The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request is from the Senator from South Carolina to speak as in morning business.

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, before we move off the Defense bill—if it is within the rules, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate enter into a period for morning business, with Senators not to speak for more than 15 minutes each.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I will not object. That will mean we will now go off the Defense bill, which we discussed. In consultation with our chairman, I hope by Monday we will be ready to proceed with some amendments as soon as the leadership establishes the parameters as to when the votes will be taken. We will be ready.

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I appreciate very much the report from the ranking member. The ranking member and the chairman have done a good job getting us to this point. We ought to be ready with amendments. We are going to have votes as early as 12 o'clock on Monday. I would like to entertain amendments as early as 10 o'clock on Monday morning and be prepared for votes as early as 12 o'clock on Monday.

We will certainly work with the ranking member, the chairman, and accommodate those Senators who wish to offer amendments. We need to get started. I would like to get into a very complete debate on Monday. We will be in throughout the day and maybe into the evening on Monday in order to continue our work on the Defense authorization bill.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I thank our distinguished leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I will also say for the interest of colleagues, we will be propounding the unanimous consent request with regard to the consideration of the aviation legislation sometime shortly, but it was in the interest of accommodating Senators who wish to speak that I thought it would be appropriate for us now to enter into a period for morning business. We will do that and be back on the floor with the request in the not too distant future.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Who seeks recognition? The Senator from South Carolina.

## MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 1447

Mr. HOLLINGS. Madam President, I understand that a settlement has been reached between the leadership of the House and Senate relative to the airline assistance measure. This measure, an attempt to propound a bare bones solution, does not encompass all the main considerations that came out at the hearing we had in the Commerce Committee yesterday.

It is more or less a gentlemen's agreement that safety is just as important, or this particular Senator was trying to get safety and security ahead of money. Be that as it may, the money has prevailed and the bill will pass, perhaps this weekend or perhaps this afternoon. I want to save time by speaking now so that when the bill is under consideration, I will not be holding up my colleagues who are trying to catch transportation to get home for the weekend.

In that light, I have at the desk a bill by myself, Senator MCCAIN, Senator KERRY, Senator ROCKEFELLER, Senator HUTCHISON, Senator BREAUX, Senator CLELAND, Senator NELSON, Senator EDWARDS, Senator BURNS, Senator SMITH, and Senator REID. I ask it be given its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1447) to improve aviation security, and for other purposes.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I thank the distinguished Chair. Madam President, there is not any question when we are talking about financing that we can give the airline industry billions upon billions of dollars in the next 10 minutes, but the sustenance, success, and the full resumption of airline travel will never occur until the traveling public is confident of safety and security at the airports and on planes in America.

First and foremost, of course, is the matter of the cockpit. Pilots do not want to get into the position of those pilots on 9–11. So they are not only asking for a secure door that can only be opened from the inside, going along with the rule that it not be opened in flight, but that they also be equipped with stun guns. That is going to be taken care of.

We have Federal marshals. We need to extend that program, there is no question about it. But the main kick in the arm of security at all airports of America is the reliance upon the industry itself to provide for that security. It has been going to the lowest bidder, to temporary workers paid minimum wage, their average stay not exceeding 5 months. So there is no professionalism, there is no experience and, as a result, there is no security. Everyone knows this. This was not just revealed at the hearing.

The bill establishes a Deputy Administrator at the Federal Aviation Administration for Aviation Security. We need a central command with fixed responsibility for this security.

The bill also establishes an Aviation Security Council comprised of representatives from the FAA, the Department of Justice, the Department of Defense, and the CIA to coordinate national security, intelligence, and aviation security information and make recommendations.

There was a question about curbside check-in. Employees stationed there look at their computers. They are well trained to look for certain persons that Interpol, other countries, or the FBI in this country have given as known security risks.

With those that they may have some suspicion about, they check that baggage. Obviously, if the distinguished Senator from California was going through, and she comes through every other week or so, going back and forth to the west coast, she is a discernible public figure, no security risk whatsoever and there is no reason to open the bag. That facilitates airline travel and that is understood.

Even at curbside when they use the computer and bring up the name ''Hollings'' on the computer, they can see exactly what his travel practices are and other important information to the security of air travel, and either give a double-check through his luggage or maybe a personal check.

