

for retention. We're getting them and recruitment is rising.

This year, for the first time in nearly a decade, public sector pay will rise faster than private sector pay.

And we are the only major government in Europe this year to be increasing public spending on health and education as a percentage of our national income.

This Party believes in public services; believes in the ethos of public service; and believes in the dedication the vast majority of public servants show; and the proof of it is that we're spending more, hiring more and paying more than ever before.

Public servants don't do it for money or glory. They do it because they find fulfilment in a child well taught or a patient well cared-for; or a community made safer and we salute them for it.

All that is true. But this is also true.

That often they work in systems and structures that are hopelessly old fashioned or even worse, work against the very goals they aim for.

There are schools, with exactly the same social intake. One does well; the other badly.

There are hospitals with exactly the same patient mix. One performs well; the other badly.

Without reform, more money and pay won't succeed.

First, we need a national framework of accountability, inspection; and minimum standards of delivery.

Second, within that framework, we need to free up local leaders to be able to innovate, develop and be creative.

Third, there should be far greater flexibility in the terms and conditions of employment of public servants.

Fourth, there has to be choice for the user of public services and the ability, where provision of the service fails, to have an alternative provider.

If schools want to develop or specialise in a particular area; or hire classroom assistants or computer professionals as well as teachers, let them. If in a Primary Care Trust, doctors can provide minor surgery or physiotherapists see patients otherwise referred to a consultant, let them.

There are too many old demarcations, especially between nurses, doctors and consultants; too little use of the potential of new technology; too much bureaucracy, too many outdated practices, too great an adherence to the way we've always done it rather than the way public servants would like to do it if they got the time to think and the freedom to act.

It's not reform that is the enemy of public services. It's the status quo.

Part of that reform programme is partnership with the private or voluntary sector.

Let's get one thing clear. Nobody is talking about privatising the NHS or schools.

Nobody believes the private sector is a panacea.

There are great examples of public service and poor examples. There are excellent private sector companies and poor ones. There are areas where the private sector has worked well; and areas where, as with parts of the railways, it's been a disaster.

Where the private sector is used, it should not make a profit simply by cutting the wages and conditions of its staff.

But where the private sector can help lever in vital capital investment, where it helps raise standards, where it improves the public service as a public service, then to set up some dogmatic barrier to using it, is to let down the very people who most need our public services to improve.

This programme of reform is huge: in the NHS, education, including student finance,—we have to find a better way to combine

state funding and student contributions to criminal justice; and transport.

I regard it as being as important for the country as Clause IV's reform was for the Party, and obviously far more important for the lives of the people we serve.

And it is a vital test for the modern Labour Party

If people lose faith in public services, be under no illusion as to what will happen.

There is a different approach waiting in the wings. Cut public spending drastically; let those that can afford to, buy their own services; and those that can't, will depend on a demoralised, sink public service. That would be a denial of social justice on a massive scale.

It would be contrary to the very basis of community.

So this is a battle of values. Let's have that battle but not amongst ourselves. The real fight is between those who believe in strong public services and those who don't.

That's the fight worth having.

In all of this, at home and abroad, the same beliefs throughout: that we are a community of people, whose self-interest and mutual interest at crucial points merge, and that it is through a sense of justice that community is born and nurtured.

And what does this concept of justice consist of?

Fairness, people all of equal worth, of course. But also reason and tolerance. Justice has no favourites; not amongst nations, peoples or faiths.

When we act to bring to account those that committed the atrocity of September 11, we do so, not out of bloodlust.

We do so because it is just. We do not act against Islam. The true followers of Islam are our brothers and sisters in this struggle. Bin Laden is no more obedient to the proper teaching of the Koran than those Crusaders of the 12th century who pillaged and murdered, represented the teaching of the Gospel.

It is time the west confronted its ignorance of Islam. Jews, Muslims and Christians are all children of Abraham.

This is the moment to bring the faiths closer together in understanding of our common values and heritage, a source of unity and strength.

It is time also for parts of Islam to confront prejudice against America and not only Islam but parts of western societies too.

America has its faults as a society, as we have ours.

But I think of the Union of America born out of the defeat of slavery.

I think of its Constitution, with its inalienable rights granted to every citizen still a model for the world.

I think of a black man, born in poverty, who became chief of their armed forces and is now secretary of state Colin Powell and I wonder frankly whether such a thing could have happened here.

I think of the Statue of Liberty and how many refugees, migrants and the impoverished passed its light and felt that if not for them, for their children, a new world could indeed be theirs.

