

Yesterday there was a two-page ad in the Hill newspaper of all the people who are supporting doing something with energy policy. So there is very wide support for it.

We have not, however, gotten support from the majority leader to bring it to the floor. We believe that is one of the legislative efforts that should have a high priority before we can finish our work, which I hope we will do relatively soon.

So there is much that needs to be done. A policy in energy, of course, has to do with conservation, how we in our homes and in our cars can do more to conserve energy. It has to do with renewables. We need to put an emphasis on renewables so we can strengthen that aspect of production. We certainly need to do more on research so that we can find, for instance, ways to even more cleanly use coal and other kinds of volume resources.

We have to talk about production. We have to talk about access to public lands. We can have production. We have shown that in Wyoming one can go into an area and have production without destroying the environment, and we should do it in a very careful way, and indeed we will.

So despite the need for both the economic boost and for the defense and security aspect of it, we have not been able to cause the majority to bring this before the Senate. We urge it be done and done quickly. We need to bring this bill forward and deal with it. Perhaps we will deal with the House bill, but we need to bring it up and make some judgments.

AIRLINE SECURITY PERSONNEL: FEDERAL OR PRIVATE

Mr. THOMAS. Madam President, on another item I want to comment on that I have heard quite a bit about, the House passed last night the airport security bill, and I am glad they finally did. Of course, the big controversial issue was whether or not those personnel that are in airports would be Federal employees or whether they would be civilians overseen by a Federal agency.

First of all, often, particularly in the media, there has been the impression that we either have Federal employees or continue to do it the way it is being done.

That is not the case. What is being talked about, if it is done without Federal employees, is the Federal Government would have oversight and the authority to authorize these kinds of activities; they would be overseen by a Federal agency, hopefully a law enforcement agency. There would be criteria for employees, there would be tests for employees, there would be measurements to be taken, all enforced by the Federal Government. The idea that would continue to be what it is, unless it is Federal employees, is not true.

The other interesting point is there has been a lot of reference, both by the

media and also by the Members in the House pushing for Federal employees, to it passing 100-0 in the Senate. It did, indeed, but the reason is there are lots of things in that bill in addition to the matter of what kind of employees we have for airport security. Many Members would have preferred to have seen what the House put in, but we knew we did not have the votes. We wanted to pass the bill because of what it contained. The idea that it passed 100-0 does not mean there are not people in the Senate who would like to see this done in the manner as passed by the House.

As we go to a conference, I hope we can do that quickly. That is one of the most important and timely things to do.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

APPRECIATION FOR EFFORT OF SENATOR THOMAS

Mr. ENZI. I take this opportunity to thank the senior Senator from Wyoming, Mr. THOMAS, for all of the efforts he has made in three areas, as well as a lot of other areas, but particularly in three areas.

Energy, of course, of which he spoke, he has been one of the Members pushing for an energy policy for this country since I have known him, which has been quite a while. It looks as if we have the opportunity to get that done soon. It will be largely due to his efforts on the committee and on the floor.

I also thank him for the effort he is making in the agricultural area. Our State is very dependent on agriculture. He serves on the Agriculture Committee. I think he is the first person from Wyoming to serve in 40 years. He got in it at a particularly crucial time, as we were redoing the farm bill. I know that is extremely difficult work. When there are 10 Senators together, they offer 20 opinions. Trying to mold those into one bill can be extremely difficult.

Of course, the Senator serves on the Finance Committee, as well. That is from where the stimulus package is coming. Again, there are multiple opinions regarding that package.

I appreciate the efforts and leadership of the Senator in all of those areas. I look forward to the great packages we will have as a result.

RACE FOR THE CURE

I also mention another effort led by his wife, the Race for the Cure, the breast cancer effort in our State. The four honorary chairs are his wife—definitely not an honorary chair; she spends a great deal of time all year working to raise funds to make people more aware of the need for breast cancer testing, treatment, and early detection. She is an honorary chair, along with our Governor's wife, Sherri Geringer, my wife, Diana, and Congresswoman BARBARA CUBIN's husband,

Fritz. They all work a lot of time during the year.

Last weekend, we were at a function that kicks off the next year's Race for the Cure. It is well underway. It is a great effort. It saves life, both men's and women's lives. That evening we were in Rock Springs, WY, for a different function called Cowboys Against Cancer. This event is not limited to any particular type of cancer. Rock Springs puts on an annual fundraising event where anyone in the community with cancer receives funds from this foundation, up to \$1,000, to help offset some of their expenses during the year. It is a great community effort to help out neighbors.