El Al Airlines requires that in Tel Aviv. The truth is, we invited El Al's safety executive, and due to the holidays he could not make it, but he will be here the first of the week and is going to brief our committee.

We know there is required security in the country of Israel, and as a result we want to try to emulate their success in that regard. First, put in a deputy administrator with a coordinated council and strengthen the cockpit doors and locks.

We have heard from the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts of his constituent who manufactures such a door. He will be momentarily addressing that.

There is no question in this Senator's mind that once the door is locked securely with a substance such as Kevlar that it cannot be penetrated. Once that is secured and you get the security personnel at Reagan National Airport, you can open up Reagan National. There is no difference between opening up Dulles Airport or Baltimore-Washington Airport and not Reagan with respect to the proximity because, after all, it was the Dulles flight that hit the Pentagon.

Once a flight takes off, to turn around and come back into Washington, it is just as easy to turn from, say, Baltimore or Dulles before anything can really be done to stop its course and come right into the Pentagon again.

I understand what the Secret Service and the National Security Council are saying, but this is no time for debate. As the President said, this is a time for action. So let us start with action, get

in the security personnel in a studied, incremental fashion. Start with the shuttle flights to New York and Boston and immediately have enough security personnel in those particular planes already equipped with the secured cockpit.

This particular measure also increases the number of Federal air marshals. In the interim, the FAA can use personnel from other Federal agencies to serve as those air marshals. It federalizes airport security operations. I heard a while ago at a conference that the Secretary of Transportation said we did not have the money to do this. We do have the money, and we have voted the money. That is why this Senator voted the $20 billion. Someone has said it is $3 billion, and that $3 billion is enough. Put some 23,000, 24,000 security personnel in the airports around the country as Federal service employees, civil service Government employees, skilled, with training, with adequate pay and retirement and health care benefits. That is when you are going to get the competent personnel.

I have had this struggle for the past several years about privatizing the comptrollers. I do not see anybody in the Chamber this afternoon talking about privatize, privatize, privatize. We can see what privatization has done to security.

Europe affords government workers in its airports. If Europe can afford it, we can. In fact, after 9–11, we must afford it. We cannot play games with the number of employees and everything else of that kind when it comes to security, and this is just as important or more so to this particular Senator than the money.

I am going to explain the money in a little while. You can give airlines all the money in the world, but if nobody comes to fly on their planes, if the airports and the planes themselves are not secure, then they are going to suffer badly financially and there is not enough money in the Government Treasury to keep them alive unless we do this No. 1 thing; namely, provide for airport security, which is on everybody's mind.

The bill also improves screening procedures for passengers. It checks the passenger's name against a coordinated list comprised of criminal, national security intelligence, and INS information.

I heard the previous administrator of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, Doris Meissner, on TV the other evening. She was talking about checking names off as they come in. The INS gets this information. The FBI gets this information. It ought to be absolutely certain that it also goes to all of the airports and is disseminated, because there is some question that they had some information about the 9–11 attack ahead of time but it was not properly dispensed among those responsible.

The bill provides for hijack training for the flight crew. It calls for background checks on students at flight schools for large planes and increases perimeter security at airports and air traffic facilities. It assesses a dollar-per-passenger security charge and authorizes funds to carry out the security initiatives.

This bill is totally bipartisan, but there was a concern amongst several of the Senators about assessing a charge. I think all members of our committee more or less will cosponsor the bill, once we can check this afternoon, in a bipartisan fashion.

Now, that charge will bring in $250 million. Assuming the security responsibility at airports is federalized, it relieves the private airline industry of $1 billion. So $250 million for passengers to start contributing toward taking care of some of these expenses is definitely in order, in this Senator's mind.

I want to cover one particular thing with respect to the bill itself. The bill might have to be repaired if there is not a cap on claims. We are establishing a Federal claims procedure so the injured are not further damaged and do not have to chase around several jurisdictions and file all kinds of legal motions. So the Federal claims provision will be included in the bill this afternoon.

My understanding, because I was trying to get it on as a cap, if you do not have a cap on these particular claims, there will not be enough money in the Federal til. That will have to be repaired.

