

CONCERNS REGARDING THE FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS BILL

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, tonight I would like to talk briefly about some concerns I have in the foreign operations appropriations bill, about some rumors that are circulating.

The bill has passed the House and it has passed the Senate. As we go to conference, it is important that we address some of these concerns and we do not retreat on our anti-narcotics efforts.

□ 1745

I know Americans are deeply concerned about the anti-terrorism as I am, but in the process of focusing on the terrorism question, we should not retreat from our war on drugs. As my friend and the Democratic ranking member of the Committee on Government Reform, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), has said, we are in a chemical war in the United States. They have distributed illegal narcotics throughout our country. We are watching the Taliban to see if their heroin makes it over from Europe. They dominate the Europe and Asia markets, but clearly we have thousands of Americans dying of illegal drugs, which is a consistent problem.

I want to talk first about an understanding that the Senate has been pushing to drop a drug certification. First, I do not think it should be dropped. I know countries do not like it. I met with our leaders and presidents in Mexico and throughout South America and in the Summit of the Americas. I know they do not like it. They do not like that it seems judgmental. But the truth is we have certification on human rights and we have certification on terrorism. Are we saying that we will drop all criteria for foreign aid and standards, including human rights and terrorism? We should not.

It is important that we have an idea of which countries in the world are co-operating in our efforts against illegal narcotics, human rights and terrorism. And if we drop one because of judgment, all will be dropped. If we have drop none, that would be the better point.

Now, let me draw in some particular things. Mexico and Colombia as well as Peru and Bolivia have in fact responded and been aggressive. Certification is not about whether you have been successful but whether the government involved is doing its best to try to cooperate with our government, and Mexico has undertaken incredible efforts in the last 4 years. Colombia has changed its government and has been fighting in the war ever since, as did Peru and Bolivia.

What you need are a carrot and stick approach. In those countries when they

elect leadership, they deserve to be rewarded with assistance. The point of being on the list is whether or not you get assistance.

We do need to make some changes in the law. For example, we should not have to certify. The question should be is if you are in noncompliance and non-assistance then you should go on a list like in terrorism or human rights. In the drug certification question, in the drug list, it only applies to whether you are going to get aid. If you do not get aid you are not on the list.

The second concern is the chopping down of the funds in the Andean Initiative. If we are to ever make progress, we cannot push in Plan Colombia. We have to look at the countries around Colombia. We cannot just focus on military. We have to focus on legal aid and economic aid. As we reduce the Andean Initiative, we will have wasted the money that is now going down into that area if we do not continue to follow through the strategy that we put in, which is we squeeze and put the pressure on the narco-traffickers in Colombia, but then as we start to move and as they start to transfer their planning and their trafficking to Ecuador to Peru and Bolivia and Brazil, we should not be backing off the efforts and spread the drug war to those countries. We need in the Andean Initiative to make sure that they are funded so our American drug addiction does not spread this terrible war to the countries around Colombia and, in fact, we can make progress.

The drug issue is very similar to the terrorism question. Unless you can get it at its source, there is only so much we can do at the border, and once it gets across the border it is about impossible to tackle.

We have worked with drug-free schools, drug-free communities, drug treatment, but in fact the closer we can get to the source the better. Just like in terrorism, once those terrorists come into our region and get across our borders, it is very hard to find them in a country that practices liberty.

I hope in the Foreign Operations bill we do not back off with a new Democratic Senate and a new Republican President from our strong efforts against narcotics, either in the Andean Initiative or in the certification of nations who are not cooperating with the United States.

AIRLINE SECURITY

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, it has been 7 weeks and 1 day since the horrific attacks by the terrorists using our commercial airlines and innocent civilians and passengers and crew as weapons in attacks on the World Trade Towers, the Pentagon and the other plane which crashed in Pennsylvania.

It has been more than 2 weeks since the United States Senate voted 100 to 0 on a comprehensive bill to improve aviation security. Now what has gone on in the House so far in these issues? Nothing.

We had the airline bailout bill, \$16 billion. There was not a penny in it for aviation security. I tried to amend in at the end of the consideration of the bill a provision for aviation security, but lost that vote.

Now, I think there is pretty broad agreement on both sides of the aisle that the current system is failing. The FAA testers, the regulators who oversee the system find it failing frequently. Their testers are able to smuggle through fake hand grenades, weapons, bombs with great regularity. It is failing us.

Then we have the issue of a number of large private security firms, most notably Argenbright, largest in the United States, subsidiary of one of the largest in the world, the three major private security firms which provide security at airports, are foreign owned. They have a problem. They were criminally convicted last year of hiring known felons, maintaining known felons on staff, lying to the Federal regulators, falsifying documents to Federal regulators. They were fined \$1.1 million and put on probation.

Well, here we are a year later and guess what? They are in court again. They are under indictment for hiring known felons, maintaining known felons on staff, falsifying documents to Federal regulators. So although there may be agreement here that we need to do something, unfortunately the majority, particularly a couple of leaders on the majority side, want to perpetuate that system. They said, all we have to do is take the Argenbright Company, known felons, the company itself, in for its second felony trial and supervise them more. How much more supervision can you provide than probation?

They are on probation. They are violating their probation. Maybe if we put the CEO in jail that will get their attention, but I cannot see that this new system of supervision they are talking about is going to shape these people up. They have got problems over in Europe at Heathrow. They have 38 people working in critical positions allowing access to secure parts of the airport who had not had background checks. Same problem they got here in the United States.

