

NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. KERRY. Madam President, as one of the original authors and cosponsors of the Aviation Security Act, I take a moment to underscore where the Senate finds itself at this moment, which I find distressing and deeply frustrating and less than an adequate response to the compelling requests made by the President of the United States a few days ago in a joint session of Congress. Only a few days ago, the Senate came together with the House to listen to the President describe a war, to describe the most compelling circumstances this Nation has faced certainly since Pearl Harbor, and perhaps in its history in the context of the nature of the attack on New York City and the Pentagon.

There is a danger in raising the level of rhetoric and not meeting it with the actions that the American public understand are required of a nation facing urgent circumstances. It is extraordinary to me that the Senate is in gridlock. That is where we are, essentially, stopped cold in our capacity, not just to do the Airport Security Act and let the Senate vote its will, whatever that may be—I don't know what the outcome will be—but let the democratic process of the Senate work. Rather than trying to hold it up completely, to subject it to some kind of prenegotiation that appears to be impossible when we even have meetings canceled and there is no negotiating going on.

We tried to go forward on the foreign ops bill. I cannot think of a bill, second to the Department of Defense authorization we just passed a few days ago, that is more important in the context of the circumstances in which we find ourselves. But we are not even permitted to proceed forward with that because, essentially, once again politics and ideology are rearing their heads with a stubbornness that suggests that a few Members of the Senate are unwilling to allow the entire Senate to work its will. What an incredible display at a time when the world is watching the greatest deliberative body, and the greatest nation on the face of this planet with its democracy, try to work effectively to respond to these needs. What is even more incredible to me is that common sense tells us what the realities are with respect to airport security and, I might add, rail security in this country.

We woke up this morning to the news that an airliner apparently has exploded and gone down over the Black Sea, a Russian airliner. We do not know yet to a certainty that it is terrorism, but we do know the early indicators of an eye witness report from the pilot in another aircraft is that he saw it explode and saw it disintegrate and go down into the sea. And Russian President Putin has said it appears as if there is some act of terrorism.

Leaving that aside, we have promised the American people we are going to provide them, not with a level of security, not with some sort of half-breed sense that we have arrived at a notion of what is acceptable, but we are going to provide the best security, the fullest level of security we are capable of imagining, that is well within the reach of this country and well within our capacity to afford.

I might add, what we are suggesting we want to provide to Americans, in terms of security, they have already suggested they are willing to pay for several times over. This is not a question of cost. It is not a question of our inability to afford this. It is a question of politics, ideology.

We have some in the Senate who do not like the idea that there might be more Federal employees, that there might be more people who might join a union even, that there might be more people who somehow might not have their political point of view but who nevertheless might perform an important function for our country. When I was in the military, what I learned about, sort of a hierarchy and about authority and about training and management, is that there is a brilliant effectiveness to the chain of command and to the manner in which a Federal entity is organized or a law enforcement entity is organized.

I do not think anybody in this body would suggest we ought to be contracting out the responsibilities of the Border Patrol, or contracting out the responsibilities of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, or contracting out the security of the Capitol, the security of the White House, or the security of a number of other efforts. But they are prepared to contract out to the lowest bidder, with unskilled workers, the security of Americans flying, notwithstanding everything we have learned. That is just unacceptable. It is unacceptable.

I hear all kinds of excuses being made: There are transition problems; you might have contractors quit in the meantime. First of all, at a time of high unemployment and rising unemployment, I think common sense would tell us most of those contractors would leap at the opportunity to have a better-paid job and to get more training and they will stick on the job because they will be part of an important security corps of the United States of America and they would want to be part of that. And, incidentally, they would want to be part of it because they would then have the possibility of having benefits they do not get today, which is one of the reasons we have employees, notwithstanding all of their best efforts and all of their best intentions, who are, many of them, simply not fully enough trained or prepared to do the job they are being asked to do. It is not their fault, but it is the nature of the pay scale.

If you were to compare the difference between the civilian nuclear industry and the military nuclear industry—i.e., the U.S. Navy on ships—we have not had major incidents on ships of the U.S. Navy. We have had Navy ships running nuclear reactors, and highly successfully, for years now: Submarines, aircraft carriers, cruisers, and others. But the military has an unlimited human personnel capacity for redundancy, for certitude in the human checks, and therefore is capable of providing a kind of safety net that you cannot provide in the private sector because the private sector is always thinking about the shareholders, the return on investment, the cashflow, and the capacity to do it. So you do not get that kind of redundancy often unless it is required.