I could give the example of this high paid group on the top of the World Trade Towers, and they are very deserving people, but if they make $8 million or $10 million a year, if I were a lawyer I know I could get a $200 million to $300 million verdict of some kind, and while I am getting the $200 million to $300 million verdict, the poor fireman's lawyer comes in and says, ''Wait a minute. You are paying that high paid individual a couple of hundred million dollars, but this is a poor fireman who rushed in and saved his life, I want $200 million,'' and up and away it goes. Or the insurance company takes a traveling passenger who was on one of those planes and the lawyer goes to the insurance company and says, ''Go ahead, give us the $50 million, give us whatever million you want because you are subrogated, you can go against the Government claims, no limit on the government claims, and you can be reimbursed.'' They say I am out here shilling for the trial lawyers, but right is right. I am confident most of my trial lawyer friends would understand, in an act of war of this kind, there have to be some limits. If there are not limits, we will not sustain.

I hold the bill up with an amendment. I was prepared, but I have been talked out of it by the leadership, to have the airline security measure that could be passed this afternoon in the House and Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I ask unanimous consent for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Madam President, since others are prepared now, let me read the most significant testimony of Harry Pinson of Credit Suisse First Boston, in Texas, and the head of the southwest regional investment banking group based in Houston that handles all of these industrial accounts. I ask unanimous consent it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONY OF HARRY PINSON, HEARINGS ON AIRLINE INDUSTRY FINANCES, SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SEPTEMBER 20, 2001

Good afternoon Mr. Chairman. I want to thank you for holding these hearings today and allowing me to appear before the Committee.

My name is Harry Pinson and I am a Managing Director of Credit Suisse First Boston (''CSFB''), and Head of the Southwest Regional Investment Banking Group, based in Houston. I joined CSFB in 1984, and moved to Houston in the summer of 1995 from New York. I am responsible for coordinating the coverage of industrial accounts in the Southwest, including the airline industry. While in New York, I was Head of the Transportation Group in the Investment Banking Department from 1990 through 1995.

I began my business career as an Associate in the public finance department of Merrill Lynch, where I specialized in the transportation industry, prior to joining CSFB. I have managed a variety of financing and strategic advisory assignments for major U.S. industrial companies including the acquisition of McDonnell Douglas by The Boeing Company, the strategic alliance between Continental Airlines and Northwest Airlines, the sale of United Airlines to its employees, advising the creditors of Continental Airlines in the reorganization of the Company, the privatization of Quantas Airways and the acquisition of TWA by AMR.

The U.S. air transportation system, for all its faults, is the envy of the world. Its cheapness and ease of use means that more Americans fly more often than the citizens of any other major country. Whole industries are built around this unquestioned principal of mobility: hotels, resorts, car rental agencies. It binds us together as a nation, and connects us to the world.

The events of last Tuesday and their ramifications are threatening that principal of mobility in a number of ways.

First, the cash losses suffered while the industry was grounded and as it rebuilds this week are weakening an industry already made vulnerable by a weakening economy.

Second, the reduction in demand caused by the loss of passenger confidence and the impact on travel times caused by the security guidelines necessary to restore that confidence, coupled with the increased operating costs and lower fleet utilization that those same safety guidelines are likely to require, means that the profit model for the industry will change, perhaps permanently. For the first time ever, an industry conditioned to growth will have to find a way to shrink to profitability. It will take a lot of Yankee ingenuity to find that path, and many will not succeed.

Third, the catastrophe last week and our government's response to it have served to raise the perceived potential liabilities of operating an airline while simultaneously reducing the availability of insurance for that

risk. This means that airline shareholders, creditors, and potentially even the officers and directors of these carriers are being asked to bear the risk of potentially catastrophic losses: an unprecedented and highly disruptive situation.

Finance, the industry I participate in, has always had a big role to play in this industry because its persistent growth, capital intensity, fierce competition and low profit margins mean lots of external capital needs to be raised: about $10 billion so far this year. Because the airplanes can be deployed anywhere in the world, have long useful lives and a long history of holding their value, the vast proportion of the capital raised is in the form of long-term debt secured by these aircraft. This form of financing keeps annual ownership costs low and has generally been available in large amounts in virtually all operating environments, allowing airlines to fulfill purchase commitments even when business is bad. It also means that the airlines have accumulated enormous debt service and lease payment burdens which will not diminish soon.

We, in our industry, are eager to get back to the business of financing this industry, as we are eager to get back to business generally. It is our livelihood. The rebuilding of this industry will generate terrific investment opportunities which will attract the capital necessary to fund the future of this industry and eventually supplant the aid you are considering.

