

have 5 minutes and then perhaps take his 10 minutes?

Mr. INHOFE. I am glad to wait until approximately 11:30, if necessary.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for up to 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has the floor. The Senator is recognized pursuant to a previous order.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, is my understanding correct that we will go back and forth, side to side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That has not been ordered.

Mr. KERRY. I ask unanimous consent that we speak alternatively, from side to side.

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

The Senator from Texas is recognized.

A UNITED RESPONSE

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, there is a time to talk and there is a time to act. The Senate today has unanimously acted with force, with resolve, and with unanimity. We spoke for the people of our country about the heinous situation in which we find ourselves, and also about the resolve to keep this from happening again.

We have passed a resolution giving the President of the United States our support and authorization for the use of military force against any person or any country that is helping the people who did the despicable acts of September 11. I heard a young woman on television this morning whose brother was lost in one of the World Trade Center Towers. The young woman was asked what she thought the response of the United States should be. She said, "I don't really want to go to war. I just don't want anyone else to have to suffer what I am suffering today." I just want to say to that young woman, and to all of the other families of the victims of September 11, 2001, that it is exactly what we did today that will prevent other people in the future from suffering what she is suffering.

If we do not respond with force, we will put American lives in jeopardy, and we will not be doing our job of protecting the people of our country whom we were elected to protect.

No one would ever have the United States move before we had absolute evidence about who perpetrated this atrocity, but when we have that evidence, we are going to move.

The Senate is speaking today in support of the President to take military action against those who have attacked our country, our people, our way of life, our very freedom.

The most important responsibility I believe I have as a Senator is to keep the freedom that so many have died for in past years for our country. We are the beacon of freedom in the world. We are a democracy that has proven that, through our voting capabilities, we can become the strongest nation on Earth.

It is freedom that is the foundation of the democracy and our way of life.

To make sure we keep the freedom we have known—our mothers, fathers, grandmothers, and grandfathers have known—for our children and grandchildren, we must act decisively when an act of war has been perpetrated on innocent people of our country.

As to the act that occurred on September 11—a day we will never forget in our lifetime, nor will our children or grandchildren ever forget—the only way we can respond to that kind of attack on our people and our freedom is to say we will fight, not just today or next month or 2 months from now, but we are in this for the long haul, and we are going to rid the world of the despots who believe they can prey on innocent citizens against freedom-loving people in the world.

I am proud of the Senate. I am proud that we did not dillydally around to say, "I wonder what we ought to do," but we are putting our faith in the President of the United States, our military forces, and our leaders who have the decisionmaking capabilities and the control of the military to act on our behalf and on behalf of the people of our country to assure that this will not happen again, and the force that we use will have the appropriate impact to protect ourselves and our freedom-loving allies wherever they may be in the world.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, my mom has an expression: Out of every tragedy, something good will come if you look hard enough.

I know the Presiding Officer, if he will forgive this point of personal reference, has had his share of personal tragedy. Everyone in this Chamber has. Some of us have gotten those phone calls that the people in New York are getting from cell phones and/or from a police officer and/or from a morgue.

We know there is not a darn thing we can do now for those people except—it is strange the way human nature works, and I know the Presiding Officer knows this—except it is amazing how those people in that circumstance draw strength from the knowledge that other people understand their pain, that other people empathize with them, that other people care about what they are going through. It amazes me that you can draw strength from that.

I think what we are doing and the Nation is doing is the right thing. Most important, what we did today should be noted is not likely to occur in any other country in the world, and that is, that we just a few moments ago operated under the rule of law.

In all our anger, all our frustration, all our feelings, very bluntly, of hatred that exists now for those who perpetrated the act against us, we did not pell-mell just say: Go do anything,

anytime, anyplace, Mr. President; you have to just go. We operated as our Founders, who were not naive people, intended us to operate. We operated under the rule of law.

We went to our civil bible, the Constitution, and we said: What does it call for here? What it calls for is the U.S. Congress to meet its constitutional responsibility, to say: Mr. President, we authorize you, in the name of the American people, to take action, and we define the action in generic terms which you can take.

We gave the President today, as we should have and as is our responsibility, all the authority he needs to prosecute war against the individuals or countries responsible, without yielding our constitutional right to retain the judgment in the future as to whether or not force against others could, should, or would be used.

That is remarkable. I suspect not many people know, other than my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Texas, a former professor, one of the brightest guys with whom I ever worked, unfortunately leaving the Senate at the end of his term; what the leading scholar in the Senate, Senator BYRD, knows and what the experienced Senator from Alaska knows. My friend from Oklahoma is the only one in this place who can fully understand, I suspect, along with his Oklahoma colleague, what our friends from New Jersey, New York, Virginia, the District, and Maryland are going through. He understands it. He has internalized it. He knows it.

