

acted upon the conference reports on 2 bills—2 out of 13 bills. And here we are. We have had two continuing resolutions, and we are now somewhat in the midst of the time allotted by the second continuing resolution. We have instead been arguing over other things—things that didn't have anything to do, as far as I am concerned, with getting on with the appropriations bills.

Partisanship. Partisanship must no longer reign over this Senate or over the House of Representatives—at least until we get our appropriations bills completed. And we had better be busy about that. We should allow the President 10 days after we send him the last appropriations bill. He should be allowed 10 days in which to sign the last appropriations bill or to veto it. He should not be given the opportunity to pocket veto an appropriations bill. We need to be busy about the people's business.

The American people want to regain that sense of security that they lost on September 11. They want to get on an airplane without worrying about hijackers. They want to go to work free of angst about every piece of mail that comes into the office. Those who go to movies want to relax while they are there, and they are entitled to that. Those who go to the shopping malls want to relax without looking over their shoulders, as it were. Unless we take—when I say “we,” I mean us folks—unless we take immediate and serious steps to address these fears, all of the rhetoric about normalcy is just plain old hot air.

This Government's most basic responsibility is to take all—not just a few but all—feasible steps to protect its citizens. The conflict is not just in the steep mountains of the Himalayas in Afghanistan. I was there 46 years ago. Let me tell you folks, you have seen the Rockies. Go to the Himalayas; spend some time in Afghanistan. The winter is coming on, and soon. And there are millions of landmines waiting on a footstep.

The conflict is not just in the mountains of Afghanistan. Our people are at risk on our own soil. Congress, therefore, must act now to ensure the security of the Nation and the American people. By investing in measures that strengthen our ability to guard our citizens right here at home, we can take an important step toward removing the paralysis—the paralysis—go look that word up in the dictionary, and if you haven't noticed it before, you will see it—the paralysis of fear. Look at our empty office buildings on Jenkins Hill right here.

We can take an important step toward removing the paralysis that results from living in fear. This should be our mission in the days ahead as we craft a stimulus package. Whether or not we craft a stimulus package, we have 11 appropriations bills awaiting

action here in one form or another. They will be coming along in conference reports. There are appropriations bills such as the one before the Senate now that will be up for action in this body. So let's get busy about our work. This should be our mission in the days ahead as we craft a stimulus package that can restore confidence, which is the backbone of a strong economy.

Mr. President, I thank all Senators and I yield.

—————

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CLINTON). The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Madam President, I rise to speak about an amendment to the foreign operations bill. I understand it has been accepted. It deals with funding for leadership training for Afghan women. I think this is an important amendment. Even though it is not a great deal of money that is involved, I think it is important for us to do.

The proposed amendment funds a specially created training program for Afghan women involving civil society development, democracy building, and leadership, at a cost of \$2 million. It is not a large amount of money, but if we can get women involved back in the Afghan society, it is an important amount of money.

This funding has two purposes. First, it helps talented but direly disenfranchised Afghan women to strategically participate in nation building. Second, this is a symbolic expression of support from the Congress for Afghan women under the present Taliban regime.

The American people are engaged in a war right now. It is a war against those who want to destroy our physical well-being, our peace of mind, and our way of life. It is a war against the Taliban, which continues to provide fertile soil and a shield for terrorists. It is not, however, a war against the Afghan people, as the President repeatedly stated and as Members of this body have stated. In fact, the Afghan people are the victims of the Taliban, and no one group has suffered more than the women.

We have all heard the horrible stories by now: How women are forced to hide behind closed doors, prisoners in their own homes, some even starving because there is no male relative to take them to market; how they are barred from schools and jobs and from desperately needed health care; how they are beaten in the streets if their ankles are showing; how they are beaten for begging, even though they are forbidden to work; how they are beaten for

no reason at all; how they are continually silenced, hidden, and treated as less than human—all of this in the 21st century.

I am sure some of my colleagues and others recall the images on CNN of Afghan women fleeing Afghanistan into Pakistan dressed in burqas that completely cover them. All she has is a small mesh area through which to look and breathe. That is so dehumanizing, as if this is not a person; they are not recognized as a separate individual.

It has not always been like that in Afghanistan. That is important for us to know and remember as well. These same women who now hide with fear and are forced into these burqas once had a voice in their country. Some choose to wear a certain traditional garb, and that is wonderful, but they should not be forced to do it.

In Afghanistan, women once represented half the students, half the civil servants, and 40 percent of the doctors in Kabul were once women. Once they were valued members of their society, and they must become this again. To accomplish this, they will need our help and support, and we should give it.