The fact that these investments will be risky does not necessarily diminish their appeal. The assessment of risk and speculation about an uncertain future are at the core of the investing process. There are, however, some types of risks that financial markets find hard to deal with which the current situation contains, and act as barriers to restarting the investing process.

For example, the more stringent security procedures which are essential to attracting passengers back to the airlines will be costly and disruptive, but we don't know how much because we don't understand them yet nor do we know who will bear the costs. Clarity on the ''rules of the game'' will be essential for the investment community to begin to assess rationally the future of the industry and its various participants. Until the rules are clear, investors will put their brains to work elsewhere. Since this issue also affects the likely size of the fleet for the foreseeable future, it makes the value of aircraft the bedrock collateral for much of the industry's financing, also hard to determine.

Second, investors are conditioned to assessing management turnaround plans and placing their bets, but liquidity concerns will make analysis again difficult. ''Shrinking to profitability'' is a new concept in the airline industry. Given the rigidity of airline cost structures in both capital and labor, it will take a long time, years for a turnaround to take place. No airline has anything like the resources necessary to fund this turnaround and investors in the current poor general investment climate are not likely to bet on a company's ability to raise money in the future to fund its plan. Therefore another, necessary condition to getting private capital moving back into this industry is to give the airlines access to sufficient liquidity to fund a turnaround, so that investors can focus on the business risks they understand.

It is in the nature of these support arrangements that, if the process goes as intended, much of this support will not be used because it will act as a catalyst for private capital to flow to the industry and take back from the government the role of financing the industry.

Third, new kinds of liability issues have arisen because of the catastrophe itself and the state of war resulting from it. The industry's insurance arrangements are not adequate to deal with this situation, and the war risk is effectively uninsurable at present. This has the potential to paralyze the industry as investors and creditors are faced with the potential of catastrophic loss. This is an impossible situation for investors to grapple with.

Clarity, liquidity, liability. Address these issues and we're in business.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I will start on page 3:

First, the cash losses suffered while the industry was grounded and as it rebuilds this week are weakening an industry already made vulnerable by a weakened economy.

This measure is not going to save a couple of airlines, in this Senator's opinion.

Continuing:

Second, the reduction in demand caused by the loss of passenger confidence impact on travel times caused by the security guidelines necessary to restore that confidence, coupled with the increased operating costs and lower fleet utilization that those same safety guidelines are likely to require, means that the profit model for the industry will change, perhaps permanently. For the first time ever an industry conditioned to growth will have to find a way to shrink to profitability. It will take a lot of Yankee ingenuity to find that path, and many will not succeed.

Third, the catastrophe last week and our government's response to it have served to raise the perceived potential liabilities of operating an airline while simultaneously reducing the availability of insurance for that risk. This means that airline shareholders, creditors, and potentially even the officers and directors of these carriers are being asked to bear the risk of potentially catastrophic losses; an unprecedented and highly disruptive situation.

Finance, the industry I participate in, has always had a big role to play in this industry because its persistent growth, capital intensity, fierce competition and low profit margins mean lots of external capital needs to be raised: About $10 billion so far this year. Because the airplanes can be deployed anywhere in the world, have long useful lives and a long history of holding their value, the vast proportion of the capital raised is in the form of long-term debt secured by these aircraft.

Madam President, jumping forward:

Second, investors are conditioned to assessing management turnaround plans and placing their bets, but liquidity concerns will make analysis again difficult. ''Shrinking to profitability'' is a new concept in the airline industry. Given the rigidity of airline cost structures in both capital and labor, it will take a long time, years, for a turnaround to take place. No airline has anything like the resources necessary to fund this turnaround.

Madam President, we are going to do our best at the Washington level to reinstill confidence in airlines, their operation, and, more particularly, the airline traveling public. We have been watching it day by day, and incrementally we have to address the insurance problem, we have to address the warrant problem with respect to payments to dividend.

I am not worried about the pay of the airline executives right now; I am worried about more substantial things for the moment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Could I ask for 10 seconds? I ask unanimous consent, following the Senator from Illinois, I be allowed to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are you propounding a unanimous consent request?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Yes, that after the Senator from Illinois, I be allowed to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KERRY. Madam President, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee for his leadership on this issue over a number of years. It has been almost 10 years that the Senate in committee has been advocating at many levels the notion of the federalizing of airport security. I guess it is part of the nature of all Members not to mention just the nature of our politics, that sometimes things of good common sense don't happen for inertia, for indifference, for other interests that weigh in, until there is a tragedy such as we experienced a week ago.