I believe it is fairly remarkable that, in spite of the reasons for the attack on us and our way of life, we adhered to the rule of law; that even in this calamity, we acted with dispatch but under the law, under the Constitution.

The resolution provides the President clear authority "to use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations, or persons that he determines planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, or harbored such organizations or persons, in order to prevent any future acts of international terrorism against the United States by such nations, organizations or persons." In short, the President is authorized to go after those responsible for the barbaric acts of September 11, 2001 to ensure that those same actors do not engage in additional acts of international terrorism against the United States.

The authority permits the President wide latitude to use force against the broad range of actors who were responsible for the September 11 attacks. If any nation harbored the terrorists while they were in training, that nation may be subject to American military power. If a nation or organization financed the operation, they may be subject to American military power. It does not limit the amount of time that the President may prosecute this action against the parties guilty for the

September 11 attacks. We must all understand that the use of force will not be easy or quick. In extending this broad authority to cover those "planning, authorizing, committing, or aiding the attacks" it should go without saying, however, that the resolution is directed only at using force abroad to combat acts of international terrorism.

The authority granted is focused on those responsible for the attacks of September 11. The President's lawyers originally proposed that the resolved clause also include language authorizing military force to "deter and preempt any future acts of terrorism against the United States." Of course, the President has the Constitutional authority to deter terrorism through a broad range of means, including diplomatic measures, economic sanctions, seizing of financial assets, or deployment of forces. The President must also ensure that Executive Branch agencies devote the necessary resources and apply the full measure of the federal criminal laws to deter, prevent and punish terrorism. Further, the President has the authority under the Constitution to use force to preempt an imminent attack, including a terrorist attack, against the United States. Rather than purporting to extend these authorities in the resolved clause, the final whereas clause reflects these recognized powers of the President.

I suggest what others have said, and that is, the President of the United States has our prayers, he has our good wishes, and he has our commitment under the Constitution now to support him in what action he takes as defined by the authority he has. That is a big deal. It is a big deal. It is worth noting.

Lastly, I compliment the President on his patience, on his resolve, and his understanding of the need of certitude because the worst thing we can do, as he is uniting the world, is to act precipitously to meet our instinct for response immediately. I compliment him. I compliment his Secretary of State for the way he is handling this situation.

I conclude by saying that I do not see what happened on the 11th as the beginning of the end of our way of life. I see it as the beginning of the end of terrorism as it has been able to be spawned over the last three decades. The world has come face to face with the reality that nation states, no matter what their ideological disposition, are all in jeopardy. We are united in understanding that we cannot allow these networks to be spawned.

I thank my colleagues for allowing me to speak at this moment. Again, I compliment them all, Democrat and Republican, in the way we have stood united.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, today, in a bipartisan unanimous vote, we gave the President the money and the

power to make war on those who have made war on us.

We are down, it seems to me, to a stark and bitter choice: We can hunt down those who made war on us and make war on them where they live, or we can allow them to make war on us where we live. We can either change our lifestyle, limit our freedom, reduce our prosperity, or we can change the lifestyle of those who have made war on us. I am not indifferent to that choice. I subscribe to the thesis that when our enemies are on the run, they cannot have the resources and the communications to carry out the kind of terrorist war they carried out against the Pentagon and against the World Trade Center.

We have to be aware and we have to accept up front that if we go too far in limiting our freedom or our prosperity in trying to fight this war, then we are ceding the very thing the war is about. So I believe very strongly this money and this vast commitment of authority and power is meant to go after our enemies and to pursue them to the end of the earth and to never let up in that process.

I do not believe this is going to be an easy war to fight, and I believe it is going to be a costly war to fight.

Our enemies have a hate for capitalism and for democracy that we cannot comprehend or understand. I believe until they are hunted down, captured, or killed we can never reestablish the safety we felt prior to last Tuesday.

I also want to make it clear that I believe we have to choose sides in this conflict. Those countries that harbor or abet or tolerate the actions of terrorists on their soil are making war against the United States of America, and I believe that we have to hold them accountable.

Finally, I want to thank our leaders. I want to thank Senator BYRD, for working to come up with a responsible appropriation. I think it is clear that under these circumstances, the Congress would literally be willing to pass any appropriations bill and spend any amount of money. As this conflict lengthens, as other priorities emerge, as we need more resources, as we ultimately will in this conflict, we will wish we had been responsible. I think we took an important and responsible first step today. I personally believe we should set up a joint bipartisan committee with the job of overseeing these expenditures, just as the Truman Commission oversaw the expenditures of World War II. The job of this committee would not be to determine how the money is spent but to simply see it is being spent as we appropriate it; to see we are not being gouged in terms of prices when there is no competitive bidding, as there generally is not when you are doing things on an emergency basis; to try and see that we are being good stewards of the taxpayers' money and getting the return on that money in comforting people who have been

hurt, helping those who have lost loved ones, rebuilding things that have been destroyed, and prosecuting this war against our enemies.