I am pleased to offer this amendment with Senator BOXER. She and I helped pass a resolution 2 years ago condemning the Taliban regime. This amendment has been accepted by the managers of the bill. I am very pleased with that.

This amendment funds \$2 million for scholarships for Afghan women. There will be approximately 300 women selected to participate in training programs for emerging leaders. They will be instructed in civil society development, including effective governance, economic development, establishing nongovernmental organizations, and an independent press, among other fundamentals of a free society, including the right to vote for all citizens in Afghanistan and human rights, including religious freedom for all citizens and people of Afghanistan.

The Afghan women will learn from top professors and experts in the field. Their curriculum will be developed in close consultation with Afghan women's groups on the ground in South Asia and in the United States. A selection of candidates will be made in close consultation with leading Afghan women in exile and leading Afghan women still in Afghanistan today, and United States embassies abroad.

I believe programs such as these can help play a key role in stabilizing the region and rebuilding the lives of its citizens. The United States is at its best when it stands up for our fundamental principles, and that includes the right to vote for everybody, the right of participation for everybody, democracy, freedom, religious freedom, and human rights.

This amendment can give the women who have far too long been victimized

by the Taliban brutality the tools to rebuild a new Afghanistan on the foundation of democracy, tolerance, human rights, and equality.

Lastly, this funding not only helps Afghanistan; it also helps America. As Afghan women promote democratic values in their society, they inherently prevail over the forces of terrorism, extremism, and repression which have also victimized us.

I am pleased my colleagues have accepted this amendment, and I look forward to its implementation where we help Afghan women rebuild a civil society in their country. As we move forward in the prosecution of this war in Afghanistan, it is very important that our next step, once we are able to secure the country, is to rebuild a civil society with everybody participating.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I rise to offer some comments on the bill before us, the foreign operations appropriations bill.

Today we are considering the fiscal year 2002 foreign operations appropriations bill. I ask my fellow Senators to consider this: The total foreign assistance spending in this legislation represents just .79 percent of the entire \$1.9 trillion Federal budget. That is less than half of what it was just 15 years ago, and it is barely .1 percent of GDP. An even smaller amount of the bill's funding is for foreign development assistance, less than .6 percent of the budget.

Anemic U.S. foreign assistance spending is not new news, but it is part of a very sad legacy of more than two decades of declining foreign assistance spending.

But at precisely the time when the events of September 11 have driven home what an integrated and globalized world we live in, a world that requires us, I believe, to reexamine the basic underpinnings of U.S. national security policy, it is baffling that the United States remains on a course to tie a post-World War II low in foreign assistance spending and a 50-year low of overseas assistance as a share of Government spending.

I do not mean this as any criticism of the managers of the bill. Given the administration's request and the allocations of the subcommittee, they have done an excellent job of putting together a \$15.5 billion bill. But in light of September 11, I strongly believe that the fundamental assumptions regarding how best to safeguard U.S. national security interests over the long term require rethinking and reexamination.

As America undertakes a war on terrorism, we must declare war on global poverty as well, and we must do so because our national security demands no less.

If we are going to win this war against terrorism, we have to be willing to invest in the lives and livelihoods of the people of the developing world. For it is the poverty and the resulting political instability and institutional weakness of developing countries, many of them failed or near failed states, which provide the ecosystem in which terrorists, terrorist operations, terrorist recruitment, and terrorist organizations are able to flourish.

The World Bank estimates that 1.2 billion residents of poor nations live on less than \$1 a day. In South Asia alone, more than 550 million people, 40 percent of the total population, live on less than \$1 a day. In sub-Saharan Africa it is close to 50 percent of the population. I know the Chair is eminently familiar with this. Close to 50 percent of the population—that is, 291 million people, or more than the entire population of the United States—live in that abject, grinding poverty.

All in all, about 2.8 million people, half of the world's population, live in poverty, getting by on \$2 a day. That is less than a cappuccino at Starbucks.

The Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations estimates that nearly 800 million people in the developing world are undernourished, 1.2 billion lack access to safe drinking water, 2.9 billion have inadequate access to sanitation, and over 1 billion people are either unemployed or underemployed.

For all too many of these people, there is precious little hope in their daily life, and they experience a world in which progress or betterment is virtually impossible.

Yet, as a recent Congressional Budget Office study on the role of foreign aid and development reports: "U.S. spending on foreign aid has fluctuated from year to year but has been on a downward path since the 1960s."

In 1962, the United States spent more than 3 percent of the budget outlays on foreign assistance. Today, as I noted, it is barely six-tenths of 1 percent. This is unconscionable. Interestingly enough, people do not understand this. I often ask people: How much do you think the foreign operations budget is as a percent of the overall budget? Some will say 5 percent, some will say 10 percent, some will say 15 percent, but nobody says less than 1 percent.

