

and that is why we are so impassioned about the need to address this now in this time when we are looking at various needs for security.

When you ride Amtrak, which a number of Senators did when they visited ground zero a couple of weeks ago, and as a number of us do regularly, you do not have to go through any security checkpoints before boarding, no metal detectors, no x-ray machines to check luggage, and there are very few security officers. Someone can just walk on a train and put a bag in the storage bins. One does not even have to be suicidal to accomplish destruction.

Indications are that security on trains is light. Under these circumstances, we have been very fortunate, in my view, to have avoided a major terrorist attack on our Nation's rail system. It is not just a Northeast corridor problem. It is a problem across the country where we have heavy rail traffic.

It is time to improve that security now. We need to think ahead to what could be a major disaster, a human tragedy for our country. That is why the Biden initiative, and the initiative of so many of us, is so important.

This amendment will provide the resources to substantially improve the security of the Nation's passenger rail system—not just in the Northeast but the Nation's rail transportation system. Funds could be used for a variety of purposes, including hiring more police officers, improving training and security personnel, purchase of security cameras, and the establishment of special emergency response teams that can respond instantly if we have a problem on our rails. It could provide helicopters to check the track coverage to make sure we are not being attacked before an event.

There are a number of things we need to do on a commonsense basis to make sure we are more secure in our rail traffic, to make sure our economy continues to roll and provide the freight connections with which Amtrak and rail across our country use to service our economy. We ought to do this now and not wait for a problem to occur.

It is also important—and this is absolutely more clear every day—Mr. President, I encourage you to come to New York, New Jersey, and try to commute across the various forms of transportation under the Hudson River or over it and see the 1½ to 2 hour lines that are taking place because of the breakdown, obviously, of the path tunnel that went into the World Trade Center. There were 50,000 riders one way each day on that pathway, and now they are looking for other ways to get into the city.

With the entry level of the Holland Tunnel now stopped because of security reasons, there is an absolute need for us to understand that these are important security chokepoints, risk points in our transportation network.

A lot of these tunnels are extraordinarily dated and, by the way, not just

the ones in New York and New Jersey, but Baltimore, Washington, and other places across the country are not up to scale for the 21st century. In fact, some of them are not up to scale for the 20th century.

The ones in Baltimore were put in place in the 1870s. The tunnels under the Hudson River were built in the early 1900s when we had the Pennsylvania railroad. They have gone through different ownerships and struggles to stay current.

If a terrorist were to attack the ones I know best under the Hudson River, there are two exits in a tunnel that is the better part of 6 or 7 miles long. Lousy ventilation was put in place, as I said, in the early 1900s, and a narrow passageway virtually makes it impossible to evacuate.

On an average day there are 100,000 passengers who go through that tunnel. It is not just Amtrak, but it is the New Jersey transit, which is one of the vital links to have a connected economy in the metropolitan New York-New Jersey-Connecticut area.

I stress that it is not only New York-New Jersey. We have similar issues in the Baltimore tunnels, and, frankly, they have a tunnel in Washington that runs right next to the Capitol Building. There are enormous risks and inefficiencies that occur here.

We have a safety issue for sure. All one has to do is watch grade B movies of days in the West, as we might have seen in South Dakota, where people blew up bridges or blew up tunnels to know it does not take a genius to figure out that these are places where security measures need to be taken and attended to.

I hope my friends in the Senate will realize this is not about porkbarrel spending. This is a serious concern for literally millions of folks who are involved in our rail transportation system.

Finally, this is a vital economic link for this country. There is an enormous amount of freight traffic up and down the east coast. There is in other parts of the country as well, and our friends need to have protection to make sure those links stay in place. If we are ever going to worry about where the status of our economy is and how we are going to keep it thriving, get it back on the right track, now is the time to be thinking about that. That is why I think we have to make sure we move on these issues with regard to rail transportation at the same time we are talking about aviation.

There is the old saying: Fool us once, shame on you; fool us twice, shame on us. Frankly, I think we are in that position. That is why I feel so strongly about support of the initiative that a number of us are taking under the leadership of Senator BIDEN, and I hope we will move that forward. Economic reasons for sure, but when you want to think about the safety of the people of America, we do not need another September 11 to produce movement on

things where we know there are problems.

As a matter of fact, the traffic has increased over 40 percent in that Northeast corridor since September 11 because a lot of people believe it is an alternative to air transportation. I hope we will move on this bill, move on it quickly, so we are looking after our citizens in a prospective way, not in a reactive way.

