (WA)	Wicker
Rangel	Snyder	Wilson
Regula	Solis	Wolf
Rehberg	Souder	Wu
Reyes	Spratt	Wynn
Reynolds	Stark	Young (AK)
Riley	Stearns	Young (FL)
Rivers	Stenholm	

NOT VOTING—9

Andrews	Granger	Sweeney
DeGette	Lantos	Thompson (MS)
Dunn	McCrery	Woolsey

□ 1735

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for rollcall votes 412 through 414 due to a family emergency. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 412, "yea" on rollcall No. 413, and "yea" on rollcall No. 414.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SHOWS. Mr. Speaker, on October 30, 2001, I missed roll call votes 408, 409, 410, and 411 because I was in my congressional district on official business and to attend the funeral of a lifelong friend.

Had I been present, I would have voted yea on all four votes.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House,

the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

INTRODUCING THE LEGAL ASSISTANCE FOR VICTIMS OF DATING VIOLENCE ACT DURING DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize October as Domestic Violence Awareness Month and to introduce the Legal Assistance for Victims of Dating Violence Act, which will turn that recognition into action.

In recent weeks, much attention has been focused on humanitarian issues in Afghanistan, particularly the cruel treatment of women under the Taliban and their struggle with domestic violence.

While conditions for women in the United States are light years ahead of those for the women of Afghanistan, domestic violence has too long been a problem in our country, as well. The Justice Department reports that there were over 791,000 domestic violence victims in 1999, with 85 percent of these attacks occurring against women.

Over half of domestic violent crimes against both men and women from 1993 to 1999 were committed by a current boyfriend or girlfriend, and almost one-third of women murdered annually are murdered by their current or former partners.

Most troubling for me is that dating violence most often affects our youth. The age group of 16 to 24, which is the group most likely to be in dating relationships, experiences the highest rates of dating violence. These statistics are alarming.

Dating violence crimes are not restricted to any one racial, cultural, or socioeconomic group. Dating violence could happen to anyone in a dating relationship. These acts occur everywhere, and are committed not by a stranger in a dark alley but by people known and trusted by the victims.

These heinous crimes not only violate the victims, but can destroy their ability to trust their friends and loved ones. Dating violence affects every aspect of a victim's life, from his or her relationship to their performance at school or work. We must act now to help the victims of dating violence, these men and women who are attacked by the very people in their lives who they trust the most.

In the last Congress I was proud to cosponsor the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act. I was more than pleased that the overwhelming majority of my colleagues agreed with me on the value of this legislation. With 239 cosponsors, VAWA passed overwhelmingly by a vote of 371 to 1 in the House and 95 to 0 in the Senate.

VAWA went a long way in addressing the problem of domestic violence in the

United States. Unfortunately, however, VAWA omitted critical protections for victims of dating violence. When VAWA took the much needed step of creating a first-ever legal definition of dating violence, as well as authorized a new grant program to provide civil legal assistance to domestic violence victims, dating violence victims were not covered under the new grants.

Many domestic violence and dating violence victims do not have the money or resources necessary to regain control over their lives. These grants go to nonprofit organizations that then collaborate with domestic violence and sexual assault service agencies to provide civil legal assistance to victims of violence. Access to the legal system can make the difference in these victims' power to break the cycle of oppressive abuse and regain control over their lives.

Mr. Speaker, my legislation addresses this omission within the VAWA legislation. My bill will address this inconsistency by allowing grant recipients to use their funding to assist victims of dating violence. This legislation does not cost anything. It simply allows grant recipients to help dating violence victims in the same way they currently help domestic violence victims. The victims of dating violence deserve the same legal assistance given to other victims of domestic violence.

The ability to obtain a legal protection order or pursue other legal remedies is just as important for victims of dating violence as it is for domestic violence victims. We must ensure that all of these victims receive the assistance they need to get their lives back in order.

I would like to thank our former colleague, Mr. Hutchinson, who is now the administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration, for introducing this important legislation before he left Congress. He recognized that it is only right that dating violence victims have access to the same services as domestic violence victims, and I wish him the best of luck in his new post.

I would also like to thank my friend and neighbor, Senator MIKE CRAPO, who has introduced this bill in the Senate.

As we recognize Domestic Violence Awareness Month, I can think of no better way to show victims we care than to pass this legislation. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this important bill and help make a difference in the lives of so many men and women in our country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CONCERNS REGARDING THE FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PUTNAM). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, tonight I would like to talk briefly about some concerns I have in the foreign operations appropriations bill, about some rumors that are circulating.

The bill has passed the House and it has passed the Senate. As we go to conference, it is important that we address some of these concerns and we do not retreat on our anti-narcotics efforts.

□ 1745

I know Americans are deeply concerned about the anti-terrorism as I am, but in the process of focusing on the terrorism question, we should not retreat from our war on drugs. As my friend and the Democratic ranking member of the Committee on Government Reform, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), has said, we are in a chemical war in the United States. They have distributed illegal narcotics throughout our country. We are watching the Taliban to see if their heroin makes it over from Europe. They dominate the Europe and Asia markets, but clearly we have thousands of Americans dying of illegal drugs, which is a consistent problem.

I want to talk first about an understanding that the Senate has been pushing to drop a drug certification. First, I do not think it should be dropped. I know countries do not like it. I met with our leaders and presidents in Mexico and throughout South America and in the Summit of the Americas. I know they do not like it. They do not like that it seems judgmental. But the truth is we have certification on human rights and we have certification on terrorism. Are we saying that we will drop all criteria for foreign aid and standards, including human rights and terrorism? We should not.

It is important that we have an idea of which countries in the world are cooperating in our efforts against illegal narcotics, human rights and terrorism. And if we drop one because of judgment, all will be dropped. If we have drop none, that would be the better point.

Now, let me draw in some particular things. Mexico and Colombia as well as Peru and Bolivia have in fact responded and been aggressive. Certification is not about whether you have been successful but whether the government involved is doing its best to try to cooperate with our government, and Mexico has undertaken incredible efforts in the last 4 years. Colombia has changed its government and has been fighting in the war ever since, as did Peru and Bolivia.

What you need are a carrot and stick approach. In those countries when they

elect leadership, they deserve to be rewarded with assistance. The point of being on the list is whether or not you get assistance.

We do need to make some changes in the law. For example, we should not have to certify. The question should be is if you are in noncompliance and non-assistance then you should go on a list like in terrorism or human rights. In the drug certification question, in the drug list, it only applies to whether you are going to get aid. If you do not get aid you are not on the list.

The second concern is the chopping down of the funds in the Andean Initiative. If we are to ever make progress, we cannot push in Plan Colombia. We have to look at the countries around Colombia. We cannot just focus on military. We have to focus on legal aid and economic aid. As we reduce the Andean Initiative, we will have wasted the money that is now going down into that area if we do not continue to follow through the strategy that we put in, which is we squeeze and put the pressure on the narco-traffickers in Colombia, but then as we start to move and as they start to transfer their planning and their trafficking to Ecuador to Peru and Bolivia and Brazil, we should not be backing off the efforts and spread the drug war to those countries. We need in the Andean Initiative to make sure that they are funded so our American drug addiction does not spread this terrible war to the countries around Colombia and, in fact, we can make progress.

The drug issue is very similar to the terrorism question. Unless you can get it at its source, there is only so much we can do at the border, and once it gets across the border it is about impossible to tackle.

We have worked with drug-free schools, drug-free communities, drug treatment, but in fact the closer we can get to the source the better. Just like in terrorism, once those terrorists come into our region and get across our borders, it is very hard to find them in a country that practices liberty.

I hope in the Foreign Operations bill we do not back off with a new Democratic Senate and a new Republican President from our strong efforts against narcotics, either in the Andean Initiative or in the certification of nations who are not cooperating with the United States.

#### AIRLINE SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PUTNAM). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, it has been 7 weeks and 1 day since the horrific attacks by the terrorists using our commercial airlines and innocent civilians and passengers and crew as weapons in attacks on the World Trade Towers, the Pentagon and the other plane which crashed in Pennsylvania.

It has been more than 2 weeks since the United States Senate voted 100 to 0 on a comprehensive bill to improve aviation security. Now what has gone on in the House so far in these issues? Nothing.

We had the airline bailout bill, \$16 billion. There was not a penny in it for aviation security. I tried to amend in at the end of the consideration of the bill a provision for aviation security, but lost that vote.

Now, I think there is pretty broad agreement on both sides of the aisle that the current system is failing. The FAA testers, the regulators who oversee the system find it failing frequently. Their testers are able to smuggle through fake hand grenades, weapons, bombs with great regularity. It is failing us.

Then we have the issue of a number of large private security firms, most notably Argenbright, largest in the United States, subsidiary of one of the largest in the world, the three major private security firms which provide security at airports, are foreign owned. They have a problem. They were criminally convicted last year of hiring known felons, maintaining known felons on staff, lying to the Federal regulators, falsifying documents to Federal regulators. They were fined \$1.1 million and put on probation.

Well, here we are a year later and guess what? They are in court again. They are under indictment for hiring known felons, maintaining known felons on staff, falsifying documents to Federal regulators. So although there may be agreement here that we need to do something, unfortunately the majority, particularly a couple of leaders on the majority side, want to perpetuate that system. They said, all we have to do is take the Argenbright Company, known felons, the company itself, in for its second felony trial and supervise them more. How much more supervision can you provide than probation?

They are on probation. They are violating their probation. Maybe if we put the CEO in jail that will get their attention, but I cannot see that this new system of supervision they are talking about is going to shape these people up. They have got problems over in Europe at Heathrow. They have 38 people working in critical positions allowing access to secure parts of the airport who had not had background checks. Same problem they got here in the United States.

Some members of the leadership of the majority on that side want to perpetuate this failing \$800 million a year security on the cheap bureaucracy because it is immensely profitable to those companies employing minimum wage, undertrained and abused employees. That has got to change.

We just cannot fix it. We cannot bring in the same firms, the same firms that have committed felonies and make them better with new regulations. They are saying, well, this is

what we will do, we will set the wage; we will set the benefit package. This is the Federal Government. We will set the training, we will supervise the training, we will do the background checks and we will supervise the workers, but they will not be Federal employees.

What sense does that make? If we are going to do all that, why not make them into Federal law enforcement personnel, just like we have right out here at the doors of the capitol. We do not have private security out there because I do not think most Members of Congress would feel safe. We have armed Federal law enforcement agents.

Should we do any less for the traveling American public when it comes to aviation safety? Should they go into the airports and have these companies that have committed felonies and perpetuated in those crimes or should they have a Federal law enforcement workforce, just like when they confront the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the Customs Service. The Department of Agriculture checks bags in Hawaii and at other times people coming into the United States. They are all sworn Federal law enforcement officers, but somehow they are telling us either we cannot afford that.

I mean one very candid member of the Republican leadership said these people could join unions if they become Federal employees. Well, guess what? They can join unions if they are private employees. In fact, this legislation is being opposed by a private union because they have unionized some of these folks. They can be unionized one way or another.

There is another concern I have about that. Most of the people who were working and died, other than those innocently at work, on the day of this tragedy, the firefighters, the medics, the police, the pilots and the flight attendants, they were all members of unions. What is wrong with unions?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PUTNAM). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. MCKINNEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, today marks the last day, this last day

of October, as the last day of the month for national domestic violence awareness. Though society has made great strides in bringing attention to the crime of domestic violence, over 4 million individuals of this country continue to find themselves victims of physical, psychological and sexual abuse. While our Nation's attention is currently occupied by security threats both here and abroad, domestic violence is an issue that this country must continue to address.

Domestic violence rarely makes the headlines, primarily because most of the abuse occurs behind closed doors. In most instances, the victim knows the attacker. Over 50 percent of the victims are battered by a boy or girlfriend. Over 30 percent are assaulted by spouses, and around 15 percent are attacked by ex-spouses. Many victims are reluctant to report these incidents to anyone because of fear of reprisal.

There are many theories to explain why individuals use violence against their partners. Some explanations include dysfunctional families, inadequate communication skills, stress, chemical dependency and economic hardship. Though these issues may be associated with battering, they are not the causes, and merely removing these factors will not end domestic violence.

Batterers begin and continue to have abusive behavior because violence is an effective method of gaining and keeping control over another person. The abuser usually does not suffer adverse consequences as a result of this behavior.

Historically, violence against women has not been treated as a real crime but rather a private matter between domestic partners. The consequences for domestic violence are often less severe than the penalties for other criminal forms of abuse.

Society tends to misplace the blame for continued abuse, focusing on the victim and criticizing him or her for not leaving the abuser. In many cases women simply do not have physical or financial resources to get out of the relationship. Risks of retaliatory abuse and injury are also factors in staying.

Every year, domestic violence results in approximately 100,000 days of hospitalization and over 28,000 visits to emergency rooms. In these cases, major medical treatment is often required.

Fear of death is another consideration. The possibility of being murdered by an abuser increases to 75 percent if the woman attempts to leave on her own.

For these reasons, outside support networks and services are vital. Yet these resources are often limited.

The lack of resources and shelters are a particular problem in rural areas. In my 66-county district, there are only nine domestic violence and sexual assault shelters. For many women in central and western Kansas, the distance to the closest shelter may be hundreds

of miles away. In Kansas, one domestic violence murder occurs 55 minutes and 48 seconds. Proximity to a safe facility can mean the difference between life and death. Ensuring safe havens for women who leave abusive environments is a priority.

Most domestic violence centers rely primarily on grants and local donations. Federal grants made under the Violence Against Women Act provided essential funds for shelter operation and support service. That program has been credited with substantially reducing the levels of violence committed against women and children. We must continue to ensure that our shelters and crisis centers receive adequate funding.

As National Domestic Violence Awareness Month draws to a close, we are reminded that domestic violence is an issue that must be addressed all year long. Only through funding, education and support can America hope to end this terrible crime.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### ANTIBIOTIC RESISTANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, antibiotic resistance is a major health threat that does not receive the attention it deserves. When bioterrorism is a prevailing concern, we can no longer afford to ignore or downplay the threat of antibiotic resistance.

Introduced in the 1940s, antibiotics gave us a tremendous advantage in our fight against tuberculosis, pneumonia, typhoid, cholera and salmonella and many other long-term killers, but some bacteria exposed to antibiotics are able to survive. These antibiotic-resistant strains then flourish and pose a dangerous threat to public health.

□ 1800

We in Congress cannot go home to our districts and say we have taken the steps necessary to prepare for future bioterrorist attacks unless and until we confront the issue of antibiotic resistance.

The links between resistance and bioterrorism are clear. Antibiotic-resistant strains of anthrax and other microbes are recognized to be some of the most lethal forms of biological weapons. These weapons exist today. We know, first, that Russian scientists have developed a strain of anthrax that is resistant to penicillin and tetracycline. We can only assume that anthrax and other lethal agents will be engineered to resist newer antibiotics like Cipro.

Overuse of antibiotics, misuse of antibiotics will render more microbes resistant to our current stockpile of drugs, potentially leaving the Nation poorly prepared in the event of bioterrorist attacks. As we have seen with the recent anthrax attacks, the broad-scale use of antibiotics associated with bioterrorism compounds the resistance problems, which in turn can render our existing antibiotics ineffective against future attacks. It is an alarming cycle.

To adequately prepare for a bioterrorist attack, surveillance capabilities at the State and local levels are crucial. State and local health departments must be equipped to rapidly identify and respond to antibiotic-resistant strains of anthrax and other lethal agents. To protect our antibiotic stockpile, we must be able to isolate emerging antibiotic-resistant microbes, monitor the ongoing effectiveness of existing antibiotics, and carefully track and discourage overuse and misuse of current antibiotic treatments.

Surveillance also provides the data needed to prioritize the research and the development of new antibiotic treatments. Drug-resistant pathogens are a growing threat to every American. We cannot, we must not continue to treat this threat as a long-term issue and a lesser priority. It is an immediate threat, and we must deal with it now.

Under last year's Public Health Threats and Emergencies Act, sponsored by my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) and my friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK), Congress authorized a grant program that can equip State and local health departments to identify and to track antibiotic resistance. The gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) and I are requesting that the Committee on Appropriations include at least \$50 million for this grant program in the Homeland Security supplemental appropriations bill, which we will take up either late this week or early next week.

I urge Members on both sides of the aisle to weigh in on this issue. Let the appropriators know that funding of antibiotic resistance is critical. We must help State and local health agencies combat antibiotic resistance. Our success against bioterrorism absolutely depends on it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### THE AMERICAN AND GERMAN NAVIES MEET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I will attempt to read from an e-mail which was sent from a young ensign aboard the U.S.S. *Winston Churchill* to his parents. The *Churchill* is an *Arleigh Burke*-class AEGIS guided-missile destroyer, commissioned March 10, 2001, and is the only active U.S. Navy warship named after a foreign national.

I read: "Dear Dad: We are still at sea. The remainder of our port visits have all been canceled. We have spent every day since the attacks going back and forth within imaginary boxes drawn in the ocean, standing high-security watches and trying to make the best of it. We have seen the articles and the photographs, and they are sickening. Being isolated, I do not think we appreciate the full scope of what is happening back home, but we are definitely feeling the effects.

"About 2 hours ago, we were hailed by a German Navy destroyer, *Lutjens*, requesting permission to pass close by our port side. Strange, since we were in the middle of an empty ocean, but the captain acquiesced and we prepared to render them honors from our bridge wing. As they were making their approach, our conning officer used binoculars and announced that the *Lutjens* was flying not the German but the American flag. As she came alongside us, we saw the American flag flying at half mast and her entire crew topside standing at silent, rigid attention in their dress uniforms.

"They had made a sign that was displayed on her side that read "We Stand by You." There was not a dry eye on the bridge as we stayed alongside for a few minutes and saluted. It was the most powerful thing I have seen in my life. The German Navy did an incredible thing for this crew, and it has truly been the highest point in the days since the attacks. It is amazing to think that only a half-century ago things were quite different.

"After *Lutjens* pulled away, the officer of the deck, who had been planning to get out later this year, turned to me and said, "I'm staying Navy."

Mr. Speaker, to our German friends we can only say, *danke schoen*. To our countrymen and colleagues I say, be of strong heart, we are not alone. We will prevail.

Mr. Speaker, before I yield back, a number of colleagues have asked if they could get copies of this e-mail as well as photos of the Navy destroyer *Lutjens*. They can get that by simply going to my Web address at [gil.house.gov](http://gil.house.gov).

#### PEDIATRIC EXCLUSIVITY BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on a bill that will be coming to the floor soon. H.R. 2887 is commonly called the pediatric exclusivity bill. This was a good bill. It was

passed and implemented back in 1997. It had a 5-year sunset, so it is necessary for Congress to reauthorize the pediatric exclusivity bill.

Pediatric exclusivity simply says this: If a drug company that currently has a drug on the market will do an exclusive study for young people, those 18 or under, we will grant to them a patent extension for 6 years.

It is amazing, but as drug companies put forth drugs, they were not required to see what the effect would be on young people. Thus, we created the pediatric exclusivity bill to make sure an opportunity was provided to have studies done to make sure the proper dosage, the amount and the type of drug, would be beneficial to young people, those under 18 years of age. Just for agreeing to do a study that the FDA wants for young people, a drug company can get its patent extended. That is of great benefit to the drug company, of course, because they hold the patent and make money off the drug, and this bill is now due to be reauthorized.

As we move through this bill in our Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, there are a number of improvements we would like to see made with the bill. While there have been a number of improvements made already, there is still one part of the bill that troubles me, and hopefully, I will be able to offer an amendment to correct this inequity in the bill. What my amendment would say is that if we provide a pediatric exclusivity, before that patent extension is provided, the drug company must make the necessary label changes on a product that has been studied.

In fact, I would like to quote the FDA's report to the Congress dated January of this year. It says, and I quote, "The ultimate goal of encouraging pediatric studies is to provide needed dosing and safety information to the physicians in product labeling." To paraphrase, and I want to emphasize, "The goal of pediatric exclusivity is the labeling." It is the labeling where we find out how much to give, the safety information, and who should be given it. That is why I must offer my amendment when this bill comes to the floor. My amendment would tie the grant of exclusivity to the necessary labeling changes.

There have been 33 drugs approved for pediatric exclusivity, but only 20 of them have made the needed changes on the label. How would a doctor, a parent, or a patient who is under 18 know what is the right dosage or if this drug is safe for them without this information? Currently, the exclusivity period is given only for conducting studies. For the safety of our children, for our health care system, this must and should be changed.

Take, for example, one of the drugs that has been granted pediatric exclusivity, Eli Lilly's drug Prozac. The benefit to the public, specifically parents, patients and pediatricians, is zero, because the manufacturer has yet to

place any information in the public record regarding the pediatric dosing or other data relating to the drug's safety in juvenile populations. Just for doing a study, for doing very little to aid our understanding of the operation of this antidepressant drug, they are allowed to have the pediatric exclusivity, to make the money, but not without giving us full disclosure of the needed safety information. That information on Prozac is never given to doctors, parents and patients on how it affects young people.

Sadly, physicians and parents have no way of knowing what the results of the study were on Prozac regarding the myriad of presumed uses of Prozac in young people. Unless Eli Lilly elects to tell us, we do not know what testing occurred, in what specific age groups, what dosage, or what reactions. Pediatricians, parents, and patients have no information; they are literally left in the dark.

When the current bill comes to the floor, it will only require that manufacturers in the future will be required to label their products after the results are known. But that knowledge will not be given until 11 months after the product is on the market. That gives them 11 months to negotiate with the FDA in a secret proceeding, unless the FDA is prepared to declare a product misbrand, and the FDA has been reluctant to do so.

Under my labeling amendment, which I hope to bring to the floor, all new drugs must complete the labeling requirement before the product is marketed. I cannot understand why we allow drug manufacturers to undertake a pediatric study but not provide the doctors, the patients, and the parents with the results of this study and the information they need to make it available.

#### FOOLISHNESS OF FIAT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, the world's politicians, special interests, government bureaucrats, and financiers all love fiat money because they all benefit from it. But freedom-loving, hard-working, ethical and thrifty individuals suffer.

Fiat money is paper money that gets its value from a government edict and compulsory legal tender laws. Honest money, something of real value, like a precious metal, gets its value from the market and through voluntary exchange. The world today is awash in fiat money like never before, and we face a financial crisis like never before, conceived many decades before the 9-11 crisis hit.

Fiat money works as long as trust in the currency lasts. But eventually trust is always withdrawn from paper money. Fiat money evolves out of sound money, which always originates

in the market, but paper money inevitably fails no matter how hard the beneficiaries try to perpetuate the fraud. We are now witnessing the early stages of the demise of a worldwide financial system built on the fiction that wealth can come out of a printing press or a computer at our central banks.

Japan, failing to understand this, has tried for more than a decade to stimulate her economy and boost her stock market by printing money and increasing government spending, and it has not worked. Argentina, even with the hopes placed in its currency board, is nevertheless facing default on its foreign debt and a crisis in confidence. More bailouts from the IMF and U.S. dollar may temper the crisis for a while, but ultimately it will only hurt the dollar and the U.S. taxpayers.

We cannot continually bail out others with expansion of the dollar money supply, as we have with the crisis in Turkey, Argentina, and the countries of Southeast Asia. This policy has its limits, and confidence in the dollar is the determining factor. Even though, up until now, confidence has reigned, encouraged by our political and economic strength, this era is coming to an end. Our homeland has been attacked, our enemies are not easily subdued, our commitments abroad are unsustainable, and our economy is fast slipping into chaos.

Printing money is not an answer, yet that is all that is offered. The clamor for low-interest rates by all those who benefit from fiat money has prompted the Fed to create new money out of thin air like never before. Driving the Fed funds rate down from 6.5 percent to 2.5 percent, a level below the price inflation rate, represents nothing short of panic and has done nothing to recharge the economy. But as one would expect, confidence in the dollar is waning.