Yet that is the fact. The United States spends less than \$30 a year for each of its citizens helping those in the developing world, compared with a median per capita contribution of \$70 by other industrialized nations. This has not always been the case and, I would argue, it is also not becoming of America's position and role in the world.

Between 1950 and 1968, the United States contributed more than half of the official development assistance provided by countries in the OECD De-

velopment Assistance Committee, and by 1978 we were contributing less than a third. By 1998, it was less than a sixth, where it languishes today.

Some would question why this matters, or they would argue that it is the responsibility of others, not us, to address these development needs.

The short answer is that it matters because development assistance is a critical tool for the protection and promotion of U.S. interests around the globe. It matters because poverty leads to financial instability, infectious disease, environmental degradation, illegal immigration, drugs, narcotic trafficking, and it fuels the hatred of "have-not" nations for the "have" nations, of which the United States heads the list.

Although not the sole cause of perceived grievances in an increasingly unequal and increasingly globalized world, poverty is a principal cause of human suffering, and the political instability that results as well.

In its worst form, poverty creates the political, social, economic, and institutional instability and chaos that leads to failed states, zones of anarchy, and lawlessness, with semi-legitimate governments, or no real functioning government, which are unable to offer their people a positive vision of the future and instead utilize the United States as a scapegoat for their hopelessness.

It matters because into the void of failed states, and lives without hope or the prospect for betterment, step terrorists, fanatics, extremists, and others who take advantage of these situations for their own ends.

If a state is unable to educate its young, terrorists and extremists will only be too happy to indoctrinate the young, poisoning their minds. If a country is unable to offer young men or women the prospect of a job and self-respect, terrorists, fanatics, and extremists are more than happy to offer conspiracy theories to explain misfortune and offer alternative employment in their criminal enterprises. And if a government is unable to offer its people a positive prospect for the future, terrorists or fanatics are able to offer their own distorted view of the world and twisted vision of the future.

It matters because poverty creates the swamp in which the terrorists find protection and sustenance, and it matters in short because our national security interests and the lives and safety of our citizens depend on us recognizing this. It matters, I strongly believe, because self-interest aside, the United States has a strong moral global obligation, especially in cases such as Afghanistan and now Pakistan, to provide assistance to those who have helped us in the past and who stand with us today in this war on terrorism.

Foreign assistance and development assistance are valuable elements in our

toolbox to respond to the events of September 11, and in cases where diplomacy or military force cannot be used, they may be the only tools available.

When nations who are friends or allies of the United States were subject to terrorist attacks prior to September 11, all too often the U.S. reaction was to bemoan the rough neighborhood in which these nations live and shrug our shoulders as if nothing could be done. But September 11 proved with startling clarity all of the globe is a neighborhood today, our neighborhood, and we must see what can be done; for if we continue to do nothing, it is at our peril.

I would not argue that the United States should waste foreign assistance spending on ineffective programs, or on projects where rampant corruption prevents us from assuring that our assistance reaches those in need.

But a report last year by the Overseas Development Council suggests that many aid programs have been successful. They have contributed to advances in public health, sanitation, and education.

As a first step in this new war on global poverty, then, it is critical that the government, private foundations, and nongovernmental organizations come together to identify areas where increased spending can make a difference, especially in the world's poorest regions. This review must also look at what government and private voluntary donors have learned about how to make delivery of assistance more effective.

This evaluation should also extend to the activities of the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and other multilateral development and lending institutions. Where these institutions need to be reformed, and I believe they do, their activities should be redefined today.

Once this evaluation is complete, I believe it is critical we reverse the past two decades of a downward trend in U.S. foreign assistance spending and dramatically increase funding, including that channeled through foundations and nongovernmental organizations.

According to the U.N. Development Program, some \$40 billion a year—remember, we are at \$15 billion—would provide water and sanitation, reproductive health, basic health and nutrition, and basic education for all in need in the developing world.

To help meet our share of this need, I believe and propose we triple the foreign assistance budget within 5 years, bringing it back up to what it was before, roughly, and this is still a meager amount, 0.3 percent of gross domestic product. I fully believe such an increase in United States foreign assistance spending would be leveraged by increases in assistance contributions by other potential public and private donors.

In addition to traditional economic development programs, our renewed focus on fighting international poverty must also focus on the creation of public goods, democratic institutions, rule of law, functioning and legitimate educational systems which allow public and economic progress and growth to take root and flourish.

