

The men and women of our Armed Forces have made us proud. For them, and their families, I urge adoption of the bill and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 407, nays 15, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 513]  
YEAS—407

Abercrombie	Cole	Goss
Ackerman	Collins	Granger
Aderholt	Cooper	Graves
Akin	Costello	Green (TX)
Alexander	Cox	Green (WI)
Allen	Cramer	Greenwood
Andrews	Crane	Grijalva
Baca	Cranshaw	Gutiérrez
Bachus	Crowley	Gutknecht
Baird	Cubin	Hall
Baker	Culberson	Harman
Baldwin	Cunningham	Harris
Ballance	Davis (AL)	Hart
Ballenger	Davis (CA)	Hastings (FL)
Barrett (SC)	Davis (FL)	Hastings (WA)
Bartlett (MD)	Davis (IL)	Hayes
Barton (TX)	Davis (TN)	Hayworth
Bass	Davis, Jo Ann	Hefley
Beauprez	Davis, Tom	Heger
Becerra	Deal (GA)	Hill
Bell	DeFazio	Hinchey
Bereuter	DeGette	Hobson
Berkley	Delahunt	Hoefel
Berman	DeLauro	Hoekstra
Berry	DeLay	Holden
Biggert	DeMint	Holt
Bilirakis	Deutsch	Honda
Bishop (GA)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hooley (OR)
Bishop (NY)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hostettler
Blackburn	Dicks	Houghton
Blumenauer	Dingell	Hoyer
Blunt	Doggett	Hulshof
Boehlert	Doolley (CA)	Hunter
Boehner	Doolittle	Hyde
Bonilla	Doyle	Inslee
Bonner	Dreier	Isakson
Bono	Duncan	Israel
Boozman	Dunn	Issa
Boswell	Edwards	Istook
Boucher	Ehlers	Jackson-Lee
Boyd	Emanuel	(TX)
Bradley (NH)	Emerson	Janklow
Brady (PA)	Engel	Jefferson
Brady (TX)	English	Jenkins
Brown (OH)	Eshoo	John
Brown (SC)	Etheridge	Johnson (CT)
Brown-Waite,	Evans	Johnson (IL)
Ginny	Everett	Johnson, E. B.
Burgess	Fattah	Johnson, Sam
Burns	Feeney	Jones (NC)
Burr	Ferguson	Jones (OH)
Burton (IN)	Flake	Kanjorski
Buyer	Fletcher	Kaptur
Calvert	Foley	Keller
Camp	Forbes	Kelly
Cannon	Ford	Kennedy (RI)
Cantor	Fossella	Kildee
Capito	Frank (MA)	Kilpatrick
Capps	Franks (AZ)	Kind
Capuano	Frelinghuysen	King (IA)
Cardin	Frost	King (NY)
Cardoza	Gallegly	Kingston
Carson (IN)	Garrett (NJ)	Kirk
Carson (OK)	Gerlach	Klecza
Carter	Gibbons	Kline
Case	Gilchrest	Knollenberg
Castle	Gillmor	Kolbe
Chabot	Gingrey	LaHood
Chocola	Gonzalez	Lampson
Clay	Goode	Langevin
Clyburn	Goodlatte	Lantos
Coble	Gordon	Larsen (WA)

Larson (CT)	Otter	Shuster
Latham	Oxley	Simmons
LaTourette	Pallone	Simpson
Leach	Pascrell	Skelton
Levin	Payne	Slaughter
Lewis (CA)	Pearce	Smith (MI)
Lewis (KY)	Pelosi	Smith (NJ)
Linder	Pence	Smith (TX)
Lipinski	Peterson (MN)	Smith (WA)
LoBiondo	Peterson (PA)	Snyder
Lofgren	Petri	Solis
Lowe	Pickering	Souder
Lucas (KY)	Pitts	Spratt
Lucas (OK)	Platts	Stearns
Lynch	Pombo	Stenholm
Majette	Pomeroy	Strickland
Maloney	Porter	Stupak
Manzullo	Portman	Sullivan
Markey	Price (NC)	Sweeney
Marshall	Pryce (OH)	Tancredo
Matheson	Putnam	Tanner
Matsui	Quinn	Tauscher
McCarthy (MO)	Radanovich	Tauzin
McCarthy (NY)	Rahall	Taylor (MS)
McCollum	Ramstad	Taylor (NC)
McCotter	Rangel	Terry
McCrery	Regula	Thomas
McGovern	Rehberg	Thompson (CA)
McHugh	Renzi	Thompson (MS)
McInnis	Reyes	Thornberry
McIntyre	Reynolds	Tiahrt
McKeon	Rodriguez	Tiberi
McNulty	Rogers (AL)	Tierney
Meehan	Rogers (KY)	Toomey
Meek (FL)	Rogers (MI)	Towns
Menendez	Rohrabacher	Turner (OH)
Mica	Ros-Lehtinen	Turner (TX)
Michaud	Ross	Udall (CO)
Miller (FL)	Rothman	Udall (NM)
Miller (MI)	Roybal-Allard	Upton
Miller (NC)	Royce	Van Hollen
Miller, Gary	Ruppersberger	Velazquez
Miller, George	Rush	Visclosky
Mollohan	Ryan (OH)	Vitter
Moore	Ryan (WI)	Walden (OR)
Moran (KS)	Ryun (KS)	Walsh
Moran (VA)	Sabo	Wamp
Murphy	Sanchez, Linda	Watson
Murtha	T.	Watt
Musgrave	Sanchez, Loretta	Waxman
Myrick	Sandlin	Weiner
Nadler	Saxton	Weldon (FL)
Napolitano	Schiff	Weldon (PA)
Neal (MA)	Schrock	Weller
Nethercutt	Scott (GA)	Wexler
Neugebauer	Scott (VA)	Whitfield
Ney	Sensenbrenner	Wicker
Northup	Serrano	Wilson (NC)
Norwood	Sessions	Wilson (SC)
Nunes	Shadegg	Wolf
Nussle	Shaw	Wu
Obeyer	Shays	Wynn
Olver	Sherman	Young (AK)
Ortiz	Sherwood	Young (FL)
Ose	Shimkus	

NAYS—15

Conyers	Lee	Sanders
Farr	McDermott	Schakowsky
Filner	Oberstar	Stark
Jackson (IL)	Owens	Waters
Kucinich	Paul	Woolsey

NOT VOTING—12

Bishop (UT)	Hinojosa	Millender-
Brown, Corrine	Kennedy (MN)	McDonald
Cummings	Lewis (GA)	Osborne
Gephardt	Meeks (NY)	Pastor
Hensarling		

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT) (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1140

Mr. OWENS and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. GEORGE MILLER of California, WELLER, and DEFAZIO changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I missed rollcall No. 513 due to technical difficulties. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. HINIJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on rollcall No. 513.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. speaker, on rollcall No. 513, agreeing to the FY 2004 Defense Appropriations Conference Report, I was unavoidably detained, and unable to make the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report to accompany H.R. 2555, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2555, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, pursuant to the rule, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2555) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 374, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of September 23, 2003, at page H 8425.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

□ 1145

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, this is an historic day, consideration of the very first appropriations bill for the new Department of Homeland Security, which was stood up only March of this spring. This subcommittee was only stood up in March of this year, and I am very pleased with the work of our subcommittee, the committee and the Congress in bringing this bill from nowhere, no staff, offices, nothing, all the

way through the hearings and to be the very first conference to take place of all 13 bills and the very first considered by the House and on the floor at this moment. It is a record that the Congress can be proud of. It is a record that the administration can be proud of in proposing the Congress respond to the creation at the outset of a new Department of Homeland Security.