It should be a joint bipartisan committee or commission to work with the GAO to see the money is well spent, to see it is spent for the purposes we provided it, to see we are being charged reasonable prices, and to hold people accountable for things they do under emergency situations in terms of prices that are charged. We did that in World War II. Harry Truman did an excellent job, and the country benefitted from it.

It should obviously not be something on the scale of what we did in World War II, but something similar to that would be helpful. I intend next week, when we come back, to talk about it. I hope my colleagues will look at that idea, look back at what Harry Truman did in his committee in terms of following the expenditures on the war and how well the money was being spent and holding people accountable.

I am proud of the Senate today, and I think we have a right to be proud. I believe the American people are proud. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. INHOFE. Will the Senator yield for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. BYRD. Absolutely.

Mr. INHOFE. I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, I be recognized for up to 15 minutes.

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

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma for his courtesy toward me. He was prepared to speak before I speak. I offered to wait and have him go ahead but he said no, so I thank him.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak for not to exceed 7 minutes, and I ask the Chair indicate when I have 1 minute left.

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

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chair.

Today, the Senate passed the fiscal year 2001 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Recovery from and Response to Terrorist Attacks on the United States.

Mr. President, the emergency supplemental appropriations bill adopted earlier today is an extraordinary response to extraordinary events. It sends a strong and unmistakable message to the world that the United States is prepared to move swiftly on all fronts to respond to the horrific attacks on our citizens and our territory. The unity and determination that have propelled this bill through Congress 72 hours after the assault on America speaks volumes about the strength and resiliency of our system of government.

The supplemental provides \$40 billion, to remain available until expended, to respond to the terrorist

events of September 11, 2001. This is an extraordinary bill that responds to extraordinary events. The President has not presented the Congress with any detailed estimates of agency needs in response to these terrorist acts. This is not a criticism. Federal Government agencies, such as the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Department of Defense, and the Corps of Engineers, are on the ground, focusing all of their attention on responding to the crisis.

Initially, the administration requested authority to spend any amount of money, for any purpose. The Constitution gives the power of the purse to the Congress. It is the Congress that has the responsibility to make sure that the needs of our people are met. This left my good friend Senator STEVENS and me with a dilemma. How do we meet the clear and immediate need for funding while protecting the prerogatives of Congress?

On Wednesday, Senator STEVENS and I joined with our Senate leaders and the House leaders at a meeting with the President to discuss our response to these evil terrorist acts. At that meeting, I laid out four goals for funding the Federal response. First, we must appropriate a specific amount for particular purposes, not a blank check, not a Gulf of Tonkin Resolution, with ill-defined goals. Second, to reinforce bi-partisan unity, we must all have trust and candor on the use of these funds. Third, the President must consult with the Congress in the allocation of the funds. Finally, there must be regular reporting to the Congress.

Mr. President, the supplemental bill that the Senate approved today meets each of those goals. The bill provides \$40 billion, all designated by the Congress as an emergency, and is contingent on the President designating the full amount as an emergency.

Funds are available to: (1) provide Federal, State and local preparedness for mitigating and responding to the attacks; (2) provide support to counter, investigate, or prosecute domestic or international terrorism; (3) provide increased transportation security; (4) repair public facilities and transportation systems damaged by the attacks; and (5) support national security.

Not less than \$20 billion of the \$40 billion is for disaster assistance and disaster recovery activities in New York, Virginia, Pennsylvania and elsewhere.

Funds are available in three segments.

The President has \$10 billion available to him after consultation with the Chairmen and Ranking Members of the Appropriations Committees.

The President has a second \$10 billion available to him after the Director of the Office of Management and Budget has submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a proposed allocation and plan for the use of the funds, and he then must wait 15

days. This will allow the Committees to review the President's plans and make suggestions—possibly enter into some negotiations with the President or his Office of Management and Budget Director.

The President has an additional \$20 billion available only when the amounts are allocated to specific programs in a subsequent emergency appropriations bill.

Mr. President, I stress that this bill is just the first order of business for Congress. This bill deals with what has already happened but does not fully deal with it. Of course, even as scores of rescue workers continue to sift the rubble of the World Trade Center and search for victims in the shattered wing of the Pentagon, we in Congress must start looking forward. We must take steps now—today, tomorrow, next week—to re-double our efforts to intercept would-be terrorists before they can launch an attack.

As most Americans, I am amazed by the sophistication, organization, and complexity of Tuesday's attacks on the United States. This was not a casual effort or the work of a lone madman. These attacks took elaborate planning, significant manpower, and detailed knowledge of U.S. aircraft and aviation systems. I have great admiration for our nation's intelligence agencies. I believe that they provide tremendous service to our nation with the resources they have, and I know that we rarely hear about their success stories. But it is, frankly, beyond belief that such a massive and well-coordinated assault on our nation could be executed without any discernable signals. It is beyond belief that our nation, with its vast and powerful network of worldwide intelligence resources, could be caught so utterly unprepared.