I am sure, due to the crisis, a faith in fiat and a failure to understand the business cycle, the Fed will continue with the only thing it knows to do: credit creation and manipulation of interest rates.

□ 1815

This policy reflects the central bank's complete ignorance as to the cause of the problem: Credit creation and manipulation of interest rates.

Since the Federal Reserve first panicked in early January, it has created \$830 billion of fiat money out of thin air. The country is no richer. The economy is weaker. The stock market has continued downward, and unemployment has skyrocketed. Returning to deficit spending, as we already have, will not help us any more than it helped Japan, which continues to sink into economic morass.

Nothing can correct the problems we face if we do not give up on the foolishness of fiat.

Mr. Speaker, a dollar crisis is quickly approaching. We should prepare ourselves.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PUTNAM). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MEEK of Florida addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. NAPOLITANO addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### FOURTH WTO MINISTERIAL CONFERENCE SHOULD NOT BE HELD IN QATAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, today we are preparing to send a letter to the President of the United States expressing the displeasure of many Members and genuine concern about the administration decision to send a delegation from our countries to the World Trade Organization's fourth ministerial conference in Qatar. That is to occur next week.

We are writing to express our deep reservations about the appropriateness of that venue in light of recent actions by the monarchy in Qatar, not to mention the obvious security concerns for our citizens.

We are deeply disappointed by the failure of the Qatari monarchy to support U.S. military action in Afghanistan. In fact, the President of the United States has said Nations should choose sides. Well, Qatar has chosen the wrong side. Indeed, in this war against terrorism, Qatar has decided to sit on the sidelines, and at worst to condemn U.S. military action; so why are we sending a delegation there?

Indeed, the government of Qatar has condemned the air campaign against the Taliban and refused to make its airports and infrastructure available to U.S. forces. On October 23, Qatari Foreign Minister Sheikh Hamad bin-Jassem bin-Jabr al-Thani condemned, and that is a quote, the allied attacks on Afghanistan and called them unacceptable.

What is unacceptable is the notion that Doha, Qatar is an appropriate site for the World Trade Organization ministerial.

Mr. Speaker, we will be asking the President to prevail on the World

Trade Organization officials to move the ministerial to another location in light of the government of Qatar's opposition to the war on terrorism.

The government of Qatar should be made to understand that its failure to support the coalition in the campaign against terrorism has consequences, and it is not business as usual.

In the Financial Times today, there is an article indicating that Vice President CHENEY disregarded fears over the WTO choosing the venue of Qatar for this meeting. In fact, it says that the White House disregarded security concerns among top U.S. trade officials this month by committing Washington to sending a delegation to the meeting of the World Trade Organization previously scheduled for Qatar.

It mentions that U.S. Government security experts on Friday warned business lobbyists planning to accompany the delegation that there were substantial risks in attending the meeting in the small Gulf state.

One delegation member was very concerned about Mr. CHENEY's call and said, "I think this is a momentarily bad call based upon what we have learned about security risks there."

It is no secret this organization calls itself the World Trade Organization, and when those two Trade Towers came down in New York, those were the Twin World Trade Towers. There is a message here, and it is a pretty important one.

For the RECORD, I will be including information on Qatar's policy of denying its own people fundamental rights. In fact, the government officially prohibits such things as public worship by non-Muslims. Our own CIA Fact Book indicates that the people of Qatar do not even have the right to vote, and freedom of speech is severely limited. I could not be giving this speech in Qatar.

In addition, like the Taliban, the rulers of Qatar oppress women, and women occupy a strictly subservient role inside that society.

I think it is fair to say that trade has failed to bring freedom to Qatar. In fact, the U.S. State Department calls oil the cornerstone of Qatar's economy, accounting for more than 70 percent of total government revenue in that country. Starting in 1973, oil production there increased dramatically, but freedom certainly has not followed.

We are constantly told how freedom takes root in unfree countries if we simply trade, whether it is Vietnam, China or Qatar. That logic is simply not true. Despite billions upon billions of dollars worth of engagement between Western commercial interests and Qatar, the people of Qatar have no freedom of speech, no freedom of assembly, no freedom of religion, no freedom of association.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Bush and Cheney administration to seriously review the decision that they have made to send a delegation to Qatar and to find a location that is safer in view of these very troubled times.

The material previously referred to is as follows:

(From the Financial Times, Oct. 31, 2001]

CHENEY DISREGARDED FEARS OVER WTO VENUE

VICE-PRESIDENT PLEDGED US PARTICIPATION DESPITE EFFORTS TO MOVE MIDEAST MEETING

(By Guy de Jonquieres in London and Edward Alden in Washington)

Dick Cheney, the US vice-president, disregarded security concerns among top US trade officials this month by committing Washington to sending a delegation to next month's ministerial meeting of the World Trade Organisation in Doha, Qatar.

Mr. Cheney pledged US participation even though US intelligence officials are seriously concerned that its delegation—due to include Robert Zoellick, the US trade representative, Don Evans, commerce secretary, and Ann Veneman, agriculture secretary—cannot be protected adequately in Doha, according to congressional and business representatives who have been briefed by the administration on security plans.

Intensive efforts are being made to launch a global trade round at the five-day WTO meeting, which starts on November 9. The Gulf state was the only WTO member to offer to host the talks, after riots marred the last meeting, in Seattle, two years ago.

US government security experts on Friday warned business lobbyists planning to accompany the delegation that there were "substantial risks" in attending the meeting in the small Gulf state.

Mr. Cheney gave his assurances by telephone 10 days ago to the emir of Qatar, despite efforts by Mr. Zoellick to persuade other countries to move the meeting to Singapore, according to accounts by diplomats from several countries that were not contradicted by US officials.

The vice-president's intervention came after strong diplomatic pressure from Qatar, which told the US and other WTO members that shifting the meeting would offend Islamic countries that have supported the US-led anti-terrorism coalition.

"I think this is a momentarily bad call based on what we have learnt about security risks there," said one US delegation member. Mr. Cheney's office did not return telephone calls seeking comment yesterday.

The US team in Doha was originally due to include about 30 congressmen. But Washington has decided to cut its delegation by more than half.

Mr. Zoellick said he was keeping his delegation "as small as possible for their safety", adding that the situation in Doha "is not exactly the happiest in terms of overall security". He said that while every effort was being made to ensure a safe meeting "there is undoubtedly risk".

The US is worried that Islamic extremists or others with ties to al-Qaeda, the organisation headed by Osama bin Laden, may have penetrated Qatar's security.

STATE DEPARTMENT CONDEMNS QATAR; USTR IGNORES HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES

Qatar would be a poor example of the argument that "trade brings freedom." However, the United States Trade Representative has continued to push for the next World Trade Organization (WTO) trade ministerial to be held in Qatar.

FACT NO. 1. QATAR DENIES ITS PEOPLE FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS

The people of Qatar don't even have the right to vote. According to the CIA Factbook, the government of Qatar has granted its people suffrage for municipal elections only (which likely indicates that

municipal offices lack any real power). The people of Qatar do not enjoy any of the freedoms that we espouse. Moreover, Human Rights Watch has criticized the selection of Qatar as the venue for the next WTO meeting because the government does not recognize a right to freedom of assembly.

The U.S. State Department has formally noted severe restrictions on the freedom of speech, assembly and association. Although Qatar is the home of the free-wheeling al-Jazeera satellite television station that Osama bin Laden frequently uses as a loudspeaker to the global village, otherwise freedom of speech is severely limited.

The government has banned political demonstrations. The government does not allow political parties, or membership in international professional organizations that might be critical of the government (or any other Arab government). Private social, sports, trade, professional and cultural societies must be registered with the government, and government security forces monitor the activities of such groups.

The government officially prohibits public worship by non-Muslims. So if our trade negotiators go there next month, they won't be able to attend church, go to Mass or synagogue or participate in any other form of worship unless they are Muslim.

FACT NO. 2. LIKE THE TALIBAN, THE RULERS OF QATAR OPPRESS WOMEN

As in Taliban-controlled Afghanistan, women occupy a strictly subservient role in Qatar. This is taken from the U.S. State Department Country Reports on Human Rights:

"The activities of women are restricted closely both by law and tradition. For example, a woman is prohibited from applying for a driver's license unless she has permission from a male guardian. This restriction does not apply to noncitizen women. The Government adheres to Shari'a in matters of inheritance and child custody. While Muslim wives have the right to inherit from their husbands, non-Muslim wives do not, unless a special exemption is arranged. In cases of divorce, Shari'a prevails; younger children remain with the mother and older children with the father. Both parents retain permanent rights of visitation. However, local authorities do not allow a noncitizen parent to take his or her child out of the country without permission of the citizen parent. There has been a steady increase in the number and severity of complaints of spousal abuse by the foreign wives of local and foreign men. Women may attend court proceedings but generally are represented by a male relative; however, women may represent themselves.

Women largely are relegated to the roles of mother and homemaker, but some women are now finding jobs in education, medicine, and the news media. Women appear to receive equal pay for equal work; however, they often do not receive equal allowances. These allowances generally cover transportation and housing costs. Increasingly, women are receiving government scholarships to pursue degrees at universities overseas. The Amir has entrusted his second wife, who is the mother of the Heir Apparent, with the high-profile task of establishing a university in Doha. In 1996 the Government appointed its first female undersecretary, in the Ministry of Education. Although women legally are able to travel abroad alone, tradition and social pressures cause most to travel with male escorts. There also have been complaints that Qatari husbands take their foreign spouses' passports and, without prior approval, turn them in for Qatari citizenship documents. The husbands then inform their wives that the wives have lost their former citizenship. In other cases, foreign wives report being forbidden

by their Qatari husbands or in-laws to visit or to contact foreign embassies.

There is no independent women's rights organization, nor has the Government permitted the establishment of one."

FACT NO. 3. TRADE HAS FAILED TO BRING  
FREEDOM TO QATAR

The U.S. State Department calls oil "the cornerstone of Qatar's economy," accounting for more than 70 percent of total government revenue. Starting in 1973, oil production increased dramatically, bringing Qatar out of the ranks of the world's poorest countries and providing it one of the world's highest per-capita incomes. But freedom did not follow.

Accordingly to the State Department, "Qatar's heavy industrial projects . . . include a refinery with 50,000 barrels-per-day capacity, a fertilizer plant for urea and ammonia, a steel plant, and a petrochemical plant. All these industries use gas for fuel. Most are joint ventures between European and Japanese firms and the state-owned Qatar General Petroleum Corporation. The U.S. is the major equipment supplier for Qatar's oil and gas industry, and U.S. companies are playing a major role in North Field gas development." So here we see Qatar's commercial sector and government-controlled oil industry directly engaged with outside interests—the European Union, Japan and the United States.

We are constantly told this is how freedom takes root in unfree countries—whether it's China, or Vietnam, or Qatar. It is not true. Despite billions upon billions of dollars worth of engagement between Western commercial interests and Qatar, the people in Qatar have no freedom of speech, no freedom of assembly, no freedom of religion, no freedom of association. And women are still subjected.

OCTOBER MARKS DOMESTIC  
VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, October marks Domestic Violence Awareness Month, and I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) for arranging Members to come to the floor and remind my colleagues about October as Domestic Violence Awareness Month.

This is a time of heightened awareness of the problem, and a time to discuss what our society and local communities can do to help. I would like at this time to talk briefly about the Call to Protect program. As a participant in this program, my offices have collected thousands of phones from around the country to donate to victims of domestic violence.

Call to Protect is a domestic violence prevention project. It provides those in danger with instant access to help in the form of a wireless phone. Donated phones are programmed so that victims can reach emergency personnel with a click of the button. This gives victims the power to protect themselves rather than live in fear.

This program has helped thousands of women. One success story is particularly close to me as it happened in my district. Brandon Pope, a 5-year-old

boy, used a donated phone to save his mother's life in Centralia, Illinois. Brandon's mother, Sandra, was a victim of systemic abuse from her husband. She sought assistance from a domestic abuse help center, and received an emergency wireless phone through the Call to Protect program.

Unfortunately, the physical effects of the domestic abuse caused Sandra to have occasional seizures. In February, Sandra suffered a particular strong seizure that caused her to fall and lose consciousness. Having learned about 9-1-1 in his Head Start class, Brandon used his mom's wireless phone to call for help. Paramedics arrived on the scene and quickly administered treatment. The wireless phone donated to Sandra was the family's only means of communication.

This is only one story of many where ordinary citizens and community organizations come to the aid of a victim of domestic abuse.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to especially thank the Cellular Telecommunications Industry Association, CTIA, who run the Call to Protect program; and Motorola who refurbishes all of the donated phones so victims have access to emergency numbers. Due to the services of these companies, this program truly saves lives.

NO RED LINE THAT TERRORISTS  
WILL NOT CROSS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, the Cold War is over, and the world is a more dangerous place. September 11 and the carnage that followed proved to us that there is no red line. There is no line that terrorists will not cross. There is no limit to what they might and in fact will do.

We are in a race with terrorists to prevent them from getting a better delivery system for chemical and biological agents, to get nuclear waste material to explode in a bomb, a conventional bomb, or even to get a nuclear weapon. They will use all of those weapons because there is no red line to them.

It is not a question of if we will face a chemical or biological attack. As we are finding out, it is a question of when, where and of what magnitude. Not every attack will be the thousand-year storm or the hundred-year storm, and we are not going to wait on our roofs with an umbrella over our heads in anticipation of that. We are going to get on with our lives, but we need to know that we are truly in a race.

We are at war. This war requires us to do what three commissions have told us: The Gilmore Commission, the Bremer Commission, and the Hart-Rudman Commission. They said we need to have a proper assessment of the terrorist threat, we need to have a strategy to face this terrorist threat, and

we need to organize our government to be more effective.

Tom Ridge and his Office of Homeland Security is going to have to work overtime in understanding what we face, making the assessment of the terrorist threat with others who will be helping him, and develop that strategy and then organize the government to respond.

One of the issues that we will be debating tomorrow is airport security. I am amazed with the amount of time and effort that is being spent discussing whether they be Federal employees or not Federal employees. That is not the issue. The issue is safety. They could be Federal employees and provide very good service to the country, and they could not be and provide very good service to the country. The key is that they be professionals, that they view this as a job that they want to develop an expertise in, and that they gain knowledge and provide tremendous energy in carrying out their duties.

My biggest concern with airport security is obviously safety. It is safety in making sure that we do not have bombs in the belly of aircraft. As things stand now, we do not check the luggage when it is put in the plane, and I am grateful that the majority party has looked to address this issue, that they are putting in the manager's amendment an amendment that will require that by the end of the year 2003, that all baggage will be checked that goes in the belly of an airplane to make sure that we do not have Pan Am 103 and others like it in the years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the Special Order by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) about the *Lutjens* and its respect for our American sailors touched my heart as well, and I am happy the gentleman talked about it today.

AIRLINE SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, the topic I want to talk about tonight, and I am pleased very much to be joined by several of my colleagues, including the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS), the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), and the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HART), is the topic that we will be debating on the floor tomorrow, and it is a topic of great concern for every single American, and that is the security of our airline system and our air travel system here in this country.

Tomorrow we will debate airline security legislation, and it is very important that we do that because we are

being urged by some to rush to judgment and pass the bill that the Senate has already passed.

□ 1830

I do not think it is appropriate to ever rush to judgment when you are legislating. Legislation becomes permanent, it becomes the law of the land, and it is binding and cannot be changed until the Congress meets again to change it. And so I think we have a duty to do that conscientiously and thoughtfully.

I want to begin by talking about what this debate is really about and what it is not about. First of all and most importantly, for the people of America, for American families who vacation by taking an airplane someplace and for American businesswomen and businessmen who have to travel on our Nation's airlines to do the business of this Nation, the issue is, how do we create the absolute safest, most secure airline system and air passenger system in the world?

As is sadly often the case in these debates on the floor, a lot of people try to hide the ball and not focus on what really is the issue. I think it is very, very important to understand that both sides in this debate believe passionately that we need to create the safest system. One side says, the Senate bill has already done that; the other side is saying, "No, wait a minute, let's take a look at that legislation."

But I want it understood that, although people may have heard that this is a partisan debate, I and my colleagues who will speak tonight on this issue do not believe that this is a partisan issue. We believe that this is an issue solely about the safety of our airline system, aviation safety in America and how to create the best possible system and the safest possible system. There is not a Republican way to do that or a Democrat way to do that, and this is not about somebody's motives. This is about how do we do it best, how do we create the best and the safest system.

Those of us who will be arguing for the House bill tomorrow and arguing it for tonight genuinely believe that it is a better piece of legislation, that it will go further and do more to protect the American people, and that there are serious problems with the Senate bill. I do not question the motives of the Senators who wrote the Senate bill. I do not question that they intended to make some mistakes in that bill; they did not intend to make mistakes. But as this discussion tonight, I think, will illustrate, there are some serious flaws in that legislation that deserve to be debated and scrutinized and analyzed; and if, in fact, they are flaws, then they ought to be corrected in the process. That is what we are trying to do.

Secondly, having said that this is about creating the safest aviation system in the world, I want to make it

very, very clear that this is not about the current system. I want to put up a chart here that shows that system.

A few moments ago on this floor, one of my colleagues stood up and said that the proponents of the House bill want to, and this is a direct quote, he said, perpetuate that system, referring to the current system of aviation security; and he said they wanted to do that because it is profitable for the companies, and he said we want to keep the same companies that are currently doing the job.

I want it understood in the clearest possible terms that every one of my colleagues in this Congress and every American can download the House bill and can discover for themselves what I am about to tell you, and that is that those statements that the House bill perpetuate the current system, that we are doing so because it is profitable for those companies and that we would keep the same companies are absolutely, totally, abjectly false and no honest debate can go forward on untruthful information.

The current system in America which that Member of Congress was referring to requires the airlines of America, American Airlines in my home State, America West, United, you pick it, to hire the guards that perform the screening of passengers as they board airplanes. They are hired by the airlines and they are private companies. I want to refer to this chart over here. Under the current system, the airlines hire private companies and there is absolutely no Federal supervision, no Federal law enforcement supervision of the personnel that do those jobs.

Let me make this point clear; I want to drive it home over and over again in this debate. No one is proposing that we keep that system. No one is proposing that we continue to rely on the existing airlines to hire the current private companies. So all the anecdotal information that you heard here on the floor about those companies are being indicted, those companies have hired felons, those companies underpay, those companies have perhaps even lied or perjured themselves, none of that is relevant to this debate because the current system is gone. It is absolutely, totally gone.

The airlines, following the effective date of this legislation, will not hire or be responsible for hiring or paying for the individuals who do the screening. Under the House committee bill, the Transportation Committee bill, the bill that I believe is a more thoughtful and better product, responsibility for airline security, aviation security, is handed over to the Federal Government and it is performed by Federal law enforcement personnel at every single site. Let me just put up a little chart that shows that.

This is a schematic of the system that would be in existence following the passage of this legislation. If you see this little green man down here, he

is a passenger. When they come on board, that passenger's baggage, carry-on baggage is screened, right here. Federal personnel are at that gate, are at that checkpoint to screen that carry-on baggage. His checked baggage goes through, and as the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) was just explaining, that checked baggage will be screened by personnel who are either Federal employees or who are being currently supervised at that site, at that moment, by Federal employees.

You go on through the system and there are other personnel, there is camera surveillance, there are Federal marshals. Every little blue man that you see on this screen is Federal Government law enforcement personnel or is somebody trained and currently being supervised right on site, at that location, by a Federal Government employee who is a law enforcement officer.

The difference, and we will go into this in greater detail as we continue this discussion, between the House bill and the Senate bill, which I believe is flawed, and we will walk through the flaws in the Senate bill, is that they say in the Senate bill, every single employee on this screen, indeed perhaps the food handlers, perhaps the people who clean the planes, perhaps the mechanics, would have to be a Federal employee or at least they would have to be screened by a Federal employee; and we say it can be a mix. We support that mix because that is in fact the system that is used throughout Europe and in Israel by El Al, the airline that is the most targeted of any airline in the world.

I just want to make this point one more time. You are going to hear all day tomorrow that this is terrible. I just want to read these points again because they are so important. The gentleman actually accused Members on this side of the aisle and some of the leadership on this side of the aisle of wanting to perpetuate the current system because it is profitable to the current companies, and they want to keep those same companies.

That is abjectly false. The current system is gone. No longer will airlines hire the screening personnel, no longer will they be the employees of Argenbright or the other companies, they will in fact be private contractors, contracted to the Federal Government and overseen by Federal Government employees on site, law enforcement personnel.

I want to turn to one more point before I defer to some of my colleagues. We talked a little bit about the Senate bill, and I want to just lay the groundwork for the key problems with that Senate bill which we are being urged to just adopt, go ahead and adopt it, and tomorrow it will be here on the floor as either a substitute or it will be here on the floor as a motion to recommit. Let us talk about some of the problems with that Senate bill just in outline form before I turn to some of my colleagues.

Number one, one of the most critical problems on September 11 was that some of the terrorists penetrated our system, although there is no evidence that there was a failure by the screening personnel at any airport because the weapons they carried on board were legal at the time, but they penetrated the system by going to small airports and flying from those small airports to bigger airports. At least it is clear they tried to do it in that fashion.

One of the incredible things about the Senate bill is, it treats small airports and big airports differently. It assigns the responsibility for large airports to the Attorney General and says that will be Federal. But it says, on the other hand, if it is a small airport, well, he, the Attorney General, can decide to hand that responsibility over to local law enforcement.

I would suggest that if local law enforcement is good enough for small airports, it is good enough for large airports, and if it is not good enough for large airports, it is not good enough for small airports. We cannot have a separate standard.

In my State of Arizona, we have a couple of very, very large airports. If you go through those, you would go through one standard. But if you get on at one of the smaller airports in a small town like Yuma or Flagstaff or Prescott or Page, when you land in Phoenix, you are inside the security perimeter. You do not get checked again.

Why in the world would we have an unequal standard, an unequal set of responsibilities, for those different size airports under this legislation? I think it is a serious flaw. I do not think the drafters of the Senate bill intended it, but it is there.

There is another problem with regard to that, and that is the fairness of the fees. The Senate legislation says, if you are lucky enough to fly from a big airport to another big airport, you are going to pay one fee. If you are not lucky enough to do that, because you live in a small State or in a small town and you have to fly a small commuter plane from your small town to a big city, you pay at least double the fee of anyone who lives in a large city. That seems to me to be unfair.

Another issue in the Senate bill, and I just want to touch on these briefly in outline form and we can go into greater detail later, there is a clear question about the accountability of the Federal employees that are mandated in this Senate bill, which creates a strait-jacket and says every single employee must be a Federal employee because by getting their paycheck from the Federal Government, somehow that would make the airlines safe.

The problem with that language is detailed, and I will go into it later, but fundamentally it is not clear that those employees do not have civil service protection. Nowhere in the bill does it say that they do not have the civil service protection created by title 5. It

does not say that they are at-will employees, though I know that some of the sponsors of the Senate bill believe they are at-will employees, and it does not exempt them from civil service in the same fashion as we have done in the past.

I want to touch briefly on the House bill, just to make sure that everybody understands that legislation and understands it clearly, as contrasted with the current system which is a flawed system and which, although my colleague attacked it earlier and said that is what we were trying to have, that is not at all what we are trying to have.

The current House bill, created by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the bill of the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) says, number one, there will be Federal supervision of screening personnel at every single security gate, at every single baggage check location. You will all be screened at a location where there are federally trained people present, including law enforcement officers or military personnel, with the capability and the ability to question someone trying to board a plane and, if necessary, to make an arrest of that person.

Second, it says that there will be Federal personnel at every checkpoint.

Third, it sets Federal standards.

And, fourth, it requires that they be either Federal law enforcement personnel or, as is happening in the case right now, military personnel. I could go on talking about these issues, but I know there are many of my colleagues that would like to get in on this discussion.