This conference agreement, Madam Speaker, will provide \$29.4 billion for the new Department. That is an increase of \$1 billion over what the President requested, and it is \$535 million over what we are spending in the current fiscal year.

In the interest of time, I do not intend to list specific amounts proposed for the many programs and activities in the Department by the bill, but I do want to take note, Madam Speaker, of the substantial amounts of money that we have provided for homeland defense since the Nation was confronted with the ugly face of terrorism a little more than 2 years ago. I also believe it is important for us to take note of where these funds have gone.

Since September 11, 2001, governmentwide, the Congress has provided \$75.8 billion for homeland security, including \$43.9 billion to date just for the Department of Homeland Security. This bill provides an additional \$29.4 billion, bringing the total appropriated since 9/11 to \$105.2 billion governmentwide, \$73.3 billion of that for just those agencies that now we include in the Department of Homeland Security.

This does not include funding, Madam Speaker, that will be provided in the other 12 appropriations bills, which could provide an additional \$17.5 billion, but I want to talk just about the Department of Homeland Security and this bill.

Since September 11, here is what has been provided by the Congress for the following things: \$513 million to secure our critical port facilities, including the \$125 million that is in this bill; since September 11, 2001, \$388 million for technology, such as radiation detectors for our ports and nonintrusive inspection technologies for cargo screening, including the \$125 million in this bill for that purpose. These technologies have been deployed at our busiest land and seaports, including such places as Miami, Los Angeles and Newark.

\$122 million since 9/11 has been provided for what has been called the Container Security Initiative, CSI, \$62 million of that in this bill. CSI targets high-threat cargo before it comes to our ports. It has been fully funded since its inception. It is now in the process of being implemented in nearly all of the major foreign megaports so that we can search those containers before they reach America's shores.

Something I am very proud of, Madam Speaker, is the aid that we are providing for our State and local governments, the so-called first responders, our firefighters, our emergency

technicians, our police and law enforcement people and the others, \$20.5 billion, including the \$4.2 billion that is in this bill in assistance to those people.

Madam Speaker, when we talk of homeland security, you cannot talk of that subject without talking about our hometown security, and this money is the biggest portion of the monies we appropriate for homeland defense.

Transportation security, of course, a continuing concern, but since September 11, 2001, we have provided a total of \$15.7 billion, \$5.2 billion in this bill, for passenger safety through the Transportation Security Administration, which was transferred to the new Department, including passenger baggage and cargo screening and the Federal Air Marshals program. \$1.9 billion, including \$400 million in this bill, has been spent on explosive and trace detection systems, including development, procurement and installation. This bill includes an additional \$85 million just for air cargo safety, principally cargo shipped on passenger planes.

On the subject of cargo security, we dealt with a very difficult issue in conference, and that is air cargo on passenger planes. The House-passed bill included a provision that would have immediately banned airlines from carrying cargo. I would point out that 22 percent of all air cargo is shipped on passenger aircraft.

But we modified that provision in the conference and in the conference report that is before us today. In short, we do not prohibit airlines from carrying cargo. That would be an economic disaster for them. It is a \$3 billion or \$4-billion-a-year business for them, which would have meant, in my judgment, the death of the airlines. And we did not establish artificial deadlines that we knew could not be met.

Instead, we faced the problem head on with the reality in mind. We adopted language that directed the Secretary to immediately research, develop, procure and install certified systems that can screen cargo being placed on passenger planes at the earliest possible date. That machinery does not exist today. It has to be developed. No one knows how long that will take, but we direct the Secretary to immediately go at it without any delay and to do it at the earliest possible time.

In the meantime, this conference report requires that the Secretary of the Department enhance what is known as the known shipper program which is currently in place that prohibits high-risk cargo from being placed on passenger planes. It requires the Department to immediately issue requests for proposals on potential technologies to screen cargo, it requires the Department to conduct background checks on employees who handle cargo prior to being placed on the aircraft, and it requires the Department to launch a pilot program to use explosive detec-

tion machines in select locations to screen high-risk cargo.

I know that we will have additional debate on this issue during this debate and on the motion to recommit the bill. In the interim, I would hope that Members would actually read the conference report as it relates to cargo security. I want to read that portion of the bill. It is short and sweet and direct. I do not know how it could be more strong. We tried to find language that would be as directive and as clear as we could make it. Let me quote you the section, 521, from the conference report:

"The Secretary of Homeland Security is directed to research, develop, and procure certified systems to inspect and screen air cargo on passenger aircraft at the earliest date possible. Provided, That until such technology is procured and installed, the Secretary shall take all possible actions to enhance the known shipper program to prohibit high-risk cargo from being transported on passenger aircraft."

There is language in the statement of managers that backs that up and requires the Secretary to immediately forthwith issue a request for proposals from the industry and the private sector to come forward with proposals to secure that equipment. The best we can do until the equipment is here, Madam Speaker, is to be sure we know who is shipping cargo on passenger planes, and if we do not know who they are, and they do not have a record of being secure, then we search every piece that is going on today, and we encourage the continuance of that. All high-risk cargo is screened for security.

Now, Madam Speaker, I want to conclude these remarks by noting that some of our colleagues here believe we should add more money to this bill. I suspect that for some, no matter how much we spend, no matter how much we add in the name of homeland security, it will never be enough. We could spend every penny we could beg, borrow or steal around the world and spend it in the name of homeland security, and it would never please some people.

I would just state my firm belief that throwing dollars at homeland security will not necessarily add to our security. What we need is a sensible plan that spends sensible sums of money on the establishment and operation of a comprehensive and complete system for protecting our Nation, and I believe this conference report is such a sensible plan.

It provides resources for the legacy functions of agencies transferred to the Department such as Customs inspections, Border Patrol, Immigration, Presidential protection, Secret Service funding, Coast Guard spending for small-boat rescue systems, buoy research and protection, fishing rights enforcement and the like. We continue spending on those things that are not directly related to homeland security.

But we continue our commitment, Madam Speaker, to first responders.

We support innovative technologies in this bill and capital investments for transportation security, for maritime safety, for the protection of critical infrastructure in the country.

In short, Madam Speaker, this conference agreement is a very good step toward a comprehensive plan for homeland security that spends sensible amounts of money. It moves us forward in leaps and bounds as we seek ways to defend the homeland and prevent future terrorist attacks.

So, Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the conference report and to reject any motions to recommit it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SABO. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, when it comes to homeland security, the rhetoric flies fast and furious. Everyone wants a safer, better-prepared America against both terror threats and natural events like Hurricane Isabel. But our actions do not always match rhetoric. In most respects, this conference report does a responsible job of allocating funds within the budget constraints we face.

□ 1200

I commend the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the staff for their hard work and the many thoughtful decisions that are reflected in this bill. It is a clear and substantial improvement over the administration's request. I suppose one of the things Chairman ROGERS mentioned was funding for port security. And I think it is obvious that we could spend more there, but every penny that has been appropriated by Congress was money not asked for by the administration.

