

from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND), and all of us who believe in the importance of airline security, that it is time out to the Congress. Step up to the plate. Say to the American public that we are going to secure you. We are going to make sure when you get on that plane, things are safe. Maybe even in the legislation that we pass, we will require that every piece of luggage that gets on a plane has been screened in some fashion.

But if we can elevate the position of airline security to an honorable position, a professional position, all of us will be better off. I am so happy to join the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) and all of the Members this evening as we talk about this important issue that is important to the security and safety of all of us here in the United States and those traveling through the United States.

Mr. INSLEE. I hope the gentlewoman will report to your former sky cap father that he has got something to be proud about, sending you to us.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. I called him up and said, "Dad, turn it on. I am talking about you tonight."

Mr. INSLEE. I thank the gentlewoman very much.

I want to yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) for some closing comments. I intend to yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) to finish the hour.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would just like to close my remarks this evening by once again referring to the editorial in the Columbus Dispatch of October 16. The editorial ends with this question: Will there be no end to the revelations of how poorly the Federal Government, airport security workers and airlines have handled the job of protecting passengers? How many other rules are not being enforced, and how much evidence do House Republicans need to convince them that only a top-notch security force, paid by the taxpayers and not hired by the low bid contractors, will make the airways as safe as possible? A bill passed by the Senate and pending in the House would federalize airport security. The House should stop playing politics with this essential legislation and pass it.

I would just like to point out in closing that in the Senate, they voted 100 to zero to pass this vital legislation. We need to bring it to this floor, and we need to pass it this week. If we do not, the American people should hold us accountable.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I would like to yield to a person who is always a voice for common sense, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) for bringing up

this very important subject at a time when the American people are expecting to hear from us, their representatives, and also our beloved colleague, the gentlewoman from Cleveland, Ohio (Mrs. JONES), whose family obviously has enormous experience in this area, merely to say thank you to all of you for highlighting this important issue to the American public, the issue of safety in the airline industry and how important it is and what common sense it makes to have a Federal position at our various airports around the country, Federal positions, Federal responsibilities, Federal training and a program of instruction and of career advancement, so we can get the very best type of training and trained individuals to serve in these critical positions now and into the future.

It would be so very easy for us to merely take the Senate bill and to pass it here; yet it has been held in abeyance now for several weeks. So there is not a commitment by the leadership of this institution to federalize these security positions.

All of us flew back here over the last 2 days. We know the people out there at the airports are doing the very best that they can. But, honestly, we need to have the same kind of professionalism that we have in our security services around this country at different levels.

I just wanted to thank these gentlemen for telling the American people that it is high time we took up the Senate bill and passed it here.

I know that the gentleman has time remaining, and I want to give him a chance to close.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, just to make a closing comment, then I am going to yield to the Chair so the Chair can yield back to the gentlewoman for another subject. I wanted to thank the Members who have joined me this evening. This is the crunch time for the U.S. House. It has a duty. I certainly hope that we do our duty, which is to set a time-line to get every bag checked for explosive devices, that we have a professional force to do it. Heaven help us if we do not discharge that duty. I hope bipartisanship will actually blossom this week to get this job done.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the Chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2330. An act 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.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 2330) "An Act making ap-

propriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. KOHL, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. DORGAN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. JOHNSON, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BYRD, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. BOND, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. BURNS, Mr. CRAIG, and Mr. STEVENS, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXPLAINING THE CONTEXT FOR AMERICA'S CONFLICT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSBORNE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 15 minutes as a further designee of the minority leader.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, as one Member, I feel a particular obligation at this time in our country's history to help provide information and insight to the American people, and indeed to the people around the world, who are looking to us for leadership and for an explanation of enduring freedom, the roots of the engagement in which we now find ourselves involved with a growing coalition around the world. From time to time I will be coming to the floor, as I did last week and now again, to talk about some of the events in past years that have created the context for the conflict in which we as a Nation have now been placed in dead center.

Last week we talked a bit about the economics of the Middle East and America's over-reliance on imported oil and the fact that each of the economies of the larger region in which this conflict is occurring make money primarily from oil, with Saudi Arabia being the largest supplier of petroleum to the United States.