The same thing is true of the checking of the security process of people boarding aircraft. Moreover, we have now learned that this is something more than just a job, significantly more than just a job. It is part of the national security framework of our country. It is the way in which we will prevent a plane from being used as a bomb or a plane from simply being blown up, or passengers from being terrorized in some form or another. Passengers deserve the greatest sense of safety in traveling.

For those who are concerned about the economy, there is not one of us who has not been visited in the last weeks by members of the auto rental industry, restaurant industry, travel industry, hotels, and countless mayors who are concerned about the flow of tourist traffic to their cities. We need to get Americans to believe in the level of safety that their Government is providing for them.

It is extraordinary to me. We have been through this period of time where government has been so denigrated. We have had a long debate in this Senate with people arguing so forcefully the adage: It is not the Government's money, it is your money and you deserve a refund. But at the same time, you know, they are incapable of doing without the very people who have put on displays of courage that have been absolutely extraordinary over these last weeks. That was government people, paid by government money, who ran into those buildings to save lives in New York. It has been government people paid by government money who have saved so many people in the course of these weeks. It has been government people paid by government money who organized and managed people who have been homeless, people who searched for their loved ones, people who needed some kind of comfort. It has been a government display, if you will, of the effectiveness of money well spent when we invest it properly.

The same thing is true of airport security. I want to just highlight the differences between what is being proposed by those of us who think we need to have a Federal structure versus what the administration has currently offered. With respect to turnover, we raise the wages. We raise the wages to a level that would put the employees on a Federal civil pay scale. That means you will attract more qualified people and you will have a right to be able to raise the standards and raise the demands of performance, which is precisely what the American people want.

Under the administration's current proposal, they will only increase the wages and benefits if the legislation specifically mandates a living wage and health benefits for the employees. So there is no demand that the wages be raised. They want to leave it to the lowest bid process unless somehow there is a specific statement to the contrary.

With respect to training, we create a stepped scale based on management responsibilities and seniority so there is an incentive within the structure for people to assume management responsibilities, to become supervisors and to actually supervise with something more than 3 months on the job. Currently the turnover rate at Atlanta airport, Hartsfield Airport in Atlanta, is 400 percent. The turnover in New York, Boston, and Los Angeles ranges between 100 percent and 200 percent, 300 percent—extraordinary turnover rates.

You can't expect somebody to be on the job at low pay and be able to provide the kind of skill necessary to read the x-ray machine properly, to profile a person, to see suspect activity, or even to make the kind of personal searches necessary when that is needed.

Under the administration's current offer, the wage scale and the management decisions are left to the low bid contractor. Secretary Mineta was in front of our committee just the other day. I asked him specifically: Mr. Secretary, isn't it true that all of these companies are basically in a position where they take on the lowest bid, and it is a bid process that encourages low bids so that they can survive? He said yes. Jane Garvey said yes. That is precisely what the current proposal will continue.

It is simply impossible to build more rail, or gain the kind of efficiency, or gain the kind of accountability and manage this process effectively if we are not prepared to have a Federal civil service structure for these employees.

I might add that while the Europeans have a slightly amalgamated system, they have wage laws and they have labor laws that we do not have that guarantee the kind of pay structures and accountability structures which we are seeking in our approach.

While there is a distinction, it is really a distinction without a dif-

ference because in the end they have achieved the kind of Federal vision and the kind of employee quality which they have been able to attract as a consequence of the ingredients they put together.

For instance, Belgium has an hourly pay of \$14 to \$15, they have health benefits, and they have a turnover rate of less than 4 percent. The Netherlands: \$7.50 an hour; England \$8 an hour; in France, they receive an extra month's pay for each 12 months of work, and less than a 50-percent turnover rate plus health benefits.

We are looking at an extraordinary difference between what European countries are able to do as they face these kinds of terrorism, and they have much stricter standards than we have for a longer period of time.

It is imperative that we in the Senate get about the business of responding properly to the demands we face with respect to the security of our airports.

It seems to me that the transitional issues are easy to work out. It is certainly, first of all, normal to assume that those people who are under contract now will still be under contract. If they breach it, I think the full wrath of the Government and the American people would be ready to come down on them, not to mention the lawsuits for breach of contract, and not to mention the loss of jobs for all the employees.

Those transitional problems that are being conjured up simply don't hold up to scrutiny. The American public knows that if we had a Federal civil service corps which we could put under homeland defense, or where we could put it under the Defense Department, if the Department of Transportation is uncomfortable with it, what better an area for the security of our airports?

There is no distinction between providing security for our borders with the Border Patrol on the ground and providing security for our air traffic and for those people who fly through the air across those borders. It is the same concept. I think most people in the country understand that.

I hope the Senate is going to quickly get enough business of paying attention to this issue and resolving it today. It has been 3 weeks now. One would have thought this would have been one of the first things we would have done almost by edict and that it would have initially been on the table.

