Members of Congress made a choice—protect the American people, or protect the three airport security companies responsible for September 11, 2001. The votes to protect those foreign corporations prevailed. The following is a quick history lesson in Homeland Security; however we will not quickly forget.

July, 2002, the U.S. House passed the Homeland Security Bill and very late they slipped in "clarifying provisions," which granted corporate immunity to Argenbright Security (British), Globe Aviation Security Services (Sweden), and Huntleigh USA Corp. (Dutch company).

October, 2000 (before 9/11) Argenbright had already been sentenced in the U.S. Court in Philadelphia, and ordered to pay $1.5 million in fines and restitution for failure to train, test, complete required background verification of employees, and more.

October, 2001 (after 9/11) Argenbright’s work was assessed at 14 airports, and the U.S. Attorney entered charges that Argenbright had continued to violate a probation agreement and more. Despite the 9/11 failures the Members of the House granted Argenbright, Globe and Huntleigh immunity from prosecution. Members of the House told us they “had no idea” certain provisions were in the Homeland Security bill.

The attorney and lobbyist for the airport security companies, Ken Quinn, continued to push for corporate immunity for his clients. Ken Quinn is a former FAA attorney, and attorney for SabreTech, the subcontractor cited in the ValuJet crash and eventually criminally indicted and convicted.

September, 2002. NADA/F sent registered letters to all U.S. Senators, plus accompanying documents, to alert the Senators to the provision in the House Bill that would grant corporate immunity to the airport security companies that were responsible for airport security on 9/11. We reminded the Senators that those airport security companies appeared to have violated numerous regulations, hired people with criminal records, hired illegal aliens, failed to provide training and supervision, failed in their responsibility to the traveling public, and left the U.S. vulnerable to multiple criminal attacks. Yet security was the reason they were paid to be at the airports. NADA/F wanted to be certain that no Senator could say it was a last minute change and they “had no idea.”

The Lieberman amendment No. 4953 would have removed 7 provisions for political favors, including the immunity for airport security companies from the Homeland Security Bill.

Another of the 7 provisions gives government broad powers to give security contracts to foreign companies. The original "Wellstone Amendment," (added before his death in a private plane crash last Oct.), restricted homeland security government contracts from corporations with headquarters in offshore tax havens (to avoid U.S. taxes).

Three Senators, Susan Collins (R-ME), Olympia Snowe (R-ME), and Lincoln Chafee (R-RI) said they voted against the amendment only after receiving a promise from Sen. Trent Lott that he would work to remove some of the provisions early 2003.

November 19, 2002, the Senate narrowly granted corporate immunity by a vote of 52-47. It was a great disappointment that some Senators thought it was more important to shield those airport security companies from corporate responsibility, which also greatly limits any investigation into the airport security failures of 9/11.