In Toledo today, where I just flew from, gas prices are down to 99 cents to \$1.01 a gallon. Do not tell me there is no relationship between the desire of the oil-producing countries to have America win this battle and therefore to manipulate a bit on the spot market and the price of petroleum. I am sure Americans in the short term think that is probably a good thing, but in the long run what it does is it connects us to a very unstable part of the world.

Indeed, 52 percent of the petroleum that we consume is imported from Saudi Arabia, from Nigeria, from Venezuela, from Mexico. America now consumes three times more in imported petroleum than she did 20 years ago. Oil and our inability to make ourselves energy self-sufficient here at home, simply because we have not had the will, is our major strategic vulnerability; and again we are faced with major unrest in the Middle East, this time some of that being brought to our own shores.

I wanted to talk a bit tonight about a wonderful book that I read 15 years

ago and I have been rereading over the last few days called "Sacred Rage," by a very well known journalist in our country, Robin Wright, who is both courageous and I think has shades of genius. The subheading of this book is "The Wrath of Militant Islam."

I just finished the chapter on Kuwait. Last night I was reading about Lebanon. I cannot go into the entire book this evening, but I will reference one of the beginning chapters that deals with Iran and the turning point as she, the author, would view it in the Middle East back in March 1982 when over 300, nearly 400 mullahs, religious leaders from that part of the world, convened at a conference in Tehran in the Revolutionary Nation of Iran at that point, and Iran was turning from a monarchy to a theocracy, and the men that came together at that time, and I will quote from the book, because it is very insightful and it bears on what is happening today, agreed to several common goals.

They agreed, first, that religion should not be separated from politics. This is a very foreign thought to people of the United States in this democratic Republic.

Second, they agreed that the only way to achieve true independence was to return to their Islamic roots.

Third, they agreed there should be no reliance on superpowers or other outsiders in their region, and the region should be rid of them.

Fourth, they recommended that the Shia, which is one sect of Islam, should be more active in getting rid of foreign powers.

Now, the Persian Gulf War a few years after that, of course, engaged the United States in trying to hold the border of Kuwait as Iraq attempted to move into that country. After that particular war, the Persian Gulf War, which was largely fought for oil, in my opinion, and the preservation of those oil supply lines through the Persian Gulf to the United States, I do not think that was a moral goal, but it was a goal that this Congress voted for and the American people supported, but after that the American people kind of forgot. It was over. Sure, we deal with the veterans in our districts and the people that served over there, but we became more and more hooked through the decade of the 1990s on imported fuel.

Not everyone has ignored this unfortunate development; and today, or actually yesterday, a brilliant writer, Rob Nixon, who resides in Madison, Wisconsin, a professor at the University of Wisconsin, wrote an editorial entitled "A Dangerous Appetite for Oil," and I am only going to quote a couple sentences of it. I will enter it into the RECORD this evening.

He advises the most decisive war we can wage on behalf of national security and America's global image is the war against our own oil gluttony. He talks about the fact that for nearly a century, oil has been responsible for more

of America's international entanglements and anxieties than any other industry. Oil continues to be a major source of America's strategic vulnerability and of its reputation as a bully in the Islamic world and beyond. Frankly, America made friends and supported regimes that could continue the oil lifeline to this country, and part of the "Sacred Rage" relates to the exclusionary manner in which the governments of those nations dealt with their own populations and the rather maldistribution of wealth that occurred.

Now, that is not America's fault; but we should be focused on those forces that create some of the rage that is directed against us and those forces that we contain here at home we should be about doing. One of those forces is to make ourselves energy self-sufficient here at home. That is what Rob Nixon writes about.

He talks about outside the West, the development of oil resources has repeatedly impeded democracy and social stability. The oil extraction industry typically concentrates wealth and power and provides many incentives for corruption and iron-fisted rule. In most oil exporting countries, the gap between rich and poor widens over time; and from the perspective of local people beneath whose land the oil lies, the partnership between oil transnationals and repressive regimes has been ruinous, destroying subsistence cultures while offering little in return. In fact, he quotes then the Nigerian writer, Ken Saro-Wiwa, who was hanged in 1995 for leading protests against such destruction and dubbed that process "genocide by environmental means."

Mr. Nixon writes, "Oil and related extractive industries have arguably done more to tarnish America's image abroad than any other commercial pursuit. By scaling back our reliance on foreign oil, we could reduce a major cause of anti-American feeling while simultaneously decreasing our vulnerability to oil embargoes and price spikes," and I might add the manipulation of the market which is occurring inside our borders today.

