

resort to prostitution; it is the only way they can support themselves and their children. That does not last very long because they normally are caught and killed.

The tragedy is intensified by the fact that prior to the Taliban takeover of the country, Afghan women were 70 percent of the Nation's schoolteachers, 40 percent of the Nation's doctors, 50 percent of the civilian government workers, and 50 percent of the college students in Kabul were women.

Just a few years ago, Afghan women were scientists, professors, members of Parliament, and university professors. They led corporations and nonprofit organizations. Today, these same women cannot show their faces in public or leave their homes alone.

In spite of the Taliban's harsh edicts, some Afghan women are risking their lives and some have lost their lives trying to run home schools and health clinics.

Let me read a few accounts of Afghan women. This is a woman who escaped a Taliban death decree. She said:

"The Taliban's take over of Afghanistan affected women more than any other sector of Afghan society. Women suffer in Afghanistan because they are forced to abandon their social lives and live as prisoners in their own homes. Women suffer in Afghanistan because they no longer have their freedom of movement, freedom to work, freedom to be educated and the right to live free from violence. Widows, often times are the sole providers for their families and suffer even more because of the Taliban's edicts that outlaw women's employment. Women watch their children suffer from malnutrition, disease, and even death. Women in Afghanistan suffer from war crimes because they are raped, murdered, trafficked, kidnapped, and forced to marry against their will.

A lot of them are 10-year-old girls. This is an account of a teenager when the Taliban took control of her village.

The Taliban's rule in Afghanistan has been the most terrifying experience in my life. I remember with fear that day in 1995 when the Taliban took over my city, and life for women forever changed. I remember the day that I was forced to wear the burqa, the day schools were closed to women, the day learning and work became forbidden to women; and darkness engulfed the lives of all women living in Afghanistan. I remember that I was beaten by the Taliban for going to the public bath and the day women in my city demonstrated against the closing of public baths and schools. The Taliban retaliated by murdering ten of those women and arresting forty others, who since that day have not been seen nor located.

This is by an Afghan woman who was beaten by the Taliban.

"During the first week of the Taliban's capture of Kabul, friends and neighbors helped my family with shopping because I only had sisters and no brothers and my father was dead. One day I decided to go for shopping alone because my neighbors could no longer help out with shopping. I wore a long dress and covered my face and head with the chadori. I went shopping for food at a market near my home. When I arrived at the market I was approached by a man with a long beard, a black turban, a gun on his shoulder, and a long stick in his hand. This man was Taliban. He asked me why I was out

alone and who else was with me. When he saw that there was no man with me, I immediately tried to explain that I had no man in my house and that my family was without food to eat. The Talib would not listen to my explanations. He began to beat me with his stick as he shouted at me to go home and leave here. My entire body ached from the bruises and slashes of the stick.

In Afghanistan, women have been stripped of their most basic human rights. The Taliban has prohibited women and girls from working, attending school and leaving their home without a close male relative. Women's punishment for violation of Taliban decrees include brutal beatings, imprisonment and even death.

As we continue life after the terrible day of September 11 and try to bring our life to some degree of normalcy, we cannot forget that the women of Afghanistan are the first victims of the Taliban. Every day, we are doing things to free that country and to restore its government. Our Government has no desire to have any degree of governmental control over Afghanistan. Our war is not against the people of Afghanistan, but it is against the Taliban. They are cruel and unusual in their dealings with people. But they are worse than that in their dealings with women. Every day that we do something to bring about the restoration of the Afghan Government which doesn't involve the Taliban, we are doing society a favor. The women are the first victims of the Taliban.

We must demonstrate our support through humanitarian relief for the women of Afghanistan and the scores of Afghan refugees in the surrounding regions. As we look toward the future of Afghanistan, we have to recognize that women must play a role in rebuilding of the post-Taliban Afghanistan.

There are people who were educated, and they are still educated. They are not being educated, but they are educated. They are women who were teachers, doctors, nurses, and scientists. They should play a part in that new government. And there will be a new government.

We simply can't forget that women are being brutalized by the Taliban, and we must redouble our efforts to help restore human rights to the people of Afghanistan, and especially the women of Afghanistan.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I certainly appreciate the comments of my friend from Nevada. I agree with what he has to say. He certainly describes one of the reasons that we are involved in seeking to find out where those terrorists are, and those countries that harbor them, and doing something about terrorism around this world.

#### THE SENATE AGENDA

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I would like to comment on where I think we are today and where I think we need to go.