Let me also pay particular respect to the hardworking staff. They are hardworking, they are professional, they are competent. From the minority staff, Beth Pheto; from our committee staff, Marjorie Duske; from my personal staff, Michelle Mrdeza, Jeannie Wilson, Stephanie Gupta, Jeff Ashford, Tom MacLemore, Tammy Hughes, and Brian Dunlop. They have had a big job to do, and they have done it in a professional manner.

It is a simple fact, however, that the United States is not as well prepared as we can and should be to meet our homeland security challenges. We should do more.

Mr. Speaker, at the end of the debate I will offer a motion to recommit that is very similar to the motion to instruct conferees that this House passed overwhelmingly 2 weeks ago. By a vote of 347 to 74, the House instructed conferees to insist on the highest possible funding levels for each homeland security preparedness and disaster response program and to require screening of cargo on passenger airplanes.

This conference agreement does not do that. One troubling shortfall is first responder funding which would remain flat at the 2003 level. The House bill

would have provided a 4.5 percent increase, which is \$200 million more. We know from our fire chiefs, police, and other first responders that more resources for equipment and training are urgently needed. The Council on Foreign Relations independently documented these needs in its recent report, "First Responders: Dangerously Unprepared, Drastically Underfunded."

I might add that adding money for such things as first responders is not simply throwing money at the problem. It is a substantial need, and we need to deal with it.

But homeland security preparedness is not just about more money. Across the board we need better management at the Department of Homeland Security. We need better plans. And in some areas we need more aggressive security goals. I put screening of cargo carried on passenger planes at the top of that list.

Mr. Speaker, 374 Members voted to instruct conferees to insist on the House amendment to require the immediate screening of cargo carried on passenger planes. This conference agreement comes up short in that respect. Instead, the agreement directs Secretary Ridge to research, develop, and procure systems to screen cargo on passenger aircraft at the earliest possible date. I do not think that is strong enough. The Department shows no eagerness to address the cargo problem. We should give them a deadline to act.

I might add that I sensed no particular interest, even, in this problem by the Department until the House passed its original amendment.

Mr. Speaker, my motion to recommit would set a deadline of October 31, 2004, for the Department to implement screening of cargo on passenger planes. We know who flies on passenger planes, but we still do not trust them. We still screen their bags. The same should be done with cargo shipped on these planes.

Airlines and others have argued that screening air cargo is a technical challenge that requires much more time to develop. This argument is similar to those made prior to 9/11 about screening passenger baggage: it cannot be done. How quickly we seem to have reworked old ways of thinking.

The motion I will offer will give the Department of Homeland Security 13 months to develop and implement a plan to screen cargo carried on passenger planes. Some may argue that is not enough time. I question how long we should make the American people wait.

I would also point out that this requirement would not affect every airport. The FAA tells us that 95 percent of all cargo carried on passenger aircraft is loaded at only 44 airports.

The lack of screening of cargo on passenger planes is not the only homeland security gap that exists today, but it is a huge one. Unless we make steady progress in closing these gaps, they will exist for years to come.

Let me add that the known-shipper program is probably better than not having anything, but I might remind Members that the gentleman who shipped himself in an air cargo crate was working for a known-shipper.

The Department's oversight of this program today basically consists of a few inspectors checking paperwork at airports. It is not a serious screening program today.

So I urge the adoption of the motion to recommit.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABO. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's elaboration of what this bill does and what it does not do. I would say to the gentleman, I have a concern. As the gentleman knows, when someone who has been very much involved in the fire grant program, and focused on the fire service, not just as it relates to terrorism, but as it relates to safety in our neighborhoods and the safety of our firefighters and emergency medical response teams, am I correct that unlike the House-passed bill, we have now shifted from the fire administration, the fire grant program, into the Office of Domestic Preparedness?

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is accurate.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield for another question, is the gentleman confident that having done that, that the fire grant program will not be adversely affected in terms of its focus on firefighting, firefighter safety, and emergency response capabilities?

Mr. SABO. No. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I was not an advocate of the position in the conference committee. I thought we made a mistake in changing it. To be fair, the language in the bill retains some money as a separate line item, and there is language indicating the fire chiefs and the people involved in fire should be involved in the grant-making process.

I personally have questions about taking a program that was well run where it was and shifting it to another agency. I have a concern that what will develop are people who do not know much about the program making the grants.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would further yield, I thank the gentleman for his observation. I have had an opportunity to discuss this briefly with the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS); and I would hope that the committee, having accepted the Senate's position, which I do not share, as I share the gentleman's view on this, will ensure that this committee program, not just for our response to terrorist activity, but in response to making sure that our firefighters and emergency medical response teams can be effective, that we can also keep them safe in the normal

day-to-day, but risky, activities in which they undertake. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his concern. We clearly need continuing strong oversight of this program.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, we agreed to move the firefighter assistance grants, but not the emergency management performance grants over to the Office for Domestic Preparedness. But, and this is a very important but, I would say to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), we include language that the fire grants have to continue to be administered "in a manner identical to the current fiscal year"; and that means grants directly to those local fire departments, not through the States. We continue the peer review process of 300 firefighters from the new recruits to the fire chiefs, gathering to review the 15,000-plus annual applications for those monies; and we include the U.S. Fire Administration during the grant process.

We received a letter of support of that from the International Association of Fire Chiefs for the manner in which we moved those firefighter assistance grants over to ODP. So I think we have solved the problem.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his observations. And I want to say that, although I would have agreed with the position of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) that it ought not to be shifted, I believe the gentleman is correct that he has tried to build in protections so that this program is not undermined. I appreciate those actions which I think certainly make this switch a more positive one than it otherwise would have been, and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the full committee, and the gentleman who had the courage and the vision at the outset to take the lead in the Congress, both bodies, to create the new Subcommittee on Homeland Security of the Committee on Appropriations, on which the other body then followed through. That is the vision of this leadership.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky (Chairman ROGERS) for yielding me this time.

I wanted to, number one, congratulate him on doing a tremendous job in presenting this conference report, along with his partner, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), the ranking member. I know there are some differences here, but the fact of the mat-

ter is this is a good bill. This is the first real homeland security appropriations bill that the Congress has considered.

Once it became evident that our homeland was no longer totally secure from terrorism, the Congress moved quickly to establish the Department of Homeland Security, and the Congress moved quickly to establish a Select Committee on Homeland Security. But when we follow the money, which is where things happen, it was the gentleman from Kentucky (Chairman ROGERS) who brought the pieces together, who brought together all of those agencies that had control of homeland security-type responsibilities. He did just a tremendous job in identifying the needs and providing the support. He worked this bill through. It was one of the first bills that passed in the House. It is one of the first bills; in fact, it is the second bill that comes before us as a conference report. He has done a really good job. While there will be some, as the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) pointed out, differences here, the fact of the matter is that this subcommittee can be very proud of the job that it has done.

I was able to appoint the gentleman from Kentucky (Chairman ROGERS) as chairman of this subcommittee, and I am proud of that decision. He has made the House look good. And I know that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is very proud of his appointment of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) as the ranking member because he has also made the House look good. They have done a good job, and I hope that we can expeditiously pass this conference report, get it to the Senate, and get it on the President's desk.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking Democrat on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the subcommittee, indicated that this bill needed "sensible" amounts of money. I would say that I would agree with that, except for one thing; terrorists are not "sensible," and that means that we may have to spend more money than we would like to spend in order to stop nonsensical people from terrorizing the world.

