

Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) representing the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), myself on the House side, and Senators DASCHLE, LOTT, LEAHY, and HATCH representing the Senate leadership and the chairman and ranking minority membership of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The issues and disagreement between the House and the Senate were thrashed out thoroughly. I can tell the membership tonight that the bill that is before us tonight is better than the bill which was passed on October 12 by a vote of 337 to 79. We were able to get a shorter sunset. We were able to include money laundering provisions which were not in our bill because of jurisdictional problems, but which were in the bill passed by the other body and language was passed by us last week as a result of the efforts of the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Financial Services, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE).

Mr. Speaker, this is not a perfect bill. I do not think we can get a perfect bill given the conflicting issues that are before us; but none of the changes are new in the legislation that is before us compared to either the Committee on Financial Services bill of last week and the Committee on the Judiciary bill of October 12. There is no surprise in any of these issues. This is a bill that is vitally needed. The President has called for it. The Attorney General has called for it, and we should not delay in passing it.

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman from Wisconsin in any position to assure Members of the House that there will be a conference on this measure?

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, it would be my hope that because this is the result of a preconference, the body would pass this bill unamended and send it to the Senate. The issues that would have been debated in the conference were debated in the preconference with the participants that I just mentioned. There was compromise that took place between what the Senate passed and what the House passed.

I think that this bill again is better than the bill that we passed on October 12, and I believe that it is deserving of the support of all Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, we had a preconference before we had a bill and before there was a conference; and now we are not going to have a conference.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I think the urgency of getting this job done is very, very great. If there were issues that were not discussed between this body

and the other body, I think the gentleman's representation would be correct. But all of these issues were discussed.

I think a conference would merely delay passing powers that law enforcement vitally needs. We have done a good job in balancing the need for stronger law enforcement powers and civil liberties. I would urge support of this bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SWEENEY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3162.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed until tomorrow.

□ 2030

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SWEENEY) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, October 23, 2001.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,  
*The Speaker, House of Representatives,*  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on October 23, 2001 at 4:44 p.m. and said to contain a message from the President whereby he submits the FY 2000 Annual Report of the Railroad Retirement Board.

With best wishes, I am  
Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAHL,  
*Clerk of the House.*

#### ANNUAL REPORT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PLATTS) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Ways and Means:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I transmit herewith the Annual Report of the Railroad Retirement Board for Fiscal Year 2000, pursuant to the provisions of section 7(b)(6) of the Rail-

road Retirement Act and section 12(1) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

GEORGE W. BUSH.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, October 23, 2001.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

#### DISTRICT IN CRISIS

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be back here where I feel most at home, on the House floor, and have felt that way for more than a decade now, especially tonight when we have had an Earth-shattering experience here in the District, just when the 600,000 people who live here were getting a grip. I speak, of course, of the death of two postal workers unexpectedly that has come down upon us.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor also to say that no city has had a greater number of direct consequences from the September 11 attack than the District of Columbia: The closure of National Airport; the shutdown of our major industry, tourism, the only real industry we have got here except government; the closure of the House; anthrax scares and now anthrax deaths. Like most of you, I know my constituents look to me, they have to look to me for leadership, especially in times of crisis. I am trying to help my people move on to avoid panic, and I need the help of this House and of the entire Congress.

My folks are being very brave when you consider what they have encountered. I have just come from D.C. General Hospital where Majority Leader DASCHLE, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. MIKULSKI of Maryland, Mayor Williams, and all of us gathered to inspect the facility where postal workers are receiving Cipro. We pray for the families of those who have died from Brentwood and of those who have come down with the disease there and on the Hill.

I must tell you that the postal workers there were amazingly calm, in their uniforms, simply ready to get their Cipro and go on with their work. But, Mr. Speaker, the 24-hour cable and the announcement that health officials have to make, public officials have to make, warning postal workers and Americans of danger have eclipsed any messages that we are Americans and we have got to go on with our lives and not be terrorized by terror.

The leadership role those of us in the Congress, all of us who are public officials, must play in times like this compels us to help our people get their balance, avoid paralysis, panic, and pain.

We have got to start reminding our folks not only of the danger but that most of us are safe.

Yes, I am struggling with the grief of two who died here; but at the same time, I tell my people that the two who died here of anthrax which gives flu-like symptoms, that 10,000 die of flu every year. We have got to put this into some perspective or else we are simply going to help paralyze our own people. We have got to remind them that the Nation's capital is the best protected city in the world notwithstanding the anthrax deaths. We have got to help the people of this city and of the United States get past this. We have got to help them understand that the House and the Senate and the Congress will soon be safe enough for all to come and see.

Above all, we have got to send a message that yes, school children can come again to their Nation's capital and can come to their Congress. I ask for your help in getting out to the people of this city and to the American people messages of reassurance that all now hunger for.

#### AIRPORT SECURITY

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

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, ground zero is still burning while the House is fiddling. Six weeks have passed since terrorists attacked America by hijacking four airplanes. Six weeks have passed since that deadly day, September 11, 2001, in which terrorists attacked the United States of America. Six weeks have passed since nearly 6,000 Americans and other people perished in the deadliest day in the history of American soil.