Let me first start with the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS).

□ 1845

Mr. BASS. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I was glad to yield to my friend from New York to make it possible to bring this important piece of legislation to the floor tomorrow. It is important. It is important because Americans demand, expect and will get aviation safety with the passage of the bill we are going to consider tomorrow.

My good friend from Arizona has talked at some length about the differences between the Senate and the House bill, and they are significant, and they are important, and it is critical that this body adopt the Mica-Young version of the bill, because it does what it needs to do, it does it quickly, and it does it effectively.

There are four aspects of this bill that are important to understand.

Number one, the Republican bill provides for real safety. It has enhanced security screening by creating Federal standards, Federal control, Federal supervision, but it does it quickly and it does it without months and possibly years of training that it would take to get personnel in place under the bill passed by the Senate.

It also provides for accountability. It provides for a zero tolerance policy for every federally certified baggage screener.

It provides for quality, incorporating the very best manager practices by hiring qualified baggage screeners and going through thorough background checks and investigation. We have heard a lot of rhetoric about how the status quo will continue under the Republican plan. Well, my friend from Arizona from the very beginning has pointed out the system will be different, the system will be reliable, and the system we are proposing will work.

Let me give Members some observations about where I see airport security at this point. As one who myself, and I think almost everybody else in this body, we are frequent fliers and we fly back and forth to our districts every week. The reality of it is that airport security today, in my opinion, is dysfunctional. You have huge lines for checking bags, and little or no baggage screening. You have enormous lines in some concourses for security screening.

I was up at an airport in the area the other day, I paced it off, there was a 1,000-foot line to get through two security screening areas. There were three available, but only two were running.

The airlines need to get the business customer back. Otherwise, this body and this government is going to be subsidizing the airline industry indefinitely. If we want exactly what we have to do, 1,000-foot lines, dysfunctional airports, vote for the substitute motion, vote for the Senate bill, because what it does is it institutes a system which is totally federally employed that will not be flexible, will not be able to reflect the realities of having to provide efficient, quick, but effective safety procedures at airports, and we will have what we have today indefinitely. We will wait for 4 or 5 years for new rules to come to make minor changes that will make airline systems run better.

Under the Republican plan, or under the plan that I support, there is Federal supervision, Federal rule making, Federal standards, but the airport authorities can adjust the system to reflect for the size of the airport or the type of system or the way the building is constructed. The employees can be trained where they qualify from the existing workforce, and it happens quickly.

But what is most important about this is that the airlines will have some input in being able to attract the business customer back by offering innovative ways for frequent fliers to get from one side of the airport to the other.

Let me give an example. If you fly two or three times a week and you are willing to undergo a complete background check, maybe a retinal scan and other things, maybe you can get to your gate more quickly than somebody who does not fly very much at all or somebody that does not want to divulge any personal information.

This kind of a concept, which could easily be implemented under the Republican plan, is unlikely to be practical under the Senate plan because the Senate plan is a one-size-fits-all approach to a problem that differs in every single airport.

I hope that Americans understand that Democrats, Republicans, the Senate, the House, liberals, conservatives, we all share the same objective, and that objective is moving forward in a productive manner to provide real, serious, effective and quick airport safety. I would suggest to my friend from Arizona and to the Speaker that our plan will do it, and it will do it right.

Mr. SHADEGG. I thank the gentleman for his participation. I know he has thoughtfully studied this legislation and cares very much, as we all do, about airline security, about making sure we have the safest system, and not about doing a quick and easy fix of just saying well, if we make them Federal employees, that will solve the problem.

There are serious problems with the Senate bill, beginning with this issue of should we have a different set of responsibilities for small airports and should people who live in small towns pay a different price?

The gentleman is from New Hampshire. I wonder if he has given the question any thought of why should we have different responsibility at those smaller airports than we have at the larger airports and how fair is it to say to people who live in small towns, you are going to pay more than people who live in large towns?

Mr. BASS. If the gentleman will yield further briefly, when you have a system that applies a block standard at this point and a block standard at that point, you tend to get situations that do not work in some instances.

Let me give one example. I note with some dismay that airport parking lots now that are within 300 yards, I believe, of the terminal, are blocked off. In some instances, in the Manchester Airport in New Hampshire, that means that two-thirds of the entire parking area is blocked off and cannot be used and you cannot go around. I can go through the details.

But the fact is that if we continue with the system that has been implemented now, these airports are going to continue to be dysfunctional. We need to have a system that applies the same standards to all the airports, big or small, so we do not have the situation discussed earlier where we do not have people properly checked getting into a properly screened area, but, secondly, these airport authorities need to get waivers and be able to make the airports work.

Mr. SHADEGG. We are joined by my colleague the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE). I know he has concerns about this disparate treatment of small versus large airports.

Mr. THUNE. I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding, and I would simply echo some of what my colleague

from New Hampshire said, that those of us who represent more rural areas of the country, this creates enormous problems.

I again would harken back to what the gentleman from Arizona said in his opening remarks, and that is the overriding concern here ought to be safety. We have got a lot of discussion and debate that will go on the floor tomorrow, there already has been in the buildup to this debate, and there has been a lot of talk about who ought to do this checking, and there has been some argument whether it ought to be Federal employees, whether it ought to be private contractors.

I think the bottom line is, it ought to be the best system put in place that will enable us to provide the highest level of security and safety for people who travel.

Frankly, the bill that we will debate tomorrow, the Mica-Young bill that came out of the committee, and I serve on the Subcommittee on Aviation of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, does not in fact preclude the use of Federal employees. In fact, it steps up Federal standards, Federal supervision, Federal enforcement, and in many cases there will be Federal employees who are employed for the specific purpose of providing security and safety to air travelers as they travel through the airports in this country and get from their origin to their destination.

But the bottom line, again, Mr. Speaker, and I would say harkening back to what the gentleman said earlier, is this really is about safety. What is the best system? How do we achieve the objective of making sure that people in this country who travel are protected and are safe and secure until they get to their destination, without respect to the argument about whether or not they should be or should not be Federal employees. That is an issue which, frankly, the discretion is provided to the administration. The President has asked for this authority in this particular legislation for him to decide, for the FAA, the DOT, the Justice Department, to decide if in fact these ought to be Federal employees.

Now, there are circumstances in which it might make sense to come up with another practice which would achieve the same level of safety, be more efficient and more cost-effective, and that is a decision that, frankly, our legislation allows, that basically puts it under the auspices of the administration. That is what the President has requested, and it gives him the flexibility and the discretion, and I think that is an approach that makes a lot of sense.

Now, let me speak specifically, if I might, again, to the points raised earlier about the impact of the Senate legislation, if it becomes the final law of the land, on smaller, more rural airports.

I come from a state that has 77,000 square miles and 730,000 people. Under

the Senate legislation, as I read it, as I understand it, there is only one airport of the seven in my State of South Dakota that would be covered under the 142 airport standard in the Senate bill, which essentially relegates the other six airports in South Dakota to the status of second class airports.

We are going to have different standards of safety and security for people who travel and board airplanes in Waukegan and Aberdeen and Huron and Pierre and Rapid City than those who board planes in L.A. and San Francisco and Chicago and Boston and places like that.

So I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that that makes a lot of sense. I do not think we want to create a two-tiered system, a two-class system, in effect, which will essentially treat travelers in rural areas of the country better than those who board airplanes at the more populated areas in the urban areas of this country.

The second thing that has already been noted is not only does it provide or apply a different level of safety and security to people who board at rural airports, it also assesses them a higher fee. They are going to in effect subsidize people who fly from larger airports for levels of safety and security that they are not going to have the same level set for rural airports.

So I think for a lot of reasons, one, it applies a different level, a different standard, to people who board at airports in smaller rural airports in this country, and secondly, it charges passengers a higher fee, because it imposes the fee on each leg of the flight.

I can tell you, there are no places in South Dakota that get direct service. There are no direct flights from Washington, D.C. to any destinations in South Dakota. We always connect through Minneapolis, through Chicago or St. Louis, and we think we are fortunate to have the air service that we have in my area of the country. But, nevertheless, we do not believe we ought to pay more for that service than people in other parts of the country, and that is in effect what the Senate bill does.

For that reason, it is inherently unfair. I think if one looks at the legislation that we are going to consider tomorrow and how that treats people all around the country, again, it emphasizes and puts in specific priority on making sure that we have a new system in place.

I think the gentleman from Arizona noted in his opening remarks as well that there is not anything about this legislation that accepts as a premise that anything in the current system will stay in place. It is just flatly not true.

We have had our colleagues on the other side of the aisle get up and say that the Republicans want to lock in and their leadership wants to lock in the failed system that we have today. That is patently, flatly untrue, because

the system we have today, as the gentleman from Arizona noted, is the airlines who hire those companies. This requires new Federal standards, new Federal supervision, new enforcement. It creates a new, entirely new, system.

So trying to make this a debate about whether we retain the old system is irrelevant. It is not a valid part of this debate. It ought to be discarded. People who are listening to this debate should just tune it out. But that is what we will hear tomorrow.

I also think that the whole issue of whether or not it ought to be Federal employees or not Federal employees, as politically controversial as that may be in the course of the debate, is not the fundamental issue. The fundamental issue is how can we put the safest system in place in the most efficient and cost-effective way that serves the traveling public in this country and treats passengers all across the United States in an equal and fair way?

My concern, as I come to this debate and I look at the legislation that came out of the Senate, is it does create a two-class system. It does create a system that treats unequally people who board from airports in more rural areas of this country, smaller airports, and those in the more populated urban areas, and it also penalizes them by forcing them to pay a higher fee. I find that to be incredibly unfair. I do not think it makes sense.

I think, frankly, that the legislation that we will act on here tomorrow, that the Young-Mica bill puts those safeguards in place, air marshals, strengthens our cockpits, makes sure we have highly screened carry-on and checked baggage through the highest of inspection equipment, well-positioned, multilayered security forces at all the points throughout the airport, and again we are not excluding or saying that they these should not be Federal employees. We are simply saying that the experts who understand this ought to be making the decisions and that they have a different idea about what works in Rapid City, South Dakota, than what works in Buffalo New York, and that that ought to be a decision they have the flexibility to make.

That is what the President has requested, I think it makes sense, and as we are going to have this discussion tomorrow, it is important that we debunk all the myths that will be put out by the other side who really want to convert this into a political debate rather than a debate about the safety of the traveling public.

So I appreciate the gentleman taking time this evening to discuss this issue. I yield back to him.

Mr. SHADEGG. I thank the gentleman. Let me comment. I want to thank the gentleman for bringing out some of the points that I think are so important to this debate.

As the chart here shows, the current system, which is what was attacked by our colleagues on the other side yesterday and today, just before we started,

no doubt if there is an hour special order after ours it will be attacked later, that the current system does not work and that the companies operating it are corrupt.

That system is gone, and I appreciate the gentleman pointing out that the House bill is very, very difficult different from that.

I also think it is important that the gentleman has brought out the fine point, and it is an important distinction, that the House bill, the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure bill that some of us believe is the more thoughtful legislation, is being supported by editorials by the Wall Street Journal, the New York Times, the L.A. Times, USA Today, the Chicago Tribune, the Washington Times, the Arizona Republic and USA Today. That legislation importantly does not say that they cannot be Federal employees or that they must be Federal employees.

□ 1900

What it says, as the gentleman accurately points out, is that that is the kind of technical decision on the implementation of the legislation that should not be made by Federal mandate, should not be proscribed and commanded by the Congress as saying, we want the safest skies, but the only way to get there is this way.

I think the gentleman made an excellent point in saying that the Secretary of Transportation under the House bill could, in fact, choose to make them all Federal employees, make some of them Federal employees. Many of them will be Federal employees, but the discretion is left there.

I would quote from the Washington Post in its editorial. They said, referring to this issue of all-Federal or a mix of Federal and private that "Security could work either way, as long as there is a government agency in charge dedicated to safety only and insisting on overseeing high standards in hiring and training." That is in the House bill. That is what we have. It goes on to point out that a number of European countries and Israel use a mix of private and public.

But I think the gentleman dealt very well with this issue in pointing out that in the House bill, we simply choose not to create a straightjacket saying we want a safe air system and oh, by the way, we, the Congress, know how to do that. Rather, we just say, we want a safe air system; you figure out the right mix and the right way to do that.

I thank the gentleman for his comments. I particularly appreciate his comments about the idiocy of charging people in small towns who have to fly multiple segments more money for the system and having, quite frankly, a different set of responsibilities for those.

If the gentleman wants to add anything further, please do.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I could not agree more. I think the gentleman is

exactly right in his assessment in how this impacts different people in different parts of the country. Again, the debate will be shifted tomorrow, as the gentleman has noted, by the other side to try and make this about somehow codifying a failed system that is currently in place. That is absolutely untrue.

This is a system which creates the strongest standards, but I do not think, again, the gentleman made the point, that we as a Congress ought to be making that determination. Frankly, there are people who are a lot better equipped to make those decisions than we are.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, let me yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I know the gentleman has a lot of transportation experts here, and unfortunately, I have an engagement I want to go to. But one of the central questions here is, do we want to support the President of the United States or not. It is that basic.

It amazes me, as I watch television on Sundays, that every week across the aisle, there is a new Senator born who is an expert on security. Yet, I do not recall them being named to any key security committee. They are not in charge on the homeland security. They have not been the foremost experts on terrorism. Yet, suddenly, there are 100 experts on terrorism in the United States Senate, and they want to second-guess the President's team.

I think at this time it is important for us to be supportive of the President and his team of experts, and non-partisan because this is a nonpartisan issue. I am just appalled that every week there is a new Senator who seems to think he has a lock on all of the intelligence that we need to fight terrorism.

I feel real strongly that this House bill gives the President and future presidents, Democrat or Republican, the flexibility they need to secure not just the airways, but all modes of transportation in America. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for participating. I think he makes an excellent point.

The President has said that the Senate bill has problems in it, and we have been talking about some of those problems. One of the problems is, it says there is just one way to do this. The President has said, no, he thinks there are multiple ways to do it. No less than the Washington Post, not exactly an arch right-wing organization, has said, yes, the House bill is a reasonable bill and it would do the job. We just need to get it passed.

I also commend the gentleman for pointing out that as sad as the debate tomorrow will be on the issue of partisanship and one side attacking the other side, saying that because we do not support the Senate bill it is because we are partisan or we are Republican or we love the companies that are

currently doing the job, which is rather ridiculous, this really is not a partisan issue. This is about how we make our skies as safe as possible.

On that point, one of the arguments that has been made over here is that we really cannot ever delegate this kind of responsibility to anything other than Federal law enforcement personnel. Well, I came to the United States Congress having in a past life been a member of the Arizona attorney general's office. I spent my life in law enforcement, and my dad was a deputy sheriff before that.

I will tell my colleagues that I do not know many law enforcement personnel who believe standing in front of a screen looking at whether the image inside there reflects a knife or a gun or something is necessarily a law enforcement function, and certainly they do not think that as law enforcement officers, they want to spend their days saying, would you please empty your pockets of change and will you take your laptop out of your briefcase and put it on the shelf, the notion that every person at a checkpoint who says to you, will you please take out your laptop or the change out of your pockets has to be a law enforcement officer.

But on this point of whether or not some of these functions could be performed by a mix of law enforcement personnel and contract personnel who are not Federal law enforcement personnel, I think there is some precedence. I am glad we are joined by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), and I would like to yield to him to address that specific issue.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I would also like to thank the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) for pointing out the difference between the House bill and the Senate bill in treating airports differently.

I represent a district which largely uses O'Hare. We are going to have the highest technical level of security. But we are a feeder airport, and if passengers arriving at O'Hare are coming from rural airports that are not protected, then we are not protected. So his point is exactly right, that the Senate bill does not offer the level of protection that the House bill does.

We want to federalize airport security, but not rigidly nationalize the system. I must note that all 19 hijackers of the September 11 attack were admitted to the United States by Federal workers. While most Federal workers are hard-working, idealistic Americans, their status as civil servants does not guarantee safety in our skies. We must do better. We need an airport security bill in this Congress; we cannot accept the current status quo.

I would note that 90 percent of the screeners at Dulles Airport were not American citizens. Some of the screeners in our country who let terrorists aboard were illegal aliens.

Our bill would replace those screeners with American citizens, and we stand for the basic principle that U.S.

citizens should protect U.S. citizens at U.S. airports.

Our bill also requires that all screeners be deputized, Federal transportation security agents. They will have a common uniform, badge, and arrest powers. Their mission will be clear: As Federal transportation security agents, they will ensure that when we fly, we fly safe.

We want these agents to have arrest powers under rules in which they are highly paid and trained. Our models for such security arrangements are two: Israel's El Al Airlines and the U.S. Marshals' Court Security Officer Program.

With regard to El Al, El Al Airlines has operated under a 30-year threat from terrorism. The combined El Al team has defeated attempts by the PLO, the PFLB, Black September and Hezbollah to hijack Israeli airlines. El Al has evolved into a public-private partnership, and its partners in the Israeli Government, as well as its contractors, Israeli Security Agency and Mossad, have formed a team that has defeated all terrorist attacks in the past. I will note that Mossad regularly tries to screen weapons and explosives aboard Israeli aircraft to test the screeners, and if those screeners fail, they are discharged.

Similarly, let us look at a U.S. program, the U.S. Marshals' Court Security Officer Program. This program started in 1983 and currently employs over 3,000 court security officers. They are privately contracted employees, but they are recruited exclusively with 3 years' minimum police experience. Unlike the current airport screeners that failed us, these court security officers are paid \$16 to \$24 an hour. Their mission is to protect judges, witnesses, juries, prosecutors, and courthouses.

In the courtrooms they face a daunting security threat, a much higher threat, I would note, than what screeners face at airports, and we can think of who would come to a Federal courtroom: mobsters, terrorists, drug gangs, mass murderers. But these court security officers perform their function and perform it well with one key difference between them and civil servants. Court security officers can be discharged immediately for allowing weapons and explosives into a courtroom.

We provide for all screeners in our bill to be U.S. citizens and to be deputized Federal transportation security agents. We give them standards, supervision, and training, but we do not protect them from their own criminal activity or incompetence. Worse than having no screener is a screener who has job protection that would allow him to permit weapons to kill more Americans aboard an aircraft.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I wanted to insert into his remarks actually a direct quote from Frank Durinckx, the director of the Belgium Aviation Inspectorate, and he is the guy in Belgium

who oversees their security. He says, "It is harder to do quality control on our own government people." And the reason he said that is, government agencies do not like to criticize themselves or one another, and civil servants are hard to get rid of if they are not performing.

He goes on to say, "If we give the work to a private contractor, we have control over them. If we are not pleased with the screener, we can withdraw his license. If we are not pleased with a company, we can get rid of a company."

That is exactly what the gentleman is saying. It gives the United States far more flexibility, and this is security we are talking about. This is not politics, this is not creating jobs; this is a security program.

So I appreciate the gentleman for letting me stick that into his comments, but I thought it was very relevant.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I will note that European security officials have started out exclusively with public employees, but they have modified their structure into a public-private partnership, so that now 31 of 35 European airports are this public-private partnership, to ensure the quality of the screening personnel. This was a mixture that allowed them to defeat terrorist threats from the Bader-Meinhof Gang, the Red Brigades, the ELP and the IRA, and it has been a very effective tool used by both our European and Israeli allies.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, what is so relevant to this is that we are not alone in this. We do not have to go out and invent something, we just need to follow the model in Europe and in Israel and in Ireland, because they have been living with terrorist threats for 20, maybe, years, or even 30 years. So we have a tried and true method. It is not speculation. They do know because they have experimented.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I will note that it has been 25 years since an Israeli aircraft has been successfully attacked.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time just a moment, if I might, maybe the gentleman would want to refer to these charts, because they make the point he is making.

This is the private-public partnership that is in place in Europe. If we look at this chart, we will see that it shows the countries that have switched to, instead of a 100 percent government employee operation, to a mix of government supervision and training, but with some private-sector employees actually doing some of the work. It began in, I believe, 1982, and if we look at the dates on here, it shows the dates on which all of these countries switched to that private-public partnership.

This is a second chart that kind of follows on to that, and it shows the

mix of what we have. That is, for example, this is the number of private-sector employees and the number of public-sector employees in each of those locations. So we look at this and we see that in Norway necessity has 150 private-sector employees supervised by 20 public-sector employees, and in various other countries, across the map we can look at that in Brussels, it is 700 private-sector employees supervised by 50 public-sector employees. It illustrates precisely the points that the gentleman has been making.

Then I think he was just about to talk about what the effect of that was going to be. This shows the trend beginning in 1982 of how they went to this private mix, and I think the last point, maybe I will let the gentleman discuss this chart, which I hope he has seen, which shows what is happening. The gentleman was about to say it has been quite some time since there has been a hijacking in Israel which uses this kind of mix.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, it is. I was very honored to be able to contact Israel's Ambassador David Ivry who dispatched a team from Israel to brief the Congress and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure in particular on this.

□ 1915

We had six to nine Members there, about 70 staffers. We looked at not just the screening problem, but they took the airport security problem as layers of an onion. Each layer had to work. Transportation security, El Al, had to be able to task Mossad with tasks to collect foreign intelligence. We had to take care of the tarmac, the ramp, the gates, and then the aircraft itself.

Mr. Speaker, this is a life or death function. We need to be able to discharge screeners who allow weapons aboard the aircraft. We have the models. We have looked at El Al. We looked at the Marshal Court Security Officer Program, and we have learned the lessons of security that have worked well against Hezbollah, the PFLP, the El Rukin drug gangs and the Mafia.

Our bill ensures highly trained professionals with a badge will protect us, but also that their supervisor will have the power to be able to replace screeners who fail us in this life or death mission.

I will also note that our bill makes one other change. In the chairman's amendment we have a deadline that by December, 2003, all baggage will be screened. The Secretary of Transportation has focused particular attention on the government's deployment of the CTx 550 machines that will enable us to reach our goal of having all the baggage entering not just the passenger compartment but also the cargo hold to be screened for weapons and explosives. That gives us the critical edge in security that this bill would provide.

I thank the gentleman for organizing this special order.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, let me just ask the gentleman a couple dif-

ferent points to make sure I understand this.

This screening requirement for baggage says all baggage must be screened by December 2003. That is currently not being done. I heard our colleagues on the other side railing about the fact that that is not currently being done, but if I am not correct, and I would yield to the gentleman to answer this, that requirement that 100 percent be screened by December 2003 is nowhere in the Senate bill whatsoever, is it?

Mr. KIRK. Correct. In fact, this bill will give us a security system that is even stronger than Israel's. Even El Al at this time does not screen all baggage that enters the cargo hold for weapons and explosives. But under the House Republican bill, we have a deadline of December 2003 that, when using the CTx 550 and other technologies, all bags will be screened. That will give us the world's highest level of security standard.

Mr. SHADEGG. That requirement is not in the Senate bill, which we are going to be urged to pass?

Mr. KIRK. It is not.

Mr. SHADEGG. The gentleman referred to the requirement that all screeners be U.S. citizens. Is that in the Senate bill we are going to be asked to pass tomorrow?

Mr. KIRK. That is, but that is a critical difference from the current status quo, which we are against. Over half of all the screeners in the United States are not American citizens. Over 90 percent of the screeners at Dulles were not American citizens. In fact, prior to the September 11 attack, the Department of Transportation Inspector General was leading an investigation of illegal aliens who were serving as airport screeners.

All of this will come to a stop under our bill.

Mr. SHADEGG. So when somebody attacks the current system in the debate later tonight or tomorrow and says, well, the other side, our side, the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure majority side wants to retain the current system, on that point they would be dead wrong and that argument would be unfair, would it not?

Mr. KIRK. No. Well over half of the 20,000 screeners, by the terms of our bill, would automatically be discharged from their duties because they are not American citizens. We would have to upgrade to the new system under regulations and supervision by the Department of Transportation under the Secretary for Security, and these people would be badged Federal transportation security officers with full arrest powers at the screening site.

