

and thought is tested. History will judge us in the weeks and months ahead by our capacity to sustain civil discourse in the face of deep disagreement, for we are certain to disagree with one another. We will disagree about how best to hold accountable those responsible for the attacks of September 11. We will disagree about how broadly the blame should be shared. We will disagree about the ways in which nationalism and religion can be perverted into fanaticism. We will disagree about whether a just retribution can be achieved if it leads to the deaths of more innocent victims. We will disagree about the political and tactical decisions that our government will make, both in achieving retribution and in seeking to protect against similar attacks in the future. We will disagree about how and when to wage war and how best to achieve a real and lasting peace.

The conversations we will have on our campuses are not intended to reach a conformity of view, a bland regression to the mean. Rather we aim to come to a deeper appreciation and understanding of the complexity of human affairs and of the implications of the choices we make. Perhaps, if we are very dedicated, we will find the wisdom to see an honorable, yet effective, path to a world in which terrorism is a thing of the past. With generosity of spirit and mutual respect, we must listen carefully to one another, and speak with our minds and our hearts, guided by the principles we hold dear. By conducting difficult discussions without prejudice or anger, by standing together for tolerance, civil liberties and the right to dissent, by holding firm to core principles of justice and freedom and human dignity, this university will serve our country well. By so doing, we will be true patriots.

Let me now turn to the third obligation that we have to society: the education of the next generation of citizens and leaders. Princeton's view of what constitutes a liberal arts education was expressed well by Woodrow Wilson, our 13th President, whose eloquent words I read at Opening Exercises: "What we should seek to impart in our colleges, therefore, is not so much learning itself as the spirit of learning. It consists in the power to distinguish good reasoning from bad, in the power to digest and interpret evidence, in the habit of catholic observation and a preference for the non partisan point of view, in an addiction to clear and logical processes of thought and yet an instinctive desire to interpret rather than to stick to the letter of reasoning, in a taste for knowledge and a deep respect for the integrity of human mind."

Wilson, and the presidents who followed him, rejected the narrow idea of a liberal arts education as preparation for a profession. While understanding the importance of professional education, they made it clear that at Princeton we should first and foremost cultivate the qualities of thought and discernment in our students, in the belief that this will be most conducive to the health of our society. Thus we distinguish between the acquisition of information, something that is essential for professional training, and the development of habits of mind that can be applied in any profession. Consequently we celebrate when the classics scholar goes to medical school, the physicist becomes a member of Congress, or the historian teaches primary school. If we do our job well as educators, each of our students will take from a Princeton education a respect and appreciation for ideas and values, intellectual openness and rigor, practice in civil discourse and a sense of civic responsibility. During these troubled times, our students and our alumni will be called upon to exercise these qualities in their professions, their communities and their daily lives. By so

doing, and through their leadership, their vision and their courage, they will help to fulfill Princeton's obligation to society and bring true meaning to our motto, "Princeton in the nation's service and in the service of all nations."

Thank you.

SCREENING BAGGAGE FOR EXPLOSIVE DEVICES

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share some information to my colleagues that is pertinent to our next several hours of us in the House of Representatives. The reason I say that is in the next several hours probably about 80 percent of us will be getting on airplanes. We are going to go out to Dulles, some to National. We are going to get on airplanes to fly back to our districts to work with the people who have been so traumatized by our recent losses, and that is part of our duty to do it.

But what the information I want to share with my colleagues is that when we get on those airplanes in the next several hours, we will be getting on the airplanes with 100, 150, 200, maybe 300 other Americans. All of those Americans will be getting on airplanes that have not had the baggage screened for explosive devices when they are put in the belly of the jets that we get on.

The sad fact is that today I have found and many others in the last few weeks, much to our surprise, that our security apparatus does not screen for explosive devices on bags that are put in the baggage compartments of our airlines. The reason that we have not done that in the past is two-fold. Number one, the theory has been in the past that we do not have to screen for bombs in luggage. All we have to do is to make sure that the people who put the baggage on get on with the plane, under the assumption that no one would want to go down with the plane. Well that assumption is certainly moot after September 11. That basis for our strategy has greatly outlived its purpose.