Mr. Speaker, it is high time House leaders let the Members vote on the bipartisan aviation security bill, H.R. 2951, which I have cosponsored with the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS). It is high time Congress acts to protect the American people from future terrorist hijackings.

We need to pass this bipartisan bill, because it provides the flexibility to hire a combination of Federal, State, and local law enforcement personnel to provide security for our Nation's airports. Airport security, Mr. Speaker, should be a law enforcement function, not a minimum wage function. Let me repeat that, Mr. Speaker, because that is the bottom line that divides us here in the House. That is what this debate is all about, and that is why the bill has yet to come to the floor. Airport security should be a law enforcement function and not a minimum wage function. The American people will not return to flying until they know the skies are safe.

Despite the changes made since September 11, security lapses continue. I recently met with several Minneapolis-

St. Paul airport police officers, airport screeners, and supervisors as well as Northwest Airlines pilots and flight attendants. To a person, they all told me airport security is still inadequate. I talked to a supervisor of screeners, security checkpoint screeners at Dulles Airport, spent about a half-hour with this woman, this supervisor, and she said, "Congressman, airport security here is a joke. It's not uniform, 80 percent of our personnel at Dulles are not citizens, 40 percent of them don't speak English and don't understand what is expected in terms of our security."

Mr. Speaker, that was alarming to me and it is certainly not reassuring to the American people. Low-paid and undertrained baggage screeners and spot checks of passenger luggage are not the solution. They are the problem. When the president of a major flight attendants union says that flight attendants do not feel safe yet, how can we expect the traveling public to feel safe? How can we expect the traveling public to return to the airlines?

We all know that the President has said he will sign our bipartisan aviation security bill if we can get it passed in this body. It passed the other body 100-to-nothing, unanimously. It is high time to stop the delay and pass this bill now.

Aviation security delayed is aviation security denied.

#### ECONOMIC STIMULUS BILL

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, over the past few days, I have been meeting with constituents in Maine, including a couple of meetings with fire department, police department, and EMT personnel about what they have been going through since September 11. My colleague, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. BALDACC), and I did one of those meetings together; and I did another one yesterday morning in Portland.

What those people said to me over and over again is we need help with the added costs that we have run up since September 11; and, after all, this was an attack on the United States and not on the State of Maine or the City of Portland or the towns in my district or anywhere else in the country. Second, they said we need training to cope with these new threats, chemical and biological threats or other threats, that we are not entirely prepared for. And, third, they said we need better communication with Federal officials, State officials, and others, in fact with each other, in order to do the jobs that we have set out to do.

But when we look at what is happening to our States right now, we notice several things. First, costs are up. Costs are up because of overtime and all sorts of additional tasks that are being undertaken since September 11. Revenues are down because of the slow-

ing economy. Sales taxes have dropped; and other State revenues are down, so that for many States deficits are looming. In fact, for more than half a dozen States in this country, the deficits look like they could be over \$1 billion.

Tomorrow, this Congress, back in session, will take up an economic stimulus bill; and I have to say how disappointed I am in the bill that has been reported out by the Committee on Ways and Means on a partisan, not a bipartisan, basis.

First of all, it provides huge tax breaks to some of the largest corporations in the country. Second, it will cut State revenues. I said cut State revenues, by \$5 billion a year for each of the next 3 years. And, third, it is, as I said, not a bipartisan bill, not in the spirit of unity and resolve that we have shown in this Congress and around the country since September 11 but a partisan bill.

Let me touch for a moment on the tax cuts to corporations, largely coming from the repeal of the corporate alternative minimum tax and certain AMT tax credit carry-forwards, a technical term. But let us look at this.

People around this country, many of them, got \$300 for a tax rebate a little while ago. IBM, if the bill passes tomorrow and is signed by the President and passed by the Senate, would get \$1.4 billion in a tax rebate. General Motors would get \$833 million in a tax rebate. General Electric would get \$671 million in a tax rebate.

What sense does that make? I cannot explain that to people back in Maine. We have \$25 billion going to some of the largest and most successful corporations in this country. They are good companies, they work hard; but these corporations do not need \$25 billion in tax rebates now.

□ 2045

Let me go quickly to another point. I mentioned what has been happening in our States. Revenues are down; costs are up. A report by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities shows that the States collectively will lose \$5 billion in revenues over each of the next 5 years precisely because of the tax changes that are going to be made at the Federal level if the House bill passes tomorrow.

Now, why does that happen? It happens because so many States, in fact, 49, have their tax laws tied to the Federal tax laws, so when we make a change here, it affects State revenues. What does this mean for economic stimulus? It means that State revenues will be cut. They will have to increase taxes or lay off people because of the changes that we make. What will that do? It will slow down the economy.

So the steps that are proposed to be taken by the Republican majority tomorrow are steps that will slow down economic activity in our states. It makes no sense.

Now we are engaged in a war on terrorism. We are engaged in conflict