

Frankly, I am anxious to talk about education, prekindergarten all the way through age 65, because I think that is the way we should define education. A lot of our students in Minnesota are 55 and going back to school. They have lost their jobs. They worked for the taconite industry on the range. LTV shut down, and they are going back to school so they can get different sets of skills for different employment opportunities to support their families.

So I would put it to you this way: As I see it, the early years, starting with the little ones, who are all under 4 feet tall and beautiful—we should be nice to them. That is prekindergarten and the early elementary school years. We want to make sure every kid in our country has an equal opportunity. Education is so important.

Then, when people get older, out of school, it is the jobs, decent wages, health care coverage. Then, when people get older than that, it is Medicare, it is Social Security, it is not losing your pension. There is the whole issue of pension reform so we do not see more people cheated and some of them financially destroyed with more Enron kinds of situations.

All of this is before us: pension reform legislation, getting it right for health care, reimbursement, Medicare. A lot of our hospitals in rural Minnesota are being killed right now from inadequate Medicare reimbursement. Hospital people have been here talking about what is going to happen to our ability to deliver care. Children's Hospital here—what is going to happen with cuts in medical education?

Other people are talking about more funding, expanding health care coverage, prescription drugs, education, raising the minimum wage, going after hate crimes, ending the discrimination.

I will finish this way. Tomorrow, we are going to have close to 2,000 people here from around the country; families who have struggled with mental illness. By the way, I do not know that there is a person in the Senate who does not know someone in their own family or a friend who has to struggle with this illness, saying: Treat it like any other illness. End the discrimination in this coverage. Don't tell us that if our daughter is struggling with depression, and we are scared to death she might take her life, that the health insurance plan will cover a couple of days in the hospital and that is it; a couple visits to the doctor and that is it. Treat this illness as any other illness. End the discrimination.

We want to bring this bill to the floor of the Senate. It is bipartisan. Senator DOMENICI has been the leader. I have been fortunate enough to join him. We have 66 Senators. We have the majority of the House on board.

There is a lot of important legislation we can pass that will lead to the improvement of the lives of people we represent.

I come to the floor tonight just to express some indignation at this delay,

delay, delay strategy, slowing the Senate up, making it a nondecisionmaking body, because I think we are not at our best when we operate that way.

I just as soon have at it, have the debate, have the amendments, bring the legislation up for votes; vote yes, vote no. If you want to filibuster, filibuster; have the votes or don't have the votes. But what colleagues are doing now, at 6 o'clock at night—all gone, and will not let us vote on anything else—is making the Senate a nondecision-making body.

Frankly, there is a whole lot we could do to help people. The reason we are here is to help people. We might have different definitions of what it means to help people, so then let's have a debate about that. But, for God's sake, let's deal with the relevant legislation that affects people's lives. And let's do it now. Let's not just continue to grind away and slow everything down and block everything and make it impossible for us to move forward.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WELLSTONE. I am pleased to yield.

Mr. REID. The Senator would agree, would he not, that doing nothing does not meet the needs of the people of Minnesota, the people of Nevada, or anyplace in this country?

Mr. WELLSTONE. I say to my colleague from Nevada, only if you believe that we are here to do nothing is doing nothing defensible in any way, shape, or form. And that is what we are doing right now. Because if you want to gum up the works here in the Senate and block everything and basically make it impossible for us to move forward—which is what our Republican colleagues have done—you can do that. But I will tell you, the people we represent will not be pleased with us if we operate this way.

Mr. REID. Does the Senator know that in this morning's Daily Monitor there is a quote from a Republican—in fact, that is not true. It says: "Senate Republicans say they will not hesitate to slow-walk legislation important to Democrats."

Mr. WELLSTONE. I am sorry. They will not—

Mr. REID. "... they will not hesitate to slow-walk legislation important to Democrats." Is the Senator aware of that statement that was made?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Well, see, I would say to my colleague—and he might disagree about this—there are two different issues here. Listen, if you think a piece of legislation is egregious, and you know the rules, have at it, slow it up. Fine. I have done that. I do not want to be inconsistent.