We have seen the extraordinary process of sort of back and forth going on now as to whether or not we ought to do it. I don't think this enters into the realm of politics. I don't think security has a label of Democrat or Republican on it. It has a common sense label.

What is the best way to guarantee that you are going to have security in an airport? If you have a whole bunch of different companies, each of which bid, even if you have the Federal stand-

ards, even if you have Federal supervision, they are hired by private sector entities. They belong in one airport to one group and in another airport to another group. You don't get the esprit de corps. You don't get the horizontal and vertical accountability and management that you get by having the civil service standard. That is why we have an INS. That is why we have a Border Patrol. That is why we have an ATF. That is why we have all of these other entities that are either State or Federal law enforcement entities, because they guarantee the capacity of the chain of command, they guarantee accountability, they guarantee the training, and they guarantee ultimately that we will give the American people the security they need.

I want to add one other thing. It is not on this bill. I think we have to pass this bill rapidly. There is a whole different group within the Senate who, because of their opposition to trains, Amtrak, ports and so forth, somehow have a cloudy view of what we may need to do to provide security for our rails. But there is absolutely no distinction whatsoever between those who get on an airplane and travel and those who get on a train and travel. In point of fact, there are more people in a tunnel at one time on two trains passing in that tunnel than there are on several 747s in the sky at the same moment—thousands of people. We have already seen what a fire in a tunnel can do in Baltimore. We have tunnels up and down the east coast. We have bridges. All of these, if we are indeed facing the kind of long-term threat that people have talked about—and we believe we are—need to have adequate security.

I was recently abroad, and I got on a train. I went through the exact same security procedures to get on that train as I do in an airport under the strictest examination—interview, examination of ID, and thorough inspection and screening of your bags. You can walk down to Union Station, go to any train station in America, and pile on with a bag. You can get off at any station and leave your bag on the train. Nobody will know the difference.

We have an absolute responsibility in the Senate to be rapid in resolving this question of train security just as we are trying to resolve this question of airline security.

A lot of these ideas have been around for a long time. We have always had the ugly head of bureaucracy raising its objections for one reason or another against common sense. We are not even looking for the amount of money that almost every poll in the country has said the American people are prepared to spend. Ask anybody. Ask any of the families in New York, or in Washington, or any part of this country who suffered a loss on September 11, what they would be willing to pay on any

ticket to guarantee that they knew their loved ones were safe. We are talking about a few dollars per ticket to be able to guarantee that we have the strongest capacity and never again have an incident in the air, certainly because we weren't prepared to do what was necessary.

There is no more urgent business before the Senate today. I hope the Senate will quickly restore itself as it was in the last few weeks to be able to discard ideology, discard politics, and discard sort of the baggage of past years to be able to find the unity and the common sense that have guided us these days and which have made the Nation proud. We need to do what provides the greatest level of security in our country, and that means a Federal system of screeners, and most of those people responsible for access to our aircraft and other forms of travel.

I yield the floor.

MILLIKEN JOINS HALL OF FAME FOR TEXTILES

Mr. HELMS. Madam President, on September 10, Roger Milliken, a distinguished American, was inducted as a charter member of the Textile Hall of Fame in Lowell, MA.

Roger Milliken has long been a leader in the textile industry and his induction as a charter member of the Textile Hall of Fame was well-deserved. But Roger Milliken is far more than an outstanding American industry leader. He is a true patriot, and his love of country constantly manifests itself in countless ways.

Roger Milliken's genuine commitment to the health of the American economy is unfailing and unyielding. It is typical of his nature and his fidelity to his country that he used the occasion of his induction into the Textile Hall of Fame to sound a warning about the continuing erosion of the U.S. manufacturing base—and the hollowing-out of the U.S. economy—by the displacement of solid manufacturing jobs in America to low-wage paying countries all over the world.

You see, Roger Milliken has steadfastly supported keeping American manufacturing strong but too often, his wise counsel has gone unheeded by the so-called "trade experts."

But make no mistake, in the name of globalization, our trade policy is, in fact, encouraging overproduction, as subsidized foreign industries flood the global market and bring prices in this country below the cost of domestic production.

The economic threat has been eating away at our manufacturing base slowly but surely. In this year alone, the malignancy will result in the loss of 1 million American manufacturing jobs. In the U.S. textile industry, more than 600,000 jobs have been lost since NAFTA and the Uruguay Round's

Agreement on Textiles and Clothing became effective in 1995.