They asked me to emphasize that, even though we have this focus in the United States on terrorism, anybody who comes down with cancer has a form of terrorism. It is important we keep giving the ways we have been giving, as well as giving in new ways. The American people are the most giving people in the world. This is a time when we need to give in new ways, but we need to continue the old ways, as well.

When somebody in your family comes down with cancer, you have ground zero in your home, too. That is the potential for a total loss. I hope everybody keeps up all of those efforts, as well as the new emphasis.

I yield the floor.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the Senator for his kind comments and I certainly enjoy working together.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TROUBLING TIMES

Mr. TORRICELLI. Madam President, these are, for all Americans, troubling times. While we are defending our Nation at home and abroad, we find ourselves with conflicting emotions. We are by nature a peaceful people but a people of enormous resolve, with a great love of our Nation, our culture, and each other. We respect each other's faiths. We respect the faiths and cultures of those of other nations.

This mix of emotions has placed us in an extraordinary position. Two principal issues arise from this dilemma. First, in the midst of a military campaign in Afghanistan, we now find the religious holidays of the Muslim faith upon us, the celebration of Ramadan. It is a central date on the Islamic calendar.

The second issue is the extent to which our military operations in Afghanistan involve the inevitability and the tragedy of civilian casualties. I

would like to address both of these concerns for a moment.

It speaks well of the American people that we would have a concern about engaging in military activities during the religious holidays of some of our own citizens, and more important, those of other nations. In a nation that is overwhelmingly Christian but with large Jewish and Islamic populations, it is a tremendous statement about America that even in the waging of conflict we want to be deferential to the religions of others. Indeed, it speaks well of our President that there is even a consideration of the postponement of military activities in our air campaign in Afghanistan during Ramadan.

I strongly urge the President, despite his best instincts, that the bombing campaign should not be postponed—not for a minute, not for a day. What happened on September 11 and the motivation of those who might have orchestrated this campaign from Afghanistan is all the evidence that is required that bin Laden, al-Qaida, even the Taliban are not practicing Islam.

The massive loss of life at the Pentagon and the World Trade Center in the name of that faith is not only not in keeping with the teachings of Islam, it is blasphemy. It is blasphemy against the teachings of Mohammad and the Koran. It is an insult to every person of Islamic faith in the world.

For the United States to hesitate or suspend our military operations against al-Qaida because of Ramadan is to suggest that these people are actually legitimately practicing their faith or even, in fact, are of the Islamic faith. Their practice of Islam that engages in terrorism, the massive loss of life, the use of assassination and terror against their own people and the United States, their declaration of war against people simply because they hold a different religious faith or live in a different culture, is not the legitimate practice of Islam. It is against everything written in the Koran.

Not only should this bombing campaign not be suspended in deference to Ramadan, indeed—it is the policy of our Government that bin Laden and al-Qaida are not practicing the faith at all—suspension would be to give a cloak of legitimacy that indeed they are practicing a religion rather than that they are an aberration. They are a cult, mindlessly pursuing some horrible vision of exercising personal power, the teachings of which are not legitimately accepted by any faith.

No, the bombing campaign should not be suspended. Indeed, it must continue to underscore that this is not a war against Islam, and the people we are fighting are not practicing Islam.

Second is the issue of civilian casualties. It is a wonderful statement about our people that even in the face of horror and the massive loss of life of Americans, that there is a concern that people in another nation, as we seek justice, might inadvertently and tragically lose their lives as we pursue al-

Qaida and bin Laden. It is right we should have this concern, but it cannot deter us.

I hope my comments are not misunderstood. I do not want them to seem overly harsh. But there is something missing from this debate, from those abroad, and those within our own Nation who are understandably concerned about this loss of life. There is not a question that there is going to be a loss of civilian life. That happened on September 11. If you want to see civilian casualties, come to New York. We have thousands of bodies still not recovered.

Concerning the issue of whether there is going to be an innocent loss of life, that already happened. We want nothing but the best for the people of Afghanistan. But it is impossible to engage in large scale military hostilities, to find thousands of al-Qaida fighters where they are being shielded, without some loss of Afghan life. Every loss of life of an Afghan citizen is regrettable but unavoidable. We can minimize it, but we cannot avoid it.

We have responsibilities. Our first responsibility is to bring to justice those who killed our people and attacked our Nation. An equally great responsibility is to ensure that if American soldiers enter Afghanistan to find bin Laden, we minimize the loss of American lives. Anything that is done that avoids the possibility of the loss of an American soldier is our highest priority. If we can do that while minimizing the loss of Afghan citizens, it is the right thing to do.