It has long been acknowledged that to be forewarned is to be forearmed. Well, we have been forewarned. Now, we must focus our efforts on improving our intelligence-gathering systems so that we have a chance to thwart a terrorist plot before it can be executed, before innocent lives can be lost. The stunning attack on the heart of America's military, financial, and transportation centers has exposed our vulnerabilities.

As we move quickly to provide assistance to the victims of these horrible acts, to improve security at our airports, to rebuild the Pentagon, and to repair the devastation of New York's financial district, so must we move to rebuild our intelligence capabilities. This emergency supplemental appropriations bill is the first step in a long road that will not end in my lifetime. We must guard against being sidetracked by politics or partisanship.

There will still be politics. We have other things to do along with these matters. There will still be some politics and some partisanship, but we must not be sidetracked by politics or partisanship. Congress and the President have demonstrated this week that

in times of crisis there is no center aisle. There is no aisle between us. We can overcome our political differences and work together. Make no mistake about it, we are in a time of crisis, and it is a time of suspended crisis. We will weather this crisis, but it will last a long time. We will emerge stronger. We must work together to achieve that goal.

I close by commending Senator TED STEVENS, former chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, a very valued Member of this body, for his tireless strength and dedication and patriotism. I commend Representative BILL YOUNG of Florida for his dedication to purpose, for his cooperation, for his characteristic courtesy to those across the Capitol and across the aisle. I commend Representative DAVID OBEY for his tenacity and determination, his patriotism, his dedication to the separation of powers in this great country of ours—all of these people for their outstanding contribution to this extraordinary bill. I could not sit down without commending, also, the Speaker of the House, our two leaders, in particular, Mr. DASCHLE and Mr. LOTT, and our excellent staffs who have worked long hours and rendered invaluable assistance, without whom we could not succeed in this mighty effort.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized under the previous order for 15 minutes.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I will identify myself with the remarks of the previous speaker, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia. He is a very wise man. He has thought this through. We have heard a lot of wisdom in the last few days in this Chamber.

Sometimes a child has an innocent wisdom that is more wisdom than anything we hear in this Chamber. My wife and I have four children and nine grandchildren. I can recall when my No. 2 son, who is now a hand surgeon, was very small, I was teaching him how to ride a bicycle. We have all had this experience, running beside them, and finally they are balanced and they make the first trip around the block. He came up the hill panting away. He looked at me and said: Daddy, I wish the whole world was downhill.

We know the whole world is not downhill. We think about these things. I had a phone call from my daughter, Molly, on Tuesday after this tragedy happened. She is a professor at the University of Arkansas, and a very accomplished one. She has four children—three boys and a little girl. In fact, the little girl she just adopted from Ethiopia. Her older boys are Jason, age 5; the next one is Luke, who is 3 years old. She was taking him to kindergarten.

On the way to kindergarten, they were listening to the radio. It is Ed Koch speaking from New York. He said—I believe she told me—three times in a row: We need to kill bin

Laden. We need to kill bin Laden. We need to kill bin Laden.

Little 5-year old Jason looked at up and said: Mommy, who is bin Laden?

She said: bin Laden is a very evil, bad man.

He said this. He said: Instead of killing Mr. bin Laden, why don't we do a powerful prayer, and we will build a powerful shield around him so that he cannot hear the voices of the devil. He will only hear the voice of God, and God will be in his heart.

I thought, that is the real intellect in America.

I believe that God is in the hearts of more Americans today than perhaps ever before. People realize that there is something bigger than what has been happening here on Earth.

I think because of four reasons I probably had more opportunities to respond to this disaster than others. Those four reasons are: No. 1, I am on the Intelligence Committee; No. 2, I am on the Senate Armed Services Committee; No. 3, I am a licensed pilot; and No. 4, I am from Oklahoma.

As far as being a pilot is concerned, I believe that since the retirement of John Glenn, Senator Glenn of Ohio, that leaves me as the last active commercial pilot in the Senate.

I have been called by a lot of people in the media to talk about those issues. For example, most of my pilot friends would have thought the same as I did on Tuesday afternoon before any of the details came in, that virtually anyone who knew the basics of flying could take over an airplane that is already in the air and apply those basics to go hit a target—until I heard some of the details—for example, the 757 that I believe we now know, after picking up these fragmented details—we came to the conclusion, which may or may not be right, and we have expressed them here on the floor—the 757 was headed for the White House and for some reason made a diversion, for reasons which we don't know. Maybe that was the original plan. Maybe it was something that was there that made him believe he could not make that target and he made an alternative target, which was the Pentagon. He made a very steep 207-degree turn with the 757 at a low altitude, knowing there is such a thing as a high-speed stall with a high bank.