Sadly, precious little attention is being paid to the real victims of this trade policy: the small towns and medium-sized cities throughout America devastated by plant closings and job losses. The textile and apparel industry in the South is only one part of the tragedy. The same can be said of the auto industry, the steel industry, and even the high-tech semiconductor industry in California.

Roger Milliken's eloquent statement on behalf of American manufacturing rings clear, and it merits the attention of the Senate. I therefore ask that excerpts from the Milliken statement—entitled "The Wealth of Nations: U.S. Manufacturing in Serious Trouble" be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE WEALTH OF NATIONS: U.S. MANUFACTURING IN SERIOUS TROUBLE

(By Roger Milliken)

Today almost all of the manufacturing industries in the United States are in serious trouble. I would like to take this time and this place to light a fire of debate on the serious consequences of that statement on the future of our country. . . .

Thanks to Thomas Edison's invention of the electric light, our industry learned in World War I that textile machinery could run at night as well as during 12-hour day-time-only shifts.

At the end of that war, we found ourselves with 18 million spindles in place north of the Mason-Dixon line and 18 million spindles south of the Mason-Dixon line, all of which could be run around the clock. Our production capacity had been doubled.

Seventy years later, 1990, after a long period of fair competition, we found ourselves with 18 million modernized, surviving spindles in the South and 800,000 in the North, producing more products and higher quality than the 36 million spindles after World War I.

Today we are told that during that period the U.S. went from an agrarian economy to an industrial economy and that we are now similarly transitioning to an information-based economy.

As I see it, the main thing wrong with that comparison is that in the first transition our country did not lose either the farms or the products of those farms. In fact, agricultural production increased as new technologies were introduced. Today, our country continues to produce a surplus of agricultural goods.

During the current transition, the U.S. is losing both its manufacturing plants and the products manufactured in them, as well as the jobs they provide—thus putting at risk our leadership position as the strongest manufacturing economy in the world.

GLOBALIZATION'S FATAL FLAWS

Our founding fathers, specifically Alexander Hamilton, understood the importance of manufacturing. The second act of the First Congress imposed tariffs on manufactured goods from abroad. This encouraged our new nation, and its people, to develop our own manufacturing base rather than merely exporting low-value raw materials to our former colonial masters and importing

back from them the high value-added finished goods. . . .

Now as our country stands alone as the world's last remaining superpower, we in textiles and almost all of U.S. manufacturing find ourselves at risk of losing what our forefathers fought so hard to create. This is neither necessary nor wise.

. . . At the current rate, we may end this decade with as few as seven economically viable manufacturing industries remaining in America.

A recent survey of manufacturing revealed that 36 of our 44 existing manufacturing industries had an adverse balance of trade and had cut substantial numbers of jobs this year. The hemorrhage continues.

All U.S. manufacturing employment is shrinking at a pace which will eliminate 1 million high-paying, middle-class jobs this year alone. This is four times what we lost in the year 2000. Actual employment levels in our vitally important manufacturing sector have already fallen to levels last seen in 1963.

We are in an era of so-called globalization, and everyone talks about the new economy. We have been lured into thinking that the negative aspects of these trends are both unstoppable and inexorable.

Isn't it our leaders' responsibility to ensure that this country and its people survive this period strong and prosperous?

A fatal flaw of the current idea of globalization is the lack of recognition that subsidized global production creates a strong incentive to create overproduction that outstrips global demand.

A further flaw is the lack of recognition that in emerging economies the people and manufacturing production workers are not paid enough to buy what they make. Instead, the fruits of their labor are subsidized and shipped to the United States, which serves as the market of first and last resort.

In the process, our standard of living is undermined, and both political and economic instability is increased. . . .

Mounting consumer debt helped fuel the boom of the 1990s. Despite strong productivity growth, the 80 percent of our country's wage earners and their families who work for others have not seen an increase in their real income over the past 20 years.

As increase in purchasing power stagnated because of the massive shifts of good, well-paying jobs to low-cost emerging economies, we continued our growth of consumer spending, but we did it on credit. Consequently, the American consumers have been spending more than their earnings at the expense of savings. The result is that we are consuming a billion dollars more in manufactured goods each day than we produce. These facts are a prescription for social, political and economic unrest.

Our manufacturing base is being eroded as dollars are diverted from wealth creation to wealth consumption. If economic history has any lesson for us, it is that a nation's well-being is determined by what it produces, not by how much it consumes.

ALTAR OF FREE AND UNFETTERED TRADE

While technologies always present new opportunities and challenges, globalism is not a new idea. It was born around the time of Columbus, and most of world politics has been about how to control it ever since. Past and present administrations in Washington seem to think globalization is something new for which the lessons of history are irrelevant.

George Santayana is quoted as saying, "Those who can't remember the past are condemned to repeat it."