

WOMEN IN AFGHANISTAN

Mr. REID. Mr. President, this week we have watched on television the images of women in various places in Afghanistan, in cities, towns, running into the streets without male relatives and throwing away their burqas. I was here a week ago talking about how women were treated in Afghanistan. I brought with me the eyeshade they must wear, which is netting they can barely see out of and people can see nothing beyond. All over Afghanistan, women can wear these if they want, but they are not required.

A week ago, women would have been beaten publicly, or even executed, for these acts. Under the Taliban's rule, women could not work outside the home, receive an education, or even leave their home unless accompanied by a close male relative—brother, father, or husband.

The defeat of the Taliban means that Afghan women are now free from the Taliban's brutal rule. As we begin the peace process and reconstruction of the Afghan Government, we cannot forget about the women who, in spite of the Taliban's harsh edicts, risked their lives to run home schools and health clinics. That is just not a matter of a few words. They actually risked their lives by taking care of sick people and teaching kids how to read.

We have to remember that, prior to the Taliban's rule, Afghan women were scientists, professors, Members of Parliament, and university professors. They led corporations and nonprofit organizations. In fact, women were 70 percent of the nation's schoolteachers, 40 percent of the doctors, 50 percent of the civilian government workers, and 50 percent of the college students in Kabul.

These women must play a role in the rebuilding of post-Taliban Afghanistan. In particular, the education system must be rebuilt with the help of the women, who once comprised the majority of the nation's teachers. I hope that we, at the first opportunity, move in an army of Peace Corps workers. They will teach people English and how to read generally.

I hope the United Nations will focus on the problems of education in Afghanistan. We have to direct our humanitarian aid to the specific needs of the Afghan women and girls who suffered major setback after major setback as a result of this tyrannical rule. For example, over 90 percent of Afghan girls are illiterate. Rebuilding the country's educational system is the only way to repair the damage Afghan women and girls have suffered at the hands of the Taliban. Women will be key to this event.

We also cannot let misconceptions about a very good religion, Islam, guide our efforts in the reshaping of a post-Taliban Afghanistan. Nowhere does the religion say women cannot be educated or employed. In fact, the president of the world's largest Islamic organization in Indonesia is a woman.

As I said, 70 percent of Afghanistan's teachers were women prior to the Taliban regime. Afghanistan first adopted a constitution in 1964 that included universal suffrage, equal rights for women, and separation of powers with an independent judiciary. Afghan women were members of the judiciary, Parliament, and Cabinet, and 30 percent of Afghan's civil service workers were women.

If we are truly committed to restoring the human rights of the Afghan people, and we are, then we must be truly committed to restoring the rights of Afghan women because then women will be given from the start a seat at the table of the peace process and the establishment of the future Government of Afghanistan. Only then will we be truly able to secure the rights of the Afghan women.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARPER). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROVIDING FOR CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF CONGRESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the adjournment resolution S. Con. Res. 85 submitted earlier today by Senator DASCHLE; that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The matter is privileged. The concurrent resolution is agreed to.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 85) was agreed to, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 85

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Friday, November 16, 2001, Saturday, November 17, 2001, Monday, November 19, 2001, or Tuesday, November 20, 2001, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on Tuesday, November 27, 2001, or until Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of business on Friday, November 16, 2001, or Saturday, November 17, 2001, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Tuesday, November 27, 2001, or at such other time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the

Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble at such place and time as they may designate whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

Mr. REED. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE FARM BILL

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, before we adjourn for the week, I want to comment about the Agriculture Committee's action yesterday here in the Senate. I'm very pleased that they passed the farm bill out of the committee, which will, I hope very soon, come to the floor of the Senate. I want to make a few comments about it, about the importance of it to family farmers.

We deal with a lot of issues in the Senate. I know everyone has a favorite issue or a most important issue from their State or from their perspective. I come from a farm State. The subject of family farming is very important to me.

I know some say: But the family farm in America is largely gone. In any event, the notion of family farms is just old nostalgia. It is not relevant to today. Today we need big, mechanized corporate agri-factories. The family farm is like the little old diner that got left behind when the interstate came through. It is kind of nice to look back at what it was and think about it, but it is really not relevant in today's terms.

Those who believe that are just dead wrong. Family farming remains a critically important part of this country's economy.

