

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN MEMORY OF JOE LACEY

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 11, 2007

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a longtime San Francisco community leader and friend, Joe Lacey, who died on December 30, 2006.

Joseph Patrick Lacey's family moved to San Francisco in 1921. As a scholar athlete, Joe attended St. Ignatius High School and the University of Santa Clara on a football scholarship, playing in two Sugar Bowls. In 1940, Joe won the Pacific Coast Heavyweight Boxing Championship. In 1941, Joe played on an All Star Football team in Hawaii where he met his beloved wife of 55 years, Katharine Faye Dooling.

He served our Nation with distinction in the Navy on the USS *Yarnall* DD 541 in World War II participating in several Pacific battles, including Tarawa, Saipan, Guam, Iwo Jima and Okinawa, and again in the Korean War, serving on the USS *Walker*.

After the war, Joe began the next chapter of his life, starting a successful homebuilding company whose work includes thousands of homes in the San Francisco and Sacramento areas. Later in life, he taught special education in the Watsonville, Newark and San Francisco County school districts.

Joe was a life-long volunteer, dedicated to children and our city's most vulnerable residents. He was active in youth sports and a champion of San Francisco's homeless and elderly populations. He served on the boards of several non-profit organizations in San Francisco for more than 25 years, including Old St. Mary's Housing Committee, Catholic Charities, Senior Action Network, Planning for Elders and TURN.

Joe was well known in the halls of San Francisco city government buildings, representing nonprofit organizations. Mayor Willie Brown appointed Joe as a commissioner on the San Francisco Commission on Aging, where he proudly served until his death.

With great appreciation for his extraordinary work and service to our city and our Nation, I extend my deepest sympathy to his large and loving family. He will long be remembered by countless individuals whose lives he touched. He was a great friend to the people of San Francisco, and we are diminished by his passing.

IMPLEMENTING THE 9/11 COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS ACT OF 2007

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN L. MICA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 9, 2007

Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to bring to Members' attention a number of con-

cerns have with the aviation security, emergency preparedness, and port security provisions contained in H.R. 1, the "Implementing the 9/11 Commission Recommendations Act of 2007."

AVIATION SECURITY PROVISIONS

Almost all of the aviation security provisions in H.R. 1 address requirements previously authorized or mandated by the Republicans in the years since September 11th.

H.R. 1 sets up an unrealistic Cargo Inspection Program that will be impossible to implement without bringing commerce to a halt and diverts limited funding and attention from higher security threats. Even more, Congress already addressed this recommendation in the Intelligence Reform and Terrorist Prevention Act of 2004; provided \$200M each year 2005–2007 to improve cargo security and \$100M each year 2005–2007 for research and development.

H.R. 1 will require inspection or a physical search of each piece of cargo and will therefore bring commerce to a grinding halt.

H.R. 1 ignores risk assessments to date that cargo is not a high threat area. Rather, passenger and baggage screening has been and should continue to be the first priority. Yet, passenger security checkpoints are still using 1950's technology with little explosive detection capability. Currently, only 28 out of 441 commercial airports have full or partial in-line EDS. Of the largest 29 airports that handle 75% of all passengers, only 9 have full in-line EDS systems.

Additionally, even though it is NOT a 9/11 Commission Recommendation, H.R. 1 gives TSA employees collective bargaining which will keep in place a flawed system and negatively impact the introduction of much needed screening technology.

Only thing worse than government bureaucracy is entrenched government bureaucracy. Yet that is exactly what H.R. 1 is seeking to create. In fact, H.R. 1 ignores and reverses Congressional direction in the Aviation and Transportation Security Act that a flexible personnel management system is essential to TSA's critical national security role. H.R. 1 also ignores and reverses TSA's January 2003 determination that, ". . . individuals carrying out the security screening function . . ., in light of their critical national security responsibilities, shall not, . . . be entitled to engage in collective bargaining. . . ."

H.R. 1 will be costly and will keep in place a flawed, security system and deny the opportunity to put in place much needed screening technology. Europeans learned the hard way and moved from a government-run airport security system to a private system with government oversight. It looks like we are not learning from their efforts.

Finally, H.R. 1 does not address many important aviation security issues such as: Ensuring biometrics operations in identification and access control; deploying high technology solutions; improving pilots' licenses; setting a term for TSA Deputy Secretary position. We have had 4 different people in charge in the 5

years since the agency was created (Magaw, Loy, Stone and Hawley)—not counting when the post was unfilled. For instance, in 2001, the Democrat-lead Senate adjourned for the year without taking action to fill this post—the President had to make a recess appointment on January 7th, 2002.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PROVISIONS

The Post Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act and past appropriations bills already address most of the 9/11 Commission's first responder recommendations. Republicans already implemented comprehensive emergency management reform. Normal procedure and a committee markup would have allowed Congress to address the few inconsistencies with the Post Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act enacted by the last Congress.

H.R. 1 makes only minor emergency management reforms. Republicans enacted comprehensive emergency management reform last year in the Post Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act addressing interoperable communications, emergency preparedness standards and FEMA reform. H.R. 1 authorizes another grant program for communications equipment, providing for "such sums as necessary." This is just an authorization, not real money. In contrast, the Republicans passed a law that will allocate a portion of the digital spectrum sale to interoperable communications grants. This is real money, and will be a billion dollars.

H.R. 1 is a first step toward the Federal Government placing unfunded mandates for preparedness on private businesses. It is important for individuals and businesses to be prepared for disasters, but H.R. 1 includes a provision that is a first step toward the Federal government placing unfunded mandates for preparedness on private businesses. It goes well beyond any Congressionally-mandated role and inserts the Federal Government into state and local affairs.

PORT SECURITY PROVISIONS

Well before the 9/11 Commission's report in 2004, Congress recognized the potential for a maritime-based terrorist attack. In 2002, Congress adopted the Maritime Transportation Security Act which established a framework of comprehensive port and vessel security. Congress expanded the Act in 2004 and adopted the SAFE Port Act last year. The SAFE Port Act established a cargo scanning pilot program. That program will start scanning containers bound for the United States in at least 5 foreign ports later this year.

So, I am surprised to see the proposal to mandate 100 percent screening on the floor today. That is NOT the recommendation of the 9/11 Commission. The Commission recommends that the government "identify and evaluate the transportation assets that need to be protected, set risk-based priorities for defending them, select the most practical and cost-effective ways of doing so, and then develop a plan, budget, and funding to implement the effort." That isn't what this provision does.

While the proposal before us today would allow the existing pilot program to continue, it

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.