Mr. SHADEGG. My understanding is that also there is no requirement in the Senate bill that they have to speak English. Is that correct?

Mr. KIRK. That is correct, as well. We stand for a key principle: that U.S. citizens should protect U.S. citizens at U.S. airports.

There is a critical danger here in the war on terrorism which will take quite some time. The al-Qaeda organization, with its vast network and resources, is able to put sleeper agents into countries who could then take jobs as airport security agents. But I will note of the hijackers, none were American citizens. We would give the flying public that extra level of security by making sure that only people with a U.S. passport can even apply for these jobs.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman made an interesting point. He said none of the hijackers were U.S. citizens. That means that all of the people who got here made it through some government employee, through some government process to get here in the first place. And if mistakes were made, those mistakes were made by government employees.

Now I am a fan of government employees. I have a lot of great government employees who are personal friends. I do not think because one works for the government one is better or worse. I do not think if one's paycheck comes from the government, as mine does, one is somehow bestowed with special powers or less than special powers. I think we are all human beings.

But the notion that government employees cannot make mistakes is kind of belied by the fact that a number of the hijackers were here in violation of their visas or had obtained visas falsely, or had otherwise slipped through a system run by government employees already.

Everybody makes mistakes; I certainly do. That is why I think the requirement that we just say, oh, well, everything must be done by a government employee and that is the sine qua non really kind of misses the boat.

To that point, I just want to reemphasize something the gentleman said. This Marshals Court Service or Court Security Program, those individuals are in fact private sector employees; is that what I understand the gentleman to say?

Mr. KIRK. Yes. They are badged, uniformed, armed deputized U.S. Marshals.

Mr. SHADEGG. So the notion that we have never delegated this kind of authority to anyone other than a Federal employee is simply wrong?

Mr. KIRK. Correct. And there is another thing. In the current airport security program, turnover can reach 400 percent, but in the U.S. Marshal Court Security Officer Program, turnover is less than any normal civilian, 4 percent. So we have a stable, highly-trained force with law enforcement experience that protects that critical Federal courtroom where many criminals are asked to come. That is delegated to deputized Federal agents.

Mr. SHADEGG. An even perhaps more dangerous environment than otherwise.

We are joined by our colleague, the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms.

HART). I would hope she would join in this debate and express her concerns on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HART).

Ms. HART. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. It is an honor to be here.

I want to add something that the gentleman from Illinois had said regarding the issue of technology. The fact that currently not all baggage is screened is a serious problem, but it is the way it is now. The fact that the House bill would require all baggage to be screened by a date certain is extremely important.

But beyond that, one of the reasons that I think it is important that we maintain this mix of public and private involvement in the actual security is that we will encourage competition among those firms that wish to participate.

I had a discussion in my district just last week with a gentleman who is the chairman of a company that produces high-technology optical devices and x-ray devices. I had spoken with him about what they use those x-ray devices for now. He said that some of it is comparable to the kinds of things we will need in baggage screening down the road.

The more advanced optics of a company like this, every time we have competition and opportunity for a better product, it is going to only make us safer and everyone who flies safer.

So I am pleased to join in the discussion with my colleagues, and I am pleased that the gentleman allowed me some time.

I did want to shed some light on some of the issue of really why we are here in the first place. I am from Pittsburgh. The area that I represent is a hub. We have a lot of people who not only work for the airlines, but who live there because they fly often as a matter of their daily life, for their living, to support their families.

This issue is, yes, about the things we have been discussing tonight. It is about why our plan is better. But the ultimate concern and what we are looking to address is the safety of the American public.

Our interest, and the reason that we have spent this hour with America tonight, is to explain why what we are doing is better. It would certainly be much easier for us to take the path of least resistance and to support the bill that passed the Senate, but we know it is not the best we can do.

That is why we are here. It has to do with safety, it has to do with concern for those people who fly every day as a matter of their living, for their families; and those people who want to take a vacation and fly on a plane; and also those on the ground who, as we saw on September 11, could all too easily be harmed or killed as a result of bad screening and bad safety precautions.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things I want to talk about regarding that that is so

much superior in the bill that the House has produced is the mobilization of the new security system. We all know as Federal Government employees how long it takes to get a new system up and running. If the Federal Government wants to start a new system that is completely federalized, it will take a while.

Our goal is efficiency. Our goal is delivering that safety, conveying that safety to the public as soon as possible and have it be as safe as possible.

Having a new Federal bureaucracy put into place and forcing that whole thing, with every employee to be a Federal employee, will take much longer than mobilizing a brand new system, yes, a brand new system, but with people who are highly trained, a combination of Federal, law enforcement people, Federal security people, and people in the private sector who do this, who compete with each other to do the best job. Otherwise they will not get the contract. That can be put into place much more quickly.

In my opinion, the mobilization of the system is paramount, and we need to support the House bill, because it will get us there sooner.

The House bill is also very organized. The way the system will work is so much better. It creates a new Transportation Security Administration within the Department of Transportation, because this is all about transportation. It is not just airplanes, it is also trains, it is other public modes of transportation that we need to keep safe.

So there will be within the Federal Government under our bill, but not under the Senate bill, this center, this brain center of security. It is important for us to have that, because that will provide for us someone to go to, the accountability that we need to be secure that we will be safe.

Mr. SHADEGG. Reclaiming my time for just a moment on that point, Mr. Speaker, as I am sure the gentlewoman is aware, the Senate bill is very confusing on that issue. It says that overall transportation safety goes to a Deputy Secretary of Transportation, but says that airline safety or airline security goes to the Attorney General, and it fails to sort out who has the ultimate authority.

It seems to me that is a serious problem with the Senate bill, and I think the gentlewoman has said it quite well, that the Senate bill, although a good bill and well-intended with some good provisions, is not the best we can do. We can improve upon it in this body.

I would be happy to continue to yield.

Ms. HART. I think that is why we have a bicameral legislature. The Senate did a very good job and did it first, and usually, doing it first, you take a risk that someone will look at the bill and find things that can be done better. That is what we have done.

The gentleman's point about the Department of Justice having some au-

thority and the Department of Transportation having some authority is actually extremely important, because if we do not know who to go to to be ultimately accountable for the security on our transportation system, on our planes, on our trains, then we will not be able to enforce it, and enforcement is going to be extremely important.

The other issue I wanted to touch on quickly was that we do get the best of both worlds by having a system. I mentioned earlier about competition. When we have the opportunity to bring in specialists from the private sector and have them offer their professionalism to us as a Federal agency, I think we will get the best of both worlds.

Again, as I said, our concern is ultimately the safety of every passenger. In order to get that, I think we need to bring in a mix of the finest we have to offer: Federal agents and private specialists.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for participating. We are about down to the last minute-and-a-half. I would kind of like to summarize.

I think she makes the point very, very well. The reality, as the gentlewoman said, is that at the end of the day this is not a partisan debate. This is not Republican and it is not Democrat. There is not a Republican or Democrat way to make our skies safe.

But it is a very, very serious debate. I think the gentlewoman has said it well, and I appreciate her and all of my other colleagues who have joined us tonight. Our number one concern and the challenge before us in this debate is to create the safest and most secure aviation system in the world, and we can do that.

There are many, many good things in the Senate bill. It has many good pieces, and I commend the people who wrote it. I think they did a great job, and much of it is in the House bill. If we go to conference, much of it can be put into the House bill.

But the question tomorrow is, should we just pass the Senate bill, or should we look at where it is flawed? And sadly, I am afraid that the debate tomorrow is going to sink into some partisanship, with some people saying, well, it is just House leaders that do not want a new system.

As we said earlier, and we began this debate and I want to end this debate by making this point, the demagoguery and the rhetoric we will hear on this debate on the floor here tomorrow saying that the current system is what we are trying to perpetuate could not be further from wrong. It is absolutely wrong.

Under that current system, airlines hire private companies to do the job. Under the House bill, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure bill, that authority is given to the Federal Government, to Federal law enforcement officials who are at every single gate and every single checkpoint and who have total responsibility.

□ 1930

But there are serious, very, very serious flaws in the Senate bill. It gives different responsibilities to two different airports and says we are going to treat the big and the small differently. It has vague language on accountability.

We owe it to the American people to conscientiously legislate and to create the best possible legislation. That is what we will be arguing for here tomorrow.

---

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3150, SECURE TRANSPORTATION FOR AMERICA ACT OF 2001

Mr. REYNOLDS (during special order of Mr. SHADEGG) from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-264) on the resolution (H. Res. 274) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3150) to improve aviation security, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

---

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMMONS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPP) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAPP. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to join in extension of remarks that were made earlier this evening by many in the Women's Caucus to stand to speak out this evening against domestic violence and I am graciously thanking my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) for yielding time for me to enter into this dialogue with my other colleagues earlier this evening. I thank the gentleman for yielding that time to me as well.

October is Domestic Violence Awareness Month. This is the last day of that month. It is a time when battered women's advocates, policy makers and grassroots activists across this Nation focus the public's attention on the insidious epidemic of domestic violence. Of course, we can call attention to this fact and these matters in October. The challenge is before us every single day of the year.

In the United States alone, nearly one-third of American women report being physically or sexually abused by a husband or a boyfriend at some point in their lives. For this reason I am introducing legislation which would provide women of all ages and backgrounds with preventive services such as domestic violence screening and treatment. With a simple screening test that can be administered by any health care provider such as a personal health provider, a doctor, a clinic, an emergency room provider, red flags and signals can be given and referrals can

be made which can pick up more instances and get people into prevention and treatment much earlier.

I believe that it is vital that we begin to educate young women and men in an effort to prevent the incidence of domestic violence and to curb its devastating effects.

Not surprisingly, current Department of Justice statistics indicate that women in their high school years to their mid-twenties are nearly three times as vulnerable to attack by husband or boyfriend or former partner as those in any other age group. So we must keep in mind that domestic violence has ramifications for more than just those parties who are involved. It affects every family, every workplace and every community.

For these reasons it is essential that we all play a role in combatting the prevalence of this epidemic. If we can take responsibility and action, we can prevent this criminal act from occurring. Action can be as simple as contributing money or clothing to a local battered women's shelter, volunteering time to a program that aids victims of abuse, talking to a child or to a classroom about relationship violence, posting awareness materials in public places.

I stand here this evening in recognition and to honor the many people in my community on the central coast of California who work diligently each day staffing shelters, raising funds to keep the shelters going, working to develop materials within nonprofit groups that serve young women, Girl Scouts and Girls Clubs and Boys Clubs entering our school places and working with classroom teachers to create a climate of awareness and acceptance and referral possibilities.

This is diligent work that goes on day in and day out in my community and across this Nation. This is the way we will get to the heart of the matter and the way we can hope for raising a generation of young people who can speak out against violence, can learn alternative ways of conflict resolution and protecting themselves and their friend and others, and that we can hope for a time when domestic violence will be a thing of the past.

At the close of this month, we must remember that each citizen has a duty to help end domestic violence, not only nationally but also globally, and we think and are mindful of the Afghan women who are now subjected to the Taliban regime for whom this is an ever-present part of their lives.

But our work does not stop today on the last day of October. We must continue to work diligently every day, every hour and every minute to put an end to domestic violence and all violence against women.

---

VIOLENCE AGAINST AFGHAN WOMEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

woman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) for yielding.

This morning a very important development occurred in the work of the world to build toward a post-Taliban regime in Afghanistan that will be democratic. A group of Afghan women asked to be included in talks concerning a new democratic government in Afghanistan.

Women are the oppressed people of Afghanistan. There can be no freedom there if the United Nations and the United States do not yield to this plea of Afghan women.

I believe I know what segregation, racial segregation is because I grew up in the segregated District of Columbia. I believe I know what racial apartheid was in South Africa. I was one of the first four people to go into the embassy which led to many people being arrested and finally sanctions and the end of apartheid.

But what we are seeing in Afghanistan is something I have never seen up close before. It is gender apartheid. That is very different from gender inequality which is, of course, universal. Gender apartheid as we are seeing in Afghanistan is much like the stigmatization we saw in Nazi Germany or to slavery. Indeed, the women in Afghanistan have been essentially converted into slaves. All the elements of slavery are there. They cannot work. They cannot go to school. They cannot go to universities. They cannot even leave home except in the company of a man. It has become shameful to be a woman. You are covered from head to toe, not just your face and head as so many religions require, but every part of you. It is shameful to be seen as a woman.

All the physical aspects of slavery are there, public flogging, selling into prostitution, women taken by commanders as wives, killing, indeed, for those who violate Taliban decrees.

What makes this especially tragic in Afghanistan is that pre-Taliban, in some way, Afghan women were more advanced than women in most advanced countries. Half of the university students were women, 40 percent of the doctors, half the health care workers, 70 percent of the teachers. All that is gone. That is all merit and hard work brought down.

The Afghan Constitution guaranteed freedom and equality to women, as our Constitution does not explicitly. That was suspended in 1992. Now, 75 percent of the refugees are women and children.

I am not surprised that a regime propped by people who use planes as missiles to take down innocent people would treat their own women as chattel. I would be surprised, I would be very disappointed and I do not believe we can let happen if our government does not insist that the liberation of

Afghanistan must include the liberation of its women. Any future government talks must have the women of Afghanistan at the table.

#### AVIATION SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I may be joined by other colleagues. I am not sure at this point. This evening I wanted to talk about the issue of aviation security in the aftermath of the tragedies of September 11, and I must say that in many ways I would like to start out by responding to the special order given by some of my Republican colleagues just a few minutes ago.

I want to express my disappointment in what they said, and basically almost emotionally if I could explain why I am so disappointed in the statements that were made by some of my Republican colleagues just a few minutes ago.

In my district in New Jersey, I represent right now two counties. We had about 150 victims of the World Trade Center who died. We have been to a lot of funerals. We have been to a lot of vigils. We have been to a lot of services over the last 2 months or so. I have to say my constituents really have lost patience. They no longer believe that this House of Representatives is going to do anything effectively on the issue of airport security. They wonder why we are even debating this issue tonight and why this issue was not disposed of within a week or two of those tragedies.

It is now October 31, about a month and a half since September 11. In fact, it is about 2 or 3 weeks I believe since the Senate took action on the bill that my Republican colleagues have been criticizing, and I would ask initially this evening as I begin, why have we waited? If they do not like the Senate bill, why did not they bring up a bill in the House the next day, 2 or 3 weeks ago, to address this problem? Why have they waited for a month and a half to even address the issue? I sincerely doubt their willingness to address the issue of airport security.

I believe that what they are doing now, what the House Republican leadership is doing now in bringing up this bill tomorrow is nothing but a ruse. I do not think that they want to change the status quo at all. I believe that they like the status quo, and I believe that the reason they are not bringing up the Senate bill tomorrow and they are bringing up a new House Republican bill is because they hope that they can pass that bill on a partisan vote, send it to conference, and because it disagrees significantly from the Senate bill, they will simply kill any legislative initiative to try to address the airport security issue, and as a consequence, those corporate interests,

those airline interests that do not want to see any changes in the status quo will triumph. That is what is going on here.

No one can tell me that this House of Representatives cannot act quickly in the aftermath of the type of tragedy that we had on September 11. No one can tell me that if the Senate bill passed 2 or 3 weeks ago that we could not have passed a bill within a few days of that.

What is happening now is that the momentum is building in my State and around the country where people are outraged over the fact that we have not taken action on this measure, and the Republican leadership knows that the public wants something like what passed in the other body, like the Senate bill, and that they want a Federal workforce and that they do not like the status quo.

So now the Republican leadership in the House feels that they have to bring up something, even a fig leaf. So they will schedule a vote tomorrow and they will start a debate, knowing full well that once that bill passes, it will go to conference and nothing will happen and the status quo will continue.

I heard some of my Republican colleagues talk about the fact that they do not like Federal workforces. I do not really care whether they like or do not like Federal workforces. I mean they can stand up here and they can talk about whether they like the Postal Service or they think it should be privatized, whether they like the Border Patrol or they think it should be privatized, whether they like the Customs Service or they think it should be privatized. The bottom line is that we know that whatever system, and in this case a private corporate system that was in place on September 11, failed, and it failed miserably.

The fact of the matter is that it has not changed. I have my constituents come to my town meetings. Because I am not very far from Newark airport, we are maybe half an hour away, if not maybe less, and they tell me when they go to the airport nothing really has changed. Their baggage is not being screened. They are able to get through with devices to bypass the screening machines, and they are very, very disappointed in the quality of the workforce.

I heard my colleagues say that they do not like the existing workforce. Well, the existing workforce is a private workforce that is put in place by the airlines, and there is no way in the world that we are going to create competition and create some sort of private enterprise system that is going to correct it. There is no money available.

I heard one of my colleagues say, well, maybe they should be paid \$16 an hour, they are only being paid minimum wage, maybe they should be paid \$16 an hour. Is he going to mandate in the legislation that they get paid \$16 an hour? The problem we have now is that the airlines, many of them, are

bankrupt. Many are in very bad shape. They have no incentive to go out and hire people and pay them a living wage. They have no incentive to do the type of training that would be effective.

□ 1945

And the people who are manning these screening devices do not have any esprit de corps. They do not have pride in what they do.

If my colleagues were to go to Newark Airport, they could go to the screening device and look a few feet away and see some of the fast food restaurants. Some of the people working in the fast food restaurants are being paid more than the people manning the screening devices. Why should they have any more pride in what they do if they are not getting properly paid and they have no benefits? They are not going to have pride in what they do.

One of my Republican colleagues said, well, 80 or 90 percent of them are not even U.S. citizens. What do my colleagues expect? Should we expect that U.S. citizens are going to take minimum wage jobs under the conditions they have to work with these screening machines? Of course not.

The only way that we can do anything is if we make a radical change. And I say "radical" because I understand that putting together a Federal work force something like the Customs Service or the Post Office or the Border Patrol, I understand that is a radical change from what we have now, but I do not have a problem with it. Not because ideologically I think a Federal work force is superior, but just because I know the current system does not work and we cannot just tweak it.

One of my Republican colleagues said, well, we will make sure that at every entrance to the airport there is a Federal employee, but I do not want the people manning the screening devices to be Federal employees. What are we afraid of? Is it some sort of ideological nonsense or something in my colleagues' minds that somehow this is socialism or communism or something? I just do not understand it. I just think that this is a practical problem that needs a practical solution and that we cannot wait for some tweaking of the system when we know that we have to do something dramatic to change it because the status quo is currently not working.

I just wanted to mention, if I could, a few talking points about the Senate bill. I call it the House Democratic Aviation Security Bill, which I understand will be the alternative tomorrow, the substitute, that hopefully we will be allowed to vote on in lieu of this House Republican bill.

If I could just talk about this bill, first of all, understand that this passed the Senate, the other body, 100 to nothing. In the other body they were not being partisan. There were a lot of people in the other body, in the Senate, who are very right-wing ideologically, but they were willing to join together,

Democrat and Republican, 100 to nothing, unanimously, to say that we need to make some major changes, we need to have a Federal work force, we need to create a new body of people that are going to screen and do the security and who will take pride in what they do.

I do not understand why if the other body, the Senate, could eliminate all the ideology and do something on a bipartisan basis, why the House Republican leadership cannot do the same here.

The Senate bill, and now the House Democratic alternative, ensures that Federal security personnel screen and check all individuals and baggage before boarding a plane. Specifically, the bill federalizes all security screening functions at the 140 busiest airports to ensure a professional, well-trained and well-qualified air security law enforcement force.

Now, some of my Republican colleagues said, well, why are we only dealing with 140 of the busiest airports? For over 250 smaller airports the legislation would allow the Justice Department the flexibility to use Federal law enforcement personnel or State and local law enforcement under strict Federal oversight as screeners. My colleagues said, that is not fair, we have different systems, different standards for the larger airports than the smaller airports. I think the reason is basically recognizing the fact that the smaller airports do not have, maybe, the same responsibilities.

But if my colleagues on the Republican side do not like the two-tiered system, then let us federalize everyone. Let us not say that because the Senate bill does not allow the smaller airports to have a Federal corps of employees that we should not have them for any of them. I think the answer is, if there is strong objection to a two-tiered system, make them have Federal law enforcement officers at all of the airports, small and large combined.

What we are trying to do, and I want everyone to understand this, what we are trying to do with this Federal security screening work force is to ensure that the security screeners are more highly paid, rather than continuing the practice of private contractors hiring personnel at minimum wage basically. Experts, including the General Accounting Office, the Federal Aviation Administration, the Transportation Department have all indicated that low wages and high turnover are the major problems in aviation security.

Under the bill, under the Democratic alternative, the Senate bill, screener applicants would be required to pass a rigorous selection examination and complete classroom and on-the-job training. It also gives the government flexibility to suspend or terminate underperforming employees.

Under the Democratic alternative, there is a mandate that all checked baggage be screened by explosive detection equipment. We require screening of all persons, vehicles and other equip-

ment entering secure areas, including catering and other companies with access to secure areas. All current air carrier, airport and screening personnel have to submit to background checks and criminal history record checks.

There are many other things that we do, and I would like to go into some of them, but I see that one of my colleagues is here, and I know that he is very interested and has been involved in this issue, so I would like to yield now to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. I thank my colleague for yielding to me and for being here tonight. I know it is late tonight and the gentleman is working out here making things happen for our communities, and I know this issue is a key issue.

Aviation security is a national security issue, and it is something that we need to take a look at from that perspective. The current system is broken, and we do have a lot of problems with it and we need to begin to do a lot of things. This bill brings it in that direction, begins to open it up, begins to look at one of the key problems that we have, and that is that we have in the past privatized some of the inspection efforts.

As the gentleman well knows, some of the companies have not done a good job of hiring people. They have not been doing background checks, and their turnover rates in some cases are over 400 percent because of the fact that they pay very low wages. So there is a real need for us to get professionals there. Just like in law enforcement, we want people that are well-educated, that are professionals, and we should have nothing less to make sure that we secure the airports.

When we look at the security of our President and the security of our Nation, we would not even consider privatizing that. So when we look at securing our airports and the public, we should consider nothing less than the most important thing, and that is to make sure we provide the best in security.

When we talk about privatization, yes, sometimes things are improved upon. Private companies might do a lot of things a lot better. But with time, one of the basic principles about that system is that it is a for-profit system, so sometimes they will start cutting corners to make a profit. So when we look at that issue, I think it is important that we federalize our screeners and we make them part of the system.

We have great professionals at Customs; these people check baggage, and I can share a couple of incidents. We caught a terrorist on the Mexican border because, as they were crossing back into Mexico, one of the persons was just asked where he was headed, and the individual hesitated in terms of responding. That was a clue that there was something wrong. These people that are professionals are able to catch them, and that is what we need to do.

We are hoping that we do not politicize this bill, that we do the right thing on behalf of all the people in America, which would be to federalize those workers. I know that the Senate, 100 percent of them, voted for it. I know Senator HUTCHINSON, Senator GRAMM from Texas, both Republicans, supported it, and I am hoping that we can pass it out of the House.

It has been almost 7 weeks since September 11. We need to move forward on this and hopefully make this happen, because we have a lot of work, as the gentleman well knows, that we still need to do in a lot of other areas where we still feel very uncomfortable.

And I just want to thank the entire Nation as a whole, because I know we have come together after this incident. This is a war that we have to win and this is a war that we have no other choice but to go forward with and make sure that we pull it off. I know that we can, but we have to continue to work together; and one of the first things we have to do, as we all know, is secure our borders. We need to secure our borders. Airport security is part of that effort.

There still are a lot of other efforts. I know we filed, as Democrats, other pieces of legislation on bioterrorism that talk about making sure that we have those first response teams also. That is also extremely critical. Throughout this country a lot of our towns and cities and communities are having a lot of difficulty. Some might not have as many qualified as they should to do that first response, but that will be very important, that we provide those resources.