This guy knew what he was doing. He was an accomplished pilot, and he went ahead and hit, I believe, what was the second target in his very well executed terrorist act.

Second, as far as flying is concerned, one of my closest friends is—this goes way back from the time we were in the House of Representatives together—Norman Mineta, a Democrat from California. Both of us were on the Transportation Committee. He was chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee and then the Transportation Committee. We became very close friends.

In fact, when he was appointed by President Bush, I called him up. I said: Norm, who was the only Republican

who openly supported you even over your Republican opponents during the years that you served in the House. He said: This must be JIM INHOFE.

We have had a chance to visit about this. I consider him a very close friend.

There are some obvious things that can and will happen.

One, I think we all know that we need to have secured doors for the cockpit. That goes without saying. It is very elementary and something that should probably have been done before.

Second, sky marshals: It is very important that we adopt a program so that we have sky marshals.

Third—and this has come about recently. Someone was very critical of me recently—yesterday, I believe—because I have a hold on one of our President's nominations. He nominated someone to be the Customs Commissioner.

I have to share a frustration with you. When I was in the House in 1988, when they had the Pan Am 103 disaster, JIM OBERSTAR, a Democrat, came with me as a Republican to Europe to test certain types of detection technologies out there that were better than what we had been thinking about.

We have to do something to have better detection technology used to protect American travelers and the American people.

We found several. We came back, and we were unable to get anything approved, accepted, or even tried by Customs. They were locked into old technology. They weren't going to move from that technology.

I didn't do anything until 1995 and Oklahoma City, which is the site of the worst domestic, devastating attack by a terrorist in the history of this country—until this past week. I decided, again, after that, let's see what we can do to try to get some new technology.

We discovered a technology called pulsed fast neutron analysis. It is called PFNA. This is a technology that not only shows through something, but for a sealed container, it has a three-dimensional view of what is inside. They can detect what substances are inside. They can detect the chemical composition from within.

This is a possibility. I am not saying there is a great likelihood that if we had this technology on Tuesday the tragedy might not have happened because we would have been able to detect things we could not otherwise detect.

We thought that this was worthwhile; let's go ahead and authorize it and ask the Director of Customs to have a side-by-side competition or technology competition. So we put that in some report language. Nothing happened. They didn't do it.

I spoke to the previous—I will not mention by name—Customs Commissioner in my office. I said: Will you commit to having this competition that we have directed?

He said: Absolutely. I will.

And he didn't do it. I couldn't figure out why.

It wasn't until this happened Tuesday that I thought we couldn't wait any longer. That is when I put a hold on this man because I wanted a commitment that this person who would be the Commissioner of Customs would obey the law and have the competition. In fact, we actually put it in. It is in the appropriations bill over in the House. It has \$3 million for the conduct of this competition down in El Paso, TX, and directs them to do it.

The language is very clear. I have talked to Senator DORGAN and others over here. They agree that this should be a part of it. I think Senator STEVENS would agree with that, as well as the President.

I will leave that as the commitment that we are going to try that. As technology advances, we have to advance with it.

Getting back to Oklahoma, Senator BIDEN said something a few minutes ago. He said that I am probably the only one here—prior to Tuesday—who really understands the pain that goes with a disaster like that. Me pointed towards me. This is because in 1995 we had that terrible, tragic blowing up of the Murrah Office Building. I have to say that even though a detection device would not have precluded that from happening, it reminded me of the need for detection devices.

I wouldn't expect that the next terrorist attack on America—there will be more—would come in the form of a 767 or 757. I don't think that is going to happen. But we can still have that technology in place.

I can remember at that time—I was reminded of this last night. Last night, I went to the Pentagon. There are 194—I believe at the last count—lives lost at the Pentagon, and 168 in Oklahoma in 1995. It is very analogous. I stood there. I had tears in my eyes remembering 1995. I happened to be there right after it happened and hearing the thundering march of the volunteer firemen going into the Murrah Federal Office Building before it was secure and coming out with bits of body parts; there were hands stuck in the wall; there was a lady, a doctor went in and heroically amputated her leg so she could be pulled from the rubbish. She is alive today.

I talked to Cindy Rice yesterday who lives in Oklahoma City. Her son, David, who we assume is dead today, called her. He was on the 104th floor of one of the two towers. I am not sure which one. She wasn't sure which one. He called his mother. She said to me: David has always been a very spiritual boy. Right then I detected from this story that he knew the Lord, and that he knew what was going to happen to him. And he called, really in a sense of joy, saying: "Mother, don't worry about this. I'm going to be well taken care of." Here is a guy calling, knowing he is about to die in the implosion of that building.