I think we need to understand exactly what this bill does, cutting through the rhetoric. This homeland security conference bill is 2.3 percent above last year's legislation. That does not even equal inflation. When the President addressed the Nation on September 7, he said, "We will do what is necessary, we will spend what is necessary to achieve this essential victory in the war on terror to protect freedom and to make our own Nation more secure."

□ 1215

Regrettably, Mr. Speaker, this conference report before us today does not

live up to that promise made by the President just 2 weeks ago and neither do some of the President's actions. Let me give a few examples.

First, the conference report provides no funding to improve security at the perimeters or backsides of the airports.

Secondly, the conference report does not provide sufficient funding to secure ports in anything less than 20 years. Only \$125 million is provided to port security grants in the conference report.

Third, this conference report does not increase funding for first responders above that provided in the previous year.

Fourth, the conference report does not provide sufficient funding to screen all cargo carried on passenger aircraft in anything close to a year. And with all due respect, the proposed conference report provides \$85 million for cargo security conference. TSA Administrator Loy said he may need as much as \$500 million to implement a cargo screen program.

Fifth, the conference report provides no funding for Customs to substantially increase the checking of cargo entering through our ports for weapons of mass destruction. GAO has said that the current low inspection rate makes container shipments a prime target for terrorists. Also, the screening requirement carried in the House bill for cargo carried on passenger aircraft has been weakened in the proposed conference to such an extent that it has no real meaning despite efforts of several speakers today to try to imply that something meaningful was done on this issue.

I support the gentleman from Minnesota's (Mr. SABO) pending recom-mittal motion because I think it is in the interest of national security to pass it.

I would also make one other observation. Words are funny things. They can be used either to clarify or obscure. The subcommittee chairman indicated in a "Dear Colleague" letter and again made reference on the floor today to the large amounts of money that we are supposedly spending for homeland security. He suggests, for instance, that we spent more than \$75 billion since September 11. That masks the true fact that that assessment includes all of the base funding that existed before 9/11. If you are looking at the additional funding that we have provided since that time, that figure would be \$33 billion, not \$75 billion.

Secondly, it is not true that we provided \$29 billion in additional homeland security efforts in 2004. If you subtract the base from that figure, the real figure is more like \$18 billion additional funding. That is a lot of money, but given the threat, in my judgment, it is not enough.

It has also been suggested that Congress will provide an additional \$8.4 billion for border and port security in 2004. Again, that figure includes the base funding that existed prior to 9/11. That is not going to help much to deal with the increased threat.

And then we are told by the chairman very often that we could spend every single dollar of the Federal budget and some of us would argue we were not spending enough. I would strongly dispute that, and I would simply ask why should we be spending more in Iraq on a per capita basis than we are spending here at home to defend our homeland from threats such as cross-border threats?

I would urge support for the Sabo recommitment motion. I think that we need every dollar contained in that motion if we are to provide adequate security to this country.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP), a very hard-working and productive member of this subcommittee.

(Mr. WAMP asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Speaker, first of all, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) could not have selected a better person to chair this historic Subcommittee on Homeland Security of the Committee on Appropriations than the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) who is as tough as nails, very diligent, thorough, knowledgeable. I served under him on the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, Judiciary and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations, and he is the right man for this task. He could not have selected a better professional staff to carry out these most important responsibilities.

We have had incredible cooperation, despite the gentleman from Wisconsin's (Mr. OBEY) words, and some of those are very well-taken and well-spoken. This is for the most part a bipartisan product where there is widespread agreement on most of the issues. We are going to differ today on some substantive issues, but we have worked together very well. And the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) and his professional staff have done an excellent job.

This is really a great work product. When you consider the Container Security Initiative, Project Bio-Shield, some of the brand new programs that are so critical to program ramp up quickly for our homeland security needs and extend, frankly, the proverbial borders of our country around the world to protect us before it is too late, before things do come in and happen. We have made great strides very quickly.

I do not think the President could have selected a better Secretary than Tom Ridge for Homeland Security, also tough as nails, very thorough. We have had multiple hearings and done a lot of good work together. So while we differ today a little, we need to stick together in a bipartisan way to do the work of the country. This is just like national security, a whole new frontier.

Let me also say one other thing. In national security, there is the Berry

amendment that says we have got to buy American products and use American vendors for these things. I want to do more. And I want it said today that we need to do more on homeland security. We need domestic producers, American manufacturers for pharmaceuticals for Bio-Shield to protect our interests. We need American companies in our manufacturing base to expand to provide the technologies and the equipment that we need to protect Americans first.

So as we move forward, let us say beginning today we will do more to strengthen this and have an amendment just like the Berry amendment, so that we can guarantee Americans that American people will be used to carry out the homeland security needs.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) has 15 minutes. The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) has 10 minutes.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I agree that this is, generally, a good bill. The distinguished chairman talked about containers being searched in Newark and Los Angeles. He said the Container Security Initiative will target high-threat cargo before it reaches U.S. shores.

Mr. Speaker, it only takes one weapon of mass destruction, in one container, to destroy an American city.

Mr. Speaker, this country will not be safe until every container is searched and sealed and certified by an American inspection team before it is put on a ship in a foreign port. This country will not be safe until no container can be put on that ship before it is searched and sealed by the American team in the foreign port, every container, not just the high-threat ones.

The terrorists know we will inspect the high-threat containers; so they will put the bomb in the low-threat container. We cannot depend on the good guys, that we know who the good guys are who are, long-time shippers to us. How do we know that some terrorist is not an employee of a good-guy shipper? We must spend the 6 or 7 or \$8 billion a year that it will take to put an American inspection team to search every container before it is sent to our shore and the additional money to electronically go around every ship 100 miles off our shore before it is allowed into American territory or waters to make sure that there is no plutonium or enriched uranium onboard that ship. We can do that scientifically.

But until then we will not be safe. We are just nibbling at the edges with everything we are doing.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise both in support of the conference committee report and thank both the chairman and the ranking member for putting this together.

Obviously, we need more money. I want to raise an issue that some of my colleagues in the Harris County delegation will talk about, including the functioning of the Customs and Border Protection at Bush Intercontinental Airport in Houston.

We have problems with our wait times for our passengers up to 2 hours. It is causing many international passengers to miss their connection. The Houston Chronicle has reported twice on the growing anger of people waiting in line to clear Customs and Border Protection. Missed flights are a major problem because of the wait time. For example, one airline had over 1,000 people miss connections in one day this summer.

We need additional inspectors at Intercontinental Airport, a commitment to maintaining 100 percent the utilization of the number of authorized positions, including overtime for the inspectors who are there to cover the problem.

We have looked at the numbers in other parts of the country at international ports of entry, and we know we are lower than other areas. So we need to make sure that Customs and Border Protection makes that adjustment.

The Members from the Houston area, the nine Members will meet tomorrow again with Customs and Border Protection, and hopefully they will understand that we need to have parity and not the wait time that we are seeing for our the international passengers coming into the Houston Intercontinental Airport.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me take a few minutes to talk about another provision in the bill which I think is important and it relates to the CAPPS2 system.

TSA has been working on this system for almost a year, but there remains many unanswered questions about it. I am concerned particularly that those people who move residences a lot or do not have phone or other bills in their name, like children and some older Americans, will be singled out for further TSA screening, not based on risk, but simply because of these two factors.