So we need to look at that piece of legislation that is very comprehensive, that looks at our borders and at a lot of our agencies.

As we move forward, there will be a variety of other pieces of legislation, and I want to thank the constituents out there because they have been providing us with ideas as to what we need to do and not do. Most of these ideas have come from back home, our constituents, who have the answers to a lot of these questions.

As we move forward, we are hoping that we can come to grips with this. Yes, a lot of it is trial and error. We have never been in this kind of situation before. But I know that we can begin to solve these problems and, working together, we can make some good things happen.

I am looking forward to pushing forward on this particular piece of legislation on aviation, on national security at our airports, because this will be one bill that would allow that sense of security. We still have a lot more, but it is definitely going to be helpful in moving in that direction.

We also need to do a lot when it comes to our infrastructure. I know the GAO just came out with a major report talking about our bases throughout this country and the fact that a lot of them are vulnerable. We

have started in that area. We need a lot of resources to make sure from an infrastructure perspective there are safeguards at all our bases, not to mention our facilities and where people meet.

There have been a lot of comments from people as to, what can I do, what is the best thing that we can do; and I would just say, educate yourself. Let us continue to move forward. It has been an educational process for all of us. I think that we need to learn how to act and be able to react appropriately to certain crises and certain things that occur. Part of that is doing the right thing, and the right thing is making sure that we have good, qualified people and that we just do not go to the lowest bid when it comes to our security people in the airports. So I am hoping that we will be able to pass that legislation.

And once again I want to thank the gentleman for allowing me to be here with him tonight.

Mr. PALLONE. I thank my colleague from Texas.

When the gentleman started off and he was talking about the federalization of the work force, he made me think about my Republican colleagues that were here for the first hour tonight. I was wondering, if we proposed that the Capitol Police, for example, if they should be privatized, whether they would support that.

It is sort of ironic, because here we are and we are protected by a Capitol Police force. They are not contracted out. We know that there is a certain pride that we see with the Capitol Police officers. My colleagues have no problem with the force here that is federalized, but they do not want to see it for the average person at the airports.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. I apologize for interrupting, but our leadership here is also protected by Federal workers. Our President is protected by the Secret Service that are Federal workers. We should not expect any less when it comes to our airports. It is a national security issue. It should require Federal workers that are well-trained, well-equipped and well-paid to make sure they do the right thing.

And I was told, well, what about if they make a mistake; we are not going to fire them. We have made some stipulations on that. If they are not doing their work, they are going to get fired. So it is important for us to move forward on that versus what we have right now, which is a shambles, a 400 percent turnover.

And by the way, 82 percent of the people, based on what the Washington Post says, say that they want Federal workers there making sure they check our baggage and making sure they check on people as they move forward.

So I think if we expect that for our President, and we should expect the best, then we should expect it for our public and for our airports throughout this country. So I am hoping we can make that happen. And I am optimistic that we will get a lot of Republicans

like we have on the Senate side where we got over 49 Republicans to vote with us.

Mr. PALLONE. I want to thank the gentleman again for his comments, and I want to now yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. First of all, I want to commend the gentleman for his leadership on this matter. I really stand with my colleague and all of the people from his area, all those families, who after 9-11 their lives will never be the same.

I hope the gentleman will take a look that I have on black and orange for Halloween. This is October 31. But, my colleague, we might be in for another trick tomorrow. Tomorrow, the House leadership may not bring up the aviation security bill after all.

□ 2000

Would that not be a horrible trick on the people of the United States?

After September 11 we all pulled together to stand by this country and to make sure that we moved forward together with one voice. I cannot believe that 7 weeks after September 11 we have not had an opportunity to vote on an aviation bill. When we were passing the airline bailout bill, I told my colleagues then that we should have included airline security in that bill. We should have made sure, as the airlines were getting \$15 billion and not a dime for the workers, and to this date not a dime for the workers.

In addition to that, I have not heard anything about those schools that train pilots. As we speak here on the floor, there are aviation schools training pilots today, terrorists, today. Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe that people can walk into a school and give \$25,000 cash, and they will train pilots; for what? It is ironic that one of the planes that went down in Pennsylvania on September 11, that the people on that plane pulled together. They took a vote and they voted that they were going to stop this plane and those people. They are heroes.

Here we are in the House of Representatives, the people's House, 7 weeks after September 11, and we have not had a vote. We have not had a discussion on the floor. The Senate on a bipartisan vote of 100 to zero passed the bill. We need to take up that bill and pass that bill. By tomorrow afternoon that bill can be on the President's desk. He can sign it and we can move on to other things.

Aviation security is just one area that we need to work on. We also need to work on port security, rail security, bus security. We need to change the way we do business in this country. The economic stimulus package which passed this House, the same old big dogs were eating. Nothing in there for all of the areas of security that we need to address, like the United States Coast Guard, giving them additional monies to patrol our ports. The list goes on and on.

A lot of people during election times say it does not matter who is in charge. It does matter because if the Democrats were in charge, we would have had an aviation security bill on this floor, and not one person would be delaying and delaying and delaying that bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am outraged that on October 31 we have not yet discussed or debated an aviation security bill and what should be included in the bill. One of the things that should be included is cockpit security. The pilot and the flight attendants all agree that is one of the things that should be included, one of the things. In addition, marshals, U.S. Marshals on all of the planes.

The only question it seems is whether or not the people that screen the luggage should be Federal employees. We have Members here who say they do not like Federal employees; but more than that, they might join the union. They might join the union.

I have something to say, Mr. Speaker. We have been honoring some great Americans, the pilots that went down on September 11, the flight attendants, the police and firefighters, every single one of them were union men and women who were fighting and died for this country on September 11. We have not done one single thing to make sure that does not happen again. I am very disappointed in the leadership of this House. This is the people's House. We should have been first in addressing the needs of the American people.

One of my colleagues said that the big dogs always eat first. A lot of people want to know what do we mean by the big dogs. I am talking about the lobbyists with the money. That is what is driving it. There are some people that want to make sure that the companies that really failed us on September 11, those are the ones that are going to continue to have the business and pay minimum wage. Minimum wage with no training, what do Members expect. America is better than that.

I am hoping tomorrow we will pass an aviation security bill, and that tomorrow evening at this time that bill will be on the way to the President's desk and that we can move forward and look at other security needs in this country. It may not be a perfect bill. I have been here for almost 10 years, and we have never passed a perfect bill; but it is a perfect beginning. Let us pass that Senate bill tomorrow and move forward for the American people.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman, and if I can comment on a few things she said.

I am embarrassed when I have town meetings, and I have had a town meeting almost every weekend, and my district is about a half hour from Newark airport. I talk about aviation security, and they do not want to laugh, but some literally laugh when I talk about what we are going to do. They go to the airport and they witness the same

problems that existed before September 11. They cannot imagine how the tragedy of September 11 does not spur us to action.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, some of the changes are just cosmetic. Unless we agree to screen all of the luggage, have background checks and communication between the FBI and CIA and the airport security, it does not work. We need to put a system in place that protects the American people. This is not a game. We talk about bipartisanship. I am for it. I am for it as far as it goes, but that is not what we have. It is my way or nothing at all. That is the rule of the House of Representatives. It matters who is in charge of the House of Representatives. This is the people's House. The people should have an opportunity to put their issues on the floor and have an up-or-down vote.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman points out so well that if this Senate bill was taken up here tomorrow, if it passed, if the Republican leadership did not do whatever they could to try to prevent it from passing, it would immediately be signed by the President. There is no question about it. Our colleagues this evening were talking about the conference.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it was disgusting. They were talking about why were we rushing. I would have passed the bill on September 12. Here we are 7 weeks later and we are rushing? I am on the House Committee on Transportation and the Infrastructure. We have not had a discussion, a debate. What we passed out should have been on the floor. But we have the leadership refusing to take up a bill. The Senate passed a bill on October 11, I think.

Mr. PALLONE. It has been several weeks.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Yes.

Mr. PALLONE. And our Republican colleagues were talking about the conference. It was a foregone conclusion that they were going to conference, which the gentlewoman knows can take weeks.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. We understand who runs the House. People talk about we are working together, but the proof is in the pudding. Let us pass an aviation security bill for the people of the United States.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I have come to the floor tonight because we are in the cusp of a pivotal vote tomorrow. The vote will decide whether to make a full commitment of the United States to a secure and meaningful airline security bill or, at the bidding of some very well-paid lobbyists for some companies who have a large financial stake in this, will adopt a half-baked half-measure, a low-bid proposal that will continue the loophole driven, Swiss cheese, alleged security system we have at the gates of our airports.

I think the choice is that stark. In the last decade the United States has engaged in an experiment. That experiment involved having private companies who sent in their low bids to airlines that were routinely accepted, that as a result got the cheapest employees with the least training, with zero certification under FAA supervision, under the supervision of the Federal Government. That was the experimental system that we have had for the last 10 years.

That experimental system failed on September 11 big time, as someone said. Yet some of our colleagues, the leadership in the Republican Party, because of this fixation of anti-union sentiment, want to continue that failed experiment because the meat and bones of their proposal is this: Let us continue to have private companies with low-bid contracts supervised by the FAA handle security at airports.

Members have to understand that they have dressed this up with a few ribbons, but the proposal is to continue this failed relationship. The reason it is a failed relationship is because of something that is happening tonight as we speak.

The reason that this system has not worked is that every single time the FAA and the U.S. Congress has even talked about having meaningful training and standards for these employees, these employees with million dollar contracts, and to some degree the airlines, have gotten on the phone to the lobbyists and instructed them to go to Capitol Hill and tell Members to lay off. We do not want to spend another dollar on safety. It is going to cut into our profits.

As a result, Congress has not acted. The FAA has not acted, and we have had low bid, no certification, no training, no citizens, no speaking English, felons hired to do this job.

Our friends across the aisle, at least the leadership, want to continue this failed experiment. We are going to get the same result. If we do the same thing time after time, there is no reason to expect anything to change. Tonight we are seeing that same thing happen.

On Halloween, Members are going to hear the kinds of things that one hears on Halloween, but we are also going to hear the sound of arms breaking, because some arm breaking is going on by the Republican leadership. We have Federal employees who are our border guards and our Capitol Hill police, and there is no reason these airport security screeners are not Federal employees. Lobbyists for these low-bid companies are so afraid they are going to lose their contracts they want Members to back off and adopt this half-a-loaf approach.

These companies and their lobbyists who are asking our friends on the other side of the aisle to vote to continue their failure, they are afraid that they are going to lose their contracts, and they should be. They should lose their

contracts and should be out of business. They should be seen as failures. We should not allow the Republican Party, at the largess and the request of their favorite lobbyist, to allow that continued failure.

□ 2015

We should go in there and do what we ought to do.

I have heard that they have said that some of the European countries, that there are some other countries that have some other systems, that have some private employees doing their work. I always kind of thought America was supposed to lead the parade, not follow it. If they pull this off in Lithuania or Germany, fine, but in Germany, apparently the companies cannot come in and tell the government not to enforce safety rules. They have been effective in doing that here, in part because of the effectiveness of their lobby. That is why in this country we need the same kind of safety we have with our border guards, to have government employees to be certified to do this job.

I will mention one other thing before I defer. We have been working, many of us have been working for the last weeks, to try to convince the majority party to have an insistence that the baggage that goes into the belly of an airplane is screened for bombs, because as you know, 90, 95 percent of it is not screened today. Why is it not screened? It is the same thing we talked about. They send the lobbyists down to the FAA and say, we don't want to spend a buck to do this and the FAA has backed off and they have had some of their friends on the other side of the aisle back off. The same thing has happened.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. If the gentleman will yield, is the technology available to screen the luggage?

Mr. INSLEE. Yes. The good news is that these machines are built, many of them are in airports today, but unfortunately the airlines have not turned them on. They stick them in a corner. The U.S. Government spent \$400 million 5 years ago for a technology called CTX-5000s; they are machines with a very good success rate of finding explosive devices. Many of the airlines took them, put them in a corner and did not even turn them on, literally. We have finally got them to turn them on, but the problem is, we do not have enough of those machines yet; we need to buy some more and we need to get them into these airports.

We have finally prevailed on the majority party to put some at least sugar-coating language to say they are going to do this to get these machines into airports. That is great. We have finally got them to put some language in there like that. But if you have people falling asleep working for these low-bid contractors at the machine, it does not matter how good your machine is if you have still got incompetent ex-felons who cannot read directions on the machines, how to run them.

So if we are going to do this, we need certified people to do it. We also need a way to pay for it. The Senate bill, which we are proposing, specifically allows the Airport Improvement Trust Fund to be used by airports to bring these airports up to speed. They do not have any way to pay for it.

I have proposed an appropriation that was rejected by the Republicans. The Senate bill allows the Airport Trust Fund to be used to help airports. We have got to find a way to pay for this. So what I am saying is, if we are going to have a real screening of bags to keep bombs out of the belly of airplanes, we have got to pass the Senate bill.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I agree with the gentleman 100 percent. Following that up, I am just concerned that the Europeans, he mentioned them, they talked about their system. But I want to be clear. Those jobs in Europe and other places are not minimum wage jobs.

Mr. INSLEE. That is right. As the gentlewoman knows, that is exactly what we have ended up with. And as has been pointed out, with a 400 percent turnover rate.

Mr. PALLONE. If I could just mention one thing, one of the things that really irked me tonight was when we had the conversation among some of our Republican colleagues about the value of competition. They were talking about how, if we have a Federal work force, we are going to eliminate competition. All I kept thinking in my mind is, how can it be competition when you are paying people minimum wage, you are not providing them any benefits, they have no pride in the work force, you are going to create competition?

Half of these airlines are bankrupt or near bankruptcy. There is no incentive in a competitive process to do any better. The whole notion of competition in this atmosphere where there is not the money and they are not paying the wages is just nonsense.

Mr. INSLEE. To me, this is a relatively easy question. We can have arguments about what goes on in Europe and everything else, but the question is, are there certain functions that are so important to Americans' lives, the issue is if this job is done well, people live and if it is done poorly, they die; and are there certain functions that are so pivotally important to the continuation of human life that you make sure you have the government do it.

We do that in certain cases. Firefighters, we do not privatize firefighters because people die if it is not done well. Police officers, we do not privatize police officers; people die if it is not done well. Capitol Police, the same thing. Border Patrol, the same thing.

FBI agents, the nature of this function is a law enforcement function. It is not an administrative, baggage handling function; it is a law enforcement function. These people should be treated as law enforcement officers.

I will just leave by saying one thing. It is a well-established American value that our law enforcement people ought to work for Uncle Sam. I think that is the right thing to do. I hope the House votes in that way.

I thank the gentleman for letting me join him this evening.

Mr. PALLONE. I appreciate his comments.

I do not like to sound morbid, but as I started out tonight, people have died. We had 6,000 people die at the World Trade Center, many of them my constituents. It is just incredible to me to think that with all of that happening that we have not moved on this and that that does not move the House Republican leadership to take up this bill that was adopted unanimously, 100-to-nothing.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Many of us went to Ground Zero a couple of weeks ago, over 100 Members of Congress, and everyone talked about the physical devastation. What stands out most in my mind was the number of people that lost their lives. We cannot put that back together. How many families got destroyed? We can rebuild the buildings, but we need to do what we can in this House to make sure that that never happens again.

That was my commitment. I wish it was everybody's commitment, in particular the people on the other side of the aisle. I do think it is not most of them; it is just a few people that are holding up our passing a meaningful aviation security bill. Shame on them. Shame on them.

Mr. PALLONE. I want to thank the gentlewoman. She expresses better than I do how I feel about this right now. I really appreciate what you have said.

I want to yield to my other colleague from California and stress that this evening part of the argument that I have been trying to make is not only that the Republican House leadership has refused to bring up an aviation security bill, but by contrast, they have instead last week brought up this so-called economic stimulus package with all these tax cuts that go primarily to corporate interests and wealthy people.

I think we estimate that of the money that is given back in tax breaks in that Republican economic stimulus package that was passed last week, very narrowly, by two votes, I think, of \$100 billion in tax cuts in the next year, 2002, \$70.8 billion benefits corporations and \$14.8 billion benefits affluent individuals.

So here we have where two-thirds, I guess, of the money that they would like to allocate with these tax breaks is going to corporate interests, and then at the same time they will not pass a bill on aviation security because those same corporate interests refuse to spend the money or make a commitment to do the aviation security. It is part and parcel of the same thing. Where are the priorities? The priorities for the Republicans in trying to get the

economy going again are to give money to the corporate interests.

I do not see how in the world that stimulates the economy in the way that they hope it to be stimulated. I think just the opposite occurs. Of course, the Democrats had an alternative last week, which did not pass because we are not in the majority, that does the opposite. It gives money back to the displaced workers, it gives unemployment compensation, it gives health benefits, it provides for a major component of funding for security not only for airlines, but for all other means of transportation as the gentlewoman from Florida said. That is the kind of thing that would create the economic stimulus and create the jobs and get people back to work, and they are not willing to do it.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Just one last point. Recently, for the past couple of weeks I have been flying into Orlando. Orlando aviation has over 30 million people flying through there. It was very disturbing that nobody was there. Why? Because if you want to stimulate the economy, pass aviation safety so people will feel confident and secure in traveling again, so we can get the economy moving. Let us put the money, the economic stimulus, into security.

In closing, one of my favorite scriptures is "To whom God has given much, much is expected." The people of this country are expecting a lot from the Members of the House of Representatives. They are expecting us to put aside partisan bickering and do the people's business in the People's House.

Mr. PALLONE. Well said.

I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. SCHIFF. I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my continuing concern over the economic stimulus package passed in the House and to urge my colleagues in the Senate to put forth a more balanced, effective stimulus that will stimulate our economy in the short and long term and provide help to those who have been most affected by the events of September 11. We need a smaller, more targeted, more temporary and more bipartisan stimulus package.

Congress should act to restore consumer and investor confidence in the safety, security and solvency of America. We cannot use the economic predicament or the war as an opportunity to merely revisit priorities and agendas we advocated before September 11, thus spiraling Congress into budget-busting deficit spending. This would threaten the fiscal discipline that prompted much of the 1990s' economic boom. Already, long-term interest rates remain high despite the Federal Reserve's cut in short-term rates because of market concerns that deficit spending is making a comeback.

We must concentrate on boosting the economy by doing everything possible

to restore confidence in the management of our government, in the prosecution of the war, and in the development of a stronger and more secure nation. We should not be providing more of a tax cut for the wealthiest Americans, who have already enjoyed their fair share of tax cuts this year or for the Nation's most powerful corporations. Renewed fiscal discipline is important because we must maintain our standing in the world financial markets and ensure the solvency of the stock market.

Further, we do not know yet how much this war on terrorism will cost. We must make sure that our military personnel are well-equipped and well-trained and, as Secretary Rumsfeld has stated, this is a marathon, not a sprint. We need to be prepared to support the cost of a long war without spending erroneously at the outset.

But perhaps most importantly, we need to stimulate the economy by putting money in the hands of people who will spend it immediately. This is the true meaning of an economic stimulus.

We need to focus on ensuring unemployment relief, training and reemployment opportunities for workers laid off as a result of the terrorist attacks. We also need to help the unemployed maintain their health insurance and provide relief for laid-off workers who would otherwise slip through the cracks in the current unemployment insurance system. By providing unemployment benefits and health care coverage to those laid-off workers, we will be targeting those who are most likely to spend and, thus, most likely to help in reviving the economy.

If you give financial assistance, whether it is tax cuts or unemployment insurance, to people who can put the money in savings, they are not going to spend it; it is not going to stimulate the economy. If you provide unemployment or health benefits to a laid-off worker, they are going to spend it immediately. The rent is not discretionary. Food is not discretionary. Medicine is not discretionary. This is an effective economic stimulus.

I have introduced legislation that I believe can be an essential component of these efforts to help those affected by September 11. My bill, the COBRA Coverage Act of 2001, would provide a 50 percent tax credit toward COBRA coverage for laid-off workers. We simply cannot allow so many hard-working Americans and their families to go uninsured. We must find a way to make COBRA coverage more affordable for the thousands of laid-off workers trying to recover from the September 11 attacks.

This bill does exactly that. The COBRA Coverage Act of 2001 provides continuing health care coverage for laid-off workers at half the price. Under this legislation, laid-off workers would be eligible for a tax credit of 50 percent towards the COBRA coverage premium, receiving an immediate benefit, not having to wait till the end of

the year to claim the tax credit. Nearly identical legislation has been introduced in the Senate by Senators JEFFORDS, LINCOLN, CHAFEE, BAYH and SNOWE. Our bipartisan effort will ensure that American families can afford to remain insured in case of sickness or injury.

We must take the lead in ensuring that the thousands of hardworking Americans who have fallen victim to the effects of September 11 are not further set back by a lack of health insurance. We must remain diligent in our efforts to protect the American people, and that starts right here in the U.S. Congress.

□ 2030

Our commitment to sound, effective government must be reflected in our ability to provide relief to laid off workers and jump start the economy during our war on terrorism.

I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort to make COBRA coverage more affordable for laid off workers and to offer the people of this country an economic stimulus package that actually works.

Mr. PALLONE. Reclaiming my time, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF). I do not think there is any questions that what is happening with the Republican leadership in terms of this economic stimulus package is very similar to what is happening on the aviation security issue. And that is, nothing is happening.

We know that last week when the Republican leadership put forward this so-called economic stimulus package, they knew full well it was not going to go anywhere. They were barely able to get the votes. I remember at one point at the end of votes there were more votes against it than for it. And we saw some of the Republican leaders going around and strong arming their colleagues so they could turn around a few votes. I think it ultimately passed by one or two votes maybe at the end.

We know the way the procedure works around here. If a bill passes on strictly a partisan vote and then it goes to the other body, the Senate, where the Democrats are in majority and totally disagree with this bill because of the way that is structured, that nothing is going to happen. There either never is a conference where the two Houses get together or if a conference occurs, there is no meeting of the minds.

So once again, just like with the issue of aviation security, my major criticism of the House Republican leadership and my colleagues who spoke earlier on the Republican side tonight is that they keep talking about the need to go to conference, which really means the need to delay, delay on aviation security, delay on economic stimulus. Meanwhile, the economy does not get any better and the problems with aviation security at the various airports continue.

I just think it is very sad. People want action. Regardless of whether we

agree or disagree they want action and we are not getting it. We are certainly not getting it on the part of this leadership on the Republican side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I know there is only a few minutes left, but I just want to point out the contrast which you did so well on what the Republicans had in mind with this economic stimulus package. I mentioned of the \$99.5 billion in tax cuts proposed for the next year, 2002, \$70.8 billion benefits corporation, \$14.8 billion benefits affluent individuals, and only \$1.37 billion goes to workers with lower incomes who did not get the previous rebate. A lot of it is even going to finance multi-nationals so the money would not even be spent here, which is incredible to me. How can you have an economic stimulus package when you have a provision that allows multi-national corporations to defer U.S. income taxes on profits from certain offshore activities so long as they are kept outside of the country. That is \$260 million next year, \$21.3 billion over 10 years.

Now, by contrast what we did, as was pointed out with our Democratic substitute, is provide rebates or tax breaks or unemployment compensation for displaced workers or money for aviation security and other investments in public infrastructure. That would be mean dollars immediately going into the economy either because the person who gets the unemployment compensation would spend it or because we would be hiring people for these various public infrastructure necessities such as the security that we talked about earlier this evening.

I do not understand. I do not know an economist on the face of the Earth who would suggest that what the Republicans tried to pass last week would do anything significant to benefit the economy. And I do not know what we do. I think the only thing we can do is to simply come here every night as we are, as Democrats, and demand action, demand that whether it is a security issue or an economic issue that the Republican leadership take some action, work in a bipartisan way so we can actually accomplish something. Nothing is being accomplished here. We just have to continue to demand that something be accomplished in a bipartisan way that can achieve some progress in these areas. But so far we are not getting it.