For all of these reasons, I strongly urge my colleagues to support the Biden amendment when it is presented. I hope to come back and speak to this again and make sure people forcefully understand this is a need that has to be addressed now, not after the fact. I appreciate the attention of the Senate, and I hope we will all be attentive to the needs of what I think are important rail safety issues, as well as our aviation safety.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON). The Senator from Idaho.

RESOLVING DIFFERENCES

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, this afternoon I want to speak to the issue that many of my colleagues have spoken about. For the first time since September 11, I have heard an interesting word used by the majority leader of the Senate, the word “obstruction.”

I am disappointed Senator DASCHLE has decided that is a word he needs to use to express his concern about where we are in the Senate at this moment.

What I will say this afternoon to the majority leader is there is an awful lot about trying to get the work product we are going to offer to the American people next week right correct, well done, before we bring it to the floor. For example, if Senator DASCHLE had suggested we bring the antiterrorism package to the floor yesterday, we would not have had a completed product. Somebody would have had to stand up and object and say, wait a moment, Tom, somehow you have the cart before the horse.

If we spend another 24 hours on it, maybe we can resolve our differences. You know what happened in that 24-hour period? Differences were resolved. The Senate stood in a bipartisan way last night and crafted an antiterrorism package, and the House voted out of committee unanimously in a bipartisan way to resolve it.

There is not a great deal of difference between that and the airport safety package that came to the floor without clear instructions and a bipartisan unity that would have led us to resolve it in the correct fashion. Many of our colleagues were lining up, and rightfully so, to offer a variety of amendments that could have taken us well into next week, substantially changed the character of an airport safety package, and sent a very confusing message to the American public. The public has a right to be concerned at this moment because current airport safety failed us

on September 11. They want to make darn sure that whatever we do this time we get it right.

In getting it right, my guess is the first question you would ask is, Are you going to use the old model that failed us on September 11 and throw more money at it and throw more people at it, or are you going to think differently? Are you going to step out of that box and look at something new that really is an awful lot about law enforcement and a lot less about hiring the cheapest kind of personnel you can get to fill what is required by the FAA? That really is the debate that is going on behind the closed doors that the majority leader has not been willing to expose to the American people this afternoon. He has simply stood on this floor, wrung his hands, and used the word "obstruction."

Let me say what is going on in the back rooms at this moment: The White House, the Secretary of Transportation, the chairman of the Commerce Committee, the ranking member of the Commerce Committee, and a good many others are trying to craft a final product that is a hybrid, that is out of the box, that is different, that is unique, that we can bring to the floor next Tuesday and show to the American people we can get it right and they will, from that day forward, as this new product gets implemented, have the kind of airport security they want, demand, and are going to require of their government.

Is it more of a model of law enforcement, maybe like the U.S. Marshals Service that has a cadre of professionals that allows contracting out but does so with very strict parameters? The White House has said they do not want to federalize all of it. They recognize you cannot make all of these people Federal employees and expect the best product, but if you do, then you have to change the character of the way you hire a Federal employee, and you have to allow hiring and you have to allow firing. You have to be able to proscribe and demand and inspect and make sure the end product, the inability to penetrate security at all of our Nation's airports, is absolute.

I suggest to the majority leader the reason we are not debating this issue on the floor this afternoon is not a matter of obstruction; it is a matter of getting it right before it is brought to the floor. It is an awful lot more about airport security in the long term because we only have one more bite at this apple. If we get it wrong this time, shame on us.

We heard the Senator from New Jersey talk about a very important issue: rebuilding the infrastructure of the rail delivery system of the east coast. Should it be a part of airport security or should it be a part of an infrastructure bill that has long been needed that addresses the refurbishing of a very antiquated rail system? How much money is it going to cost? Should we rush to judgment and spend a few billion dol-

lars more when we are on the verge of spending beyond what we now have available to spend?

September 11 awakened us to a great many needs, but it does not mean we do them all overnight or we spend hundreds of billions of dollars into deficit to accommodate it. It says, though, that we have some immediate needs. One of the most immediate is airport security.

While Americans are beginning to return to our airports because they know security has been substantially heightened, what we are going to offer them in the package that is brought to the floor next week is a new model that creates a new paradigm of thinking, that clearly allows the American people to see on an annual basis, as we review it, as it is implemented by this administration, an airport security system that has the integrity not to allow the penetration, not to allow a September 11 to ever happen again in this country, and to say to them, as I should as a policymaker in a legitimate way, we have offered the best product available to guarantee security and a sense of well-being when one steps on an airliner at any airport in this country.

So should we be rushing now to get it out or should we be trying to do it right?