But when you have a statement like this, which says: We will not be reluctant to slow up legislation that is important to Democrats, then you are playing a different kind of game. Then it is straight partisanship. It has nothing to do with whether you feel strongly about it. It has more to do with a

strategy of basically being able to say: Aha, a majority in a Democrat-run Senate can't get the job done because we will make sure they can't get the job done.

That is not acceptable. Do you know what that is? That is inside party strategy, total reelection stuff, which then means we do not pass affordable prescription drug legislation, we do not get it right for education, we do not get it right on a whole bunch of other issues that are important to people.

Mr. REID. Finally, would the Senator agree that this legislation now before the Senate that is being slow-walked, as the distinguished Senator from Texas said yesterday, and he reminded me he said it today, he felt it was important to "slow the train down"—would the Senator agree that it is not good for the country to slow-walk or "slow the train down," the Supplemental Appropriations Act for further recovery from and response to terrorist attacks on the United States?

This is an emergency supplemental bill. Does the Senator believe this is something we should be moving expeditiously?

Mr. WELLSTONE. I will just say this to my colleague from Nevada. There are two sets of issues people have, and both of them deal with security. There is an uneasiness about economic security, about the future, about jobs, pensions, good education for kids, health care. It is all there.

The other thing is that people—and with considerable justification—are really worried about physical security. Look what we have been through. People want to make sure that we are going to be able to do everything possible to best defend ourselves, everything possible to head off any kind of attack, everything possible to protect them, to protect their children.

So all of the money for Minnesota and all the other States in the country, for homeland defense, I do not think the people view as a waste. I do not know what the problem is in moving this matter forward. I think people in Minnesota and the people in the country—if they know; and we will make sure they know—disapprove, and for good reason.

I came to the floor to call on my colleagues to get going. Let's do the work. Let's get involved in the work of democracy. Let's not just do delay, delay, delay, all for the sake of some party strategy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAYTON). The Senator from Washington.

TRANSPORTATION SECURITY

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, as the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, I rise this evening in strong support of the Senate amendment to H.R. 4775, the supplemental appropriations bill for 2002.

During our debate, I have heard complaints from some colleagues that this

bill is beyond the President's request. Members are asking why this bill is larger than the administration's request and why it is larger than the House-passed bill. Our bill is larger because it makes the critical investments we need to make in transportation security.

We have spent months listening to the experts and finding out what investments we need to make. We did that in my own subcommittee, and through Senator BYRD's leadership we discovered the needs through full committee hearings on homeland defense. The President's budget and the House budget do not make the necessary investments in transportation security. Our bill does. That is why it is larger than the President's request.

I want to spend a few minutes explaining what is in our bill because it will prove that these are critical investments that the President and the House have not been willing to make.

For example, our bill funds the Transportation Security Administration. It will improve cargo security. It will enhance the security in and around our Nation's airports. It will improve security on inner-city buses. It will allow the Coast Guard to assess the vulnerability of our seaports. It will ensure that the FAA can meet the staffing needs at our Nation's control towers this summer without stealing from the budget for modernization and safety improvements. It will better reimburse our Nation's airports for the considerable expenses they have incurred due to our new security requirements. Overall, it will address the security challenges we all know are out there.

Before I talk about some of the specifics of the bill, I want to correct the record on one point. I have heard some claim that our bill is \$2.2 billion larger than the House-passed bill. That is simply not accurate. While some in the House claim their bill is \$28.8 billion, it is actually \$30.1 billion when we use traditional, customary Congressional Budget Office scorekeeping. Instead of using that method, they have used accounting gimmicks. For some items in their bill they have actually chosen to use OMB scorekeeping; for example, concerning the delays in the availability of airline loan guarantees.

That point aside, the Senate bill is larger than the President's request and the House request, and one of the largest differences is in the area of transportation security. In this area, the funding level in our bill is \$928 million or 20 percent higher than the administration's request.

It is important to point out that the House of Representatives actually cut the President's request for transportation security. That is why the Senate bill is \$1.244 billion or 29 percent higher than the House-passed bill.

