

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 hamstring 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 checkpoint 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 deadliest 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 gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman 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 virtually 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 Tsetung 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