The Senator from South Carolina has talked for a moment about the issue of the finances of our airlines. I emphasize that we obviously need to do something and do it fast. But that something has to be smart. That something has to recognize the distinction between the airline industry that existed on September 10 and the airline industry that was impacted on September 11 and what happens as a consequence there of. It is clear that prior to September 11, the airline industry was already experiencing a significant downturn in passengers and ridership because of the state of the economy. That has now been exacerbated a hundredfold.

I say to my fellow Americans today as forcefully as I can, there is no reason not to fly in an airplane in the continental United States or to fly out of the United States in today's system. There really isn't. That system is safer than the air system has been in years. The scrutiny level already in our airports today is significantly higher than it has ever been. The level of safety today as a result of the redundancy of checks and the level of concern by air marshals and State police, local police, and others is raised to the highest level it has ever been in our country. It is safe to fly in aircraft in the United States today. It may be that some people in this country would deem most of those in Washington expendable anyway, but if it is any consolation, Senators, Congressmen, and others are flying those planes now, and the American public should not hesitate to do so.

Here is also a truth, a reality. We can do things that create almost a fail-safe capacity, that raise the scrutiny level

often further in order to establish an even greater level of confidence notwithstanding that what we are doing today is the greatest level of scrutiny we have ever had. That is what brings the Senator from South Carolina, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. MCCAIN, myself, and others to the floor today to introduce an airport security bill that will, in fact, raise the level to the point where there is no excuse for anybody having any fear or any sense of dread about flying.

How do we do that? Let me remind people that what happened last Tuesday was not high technology, nor was it even force at the end of a gun barrel or a bomb that had somehow gone through and evaded security. In fact, everything that was used as a weapon was used within the permissiveness of the system as it existed then. It wasn't as if somebody walked through security and had a weapon that wasn't detected. What these terrorists evidently did was use terror in a low-tech way as effectively and as deviously, as hideously, as any of us could ever have imagined; using a box cutter, using a minimalist kind of weapon, they managed to terrorize flight attendants and terrorize passengers who, up until that point in time, had an understanding of hijacking that you sort of behave. You try not to unsettle the hijackers. In fact, the tapes that were used by the flight attendants were 1970 tapes, a 1-hour tape that taught them to try to calm the hijackers and perhaps persuade them to seek political asylum, or at least not to harm the passengers while they took them to Cuba or took them to some other country.

What we learned on September 11 was that now there is a completely different strategy that we now know people are willing to employ. Someone is willing to commit suicide and try to take over an airplane and use it as a weapon.

The task now is to make certain that no one can again use an airplane as a weapon. I again point out that, in an act of absolutely extraordinary heroism, three American citizens who were informed of the change in tactic, who were told by loved ones on the ground that the planes prior to them had been used as weapons, understood the new equation. They understood that they were faced with the potential of imminent death and, if that was true, they were going to take matters into their own hands.

I think that forever changes the equation with respect to the potential of an aircraft again being used as a directable weapon by someone moving into the cockpit, taking over and actually flying the aircraft, using it as an instrument with specific targeting.

It may well be that through some extraordinary lapse, even after all the security measures, although it is hard to imagine how that might be if we do our jobs properly, someone might be able to terrorize passengers. But they could walk into any restaurant anytime, anywhere and do that. They could walk into any mosque, any church, any synagogue—they could walk into any place where crowds gather and, if they were willing to die, tragically they would have the ability to wreak havoc and chaos and mayhem in the area of their choice.

But we have the ability to do something to make it safe to fly, beyond any doubts whatsoever, beyond what I think is the extraordinary level of safety that exists today. One of the things that would give greater confidence to our fellow citizens is the awareness that all across this country there is a standardized, uniform system by which people are being screened as they come to an airport, not some individual company in Boston and a different company in New York and a different company in another city with different supervisors and no accountability across the board except to those particular airports and to some Federal standard which is not applied in a Federal way.

It seems to me we could guarantee that safety. A lot of people in America are not aware of it, but the turnover rate of the current employment of those security operators is simply unacceptable: in some places 100-percent turnover, 200-percent, 300-percent turnover within the span of a year. And that is even among supervisors.