I speak, now, directly and bluntly. The people of every nation bear some responsibility for those who govern it. That is obviously true in a democratic society, where governments rule with the consent of the governed. But, indeed, it is true in all societies.

I know the Afghan people are powerless. I know the Taliban rules against the wishes of many Afghans. But, nevertheless, as a historic principle, they are accountable for their government. It is a fact that their government has harbored terrorists who have attacked our greatest city, declared war on our Nation, and killed thousands of our citizens. This is not to suggest that I believe that we, by design, would ever take their innocent lives. But it is to put in context the fact that, if inadvertently, against our policies and our desires and our prayers, Afghan lives are lost in the hunt for bin Laden and the search for justice, it may be regrettable, but it is historically and legally and morally defensible.

By historic parallels, a third of the German people voted for the Nazi Party.

Virtually none of the Japanese people as a matter of right could have been held accountable because they were directly responsible for Tojo's government in Tokyo. But I don't believe it would have been legitimate then any more than it would be legitimate now to have said somehow the

people of those countries do not bear responsibility for their government no matter how they came to power. The innocent Afghan people who regrettably now lose their lives, as the people of all nations, bear some responsibility for those who govern them—by the ballot box wherever it is possible, by force of arms where it is necessary, or by whatever means that might be required to free themselves, or to ensure that their governments are either not engaged in actions against other people or harbor those who would harm other people. Responsibility rests on all of us who are citizens of nations.

I hope the loss of civilian life is minimal. But our Nation is at war. This is not some gentlemanly understanding between the government of the United States and the Taliban government of Afghanistan. This is not a problem of languages or cultures. This is a fundamental judgment by the government of Afghanistan to harbor a terrorist element that has come to the judgment that they cannot coexist with Western society.

Either their government falls or ours falls. There is not something here to be negotiated. It is not some misunderstanding that we reconcile. There is nothing to be discussed. Their government falls or ours does. We are vulnerable to them or they are vulnerable to us. Bin Laden lives or some of our people die.

Sometimes, even in a complex world which has seemingly advanced so far, some things are so simple. That is the nature of this conflict.

It has been called a war on terrorism. It isn't a war on terrorism. Terrorism is a methodology of warfare. Had they attacked the World Trade Center with fighter planes or used the most modern technology available, we would be grieved nonetheless. They used terrorism. But it isn't their methodology that we are fighting. It is them.

This is a small group in a remote place that has come to the extraordinary conclusion that they cannot coexist with Western society. As a matter of our faith, our culture, and the means by which we choose to live our lives, they have come to a judgment that they cannot share this planet with us because of who we are and what we believe.

None of us wants any loss of life. There is a wonderful strength of our country. We can fight an enemy and still worry about his wounds.

I leave you with a simple reminder as our country debates whether to pursue this war during Ramadan and whether we lose our nerve because of loss of life of Afghan citizens. It has been a long time since this country fought a war seeking an unconditional result. Indeed, it has been more than half a century. War is different. It is different than a misunderstanding. It is different than a military action. It is different than a police action. It is different than the Persian Gulf or Vietnam or even Korea that had limited objectives.

This has no limited objective. This is unconditional.

Those people will not stand. We don't want to talk to them. We don't want to negotiate with them. We don't want to work out a misunderstanding with them. They will not stand.

The judgment about whether to fight during Ramadan and pay them the respect that they are actually of the Islamic faith should be debated in that context because they are not Islamic. They are not exercising their faith. They are blasphemists of their own alleged religion.

Civilian casualties need to be debated in this context because, though regrettable, they are inevitable and a part of unconditional war in a threshold that was already crossed, and then finally all of us coming to recognition of what it is we fight—terrorism, bin Laden. We fight against people whose weapons are not the principal concern. Their methodology is not our principal concern. Our concern is the profound judgment that they reached: that our presence and our lives are somehow a central threat.

Before the Senate left for this week, I wanted to share these thoughts knowing that we will revisit these issues again and again in what promises to be, unfortunately, a long and difficult engagement in Afghanistan, knowing that among the many strengths of our people, patience is not the greatest of American virtues. But we did not seek this war. We did not want it. We would have done anything to avoid it, but it was not our choice. It was thrust upon us. The decision to take lives was made by others. We only have one thing to do—no decisions, no choices, no judgments—just to win. That takes time. It takes sacrifice. Sacrifices we have made before. Now we will make them again.