Will Rogers said, many years ago:

You know, if one day all the lawyers and accountants in America failed to show up for work, it really wouldn't mean very much. But if one day all the cows in the United States failed to show up to get milked, now that would be a problem.

He was in his own, simple, interesting way describing the importance of agriculture. It is the case, it seems to me, that our country has been blessed by not being hungry as a nation. We have had some pockets of hunger to be sure, but we have not been hungry as a nation for many decades. So we forget from time to time the contribution made by family farms.

I think most people in a highly urban setting just think of butter as coming from a little box that you pick up at the grocery store. Cereal? Why that comes from a box as well. Pasta? That comes from a box with a cellophane window so you can see the size of the pasta you are buying. But, in fact, it all comes from a field somewhere, a

barn somewhere. It comes from the sweat of the brow of a family farmer, often a man and woman who decided to latch their dreams to running a family farm, to being independent, and to producing from the land.

It is true they have had a pretty difficult time in recent years. I have had calls from farmers over the years, especially in recent years. A woman called me. She said: My husband and I got married shortly after high school, and for 18 years we have run a dairy farm. We milk 80 cows, milk them every morning and every night. If you know anything about milking cows it is a tough job.

She began to weep on the phone as she described the financial hardship they were facing and the fact they were going to have to sell their farm because they couldn't make their payments because the price of milk had collapsed.

She said: It's not our fault. We don't go to town on Saturday night. We don't spend money in a way that is extravagant. When my children say they need a new pair of jeans for school, I have to say we have to wait because we don't have the money to buy jeans right now.

She said: The fact is, we have done everything we possibly can. We have worked as hard as we can to make this dream come true and we are losing our farm. And through tears she described the death of this dream that she and her husband had.

That is happening across our country these days as the price of commodities collapse and families, one by one, confront this terrible dilemma. One fellow wrote to me and he said he was sitting at his dinner table at 1:30 in the morning. He said: I am writing this letter to you at 1:30 in the morning, telling you about where I live and where I farm. It is spooky quiet around here. Most of my neighbors are gone. They left family farming because they couldn't make it. I go to town, a small town, and the Main Street is spooky quiet. There aren't any vehicles on Main Street anymore.

He described in a passionate way his belief about wanting to pursue his dream, of continuing to farm the land and raise America's food, but not being able to when the price of their commodities is below the cost of production when they take them to the elevator.

We have passed a farm bill through the Agriculture Committee and we need to get it to the floor of the Senate. We need to get it to the President and he needs to sign it. Why? Because we need a farm bill that says to family farmers: During tough times, when you run into price valleys, we have a bridge that takes you across those price valleys. Why? Because this country believes you are an important part of our economy and because we believe both economic and national security rests on our having a network of people who produce our food across this country.

It is true that we could probably have a country without family farmers

and giant agrifactories would produce our food. From California to Maine, the largest agrifactories in our country would produce food. They would milk 3,500 cows three times a day, as some dairy operations do in California. They would drive tractors in one direction until they are out of gas and then gas up and drive back. We all understand about giant agrifactories. It is just that family farms produce more than just food, and that is what people forget. The agrifactories produce just food. Family farms produce communities. They produce a culture. They produce family values. Those family values move from the family farm to small towns to big cities, nourishing and refreshing family values in America. It has always been the case, and it is not old-fashioned to think that should be part of our future as well.

How do we make that a part of our future? We as a Congress and we as a country say to family farmers: You matter. You are an important part of our future. We are going to pass farm legislation that reflects the urgency, reflects our desire to address this problem of collapsed prices, this problem of tough times for America's economic All Stars. We produce the best quality food for the lowest percent of disposable income of anyone in the world. In the spring, family farms in North Dakota or elsewhere in the Farm Belt, they borrow money to buy the seed, the fuel and the fertilizer; fix up the tractor; and then plow the ground and plant the seed. Then they hope, hope above hope, that it won't hail, that it will rain enough, that it won't rain too much, that the bugs won't come, or disease won't hit. Finally in the fall, they grease up the combine and go out and take that crop off the field, put it in the back of a 2-ton truck and haul it to the country elevator. After all this, if everything falls into place and works, they are told by the grain trader: By the way, that food you have produced doesn't have value. And that family farmer scratches his or her head and says: Doesn't have value? A half billion people go to bed at night with an ache in their belly and the food we produce in such great abundance has no value?