I think of a country where people who do well, don't have questions asked about their accent, their class, their beginnings but have admiration for what they have done and the success they've achieved.

I think of those New Yorkers I met, still in shock, but resolute; the fire fighters and police, mourning their comrades but still head held high.

I think of all this and I reflect: yes, America has its faults, but it is a free country, a democracy, it is our ally and some of the reaction to September 11 betrays a hatred of America that shames those that feel it.

So I believe this is a fight for freedom. And I want to make it a fight for justice too. Justice not only to punish the guilty. But justice to bring those same values of democracy and freedom to people round the world.

And I mean: freedom, not only in the narrow sense of personal liberty but in the broader sense of each individual having the economic and social freedom to develop their potential to the full. That is what community means, founded on the equal worth of all.

The starving, the wretched, the dispossessed, the ignorant, those living in want and squalor from the deserts of Northern Africa to the slums of Gaza, to the mountain ranges of Afghanistan: they too are our cause.

This is a moment to seize. The Kaleidoscope has been shaken. The pieces are in flux. Soon they will settle again. Before they do, let us re-order this world around us.

Today, humankind has the science and technology to destroy itself or to provide prosperity to all. Yet science can't make that choice for us. Only the moral power of a world acting as a community, can.

"By the strength of our common endeavour we achieve more together than we can alone".

For those people who lost their lives on September 11 and those that mourn them; now is the time for the strength to build that community. Let that be their memorial.

## ACTIVATING GUARD AND RESERVE UNITS

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, one of the other things I did just a few days ago—and I hope my colleagues will consider doing the same—was to visit some of the Guard and Reserve units that are being activated.

When I asked for the opportunity to go to Scott Air Force Base in Belleville, just to spend a few moments with the men and women of the 126th Air Guard Refueling Wing, I wasn't certain whether they would consider this a colossal waste of time to have to have some political figure come and drop by. Exactly the opposite happened.

It was an important experience for me, and I also think for many of them, just to come by, have a few kind words, and to really thank them for the sacrifice they have shown for this country.

This is an Air Guard unit that has been activated many times. It was originally based at O'Hare and now is at Scott Air Force Base. They refuel planes and are very important to any military effort of the United States. There were about 340 members of this unit, men and women, who have joined the military, understanding their lives would be on the line. To go through the crowd there and meet each one of them, to talk for a few moments about their hometowns and their families, baseball, and so many other things that are just part of American life, was so refreshing and encouraging and, in a way, inspiring—spending that time with them and General Kessler, who is their commanding officer at Scott Air Force Base.

Theirs is a unit that has been activated, in part. And I am sure others will be as well. The 182nd Airlift Wing

in Peoria is also a unit that is likely to be mobilized—the 183rd Air National Guard Fighter Wing in Springfield, the 954th Air Reserve Support Unit out of Scott Air Force Base, the 182nd Air National Guard Security Forces, the 126th Air National Guard Security Forces, and the 183 National Guard Security Forces out of Springfield.

The one thing they raised to me—and I think at least bears some comment in this Chamber—was their concern about their families once they left. That is a natural feeling. It is one we ought to remind ourselves of, that we have passed laws to protect these men and women in uniform who are activated so that they can return to their jobs without any loss of status, and also to help them in some financial circumstances.

But beyond the laws, and beyond the Federal commitment, beyond the political speeches, I hope that every community across the United States will offer a helping hand to the families of those in the Guard and Reserve who are now called on to serve our country, as well as the active-duty men and women who are in harm's way at this moment in service to our Nation.

Many times, as I went around Illinois, people would say: Senator, what can I do? I have given blood. I have sent my check in. The President has said to embrace my family. I did it; I do it every day. Is there anything more I can do? Think about the families of the men and women in uniform in your community who just may need a helping hand or a word of encouragement of perhaps a little more. That is something every one of us should do.

#### TRANSPORTATION SECURITY

Mr. DURBIN. I would like to address this issue of aviation security, which has been addressed on the floor by my colleague from Massachusetts, Senator KERRY. I note that Senator TORRICELLI is also in the Chamber. We were in a meeting yesterday to discuss security transportation security, not just aviation security. There are many of us served by Amtrak who believe that George Warrington, the CEO of Amtrak, has given us fair notice that he needs additional resources to make certain that Amtrak continues to be one of the safest ways to travel in America.

I believe there are over 600 Amtrak stations across this country. They are putting in place the kind of security we want, to make certain that no terrorist will see a target of opportunity in the metroliners or Amtrak trains that crisscross America.