I am also concerned that TSA will have no real system where passengers can correct incorrect information. The provision in the bill, which I originally offered and strongly support, requires GAO to review CAPPS2 as it exists today before funding can be obligated on a planned pilot program. TSA is allowed to test the system while GAO's review is being conducted.

The GAO's review would mirror the recommendations put forth by the Secretary of Defense and the Attorney General in the report they submitted

on May 20 on DOD's Terrorism Information Awareness Program.

It is unclear how many of these recommendations, if any, have been followed by the TSA or by the Department of Homeland Security. I suspect none. Those recommendations include testing the search tools and security of the architecture, ensuring that the system is secure from hackers, and that the proper policies and processes of the system are in place.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the passenger profiling system we are using today is a sophisticated or good one. However, we as a Nation need to be very careful as we proceed.

We recently heard about further problems about the TIA where a test conducted with Jet Blue, unknown to its passengers, matched up passengers and Social Security information and allowed some of this information to become public. We need to prevent this and any aviation passenger profiling system TSA develops, and that is what this provision in the bill seeks to do.

The bill has good language, and I hope it is fully implemented and followed by TSA.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM), one of the hardest working members of our subcommittee.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference agreement and urge my colleagues to do the same. I want to commend the gentleman from Kentucky (Chairman ROGERS) who has done such an outstanding job in putting together this first ever Homeland Security appropriations bill, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), and all the subcommittee staff for the tremendous work on this bill.

The process of structuring a new appropriations bill to address the operational needs of the 22 agencies and departments under the new Homeland Security Department has not been easy this year. It will not be easy next year either because we have to make changes to accommodate the lessons that we are going to learn.

Having watched and participated in this process, I have come to the conclusion that our approach to funding Homeland Security has been measured and judicious. We have not thrown good money after bad, but have made difficult choices in funding the different functions of this new department.

All along, I felt that the worst mistake we could make in funding this new department would be to get into a bidding war in the Congress over what faction could spend the most money on individual activities and facilities before we have a full picture of needs and capabilities.

□ 1230

There are some in this House who want to put more money in that bureau

or that agency. Some of those Members are well-intentioned, while others simply want to create a political issue by forcing Members to make a choice between spending more money on one hand or appearing to be less than responsible on homeland security issues on the other. This political game is played by throwing arbitrary numbers into the public arena and then questioning the commitment to homeland security on the part of some in this body.

The time for games is over. It is time to get serious. At the end of the day, there is much room remaining for an honest debate, but not one of our constituents is served well by gaming the debate.

As we go forward in this new area of homeland security, we will make progress in sorting out priorities. In the process, we will have the benefit of the ideas and knowledge of the State and local officials from our districts around the country. That collective wisdom will serve us well.

Knowing that we have the opportunity to improve this bill over time is a good reason to be measured in the way we appropriate these funds, and again, I want to commend the chairman and ranking member and urge the Members to support this conference report.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for his excellent work and, too, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

This is a critically important bill. We are debating, we are discussing the security of the American people at home. The President says that the security of the American people at home can be enhanced by spending \$5.7 billion to rebuild Iraq's electricity grid; that our security is enhanced by spending \$3.7 billion to expand access to safe drinking water for Iraqis; \$875 million to restore marshlands in Iraq, that helps our security; \$20 million for political consultants to the Afghan Government, that helps our security; \$856 million to the Iraqis for their airports, that helps our security.

But when it comes to screening cargo that goes on the passenger planes, that every American flies on, nothing. Under existing law that this administration and the Republican leadership are going to pass, we all, Americans, we have to go through security, take off everything we have got on if necessary, put our carry-on bags through, our computers, our cell phones to prove that we are not threatening that passenger plane, but on the very same plane, that cargo goes on unscreened.

We are told by the Republican leadership that we cannot afford to do it, that the technology does not exist to do it. Let me ask this: If a person's carry-on can be taken on a plane this size and be put through a device that ensures that it does not have a bomb

on it, why cannot this package of cargo go through the very same screening device? What do my colleagues mean the screening device does not exist? Put this through the screening device. It is going on the same plane, except a person is going to be on the plane with their baggage. The terrorist will not be on the plane with the cargo.

What about this 16-ounce package? Not only does it not get screened if it is cargo, but there is no paperwork required. Why cannot this go through the same screening device we go through if it is going into the belly of the plane? What do my colleagues mean the screening device does not exist?

I will tell my colleagues what does not exist. The screeners do not exist. The Republican administration has laid off 6,000 screeners who could be putting this cargo through the screening device to make sure that, as it goes on the passenger planes, that the people of America, every person that flew here to Washington, D.C., to visit the Capitol, who are flying back on a plane with cargo on it that has not been screened, that has not been put through the same machine that their bags are put there.

So if you are al Qaeda, are you going to try to get through that screening device, through the two air marshals, through the metal door of the pilot's cabin, past the pilot with a gun, past all the passengers who are going to jump you if you get up in the aisle, or are you just going to go right around this machine and put your bomb on the plane unscreened because they do not want to pay to put it through that device?

We cannot spend \$87 billion on top of 65 billion other dollars that we have already spent to provide security for Americans in Iraq and then say we are not going to ensure that the packages which go on passenger planes in America, that our cargo are screened.

It is at the top of the al Qaeda terrorist list. We know that the four planes that they brought down were only a small part of what their plot was, a small part of how many planes they wanted to bring down. They know what it does to the psyche of the American people, to the economy of our country. That is what terrorism is all about. It paralyzes a country. It has paralyzed us, and we have come out of it, to the credit of the American people, but we cannot allow it to happen again because we know what they are targeting.

Laying off 6,000 screeners and saying that technology does not exist is not accurate. We can put these packages through the very same screening devices. How can it consume more time to put all of us through the screening device, human beings, than it does to just put a package through? In fact, it would take less time to ensure that that cargo is screened, but the industry does not want to pay for it, cargo or airline. The Bush administration says

we do not have any money for that domestically, even though we have \$87 billion for Iraqi security.

It is wrong. This bill must be defeated. We must ensure that every person flying in our country is not subject to this threat.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY), a very hard-working member of the subcommittee.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me the time.

The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) said earlier that rhetoric as it relates to homeland security flies fast and furious, and indeed it does, and I guess that is just reflective of what this process is and system is, and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), who is a great friend of mine and serves on the Select Committee on Homeland Security, just made some statements that I think are great examples of that rhetoric flying fast and furious. And if the motivation is derived from frustration that we want to do more and we want to do it sooner, because indeed we do want to protect every American citizen, then I applaud him, and I think in large part that is true.

But unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, I think in large part it is not true. It is not true because it belies many of the facts that many of us have seen both on this important committee and on the Select Committee on Homeland Security as it relates to what we can do today, what technology indeed exists. And the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) makes the point that if every American passenger has to pass through a metal detector on their way to an airplane, that we ought to be sending cargo through that metal detector as a means of securing that some sort of explosive device does not exist, and that is not true.

That technology, those machines, the technology applied to current passengers is distinctly different than what is needed to ensure that cargo transportation is fully inspected. The best known package system being used now currently is the best process we have available.

This bill is an important bill to support because we put in it funding that specifically moves forward the process to develop the kinds of technology that will get us where we all want to be, and to say that we can simply do that today by spending more money is incorrect and misleading, and I do not think it is a service to what we really want to accomplish here.