The image of "draining the swamp" of terrorists has become a commonplace metaphor, but the metaphor has its limits. The environmental elements which contribute to the germination and flourishing of terrorists and extremists cannot, in fact, simply be drained away. Indeed, I am worried that if we do not act wisely and address every dimension and level of this war on terrorism we run the risk of fueling a new generation of terrorists.

Rather, we must adopt a long-term, carefully crafted strategy to reduce and perhaps even eliminate factors such as global poverty, which underlie and foster terrorism. So I call upon my colleagues to recognize that such long-term efforts are as much a part of the burden of global leadership and the war on terrorism as cruise missiles and aircraft carriers. Meeting this obligation of leadership demands and requires a serious, long-term commitment of the necessary resources by the United States.

As one Senator, I am prepared to make that commitment and I hope my colleagues are as well.

I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 1940

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I send an amendment to the desk, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), for herself and Mr. BROWNBACK, proposes an amendment numbered 1940.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask unanimous consent reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate regarding the important role of women in the future reconstruction of Afghanistan)

At the appropriate place, add the following:

SEC. . . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE IMPORTANT ROLE OF WOMEN IN THE FUTURE RECONSTRUCTION OF AFGHANISTAN.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that:

(1) Prior to the rise of the Taliban in 1996, women throughout Afghanistan enjoyed greater freedoms, compromising 70 percent of school teachers, 50 percent of civilian government workers, and 40 percent of doctors in Kabul.

(2) In Taliban-controlled areas of Afghanistan, women have been banished from the work force, schools have been closed to girls and women expelled from universities, women have been prohibited from leaving

their homes unless accompanied by a close male relative, and publicly visible windows of women's houses have been ordered to be painted black.

(3) In Taliban-controlled areas of Afghanistan, women have been forced to wear the burqa (or chadari)—which completely shrouds the body, leaving only a small mesh-covered opening through which to see.

(4) In Taliban-controlled areas of Afghanistan, women and girls have been prohibited from being examined by male physicians while at the same time, most female doctors and nurses have been prohibited from working.

(5) In Taliban-controlled areas of Afghanistan, women have been brutally beaten, publicly flogged, and killed for violating Taliban decrees.

(6) The United States and the United Nations have never recognized the Taliban as the legitimate government of Afghanistan, in part, because of their horrific treatment of women and girls.

(7) Afghan women and children now make up 75 percent of the millions of Afghan refugees living in neighboring countries in substandard conditions with little food and virtually no clean water or sanitation.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) Afghan women organizations must be included in planning the future reconstruction of Afghanistan.

(2) Future governments in Afghanistan should work to achieve the following goals:

(A) The effective participation of women in all civil, economic, and social life.

(B) The right of women to work.

(C) The right of women and girls to an education without discrimination and the reopening of schools to women and girls at all levels of education.

(D) The freedom of movement of women and girls.

(E) Equal access of women and girls to health facilities.

Mrs. BOXER. For the benefit of my colleagues, I will not take but about 7 minutes on this and one other amendment dealing with suicide bombing, both of which I believe will be adopted. I will be very brief and ask my colleagues' indulgence.

Madam President, I know you are very well aware of the women in Afghanistan under the rule of the Taliban. I give praise to this organization called Fund for the Feminist Majority that brought this issue to my attention several years ago. I was unaware of what the Taliban were, what they were doing to women. My friends came to see me and not only told me about the abuses of the Taliban toward women but they also told me the women were forced to wear these burqas, dehumanizing them, taking away every semblance of humanity from the women.

Therefore, what we try to do in this amendment after we detail the condition of women, which the clerk read so beautifully, we talk about the fact they have to wear the burqas which completely shroud their body, leaving only a small mesh-covered opening through which to see. Americans have seen that on TV. Women are completely obscured. If you try on one of those burqas, you can barely breathe.

We know women in Taliban-controlled areas of Afghanistan have been prohibited from being examined by male physicians while, at the same time, most female doctors and nurses have been prohibited from working. We know women have been brutally beaten and publicly flogged, even executed, and we have seen that on CNN on an incredible documentary called "From Beneath The Veil."

Senator BROWNBACK and I in this amendment say it is the sense of the Senate that Afghan women organizations must be included in planning for the future reconstruction of Afghanistan and that the goal of the new government should be equality for all.

That is all I have to say about this amendment. I ask it be laid aside, and I ask to call up my second amendment.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1941

Mrs. BOXER. I send the amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER] proposes an amendment numbered 1941.

(Purpose: Condemning suicide bombings as a terrorist act)

At the appropriate place, add the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE CONDEMNING SUICIDE BOMBINGS AS A TERRORIST ACT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that:

(1) Suicide bombings have killed and injured countless people throughout the world.