The centerpiece of the transportation chapter of this bill is the \$4.7 billion the committee has included for the new Transportation Security Administra-

tion, or TSA. That amount is more than \$300 million higher than the level requested by the administration and more than \$850 million more than what is provided in the House bill.

First and foremost, the funding provided for the TSA will fully cover the administration's request to implement the recently enacted Aviation and Transportation Security Act that the President signed into law.

The House version of the bill imposes several cuts to the administration's request just at the time that the administration is aggressively seeking to meet the deadlines imposed by the Transportation Security Act. The most daunting of these deadlines is the requirement to screen all checked baggage for explosives by the end of this calendar year.

As many of our colleagues, I have been frustrated with the performance of the Transportation Security Administration in implementing those requirements. There has not been sufficient consultation with the Nation's airports or with Congress, and there has not been a sufficient amount of hiring at the TSA of individuals with transportation backgrounds. But still I don't think the solution to these problems is to impose significant cuts on the resources the administration itself has requested.

As with most of my colleagues, I do a lot of flying. I have witnessed the long lines of passengers seeking to get through airport security checkpoints. I have shared the frustration of clearing the security checkpoint only to be screened at the gate again. Our aviation industry is already suffering due to the fact that the high revenue business travelers who provide 40 percent of the airline's revenues are not returning to the skies.

If the Transportation Security Administration does not succeed at its stated goal of providing high-quality customer service and a short wait to clear airport security, our aviation industry is going to suffer a great deal further.

Secretary Mineta and Transportation Under Secretary Magaw have committed themselves to a national standard where no passenger will wait longer than 10 minutes to clear airport security. Frankly, many of us question whether they will ever achieve that goal. That is why the bill before us contains a requirement that the TSA publish on a monthly basis the actual wait times at each airport. I intend to monitor the TSA's performance in this area on a regular basis.

Another area of great concern to me is that air passengers are treated with dignity as they pass through our Nation's airports. If passengers can be expected to be treated as criminals from the moment they walk into the airport, they are not going to fly. Treating air passengers as criminals is not a formula for helping our airlines get back on their feet.

The administration's TSA budget has gone through a very torturous path. A

full month passed from the time the Bush administration submitted its \$4.4 billion supplemental budget request for TSA to the time Secretary Mineta could sit down with members of our committee and discuss what funds could be used for.

That was not necessarily Secretary Mineta's fault. He was spending that month arguing with the President's Office of Management and Budget on how much money we needed to implement the requirement to screen all checked baggage for explosives. When the noise finally quieted down between the DOT and OMB, the results were, frankly, very disappointing. Rather than deploy a significant number of explosive detection system, EDS, machines that can be easily integrated at the airports' luggage distribution system, the administration has chosen to take a cheaper route. They want to deploy only trace detection machines at three-quarters of our Nation's airports. These trace detection machines are effective at detecting explosives, but they were never designed or intended to be primary explosive detection mechanisms at our airports.

What I find most troubling is the TSA's plan to require more than half of passengers' bags to be opened by Federal enforcement personnel at three-quarters of our Nation's airports. I don't believe the flying public is going to be very warm to the idea that more than half of their luggage will be checked by Federal personnel who will rifle through their baggage in the airports.

As such, the committee has included directives to the TSA to ensure that this regime is implemented with dignity and privacy in mind so passengers will not have to open their baggage in full view of all the other passengers with whom they are traveling.

The committee appropriation for the TSA includes a \$35 million initiative in the area of aviation safety and security that was not requested by the administration. Those funds are to be used exclusively for enhanced perimeter security and terminal security. Unfortunately, it is not necessary to get through the security checkpoints to attack our Nation's aviation system.

A terrorist can do a great deal of damage to our aviation system merely by performing a terrorist act within a crowded airport terminal.

I believe we need a stronger surveillance regime in our airport terminals, and the funding entered by this committee will be used for that purpose.

Also, the record indicates that more needs to be done to ensure that only those individuals who are properly credentialed and qualified are granted access to the secure areas of our airports.

Over the last few months there has been a spate of indictments and arrests of individuals who used falsified documents to gain access to secure areas of our airports. The additional funding provided by our committee will ensure better protection of those areas.