The farmer is told what they do is not valuable to this country. And the farmer wonders—in a country where the saying goes, two-thirds of the people are on a diet and a substantial portion of the world is hungry, and those who are producing America's food are told that their food has no value—farmers rightly wonder whether there is a connection missing someplace, whether there are some wires hooked up wrong.

Clearly, if you look at this world and evaluate what this world needs to produce peace and stability, and to help people live a better life, the first item would be to say we need to alleviate hunger.

Just as a note, One of my friends many years ago was a singer named

Harry Chapin. Harry was a wonderful man. When I announced I was going to run for Congress, he flew to North Dakota and did a concert; wouldn't even allow me to pay for his airline ticket. He showed up, borrowed a Martin guitar from the local music store, and did a 3-hour concert to 2,400 people who filled the Chester Fritz Auditorium in Grand Forks, ND. What a wonderful guy he was.

The reason I talk about Harry Chapin is that he donated one-half of the proceeds of his concerts every year to fight world hunger. He used to say that hunger is not headlines. It just isn't, because people die every single day. Every single day, 45,000 children die from hunger and hunger-related causes around the world, and you won't read a thing about it in tomorrow's paper. He said if 45,000 people died in New Jersey tomorrow from one terrible calamity or another, it would be headlines. But every day, the winds of hunger sweep across this globe, and children die, people die, and somehow it is not headlines.

Then our farmers in North Dakota go to the elevator with a load of grain that they prayed they would be able to raise against all the odds to be told that grain has no value, that food has no value. They have a right to wonder whether the wires are not connected somewhere with respect to our priorities.

In the midst of all that background, we wrote a farm bill. This Congress wrote a farm bill a while back called Freedom to Farm. It should have been titled "freedom to fail." It was a terrible piece of legislation. It didn't work.

We have done an emergency bill every year to try to fill the vacuum that was created by this piece of legislation that didn't work, and this law has one more year to go.

Next year, the Freedom to Farm bill expires. We believe that this is the time to write a bill so that when farmers go into the field next year, they will know there is a better farm program.

Congressman COMBEST in the House, against the advice of the White House and the President, wrote a bill. They said: Don't do it this year. He said: It doesn't matter what anybody says; I am going to do it; it needs to be done. Good for him.

Senator HARKIN yesterday in the Agriculture Committee said we are going to write a bill. It was reported out of the Senate Agriculture Committee, and now our challenge is to bring it to the floor of the Senate immediately when we return. I understand there are some here talking about blocking it. As we know, it takes 60 votes to overcome those who want to block legislation. I think we can do that, if we must, but I hope they will not try to block it.

We have a responsibility. In my judgment, we ought to write this farm bill this year. Even if you do not care much about family farmers—I can't conceive

of people who do not—you ought to care about food security in this country.

How do you best provide food security in America? You do that by having a broad network of dispersed producers producing America's food. If you are concerned about bioterrorism harming America's food supply, you should be concerned about feedlots with 200,000 animals run by the big agrifactories. In contrast, widely dispersed family farms that dot the Nation and which represent the network of producers across the prairie, they are much less at risk, when it comes to bioterrorism.

If this country wants to do something for its economic future, for economic recovery, for food security, for national security, then it ought to decide it will stand up for family farmers and pass a decent farm bill.

Let me make a comment about the legislation that passed the House and the Senate Agriculture Committee. That legislation is not perfect. It is not what I would write were I to write it myself. However, it is better than the than Freedom to Farm. Each hurdle is a hurdle that we have to get past. We got past a hurdle yesterday by getting this out of the Senate Agriculture Committee. The next hurdle is to get it on the floor of the Senate.

I urge my Colleagues to bring this farm bill up as soon as we return from the Thanksgiving break. I hope to offer an amendment that will improve the safety net in this bill. I hope we pass this farm bill after some improvements on the floor. Then we can have a conference with the House, and then send the bill to the President.

We cannot fail in this job. We have a responsibility to pass a farm bill, and to do it now and do it right.

As I said, I know a lot of people have a lot of different interests. I come from a farm State. Yet I stand on the floor of the Senate and I say to people, I support Amtrak. I am a strong believer in Amtrak. Why? Because I think this country needs a rail passenger system. Amtrak comes to North Dakota, and it is important to us. But it is not the biggest issue in the world. To me, the national issue of having rail passenger service in this country is a very important issue. I support mass transit in the cities. We don't have mass transit in my home county. My home county has 3,000 people.