(2) Suicide bombings and the resulting death and injury demean the importance of human life.

(3) There are no circumstances under which suicide bombings can be justified, including considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature.

(4) Religious leaders, including the highest Muslim authority in Saudi Arabia, the Grand Mufti, have spoken out against suicide bombings.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) Suicide bombings are a horrific form of terrorism that must be universally condemned.

(2) The United Nations should specifically condemn all suicide bombings by resolution.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I think this amendment is very clear. As far as we can tell, the United Nations has never passed a specific resolution condemning suicide bombings, nor has the Senate done it, as far as I can tell. This would be important. Religious leaders of all kinds have basically said there is never a political reason, a philosophical reason, an ideological reason, a racial, ethnic, or religious reason, no reason for someone to become a suicide bomber. It demeans life.

I am very hopeful the managers of the bill will accept this amendment. I have no need to speak any longer on it

except to say I am hopeful it will be passed.

I ask the Presiding Officer if it is appropriate because I want to make sure the amendment is disposed of—if it is appropriate to ask for the yeas and nays or simply to lay it aside at this time; what is appropriate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator can do either.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask this amendment be laid aside. In doing so, I have two amendments laid aside, one dealing with the Afghan women and one dealing with suicide bombings. I thank my colleagues for their forbearance. I am pleased to be on the Foreign Relations Committee where I have an opportunity to work on these matters.

I thank my Republican friend, and I ask unanimous consent that Senator ALLEN be added as the original cosponsor of the suicide bombing amendment. I thank him and Senator BROWNBACK for working with me on both issues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendment is laid aside.

The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Before the Senator from California leaves, I wonder if she would put me on the two amendments, and I thank the Senator for recognizing I have been waiting. I do appreciate the brevity.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank my colleague. I am very proud to ask unanimous consent that Senator DOMENICI as an original cosponsor of both amendments.

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

WORKING TOGETHER

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, I come to the floor today to talk about history, but strangely enough, short history—the last 3½ to 4 weeks. Because so much has happened in that period of time, I am firmly of the opinion today that while we will return to some level of normalcy and we will all begin to understand what has changed in the world, we all found out in a short period of time what kind of people terrorists are and what they will do. Americans can hardly understand how somebody would organize people—having no country, no real habitat, with no concern except to wreak havoc on those they do not like. We live in that new bubble.

I rise today to urge that we continue one other important thing. I believe we have a long-time reputation of being the body wherein issues are argued, debates can even go on forever. What we did immediately after that New York disaster, when the terrorists showed their true light to the Americans, was we decided in the Congress we would not conduct business as usual. Something rather magnificent happened. The public perceives us completely differently. We, too, have changed in their

opinion because we lock arms on big issues, we work very hard behind the scenes with experts. We come to the floor and, with a minimum of debate, we pass important measures.

That has been one of the most significant signals to our own people and to the terrorists of the world, that we can adjust this great Republic to the modern problems, the problems we never, ever, anticipated, even 2 years ago, much less when our Constitution and Bill of Rights were written.

I think something is going awry, that maybe this unity is falling apart or breaking. I am hearing leadership offer their own proposals. Just yesterday I heard the majority leader, who I thought was doing a magnificent job joining with Republicans, introducing a reconciliation package. I thought we were going to work the big issues together.

I urge that we return to that mode and during the next 4 to 6 weeks, or however long we want to spend, we complete some very fundamental work and we get on with a few packages that will indicate we need to do something new and different. That way, we would not have either the tremendous buildup and pressure of not being able to get things done, nor would we have a cantankerous partisan debate over matters that could easily be resolved, as we resolved the first four or five bills of importance when New York was still on fire and the Pentagon was still steaming because we hadn't put out the fires deep inside the beaten-upon building that was a symbol of our strength.

I also want to say something else is happening which makes this a very difficult burden for our President, for us, and for the American people. First I commend the President. I think he has done a tremendous job. I believe he leads not only us but I think right-minded people everywhere, although they all have different political problems. They are seeing America, now, under his leadership, presenting a real opportunity for the world to get rid of terrorism. They are joining us, not one or two a day, but in flocks; the countries of the world are joining us.

Maybe from this will come a new world order. Who knows? I said that a few weeks ago. The father of this President came into office saying he wanted to work for a new world order. Things got out of hand. The new President did not claim that. But, because of the courage, tenacity, faith, he is leading the Nation to a whole new set of alliances, all of which I see as very positive.

It seems to me Russia and America may come out very differently as a result of this incident. It also seems to me that a number of countries that were not willing to join us are looking around and saying: We would like to help America.