Certainly I am very proud of Americans since September 11. I think it has been amazing how everyone in this country has come together with a commitment. I am proud of their work and their dedication to find where we are with these terrorists and to do something about it and to get rid of terrorism around the world.

As I go home to Wyoming, I am very pleased that even though Wyoming is quite a ways from here, those folks are just as committed, just as involved, and just as interested as the rest of us. I am very pleased about that.

When we are challenged and attacked by terrorists, this country demonstrates its commitment to freedom and its commitment to doing away with the things around the world that cause terrorism.

I am very proud of this Congress after September 11. Everyone in both parties in the House and the Senate came together to do the things that were necessary, to do the things the President asked of us regardless of party lines, to do the things for defense, and to do the things for New York and Virginia in terms of the need because of what happened, and then to continue to do that. I am very pleased about that.

Obviously, in the Senate and the Congress, everyone has different ideas about how we should go forward. Once we get past the emergency kinds of things, we, of course, go back to not having universal agreement on everything that we talked about doing. That is the way it is. That is the way it should be. We are here to represent different views as we have different views on things that should be undertaken.

I believe we have a number of things that we ought to accomplish before we leave, and indeed it seems to me that we should. One of the reasons we have done the things we have done is so that we can continue to live a relatively normal life as well as meet our emergencies. I think one of the things that calls for normalcy is for us to leave and go home after Thanksgiving and during Christmastime. I suspect that rather than sine die, we will be leaving at the call of the Chair. I will support that. If it is necessary for us to return, we could do that.

But we have a number of things we must do. One of them is certainly appropriations, on which the Presiding Officer has given leadership. Obviously, appropriations are a very important and vital part of what we do in Government. I think we completed 5 of the 13 appropriations bills. We are moving forward. We need to continue to do that.

We need to have an economic stimulus package. Our economy, of course, about a year ago began to weaken. Then, of course, with the September 11 tragedy, it took a rather sharp decline. We have to do something about that decline, and we can.

I think it is necessary for us to complete the airport safety bill that we

have passed in the Senate and now has been passed in the House. We have to come together on some differences that exist.

So these are the issues I think we need to complete. Quite frankly, most of the other issues we have before us are not necessarily issues that have to be done prior to the beginning of next year's session, in my opinion. Obviously, not everyone agrees with that opinion.

Also, at the end of a session—any session; and I think particularly this one where there are things that have to be passed—we are going to find ourselves with items that anyone has ever wanted to be passed hoping to be attached to a vehicle for passage. Frankly, that is wrong. We ought not to legislate that way.

I hope that in the appropriations process we stay within budget. Obviously, we are going to have special spending that is outside the budget. We recognize that. We have authorized that. I think we have spent \$55 billion in one of the first shots, and we will probably spend another \$75 billion, or more, in this stimulus package. Those are obviously special things that need to be addressed.

We have said we will stay within the budget except in times of emergency, and this is a time of emergency. But I hope we do not use this as a reason for expanding our normal spending, for building permanent programs that might only be needed right now. I believe it is quite important to be careful.

I believe the economic stimulus package should be defined as to what its purpose is, what we want to have accomplished with it, and that is basically to have some sort of immediate impact on the economy.

I have to admit—and I am a member of the committee that deals with this—even though we have talked to some of the most knowledgeable economists in the whole country, not everyone is quite sure what has the greatest impact immediately. But we need to do the best we can to make sure the things we do will have an immediate impact.

I hope we do not end up with a Christmas tree. There will be lots of interest in tacking on everything that anyone has ever thought of passing, whether it be long-term taxes or health care programs that will go on for whatever. I hope we will limit that spending basically to the package for which the President has asked. We should do that. It is not a time to put in a program that is attractive but will go on forever after the economic crisis is over.

We are going to have to put some dollars in the package. The tax proposals will not do it entirely. We have to put some dollars in there to help extend unemployment insurance for those who need it when that expires, although relatively few have had and will have theirs expire in the next several months.

We certainly have to do something about health insurance for those who are unemployed and have lost their health insurance. But I hope we do not develop a whole new Government health insurance program that goes on forever. We ought to use a technique to help people in this fairly short term of what we should do in an emergency.

Also, we are dealing, of course, with energy. I do not know whether it will happen—there is considerable difference of view about an energy bill—but I happen to think, in this instance, energy is one of the most important issues we have to deal with; it has been for some time. We have needed an energy policy. Now we have gotten involved in the Middle East; knowing that nearly 60 percent of our oil comes from overseas, we find ourselves more at risk. So energy has become part of this matter of economic development and security.