□ 2015

But we will never be able to drill our way out of this. In fact, even if we were to drill in the Arctic Wildlife Refuge, we would get about 140 days worth of supply for this country. And he, like many others across this country, talks about encouraging more quickly advances in developing wind and wave power, biomass research, which is something I so strongly support, particularly with the development of ethanol and biodiesel so I can buy it and you can buy it; transport fuels based on renewable oilseed crops, and photovoltaic modules that can convert, even diffuse, light into electricity, such as is being done by Solar Cells, a new company in my district.

We can do this. We can do this in the United States. We just have not had

the will to do it. As far as having oil as our chief proxy of our foreign policy in the Middle East, what a dangerous dependence. What a dangerous dependence this has proven to be for our people.

Robin Wright, in her book *Sacred Rage*, was given many, many commendations by well-known Americans, one of them Roger Mudd from NBC News who said, "If ever there was the right book on the right subject for the right readers at the right time, *Sacred Rage* is it. The *Kansas City Star* wrote, when the book was published, 'Robin Wright manages against all odds to get a fix on a phenomenon that is complex, elusive, and kaleidoscopic. Moreover, her style of writing is so vivid that the book reads like a novel.' I know that those who are listening can also get this at local libraries.

Mr. Speaker, if one looks at page 69, one will see a poster from the Party of God, which is one of the groups operating, in this case in Lebanon at that time, and it shows a powerful image of how those who were engaged in this particular sect felt about the West. It is important for Americans to understand who is actually trying to exert this negative force against us and to understand why, because once the why is understood, we can begin to move the world forward.

Today in *The New York Times*, there was an editorial by Thomas Friedman, which I will also enter into the RECORD, called *Drilling for Tolerance*. And again, he talks about why there is such instability in that part of the world, the role of oil in shaping our foreign policy to too great an extent and, again, he proves the point that trade has not brought freedom. He talks about how little many who should have known here in the United States understand about the internal politics of Saudi Arabia, and, in fact, some of the very schools that are educating youth to hate us. He talks about all public schools, the religion classes in Saudi Arabia, students being required to learn the following, and it states, "It is compulsory for the Muslims to be loyal to each other and to consider the infidels their enemy." That is, anyone who is a non-Muslim is an infidel, someone who is an enemy. Imagine this being taught to 10-years-olds, 12-year-olds. He goes on to talk about how it is time to tell the truth. He says he was always for getting rid of oil imports before September 11, but now even more. He says, Why should we continue to purchase oil from countries like Saudi Arabia when they are using the very proceeds to buy textbooks to teach this kind of wrath to their youth?

So I just this evening very much want to urge the American people to have courage in these moments. The depth of this democracy of our great Republic will weather us again. We have educated all of our people. We believe in helping both men and women move forward in our country. We believe very much in free enterprise. We

are not a monarchy. We believe in helping to distribute the resources of this land to all who work hard, and for those who are unfortunate and cannot, we try to take care of them as well. Those strengths, along with our military and with the great patriotism we have, will carry us through.

[From the Foreign Affairs, Oct. 30, 2001]

DRILLING FOR TOLERANCE

(By Thomas L. Friedman)

In April 1988 Saudi Arabia asked the U.S. to withdraw its newly appointed ambassador, Hume Horan, after only six months. News reports said King Fahd just didn't like the U.S. envoy. What the Saudis didn't like about him, though, was that he was the best Arabic speaker in the State Department, and had used his language skills to engage all kinds of Saudis, including the kingdom's conservative religious leaders who were critical of the ruling family. The Saudis didn't want someone so adroit at penetrating their society, so—of course—we withdrew Mr. Horan.

Ever since then we've been sending non-Arabic-speaking ambassadors to Riyadh—mostly presidential cronies who knew exactly how to penetrate the White House but didn't have a clue how to penetrate Saudi Arabia. Yes sir, we got the message: As long as the Saudis kept the oil flowing, what they taught in their schools and mosques was not our business. And what we didn't know wouldn't hurt us.

Well, on Sept. 11 we learned just how wrong that view was. What we didn't know hurt us very badly. On Sept. 11 we learned all the things about Saudi Arabia that we didn't know: that Saudi Arabia was the primary funder of the Taliban, that 15 of the hijackers were disgruntled young Saudis and that Saudi Arabia was allowing fund-raising for Osama bin Laden—as long as he didn't use the money to attack the Saudi regime.

