

to have been leading an assault on a Presidential foreign policy. We have a tradition of deferring to Presidents in foreign policy, indeed excessively, it seems to me, in many cases because legitimate differences ought to be articulated.

Eddie Boland, as the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from California just said, did a great deal to legitimize the notion that in a democratic society, elected officials had not only the right but the duty to speak out if they thought the President was pursuing gravely mistaken foreign policies. The fact that Ed Boland did that and did that with his dignity and with his respect for this institution and with all of the cultural attributes that he brought to the job really did, as the gentleman said, give it the imprimatur, or did give it a legitimacy.

What that meant was this. It meant we could argue it on the merits. Too often when we are dealing with an issue like this, there is a whole set of deferences, a whole set of attitudes that interfere. Ed Boland's stature in this institution was justifiably of sufficient weight so that when he spoke on that issue, he overcame those deferences and we got to the merits, and he did a great service. He was also, of course, defending the prerogatives of the elected legislature against the executive, and in that also he was carrying on in the tradition of great parliamentarians.

Finally, as someone who has been concerned with housing policy since I got here, I want to acknowledge his great leadership as subcommittee Chair in terms of recognizing the obligation of this very wealthy country to do something about the housing needs of the people. We look back now to the days of Ed Boland's chairmanship of the appropriations subcommittee dealing with HUD as golden days when we in fact did far more to meet vital social needs than we are doing today, unfortunately. And there are a lot of reasons for that. But Ed Boland's committed and passionate advocacy, and you can be passionate without making a lot of noise, you can be passionate by having an unstinting, unyielding determination to do the right thing; and that is what he had.

As my friend from Massachusetts has said, he and I are the last two Members who served with Ed Boland and know just what integrity he brought to this job and just to what extent he exemplified what an elected representative of the people ought to be in a functioning democracy. I thank the gentleman for giving me the opportunity to say this.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I thank all of the Members who have participated in this Special Order.

We will keep this part of the RECORD open so that any other Members who wish to do so may enter their own statement.

Eddie Boland's career ended the way it began. He worked tirelessly in order to make the world a better place. I am proud to have known him. I am proud to have worked with him. I am proud to have served with him in this institution that he loved so much. I am proud to have called him my friend. His service to this country will never be forgotten. Our condolences to his wife, Mary, and his children.

May Eddie Boland rest in peace.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the life of public service and passing of Congressman Edward "Eddie" P. Boland. Congressman Boland was a humble statesman who moved legislative mountains and earned the respect of his colleagues with a polite manner and solemn regard for this body.

He received his education from Springfield's Bay Path Institute and Boston College Law School. The son of an Irish immigrant railroad worker, he would later establish himself as a community leader. Boland began his life of public service at the age of twenty-three when elected to the Massachusetts House of Representatives. Later, he was elected as the Hampden County register of deeds. In 1942, he enlisted in the Army to fight tyranny in the Pacific theater of World War II and was promoted to captain.

In 1952, Eddie Boland won election to Massachusetts' second congressional district seat in the U.S. House of Representatives. During his 36 years in the House, Congressman Boland became the Chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and of the VA, HUD and Independent Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee. Developing the necessary trust between his committee and the intelligence community and an acceptance of the need for Congressional oversight were hallmarks of his Chairmanship. Furthermore he was a steadfast advocate for individual's privacy rights and providing informative but discreet intelligence information to the public. Among this most notable legislative achievements was passage of the Boland amendments which restricted the use of U.S. funds by Nicaragua's Contra rebels and lay at the heart of the "Iran-Contra" scandal.

Although Congressman Boland rose to become a figure of national prominence, he never lost sight of his modest beginnings in the Hungry Hill district of Springfield, Massachusetts. Congressman Edward P. Boland is survived by his wife Mary Egan, and four children. His legacy to our nation is a model of leadership born from quiet dignity and integrity.