Mr. Speaker, with that I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

#### CIVIL RIGHTS ABUSES UPON AFGHAN WOMEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, the subject I was going to speak on tonight is the treatment of women in Afghanistan.

In 1996, I had the opportunity with Senator Brown on the Senate side to

co-chair a hearing on what was underway in Afghanistan and that same year I organized a hearing on the House side here as well to call attention to the civil rights abuses that were occurring in that country and to call attention to the fact that Afghanistan was rapidly becoming a national security threat to the United States, and this is something that I have been speaking on over the years, the fact that in Afghanistan the terror and the chaos and the despair has become worse and worse year after year.

However, in the wake of September 11 and that terrorist attack on that day, many Americans are just beginning to learn about the horrific treatment of women in Afghanistan. The practice there of the Taliban of restricting the rights of women has even been explained by some as being in line with traditional practices and I have to say to the contrary. It is clear that the Taliban is at odds with Islam and Afghan society, especially in its treatment of women.

Prior to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, women there had the right to vote, along with other liberties enjoyed by most people around the world. But when the Taliban swept into power in 1997 that organization immediately institutionalized widespread and systemic gender apartheid. A government mandate made it unlawful for women and girls to go to work or to go to school.

This edict was a devastating blow to the women and to the country. And at that time women were a vital part of the Afghan workforce. They made up 70 percent of the school teachers, 40 percent of the doctors, 50 percent of government workers. They were 50 percent of university students. And with that edict none of them could continue to work or go to school.

Women under the Taliban regime have been subjected to remarkably harsh restrictions that impede their ability to move freely, to prevent them from socializing, to prevent them from seeking medical treatment. There is in place a complete ban on women working or receiving education outside the home. And to tell you how bad this is, the reality is that for one of the organizations that helped teach women how to read and write in the home, to be a member of that organization is to face capital punishment in Afghanistan.

If a woman leaves her home, she is required to don a head to toe garment known as a burqa, which has only a small mesh screen for vision. A designated close male relative also must always accompany her wherever she goes. If so much as an ankle is not covered she can be whipped in public.

There is a ban on the use of cosmetics. How is it enforced? Women with painted nails have had their fingernails pulled out by the Taliban authorities.

Women must paint their windows so that no one can see inside their home. Among other restrictions, women are

banned from laughing loudly, from riding in taxis, from playing sports or entering a sport center or club, from riding bicycles or motorcycles, gathering for festive occasions, playing cards, riding public buses with men and appearing on the balconies of their homes. Even owning a kite, flying a kite or keeping a caged bird can become a criminal offense.

If a woman is accused of disobeying prohibitions, a severe punishment is often administered. Women have been whipped, they have been beaten, they have been verbally abused in the streets, but I am afraid there have been many worse Taliban abuses than that. Women who have been accused of adultery have been stoned to death. Women accused of prostitution have been hanged in public. And I think many of us have viewed the film of the women who have defied Taliban edicts who were taken into the soccer stadium in Kabul, and before audiences of men seated there publicly executed in the stadium.

A few weeks ago on CNN the anchor was interviewing a Taliban official and the anchor reporter asked why there is no more soccer at the sports stadium which the European Union helped build before the Taliban's rise. The official was so brazen to answer, "If they build us another place to hold our executions, then we will play here."

Mr. Speaker, I did want to bring this condition to the attention of the Chair and to the Members.

#### AVIATION SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to come to the floor tonight on the eve of consideration by the House of Representatives of the Aviation and Transportation Security bill, which is scheduled for debate and consideration tomorrow before the House.

Tonight is Halloween. It is a time when sometimes people are frightened. It is a time when goblins and ghosts and images are raised. Unfortunately, in some of this debate about aviation and airline security there has been some scaring on this Halloween eve.

I happened to hear some of my previous colleagues who spoke about the aviation security measure. And I want to say from the Republican side of the aisle, from the majority side, that each and every one of us want to pass legislation that will ensure the safety, the security of every member of the traveling public. We think it is absolutely essential that we pass the best possible legislation.

Part of being an American is being able to go anywhere you want at any time without any restrictions. And we want people to feel safe, to be able to take to the air if they choose and feel secure anywhere they have takeoff,

whether it is a small airport in a rural area, in a small state or one of the metropolitan areas or one of the major hubs.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Aviation of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, I have tried to work in a bipartisan manner. I have only had this responsibility for some 8 or 9 months and, of course, was thrust into the limelight by the events of September 11.

I have tried to approach my responsibility in a business-like fashion. Particularly since I took office, one of my concerns has been aviation security. I have gone around and around about issues of aviation security with FAA from, I believe, February, when I first took on this position, and from the beginning I have been concerned that we have not properly prioritized the risk that the travelling public has taken. In fact, I have had communications back and forth to the Security Director of FAA, who has now been replaced and removed, but we went back and forth in regard to the deployment of equipment that sat idle in regard to setting priorities, in regard to instituting on a more expedited basis security measures.

Unfortunately, some of that was not done as of September 11. Now it is very important that this Congress act in a responsible fashion and craft legislation that deals with not just the political questions that have made the headlines and have been the center of some of the debate, screeners and their role as in any new proposed structure as either Federal employees or private sector employees, but looking at the larger picture of aviation security.

Even going beyond that, one of the things we have done is sat down, and it is amazing. When I sat down and looked at who is responsible for transportation security, under the current structure it is almost impossible to pinpoint who has that responsibility in the Department of Transportation.

□ 2045

Then we look at the other modes of transportation. Of course everyone is now focused on aviation, but when we look at highways and hazardous materials and trucking, we look at pipelines, we look at our ports, we look at any type of transportation security and we see that there is no one, if we look at a chart of organization, in charge with the specific responsibility and also the authority to move on issues of security. So that is one of the glaring examples that we all found lacking.

We find actually in the Senate proposed bill that they do create a new Deputy Under Secretary of Transportation Security in a measure that will be before the House tomorrow, and the House Republican majority proposal also has that provision. To start out, when we look at the problems of transportation security and see no one in

charge, we know that someone specifically must be in charge of all modes of transportation security.

We have done that in the House majority bill. What is better than the Senate proposal, which was somewhat hastily crafted and put together, is, we have given some specific authority. If we look at the provisions of the Senate proposal, they create the position of a Deputy Under Secretary for Transportation Security, but that individual can only act when a national emergency is declared.

What is even more lacking in the Senate proposal, again that was hastily put together, is there is no ability for that individual who is charged with transportation and aviation security to put in place security rules on an immediate basis. In fact, that is the biggest flaw of the bill. That is why if that measure should pass, I would urge the President to veto the Senate bill.

It was hastily crafted. It is a nice cosmetic proposal that says we are going to make baggage screeners Federal employees and that is going to solve the problems. But I say to my colleagues, that is merely a cosmetic proposal. Whether those employees were under Federal supervision or all Federal employees or all private employees, it does not matter a bit. What matters is the standards that are put in place.

Most people, if we stop and just take a minute and look at what happened on September 11, baggage screeners were not at fault. Baggage screeners did not fail. Baggage screeners actually did their job according to the rules and regulations established by Federal employees and the Federal Government. The Federal Government was not able, even after two directives by Congress, to put in place standards for improving the quality, the qualifications, the background checks, and again, generally improving all of the requirements for being a baggage handler for more than 6 years. And, as of tonight, on Halloween night, we still do not have in place strong provisions for qualifications for baggage handlers.

That is for a very simple reason. That is because it takes, on average, in the Department of Transportation 3.8 years to pass a rule; in other words, to get a regulation to put in place newer standards. So today, some 6 years after Congress first directed FAA to get a rule into place, higher standards and regulations for baggage screeners and background checks, those qualifications are still not in place.

What is absolutely astounding is the Senate proposal does not even have a single provision giving the new Deputy Under Secretary any authority to put in place rules on an expedited basis, so that actually, if we pass the Senate provision, it puts us in a worse position than we were on September 10. And we have not learned very much by the experience, the horrible experience, that we never want repeated of September 11.

So, first, the Senate bill creates a position with really no authority, some limited responsibility, mainly to report to Congress, but the whole crux, the whole solution to the problem we face is getting rules into place on an expedited basis. So, on September 11, there were no high standards for baggage screeners. On September 11, there was no requirement, there was no regulation put in place to put in place the very best equipment we could, the very best technology. In fact, getting a rule in place was thwarted.

We have technology, and this will not show up to all of my colleagues who are watching, Mr. Speaker. I do not think my colleagues can see this, but this is technology that is electromagnetic technology. It is not x-ray technology. X-ray technology and the machines we see at most airports, that happens to be equipment from the 1970s and 1980s; it will detect metal.

On September 11 we believe that hijackers took plastic weapons, possibly plastic knives, they could have been ceramic knives, but the x-ray technology of the 1970s will not detect that. This shows a body outline and it shows plastic weapons, plastic guns, plastic knives and others that we are able to detect with this latest equipment. This technology has been tested, but not deployed, because we cannot get a rule passed to get the latest technology into place.

We can have a Federal employee, we can have a Federal employee as we require who is an American citizen, we can have a Federal employee supervised by a Federal employee, we can have a Federal employee with a college degree, we can have a Federal employee as a screener who has a Ph.D.; but he or she is only as good as the equipment that is issued. The Senate bill has not one word, again, or one ability for the new Deputy Under Secretary to get this equipment, this new technology in place on an immediate basis. So basically, if we pass the Senate bill, we would be just as bad off as we were on September 10, the day before the tragedy; and it will not make any improvement in the ability of the screener, be he or she a Federal employee, a contract employee or whoever.

So the Senate bill does not address the basic problems with the deployment of technology.

I heard the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) and some others who were discussing some of the problems with getting legislation passed, and let me say again tonight there were some scary things said, and the American people should not be frightened to fly. The American people should understand, first of all, that the President of the United States acted immediately, and under his order, within just a matter of days now, every large commercial aircraft flying in the United States will have secure cockpit doors. The President acted, Secretary Mineta has informed me by, I believe it

is November 5 or 7, but within a few days, every commercial airline or large aircraft, not all of the smaller aircraft, but the large ones, will have secure cockpit doors. That is one of the provisions of both the Senate bill and the House bill. That is a moot point. That has been done. It is in place and it is ongoing.

A second provision that is very similar, and the American people again should not be scared on Halloween or any other time, because the President of the United States has acted with due speed and he has required that air marshals be on flights.

I can tell my colleagues, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Aviation and former chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil Service, and we will get into that in just a second, but I can tell my colleagues as chairman with, again, the responsibility in the House on the aviation side, that air marshals are being trained every day, they are being deployed, they are on most of our flights, that hijackers will not know which ones; and whether the bill passes or not, they will be on almost every domestic and international flight. So that has been done.

I can tell my colleagues that Secretary Mineta acted yesterday, issuing additional orders for higher security and improvements and higher standards. So the administration has acted. The President has acted. It has never been safer to fly.

Now, is it impossible, or is it possible, I should say, to have some other incident? When we have people who are willing to give up their lives to destroy an aircraft, to go into a marketplace and blow themselves up as they have done in Israel, there is no place that can be totally secure. So we put in place the best provisions humanly possible.

What is important now is not for the Congress to rush and act, and everyone says, oh, the Senate passed this in a few weeks; and, yes, they did, and the product shows that it is a product of haste, it is a product of lack of consideration.

We, on the House side, held 4 weeks of public hearings, numerous public hearings. We held several closed hearings. We brought in experts from around the world and around the United States to hear what was going on. I do want to say that there has been a scare again by some of the previous speakers about baggage checking, and I can tell my colleagues that tomorrow, when the House votes on the package, the final package that the House majority has put together, it has the very best provisions for checking baggage.

Now, as the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) has said, 95 percent of the checked baggage is not screened. He was correct in saying that. The problem we had, and he did attend, I will give him credit for attending one of our hearings, which is more than the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE),

who is the prime sponsor, has ever done. One of the prime sponsors of the Senate measure and a member of the majority never bothered to discuss with me or anyone else any of the provisions of our legislation, but at least the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) did take the time to come to the hearing. I do not know if he heard everything that was said at the hearing about checked baggage; and he did repeat tonight on the floor some information about explosive detection devices.

What the House of Representatives cannot do is repeat the mistake they made in 1996 after the TWA 800 crash, after Oklahoma City, when all the attention became glued on explosive devices. We went out and we spent \$443 million, almost a half a billion dollars, on buying explosive detection devices. Some of that sat in warehouses, some of it is not used. We had testimony to that effect in the hearings that we had. Why? Because some of it does not work, and Congress required the purchase of that.

We also heard from experts, technology individuals from a broad range of the sciences, who told us that the explosive devices, the actual materials, explosive materials are changing every 3 or 4 years. There are new products that can be used as explosive devices. So the last thing we need to do is put a provision in a law that requires us to go out, put in place in 3 years, or some specified time, equipment that will be outdated by the time that it all gets deployed.

□ 2100

It does not matter how we deploy that equipment, it still will take a number of years to get it deployed everywhere.

So in the House measure we have the tightest and the best provision. We do not repeat the mistake when we spend a lot of money, when the equipment is not used, when new technology is being developed, and we have spent the money on old technology, and we get this in place on an expedited basis.

The other thing that the Democrat side has lost is that we cannot get that technology in place without a rule-making expeditious provision in the law. The Senate bill has no provision. If we go through the normal rule-making to require this type of equipment, it could be some 5 to 7 years, as we have seen in the past, so the public is left in the lurch. Baggage checking at the level that should be done is not complete.

So we do not want to make the mistakes of 1996. Everyone says we must hurry, that this legislation should be rushed through. It passed the Senate 100 to nothing. The worst thing we could do is make a mistake tomorrow and pass bad legislation.

I do not want to be rough on the Senators, Mr. Speaker, but the Senate passed legislation, the other body passed legislation that primarily deals

with the airline screening process. It is only a small piece of the total transportation security network, a small piece of the total aviation security network that we should be dealing with.

When they passed their legislation in haste, they moved it to the Department of Justice. The Department of Justice, let me read what the Department of Justice has said about the Senate provision.

It says: "We also feel that attempting to divide the responsibility for aviation security between two separate agencies is not the most effective way to enhance aviation security."

They also go on to say that right now, "In light of DOT's strong capabilities and the Department of Justice's many responsibilities in fighting the war on terrorism, we feel that the resources would be better spent carrying out our current mission than developing a new transportation expertise."

Again, that is in opposition to what the Senate passed. Their focus is on going after terrorism. Actually, the most important function, if we wanted to increase the number of Federal employees, we only have 11,000 Federal FBI investigative agents. This bill creates 28,000, now get this, baggage screeners, Federal baggage screeners. Would we not be much better off getting investigative personnel for the FBI?

If we look at the events of September 11, again, it was not the baggage screeners that failed. It is nice to make them the scapegoat, but to tell the American public everything will be fine if we just make them Federal employees, that in fact will not solve the problem. The problem is that we cannot get security in place with, again, a disjointed organization that is created by the Senate bill.

We have a plea from the Department of Justice not to send and create a two-tiered system. What is strange in the Senate bill, and I went through the Senate bill, the Senate bill in fact creates several layers of aviation security.

Now, if the traveling public and Members of Congress are concerned about a good aviation security system, they should read this bill. I would venture to say that 95 percent of the Senators did not read this legislation. This legislation by the Senate was put together so hastily they left the actual law enforcement functions, law enforcement functions, under the Department of Transportation, while transferring baggage screening to the Department of Justice.

Not only did they leave the Department of Transportation with the law enforcement responsibility, and it is hard to believe, but that is exactly how it reads. I went back and had the staff attorneys check this to see if in fact that is what they did, and it appears they did it by error.

However, what they did was they also created several levels of law enforcement. They only require one law en-

forcement officer at each airport screening location at the 100 largest airports. There are another 270 airports for which they exempt security at small community airports, and they go on and say that at smaller airports with scheduled passenger operations, they should enter into agreements under which screening of passengers and property will be carried out by qualified, trained State or local law enforcement personnel.

So we might get in in Portland, Maine, as some of the hijackers did, and there would be one level of security. Someone might come to Boston and have a different level of security. Again, this is a fractured system that is far worse than what we have now.

Now, trying to make 28,000 baggage handlers Federal employees in even the most expedited fashion might take some 3 years. In the meantime, we would have created a disaster with some of the current services that have already been considered by private vendors.

I am not here to defend any of the private vendors who have not put in place already standards. Of course, FAA, a Federal agency and Federal employees, did not require the higher standards. We had no rule in place and could not get a rule for 6 years, and do not have a rule tonight. With the Senate bill, we have no hope of getting a rule because there is not an expedited rule-making process.

So again, the bill was hastily crafted by the Senate, sent over to the House, and I think that their intent was that we work on this measure as they have sent it to us. We have conducted, again, a much more comprehensive series of hearings, bringing experts in and trying to see how this would function best. A split system between the Department of Justice for baggage screeners, for some law enforcement to be under the Department of Transportation and for some screening to be done by State and local officials, is not the way to go. It is a fractured, disjointed security system.

The bill which we have proposed in the House is well thought out. It has one level of responsibility first of all for transportation and aviation security. That is an undersecretary of transportation level. That Secretary is responsible for all security measures in transportation and all in aviation; all elements, not just a few, not just the baggage issue.

There are also issues of airport perimeter security; there are issues of cargo security; there are issues of ramp personnel, those who have access to the airplane; there are issues of those who maintain the airplane and clean the airplane; there are issues of the FAA towers at each of these airports, and we have heard reports some of those may be at risk.

The Senate bill does not touch any of those issues. They only deal with the most visible, doing a cosmetic job on the public and convincing people that

they acted in a hurry and they got the job done and sent it to the House and we did not act.

I can tell the Members that nothing is further from the truth. We acted in a very reasoned manner. We held hearings. We heard testimony from dozens and dozens of witnesses, the best experts. We looked at what was successful in Europe.

Today, there is an article from the former head of El Al Airlines. We had that individual come and testify before us. We said, "What worked well?" Do Members know, in Israel and Europe they tried federalization in the 1970s and 1980s and it did not work. They went to Federal supervision, Federal management, Federal oversight, Federal background checks, and Federal testing. That has worked. That is the best model. That is the model that we bring before the House tomorrow.

We also again go back to the individual responsible for all of these elements of transportation and aviation security, not only responsible, but with the authority to put in place security regulations on an immediate basis.

That is the biggest problem with the Senate bill. The Senate bill is a terrible measure, again taking us back to September 10. Have we learned nothing from the events of September 11?

So while screeners are the most visible, while we want them under Federal supervision, now the airlines have that responsibility. The airlines now are charged with that responsibility, and are also paid for airline and airport security.

The Republican measure, the House majority measure, takes that responsibility away from the airlines. It makes it a Federal process. We have made the Federal Government responsible for aviation security and transportation security, but not just making someone responsible, because we have done that in government before.

We have passed two measures, one in 1996 on aviation security, in a reaction to TWA 800, which incidentally turned out to be a technical malfunction in the gas tank, the fuel tank of the airplane. But we passed that legislation in 1996. We passed legislation a year ago, in 2000, directing that we have higher standards for baggage screeners, and it still is not, as of tonight, in place. So Members can have someone with the responsibility, but they must have the authority.

It is absolutely unbelievable. We have to take their bill and look at the bill. The bill has no provision for an expedited rulemaking, so we cannot get the rules in place, we cannot get the new technology in place. The mistakes of September 11 can be repeated. It would be years if we could ever get in place this latest technology that can scan the body.

Incidentally, we had this tested. We asked why we would not get this in place. Basically, they cannot pass a rule, so they might have the responsibility to get the latest technology in

place, government, but they do not have the ability through the rule-making process, which is delayed or which people go into court and try to kill or stymie, to get this technology.

This technology can detect plastics, ceramics or other materials, and there will be even a later technology coming on board. Of course, this technology also has upset some of the civil liberties union. It is very invasive. It shows body parts in great detail, but it will detect materials. It would have, if it had been in place in Boston Logan, detected if in fact a plastic weapon was used on one of those flights.

The Senate bill does nothing to address the rule-making process. It again divides responsibility in an unclear split between the Department of Justice and the Department of Transportation. It leaves law enforcement in charge, actually under the direction of the Department of Transportation. Now, get this: They move baggage screening to the Department of Justice, but they leave law enforcement under the Department of Transportation.

Mr. Speaker, I said that we must have rules in place in an expedited fashion. We do not have the rules for high standards for baggage screeners in place. We do not have the technology in place because we have not had the ability to put a rule in place. No one has expedited rule-making ability under the Senate provision.

I have to repeat that, Mr. Speaker, because no one seems to hear it. It is nice to come here and pass legislation, but legislation that does nothing is a fraud on the American public. Legislation that does not enhance security or put in place security measures on an expedited basis is a fraud.

At this time it would be an abdication of our responsibility as Members of Congress not to put it in place, and if it takes another day, if it takes another week, if we have to go to conference, but this time to do it right so that we have a comprehensive transportation and aviation security measure.

This is not a bipartisan issue. Actually, we worked very closely the last 4 or 5 weeks with members of both sides of the aisle. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) worked with us. We crafted most of this legislation with the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the ranking member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. We crafted this legislation with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI), my counterpart, the ranking Democrat member on the Subcommittee on Aviation. We did this in a bipartisan fashion, and this is a good bill.

□ 2115

One issue deep-sixed the bill that the Democrats were going to introduce which was exactly the same as ours and one word. They said all screeners shall be Federal employees. We said all

screeners may be Federal employees. We gave the option because again we think a public-private partnership can serve us best.

Let me say, I have no problem with having Federal employees handling the supervision. I have no problem with Federal employees handling the oversight. I have no problem with Federal employees doing the background checks, the testing, all of the other management responsibilities of the screening process, and that is what our bill proposes. It makes this a Federal process and then gives the President and also the DOT security administrator the option, and we think that is the best way to go.

One of the problems that has already arisen with the Senate bill is the language, when they passed this bill in haste, in trying to make it appear that they were doing something, they passed this bill in haste, and unfortunately, it has raised some questions about unionization of the potential Federal employees. Part of this was done by some of those who would like to represent the new Federal employee group of some 28,000.

A quote taken just the other day from AFGE, the American Federation of Government Employees, Legislative Director Beth Moten said the union could live with the measure; that is, the Senate measure, but litigation may be required to ensure most of the civil service obligations remain in place.

We were told that this would be a different brand of Federal employee, but it appears the way the language is written that every one of the constraints now and every one of the obligations that are now provided by law for a Federal civil servant will be imposed on those that may be employed of this force of 28,000.

My colleagues have to understand the size of 28,000 Federal employees. There are five agencies in the Federal Government, five Cabinet departments, that do not have 28,000 Federal employees. This will be larger than the State Department. It will be larger than the Department of Labor. It will be larger than HUD. It will have more employees than the Department of Energy, more employees than the Department of Education, and they will all be baggage screeners. So we will have a department basically of baggage screeners, taken away from the Department of Transportation and put into the Department of Justice with the Department of Justice saying today that they have no ability to handle them.

The Department of Justice only has 11,000 FBI agents in the entire agency and only has between 4- and 5,000 Federal marshals, but we are going to put them in charge of baggage screening. It just is a ludicrous idea. It may sound good.

What does it do? Here we create Federal employment with the possibility of getting into a brawl over the status of these individuals the way the language is poorly written on the Senate side.

I implore my colleagues, look at this. We cannot create a huge bureaucracy, and having been chairman for 4 years in the House of the Subcommittee on Civil Service, I tried on this floor on numerous occasions over my 4-year tenure to bring to the floor measures that would require performance standards for Federal employees, a performance-based management system, and I actually passed it in the House several times, and it was defeated in the Senate, and we still have nothing in place.

Let me say out of the 1.9 million Federal employees, and there are 8- or 900,000 postal employees, there are some dedicated employees. There are some great employees who go to work every day and do an incredible job in the country, serving their agency.

