

I have asked the Governor of California, and my colleagues have asked the Governors of their border States, to declare a state of emergency to bring attention to this economic disaster area. We have asked the President of the United States to declare a national state of emergency. Let us get help now to the border communities. We can have security and economic activity at the same time.

#### PRIVATE-PUBLIC CONTROL OF AVIATION WORKFORCE WORKS BEST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, it seems that one of the continuing objections to the upcoming legislation that is dealing with aviation security is the whole question of the federalization of the employee workforce at the airport. I rise today in opposition to total airport workforce federalization, and I am here to convince my colleagues of the same. Mr. Speaker, in general, foreign governments provide an average of 10 to 15 percent of security personnel, while the private sector provides the remaining security personnel.

I would like to share my experience in coming up here on United Airlines. It was Monday afternoon and I had advanced through the ticket counter and the x-ray machine where both my carry-on and myself was inspected. The flight attendant and another employee of United Airlines politely detained me. It seems that a pair of trimming scissors which I carry in a small manicure kit had been detected with the metal detector. They asked, of course, permission to open up my bag, which I gave them, and they asked me also to turn on my laptop computer. They proceeded to investigate my person, in the form of hand metal detection and a pat-down, and finally they permitted me to board but, of course, not before confiscating my trimming scissors. Throughout the few minutes that it took, the two employees were resolute, thorough and professional.

I understand on Wednesday, October 3, a bipartisan group of members of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure met with top security officials at El-Al, Israel's state airline. This airline is widely considered to be the most secure in the world, and any of my colleagues who have flown it can probably attest to that fact. These experts emphasized that when they find a screener to be negligent, that individual is relieved of his or her job immediately. They will simply not stand for any incompetent employee to remain in place. In a proven example of public-private partnership, the Ben Gurion Airport Authority in Tel Aviv conducts training, establishes standards, and manages the overall effort, while a private company conducts the

pre-board screening and other security functions.

Furthermore, in Europe, following a spate of terrorism, events that occurred in the 1970s and the 1980s, the aviation system exchanged their previously nationalized workforce to a private sector approach and workforce. In these European airports these privately contracted screeners are highly trained, paid, and retained. We can glean advice from these precedents: London Heathrow and Gatwick, Belfast, Rome, Athens, and Paris, and the aforementioned Tel Aviv.

Now, I know Federal employees can do the job. I have great respect for them. In fact, I am one myself. My father was an employee of the Federal Government for 35 years. The case, Mr. Speaker, is not against government employees, but for the private-public arrangement. It is a better model from all of the experience of other airports, and we should learn from them.

The solution also comes from the Transportation Secretary, Norman Mineta's aviation workforce proposal, which would combine the best of both the private and public sector worlds. It would institute Federal Government control and oversight, while retaining the flexibility and accountability inherent in the private sector. It would take steps to promote the function of baggage screening to a higher level of professionalism. Specifically, the administration's proposal would implement practices of more stringent hiring, training, and better pay and benefits. Moreover, screeners would work in conjunction with law enforcement officers, including both local airport police and Federal marshals.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this is the answer to the real problem of security at our airports. Based upon a tradition of what works at other airports, I believe a private-public arrangement is the best solution. I hope my colleagues will support this approach.

Mr. Speaker, I will insert into the RECORD at this time a sheet distributed by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), chairman of the Subcommittee on Aviation, entitled "Fact vs. Fiction: The Truth About Airline Security." It further summarizes the arguments for a public-private arrangement for effective airline security and has the statistics that bear out the argument that I have made.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC.

#### FACT VS. FICTION: THE TRUTH ABOUT AIRLINE SECURITY

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Let me provide you with the truth relating to effective airline security screening.

Fiction: We must create a new 27,000 Federal employee bureaucracy to model European success.

Fact: Most airports in Europe provide security through a coordinated effort of public sector oversight and supervision of private screening contractors. In general, foreign governments provide an average of 10 to 15 percent of security personnel, while the pri-

vate sector provides the remaining 85-90 percent of security personnel.