#### AIRLINE SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIBERI). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) is recognized for the balance of the hour, approximately 28 minutes.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I have come to the floor this evening to comment on what I believe is a major, major step forward in our national security and, that is, the imminent pas-

sage of our airline security bill. Our conferees, we have been told, have been successful in ironing out a bill that I think is a real major step forward in several respects. I would like to talk about two of those ways that this bill is really going to advance Americans' sense of security and hopefully instill a fair measure of confidence in airline travel.

The first is that our efforts have been successful to make sure that 100 percent of the checked baggage that goes into the belly of our airplanes in fact will be screened for explosive devices. This is a major step forward to give the traveling public the assurance that any bag that is going to go into the luggage compartment of an airplane, we are going to be assured, does not have an explosive device in it. Given the nature of the threat, it is high time that the U.S. Congress has passed such a measure. We are told now that our conferees in both parties, in the House and Senate, have agreed on a measure that will set a deadline for the actual implementation of 100 percent screening for checked baggage. We also are told that we are going to have interim measures while we get to that 100 percent use by mechanical devices, by some of the sophisticated machinery, to be assured that we cannot see a plane taken down out of the sky.

This has been the result of a lot of effort here in Congress, but I want to pay a real congratulatory note to two gentlemen who have been working for over a decade now to achieve that end, and those gentlemen are Bob Monetti and George Williams, two gentlemen each of whom lost a son in the Lockerbie bombing in Scotland in 1988. Bob Monetti, who lost his son Rick, a Syracuse student, in that bombing and Mr. Monetti since then has been working with the community of families that lost members in the Lockerbie bombing to try to get this Chamber, the U.S. House, and the Senate, to pass a provision to assure that that type of tragedy cannot happen again.

I have met Mr. Monetti; he is a great leader in this regard and has been a conscience of his community to see to it that the House of Representatives would act. I have also met Mr. George Williams, who lost his son Geordie, an American soldier, Mr. Williams, a proud Marine. I really want to thank Mr. Williams for his efforts to make sure that the U.S. Congress would finally act to see to it that other family members do not have to suffer a loss that they have done. I think it is a real mark of tribute to these families that they have hung in this effort for over 10 years to see to it that the Congress would finally act.

Now in the next day or two, we will be voting on a provision that will finally achieve their goal of having 100 percent screening. I want to thank Mr. Monetti and Mr. Williams and all of

the Lockerbie families for their efforts to educate us in Congress about the need for this. I hope they take some measure of satisfaction. I know Rick and Geordie would be real proud of their fathers when this bill passes, as we were of them.

I also want to thank some of our co-sponsors, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND), a Democrat, who has insisted on this; the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), a Republican. The gentleman from Connecticut has been a great, great leader on many reform efforts. He has been instrumental in convincing some of the leadership on the Republican side of the aisle in including this measure in the eventual airline security bill. I consider this a bipartisan success through the efforts of the gentleman from Connecticut and several other Republicans, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and others on our side of the aisle who have gotten this in. We are happy that we have finally achieved this end, that we can now tell Americans that they will be able to have the peace of mind when they get on an airplane that we are not going to have explosives in the belly of the airplane.

There are a couple of things we hope that both our conferees, if this has not been totally finalized, and our friends at the FAA and the Department of Transportation need to be attentive to, and, that is, that we need to very quickly evaluate the screening devices for various types of technology to make sure that we use the most effective, the fastest, the most efficient, the most cost-effective means of screening this baggage. We brought to the Cannon House Office Building last week some new technology that we hope that the FAA will look at very closely when we choose which types of screening machines to use. We want the FAA to be very open in its assessment so we have the fair opportunity to assess all of the technologies, and there are several types of machines that use several types of technology to determine whether there is an explosive device in a bag. We are going to be working diligently with the FAA to make sure that they have a fair evaluation process to decide which type of technology to implement throughout our Nation's airports. In doing that, we are going to be very insistent that we fully mobilize the industrialized base of the United States.