Now, perhaps these are improvements that the OMB considers to be unnecessary security add-ons, but I recommend that Director Daniels review the testimony of both Secretary Mineta and Under Secretary Magaw before making these complaints. Both of those gentlemen identified perimeter security as an area of significant need. That is not adequately funded under the President's proposal.

In the area of port and maritime security, the committee has included several new funding initiatives over and above those requested by the administration.

In the last supplemental appropriations bill, the committee included \$93 million for a new advanced program to beef up security in our Nation's seaports. That \$93 million appropriation elicited almost \$700 million in applications.

In order to better meet that demand, the Senate bill includes an additional \$200 million in the bill and also includes a \$28 million initiative to deploy Operation Safe Commerce.

During our full committee's hearings on homeland defense in April and May, we heard testimony from ADM Richard Larrabee. Admiral Larrabee recently retired from the Coast Guard and became the director of commerce for the ports in New York and New Jersey. He was sitting in his office in the World Trade Center when the terrorists attacked and he lost dozens of his colleagues on that day.

Admiral Larrabee, along with CDR Stephen E. Flynn, Coast Guard, Retired, testified before our Appropriations Committee about the urgency of establishing a security regime to security cargo containers from the point of origin to their domestic destination.

In addition to the work of the full committee on this issue, the subcommittee has held 2 hearings on this issue, hearing from the administration, labor, industry, port authorities, and others in the field. It is difficult to overstate the importance of beginning to deal with this set of issues now.

Over 30 million intermodal containers enter our Nation's seaports each year and, frankly, we know very little about what is in them.

Between the Coast Guard and Customs Service, fewer than 2 percent of those containers are ever physically inspected. The Customs Service has only recently begun to beef up the reporting requirements regarding the content of those containers.

The Operation Safe Commerce initiative in our bill will be deployed at the three largest container load centers in our country. Together, those port areas take in more than 50 percent of the containers that enter our country every year.

It is impossible to exaggerate the damage that could be done to our economy if we are suddenly required to slow down the trade lanes into and out of our country because of security concerns.

This initiative will demonstrate the art of the possible when it comes to improving security of container shipping.

Also, within the amount provided for the TSA, the committee provided \$20 million for improved security for over-the-road bus operators.

I wish to particularly commend the leadership of my colleague from Georgia, Senator MAX CLELAND, on this issue. As he notes, intercity bus transportation is part of our country's vital infrastructure. The Nation's intercity bus operators are just beginning to use the most rudimentary methods to better ensure security of bus passengers. Given the frequency with which we see terrorists overseas use buses as a venue for horrific acts of terrorism, this is the minimal investment we should be making in this area.

The Senate bill provides slightly more than \$666 million for the U.S. Coast Guard. Those funds will be used to accelerate the Coast Guard's planned vulnerability assessments of our Nation's seaports.

Funds will also be used to expedite procurement of critical surface and aviation assets and to launch a new maritime domain awareness program to dramatically improve the Coast Guard's readiness to deal with domestic terrorist threats.

During our committee's hearing with Admiral Larrabee, we were disappointed to hear that the Coast Guard doesn't plan to conduct its vulnerability assessment of the second largest shipping port in the United States for 2 years. The committee did not consider that to be a satisfactory plan. So our bill grants the Coast Guard funds to expedite these port vulnerability assessments across the country so we can better secure these gateways of the globe.

The bill also includes \$115 million that was not requested by the administration for the emergency funding needs of the Federal Aviation Administration. Since September 11, the FAA has had to spend at least \$100 million to dramatically enhance security around its own critical air traffic control towers.

As a result, the FAA now finds itself \$100 million short of the amount it needs to provide critical overtime expenses for air traffic controllers as we enter the busy summertime travel season.

Senators will remember, as I do, that during the two summers prior to September 11, air transportation in our country was rife with delays. If we don't adequately fund the shortfall in overtime at the FAA, we can expect to experience those delays again.