Amsterdam: 2,000 private; 200-250 law enforcement.

Brussels: 700 private; 40 law enforcement.

Paris-Charles DeGaulle: 500-600 private; 100 police.

Paris-Orly: 350-400 private; 50 police.

Lyons: 150 private; 30 police.

Nice: 150-250 private, 20-30 police.

Frankfurt: 350 private; 500 federal, with plans to increase private participation.

Geneva: 250 contract, 250 government.

Stockholm: 200 private; 40 law enforcement.

Norway Oslo: 150 private; 20 law enforcement.

Helsinki: 150 contract; 20 law enforcement.

Berlin: 450 private; 60 law enforcement.

London Heathrow: 3,000 private contractors for screening; hundreds doing guard and perimeter security for the private British Airports Authority; and 20 federal law enforcement.

London Gatwick: 1,500 private contractors doing screening; hundreds doing guard and perimeter security for private British Airports Authority; and 11 federal law enforcement.

Sincerely,

JOHN L. MICA,

Chairman, Subcommittee on Aviation.

#### BIPARTISANSHIP IN DANGER OF SHATTERING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, at a time when people are justifiably concerned about the spread of toxic agents in our mail system here on Capitol Hill, I personally have a greater fear that we are going to fall prey to an agent that I think, in its own way, is every bit as toxic. The bipartisanship and cooperative problem-solving that the President and our legislative leadership have talked about and that the American public needs, not just symbolically, but in a practical, hard-headed way, is in danger of being shattered.

□ 1245

Everybody here on Capitol Hill knows that, to date, the reality is not quite as bright as the rhetoric and the promise. Our desperate desire for unity and cooperation has temporarily obscured some deep divisions.

There were rocky times on several items in the aftermath of the tragedy on September 11, although it appeared as though the President's challenge was being met by the gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT) and the Democrats, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT).

A series of three events has the potential to deal a body blow to our fragile accord.

The first, unfortunately, has already occurred, with an unnecessary decision by the President and the Republican leadership to abandon a carefully crafted, bipartisan antiterrorist bill from

the Committee on the Judiciary. They replaced it at the last minute, without consultation and without even the opportunity for amendment, and without Members on this Chamber floor knowing fully the implications of what they were voting on, and locked it into statute for years to come.

The second threat is brewing as we speak. The economic stimulus package which, without the President's steady hand and the leadership of the gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT), is going to turn into a grab bag of tax cuts that are to be charitable, wildly controversial, and extremely problematic in terms of affecting our economic recovery.

Here again, this is legislation that does not need to happen immediately. We can take our time and do it right in a cooperative and thoughtful fashion.

Last, and it is important and perhaps most frustrating, there is legislation that may be advanced that is designed to accentuate our differences on international trade, instead of enhancing bipartisan cooperation that is possible.

There is a little contest that is brewing between the legislation of the gentleman from California (Chairman THOMAS) and that of the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), differences that are significant but not insurmountable.

If the decision is made to force this through and draw bright lines on trade issues instead of bringing us together, more than just an opportunity will be lost on the divisive and potentially explosive issue of trade. We could also slow the bipartisan momentum that is needed to deal appropriately with the threats of terrorism and the dangers to our economy.

The American public deserves better. This is a unique opportunity to do our best. The President and the Republican leadership should join with the Democratic leadership rising to this occasion.

The President can start today by insisting that any bill for trade promotion authority needs to have at least 250 votes on this floor, and we can do it. It should make serious advances in promoting trade while protecting the environment, worker rights, and having legislation that does not put foreign investor interests ahead of those that are of legitimate American and private citizen interests. He should exercise the unique leadership opportunity that he has to bring Congress and the American public together.

As our President and the legislative leadership have all united in communicating to the American public, we are in a long-term struggle. We are going to need the executive to do its job, we need Congress to function, we need to be able to trust each other, and we need our committees to operate the way that they are designed to do.