Some time ago, the FAA talked about getting this done in 10 years or more, to get enough machines in our airports to get this done. We are not going to wait that long. We need to do the same kind of industrialization and mobilization that happened in World War II. We built about 10 or 12,000 B-24s in World War II when we fully mobilized our industrial base. We have got to do the same thing with these machines. We need a couple of thousand of

them, and we need to find the licensing and a contractual way to fully engage the manufacturers of this country to get this done right away. We are going to be very insistent on that. We look forward to working with our agencies to make sure we make this decision promptly and in a way that gets the best technology into our airports.

The other aspect of this bill that we are very, very pleased about is that it will have a quantum leap forward in the quality of screening of the individuals who screen passengers when they go through these screening gates heading for their airplanes. We have had such a litany of failure. We have had such a disastrous experience with private companies, low-bid contractors, who have allowed these types of failures to occur. Now we have finally agreed and our conferees have agreed to essentially ensure that we will have Federal employees who, in fact, will man these stations in the next 2 years. We are very happy that that assurance will be given to the traveling public. It is time that we have the same level of protection of folks when they get on airplanes as we do when we have folks coming across our borders, namely, we have Federal employees who have been certified and trained, that work for Uncle Sam; the same type of assurance we have with FBI agents; the same type of assurance we have for fire and police personnel who work for the public and are certified and trained appropriately. We are going to require that and that that will happen.

As you know, as with any legislative process, there has been some give and take in fashioning that, the give and take as some of the Republican leadership has resisted this idea, and we have been told that in this provision, there will be a provision that 2 years from now, airports that wanted to petition the agency to have a private contractor do this work, if they can convince the agency that that was a good idea, they would at least allow that argument to be made. But with all due respect, we do not think there is going to be any such petitions because the traveling public is going to learn that the best way to get this done is to have Federal employees to do it, and we are confident that that is going to be the case; and we feel good about the strides that have been made.

We want to compliment our friends across the aisle who showed some bold leadership to move this effort forward. I see the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE) here. I do not know if he wants to join in this colloquy or not, but I would be happy to yield to him if he would like to join me in this regard. Mr. GANSKE. I appreciate the recognition.

On September 11 when we saw the airplane fly into the World Trade Center after the first one had already struck the first building and we kept

seeing it and seeing it again and again on TV, it really brought home the fact that an airplane full of jet fuel is a flying bomb and we lost 5,000 plus American lives in that attack on our country, really more than twice as many American citizens as we lost in the attack on Pearl Harbor.

□ 1845

So, Congress has been struggling a little bit to come to a resolution on how to improve the security in our Nation's airports and on our airplanes, and I applaud the conference committee for coming together on this issue.

What we really need is, we need secure cockpits, we need more air marshals. Those things will be achieved in this bill. We need to make sure that people getting on to airplanes do not carry weapons. We need to make sure that the luggage that gets stored in the belly of those airplanes does not have a bomb.

That means that the people who screen the people walking on the planes and the people that screen the baggage need to be professionals. Unfortunately, we have had a situation in this country where, largely, the screening has been done by three foreign corporations, hiring people at the minimum wage, not doing security background checks, being fined millions and millions of dollars and still not correcting their operations, being fined by the FAA.

This is not just a problem in the United States. Securicorp, the parent company of Argenbright, has had the same types of problems at Heathrow in England. So, since September 11 we have seen more than 70 violations where people have gotten on to airplanes or gotten through the screeners carrying such things as seven knives, a can of mace and a stun gun, as an example.

It is clear that we need to improve the performance, professionalize those screeners. We made strong arguments here on the floor of the House a week or so ago that the proper way to do that is to transfer that responsibility from the airports and the airlines to the Federal Government.

The bill that we voted on, some of us voted for on the House floor, would have moved that to the Department of Justice, as the bill which passed originally in the Senate. In this compromise, that will still be handled under the Department of Transportation. However, all of these screeners will now be Federal employees.