And most of all, we've learned about Saudi schools. As this newspaper recently reported from Riyadh, the 10th-grade textbook for one of the five required religion classes taught in all Saudi public schools states: "It is compulsory for the Muslims to be loyal to each other and to consider the infidels their enemy." This hostile view of non-Muslims, which is particularly pronounced in the strict Saudi Wahhabi brand of Islam, is reinforced through Saudi sermons, TV shows and the Internet.

There is something wrong with this picture: Since Sept. 11, the president of the United States has given several speeches about how Islam is a tolerant religion, with no core hostility to the West. But the leader of Saudi Arabia, the keeper of the Muslim Holy places, hasn't given one.

The truth is, there are at least two sides to Saudi Arabia, but we've pretended that there's only one. There is the wealthy Saudi ruling family and upper middle classes, who send their kids to America to be educated and live Western-style lives abroad and behind the veil at home. And there is an Islamist element incubating religious hostility toward America and the West, particularly among disaffected, unemployed Saudi youth.

It is said that truth is the first victim of war. Not this war. In the war of Sept. 11, we've been the first victims of our own inability to tell the truth—to ourselves and to others. It's time now to tell the truth. And the truth is that with the weapons of mass destruction that are now easily available, how governments shape the consciousness, mentality and imagination of their young people is no longer a private matter.

We now have two choices: First, we can decide that the Saudi ruling family really is

tolerant, strong and wants to be part of the solution, and thus we can urge its members to educate their children differently and ensure that fund-raising in their society doesn't go to people who want to destroy ours. If so, I don't expect the Saudis to teach their kids to love America or embrace non-Muslim religions.

But if countries want good relations with us, then they have to know that whatever religious vision they teach in their public schools we expect them to teach the "peaceful" realization of that vision. All U.S. ambassadors need to make that part of their brief. Because if tolerance is not made universal, then coexistence is impossible. But such simple tolerance of other faiths is precisely what Saudi Arabia has not been teaching.

If the Saudis cannot or will not do that, then we must conclude that the Saudi ruling family is not really on our side, and we should move quickly to lessen our dependence upon it. I was for radical energy conservation, getting rid of gas-guzzlers and reducing oil imports before Sept. 11—but I feel even more strongly about it now.

"Either we get rid of our minivans or Saudi Arabia gets rid of its text books," says Michael Mandelbaum, the Johns Hopkins foreign policy specialist. "But one thing we know for sure—it's dangerous to go on assuming that the two can coexist."

[From the New York Times, Oct. 29, 2001]

A DANGEROUS APPETITE FOR OIL

(By Rob Nixon)

ADISON, Wis.—For 70 years, oil has been responsible for more of America's international entanglements and anxieties than any other industry. Oil continues to be a major source both of America's strategic vulnerability and of its reputation as a bully, in the Islamic world and beyond.

President Bush recently urged America to reduce its reliance on foreign oil. We can take his argument further: by scaling back our dependence on imported oil, we cannot only strengthen national security but also enhance America's international image in terms of human rights and environmentalism.

Importing oil costs the United States over \$250 billion a year, if one includes federal subsidies and the health and environmental impact of air pollution. America spends \$56 billion on the oil itself and another \$25 billion on the military defense of oil-exporting Middle Eastern countries. There are additional costs in terms of America's international reputation and moral credibility: our appetite for foreign fossil fuels has created a long history of unsavory marriages of convenience with petrodespots, generalissimos and forerunners of terrorism.

The United States currently finds itself in a coalition with Russia, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia and the Northern Alliance. Their human rights records range from bad to heinous. This is a conjuncture familiar to oil companies. From the Persian Gulf states to Indonesia, Turkmenistan, Kazakhstan, Colombia, Angola and Nigeria, they have cozied up to dubious, often brutal regimes that allow corporations to operate with few environmental or human rights constraints.