Some members of the leadership of the majority on that side want to perpetuate this failing \$800 million a year security on the cheap bureaucracy because it is immensely profitable to those companies employing minimum wage, undertrained and abused employees. That has got to change.

We just cannot fix it. We cannot bring in the same firms, the same firms that have committed felonies and make them better with new regulations. They are saying, well, this is

what we will do, we will set the wage; we will set the benefit package. This is the Federal Government. We will set the training, we will supervise the training, we will do the background checks and we will supervise the workers, but they will not be Federal employees.

What sense does that make? If we are going to do all that, why not make them into Federal law enforcement personnel, just like we have right out here at the doors of the capitol. We do not have private security out there because I do not think most Members of Congress would feel safe. We have armed Federal law enforcement agents.

Should we do any less for the traveling American public when it comes to aviation safety? Should they go into the airports and have these companies that have committed felonies and perpetuated in those crimes or should they have a Federal law enforcement workforce, just like when they confront the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the Customs Service. The Department of Agriculture checks bags in Hawaii and at other times people coming into the United States. They are all sworn Federal law enforcement officers, but somehow they are telling us either we cannot afford that.

I mean one very candid member of the Republican leadership said these people could join unions if they become Federal employees. Well, guess what? They can join unions if they are private employees. In fact, this legislation is being opposed by a private union because they have unionized some of these folks. They can be unionized one way or another.

There is another concern I have about that. Most of the people who were working and died, other than those innocently at work, on the day of this tragedy, the firefighters, the medics, the police, the pilots and the flight attendants, they were all members of unions. What is wrong with unions?

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. MCKINNEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, today marks the last day, this last day

of October, as the last day of the month for national domestic violence awareness. Though society has made great strides in bringing attention to the crime of domestic violence, over 4 million individuals of this country continue to find themselves victims of physical, psychological and sexual abuse. While our Nation's attention is currently occupied by security threats both here and abroad, domestic violence is an issue that this country must continue to address.

Domestic violence rarely makes the headlines, primarily because most of the abuse occurs behind closed doors. In most instances, the victim knows the attacker. Over 50 percent of the victims are battered by a boy or girlfriend. Over 30 percent are assaulted by spouses, and around 15 percent are attacked by ex-spouses. Many victims are reluctant to report these incidents to anyone because of fear of reprisal.

There are many theories to explain why individuals use violence against their partners. Some explanations include dysfunctional families, inadequate communication skills, stress, chemical dependency and economic hardship. Though these issues may be associated with battering, they are not the causes, and merely removing these factors will not end domestic violence.

Batterers begin and continue to have abusive behavior because violence is an effective method of gaining and keeping control over another person. The abuser usually does not suffer adverse consequences as a result of this behavior.

Historically, violence against women has not been treated as a real crime but rather a private matter between domestic partners. The consequences for domestic violence are often less severe than the penalties for other criminal forms of abuse.

Society tends to misplace the blame for continued abuse, focusing on the victim and criticizing him or her for not leaving the abuser. In many cases women simply do not have physical or financial resources to get out of the relationship. Risks of retaliatory abuse and injury are also factors in staying.

Every year, domestic violence results in approximately 100,000 days of hospitalization and over 28,000 visits to emergency rooms. In these cases, major medical treatment is often required.

Fear of death is another consideration. The possibility of being murdered by an abuser increases to 75 percent if the woman attempts to leave on her own.

For these reasons, outside support networks and services are vital. Yet these resources are often limited.

The lack of resources and shelters are a particular problem in rural areas. In my 66-county district, there are only nine domestic violence and sexual assault shelters. For many women in central and western Kansas, the distance to the closest shelter may be hundreds

of miles away. In Kansas, one domestic violence murder occurs 55 minutes and 48 seconds. Proximity to a safe facility can mean the difference between life and death. Ensuring safe havens for women who leave abusive environments is a priority.

Most domestic violence centers rely primarily on grants and local donations. Federal grants made under the Violence Against Women Act provided essential funds for shelter operation and support service. That program has been credited with substantially reducing the levels of violence committed against women and children. We must continue to ensure that our shelters and crisis centers receive adequate funding.

As National Domestic Violence Awareness Month draws to a close, we are reminded that domestic violence is an issue that must be addressed all year long. Only through funding, education and support can America hope to end this terrible crime.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ANTIBIOTIC RESISTANCE

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, antibiotic resistance is a major health threat that does not receive the attention it deserves. When bioterrorism is a prevailing concern, we can no longer afford to ignore or downplay the threat of antibiotic resistance.

Introduced in the 1940s, antibiotics gave us a tremendous advantage in our fight against tuberculosis, pneumonia, typhoid, cholera and salmonella and many other long-term killers, but some bacteria exposed to antibiotics are able to survive. These antibiotic-resistant strains then flourish and pose a dangerous threat to public health.

□ 1800

We in Congress cannot go home to our districts and say we have taken the steps necessary to prepare for future bioterrorist attacks unless and until we confront the issue of antibiotic resistance.

The links between resistance and bioterrorism are clear. Antibiotic-resistant strains of anthrax and other microbes are recognized to be some of the most lethal forms of biological weapons. These weapons exist today. We know, first, that Russian scientists have developed a strain of anthrax that is resistant to penicillin and tetracycline. We can only assume that anthrax and other lethal agents will be engineered to resist newer antibiotics like Cipro.