So these stories are out there, and we have heard so many of them. I think

we all have such a seriousness in our hearts for what happened, but I would like to say this: People ask the question, Should we declare war? There is all this talk about war. On whom do you declare war?

I think we need to stand back and look and see. Yes, we think we know that Osama bin Laden was involved in this. It is not clear cut.

I remember so well, as I am sure the President pro tempore remembers, back in 1986 when, in a discotheque in Germany, there was a terrorist attack that ended up injuring many American soldiers and killing another. At that time President Reagan was the President of the United States, and we determined that Muammar Qadhafi did it. In a matter of hours after that took place, he dispatched, in addition to other planes, the first real use of our first stealth plane, the F-111, to Libya. And they took them out. They bombed them. We have not heard from Qadhafi since then. That was 15 years ago. This is not that easy. We do not have the target out there. But we need to act just as decisively when that time comes. It would be a disservice to the American people and to our system and to America to do that before we know.

But lastly, and this is the most significant thing I want to visit with—I do not say this critically of the previous administration—I am saying that during the Clinton administration the priorities were different than they were during the Reagan administration and the Bush administration before him. He did not have the emphasis on defending America and building a strong defense.

Now, as evidence of that, I have a couple of charts I have made for this purpose. If you took the fiscal year 1993 budget, and you took all of the money that was appropriated in that budget for Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, then that would be right at this point shown on the chart. Eight years after that, if you took the normal CPI, or any inflation figure you want to use—this is the index we use—and added for inflation, then what he would have appropriated for Labor, HHS, and Education would be this red line shown on the chart. However, this is what he did as shown on the green line. So at the end of 8 years he ended up successfully asking for the appropriation of \$150 billion above the inflation rate.

If you took Defense and you used that same model, and you started with fiscal year 1993, and took the amount that was appropriated at that time, if you added for inflation, this is where it would be today shown on the chart with the red line. However, the green line shows us the actual budget. So in that 8-year period, his request for appropriations, I say to Senator STEVENS, was \$375 billion below the inflation rate.

Those were his priorities, and he was elected President. I do not have a problem with that. But I can tell you, we

were saying all along we were getting into a very serious problem.

I began to end every speech in 1995 with this phrase. I said: We, in America, are in the most impaired and threatened position today than we have ever been in the history of America.

It was not until 1998, when the Director of Central Intelligence happened to be present, that I said this same thing in a meeting that was broadcast live on C-SPAN, when I was chairing the Readiness Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee. I said: Mr. Director, I have been saying we are in the most threatened position today that we have ever been in in the history of America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 5 additional minutes.

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

Mr. INHOFE. I thank the Chair.

And he said: You are absolutely right.

So this is the Director of Central Intelligence. Now it comes in three forms. First of all, our conventional capabilities are one-half of what they were in terms of force strength today. And the President pro tempore knows this in terms of the number of Army divisions, tactical air wings, ships dropping from 600 down to 300.

No. 2, we have had all these deployments that have taken these rare assets and put them in the position where they are no longer usable.

No. 3—this is what I am getting to right now—we were on schedule to have deployed a limited national missile defense system by fiscal year 1998. We would have done that except for the vetoes of President Clinton.

I carry with me his veto message of the 1993 Defense authorization bill when, I say to Senator STEVENS, he said: I will continue to veto any bill that has money in it for a national missile defense system because the threat isn't there.

What people do not understand is, when you take down our military, you are taking down our intelligence at the same time because the intelligence budget is tied to the Defense budget. So our quality of intelligence has deteriorated to the extent that in 1998, on August 24, when I had been asking for a response to a question—how many years will it be when North Korea has a multiple-stage rocket capability?—the answer came in a letter from General Shelton. It was dated August 24, 1998. It said it will be between 5 and 10 years. A week later, on August 30, 1998, they deployed from North Korea a multiple-stage rocket. I say that not to criticize General Shelton, but the quality of our intelligence is not good.

What is the ultimate weapon of a terrorist? The ultimate weapon of a terrorist is a missile with a nuclear warhead. I really appreciated the editorial in this morning's Wall Street Journal. I will read one paragraph out of it in just a minute. But I want to say this:

We have an opportunity now to take advantage of the fact that the No. 1 priority of America should be to defend ourselves against an incoming missile.

Now they might argue, they might say: Only China and Russia and North Korea have a missile that will reach the United States of America from halfway around the world. I think that may be true. On the other hand, we do know that Iraq, Iran, Syria, Libya, Pakistan—all these countries—have weapons of mass destruction and have at least intermediate-range missiles. So that threat is there today.

So I only say that we need to get this done and get it done today.

I am going to read just the first paragraph and one of the last sentences of an editorial in this morning's Wall Street Journal:

Can anyone doubt that if the terrorists behind Tuesday's attacks had had access to a ballistic missile, they would have used it? Why settle for toppling the World Trade Center if you can destroy all of New York in an instant, without having to go to the trouble of sneaking a crew over the border and arranging for pilot training in Florida?