Outside the West, the development of oil resources has repeatedly impeded democracy and social stability. The oil-extraction industry typically concentrates wealth and power and provides many incentives for corruption and iron-fisted rule. In most oil-exporting countries the gap between rich and poor widens over time. From the perspective of local people beneath whose land the oil lies—Bedouins in the Middle East, the Huaorani in Ecuador, Nigeria's Ijaw and

Ogoni, the Acehnese of Indonesia—the partnership between oil transnationals and repressive regimes has been ruinous, destroying subsistence cultures while offering little in return. The Nigerian writer Ken Saro-Wiwa, hanged in 1995 for leading protests against such destruction, dubbed the process "genocide by environmental means."

Oil and related extractive industries have arguably done more to tarnish America's image abroad than any other commercial pursuit. By scaling back our reliance on foreign oil we could reduce a major cause of anti-American feeling while simultaneously decreasing our vulnerability to oil embargoes and price spikes.

Long before the Sept. 11 attacks, President Bush adopted the slogan, "National security depends on energy security." How can America best come closer to energy self-sufficiency? To date, the Bush administration has changed our relationship to fossil fuels primarily by deregulating and decentralizing controls, while advocating increased drilling. Interior Secretary Gale Norton supports opening up many wilderness study areas, national monuments and roadless national forests for oil and gas leases.

But we will never be able to drill our way out of even our short-term energy problems, much less our long-term ones. America consumes 25 percent of the world's oil while possessing less than 4 percent of global oil reserves. Even opening the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to drilling would provide a mere 140 days' worth of fuel. Such modest new supplies would take an estimated seven years to reach the consumer and would be more costly than imported oil.

We have to be more inventive about easing our reliance on all oil, foreign and domestic. A good start would be to reverse the administration's rollbacks in financing research into fuel efficiency and renewable, clean energy sources. We need to build on the encouraging advances in developing wind and wave power, biomass research, transport fuels based on renewable oilseed crops, and photovoltaic modules that can convert even diffuse light into electricity. Some of the most promising progress has been in energy efficiency: household appliances that require half the energy they did a decade ago; cars that can get 70 miles per gallon.

Changing public attitudes is going to be an even steeper challenge. Yet it is too much to hope that the S.U.V. will come to be viewed as an unpatriotic relic of the 90's, when America's dependence on foreign oil spiked by over 40 percent? Is it unreasonable to believe that with commitments from Detroit and government, hybrid cars could become not just more sophisticated but sexier, narrowing the gap between fashion and conscience while saving us money at the pump? Could hybrids and fuel-efficient vehicles emerge as the cars of choice for a more patriotic and worldly America?

Redesigning hybrids is one thing; the business of remodeling American consumer desire is an undertaking altogether more ambitious. But we do have precedents: remember the beloved Oldsmobile 88's and Ford LTD's that lost their appeal after the 1973 Arab oil embargo? With a combination of pocketbook incentives, government stimulus and industry inventiveness, perhaps we could untangle America's passion for the automobile from our dangerous and doomed appetite for oil. The most decisive war we can wage on behalf of national security and America's global image is the war against our own oil gluttony.

AIRLINE AND AIRPORT SECURITY: WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

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, I want to talk tonight about an issue that was discussed in the last hour and will be discussed in this country and in this Chamber tomorrow and the day after. Indeed, it is a topic that all Americans have been focused on if they are watching the great debate here in this city. That topic is a critical one for this country; it is airline and airport security.

This country's economy depends on our national air system, on our air travel system, on the security of people who decide to take a flight, whether it is for recreation or business, from their home to some other location to conduct business or to go on a vacation.

We heard a discussion in the last hour about the bill that will be before us, and I think it is important for all Americans to understand the issues presented by this legislation. It is vitally important that we make America's airports and America's airlines and America's air travel system absolutely safe. However, it is also important in doing that that we have an informed debate, a debate about what needs to occur and a debate about what is wrong with the current system, and a debate about what the alternatives are for the future.

Unfortunately, a lot of the debate that we have had and that we heard in the last hour focused on the past and not accurately on the future or the issue that is presented for the future. We heard a lot of discussion in the last hour about the flaws in the current system and about what is wrong with the current system.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it absolutely clear that no one is proposing that the current system be retained. No one is proposing that. I want to make it also clear that while a lot of the discussion in the last hour focused on this issue of a Republican versus a Democrat solution of philosophy or ideology, those really are not the issues. The issue which all Americans need to understand as the issue is the safety of our airlines, the safety of our airports, and the safety of air travel in America. On that issue, I and my Republican colleagues do not see it as partisan and do not see any benefit in discussing a partisan divide. We see it as one issue: how do we make the skies of America safe for every single American, black, white, Republican, Democrat, brown, red; every American needs and deserves the best possible protection system for our Federal aviation system to ensure that we are all safe.