If we federalize the process we not only have the opportunity to hire people at a decent wage, to guarantee the continuity, to guarantee the level of supervision, but we also will have an ability to do one of the most critical things now. We recognize that airport security is also a matter of national security. If it is a matter of national security, then those airport personnel have to work within a system that has the ability to share information that comes from law enforcement, information that comes from national security—the CIA, NSA, FBI, Defense Department.

If someone is on a watch list or if someone is a frequent flier with patterns that raise suspicion because of those prior trips and travels—which, incidentally, do show up in your passport check when you come through INS, and you can begin to make those determinations but there is no such similar kind of cross-tabulation or verification in the processing of passengers' manifests and flights—in a virtual world where we have computers at our fingertips with instantaneous communication of the Internet, shame on us for not having a system that has that kind of cross-pollination between our law enforcement agencies and security agencies across the Nation.

This is now a matter of law enforcement and national security. The only way to raise the airport security issue to that level is to federalize the process.

We are here to talk about how we are going to bail out or help the airlines. The airlines pay $1 billion a year for their security costs. So if the Federal Government indeed takes over those security costs, we are automatically reducing the burden of $1 billion a year or more, under increased status, from the airlines. Given that the airlines are working, hopefully, for profit and this affects the profit line, and therefore affects the kind of bids and expenses they are willing to put out in it, we should guarantee to Americans that security at our airports is not going to be subject to the bottom line of an industry that is already in difficulties. It is going to be subject only to the judgment of our public officials about what offers the greatest level of security.

In the legislation that Chairman HOLLINGS and Ranking Member MCCAIN and I and others on the committee are offering today, we are suggesting the establishment of a Deputy Administrator at the FAA for airport security. We establish an Aviation Security Council with the FAA, the Department of Justice, the Department of Defense, and the CIA, to coordinate national security intelligence and aviation security information and make recommendations.

We require the strengthening of cockpit doors and locks with limited access to the cockpit so every passenger who boards an aircraft will know that unless it is at the choice of the pilots, no person will enter that cockpit from the time they leave the gate until the time they arrive at their destination.

We increase the number of Federal air marshals so people will know that while riding an aircraft, particularly those with the greatest potential of diversion, they would be protected by the use of Federal air marshals riding in the air with them.

We federalize the overall airport security operations, providing improved training and testing for screening personnel.

We improve the screening procedures for passengers, checking passengers' names against a coordinated list comprised of criminal, national security, intelligence, and INS information. I might add, the INS component is a critical component in the context of security.

We will provide new and modern hijack training for flight crews based on what we now understand to be the threat. We perform background checks on students at flight schools. We increase perimeter security at airports and air traffic facilities, and we authorize the funds to carry out these initiatives.

Let me echo what has been said here previously. We can pass a bill that provides funding for the airlines through these next weeks. But we need the passengers of this country to come back to those airlines. I reiterate, I am convinced—I know the Senator from Florida is; he has flown commercially in the last days, as have others—this airline system is safe to fly today. But to whatever degree our fellow citizens doubt that, we need to guarantee they

will come back to those airports to ride the aircraft that we empower to fly.

Nothing is more important to revitalize the car rental industry, the restaurants, the hotels, the entertainment industry, the travel industry—all those ancillary spinoff industries that depend on people flying the aircraft of our various entities in this country.

I believe this legislation, while we will not vote on it today, is imperative to move on as rapidly as the legislation that we are moving on today with the hopes that we will be able to guarantee to every one of our citizens the full assurance of every level of safety that they expect. I hope we will do that as rapidly as possible.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. AKAKA). Under the previous order, the Senator from Illinois is to be recognized.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry: I would like to ask if the Senator from Illinois would allow me to speak for 5 minutes on the aviation security bill on which I am a cosponsor with Senators HOLLINGS, KERRY, and MCCAIN, if the Senator from Minnesota will agree.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to follow the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

I rise to speak on behalf of the aviation security bill that has been introduced by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, Mr. HOLLINGS; Senator MCCAIN, the distinguished ranking Member of the Commerce Committee, the Senator from Massachusetts, and myself. This is very much a part of the overall program that we are putting forward.