Our President spoke about being calm, about missiles or bombs not flying the day after September 11, about going out and finding out where the enemy is, building coalitions and doing it in a progressive, constructive way that forever would rid this world of terrorism. He preached calmness and he asked us to unite. The kind of divisive word, "obstruction," that I heard this afternoon does not serve this body well. It does not bring us together. It divides us. It divides Members along a line that says: there is somebody for something and somebody against something.

I suggest there isn't anything that we can all be unanimously for at this moment because there are very legitimate questions about the integrity of the proposal and how it will work and who will manage it—FAA? Department of Transportation? Department of Justice? Is it a transportation issue? Is it a law enforcement issue? They are reasonable questions to be asked, not after the fact but before the fact, before you get to the floor, before you have a final product, so we can stand united, together, as the American people are expecting in this time of national crisis, and not to divide along party lines.

As a result of that need that I think is critical and that my leader thinks is critical, we had to say: Wait a moment; back off for just a little bit. Let's finish that product and let the chairman of the committee, who has worked hard and had a good idea, and the ranking member and the White House, and others, come together.

It is true there was a bill and the bill they tried to present and bring forward

yesterday afternoon had not been before the committee, had not had hearings, had not worked the process. I understand that. We all understand that. It is a time of urgency. But in that urgency, in the very critical character of what we do, we cannot do it wrong. We cannot rush to judgment and load it down with everything else, including social agendas, unemployment agendas, a whole infrastructure, transportation system for Amtrak. That is for another day and another issue. Darned important, yes. We need time to debate it on the floor. Let the committee work its will.

I am not going to suggest I understand exactly how any of these systems ought to work. I understand when we take our time and involve all of our colleagues and use the process appropriately, we produce better public policy.

Clearly, the White House engaged us yesterday in a much more direct way with some examples of things they believed were necessary that were not in the bill, that the leader was trying to bring to the floor, that he now accuses us of having obstructed. Mr. Leader, of course you speak out as you wish, but I will suggest that come next Tuesday or Wednesday we will have a better product. We will be more united. We will stand together as the American people ask. We will craft out of a box, out of the old failed paradigm, a new product, and we will be able to turn to the American people and say, in the collective best thinking of the U.S. Congress, the President of the United States, the Secretary of Transportation, and all of the experts we could assemble, we are creating an airport security system in this Nation that will work.

Following that, I hope we can move to antiterrorism and the kind of package that was crafted in an unhurried but aggressive environment which the House voted out unanimously last night from their committee, and Senators came around yesterday evening in final draft to say that is a product that will work, that will give the FBI, that will give other law enforcement agencies in our country the kind of seamless web and communications system that allows them to know what the right hand is doing for the left hand, and vice versa, and the ability to track in a modern, electronic way those who might be brewing ill will for our Nation and our Nation's citizens.

Let us stand together in this Nation's time of need. "Obstruction" is not a constructive word. It is not the glue we need. My guess is, getting it right is what we are about and what the American people expect.

For tomorrow, for Saturday, and for Monday, our work is all about getting an airport security bill right. When we do, then we can turn to the American people and say we are putting in place a security system second to none. And from that, we can suggest the skies of America and America's air carriers are

safer than they have ever been. That is our goal. It is our charge. Frankly, it is our responsibility. We are up to it in a bipartisan fashion with the whole Senate speaking as one voice. Next week we will be prepared to do that.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JEFFORDS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO MARION EIN LEWIN

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, today I want to pay tribute to Marion Ein Lewin, a prominent health policy analyst and the long-time director of the highly regarded Robert Wood Johnson Health Policy Fellowship program. Marion is retiring from the fellowship program this year, after 14 years of dedicated service during which she guided and mentored scores of health care professionals from around the United States who took time off from their careers to participate in the policymaking process in Washington, DC. Her mixture of warmth, wisdom, and compassion will be sorely missed by future RWJ fellows and by the Members of Congress and the administration offices who have had the good fortune to work with Marion and the top-notch fellows she has overseen.

For almost 30 years, the RWJ Health Policy Fellowship program has selected a small group of leaders in America's academic health centers to participate in the development of America's health policy. RWJ Fellows come to Washington understanding health care delivery, and, during an extensive training program, they supplement their health care expertise with lessons about health policy and the process to develop that policy. This training and the unique opportunities created by working on the health staffs of Members of Congress and in the Executive Branch have allowed RWJ Fellows to participate in every major health care debate over the last 25 years.