The second reason that we have not screened for bombs on aircraft in the baggage compartment is that it has involved some cost. But, Mr. Speaker, I can state that I am very, very confident that the hundreds of people that are going to get on the airplane at Dulles and National today believe that the cost is worth it to screen for bombs in the baggage compartment of airplanes. The threat is too great, the potential loss is too great, and the available technology is too good not to use it. The fact is we have technology that can sniff with high level, actually not sniff, but they use another technology, a high level of probability will catch explosive devices, but we are simply not using it.

As a result of that, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), the gen-

tleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND), and myself and 14 others introduced yesterday the Baggage Screening Act which will require that bags shall be screened for explosive devices before they go on an airplane 100 percent. Right now maybe 5 or 10 percent are screened. That is not enough. That means 90, 95 percent of our bags are not screened for explosive devices. That is not good enough security for American people.

The reason we introduced this bill is that today and in the next few days, we are attempting to reach a bipartisan consensus on a security package for airlines. We want to bring to the attention of our leadership that this feature needs to be in our security package. We need to screen for explosive devices. It is the right thing to do. We need to find a way to pay for it. If we do that, a lot of Americans will feel a lot more confident. If we take away nail clippers from passengers, let us keep the bombs out of the baggage.

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

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

CIVILIZATION WILL DEFEAT TERRORISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, all of us have been heartened by the way the Americans have pulled together after the attack of September 11. We have seen the best qualities of America at work, pride, patriotism, courage. Passengers on the plane that went down in Pennsylvania foiled their hijackers' diabolical objective by fighting for freedom. Police, fire, and rescue workers disregarded grave risks to their own lives just to save others. The President rallied America to our purpose through his determination and his grand leadership. And from across the country, we feel a wave of love and support and patriotism.

We saw the best of America after the raw hand of evil struck our Nation. We are left with a defining question. How will we best protect our way of life from those who would destroy freedom to lower an evil nightmare over the free world? It starts with our mindset. Too many people thought that threats to the United States ended with the Cold War. The first thing we have to do is to reinvigorate the idea that freedom is never free. Our way of life has a price tag.

Our founding fathers knew that price of freedom is eternal vigilance. Now we

truly understand that obligation. Now our eyes are wide open. We will never become complacent again. Complacency in the face of evil lays the foundation for the end of liberty.

The international terrorist networks are a cancer growing on the heart of freedom and a direct threat to civilization itself. The events of September 11 reminded us that we must do whatever it takes to defend freedom and root out tyranny and terrorism. That mission begins with good intelligence and a more robust military. For far too long the people we asked to defend America have been fighting our enemies with one arm tied behind their back and that must change.

Today we added to that effort by passing the Intelligence Authorization Act. We need to renew our commitment to our national defense. We must once again rebuild our military by arming our forces with the tools that they need to meet the full scope of threats to our security. We need to spend what it takes to defend America. It is time to begin upgrading our capabilities to defeat and deter those who would target freedom.

We need better human intelligence. Good intelligence is essential to protecting our Nation and our allies, and it is vital to ensuring that our military has the information it needs to safely and effectively carry out its mission. We need to cultivate and develop sources of information that will reveal the movements, activities, and identities of the people plotting evil schemes against people of freedom and civilization.

What might be the most important change, we need to provide our defenders with the flexibility to protect America effectively. The men and women working to save our freedom must have those tools that they need to defeat those who are thinking the unthinkable.

As we move forward in the campaign to save civilization, we need to remember that there is no quick victory just around the corner. We will suffer additional losses. We will lose more great Americans, and we will have to make additional sacrifices here at home. But freedom is worth it. All of us need to understand that.

This war against the cancer of terrorism is a perpetual obligation. It never ends. So we can never drop our guard again. We cannot be confused about the nature of this threat. This conflict is larger than one man or one terrorist network. It is a struggle between all of those who wish to live in freedom and those who wish to enslave the world beneath an oppressive, evil totalitarian ideology. It is a new battle between every American and all of the terrorist networks.

