

□ 1930

But there are serious, very, very serious flaws in the Senate bill. It gives different responsibilities to two different airports and says we are going to treat the big and the small differently. It has vague language on accountability.

We owe it to the American people to conscientiously legislate and to create the best possible legislation. That is what we will be arguing for here tomorrow.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3150, SECURE TRANSPORTATION FOR AMERICA ACT OF 2001

Mr. REYNOLDS (during special order of Mr. SHADEGG) from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-264) on the resolution (H. Res. 274) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3150) to improve aviation security, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMONS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPs) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAPPs. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to join in extension of remarks that were made earlier this evening by many in the Women's Caucus to stand to speak out this evening against domestic violence and I am graciously thanking my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) for yielding time for me to enter into this dialogue with my other colleagues earlier this evening. I thank the gentleman for yielding that time to me as well.

October is Domestic Violence Awareness Month. This is the last day of that month. It is a time when battered women's advocates, policy makers and grassroots activists across this Nation focus the public's attention on the insidious epidemic of domestic violence. Of course, we can call attention to this fact and these matters in October. The challenge is before us every single day of the year.

In the United States alone, nearly one-third of American women report being physically or sexually abused by a husband or a boyfriend at some point in their lives. For this reason I am introducing legislation which would provide women of all ages and backgrounds with preventive services such as domestic violence screening and treatment. With a simple screening test that can be administered by any health care provider such as a personal health provider, a doctor, a clinic, an emergency room provider, red flags and signals can be given and referrals can

be made which can pick up more instances and get people into prevention and treatment much earlier.

I believe that it is vital that we begin to educate young women and men in an effort to prevent the incidence of domestic violence and to curb its devastating effects.

Not surprisingly, current Department of Justice statistics indicate that women in their high school years to their mid-twenties are nearly three times as vulnerable to attack by husband or boyfriend or former partner as those in any other age group. So we must keep in mind that domestic violence has ramifications for more than just those parties who are involved. It affects every family, every workplace and every community.

For these reasons it is essential that we all play a role in combatting the prevalence of this epidemic. If we can take responsibility and action, we can prevent this criminal act from occurring. Action can be as simple as contributing money or clothing to a local battered women's shelter, volunteering time to a program that aids victims of abuse, talking to a child or to a classroom about relationship violence, posting awareness materials in public places.

I stand here this evening in recognition and to honor the many people in my community on the central coast of California who work diligently each day staffing shelters, raising funds to keep the shelters going, working to develop materials within nonprofit groups that serve young women, Girl Scouts and Girls Clubs and Boys Clubs entering our school places and working with classroom teachers to create a climate of awareness and acceptance and referral possibilities.

This is diligent work that goes on day in and day out in my community and across this Nation. This is the way we will get to the heart of the matter and the way we can hope for raising a generation of young people who can speak out against violence, can learn alternative ways of conflict resolution and protecting themselves and their friend and others, and that we can hope for a time when domestic violence will be a thing of the past.

At the close of this month, we must remember that each citizen has a duty to help end domestic violence, not only nationally but also globally, and we think and are mindful of the Afghan women who are now subjected to the Taliban regime for whom this is an ever-present part of their lives.

But our work does not stop today on the last day of October. We must continue to work diligently every day, every hour and every minute to put an end to domestic violence and all violence against women.

VIOLENCE AGAINST AFGHAN WOMEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

woman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) for yielding.

This morning a very important development occurred in the work of the world to build toward a post-Taliban regime in Afghanistan that will be democratic. A group of Afghan women asked to be included in talks concerning a new democratic government in Afghanistan.

Women are the oppressed people of Afghanistan. There can be no freedom there if the United Nations and the United States do not yield to this plea of Afghan women.

I believe I know what segregation, racial segregation is because I grew up in the segregated District of Columbia. I believe I know what racial apartheid was in South Africa. I was one of the first four people to go into the embassy which led to many people being arrested and finally sanctions and the end of apartheid.

But what we are seeing in Afghanistan is something I have never seen up close before. It is gender apartheid. That is very different from gender inequality which is, of course, universal. Gender apartheid as we are seeing in Afghanistan is much like the stigmatization we saw in Nazi Germany or to slavery. Indeed, the women in Afghanistan have been essentially converted into slaves. All the elements of slavery are there. They cannot work. They cannot go to school. They cannot go to universities. They cannot even leave home except in the company of a man. It has become shameful to be a woman. You are covered from head to toe, not just your face and head as so many religions require, but every part of you. It is shameful to be seen as a woman.

All the physical aspects of slavery are there, public flogging, selling into prostitution, women taken by commanders as wives, killing, indeed, for those who violate Taliban decrees.

What makes this especially tragic in Afghanistan is that pre-Taliban, in some way, Afghan women were more advanced than women in most advanced countries. Half of the university students were women, 40 percent of the doctors, half the health care workers, 70 percent of the teachers. All that is gone. That is all merit and hard work brought down.

The Afghan Constitution guaranteed freedom and equality to women, as our Constitution does not explicitly. That was suspended in 1992. Now, 75 percent of the refugees are women and children.

I am not surprised that a regime propped by people who use planes as missiles to take down innocent people would treat their own women as chattel. I would be surprised, I would be very disappointed and I do not believe we can let happen if our government does not insist that the liberation of

Afghanistan must include the liberation of its women. Any future government talks must have the women of Afghanistan at the table.

AVIATION SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I may be joined by other colleagues. I am not sure at this point. This evening I wanted to talk about the issue of aviation security in the aftermath of the tragedies of September 11, and I must say that in many ways I would like to start out by responding to the special order given by some of my Republican colleagues just a few minutes ago.