The administration's budget proposed to meet this \$100 million shortfall by transferring funds already appropriated to improve air traffic control equipment, safety, and capacity. To me, that is not a responsible solution. We are years, if not decades, behind where we need to be in modernizing our air traffic control system,

and we have huge, unmet needs at our airports.

That is why our bill provides the \$100 million needed to pay for the air traffic controllers without stealing from those other accounts.

The Senate bill also includes an additional \$100 million to better compensate the Nation's airports for the security costs they have incurred since September 11. Last year, the committee appropriated \$175 million for that purpose.

But the airports committed almost \$500 million in costs to the FAA for this funding. This additional \$100 million will better reimburse the Nation's small, medium, and large hub airports for the costs associated with the security directives issued by the FAA since September 11.

Finally, separate from the issue of homeland defense, the bill includes a provision drafted by Senator HARRY REID and myself authorizing a higher obligation ceiling for the Federal Aid Highway Program for fiscal year 2003.

As Members should be aware, the administration's budget proposes that overall highway funding to the States be drastically slashed by \$8.6 billion next year. That represents a cut of more than 27 percent.

Senator REID serves as the chairman of the authorizing subcommittee for highways, and the provision he and I drafted will ensure that, as part of the appropriations process for 2003, the Appropriations Committee will restore at least \$4.5 billion of the President's cut and perhaps as much as \$5.7 billion.

I believe my colleagues will agree that during this uncertain time in our economy, we must do our best to avoid the President's proposal to slash thousands of jobs and cut our investment in our Nation's transportation infrastructure.

The provision included in this bill—authorized by Senator REID and myself—will go a long way toward that goal.

I also thank my colleague from Alabama, Senator SHELBY, the ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, for his assistance in developing the transportation chapter of this bill.

I also thank Senator BYRD and Senator STEVENS for the bipartisan leadership of the Appropriations Committee and for their receptive approach to the views of our subcommittee. Both leaders demonstrated needed vision and commitment to exploring and understanding these issues of critical importance to our Nation's security and prosperity.

I believe the transportation chapter of this bill represents a strong, comprehensive approach to our homeland security needs, and I look forward to arguing for every dollar of this funding when we go to conference with the House of Representatives.

Each item was developed with thought and care. Each item represents an investment that needs to be made.

Each item will help build a more secure America.

The critics of this bill, and those who are impeding progress, put those investments at risk. I ask: What investment in airport security don't you want to make? What investment in seaport security don't you want to make? What will you say to the American people—our soldiers and sailors who are defending the Nation—when we don't make these needed investments?

This is a reasonable bill. It takes a reasonable approach to investing in America's security needs.

It was reported unanimously by our committee, and I hope the Senate can dispense with the delays and get on with passing this very important bill. I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish to briefly speak about the legislation before us and to lend my support to the supplemental appropriations bill. I commend Chairman BYRD and Senator STEVENS for a job well done. They took extensive testimony in many hearings to determine the needs for homeland security, as well as many other needs, and they have incorporated those provisions in this bill.

I also salute and commend my colleague from Washington State, Senator MURRAY, for giving an excellent discussion of the transportation aspects of this bill. She indicated the detailed and the careful deliberation that went into the crafting of this legislation and suggested also the reality that was confronted by the committee in hearing testimony from witnesses who indicated it might take up to 2 years to do a survey of a port when, in fact, the American people are demanding action immediately, not 2 years from now—when the threat is immediate, not hypothetical or 2 years removed.

As a result, I find it ironic, to say the least, that opponents of this bill would simply say we will sacrifice all the needed expenses because the total that we recommend is higher than that recommended by the President of the United States.

Frankly, if you asked most Americans, they would say we are not spending enough on homeland security. If you asked them how much they would want us to spend, it would be: Spend as much as you need to ensure not just one port or one airfield but every port and every airfield, and to ensure every community in America is protected. That is what this bill attempts to do.

This is a downpayment on a much larger bill because the issues and threats we confront will not be banished within a few weeks or a few months. It is long term, ongoing, requiring a tremendous commitment of resources. This is a good downpayment and one that I support wholeheartedly.