We also have to remind everyone that this is not a conflict over faith. Millions of people in the world draw meaning and fulfillment from the Islamic faith. The extreme views of this splinter movement do not reflect the

wishes of millions of Muslims who only seek a better life for their families.

There is additional danger in the campaign against terrorism. We have got to remember that the traditional threats have not receded. If anything, the terror networks exacerbate the long-standing threats we have always faced. One thing we could do is reduce our dependence on foreign sources of energy. Our dependence, a 57 percent dependence on foreign sources of energy weakens our national and economic security.

We need to move towards energy independence and energy security. It will take weeks, months, and years; but America must reduce our dependence on energy from volatile corners of this world. This is a test. It is a test of this generation of Americans. An evil movement thinks it can extinguish that wonderful light of freedom. Terrorists send people to die because they believe we have forgotten who we are. They believe that we lack the resolve to defend our way of life. They hate America and not because we act but simply because we exist.

Americans know who we are. During World War II, America defeated the forces of fascism because that generation risked all that they had to secure freedom for their children. So today we face a crisis that is every bit as serious as that crisis in World War II. It is going to take sacrifices; and unfortunately, it is going to cost lives. But the American people retain the determination, the conviction, and the love of liberty to resist this ongoing aggression and vindicate freedom. We will defend freedom. We will keep freedom alive.

ANDEAN TRADE PREFERENCE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I just learned yesterday that a bill was hastily prepared 2 nights ago by the staff of the Committee on Ways and Means and without the opportunity to seek comments and testimonies, even to appear before the Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade, the bill was marked up in full committee this morning. The bill passed today by a vote of 23 to 17, rejecting my good friend's, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), amendment that would have literally saved the U.S. tuna industry.

I wanted to thank my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA) for his eloquent remarks, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JEFFERSON) for his support, and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) for his support. I especially want to note, the precious vote that also was received by my good friend, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) for his support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope the great spirit will enlighten my colleagues of the House, especially if this bill, H.R. 3009, the Andean Trade Preference Act, if this bill passes by not excluding tuna as a duty-free import from Andean countries, it will essentially mean the loss of some 10,000 jobs to tuna cannery workers in California, Puerto Rico, and my district of American Samoa.

Mr. Speaker, current trade policy with regards to canned tuna has provided significant benefits to certain Latin American countries, while at the present time has maintained an industrial tuna processing base in the United States.

Since the enactment of the Andean Trade Preference Act, a number of tuna factories in the Andean region has increased to 229 percent, production capacity is up to 400 percent, direct employment is up to 257 percent, and U.S. exports have grown from about \$15 million to \$100 million annually.

□ 1315

In addition, the U.S. tuna industry has invested over \$20 million in new facilities and vessels. However, I must repeat, extending this agreement by providing duty-free treatment to canned tuna from Andean countries, especially Ecuador, will, in my opinion, destroy the U.S. tuna industry.

I have heard the argument that Congress has included canned tuna both in the Caribbean Basin Initiative and NAFTA, and some have questioned why we are not doing the same for Ecuador and the Andean region. Well, the answer simply is that no other region, especially a country like Ecuador, once we allow duty-free canned tuna to be imported from the Andean countries, has the potential of literally wiping out or destroying the U.S. tuna industry.

For example, Mr. Speaker, Ecuador alone has the production capacity now equivalent to 2,250 tons per day production. Using a 5-day workweek, this equates to a production capacity equivalent to 48.6 million cases of canned tuna per year. And using a 6-day workweek, Ecuador's production capacity is equivalent to 58.5 million cases of canned tuna per year. Now, the interesting thing about this, Mr. Speaker, is that U.S. consumption is only 45.3 million cases of canned tuna per year. What does that mean? Ecuador could produce enough canned tuna to flood the entire U.S. market. And brand names like Chicken of the Sea and Bumble Bee, brands that Americans have come to trust, would be eliminated from grocery stores. It is even questionable whether tuna from Ecuador is dolphin-safe. So serious are these issues that Mexico levied a 24 percent duty last year on canned tuna exported from Ecuador.

Mr. Speaker, it is also important to note that Ecuador levies a 20 percent duty on imported canned tuna from the United States. Now, I am all for free