I am happy, as I have noted at the beginning of my statement, to be a cosponsor of S. 1447 on aviation security. There are many provisions that I think are excellent. I am happy to join Senator HOLLINGS and so many others, on a bipartisan basis, to support the bill. But we would be remiss to believe that passing a bill on aviation security takes care of our obligation, our re-

sponsibility. Beyond that, we have to look to the traveling public and other vulnerabilities.

I agree with my colleagues who also have Amtrak service that we need to give to Amtrak the resources and the authority to make certain they can upgrade their security and take a look at a lot of their vulnerable infrastructure.

In this Chamber yesterday, Senator TORRICELLI talked about some of the tunnels. George Warrington of Amtrak has brought this to my attention. Many of these tunnels date back to the Civil War in their construction.

They do not have adequate safety in the tunnels so that if anything occurred, the people on the train would be in a very perilous situation. As these trains pass in the tunnels, literally hundreds if not thousands of passengers are trusting that we are doing everything we should do for the security of their transportation. I don't think we are doing enough. In fact, I believe we should include in this aviation security bill the authorization for Amtrak to receive additional funds for security.

I am troubled—I have to say this with some regret—that a lot of my colleagues in the Senate who have had a very negative view of Amtrak as a governmental function are translating that into a reluctance to address these security and safety measures. I am not one of them. If we take a look at the annual expenditure for transportation at the Federal level, we spend roughly \$33 billion a year on highways, \$12 billion a year on airports—before the crisis—and about \$500 million a year on Amtrak. Anyone in the State of Illinois and in many States across the Nation knows that if we are going to have a balanced transportation system, we need all three. We need aviation, good highway transportation and mass transit, and a national rail passenger corporation such as Amtrak.

It is no surprise to me, as I have been on the trains more often since September 11 than before, that more and more Americans are turning there.

We have an obligation to protect them, not to wait until there is an accident or something worse. I hope my colleagues will reconsider their opposition to Amtrak security authorization and appropriations. We should do it, and we should do it now without question.

Our commitment should be to every American to make their transportation as safe as humanly possible.

Let me address the aviation security issue for a minute. Yesterday, in my office I had representatives of the three major international corporations involved in aviation airport screening and security. They told me an interesting story. For those who may not be aware, until this moment in time, we have given to the airlines the responsibility to contract out the security and screening stations at the airports. We have found, as we have looked into it, that going to the lowest bidder in some

circumstances meant that you didn't have an employee who was adequately compensated or trained.

I will quickly add that in my hometown of Springfield, IL, and many airports I have visited, the people working the screening equipment are doing an extraordinarily good job. Any one of us who has been through an airport at any time in the past few years knows that too often you have found at those security stations employees who were not taking it seriously.

Examine the analysis from the GAO, and it turns out that the turnover in some of the airports is 100 percent a year, 200 percent a year and, in the worst case, over 400 percent a year. The employees come and go if they are given an opportunity to take a job at Cinnabon or anywhere else in the airport. They are quickly gone from the screening stations. We have not taken this responsibility seriously, nor have the airlines.

Now we face a new day. The private contractors who came to me yesterday said that it is a different world altogether overseas. In fact, one of them noted the fact that in Israel it is a private company that handles the security at the airport with certification by the Government and supervision by the Government, as is the case in many European capitals. I don't know if we can safely move in our own minds from what we see today with these same companies to a model using those companies in a different context.

When I asked Secretary Mineta last week to describe for me how this might work, the details were still forthcoming. That left me a little bit cold. Many of my colleagues share the belief that the safest way to address this, as we do in the bill, is to say that we will federalize the security and safety at airports. This bill goes beyond the screening station and talks about the responsibility under this bill. Let me quote from it on the security operations:

The administrator shall establish and enforce rules to improve the fiscal security of air traffic control facilities, parked aircraft, aircraft servicing equipment, aircraft supplies, automobile parking facilities, access and transition areas at airports served by other means of ground or water transportation.

The important thing is that this bill goes far beyond the screening stations at the airports. I believe if we are going to maintain safety at airports and on our airplanes, it has to be a secure environment. That means we are not only conscious and sensitive to what passengers bring onto airplanes but every single person who has contact with an airplane. A caterer, a clean-up crew, refueling personnel, someone who is a mechanic coming on board, or baggage handlers, all of them have to be supervised to make certain that those airplanes are secure. This bill does it. It does it through federalization.

I think we should view the safety of our airports and airplanes as matters