When I was chairman of Civil Service, I met so many of these dedicated individuals, but if you get these people aside and you talk to them about what would improve their agency, they will tell you what improved their agency is getting rid of the deadwood, and it is part of the problem we have with our Federal bureaucracy and sometimes government at every level is that we create an insular system, a system in which you cannot, as you do in the private sector, get rid of the deadwood.

We tried everything, including giving the employees the right to set up a performance-based system: Reward good employees and get rid of the bad employees, but it is almost impossible to do. In fact, it takes years to get rid of a Federal employee, and if they want to fight the system, it takes on average 38 months just to go through the normal complaint process. That is on average.

If we want responsiveness in those screeners that are out there doing a job, if we want the ability to fire somebody and get rid of the poor performers, then certainly the Federal model is not the way to go. I might say that there are Federal employees that try to do the best job, and even if they attempt to do the best job, they make mistakes, too.

Let me cite an example of a Federal prison in one of our States. A recent report said that in a maximum Federal prison facility, with Federal guards, Federal employees, Federal oversight, with strip searches, with body cavity searches, with searches of the personnel coming in, with detection screening equipment, still more than a hundred weapons entered the Federal security prison. So it can happen. We have the possibility of a weapon getting on to a plane, but we also have the possibility of weapons going into a Federal maximum secure facility.

What is important here, again, is when we create this position that we have someone responsible, who can act on an immediate basis, not just giving someone the responsibility but without the authority, and that is what happens if tomorrow they pass the other body's provision, the Senate's provision. They have the responsibility as

they may define a partial responsibility in a new individual but no authority to move forward.

The other thing that we tried to do in this legislation is find a responsible manner to pay for aviation security. I have Republicans who do not like to impose any taxes. I have Democrats who can never find a tax high enough and they are trying to find a compromise. It has been a challenge but we did put a provision that allows up to a maximum of \$2.50 per one-way trip in our legislation, and this money can only be used to pay for aviation airline security. It cannot be used for ads. It cannot be used for anything else.

We also do not let the airlines off the hook. Interestingly enough, the airlines have been anxious to get rid of this screening responsibility. They do not want this. This is a hot potato, but they also now pay for it, and they pay about a billion dollars out of their revenues, and heaven knows, we have tried to help the airlines get back on their feet. We may even have to do more because we are so dependent on aviation as a transportation system in this country. We felt that it was important and we asked questions to these airline representatives: Would you be willing to pay? They said they would pay.

Of course, they would like to get off the hook for aviation security responsibility because of the costs, but they have agreed, and under our legislation, the airlines can also be assessed part of the cost. The passenger can be assessed part of the cost. We tried to do a very fair measure.

With the Senate provision it basically lets the airlines off the hook. They get a billion dollar free ride, and the taxpayer is going to pay because it is going to come out of the national Treasury and the passenger will pay for the balance.

I think people are willing to pay. I have never voted for a tax. I do not consider this a tax. I consider it a user fee, and we do have specific provisions in our legislation that says the actual cost of the screening, passenger screening must be passed on, and we give an amount up to, but we also make the airlines partially responsible, which we think is very important.

What concerns me is not only the disjointed approach to aviation security proposed by my colleagues from the other side of the aisle and rapidly put together and sent to the House by the Senate. What concerns me is that we have this disjointed part of the functions now in the Department of Justice, who has said publicly today they have no way of handling 28,000 more employees. They are not geared to that. They think it is best in the Department of Transportation.

It also takes out part of the Transportation function, one part of it, and leaves all the rest sort of to hang by itself, again leaving the public at risk. Who knows what is going on in the airport perimeter? Who knows what is going on with ramp personnel? Who

knows what is going on with maintenance people? Who knows what is going on with the mechanics? Who is protecting the FAA tower?

So they do sort of a half-baked job with a split, undefined responsibility, having screeners in the Department of Justice, 28,000 of them, leave law enforcement under the Department of Transportation, which is just beyond me, having a different level of law enforcement for the hundred top airports. The smaller airports, well, they sort of fend for themselves, and we will take State or local offerings, and again, we do not believe that that is the way to go.

We need Federal standards across the board. We need someone with responsibility and someone with authority, which again is lacking in the measure that will be presented by the other side tomorrow.

The worst thing that we could do is have several levels of security at our airports. We have another measure in the bill for screening. Some of the screening at the smaller airports may or may not be done according to having Federal standards and Federal regulations in place that are even and across the board for small airports and for larger airports, and that is important. There must be a seamless security and comprehensive security plan or we are just fooling the American public and that would be a shame.

Most of what is being done by the Senate bill is cosmetic. Most of it was done in haste. There was a hundred to nothing vote on it to get it over here. The Senate has voted a hundred to nothing before. They voted unanimously, after the British burnt the Capitol in history, if you look this up, to move from Washington, and it was saved by a few votes in the House of Representatives. The House votes unanimously every day on issues. We had several votes today. I think that we were unanimous. Everything is done by unanimous consent and they unanimously tossed the ball into our court, and we tried to be responsible.

We held continuous hearings, both open and closed. We brought in the best experts, and we tried to put together the very best provisions possible.

One of the other provisions of the legislation that sort of surprised me, and I have the Senate bill here, and again I would venture to say very few Members have taken the opportunity to read this legislation, and that is the frightening part because they will wake up if they pass the wrong measure and see that we do not have in place the very best provisions for airline security, but one of the interesting things is that the Senate bill brings together all of the different intelligence agencies' and enforcement agencies' information, but the Senate measure does not have any way to distribute information about the bad guys. We do provide that that information be available to the airlines.

□ 2130

The airlines are the only ones that have the passenger lists. We have a requirement that every airline that flies into the United States must provide us with a passenger list.

If we want to avoid the mistakes of September 11, we need to at least allow the airlines to have some information about who the suspected terrorists are. The Senate bill puts together a committee, but has no requirement. It does not require that every airline coming into the United States provide us with a list.

So the very least we can do is learn by the mistakes of September 11, see that they are not repeated. The very least we can do is not make the same mistakes we made in 1996, when we passed knee-jerk legislation, and we bought billions of dollars' worth of equipment, made all kinds of changes, and addressed explosive devices. We acquired explosive devices, and we have unused explosive devices because we do not have rules to get in place the proper explosive devices.

The worst thing we can do is repeat the mistakes of 1996, so we do not want to do that.

Then again in 2000, when we saw we still did not have in place rules for baggage handlers, we passed another law directing the agency to do it. As of tonight, they still have not done this. So while the Senate bill, I think, was well-intended, they tried to pass something in a hurry and get it to us, but it was done in haste.

We need to proceed with caution. We need to proceed in an expeditious fashion, but also take the very best from others who have put into place the tightest possible security systems, to put people in place who have both the responsibility and, most importantly, the authority.

If there is no other reason to defeat the Senate proposal, it is because it lacks the ability to put rules in place relating to security on an expedited basis, and this brings us back to September 10, not learning one single thing, using airline screening employees as the scapegoats. Airline screening employees on September 11 did not fail; it was the lack of Federal standards put in place to check even their background. It was the lack of Federal agencies to do their jobs.

If we want to put more personnel someplace, we should put them in our visa department. I checked to see how many people work issuing visas around the entire world, and it is somewhere in the neighborhood of 5,000. Here we are creating a bureaucracy of 28,000 baggage screeners and what we may need are people who can identify a potential terrorist, a hijacker, a potential murderer who may be let legally into the United States.

Most of the terrorists used our border as a swinging door with a visa, with a permit. We can do all the checks, we can send the National Guard to do a check at the screening area, we can

have a Federal employee or a contract employee, we can have the airline employees all become Federal employees and they can check the IDs. But if Mr. Adda comes to the counter, and they check him, and he has an ID and a visa, they let him go; and he goes next to the airport screener or to a National Guard person, whoever is checking the IDs there now, and that person checks it and say, oh, this is Mr. Adda, go forth Mr. Adda, you have a visa. A Federal Government employee has given him that visa; therefore he goes to the next stage and he gets on the airplane. Congratulations, Mr. Adda; welcome, get on the plane.

So if we are going to put Federal employees someplace where we need them, we need to put them at the visa locations. There are less than 500 INS inspectors and inspectors along our Canadian border, and that is where we understand the terrorists came in. We have 6,000 or 7,000 down in Mexico, but these terrorists picked our weakest point. If we are going to put employees there at the airports, 28,000, why not put a few in place to protect our borders to catch these people as they come in?

So we need the intelligence, first of all, about these individuals. We need someone checking the visas. All the protections in the world can be put in place, but they will be useless if we do not do this.

Again, look at the September 11 events. Plastic weapons were not in place because we did not have the most modern equipment in place. We cannot make the mistakes we have made in the past.

Tomorrow my colleagues will have an opportunity to debate this and, hopefully, we will do the right thing to ensure a comprehensive transportation and aviation security plan for the country. We must do it right. We must do it in a comprehensive fashion. I plead with my colleagues not to make this a partisan issue, but to make it a public interest issue and pass the very best legislation. The American people deserve no less.

---

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLAKE). Members are reminded to refrain from characterizing Senate action.

---

#### ABUSES SUFFERED BY AFGHAN WOMEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, once again we have come to denounce the ongoing abuse of Afghan women, and we will not stop coming here each week to highlight the atrocities of this attack on the very funda-

mental human rights of women and children, especially their girls. I want to ensure that the plight of Afghan women and girls is not forgotten, and in order to do so, we must continue to bring attention to their status.

The women of this House have constantly taken a stand for Afghan women, and some of the very sensitive men as well. Tonight I am joined by one of my colleagues who has been extremely sensitive and passionate about the Afghan women and their plight and the atrocities that they have had to withstand. But it is the resolve of the entire Congress that will help return civil society to Afghan women and children.

Women and children in Afghanistan have been the primary victims of the Taliban regime. Before the Taliban took control, women were leaders in public life and politics. For example, in Kabul, over 70 percent of teachers were women. Forty percent of the doctors and the vast majority of the health care workers were women. In addition, over half of the university students were women. In fact, in 1977, women made up over 15 percent of Afghanistan's highest legislative branch. Now, that is more than the 14 percent of women that serve here in the U.S. Congress today.

When the Taliban came to power, they banned women from working, prohibited women and girls from attending school, and forbade women from leaving their homes without being accompanied by a close male relative. Women have been brutally beaten, publicly flogged and killed for violating the Taliban decrees, decrees no doubt that the Taliban imposed and no one else.

Let me cite some of the horrific examples of the heinous acts of the Taliban. A woman who defied Taliban orders by running a home school for girls was killed in front of her family and friends. A woman caught trying to flee Afghanistan with a man not related to her was stoned to death for adultery. An elderly woman was brutally beaten with a metal cable until her leg was broken because her ankle was accidentally shown from underneath her burqa. Women have died of curable ailments because male doctors are not allowed to treat them. The two women who were accused of prostitution were publicly hung.

Mr. Speaker, these acts are unconscionable and inhumane and members of the Women's Caucus here in the House, of which I serve as co-chair, have taken on this project, along with my dear friend and colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE). Together, we are working to make sure that the women throughout this Nation and around this world help to empower Afghan women. We will continue to take action until we end this horrendous gender apartheid.

Mr. Speaker, tonight I am joined by this friend of mine who has been diligent in working to bring attention, to

shed light, and has been most passionate about the plight of Afghan women. The gentleman from California is no stranger to this issue, as he is no stranger to the many issues surrounding women in this House. He has a bill that he has introduced, and I am one of the original cosponsors, which is the Radio Free Afghanistan Act. He is here tonight to share with me this hour to talk about the women of Afghanistan.

I now would like to yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California, and I very much appreciate all the effort she has put into calling attention to the plight of these victims.

The gentlewoman is right to say that women were leaders in Afghanistan. I think many people today, when they look at the situation there, they do not understand how that culture was hijacked, how the Afghan culture was hijacked by the Taliban and the consequences to that society. When we think about the fact that, as the gentlewoman correctly pointed out, the majority of the people in the work force were women, we should ask why that was. It was because so many men had lost their lives in the battles when the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan. So women were typically the heads of household.

Because women had played a role in Afghan society, women had the right to vote. Women were in the work force, as the gentlewoman said. They were such a large percentage of the professionals, I think 40 percent of the doctors. So many university students were women, over half the student body.

Imagine for a society like that what a shock it was, since these were the majority of the people who were heads of household, bringing home a paycheck to feed children in an economy that was already in trouble, the day that edict came down that said women could no longer work in the work force. This was a death knell for many families. Starvation followed. People were subjected to unbelievable deprivation.

One of the things we wanted to do with Radio Free Afghanistan, and we have been working for some time to try to get some other voice into that society other than Radio Taliban. Radio Taliban comes on at night and tells people only what the government wants them to hear, and comes up with these proclamations, one after another, about what is to be interpreted as illegal under Taliban law. And as that list grows, so many of these restrictions are on women, I just thought I would share some of the restrictions that the Taliban have placed on society.

Women are not to laugh loudly; that is against the law. Women are not to ride in taxis or play sports or enter a sports center or ride bicycles or motorcycles or gather for festive occasions or play cards. Riding public buses with men is against the law. Appearing on the balconies of their home is against

the law. When they are in the home, they are to paint the windows so that no one can see in.

But far more serious than these dictates are the costs paid in human lives for those women brave and bold enough to defy these laws and to go into homes and try to home school a new generation of young Afghan girls so that they will have the ability to read and write, so that they will have the capacity in life, someday, hopefully, if this iron control that the Taliban has over society lets up, so that they will have hope.

□ 2145

Those brave women are often put to death.

I mentioned earlier the response by the Taliban official that soccer is a game enjoyed for years in Afghanistan. There was a question put by a representative of the European Union about soccer returning to Afghanistan. The response by the leader of the Taliban was, if the European Union will build us another stadium, then we can have soccer; but we need this stadium for our public executions. I think all of us have seen photographs of the women brought into the stadium, the Taliban men filling the bleachers, brought down and publicly executed for not following the rules of the Taliban.

Since women are not allowed to work to support themselves in Afghanistan, thousands of Afghan war widows have reluctantly become beggars in that society. Because male doctors may not examine women, women are banned from working, Afghan women have no access to health care.

One example, one day while filling a woman's tooth, Taliban police stormed the office of a male dentist and began whipping the women present because they were not accompanied by male relatives. The dentist was jailed and his office was closed for 2 days.

To cope with the overwhelming stress living under Taliban control like this, large numbers of women are turning to drugs. From 1995 to the year 2000, there was a 75 percent increase in drug addicts with no health care to support their addiction, to get them off of drugs. It is not surprising that the suicide rate for women in Afghanistan has escalated. Many women choose to take their own lives rather than live the life that the Talibans dictate that they live.

One female Afghan refugee told a reporter, "Because of the Taliban, Afghanistan has become a jail for women. We do not have any human rights. We do not have the right to go outside and look after our children. We do not even have the right to go to the doctor. We always need permission." Those are the words of an Afghan woman.

The Taliban denial of women to have a job has created a flood of unemployment. These unemployed women face serious financial problems; and as a natural consequence, what happens to the children? The children suffer from

hunger, from malnutrition and a chronic state of poverty. Most of them have lost their last recourse to income. They have sold most of their possessions to buy food. Those who could afford leaving the country, have already sold their assets to do so. Those who could not are making up the bulk of the beggars in Afghanistan today. Here we are with Afghanistan's brutal winter approaching.

A large number of these beggars are ex-teachers. A large number are ex-civil servants. This is the horror of what has been happening in Afghanistan. A false assumption by some is that Afghans in general back these practices. While the Taliban maybe by some was originally seen as a force for stability, and we have war-weary Afghans after years of fighting, they heard on Radio Taliban that a force for stability is coming. But that force for stability that those people thought might be stability soon wore out its welcome. Faced with a few years of this abuse, it is no surprise that Afghans now want to overthrow the Taliban.

In a recent poll conducted by Physicians for Human Rights, that poll found 90 percent of Afghan men and women rejected the Taliban's restrictions that exclude women from participating in education, employment, and other aspects of civilian life. 94 percent of women in the Taliban-controlled area said that the Taliban has made their lives much worse, and attributed their declining physical and mental health to Taliban policies.

Muslims at large do not support the Taliban's fanatical practices. Moderate Muslim governments oppose the Taliban's treatment of women and its false interpretation of Islam. The Taliban is a repressive political regime whose aim is to monopolize power in Afghanistan; and to do that, it practices pure terror.

President Bush recognized this in his speech to the Joint Session of Congress which we heard here on the floor when he said, "The United States respects the people of Afghanistan, but we condemn the Taliban regime." The Taliban has demonstrated a blatant disregard for the well-being of Afghans, and by harboring terrorists, it has demonstrated a blatant disregard for human life, both within and outside the Afghanistan borders.

The U.S. is right, therefore, to seek to overthrow the Taliban government. This will rid the world of an evil regime and will improve the livelihood of the Afghan people and will put a stop to the violations of women's rights which in Afghanistan today is a more dire situation for women than anywhere else on this planet.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) for organizing an ongoing effort to call attention to the plight of these women. My hope is that the world community becomes more involved and understands better

why it is we have to make certain that this Taliban regime is replaced, and that the women of Afghanistan are again given a voice and basic human rights. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I am certain that we will continue this each week and will not stop until we see the improvements on women and children in Afghanistan.

We have been joined by another member of the women's caucus who has spoken out passionately about the women of Afghanistan, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want the gentleman to know that there are many women who appreciate his leadership on this issue and appreciate the gentleman coming to the floor and speaking out for the women in Afghanistan.

I also want to bring to the attention of my colleagues in Congress and others the leadership of the gentleman on the Voice of America, the voice for Afghanistan, to bring the truth to the people about what our country is trying to accomplish. The fact that we are also supplying humanitarian aid and that we are attacking terrorists, not Afghanistan and the people there, but the Taliban and the terrorists.

I would like the gentleman to explain his bill which I think is an extremely important one, which I support. Even though it is not the purpose of this Special Order, I think it is an important issue and one that should be highlighted.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for this opportunity to explain what we have in mind with respect to Radio Free Afghanistan.

Basically the people of Afghanistan, and through this region, have not had the opportunity to hear information that contradicts the ongoing propaganda from the government in a way which was intended to explain the lies and to explain to the people what was actually happening inside the country.

So the concept behind Radio Free Afghanistan is to do what was done with Radio Free Europe in Poland or Czechoslovakia. When we talk with leaders of Poland or the Czech Republic, they say that the hearts and minds of those people in those countries were turned by the opportunity to listen daily to a radio broadcast which explained what was actually happening inside their society. These broadcasts which were done by ex-pat Czechs and Poles, and so forth, was able to explain and put in context what they would be hearing from the Soviet broadcasts.

Over time we know, from those leaders that we have talked to, that this was the most effective single thing that changed the attitudes of the average person in Eastern Europe, so much so that we all recall what happened with the Berlin Wall. We recall what happened in Poland with the solidarity

movement, and part of this was because they had access to information.

What we are trying to do with Radio Free Afghanistan is to explain to the people of Afghanistan what exactly the Taliban is telling them and why it is false. Why is that important? Because the broadcasts in Afghanistan say this: They say bin Laden is innocent of any attack on the World Trade Center bombing. The assertion is on their information system that there were 4,000 Jewish workers who were absent that day from work because the Israeli government had told them that they were going to bomb the World Trade Center. Of course that is not true because we know how many people lost their lives and how many Jewish employees lost their lives. It is a lie, but it is a lie that is repeated over and over and over again, not just on that radio station, but on newspapers in this part of the world.

So the opportunity to explain the facts are essential. The opportunity to remind people that the Taliban has hijacked that Afghan culture is essential, reminding people that women used to have the right to vote and used to have the right to work and to learn to read and write.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. If the gentleman will yield, I really do think that the gentleman's bill is so crucial now given the fact that the Taliban is telling the people that the humanitarian efforts that we, led by our President is doing for that region, the food is poisonous and what they are saying now and putting out that type of propaganda, trying to influence and bring a type of stalemate or trying to keep the folks from knowing that the United States is in there to help them as opposed to hurting them.

It is very clear that we need to have that bill passed so that we can get radios into the people of Afghanistan, especially the women, so they can understand what the real issue is and not be blind-sided by the Taliban and their barbaric regime.

I know that the gentlewoman wants to speak on this issue, and I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for organizing this Special Order tonight that really focuses on the plight of the women in Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago I came to the House floor to condemn the Taliban's appalling treatment of women. I relayed the tragic story of a 16-year-old girl who was stoned to death for going out in public with a man who was not her family member; and for a woman, for the crime of teaching girls in her home, was also stoned to death in front of her husband, children and students.

□ 2200

Sadly, these terrible acts are real, and they continue under the Taliban regime.

But tonight I want to highlight who the Afghan women are and how we

must support them when Afghanistan rebuilds. Afghan women are neither weak nor helpless. They are merely being imprisoned by an oppressive and brutal regime. Many of those women behind the burqas are strong, capable women who once played a major role in Afghan society.

Women's rights in Afghanistan have fluctuated greatly over the years. Women have bravely fought the forces of extremism at various points in the country's turbulent history. At one time, women comprised 70 percent of the school teachers, 50 percent of the civilian government workers, 40 percent of the doctors, and 50 percent of the students in universities. They were scientists and professors. They led corporations, nonprofit organizations, and were very active in their local communities.

Extremist forces in the early 1990s, some of the same groups that are being proposed as potential leaders of a new government in Afghanistan, began to curtail women's freedoms. But when the Taliban came to power in 1996, it banned women from all public life. Working itself became a crime. Today, women who were once diplomats and judges can be beaten for improper dress. Women who were once army generals can be shot for leaving their homes without a male escort, even to receive medical care. The Taliban condone rape as an effective means of punishing women and rewarding soldiers.

Mr. Speaker, one of these days, we do not know how long it will be, but it will happen, we will end the Taliban regime for its support of terrorism; and we will be in a position to help Afghan women forge a better future for themselves and their families. We must begin to discuss the future of women in Afghanistan. It is crucial that any coalition that is assembled to run Afghanistan fully restore the rights of women. We will not need to construct a new, novel idea of equality between men and women. Instead, we can help reconstruct an old and better way of life.

Afghan women are proven leaders among their people. They can once again rise as thoughtful, powerful community leaders. Women in Afghanistan were guaranteed equality in their constitution, which they helped write in 1964. Women represent the majority of the Afghan people. We need to ensure that their voices are heard and their impact is felt.

Eliminating the Taliban will not automatically end the struggle for women's rights in Afghanistan. There are no angels waiting in the wings to deliver Afghanistan from all the evils of its checkered past. When the U.S. liberates Afghanistan from the Taliban, we must use our moral authority to ensure that power does not fall into the hands of a new regime with extremist views on women's rights. Any regime will surely be better than the Taliban, but our standard must be much higher than that.

President Bush has done our country proud in our war on terrorism and against the Taliban. I urge him to be mindful of this issue and vocal about it as he begins to lay the diplomatic groundwork for a new Afghanistan.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. I thank the gentlewoman from New York. We know how strong she has been and how outspoken she has been on the issue of empowering Afghanistan's women. We want her to come each week as we come to this floor to talk about this plight, to ensure that not only the American women, but women around this world and across this Nation take part in helping us to fight until these women have gotten their rightful fundamental rights, human rights restored back to them.

We do know that millions of people in Afghanistan are experiencing the most desperate poverty imaginable. In addition to the Taliban's barbaric rule, the region is suffering under the most severe drought in decades and military incursions continue to displace hundreds of thousands of Afghans. Seventy-five percent of refugees are women and children; the conditions in which they fight to survive are horrific. According to some estimates, every 30 minutes a woman dies in childbirth and one in four children die before 5 years of age.

During these uncertain times, women and families need safe havens. We must do everything within our power to guarantee humanitarian efforts and aid benefits for the women and children of Afghanistan who are suffering in this region. A significant increase in food, shelter, education and health care services is necessary to ward off starvation, disease and death and to prevent further regional instability that breeds terrorism.