... The President's plan for missile defense ought to go forward with all speed.

I would say this, and ask it in a different way: Is there any doubt in anyone's mind in America that if an individual is willing to fly a 767 into the towers in New York City, he would not be willing to deploy a missile at the United States of America?

When I remember that screen, Mr. President—and you saw it, too—of New York City, the skyline, and those two buildings imploding, if that had been a nuclear warhead, there would be nothing but a cinder, and it would not be 10,000 or 20,000 deaths; it would be millions.

I think this is an opportunity for us to make America strong again.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The senior Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, first, I thank the President pro tempore for his kindness in his comments about me in this Chamber today.

As I sat in the chair, I was thinking about the fact that 37 years ago, approximately, at about 5:30 in the evening, I got on a plane to fly to Fairbanks, AK, along with my great friend, Lowell Thomas, Jr.

Eight minutes after we took off, the largest earthquake to hit the North American continent in recorded times occurred. Somewhere around midnight, Lowell Thomas and I had chartered a plane and rounded up some physicians and nurses, and we flew back into Anchorage, landing at Elmendorf Field near our hometown of Anchorage. And I had to walk from that airfield over to my home in South Addition.

Flying in, we saw the Anchorage International Airport, and it looked as if it had been bombed. I walked home through fissures that were still moving, some of them 20 and 30 feet deep.

That was the largest natural disaster we have had in the United States.

We have just witnessed the largest national disaster we have ever had.

All of us have had varied feelings this past week, but mine have been really concentrating on what we could do to help—those of us on the committee that the distinguished President pro tempore chairs, and I used to chair—along with our colleagues in the House.

I am delighted we have reacted in a way that shows we are prepared to finance the recovery from these disastrous attacks. As I figure it, what we have appropriated, or at least earmarked for appropriations today—some \$40 billion—is about \$160 for every man, woman, and child in the country.

It is just the beginning. It is just the beginning. I appreciate what my friend from Oklahoma just said because we have really not addressed the need for the changes in our national defense and national security apparatus. We will do that in time. I believe we may have heard for the last time our people ask us, as we are talking about spending money to restore our national defense capability, “What is the threat?”

In past years, I have constantly been asked what the threat is. I have tried to articulate that we didn’t have one single threat coming at us from a monolithic empire, the Soviet Union, but that we had asymmetrical threats that were hard to conceive. We witnessed one of those as our massive new aircraft were turned into bombs by those who are terrorists. And, obviously, as the distinguished President pro tempore said, we witnessed probably the most destructive singular command and control operation by a terrorist organization the world has ever seen.

I don’t think it is over, Mr. President. That is why today I am proud I have been able to work with the President pro tempore and our colleagues in the House, Congressmen YOUNG and OBEY, on this supplemental appropriations bill so that it starts the process of recovery and the process of being prepared—or trying to be prepared—for future attacks against this country. But more than that, the resolution we have now adopted gives the President all the necessary and appropriate authority to use force against the persons or organizations that he determines planned, authorized, committed, or aided in the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11.

Some people say that is a broad change in authorization to the Commander in Chief of this country. It is not. It is a very limited concept of giving him the authority to pursue those who have brought this terrible destruction to our country and to pursue those who have harbored them or assisted them and conspired with them in any way. I am delighted that the resolution says that “he determines,” that the Commander in Chief is in control, in charge, to find a way to react against these people who have brought this destruction to our shores.

Mr. President, I commend you and those whom I am honored to work with

on Appropriations for having the courage to proceed. I have to say, we were talking about \$20 billion. The President met with the Representatives of New York and New Jersey and Virginia and decided that wasn’t enough. He sent word to us that he wanted \$40 billion. That, in the past, might have made all of us stumble a little bit. But I am delighted to see that all of us unanimously have said, yes, if he says he needs that much money, he should know he has that much money. We are going to review his plans and the requests of individual agencies, but we have committed \$40 billion.

Mr. President, I have to say that nations have defining moments. We had at least two in the 20th century—at the time when we entered World War I and Pearl Harbor. This is really the first true defining moment of this country in this millennium, and I am proud of the Congress.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The junior Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I join my colleague at this momentous time. I again recognize the President pro tempore and my senior Senator for the role they have played in bringing together the Congress and the appropriate authorization of funding to meet this crisis in our Nation.

Mr. President, on Tuesday, I think we all learned the reality that the decade of peace we have known as the post-Cold-War era probably has officially ended. Things will not be the same. During the Cold War, the map of the world could perhaps be divided into two; you were either a friend or a foe.

In the 10 years after the Cold War, the map became much more difficult to read. As we look back to Tuesday, the smoke rising from the devastation, the map is again becoming clear. We are learning, with horrifying swiftness, who our enemies in this new era will be.