We all need to do our best. We can start with the contentious issue of international trade and make it into a bipartisan victory for us all.

#### SUPPORT ECONOMIC SECURITY AND RECOVERY ACT OF 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, these are important times for our Nation as we respond to the attack on September 11, as we work to provide leadership to address the challenges that we face, as we work to provide the solutions to the military challenge, the international and national security issues, and also the economic security issues.

I particularly wanted to commend President Bush for the strong, commanding leadership that he has shown in response to the attack. I also want to commend the leadership of this Congress, particularly the Speaker of the House, for his calm, strong leadership that he has shown as we address the terrorist attack on September 11.

We have had several challenges. We have given full authority to the President for the military action that is now under way. We have funded that military action with \$40 billion, as well as the emergency and recovery effort. We have worked to address the financial challenges of our aviation sector, we have passed legislation out of this House, and we are working out the differences with the Senate on providing special powers for our intelligence and law enforcement agencies to go after terrorists.

There is another challenge that we have before us, though. That is a challenge that we were already feeling prior to September 11. That was our economic challenge.

President Bush inherited a weakening economy. The last 12 or 14 months we have seen changes in the direction of the economy. Unfortunately, the terrorist attack was also a psychological blow on our economy, causing many consumers and business decision-makers to step back.

The question is, what type of action should we take? Clearly, we need to act quickly. We need to provide strong leadership. We need to give confidence back to consumers, as well as business decisionmakers to spend and invest in the future of our economy.

I believe, as we look at what type of approach we need to take, that we need to be thinking short-term, what can we do to cause investment over the short-term to protect current jobs and get this economy growing again; essentially, a cash register effect; incentives that will cause business decision-makers as well as consumers to spend and invest.

Let me give an example of one sector of the economy that has had a big impact on our overall economy over the past decade which currently has been suffering. That is the technology sector. Over the past decade, the technology sector has generated one-third of all our growth in jobs; in fact, the majority of assets today that have

been purchased come out of the technology sector.

I would note in 1994, or in the year 2000, private investment in information processing equipment software grew at an average rate of 28 percent. Investment in computers and peripheral computers grew at an astounding 113 percent average annual rate during that same period of time.

However, that trend has reversed, and that sector that grew one-third of our jobs is now in a slump. We have seen a loss of almost 400,000 jobs in technology and telecommunications since January of this year, and actually an 8.4 percent drop in investment from the fourth quarter of 2000 to the second quarter of 2001.

We do need to act quickly. We need to provide incentives to invest in the creation of jobs, as well as revitalize important sectors of our economy. Clearly, the technology sector needs help.

This past week, the Committee on Ways and Means moved out of the committee and the legislation will now be before us in this House this week, what some call an economic stimulus package, but legislation that is called the Economic Security and Recovery Act, legislation designed to put more money in consumers' pockets, as well as provide incentives to invest.

There are three provisions in this legislation that will have a big impact in helping revitalize the technology sector, which we need to revitalize if we are going to get this economy growing again.

The three provisions include the 30 percent expensing, providing greater incentives to invest by business for the next 3 years, a temporary provision; increasing the opportunity for small business to invest from the current level of \$24,000 to \$35,000; and also, the net operating losses carryback, allowing businesses losing money now to credit that loss against previous income paid in previous years to get a refund to free up capital that they can invest.

These provisions will make a big difference in revitalizing the technology sector. As we look at depreciation reform, the opportunity for a business to expense 30 percent of the purchase cost of that asset will reward investment.

Currently, a computer is depreciated over 5 years. By expensing that first 30 percent, that would be a big incentive to allow a business to recover the cost of investing in technology, computers, software, peripheral equipment, medical technology, high technology telephone station equipment, wireless equipment, as well as DSL and networking equipment they can expense now with 30 percent, with the legislation we passed out of the Committee on Ways and Means that will be before the House this week.

That will reward investment in the creation of jobs. I would also note, it will reward investment in providing greater security. The vast majority of