I want to say that I think it is sad, absolutely sad when the debate on this kind of issue, which ought not to be partisan, sinks to a level of partisan-

ship where one side is saying the other side is driven by ideology or bipartisan gain. This issue is about the safety of the American traveling public, and it is about how we make our airports and our airlines safe, the securist and the best it can be in the world. How do we create that system? It is not by creating a one-size-fits-all piece of legislation.

I would like to go down to the easel and walk through some of these points, because I think they are extremely important for all Americans to understand, and I have some graphics that I think will help make those points.

As I said just a moment ago, this is not about partisanship. And importantly, although we have heard a lot of discussion about what is wrong with the current system, it is not about the current system. Let me say it again. Let me make sure nobody misses this point. Nobody is debating the merits of the current system. The current system, whether it could have succeeded or not, has, in fact, failed. The current system has not provided the American people with the safety they deserve. So all the anecdotal stories we heard in the last hour, all the anecdotal stories we are going to hear tomorrow and the next day about the failures of the current system, about how the airlines are not doing security correctly; about the corruption, for example, of some of the current security providers, that is really not an issue, because the issue is not the current system. Nobody, again, is proposing the current system. Let us talk a little bit about that current system.

Under the current system, airlines hire private companies to supervise airline security. That is not in the Republican bill. That is not in the Democrat bill. That is not in the President's bill. That is not in any legislation. Nobody is proposing that we retain the current system where the airlines have responsibility for security and where private companies are hired by airlines to provide that security. Why discuss it? Why debate it? I was in a debate on this topic with one of my colleagues the other day who recounted to me over and over again the failings of the current security companies. Guess what? Nobody is proposing that we keep those systems. Under the current system there is no federalized and no law enforcement supervision of any kind. There is none. Right now, the Federal Government has no responsibility because we hand it over to airlines who hire private companies, and that system has failed.

So make no mistake about it, in the debate we are going to hear in the next few days, when we hear Republicans talk about the idea of having a mix of Federal Government employees and Federal supervisors and Federal training and Federal law enforcement personnel at every gate and at every site to supervise, but not requiring that every single employee as a mandate of Federal statute, which cannot be

changed until this Congress meets again; when they talk about that, they are not talking about the current system, because that does not exist in the current system. Under the current system, airlines hire private companies. Let me make it clear. That does not exist anymore. It is gone, absolutely, totally gone.

So although the stories about what is going wrong today or what is going right today about the checks that Americans may have experienced or may not have experienced when Americans have been through airport security in the last few days, all of that is a part of the past. Indeed, we will talk a little bit later about one of the dangers about one of the bills, the Senate bill, which says what we should do is make sure that every single employee responsible for any aspect of screening is a Federal Government employee. One of the dangers is that they will go out and simply hire the people that do the job now and make them Federal employees.

I want to make another point here: the issue is not where the paycheck comes from. I have never had a single constituent come up to me and say, you know, Congressman, I think I would feel more secure when I fly in an airplane if I knew that when I got on the airplane the person who checked me through got a paycheck from the Federal Government. I have never had somebody say to me, Congressman, I think I would feel more secure if when I went through the security gate, I knew the person got a paycheck from a private company. Nobody has ever said that is the issue. Indeed, that is not the issue. The issue is and the issue that all of us need to focus on is how do we create the best system to make sure that Americans are safe and secure.

The question we have to ask ourselves is what are the constituent elements of that? Well, I can tell my colleagues that one is, we have decided not to have the airlines continue to hire private companies. We have decided that the Federal Government should take over the responsibility of making our skies safe for the traveling public.

□ 2030

And both the Republican bill and the Democrat bill will provide that. The airlines no longer hire private companies. The airlines indeed no longer have the responsibility for this task. It becomes a Federal Government responsibility.

That is a decision that has been made. That is a debate that no longer will even occur, although some are trying to get Members not to watch the ball, and they may talk about that. They may say that private companies mean we are going to keep the old system. Please understand that is not correct.

There is another point. Right now there are no federalized standards, no federalized law enforcement present,