Marion Ein Lewin has served as the guiding light for the last 14 classes of RWJ Fellows. As teacher, mentor and policy analyst, Marion has helped new Fellows understand the history and opportunities of health policy. She has introduced Fellows to the most important health policy thinkers in the country. The greatest testament to her extraordinary impact is the warmth and fondness departing Fellows feel for her.

Appropriately, Marion's experience in health policy began in a Member's office. She served as the Legislative Assistant for Health for Congressman James H. Scheurer (D-NY), where she

helped develop legislation and performed all the activities of a Congressional staffer.

Though Marion is known for her grace and warmth, she has made substantial contributions to the annals of American health policy. Marion's broad experience in health policy was bolstered by stints at the American Enterprise Institute and the National Health Policy Forum. She became director of the AEI Center for Health Policy Research before joining the Institute of Medicine. While at AEI, Marion edited five texts on health policy.

During her 14 years on the staff of the Institute of Medicine, Marion served as the study director for three IOM reports on critical issues ranging from improving Medicare, to the impact of information on the development of health policy, to the status of safety net providers. While at the IOM, she also directed the Pew Health Policy Fellowship.

Now, after 14 years, Marion Ein Lewin has decided to leave her pivotal role in the Robert Wood Johnson Fellowship. Her influence upon the 85 Fellows who served during her tenure is indelible. She has overseen the transformation of academic faculty into reasonable facsimiles of congressional health LAs. Fellows have provided my staff and me incalculable assistance over the years, and I know other Members of Congress and the administration share my appreciation. Marion's guidance has enabled these Fellows to make these valuable contributions as we seek to improve the healthcare system in our country.

Through the dint of her long service and extraordinary knowledge of health policy, Marion has come to personify the Fellowship and its values. It is hard to imagine the Robert Wood Johnson Health Policy Fellowship without Marion Ein Lewin. Mr. President, I ask my Senate colleagues to join me in congratulating Marion and the Robert Wood Johnson Program on their many successes, and sending a heartfelt thank you for her many years of dedicated service. Marion has made a genuine difference in health care. We wish her well and expect her to continue her good work as she enters this new phase in her life.

IN SUPPORT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I am grateful to President Chen Shui-bian and Ambassador C.J. Chen of the Republic of China on Taiwan for their support of the United States in the aftermath of the September 11 attacks on New York and Washington.

Taiwan was one of the first countries to declare its unequivocal support and cooperation with the United States, and deserves our gratitude for its firm stand with us.

In offering us whatever we need to combat worldwide terrorism, Taiwan has demonstrated its unity with Amer-

ica during our time of grief. During this period of turmoil and anxiety, I remind my colleagues that Taiwan will mark its National Day on October 10.

In recent years Taiwan has sought to return to the United Nations. I believe we should give Taiwan our support. The Republic of China on Taiwan is a democracy guaranteeing rights to all its citizens; it is one of the most important economic entities in the world; and despite its small population, 23 million people, Taiwan has financial resources surpassing those of many western countries.

Sadly, the international community accords Taiwan less recognition than many other non-state entities, including the terrorist Palestine Liberation Organization.

As the people of Taiwan, the East Asian region's leading free market democracy, celebrate their National Day on October 10, we should commend them for their successes and encourage other nations to support Taiwan's participation and membership in international organizations.

COMMON SENSE ON FIFTY CALIBER WEAPONS

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, long-range fifty caliber sniper weapons are among the most powerful firearms legally available. According to a rifle catalogue cited in a 1999 report by minority staff on the House Government Reform committee, one manufacturer touted his product's ability to "wreck several million dollars' worth of jet aircraft with one or two dollars' worth of cartridge." Some fifty caliber ammunition is even capable of piercing several inches of metal or exploding on impact.

These weapons are not only powerful, but they're accurate. According to the Government Reform staff report, the most common fifty caliber weapon can accurately hit targets a mile away and can inflict damage to targets more than four miles away.

Despite these facts, long-range fifty caliber weapons are less regulated than handguns. Buyers must simply be 18 years old and submit to a Federal background check. In addition, there is no Federal minimum age for possessing a fifty caliber weapon and no regulation on second-hand sales.

Given the facts on fifty caliber weapons, I'm pleased that Senator FEINSTEIN has introduced a bill, which I have cosponsored, that would change the way they're regulated. Senator FEINSTEIN's bill would ensure that fifty caliber weapons could only be legally purchased through licensed dealers. Her bill would also ensure that they could not be purchased second-hand. Buyers would have to fill out license transfer applications with the ATF, supply fingerprints and submit to a detailed FBI criminal background check. By any measure Senator FEINSTEIN's bill makes sense and I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring the bill.