But there are important provisions in this conference bill that duplicate some of the provisions we had in the Senate bill.

Number one, those screeners cannot go on strike. They just cannot walk off the job.

Number two, if they are not performing the job, then they get fired.

They get laid off immediately and can be fired, because under the terms and conditions of this conference report, they will not be under regular civil service rules. So they will be the what are excepted government employees, E-X-C-E-P-T-E-D, government employees. This will be the same whether you are talking about a big airport, one of our hubs or our smaller airports.

I think this is a good thing coming out of the conference, because we learned from September 11 that we also need to have very good security at our smaller airports, because some of those terrorists enter the system through the smaller airports, and, once they are passed the screeners, then they do not get examined again.

So what the thrust of this conference report will do is to make sure that these screeners get professional training, that they meet professional standards, that they will make a decent living wage, so that they do not just run down the hallway and take the next job that is open at McDonald's, that they will view themselves as a professional in terms of law enforcement, similar to what we have with Customs inspectors and officials.

That changes the whole mind set of the people who do those jobs. I think it is very, very important. Yet, at the same time this conference report, this compromise, addresses concerns that people had with regular civil service, in that they were worried that if a person was not doing their job, that you could not get them off the job or replaced in a reasonable period of time. Because this is a job, these screener jobs are, in my opinion, professional law enforcement-type jobs, and I think we learned on September 11 that, you know, aviation security is a matter of national security, and national security is something that we all take an oath to uphold when we say that we will defend the Constitution, because the Constitution says that we will do our best job to secure the protection and the national defense.

So, I, too, am pleased with the conference report that we are going to vote on tomorrow. I expect we will have an overwhelming vote for this conference report, President Bush will sign it, and we will start to get on our way to having better security.

I think the gentleman was absolutely correct, it will take a little while to transition. You know, there will be some mistakes made. Nobody and no system is perfect. But the question is, will we have a better system? And I think this conference report will do that.

Mr. INSLEE. I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue. It is a very difficult position, and the gentleman did an admirable job getting this issue before on your side of the aisle. We appreciate that very much.

I would now like to yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND),

who has been a cosponsor of the bill that started the 100 percent checked baggage requirement going and the amendment.

Mr. STRICKLAND. I want to thank my friend from Washington State. You know, oftentimes when we stand in this chamber, we find that we are being critical of each other. But I would like to begin my statement by just pointing out that the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE) has been really wonderful on this issue.

I am a Democrat, you are a Republican. But I have observed you during the course of your tenure in this House, and not only on this issue, but on the Patients' Bill of Rights and on many other issues. The gentleman has been such a worthy Member and has fought for really good causes. I thank you for your great efforts on this legislation.

I also want to thank my friend from Washington State (Mr. INSLEE). I really believe that the emphasis on screening all of the baggage that goes into the belly of our airplanes, which has been included in this compromise, I believe that provision perhaps would not have been included had it not been for your efforts.

So I suppose this is an evening when we stand on this floor and, instead of being critical or talking about the things that we wish would happen, we in a sense celebrate the fact that, after weeks of work, that we have been able to reach a compromise. But it is not a compromise on safety, it is a compromise on strategy and process.

I think what we have done is come up with a bill that will make the American traveling public much safer. That is something that both sides of this chamber should feel good about.

I do not think either side, Democrat or Republican, can claim total victory in terms of getting their particular point of view put forth in this compromise, but I do think this is an example of how the process can work and should work. It has worked with this issue, and it is my hope that in the remaining days of this session of our Congress, that this kind of process could work to get a Patients' Bill of Rights brought before us, to get an education bill brought before us. We still have some time remaining before we have to draw this session to a close, and the fact is that we will get nowhere as long as we are unbending and uncompromising. But if we work together for the good of the country, I think we can accomplish a great deal of good.

So I feel some relief tonight. I stood last week where the gentleman is standing, and I said that if the American people will just simply allow their voices to be heard, if they will communicate their strong desire for an airline security bill to the Members of the House and the Senate, that we can get this done before we leave here.