If indeed we say those things to motivate DHS, the Federal Government and this government to get its priorities more focused, then that is a good thing, but let us not mislead the American people as we do that.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), the very distinguished chairman of the

House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support, and I wish to escalate and join in the very deep appreciation to the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Chairman ROGERS) for the remarkable job they have done on a huge task in a very tough time constraint situation. This is a remarkable piece of legislation in what it accomplishes.

There is an awful lot of attention being paid to first responders in this legislation, and rightly so. That is a good thing. However, we need to make sure it is not done at the expense of good information acquisition, analysis, dissemination in a timely manner to people on the front lines, because this is our best weapon, preventing tragic terrorist attacks and the attendant tragedy that happens to Americans at home and abroad.

Good information, good information will keep our first responders out of harm's way, in fact, and reduce the chances that we will actually need to call into action. I would like to hope that the day will come when our first responders should be treated the same way as the Maytag men and women of our country. We do not have to call them because we have good information to head off trouble before it starts.

Getting good intelligence is a low-cost, high-return investment, and that is a piece that we have not completed yet. We have a foreign intelligence program. It is against the law to use it domestically. Americans do not spy on Americans. We have a new Department of Homeland Security, which this bill does a remarkable job of providing for. We now need a policy and implementing mechanics and funding to how best to deal with domestic intelligence information. That is a task that is now, it is urgent, it is for the future, it has got to be done.

I commit the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence to work with the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and others who are interested in this task. If we do not do this, we are going to have a problem.

I certainly agree that the people who are dealing with the prevention and defense part of this are excellent, extraordinary Americans taking huge risks. If we can give them good information, we reduce their risk and allow them to have a higher success rate. That is worth the investment.

I appreciate the time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make two points: one, to be in strong support of this conference report.

Homeland security in this country is a massive challenge. This is a huge Na-

tion, with so many risks. Yet we have put billions of dollars, unprecedented dollars, toward those risks. There is no question we are safer, we are, or more prepared, more focused on homeland security than ever before, and I support the chairman's efforts, which have just been dedicated to making our country safer. This bill moves that forward.

My second point is in support of that raised by my colleague from Houston (Mr. GREEN). We are having a serious problem of understaffing of the port of entry at the Bush Intercontinental Airport. It is not simply inconvenient. It is an intolerable line through Customs. It is a disruption of trade. We are losing jobs and business in the region as a result. This bill helps provide the resources.

I thank the chairman for the help to address those problems. We are meeting with the agency again tomorrow to focus their attention on this important need. We are hopeful they will listen carefully.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHR-ABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this well-crafted, bipartisan legislation, and congratulate the gentleman from Kentucky (Chairman ROGERS) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Ranking Member SABO) for a job well done.

During this debate it should be evident to everyone that the cost of securing our country is going to be astronomical. Later today I will propose an amendment to H.R. 2557, the Water Resources Development Act, which will help us raise some money for our own security needs from outside, from foreign sources. My amendment will permit us to establish a container fee on containers coming into our ports, which, of course, those fees will be paid by the overseas manufacturers, that will then be part of a fund that we can use for our own security, for some of the costs that this legislation is appropriating money for.

We need to make sure that the American people are not the only ones who bear the burden of having secure ports in our country when overseas manufacturers use them as well.

So I rise in strong support of this legislation and would ask my colleagues to consider my amendment in the upcoming legislation.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

First, let me indicate my strong agreement with the statement of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) that getting good information and getting it accurately out to our local units of government is incredibly important. We focus on homeland security in this bill, but clearly, some of the most important work, even more important than anything we do in this bill, is the work that is done by the Intelligence Community and the FBI to gather appropriate information.

□ 1245

And I think we are still sorting out how we get that information, even to us in Congress and to local units of government; and that remains and should remain very high on our priority list.

Mr. Speaker, I urge people to vote for the motion to recommit. Under the process of the House, there will be no separate debate on that motion after the debate concludes on this bill.

Our motion is a reasonable one. It is a problem that exists. I think we all understand that what goes into the belly of the plane is really a problem. From the earliest days of discussion of airplane security following 9/11, my initial response was that the biggest problem was not what went into the plane itself but what went into the belly of the plane.

Frankly, at one time I was not aware of the amount of cargo that was being carried. Baggage we are screening; cargo we are not. We have technology that we can use. The problem is how we put packages together and we repackage into big containers. That gives us more trouble. We could prescreen before we repackage everything.

The Department is planning pilot projects, and clearly there is technology they are going to use. They need a prod and a push. They have basically ignored the problem. There has been no interest in the industry, no real initiative from the administration and from the Department. I do not know any other way to get their attention than by putting a deadline in a bill.

We would have had a little more time frame within a motion I offered in conference for planning and then implementation, but I could not offer that same motion here because of the limits of germaneness. So we have an amendment that is reasonable, gives them over a year to put a plan in place and to implement it. If there are problems that are real, they can come talk to us. It is after the start of the next fiscal year.

If we want to deal with the issue of cargo security and cargo screening on airplanes, the only way we are going to get action from this agency is to put a real prod to them, and that is by adopting the motion to recommit and setting a time frame for when they have to have it done.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). The time of gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) has expired.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) has 2 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is a good bill. As I said before, what we are after is sensible spending

on a sensible plan. We are spending a lot of money on homeland security. This bill is \$29.4 billion. Is it enough? I think it is enough for the plan that we have, and I would urge the Members to support the conference report.

Now, on this issue of cargo on passenger planes, it has been beaten to death today; and there have been some irresponsible statements made, in my judgment, about it. Here are the essential facts.

Technology does not exist to x-ray the cargo going on passenger planes in those large pallets. It just does not exist. We are directing the Secretary and giving him the money immediately to go out and begin procuring that information and that kind of machinery. The money is there, and the direction is there; and we are telling him to do it posthaste, at the earliest possible date. I do not know how much more direct we could be.

In the meantime, we say we do not want any cargo going on a passenger plane from somebody we do not know about. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) said he could send that package as a terrorist on a plane and walk away, and it would be shipped and the passenger would not be on the plane. That is not so. If you are an unknown shipper, your package does not go on the plane until we search it; actually search it. Under the known-shipper program, no cargo goes on a plane that we do not know who it is from and where it is going and all about it. That is the essential fact.

In the bill we say to enhance that system until we can get the x-ray machines in place to actually x-ray the cargo. It is the best we can do, Mr. Speaker. It is the best we can do. And we are directing the Secretary to move posthaste to get the machinery in place.

I ask my colleagues to support the bill. Before closing, I want to thank my ranking member for his great work and all the members of the subcommittee, and especially the staff, who have carried us this far. I urge adoption of the conference report and defeat the motion to recommit.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the funding prices for first responders put forward by both the House and the Senate in the Homeland Security Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2004.

I feel especially gratified knowing that both chambers and the Administration have prioritized for this critical need by allocating resources in H.R. 2555 to solve the communication problems facing our first responders.

Already, our region has prepared the "Puget Sound Interoperable Communications Program" that will test and deploy new and emerging interoperability technologies in and around the Ports of Seattle and Tacoma. This innovative program will significantly enhance the Puget Sound region's local, State and Federal first responder communication capabilities.

This particular geographic region was chosen because of its high-density population, presence of critical infrastructure, high threat

areas, disparate communication systems and diverse user base. The project will be implemented throughout portions of the City of Seattle, City of Tacoma, City of Tukwila, Port of Seattle and the Port of Tacoma. This implementation will also integrate with other responder initiatives in the State.