The bill we will probably vote on today is the finance part of the package. I think most Americans agree we cannot allow our aviation industry to fall. So we are going to pass, I hope very shortly, a measure that will help our airlines get over the hump until the people have the security to come back and fly.

The aviation security bill that we are introducing today, that I hope we will be able to pass early next week or the following week, is very much a part of airlines getting back to normal. I think the flying public wants to come back. Aviation is an important part of our economy and our way of life and our commerce.

The way we are going to draw them back is to have the security in place so they know they will be safe when they get to the airport and board an airplane. But in the interim, until we are able to put all of these things in place, we need the financial aid package that is before us today.

I am very pleased that under the chairmanship of Senator HOLLINGS we had a hearing yesterday to talk about the security need. We talked to the Secretary of Transportation. We talked to the FAA Administrator. We talked to pilots and people who know what needs to be done to close the vulnerabilities that we saw on September 11. In fact, the bill that is being introduced today, of which I am a cosponsor, has many of the items I have proposed in the past and certainly think we must pass today. We must have sky marshals in the air. In fact, I applaud the Attorney General for putting sky marshals on many of our flights around the country. They are in plain clothes. Most people would not know they are on a flight. But we do indeed have armed sky marshals on many of the flights that are in the air as we speak. But we want to make them permanent. We want to make sure we have sky marshals on virtually every flight, and possibly every flight later down the road.

We need to assure the passengers that there is a certified peace officer onboard who is trained to do what is necessary to deal with the crime that is committed in the air.

The second major provision in this bill that I think we must do is upgrade the screening. We will upgrade the equipment, and we will upgrade personnel education and training. We all know the screeners have been hired by contractors. They have high turnover rates. They do not have the experience that we would expect in screening. We have seen pictures of things that have gone through the screens and gotten onto an airplane that are just not appropriate. We want to stop that from happening.

That is why upgrading the screeners is important. I think they should be a part of a Federal system of security.

We are going to put some kind of barrier between the pilots and the rest of the airplane so that someone would not be able to penetrate a cockpit, as so sadly happened on September 11. We will have a Deputy FAA Administrator in charge of aviation security so that we will have one person in charge of all of aviation security.

It is my hope that we would start with entry-level screeners, and that it would be a career path for the aviation security department which would include graduating to become a sky marshal, staying in the system with a career in the system so we could have more trained and experienced people.

Those are some of the important points that are in this bill. I know some people disagree with certain parts of this bill. But it is a great start. It is an important start for rehabilitating our airline industry.

If we have the security, people will fly. People love to fly. We had 600 million people fly last year. We can build back to that number if we have the security for passengers. The convenience will be there. It is going to take a little longer going through the airport, but I think people are willing to wait a little longer and go earlier in order to feel safe. The flying public will come back.

I support this bill. I will continue to work on it with the chairman. But mainly I want the people of America to know we are addressing security in the air and we will do something very shortly, as we are also trying to shore up our airlines. We will not let our transportation system fail. If we do, the terrorists will have won. The terrorists are not going to beat the United States of America.

Thank you, Mr. President.

## UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1450

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to S. 1450, the aviation assistance and security bill; that no amendments or motions be in order to the bill; that there be 1 hour for debate equally divided between the two leaders or their designees, with an additional 15 minutes under the control of Senator BYRD, with 10 minutes for Senator KENNEDY; that at the conclusion or yielding back of the time, the bill be read a third time and the Senate vote without intervening action or debate on final passage of the bill.

I further ask unanimous consent that when the Senate receives from the House its companion bill, it be immediately considered, read a third time, and passed, provided it is identical to the Senate-passed bill.

I further ask unanimous consent that once the House bill has been enacted into law, provided it is identical to the Senate measure, then action on the Senate bill be vitiated and the measure then be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Minnesota.

## AVIATION SAFETY

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I believe this Transportation Safety Act, which I know Senator HOLLINGS and others are going to introduce very soon, will certainly pass with strong support.

First of all, I ask unanimous consent to be added as an original cosponsor of this piece of legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, the Senator from South Carolina is absolutely right. Not only does safety have to be there with the money, but the fact is, without the safety, people aren't going to fly. If they don't fly, we are never going to have this industry financially viable. It is that simple. You can see it traveling around the country right now. There are very few people at the airports. People are quite frightened. We have to absolutely pass this bill. I think it should be in this