You might recall, Mr. Speaker, for the past 6 years, Afghan women and girls have pleaded with the world to free them from the grip of the brutal Taliban militia and have warned that the Taliban's threat to humanity would extend beyond the borders of Afghanistan. In the wake of September 11, we have come to see the realization of their warnings.

Mr. Speaker, again I applaud the administration's commitment to \$320 million in humanitarian aid and support, a dramatic increase in the United States' efforts to provide long-term humanitarian assistance. More importantly, I stand in full support of providing direct funding to Afghan women-led organizations like the Revolutionary Association of the Women of Afghanistan, known as RAWA, to ensure that the primary beneficiaries are women and children. As we cannot forget the tragic events of September 11, we must not forget the Afghan women and girls and children, the first victims of the Taliban.

I want to engage again my colleagues on some of those things that the Afghan women have been very prominent in, like in 1924, they had the first wom-

en's magazine and published that about Afghan women. In 1964, women were appointed to the advisory constitutional drafting committee. In 1977, Afghan women participated in the drafting committee of the constitution of Afghanistan.

As you can see, women were very much into the whole fabric of Afghanistan, and as my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) was saying, and he certainly knows this history of the Afghan women, we must again fight to ensure and restore women in these pivotal positions, such as publishing magazines, advisory committees on the constitution, because we know that the constitution in 1923 guaranteed equal rights to all citizens of Afghanistan.

The Congressman from California knows this history better than I, but these were the absolute, entrenched women of Afghanistan doing these types of things that during those eras really a lot of women from other countries, including ours, did not have the ability to do.

So you might want to expound again on some of those things that I have outlined here.

Mr. ROYCE. Let me respond.

What is astounding here is the fact that, as the gentlewoman says, you had a culture in which women played such a pivotal role, especially in education, in the professions, in governance; and suddenly, because of the civil war, first the war to repel the Soviet invasion and then the country in turmoil, in despair, you had the Taliban appear on the scene that, through a ruthless effort, grabbed control, not only of the government, but grabbed control of the ability to communicate through radio to the people. What was unique about Afghanistan is that most people got their information from radio, 85 percent of the Afghan people.

Once the Taliban forces had seized the radio stations, the broadcasting stations, they were able to begin a disinformation campaign, a propaganda campaign, to direct the people with misinformation in order to try to have them follow the Taliban.

In 1997, I had suggested to the former Under Secretary for South Asia that we support in the United States a Radio Free Afghanistan at that time. Why? Because the Taliban were sweeping across the country and, with propaganda, the fact that they controlled the information system in much the way that Goebbels in Germany controlled the information system, they were propagandizing on a daily basis.

I said at the time, if we could get a Radio Free Afghanistan up in that society, we would be able to give people true information about what was actually happening, and probably it would head off this Taliban movement, because they thrive through the lies that they spread.

What we found was that once they got control of most of the country, of course they have never been able to

take all of it, but once they got control of the lion's share of Afghanistan, they then, in addition to propagandizing, began to eliminate dissenters, began the process of rounding up and eliminating anyone who tried to disagree with them.

So how do you get information into a society like that? What you do, in my view, is recognize the fact television is already illegal, the Taliban passed a prohibition, it is a criminal act to own a television, so no one owns televisions any longer in the country. The thing you can do to reach these people, in my view, is a constant message on the air to tell them what has actually happened to them, why it has happened, who has done it to them, and why the United States is finally responding to Osama bin Laden. It took an attack on the United States to get us to finally act.

My hope is that we can commit ourselves, as the gentlewoman has correctly pointed out and as the gentlewoman from New York pointed out, not just to ending this cruel operation of al Qaeda and bin Laden, but also making certain that some measure of justice is done here to eliminate that Taliban control and to take the country to a position that it once had with a constitution, with rights.

There is such a dangerous precedent for human rights and for the rights of women especially, in terms of what the Taliban has been able to do, it demands the international community stepping in and making certain that a constitution and the rule of law come back to that country.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. It is amazing you would say the international community, because what we are trying to do as members of the Women's Caucus is to engage women around the world, ambassadors of various countries, NGOs, nongovernmental organizations, women organizations, to help us in this plight.

We applaud RAWA, because RAWA is right there in Afghanistan trying to bring about the type of human rights, the type of democracy and to bring empowerment back to women. We know that is a plight in and of itself, because the Taliban is quickly trying to denounce anyone who tends to want to give freedom and democracy to the people who are so distraught and who are in the throes of their very barbaric actions.

And so the bill, Radio Free Afghanistan, will really help to bring the type of information where the women, those others who are trying to do their level best to bring some sanity and some type of democracy back, will be more informed of what we are trying to do, what people around the world, this international community, is trying to do; and hopefully will help us to restore that type of democracy. Once that is done, I think we must ensure that women have a rightful place in any type of negotiations, any type of legislation.

Indeed, there should be types of elections where they are elected back into office and they get the education that they need so that they can be prominent in the whole fabric of that society.

We cannot stop once we restore the empowerment to women, and we will indeed continue that until we do that. But we must ensure that they continue to have their place and their seat at the table. In fact, we are asking here that Members of Congress include in all proposed legislation on the future of Afghanistan any language that assures the inclusion of women and women organizations in reconstruction of the country at every level of planning, decision-making and implementation.

□ 2215

We must do that. We have seen through the ages through the history of Afghanistan that women have played a very pivotal role. I think about in 1919 when Afghanistan women got their right to vote. In fact, that was a year before we were given the right to vote. A progressive king encouraged women to take part in the political process.

This is what we are doing here in America. This is what we must do with the women there and must ensure that the constitution that has been passed in that country be restored or be done in terms of ensuring that women get their equal rights back. It was written in 1923. We must allow that to be the sole document that encourages women to know that they have an equal right as a citizen of Afghanistan, and that this constitution that was deemed written and adopted in 1923 will encourage women to know that they have a right, a fundamental right and, therefore, should be given the restoration of their democracy and their freedom.

Mr. ROYCE. If the gentlewoman would yield, I would just like to second your observation that a return to the constitution and the rule of law in this part of the world is absolutely essential along with the development of a broad-based inclusive government in Afghanistan. We have to commit ourselves to that.

We have had an opportunity to see the terror that can result when rule of law, when Democratic principles are subverted, and that terror has given rise to an ability of Osama bin Laden and al-Qaeda to use a network of terrorist training camps across that country.

Now, if there had been a Democratic regime or if there had been a broad-based government there, there is no way that these types of terrorist training camps could be used in order to wage war ultimately on the United States.

Terrorists have a difficult time when they are on the run. But when they have a state, as the Taliban in Afghanistan presented as a state, the opportunity for terrorists to come and train

and plan and prepare and be financed and to rehearse and not just rehearse attacks but to use gas and chemicals. All of this was offered to bin Laden and al-Qaeda by the Taliban. This is why it is important to us in the United States in terms of our own lives. Not only should we care about the human beings in the rest of the world that live under this type of tyranny, and tonight we have talked a great deal about just how bereft people are in Afghanistan of any fundamental rights and how women are treated worse there than under any other regimes in the world, but we should also recognize that when the world community and when the United States ignores this type of evil, it eventually, I think, catches up with us as well.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I could not agree with the gentleman more. And this is why the bill authorizes, the gentleman's bill that he will be bringing to this floor, authorizes the funds that will allow a new transmitter that will roughly have 12 hours a day of broadcasting so that they can and in their local language where the Afghan people can really get the true meaning of what we are trying to do, get the type of information that will help to empower them, to get the type of support and to know about the support that it is not only inside RAWA, but on the outside with the international community, then this will help hopefully to further and to make the task a bit easier for us.

But we must ensure that the legislation that the gentleman is pushing, and I am the original co-sponsor of that with him, that we bring this about because we can ill afford to allow the truth not to be told to the people, especially the women of Afghanistan.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, we will be bringing that bill before the Committee on International Relations. We will be passing it out on Thursday. But after that the gentlewoman and I will be working to bring it to the House floor as soon as possible because I believe that time is of the essence.

We want the people of Afghanistan to understand why the United States is involved in this military action against the Taliban and against bin Laden. We want them to understand so that they will be our allies in this effort. And my belief is that their response, once they hear the truth, will be the same as the response by the people of Poland, the people of the former Czechoslovakia, the people of Hungary when they had that opportunity to listen to those Radio Free Europe broadcasts and when the people went to the street and said enough. It is time for tyranny to end. It is time for us to have our freedom.

Well, it is time for the people of Afghanistan to have their freedom and it is the time for the women of Afghanistan to have their human rights back.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, that is the empowerment that we are trying to do.

As we looked on yesterday with Michael Jordan returning to basketball, I am reminded of the Afghan women who in 1961 had women basketball players win the national championship in Afghanistan. This just goes to show you that they were entrenched throughout that country and not only in education, not only in medicine, not only in application, as we have said, that they made up the largest legislative body than we do now presently in the U.S. Congress, but they were also in sports. So they had the freedom to move about.

We know that a lot of them traveled to Turkey to seek higher education. And so given all of this, 1996, the Taliban came in and they just disrupted the whole lifestyle of a group of women and children. Of course, we will continue to denounce this. We will not allow this type of thing to happen, not only to women of Afghanistan but to women around this globe, around this world, we will not allow that to happen.

So with men like you, with other men in this body who are passionate as we are about the women of Afghanistan, they too will help us rise up and will fight and bring back the dignity and the democracy that they should and have enjoyed in Afghanistan.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I must again thank the gentlewoman for her efforts around the country to get the information out, the truth out about what has happened and this gross violation of the rights of women in Afghanistan. I do believe that there are more and more of our colleagues now who are committing themselves and saying we are not just going to try to attack al-Qaeda and then leave.

My belief is that unless we see this through and see the Taliban government catapulted out of power there, we risk having this cancer, that the al-Qaeda network and the Taliban expand beyond Afghanistan. I think for the hope of civilization, for the hope of the next generations, it is very important that this broad-based coalition that the President and that our Secretary of State Colin Powell have put together in order to wage this effort stay the course until we see that the Taliban rule is extinguished, and that we make certain that the international community plays a role in afterwards bringing peace and restoring fundamental rights and showing by example why the United States stands for principles of human rights, rule of law, the importance of liberty. We have to follow through.

I believe we did not do all that we should have done after the Soviet Union left Afghanistan. I believe that the United States at that time instead of adopting a strategy of benign neglect, which has basically been the strategy since the Soviet Union was defeated finally and pulled out of Afghanistan, allowed this outside group to develop this nucleus there and in this

state of despair and anarchy that existed, they were allowed to grab control.

I think there is a lesson in this. We should have at the time made certain that people had access to information, not only inside Afghanistan about what was going on around the world. We should have been more attentive to what was happening. Well, now we know. There is no longer any excuse for anyone not to rally to this cause of bringing justice for the people of Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman again.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman so much for being with me tonight. We do understand that we were encouraged to stay there once the Soviet Union had left, had really been defeated in their purpose, but we did not listen. I think the old adage of, "If you do not know your history, you are doomed to repeat it," I think at this juncture we will not do that. Once we have defeated the Taliban, we will stay there and restore democracy and give the people the type of lifestyle they want they want to know.

We have to recognize that the Taliban, Mr. Speaker, took control and that is when women who were leaders in public life and politics, leaders in every aspect of that country were then thrown aside, were not permitted to go out any more without having this burqa, really were denied the basic human rights that they enjoy.

Mr. Speaker, as I opened tonight I said that we will be here each week. Well, continue to come here each week to talk about the Taliban's barbaric ruling, how they have destroyed or think that they have destroyed the women of Afghanistan, but they have simply given us the opening and the opportunity by the attacks of September 11, we have not seen that, the atrocities in Afghanistan, and we will not stop until we can eradicate that.

Mr. Speaker, with that I will say that while the tragic events of September 11 were eye-openers for some, they presented windows of opportunity into the lives of the women and children of Afghanistan, and we will not rest until gender apartheid is nonexistent not only in Afghanistan but throughout the world.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ABERCROMBIE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MCKINNEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STUPAK, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CAPPS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SOUDER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GUTKNECHT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SHAYS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROYCE, for 5 minutes, today.

#### BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Jeff Trandahl, Clerk of the House, reports that on October 31, 2001 he presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.J. Res. 70. Making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2002, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, November 1, 2001, at 10 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4453. A letter from the Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—TRICARE; Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services (CHAMPUS); Payments for Professional Services in Low-Access Locations (RIN: 0720-AA58) received October 11, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4454. A letter from the Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Legal Assistance Matters—received October 11, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4455. A letter from the Administrator, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule—Exemption from Control of Certain Industrial Products and Materials Derived from the Cannabis Plant [DEA-206] (RIN: 1117-AA55) received October 11, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4456. A letter from the Administrator, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule—Interpretation of Listing of

"Tetrahydrocannabinols" In Schedule I [DEA-204] (RIN: 1117-AA55) received October 11, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4457. A letter from the Administrator, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule—Clarification of Listing of "Tetrahydrocannabinols" in Schedule I [DEA-205] (RIN: 1117-AA55) received October 11, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4458. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Interim Final Determination that the State of California Has Corrected Deficiencies and Stay of Sanctions, Ventura County Air Pollution Control District [CA 242-0292c; FRL-7067-2] received October 10, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4459. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Redesignation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Kentucky and Indiana; Approval of Revisions to State Implementation Plan; Kentucky [KY-117; KY-126; KY-129; KY-132-200202; IN-121-3; FRL-7082-9] received October 10, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4460. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Alaska Native Veterans Allotments [WO-350-1410-00-24 1A] (RIN: 1004-AD34) received October 11, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4461. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A330 and A340 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-257-AD; Amendment 39-12385; AD 2001-16-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 11, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4462. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada Model 206L-4, 407, and 427 Helicopters [Docket No. 2001-SW-29-AD; Amendment 39-12443; AD 2001-13-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 11, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4463. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company (GE) CF34-3A1, -3B, and -3B1 Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 2001-NE-21-AD; Amendment 39-12441; AD 2001-19-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 11, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4464. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Flightcrew Compartment Access and Door Designs [Docket No. FAA-2001-10770; SFAR 92] (RIN: 2120-AH52) received October 11, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4465. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 767-200 and -300 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2000-NM-385-AD; Amendment 39-12444; AD 2001-19-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 11,

2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4466. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc. RB211 535 Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 2001-NE-22-AD; Amendment 39-12445; AD 2001-19-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 11, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4467. A letter from the General Counsel, National Science Foundation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Conservation of Antarctic Animals and Plants—received October 11, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

4468. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, "To authorize appropriations for hazardous material transportation safety, and for other purposes"; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, the Judiciary, and Government Reform.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[October 31 (legislative day of October 30), 2001]

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 272. Resolution waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2311) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes (Rept. 107-260). Referred to the House Calendar.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 273. Resolution waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2647) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes (Rept. 107-261). Referred to the House Calendar.

[Submitted October 31, 2001]

Mr. BOEHRNER: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 2269. A bill to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to promote the provision of retirement investment advice to workers managing their retirement income assets; with an amendment (Rept. 107-262 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BOEHLERT: Committee on Science. H.R. 2275. A bill to amend the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act to ensure the usability, accuracy, integrity, and security of United States voting products and systems through the development of voluntary consensus standards, the provision of technical assistance, and laboratory accreditation, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 107-263). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REYNOLDS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 274. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3150) to improve aviation security, and for other purposes (Rept. 107-264). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 2269. Referral to the Committee on Ways and Means extended for a period ending not later than November 9, 2001.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. HYDE (for himself and Mr. LANTOS):

H.R. 3189. A bill to extend the Export Administration Act until April 20, 2002; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. HARMAN, and Mr. FARR of California):

H.R. 3190. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to authorize the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to establish a program to permit Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers to be trained to participate in the Federal air marshal program as volunteers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. ROUKEMA (for herself, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LEACH, and Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin):

H.R. 3191. A bill to provide home ownership assistance for public safety officers and teachers; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GILMAN:

H.R. 3192. A bill to establish an advisory board to monitor the collection and allocation of relief funds by charitable organizations in response to a disaster; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. BIGGERT (for herself, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. QUINN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. STARK, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 3193. A bill to amend the Violence Against Women Act of 2000 by expanding the legal assistance for victims of violence grant program to include legal assistance for victims of dating violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 3194. A bill to expand the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001 to include individuals diagnosed with anthrax; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. KOLBE):

H.R. 3195. A bill to extend the Medicare community nursing organization (CNO) demonstration project; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HERGER:

H.R. 3196. A bill to provide compensation to individuals who are injured by an escaped prescribed fire and to amend the tort procedure provisions of title 28, United States Code, relating to claims for such fires, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Resources, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 3197. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain machines designed for chil-

dren's education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PUTNAM:

H.R. 3198. A bill to respond to the vulnerability of the United States agricultural production and food supply system to international terrorism; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan:

H.R. 3199. A bill to require congressional approval of proposed rules designated by the Congress to be significant; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 3200. A bill to require that the United States Postal Service issue a special commemorative postage stamp under section 416 of title 39, United States Code, in order to provide funding to the United States Postal Service for mail security enhancements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. TANCREDO:

H.R. 3201. A bill to prohibit any department or agency of the United States from transferring funds to any individual or entity that prohibits the display of the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VITTER:

H.R. 3202. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require air carriers to remove from a passenger aircraft any baggage that is checked by a passenger who does not board the aircraft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SHIMKUS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. WATSON, Mr. HOEFFEL, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. SABO, and Mr. SERRANO):

H. Con. Res. 257. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the men and women of the United States Postal Service have done an outstanding job of delivering the mail during this time of national emergency; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. FORBES:

H. Res. 275. A resolution honoring the continuing service and commitment of the members of the National Guard and Reserve units activated in support of Operation Enduring Freedom; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. GEKAS, Ms. HART, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. TOOMEY, and Mr. COYNE):

H. Res. 276. A resolution praising Joseph Vincent Paterno for his steadfast commitment to academics, service, and citizenship, and congratulating Joseph Vincent Paterno for his many coaching accomplishments, including his 324th career coaching victory; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

200. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Ohio, relative to House Resolution No. 118 memorializing the United States Congress that the State of Ohio expresses admiration and support for the President and the United States Congress, for the Governor of New York, the Mayor of the City of New York, and for the law enforcement, firefighters, and other emergency workers of the City of New York, Washington, D.C., and other parts of our nation, all of whom decisively responded to the terrorist attacks in the City of New York and Washington, D.C.; to the Committee on Government Reform.

201. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Oregon, relative to House Joint Memorial No. 15 memorializing the United States Congress to abolish the Northwest Forest Pass portion of the Recreational Fee Demonstration Program and permit the citizens of Oregon to enjoy the national forests in the state without payment of a fee; to the Committee on Resources.

202. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to a Resolution memorializing the United States Congress to support granting of posthumous citizenship to noncitizen soldiers who sacrificed their lives on behalf of our nation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

203. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Guam, relative to Resolution No. 125 memorializing the United States Congress that the People of Guam condemn the hijackings of American commercial passenger airlines by terrorist forces and wholeheartedly and resolutely support the promise and determination of the President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

204. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, relative to House Memorial No. 1 memorializing the United States Congress to extend the current Canada-United States Softwood Lumber Agreement; encourage the end of Canadian lumber subsidy practices; and enforce United States trade laws to offset Canadian subsidies and eliminate injury to the United States timber industry if the Canadian subsidies are not terminated; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska introduced A bill (H.R. 3203) to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel *Caledonia*; which was referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 747: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.  
 H.R. 826: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.  
 H.R. 959: Mr. BRADY of Texas.  
 H.R. 968: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.  
 H.R. 1354: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island and Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.  
 H.R. 1436: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HOLT, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. MENENDEZ.  
 H.R. 1475: Mr. MEEKS of New York.  
 H.R. 1504: Mr. BONIOR.  
 H.R. 1556: Mr. WATT of North Carolina and Mr. KANJORSKI.  
 H.R. 1616: Mr. SHUSTER.  
 H.R. 1645: Mr. FLETCHER and Mr. FORBES.  
 H.R. 2063: Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. MOORE, and Mr. KUCINICH.  
 H.R. 2220: Mr. STUMP, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. STRICKLAND.  
 H.R. 2235: Mr. SHUSTER.  
 H.R. 2287: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. SOLIS.  
 H.R. 2354: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, and Mr. CONDIT.  
 H.R. 2357: Mr. FLAKE.  
 H.R. 2376: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.  
 H.R. 2623: Mr. HARMAN.  
 H.R. 2709: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. STUMP, and Mr. LUTHER.  
 H.R. 2715: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.  
 H.R. 2783: Mr. CROWLEY and Mr. STARK.  
 H.R. 2839: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.  
 H.R. 2874: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.  
 H.R. 2896: Mr. BARCIA.  
 H.R. 2897: Mr. MCGOVERN.  
 H.R. 2955: Mr. WEINER and Mr. DEFazio.  
 H.R. 2991: Mr. WATT of North Carolina and Mr. LANGEVIN.  
 H.R. 2998: Mr. GILLMOR.  
 H.R. 3029: Mr. FRANK.  
 H.R. 3035: Mr. MCGOVERN.  
 H.R. 3058: Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, and Ms. PELOSI.  
 H.R. 3067: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. MASCARA, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. WEINER, Ms. ESHOO, and Mrs. TAUSCHER.  
 H.R. 3111: Mr. FROST.  
 H.R. 3143: Mr. GIBBONS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. RIVERS, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. BALDACCIO, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CONDIT, Ms. SOLIS, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ISRAEL, and Ms. VELAZQUEZ.  
 H.R. 3150: Mr. SIMPSON.  
 H.R. 3164: Mr. TOWNS and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.  
 H.R. 3166: Mr. McNULTY and Mr. FROST.  
 H.R. 3167: Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. LAMPSON, and Mr. McINNIS.  
 H. Con. Res. 162: Mr. HONDA and Mr. ISRAEL.  
 H. Con. Res. 197: Mr. TURNER.  
 H. Con. Res. 232: Mr. WU, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. RANGEL.  
 H. Con. Res. 254: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. MASCARA, and Mr. GEKAS.

## DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 981: Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

40. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Citizens for Lewis and Clark Development Site #1, Illinois, relative to a Resolution petitioning the United States Congress to support the development of the Lewis and Clark Memorial Tower to commemorate the Lewis and Clark experience in Illinois for generations to come; to the Committee on Resources.

41. Also, a petition of United City of Yorkville, Illinois, relative to a Resolution petitioning the United States Congress that the United City of Yorkville shall observe a moment of silence to express respect and condolences to the families and individuals who have experienced a loss during this national crisis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

42. Also, a petition of the Council of the City of Kodiak, Alaska, relative to a Resolution petitioning the United States Congress to fully fund the United States Coast Guard's budget for operational readiness and recapitalization requirements to ensure the U.S. Coast Guard bases such as the one in Kodiak, Alaska, remain ready to protect and preserve not only the fishing community of this island community, but the greater national security and well being; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

43. Also, a petition of Grand Lodge of Missouri, relative to a Resolution petitioning the United States Congress that all Missouri Freemasons hereby pledge their loyalty, respect, admiration, devotion, and dedication to the United States of America; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

44. Also, a petition of Gaston County Board of Commissioners, North Carolina, relative to a Resolution petitioning the United States Congress that they unanimously thrust all of its support to the President of the United States and Congress as they endeavor to seek out the perpetrators of this heinous crime and bring them to justice; jointly to the Committees on International Relations and Government Reform.

## AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 3150

OFFERED BY: MR. TRAFICANT

AMENDMENT No. 1: Page 15, after line 24, insert the following:

“(7) a requirement that any private security firm retained to provide airport security services be owned and controlled by a citizen of the United States;

Page 16, line 1, strike “(7)” and insert “(8)”.

Page 16, line 3, strike “(8)” and insert “(9)”.