This project will create a shared infrastructure architecture utilizing the latest advances in technology that ties public and private networks and multiple communication devices together in a secure interoperable environment.

This implementation will demonstrate that a cost effective, secure interoperability solution can be achieved by using existing equipment and off-the-shelf mobile devices. Over time, this project will be incrementally expanded and become part of the Statewide Public Safety Interoperability Program.

My colleagues and I look forward to working with the Administration and the Department of Homeland Security to help make this important program a success.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, this is an important bill in order to maintain the integrity of progress in developing a system of homeland security. The Homeland Security Appropriations Act particularly does so by ensuring that in the future, when our national capacities reach requisite levels, we will be able to meet national needs and secure the requisite funding.

It has been said fast and furious rhetoric surrounds homeland security issues. I agree. It has been further stated by some that actions do not match their words. Let me suggest the disagreement is not over whether or not we should do more. I think we all agree moving forward is important. We disagree in what is doable now.

Mr. Speaker, how do we best do this while ensuring that the credibility of those expenditures are such that, as we go forward, the American people can have confidence that we are meeting the needs of our Nation in a thoughtful, capable and complete manner; without simple rhetoric, and thus without increasing waste, fraud and miscalculation?

We need better planning and response. Some Democrats have said more money is needed for first responders. The fact is we do not know the right amount or the requisite need separated from normal expenses. Further, already over \$20 billion has already been invested in homeland security. Before we invest more, I contend we first create a formula based on threat, vulnerability and consequences to allocate the funds properly.

The City of New York spends \$13.5 million dollars a week, \$700 million a year, on extra police protection during its current state of alert. That amounts to more than \$1 billion since 9/11. I am talking about the net, additional amount that New York spends to protect against terrorist attacks. One of the principle reasons many of the terrorism prevention needs are not met by many cities is because of the outdated formula applied to the vast majority of first responder funds.

The President supports a threat-based distribution of first responder funds in his National Strategy for Homeland Security, and I know from conversations I had with Homeland Security Secretary Ridge, that he also supports this approach. I hope this Congress moves quickly to enact a new threat-based formula to apply to first responders. I introduced H.R. 2512, a bill to reform the first responder formula to reflect today's reality. H.R. 2512 would

lessen the impact of allocating funds based on geography in favor of a quantitative assessment of threat information, vulnerability, and consequences. We are dealing with serious people and we need a serious formula.

I know the war in Iraq is over and the threat level has decreased since then, but we must remain vigilant in our fight against terrorism, particularly in New York.

One hundred percent screening of cargo containers is also unattainable regardless of what we spend at this time.

Mr. Speaker, we are all frustrated and want to move forward. We have to do so in a reasonable manner, not just blindly throwing money at the problem. I would like to remind every one that the other body took over one year ago to approve the bill creating the Department of Homeland Security. I am confident this bill represents the next best step and urge everyone's support.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring my colleagues' attention to one provision in the Homeland Security Appropriations Conference Report on non-intrusive inspection technology.

The conference report directs Customs and Border Protection to accelerate its efforts to complete a field test of pulsed fast neutron analysis (PFNA) technology at the Ysleta border crossing. This field test is an important part of our Nation's efforts to use next-generation technology to better secure our borders while also facilitating the flow of legitimate trade and travel.

The Departments of Defense and Homeland Security have been working to carry out field tests of the PFNA truck inspection system in Ysleta, Texas. PFNA, described in a Fortune Magazine article earlier this year as "beyond-Superman technology," has the potential to enable inspectors to detect the chemical composition of articles deeply buried in a fully-loaded cargo truck. The use of such technology in interdicting explosives, chemical agents and weapons, nuclear devices, dirty bombs, drugs and other threats has the potential to prevent destruction and the loss of life.

Earlier this month, U.S. Government screeners failed to detect, for the second time in two years, a shipment of depleted uranium in a container sent by ABC News from overseas. This is distressing and frightening news. Luckily it was just a test by one of our country's premier news organizations. However, we may not be so lucky in the future. PFNA technology could help us interdict such shipments. However, before such technology can be deployed, it must obviously be tested.

This conference report recognizes the importance of these tests and further understands that they should take place without undue delays so that if PFNA proves successful in the field, it can be deployed at ports of entry and protect America against terrorist threats and other criminal activity. PFNA could be the tool that prevents a catastrophic attack and I thank the conferees, in particular, Chairman Harold Rogers, for prioritizing our efforts to test this and other cutting-edge technologies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. SABO

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I am, in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SABO moves to recommit the conference report on the bill H.R. 2555 to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist on inclusion of (1) the highest possible level of funding for each homeland security, preparedness and disaster response program and (2) a prohibition on the use of funds in this Act to approve, renew, or implement any aviation cargo security plan that permits the transportation of unscreened or uninspected cargo on passenger planes after October 31, 2004.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on the question of agreeing to the conference report.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 198, nays 226, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 514]

YEAS—198

Abercrombie	Cooper	Gonzalez
Ackerman	Costello	Gordon
Alexander	Cramer	Green (TX)
Allen	Crowley	Grijalva
Andrews	Cummings	Gutierrez
Baca	Davis (AL)	Harman
Baldwin	Davis (CA)	Hastings (FL)
Ballance	Davis (FL)	Hill
Becerra	Davis (IL)	Hinchev
Bell	Davis (TN)	Hinojosa
Berkley	DeFazio	Hoefel
Berman	DeGette	Holden
Berry	Delahunt	Holt
Bishop (GA)	DeLauro	Honda
Bishop (NY)	Deutsch	Hooley (OR)
Blumenauer	Dicks	Hoyer
Boswell	Dingell	Inslee
Boucher	Doggett	Israel
Boyd	Dooley (CA)	Jackson (IL)
Brady (PA)	Doyle	Jefferson
Brown (OH)	Edwards	John
Brown, Corrine	Emanuel	Johnson, E. B.
Capps	Engel	Jones (OH)
Capuano	Eshoo	Kanjorski
Cardin	Etheridge	Kaptur
Cardoza	Evans	Kildee
Carson (IN)	Farr	Kilpatrick
Carson (OK)	Fattah	Kind
Case	Filner	Klecza
Clay	Ford	Kucinich
Clyburn	Frank (MA)	Lampson
Conyers	Frost	Langevin

Lantos	Murtha	Shays
Larsen (WA)	Nadler	Sherman
Larson (CT)	Napolitano	Skelton
Lee	Neal (MA)	Slaughter
Levin	Oberstar	Smith (WA)
Lipinski	Obey	Snyder
Lofgren	Olver	Solis
Lowey	Ortiz	Spratt
Lucas (KY)	Owens	Stark
Lynch	Pallone	Stenholm
Majette	Pascrell	Strickland
Maloney	Payne	Stupak
Markey	Pelosi	Tanner
Marshall	Pomeroy	Tauscher
Matheson	Price (NC)	Taylor (MS)
Matsui	Rahall	Thompson (CA)
McCarthy (MO)	Rangel	Thompson (MS)
McCarthy (NY)	Reyes	Tierney
McCollum	Rodriguez	Towns
McDermott	Ross	Turner (TX)
McGovern	Rothman	Udall (CO)
McIntyre	Roybal-Allard	Udall (NM)
McNulty	Ruppersberger	Van Hollen
Meehan	Ryan (OH)	Velazquez
Meek (FL)	Sabo	Vislosky
Meeks (NY)	Sanchez, Linda	Waters
Menendez	T.	Watson
Michaud	Sanchez, Loretta	Watt
Millender-	Sanders	Waxman
McDonald	Sandin	Weiner
Miller (NC)	Schakowsky	Wexler
Miller, George	Schiff	Woolsey
Mollohan	Scott (GA)	Wu
Moore	Scott (VA)	Wynn
Moran (VA)	Serrano	