Here again, there seems to be a good deal of resistance over a couple of issues, such as ANWR and so on, which are not the biggest issues in the world but they seem to hold up something that might very well move right along as part of this package.

Interestingly enough, there is a good deal of discussion about agriculture and an Agriculture bill. The Agriculture bill that is presently in place does not expire until September of next year. Nevertheless, the House has passed a bill that would last for 10 years, as a matter of fact. I am hopeful we can do something that does not last quite that long so we can have another opportunity in 5 years to look at the issue; it has been our history to re-evaluate bills to see how they have worked.

There are lots of ideas and very little agreement on the Agriculture bill. I am hopeful, quite frankly, that we do not do it this year. I think we have to have more time to take a look at it. We have eight or nine different titles. We have only dealt with one title in terms of a markup. It would be a very stressed situation to now try to deal with all these different programs.

Most of all—and this is not something that is new nor unique to our situation now—I hope, as we look at these issues and we look at the problems, we will try to see if we can get a little forward vision into what we want to have happen over a period of time.

Over the last 6 or 8 months, I have had a series of meetings in Wyoming we have called Vision 20/20. We began to try to talk to people in communities about what they would like to see in terms of their families, in terms of their communities, in terms of their State in 10 or 20 years. Then, as they begin to get a vision of what they would like to see, where they would like to be, then it makes it much easier to make the decisions now and to measure whether those decisions, in fact, lead to where they want to go over time.

One of the real obvious issues this applies to is agriculture. What do we

want agriculture to be? Obviously, all of us who have farmers and ranchers—and I come from an agricultural background—want to make it economically suitable for them to exist, to be a very important part of our economy in Wyoming and other places as well.

We hope agriculture is part of a conservation movement where we have trees and fields and where we have planned growth in open spaces. Agriculture can contribute to that greatly. These are the things we want to see over time.

I think we want to see an economic safety net for agriculture. On the other hand, certainly we would like to see agriculture responding to the marketplace. That is where all businesses ought to be. We ought to be building more and more markets as we can overseas. We are going to have to have agriculture that fits with today's trade issues.

WTO is meeting right now. It is fairly easy to sit down and say: Hey, we have some real problems; we need to do this right now. But then you ask yourself, where will that lead.

It is the same thing with energy. Where do we want to be with energy? Obviously, we want to have energy available for us. It should be available, to a large extent, domestically so we are not totally dependent on imports. We ought to have energy that is created in an environmentally sound manner to have the multiple use of public lands, for example, having energy produced there as well as preserving the lands.

Those are the kinds of things that I think all of us want to see over time. We would like to have conservation so that we find ways to do the things we want to do in our lives with less energy, if we can. And I suspect we will find new ways over time.

I remember being in a meeting in Caspar, WY, years ago where somebody made a point which I have always remembered: We have never run out of a fuel. Before we run out, we always find something else that moves us forward. We started with wood, then coal, then gas. We have nuclear. We have had all these sources of fuel. We will continue to have sources of fuel, I am sure, over time.

I know it is difficult—and I certainly am not critical—but I do think it is necessary that we address ourselves to those issues that should have a priority for us before we leave this session of Congress somewhere near our normal time. I think it is up to the leadership and up to the rest of us to do that, and to get those issues on the floor and to come to some agreement—which is not easy, I understand—to deal with them. After that, we can then move on to do other things.

Mr. President, thank you for the time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Minnesota.

(The remarks of Mr. DAYTON pertaining to the introduction of S. 1629

are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. 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.

Mr. DORGAN. I ask unanimous consent that Senator KYL be recognized following my comments.

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

#### IMPORTANT ISSUES FACING CONGRESS

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, we will begin this week with a vote at 6 o'clock this evening, and we will turn to other issues. I want to make some comments about the most important issues we face in Congress and what I think we ought to be doing to address them.

I just flew in from Chicago a few moments ago and noticed in the Chicago papers this morning that yesterday a man got through the screening process at Chicago O'Hare Airport with nine knives and a stun gun. He was selected for advance screening at the gate in addition to going through the metal detectors.

When they opened the baggage of this particular person, they found nine knives and a stun gun that had been missed at the screening as the individual entered the concourses.

That ought to demonstrate, as so many other studies have demonstrated, that the current system for screening passenger baggage and passengers is not working. That is quite clear.