I support mass transit because, as a national matter, this country needs it. I hope my colleagues will understand as well that when I support those issues for the major urban centers of America, they will do themselves and this country a favor by supporting the rural interests which also contribute to America's security and which contribute to America's enterprise and economic health.

I thank the Senate Agriculture Committee, Senator HARKIN and others who led the way to get a bill out of that committee yesterday, and their staff who worked so hard to get this done.

Next week we will not be in session because of Thanksgiving. But the week following, it is the desire of Senator DASCHLE, myself and many others, including Senator HARKIN, that we will bring that bill to the floor of the Senate.

We very much want to put a farm bill on the President's desk and get that legislation signed. We want our farmers in this country to go into the fields next spring and plant next year's crops under a farm bill that has a better support level than the current bill, one that gives them the hope that if they do the right thing and things work well for them, they will be able to make a living on the family farm next year.

Mr. President, I see colleagues waiting to speak. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

FLU VACCINES

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I come to the floor to talk about a program for vaccinating Americans, particularly as the country heads towards the season when many have the flu.

This is an area I have a great interest in since my days as director of the Oregon Gray Panthers. Obviously, older people are particularly vulnerable. This year, certainly there is going to be considerable focus on the flu vaccination program.

Given the new threats of bioterrorism that have been widely discussed, certainly many are going to be particularly interested in getting the flu vaccination. It is important that we reevaluate how flu vaccinations are provided in light of the unfortunate, significant new health concerns of many Americans.

Certainly the threat of bioterrorism has increased demand for flu shots. In my view, it has caused considerable confusion. In recent days, my office has canvassed State health departments and many senior citizens programs around the Nation. We have found that while no shortage currently exists, there are delays and certainly a substantial amount of misinformation about the various programs and services that are available for older people. There have also been problems with one manufacturer that may be exacerbating delays in getting vaccine doses out to the public.

Even more important, my sense is there isn't yet a clear, understandable system in place for ensuring that high-risk Americans, particularly the Nation's older people, are vaccinated early and first.

My sense is that more needs to be done in addition to prioritizing the concerns of high-risk, vulnerable Americans to put in place a better distribution system for getting out vaccines. There needs to be a better plan to make sure that there are processes in place, if there are problems or snafus of one manufacturer. It is extremely important that there be a uniform mes-

sage coming from all health officials with respect to the flu vaccine program.

For example, while CDC and others have told Americans to get vaccinated later, others in the health system have urged Americans to get vaccinated quickly against the flu because of the anthrax threat.

Since anthrax has been in the news so much, it is logical for people to think they should get vaccinated immediately. But because people cannot get their shot the day they want it or the day a clinic is scheduled, some people may think there is an immediate shortage.

On the basis of the survey we have just done of the State health departments and many senior citizen centers, it does not appear there is a shortage with respect to the vaccine. But there are delays. There are instances where mixed messages have been sent by public health officials. This has certainly contributed to the confusion that exists.

Under the leadership of Senator BREAU, the Senate Aging Committee has been looking into this issue. At Senator BREAU's request—and let me also state the ranking minority member, Senator CRAIG, on the Aging Committee has been considerably interested in this in the past as well—our Aging Committee held a hearing that I chaired to look at the flu vaccine program.

We have worked with Secretary Thompson. I think he has made a number of steps that are constructive and have moved the program in the right direction, but certainly there is more to do.

For example, our survey found that in Indiana they received about 10 percent of the order the counties have placed, but it will have 50 to 100 percent of their order in 4 to 6 weeks. And, obviously, if shipments don't arrive on time, don't arrive in line with the plans that the programs and the senior citizen centers are putting out to their members, there is going to be a great deal of confusion.

So as we move to this crunch time for vaccinations, health officials in this country still cannot tell us if all the high-risk patients are being vaccinated, or if there are plans to vaccinate them. I think we need to develop a better system, for example, to track seniors who are in these programs. Many are signed up, and there are others who should be vaccinated early. This can be done if the public health system wants to do it.

So around the country there are concerns. I mentioned Indiana. In the State of Oregon, one large provider of public health clinics has received only about 40 percent of their order.

In Michigan, health officials are concerned that by the time they get the rest of the order they need in December, the public will not come. Doses may actually have to be dumped. So there are a variety of concerns about the flu vaccine program.