The legislation includes within its provisions \$14 billion for the cost of our operations in Afghanistan. To delay

this bill any longer because of some objections or some overall objection and compromise for delaying funds for Afghanistan, to me, is inconceivable. We have those resources which we must commit and we must spend immediately.

The bill also includes \$5.5 billion for the recovery of New York City—again, expenses that we cannot ignore, cannot defer. We have to respond.

There is \$4.4 billion for aviation security, once again, a critical aspect of our response to the very real threats we face today because of terrorist attacks on the United States.

The bill contains \$1.95 billion for international programs to aid the war on terrorism. These are important complements to our military operations. The administration speaks often, and correctly, about draining the swamp where the terrorists reside. That cannot be done by wishing it away. We have to have resources to deal with profound problems across the globe—inadequate education systems, the overall threat of poverty, lack of economic development—all of those factors that contribute directly sometimes, but certainly indirectly, to the atmosphere that encourages terrorism, encourages those who attack us.

I just returned, with some of my colleagues, from a conference of defense ministers in Singapore. If we look across the globe, this threat is very real and very sobering. We need resources to mount a counteroffensive. Those resources are not just military, they also involve assistance to local governments that are assisting us by intelligence operations, by using their military forces and their intelligence apparatus to help us in this war on terror. For all these reasons, we need to pass this bill and do it promptly.

One of the major provisions of the bill is \$3 billion for homeland defense, and that incorporates many issues—first responders, police and fire—to make sure these very brave men and women have the materials and the know-how to confront a wholly different threat. I do not think anyone conceived even a year ago that our police and fire departments would be at the front lines of sophisticated attacks by terrorists against the United States, involving mass casualty operations and massive destruction, yet they are. We have to give them the tools to do the job, to protect themselves, and to protect the communities they serve so well. Those provisions are within this bill also.

We have to protect our nuclear facilities. It was shocking to me—and again this goes to the credibility of the administration saying they oppose this bill because we are spending too much. It was reported recently in the press that the authorities responsible for protecting our nuclear facilities asked for considerably more money and were told by OMB: No, we cannot afford it.

We are not going to accept that answer. We want those facilities pro-

tected. Where there are nuclear powerplants, where there are nuclear facilities of the Department of Energy throughout this country, we want those facilities guarded, protected to prevent a catastrophic terrorist attack. That is one aspect of this bill which is important also.

We also have to recognize the issue of biological terror. We witnessed firsthand in this Senate a biological attack. It is expensive, and we simply cannot wait for the next attack. We have to anticipate and, through our wise preventive actions, we hope preclude any type of attack. But that is not the result of wishful thinking and hoping it will not happen. That is putting real resources into prevention, into response, into those things that will prepare us for any type of mass casualty attack—biological, nuclear, or even a conventional weapon that is deployed against our people.

I believe the chairman, the ranking member, and the subcommittee chairmen and women and their counterparts, the ranking members, have done a very good job responding to the concerns.

In the Appropriations Committee when I sat and listened to this testimony from the people who are responsible in the Federal Government, at the State level, and in the local communities, I did not hear: You are spending too much. I heard: We need more help; we have to be responsive. Their position is not sitting here in Washington, it is literally on the front lines of this war on terror.

If we listened to the men and women who are directly responsible for protecting the American people from terrorist threats, I think they would say in a very strong and uniform chorus: Pass this bill now. It is not too expensive. In fact, it is simply a downpayment on significant costs we will face in the foreseeable future.

Our enemies are implacable. They are determined. They are reorganizing to strike again, and if we do not seize the moment and put the resources into a concerted, deliberate, expeditious effort to protect the American people, we will regret it and the American people will suffer the consequences. I urge we pass this legislation as quickly as possible.

I yield the floor.

SENATOR AND MRS. BYRD'S 65TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, a week ago today, on the 29th of May, I was fortunate to celebrate 65 years of marriage, 65 years of wedded bliss—in this day and age, a somewhat uncommon occurrence. I am sorry this is so, for I wish that more people could know the joy I have had in finding one's soulmate early in life and then sharing that deep companionship over many happy years.

In the 16th century, John Ford wrote: The joys of marriage are the heaven on earth,