I hope our country simply can steady its nerves and muster the patience to see this to the end. That will involve a great price, but there is no choice.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE ECONOMIC STIMULUS

Mr. HOLLINGS. Madam President, it is only on a Friday that we can make sense. That is my attempt here this morning with respect to the upcoming stimulus bill. We have more than enough deficit stimulus already in the pipeline, almost, without a stimulus bill.

The point is that, yes, we are going to have to spend, as the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has pointed out, for home security. The Senator has outlined our spending on homeland defense to the tune of some \$20 billion, including airport security; Amtrak security; Federal, State, and local antiterrorism enforcement; infrastructure security; highway security; clean and safe drinking water; bioterrorism response; border security. Actually, we have to add, necessarily, unemployment compensation and health care.

So let's say definitely all of us will be supporting—and should—deficit stimulus; otherwise, it makes no difference to the economy. It must be spent for home security with respect to the initiative of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

For starters, we are beginning this fiscal year with a horrendous deficit. I think of Mark Twain who once said that the truth is such a precious thing, it should be used very sparingly. That is the credo when we come to Government finance here in Washington. Specifically, we count Social Security revenues—I want to be specific in my limited time—twice. Sure, the government receives the well over \$500 billion that payroll tax payers pay in to the Social Security Trust Fund. The American people paid that amount in fiscal year 2001 for a surplus of—other than paying

out the regular benefits, \$163 billion. But the Social Security law, section 201, says, wait a minute, we don't want that money to languish and sit there, we want to gain interest on it.

So we issue T-bills, you and I buy the T-bills—the money comes into the Government, and what do they do? They count that again as revenues. So you count the money first as it comes in from the payroll tax payers, and you count it a second time from the purchase of the Treasury bills, in compliance with section 201.

Now, let's understand it. We ended the fiscal year with a \$133 billion deficit. I encourage my fellow Senators and the American public to view the public debt to the penny as issued by the Secretary of the Treasury on September 28, 2001 at: <http://www.publicdebt.treas.gov/opd/opdpenny.htm>.

Madam President, you can see that the national debt went up from the end of fiscal year 2000—the end of September in the year 2000—from 5 trillion 674 billion some odd dollars to 5 trillion 806 billion some odd dollars. It will show on the chart a \$133 billion deficit. That is verified in the final monthly Treasury statement made for fiscal year 2001. You can access this report at: <http://www.treasury.gov>.

Madam President, immediately it highlights a half truth because they show a surplus, and that is how they talk about the surplus and how it is diminishing. But don't bother with that. Go down to page 20, the particular culmination of all their moneys, and you find out how much revenue the Government took in and how much was spent. Every year since Lyndon Johnson's day, we have ended up with a deficit. Not just the \$133 billion deficit as of the last fiscal year, only a month ago. I will ask unanimous consent to have this particular document printed in the RECORD, the budget realities.

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

HOLLINGS' BUDGET REALITIES

Presidents and fiscal year	U.S. budget (outlays in bil- lions)	Borrowed trust funds (bil- lions)	Unified deficit with trust funds (bil- lions)	Actual deficit without trust funds (bil- lions)	National debt (billions)	Annual in- creases in spending for interest (bil- lions)
Truman:						
1946	55.2	-5.0	-15.9	-10.9	271.0	
1947	34.5	-9.9	4.0	+13.9	257.1	
1948	29.8	6.7	11.8	+5.1	252.0	
1949	38.8	1.2	0.6	-0.6	252.6	
1950	42.6	1.2	-3.1	-4.3	256.9	
1951	45.5	4.5	6.1	+1.6	255.3	
1952	67.7	2.3	-1.5	-3.8	259.1	
1953	76.1	0.4	-6.5	-6.9	266.0	
Eisenhower:						
1954	70.9	3.6	-1.2	-4.8	270.8	
1955	68.4	0.6	-3.0	-3.6	274.4	
1956	70.6	2.2	3.9	+1.7	272.7	
1957	76.6	3.0	3.4	+0.4	272.3	
1958	82.4	4.6	-2.8	-7.4	279.7	
1959	92.1	-5.0	-12.8	-7.8	287.5	
1960	92.2	3.3	0.3	-3.0	290.5	
1961	97.7	-1.2	-3.3	-2.1	292.6	
Kennedy:						
1962	106.8	3.2	-7.1	-10.3	302.9	9.1
1963	111.3	2.6	-4.8	-7.4	310.3	9.9
1964	118.5	-0.1	-5.9	-5.8	316.1	10.7
Johnson:						
1965	118.2	4.8	-1.4	-6.2	322.3	11.3