NAYS—226

Aderholt	Emerson	LaHood
Akin	English	Latham
Bachus	Everett	LaTourette
Baird	Feeney	Leach
Baker	Ferguson	Lewis (CA)
Ballenger	Flake	Lewis (KY)
Barrett (SC)	Fletcher	Linder
Bartlett (MD)	Foley	LoBiondo
Barton (TX)	Forbes	Lucas (OK)
Bass	Fossella	Manzullo
Beauprez	Franks (AZ)	McCotter
Bereuter	Frelinghuysen	McCreery
Biggart	Galleghy	McHugh
Bilirakis	Garrett (NJ)	McInnis
Blackburn	Gerlach	McKeon
Blunt	Gibbons	Mica
Boehlert	Gilchrest	Miller (FL)
Boehner	Gillmor	Miller (MI)
Bonilla	Gingrey	Miller, Gary
Bonner	Goode	Moran (KS)
Bono	Goodlatte	Murphy
Boozman	Goss	Musgrave
Bradley (NH)	Granger	Myrick
Brady (TX)	Green (WI)	Nethercutt
Brown (SC)	Greenwood	Neugebauer
Brown-Waite,	Gutknecht	Ney
Ginny	Hall	Northup
Burgess	Harris	Norwood
Burns	Hart	Nunes
Burr	Hastings (WA)	Nussle
Burton (IN)	Hayes	Ose
Buyer	Hayworth	Otter
Calvert	Hefley	Oxley
Camp	Hergert	Paul
Cannon	Hobson	Pearce
Cantor	Hoekstra	Pence
Capito	Hostettler	Peterson (MN)
Carter	Houghton	Peterson (PA)
Castle	Hulshof	Petri
Chabot	Hunter	Pickering
Chocola	Hyde	Pitts
Coble	Isakson	Platts
Cole	Issa	Pombo
Collins	Istook	Porter
Cox	Jackson-Lee	Portman
Crane	(TX)	Pryce (OH)
Crenshaw	Janklow	Putnam
Cubin	Jenkins	Quinn
Culberson	Johnson (CT)	Radanovich
Cunningham	Johnson (IL)	Ramstad
Davis, Jo Ann	Johnson, Sam	Regula
Davis, Tom	Jones (NC)	Rehberg
Deal (GA)	Keller	Renzi
DeLay	Kelly	Reynolds
DeMint	Kennedy (MN)	Rogers (AL)
Diaz-Balart, L.	King (IA)	Rogers (KY)
Diaz-Balart, M.	King (NY)	Rogers (MI)
Doolittle	Kingston	Rohrabacher
Dreier	Kirk	Ros-Lehtinen
Duncan	Kline	Royce
Dunn	Knollenberg	Ryan (WI)
Ehlers	Kolbe	Ryan (KS)

Saxton  
Schrock  
Sensenbrenner  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Sherwood  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simmons  
Simpson  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Souder

## NOT VOTING—10

Bishop (UT)  
Gephardt  
Graves  
Hensarling

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LINDER) (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

## □ 1313

Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. COX changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. HINOJOSA changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."  
So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 417, nays 8, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 515]

## YEAS—417

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Allen  
Andrews  
Baca  
Bachus  
Baird  
Baker  
Baldwin  
Ballance  
Barrett (SC)  
Bartlett (MD)  
Barton (TX)  
Bass  
Beauprez  
Becerra  
Bell  
Bereuter  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Biggart  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blackburn  
Blumenauer  
Blunt  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bonner  
Bono  
Boozman  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boyd  
Bradley (NH)

Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Brown (OH)  
Brown (SC)  
Brown, Corrine  
Brown-Waite,  
Ginny  
Burgess  
Burns  
Burr  
Burton (IN)  
Buyer  
Calvert  
Camp  
Cannon  
Cantor  
Capito  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardin  
Cardoza  
Carson (IN)  
Carson (OK)  
Carter  
Case  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chocola  
Clay  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Cole  
Collins  
Cooper  
Costello  
Cox  
Cramer  
Crane  
Crenshaw  
Crowley  
Cubin

Vitter  
Walden (OR)  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Tauzin  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldo (PA)  
Weller  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wilson (NM)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wolf  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

Kennedy (RI)  
Lewis (GA)  
Osborne  
Pastor

Rush  
Sessions

Feeny  
Ferguson  
Filner  
Fletcher  
Folgy  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Lofgren  
Lowey  
Lucas (KY)  
Lucas (OK)  
Lynch  
Majette  
Maloney  
Manzullo  
Marshall  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (MO)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McCotter  
McCrery  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meeke (FL)  
Meeke (NY)  
Menendez  
Mica  
Michaud  
Millender  
McDonald  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, Gary  
Mollohan  
Moore  
Moran (KS)  
Moran (VA)  
Murphy  
Murtha  
Musgrave  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Nethercutt  
Neugebauer  
Ney  
Northup  
Norwood  
Nunes  
Nussle  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Ose  
Otter  
Owens  
Oxley  
Pallone  
Pascarella  
Payne  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Pence  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Platts  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Portman  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Putnam  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Renzi  
Reyes

Latham  
Leach  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Lofgren  
Lowey  
Lucas (KY)  
Lucas (OK)  
Lynch  
Majette  
Maloney  
Manzullo  
Marshall  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (MO)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McCotter  
McCrery  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meeke (FL)  
Meeke (NY)  
Menendez  
Mica  
Michaud  
Millender  
McDonald  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, Gary  
Mollohan  
Moore  
Moran (KS)  
Moran (VA)  
Murphy  
Murtha  
Musgrave  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Nethercutt  
Neugebauer  
Ney  
Northup  
Norwood  
Nunes  
Nussle  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Ose  
Otter  
Owens  
Oxley  
Pallone  
Pascarella  
Payne  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Pence  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Platts  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Portman  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Putnam  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Renzi  
Reyes

Reynolds  
Rodriguez  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Ryan (WI)  
Ryun (KS)  
Sabo  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sanders  
Sandlin  
Saxton  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schrock  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Sherman  
Sherwood  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simmons  
Simpson  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Solis  
Souder  
Spratt  
Stearns  
Stenholm  
Strickland  
Stupak  
Sullivan  
Sweeney  
Tancredo  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Terry  
Thomas  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Toomey  
Towns  
Turner (OH)  
Turner (TX)  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Upton  
Van Hollen  
Velazquez  
Visclosky  
Vitter  
Walden (OR)  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Waters  
Watson  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
Wexler  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wilson (NM)  
Wilson (SC)

## NAYS—8

Conyers  
Flake  
Hinchee

## NOT VOTING—9

Larson (CT)  
Markey  
Miller, George  
Hensarling  
LaTourette  
Lewis (GA)  
Osborne  
Pastor  
Sessions

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LINDER) (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

## □ 1320

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 857

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 857.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report to accompany H.R. 2657, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

## CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2657, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the previous order of the House, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2657) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of September 18, 2003 at page H 8385.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present the legislative branch appropriations