The largest company that employs workers to screen baggage at airports has been found guilty of violating all kinds of FAA rules and regulations. They have violated training. They have hired ex-criminals. They have not adequately supervised them. They have falsified records. They were fined by the Federal Government for their behavior and 2 years later, after being put on probation, were discovered to have violated their probation with the same problems. This is the largest company in this country that hires these workers. In fact, it is a foreign company, but it is the largest employer of screeners in America.

One wonders why this company is still working at airports screening passengers when it has already been fined, when it falsified reports and then violated the probation that was established for it.

My point is that we have just had a significant debate in the U.S. House of Representatives on the issue of airport security and baggage screening. We in

the Senate passed legislation 100-0—all Republicans and all Democrats supported it. Then we had a couple of our friends from a southern State, Texas, whom I shall not name, who decided that the legislation was not good and needed to be altered. God forbid somebody was going to make Federal workers out of the screeners. So they ramped up a huge effort in the House of Representatives to defeat the proposal we passed 100-0 in the Senate.

My hope is that in the next week or so—in the next few days, in fact—we will convene a conference and work aggressively and to immediately pass an aviation security bill. It is unforgivable we have taken this long. After September 11, everyone understood we had a new requirement, a new duty, and a new responsibility to pass an aviation security bill, and that legislation has not yet passed despite the fact we passed it through this body with every Republican and Democrat supporting it—100-0 only to have it languish week after week in the other body.

I regret the House did that, but now that they have passed legislation that will get us to conference, it is very important that we take this seriously and find a way to develop the compromise necessary so the American people will feel confident that when they walk through airports about to board an airplane, there is not some goofball someplace carrying nine knives and a stun gun.

This person explained he had forgotten. How do you forget you have nine knives and a stun gun, for God's sake? How do you forget you have that in your luggage? How do you qualify to fly if you have a mind like that—that you take nine knives and a stun gun to the airport?

In any event, having said that, that is just the latest information in this morning's paper. Last week, it was the audit that was done at Dulles Airport and the screeners who missed what they should have known.

Why does all this happen? Because people leave screening jobs to fry hamburgers so they can make more money. These are low-paying jobs. The people are ill trained by companies that want to put the least cost employees in those positions and make good money doing it.

I am not interested in that. I am interested in accountability and security for the American traveling public. That is all I am interested in. I am not interested in the debate about for whom they work. All I am interested in is accountability.

We have had a circumstance where these employees have been working for very large firms, one of which I already described that has been fined by the Federal Government and is guilty of falsifying records. We have already had that experience. We know that does not work. So perhaps we ought to try what the Senate has suggested in the legislation it passed 100-0.

That is what is in front of us in the next few days, and I hope, as a member of the committee that generated the bill that passed the Senate unanimously, with the help of Senator HOLLINGS and Senator MCCAIN leading the effort, we can find a way to solve this very quickly.

Let me turn to the next challenge we have in addition to aviation security. The other challenge we have is to pass a stimulus package. What does "stimulus" mean? Stimulus means pass legislation that will provide some incentives to help boost this economy of ours.

Last Friday, we received word that another 415,000 people lost their jobs in the last month. Mostly, these are people at the lower end of the economic ladder. These are not people making a lot of money, in most instances. These people and their families know about second jobs, secondhand, second mortgages, and second shifts. They are the same people who during tough times find they have lost their jobs. Then they find out, at least with some people in the U.S. Congress, they are also second choice. There are some people in Congress who do not want to help them very much because they say that would not provide the incentive for those families to look for work again.

In my judgment, these people who are laid off during a very difficult and soft economy require our help. We have always, during a severe economic downturn, extended our hand and said: We will extend unemployment benefits to help those who have lost their jobs and are down and out.

That is stimulative. That money is spent immediately by the families who have lost their incomes and are struggling. That is a way to stimulate this country's economy. We must do that when we construct a package of incentives to provide lift to this economy.

What are the other incentives we could provide that would help this economy? We can do traditional things, such as tax credits that would incentivize investment. We can do things that will incentivize consumption. We can do things that will incentivize production. There are all kinds of menus with which to do that: Expensing, bonus depreciation, and targeted investment tax credits, for example.

In addition to tax credits and other incentives in the Tax Code, we can stimulate economic activity by building roads and bridges, by repairing schools, and by making other public investments that put people back to work so that at the end of the time when we have enacted a stimulus package and made those investments, we can look back and say: We not only stimulated the economy, we have something to show for it.

My colleague, Senator BYRD, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, is working with a number of us in the Senate. He has taken the leadership position on the infrastructure