I believe over the last several days the American people have expressed themselves very clearly and very strongly. They want to feel that it is safe to get on an American airliner and fly. They want to know if they put their families on that airliner, that everything that can be done has been done to see that their family members are going to be safe. They want this chamber to work together cooperatively to do the people's business.

So, as we found out throughout the course of this day, we have been able to accomplish that, and tomorrow I think we are going to have a very strong vote on this bill, the President will sign it, and we can say to the American people and to our individual constituencies that we have done our part to make sure that they are safe when they fly.

Is it perfect? No, it is not. Will it solve all the problems? No, it will not. There will be no perfect solution to the problem of airline security.

One of the things that I continue to be concerned about, as I know my friend from Washington State is concerned about, is whether or not we are moving as expeditiously, as rapidly as we should, to make sure that all the luggage that is placed on our airlines, all of that luggage is screened for explosive devices.

But this is a major step forward, and I believe we eventually will get to the point where people can say that my government has done all that it can do to make sure that I am safe when I get on an airliner.

Mr. INSLEE. I thank the gentleman, and I appreciate all your great work. When we started this dialogue several weeks ago, it was a little bit lonely talking about that checked baggage. But I agree with the gentleman: The American voice was heard. We shared some information with America, namely, that not enough of these bags were being screened. Americans responded, they let their legislators know what they thought, and we have this product.

So we want to thank Americans for their part in achieving this end, and we will look forward now to passage of this in the next day or two, and realize that we have a real step forward in airline security.

Mr. STRICKLAND. If I could just say another word, I mentioned earlier the tenacious fight of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE) for a strong Patients' Bill of Rights. Perhaps the American people can do for a Patients' Bill of Rights what they have done for airline security legislation if they just simply let their Member of Congress or they let their Senator know how important this is.

I stood on this floor a few weeks ago and I talked about one of my constituents, a young woman, 41 years of age, whose name was Patsy Haines. She had leukemia, and she needed a transplant,

a bone marrow transplant. She had a brother who was a perfect match. The insurance company was saying to her they were not going to pay for it.

I went to the James Cancer Center in Columbus, Ohio, a wonderful institution where they do great research. I talked with cancer specialists. They talked with my constituent, these wonderful well-trained doctors and researchers. They talked with my constituent, they talked with her personal physician, and they concurred that she needed this transplant, and, if she received it, she quite possibly would be cured of her condition and live a long life, and the chances were if she did not receive this treatment, that she almost certainly at some point in the future would lose her life.

I went to Secretary Thompson and talked with him about it, and he was wonderfully sympathetic. In fact, I wrote the Secretary a letter today thanking him for his concern for Patsy Haines.

But the fact is that the only way she got this surgery, and, by the way she got her surgery last week and we are staying in touch on a daily basis to see how she is doing, but the way she got her surgery was for Uncle Sam to come along and provide it. The Medicare system provided this surgery. Her insurance company never relented. So here Uncle Sam comes to the rescue.

But when I think of Patsy Haines and her critical condition tonight, and our great hope that she is going to recover and continue to be a wife and a mother to her child, I am reminded that there are many people in this country who face similar circumstances and who need the protection that this House of Representatives can give them.

So I just hope that the people in this country, as they did with the airline security bill, will contact Senators and Congress Members and say get this bill passed so that we can know that we are being protected in terms of our health care.

Mr. GANSKE. If the gentleman would yield further, I thank the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Washington for their kind words.

The economy is in a real slump right now, and insurance premiums have gone up a lot. People are being laid off work. So there is a real problem with access to health care. However, as those HMOs start to squeeze down, I predict that we are going to see more and more examples again of people not getting the type of necessary medical care that they deserve and that they pay a lot of premiums for.