I want to express my disappointment in what they said, and basically almost emotionally if I could explain why I am so disappointed in the statements that were made by some of my Republican colleagues just a few minutes ago.

In my district in New Jersey, I represent right now two counties. We had about 150 victims of the World Trade Center who died. We have been to a lot of funerals. We have been to a lot of vigils. We have been to a lot of services over the last 2 months or so. I have to say my constituents really have lost patience. They no longer believe that this House of Representatives is going to do anything effectively on the issue of airport security. They wonder why we are even debating this issue tonight and why this issue was not disposed of within a week or two of those tragedies.

It is now October 31, about a month and a half since September 11. In fact, it is about 2 or 3 weeks I believe since the Senate took action on the bill that my Republican colleagues have been criticizing, and I would ask initially this evening as I begin, why have we waited? If they do not like the Senate bill, why did not they bring up a bill in the House the next day, 2 or 3 weeks ago, to address this problem? Why have they waited for a month and a half to even address the issue? I sincerely doubt their willingness to address the issue of airport security.

I believe that what they are doing now, what the House Republican leadership is doing now in bringing up this bill tomorrow is nothing but a ruse. I do not think that they want to change the status quo at all. I believe that they like the status quo, and I believe that the reason they are not bringing up the Senate bill tomorrow and they are bringing up a new House Republican bill is because they hope that they can pass that bill on a partisan vote, send it to conference, and because it disagrees significantly from the Senate bill, they will simply kill any legislative initiative to try to address the airport security issue, and as a consequence, those corporate interests,

those airline interests that do not want to see any changes in the status quo will triumph. That is what is going on here.

No one can tell me that this House of Representatives cannot act quickly in the aftermath of the type of tragedy that we had on September 11. No one can tell me that if the Senate bill passed 2 or 3 weeks ago that we could not have passed a bill within a few days of that.

What is happening now is that the momentum is building in my State and around the country where people are outraged over the fact that we have not taken action on this measure, and the Republican leadership knows that the public wants something like what passed in the other body, like the Senate bill, and that they want a Federal workforce and that they do not like the status quo.

So now the Republican leadership in the House feels that they have to bring up something, even a fig leaf. So they will schedule a vote tomorrow and they will start a debate, knowing full well that once that bill passes, it will go to conference and nothing will happen and the status quo will continue.

I heard some of my Republican colleagues talk about the fact that they do not like Federal workforces. I do not really care whether they like or do not like Federal workforces. I mean they can stand up here and they can talk about whether they like the Postal Service or they think it should be privatized, whether they like the Border Patrol or they think it should be privatized, whether they like the Customs Service or they think it should be privatized. The bottom line is that we know that whatever system, and in this case a private corporate system that was in place on September 11, failed, and it failed miserably.

The fact of the matter is that it has not changed. I have my constituents come to my town meetings. Because I am not very far from Newark airport, we are maybe half an hour away, if not maybe less, and they tell me when they go to the airport nothing really has changed. Their baggage is not being screened. They are able to get through with devices to bypass the screening machines, and they are very, very disappointed in the quality of the workforce.

I heard my colleagues say that they do not like the existing workforce. Well, the existing workforce is a private workforce that is put in place by the airlines, and there is no way in the world that we are going to create competition and create some sort of private enterprise system that is going to correct it. There is no money available.

I heard one of my colleagues say, well, maybe they should be paid \$16 an hour, they are only being paid minimum wage, maybe they should be paid \$16 an hour. Is he going to mandate in the legislation that they get paid \$16 an hour? The problem we have now is that the airlines, many of them, are

bankrupt. Many are in very bad shape. They have no incentive to go out and hire people and pay them a living wage. They have no incentive to do the type of training that would be effective.

□ 1945

And the people who are manning these screening devices do not have any esprit de corps. They do not have pride in what they do.

If my colleagues were to go to Newark Airport, they could go to the screening device and look a few feet away and see some of the fast food restaurants. Some of the people working in the fast food restaurants are being paid more than the people manning the screening devices. Why should they have any more pride in what they do if they are not getting properly paid and they have no benefits? They are not going to have pride in what they do.

One of my Republican colleagues said, well, 80 or 90 percent of them are not even U.S. citizens. What do my colleagues expect? Should we expect that U.S. citizens are going to take minimum wage jobs under the conditions they have to work with these screening machines? Of course not.

The only way that we can do anything is if we make a radical change. And I say "radical" because I understand that putting together a Federal work force something like the Customs Service or the Post Office or the Border Patrol, I understand that is a radical change from what we have now, but I do not have a problem with it. Not because ideologically I think a Federal work force is superior, but just because I know the current system does not work and we cannot just tweak it.

One of my Republican colleagues said, well, we will make sure that at every entrance to the airport there is a Federal employee, but I do not want the people manning the screening devices to be Federal employees. What are we afraid of? Is it some sort of ideological nonsense or something in my colleagues' minds that somehow this is socialism or communism or something? I just do not understand it. I just think that this is a practical problem that needs a practical solution and that we cannot wait for some tweaking of the system when we know that we have to do something dramatic to change it because the status quo is currently not working.

I just wanted to mention, if I could, a few talking points about the Senate bill. I call it the House Democratic Aviation Security Bill, which I understand will be the alternative tomorrow, the substitute, that hopefully we will be allowed to vote on in lieu of this House Republican bill.

If I could just talk about this bill, first of all, understand that this passed the Senate, the other body, 100 to nothing. In the other body they were not being partisan. There were a lot of people in the other body, in the Senate, who are very right-wing ideologically, but they were willing to join together,