I assure the gentleman that we will continue to push continue to push for a strong Patients' Bill of Rights. The conference has not even yet been named, partly, I think, because of September 11 and because we have had to deal with a number of emergent issues, such as aviation security, and also

something I am going to speak about in the next half-hour or so, bioterrorism. But that does not mean that when we come back after Christmas, the beginning of next year, that we should not refocus attention on some of these issues that we have debated in the past.

I would encourage the gentlemen to listen to part of my next half-hour or so, because I am going to be introducing tomorrow, along with the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY), the companion bill to the Kennedy-Frist bioterrorism bill, which does a number of good things to try to address the issue of bioterrorism.

□ 1900

We are looking for cosponsors, we are going to drop that bill tomorrow sometime, and I would encourage my colleagues' participation in this, because I know both of my colleagues have been very interested in health issues. I think that this is a really good bill; it is a bipartisan bill. It is not a bill on the cheap, but it is not a profligate bill either. It will address many issues that our constituents are asking us about in terms of their threat from such things as anthrax and smallpox and potential epidemics. So once again, I thank both the gentlemen for their kind remarks.

Mr. INSLLEE. Mr. Speaker, I would love to listen to the gentleman's presentation, but I have a meeting with an incredible high school teacher named Mary Linquist of the famous Linquist teaching family that I have to keep to tackle educational matters, but I will look at the gentleman's bill and I thank the gentleman for his work on that.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I would like to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) and others who participated in this. We are going to look forward to good success over the next 2 days. This is good news for the American people.

#### THE THREAT OF BIOTERRORISM IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORBES). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, September 11 did change this country. As we were just discussing here on the floor, all of us have very vivid memories of September 11. We see images seared into our minds of airplanes flying into buildings, those tall World Trade Center buildings collapsing, clouds of evaporated concrete, steel, glass, and our fellow human beings rolling down the streets. I have a picture in my mind of the flaming crater of the Pentagon and an American flag flying in front of it.

A few days after September 11, I visited ground zero. At that time there were six or seven stories of smoking rubble. I will never forget that visit. I kept seeing superimposed on that horrific sight, essentially the graveyard of 5,000 innocent Americans, words that I had seen written on the wall of a family relief center just a short time before visiting ground zero. This was a family relief center where families of victims could come in, get financial help and get counseling as well. All along one wall for probably about 100 yards, families had brought in pictures of their mothers and fathers and sons and daughters, put them on the wall and then written personal notes to them, and there were flowers and candles underneath these pictures. I kept seeing, as I was looking at that pile of rubble, I kept seeing the handwriting of a little girl. One could tell she was just learning to write from her handwriting and it said, "Daddy, I miss you. I will love you always."

I will tell my colleagues something. We still grieve for those victims. Every day in The New York Times there is one full page of obituaries from the victims of that attack. A little picture and a little story or vignette about that particular victim. I do not know about my colleagues, but I can only read about two or three of those, and that is all I can read for that day. They are very human stories. Because they remind us that these were people just like our neighbors, members of our families, and we grieve for these victims. We grieve for the victims of the bioterrorist attacks, the anthrax attack that has killed people and made many others sick.

I remember from September 11 about 170 Members of Congress gathering on the steps of the Capitol in the lengthening twilight shadows to say a prayer for those victims. As our leadership, both parties, was walking off the steps, somebody started singing God Bless America. I felt a real sense of unity at that moment, because we were standing there, not as Republicans or Democrats, but as Americans. And the message that day and today and tomorrow to those terrorists is that we are one Nation, united we stand. You can challenge our Nation's spirit, but you cannot break it. And we will chase down to the ends of the Earth, if necessary, the terrorists who caused this attack on our country. Justice demands it for the victims' families, and our national security demands it.

I commend the brave men and women who, even at this moment, are fighting in Afghanistan, flying airplane raids against the Taliban, a thoroughly despicable lot, the Taliban and the terrorists they harbor. People who have taken little girls who have dared to do something like go to school, taken them to a soccer field and killed them.

The war is going well, but as President Bush has rightly said, this is a