Now we are faced with a task of, once again, dividing the world into two and asking the question: Are you friend or foe?

As we look at the decision that was made a short time ago by this body to authorize the use of force against those responsible for the recent attacks against the United States, we have to consider the consequences. We can only guess what they might be. Some say the only way to get to bin Laden—if indeed he is the responsible individual—is with ground troops. When people are speaking of having the stomach to do what is needed to be done, they are thinking about having the stomach to face the reality that innocent people will be killed in that process, that Americans will die. It could be bigger than just a simple operation in Afghanistan to get to bin Laden. To get any troops to Afghanistan, you have to go through Pakistan or down from the north. Would they let us? We don’t know. Would we have to initiate a

ground war from Pakistan first? We don’t know. Will other Islamic nations just stand by? We don’t know.

I think you can see where I am going. We are flirting with a world war between Islam and the West and the unknown consequences. We can only guess what bin Laden’s program is. Is this exactly what he wants? Is that why he did this, if indeed he did? Well, we can read his speeches and statements. It seems to be all right there. It seems that he really believes Islam will beat the West. He figures if he can polarize the world into Islam and the West, he has a billion soldiers.

If the West takes military action against an Islamic nation, would in fact bin Laden welcome that? What could be better from bin Laden’s point of view? This would be a war that could last for years and millions would die—not just theirs but ours. Who has the stomach for that? We know bin Laden does. But is this really what we want? Discretion is often the better part of valor, even if our stomachs hunger for more.

American leadership has not been easy. This past century saw this great country become the world’s only superpower through the grit and sheer determination of the American people—generations of American people who were called into service to lead the world back from the brink of chaos, to save civilization itself, in wars across many continents, against many terrible foes. Each time, we triumphed because of our spirit and resourcefulness but also because our cause is just and true.

We have vanquished darkness before. Now we are called upon once again to fight the enemies of civilization and the enemies of peace, the shadowy armies of evil whose cause is destruction, terror and despair.

We will not fail, nor will they succeed.

Today’s resolution approving the use of force is the call to arms against our foe in this new, uncertain era. Our enemies have unleashed upon themselves the dogs of war.

Mr. President, in peace, American leadership has not always been appreciated by our fellow nations. We have been dismissed as naive, frivolous, and wasteful. We have been ridiculed for our championship of human rights, tolerance, and fairness. We are criticized for leading in peace, and we will face much greater challenges leading in a war. As we hunt down the murderers, the terrorists, as we go to the heart of darkness to rip out the roots of terror, and the systems that breed terror, we face an elusive and deadly enemy.

Our friends, our allies, and those not as committed to this fight as are we will challenge our leadership. We need them at our peril. Leadership can be a lonely business.

My own State of Alaska, far from the battlegrounds of this fight, far from New York City, far from Washington, DC, is going to play an important role. Elmendorf, Eielson, Ft. Wainwright,

Ft. Richardson and surrounding communities will no doubt play a key role in winning this war. Located just 8 hours from New York, the Mideast, and the Asian subcontinent, Alaska has been a strategic keystone in our nation's defense for the last 50 years. Alaska will now be an offensive keystone in the battles to come. I can assure you, Mr. President, Alaskans and our adopted sons and daughters in uniform will be up to the task.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, earlier today the Senate voted unanimously to authorize the President to use all necessary and appropriate force to respond to the attacks launched by terrorists on Tuesday. Those responsible for these heinous attacks must never be allowed to do so again. For that reason we have also taken note of the President's authority to deter and prevent acts of terrorism against the United States, consistent with provisions of the War Powers Act. There may be times when the President must act swiftly to preempt an imminent act of violence. In such cases, he may not be able to consult closely with Congress beforehand. However, as a general rule, in the exercise of the authority that we have just approved, it is my expectation that the President and his advisers will consult with the Congress before taking action is contemplated by the War Powers Act.

Equally important, the U.S. Senate also voted unanimously to appropriate, on an emergency basis, some \$40 billion in additional resources to enable New York City and the Washington, DC, area to cope effectively with the aftermath of the devastation wrought by those attacks. In addition, we have provided resources to enable the United States to counter domestic and international terrorism, enhance transportation security, and to undertake additional programs to enhance our national security.

We have taken up and passed these two measures on an expedited basis because our national interests dictate that we do. The House will do so later today as well. The Congress has an obligation to reassure the American people that their government is working to do everything in its power to protect them from such heinous acts in the future, as well as to provide funding so that the cleanup and rebuilding efforts can proceed as quickly as possible.

I believe that we are all in agreement that those individuals who were responsible for the premeditated murder of so many of our citizens must be found and stopped from ever conducting such actions again. Anyone who has aided, abetted or continues to harbor these terrorists is a terrorist as well. So too are those who knowingly facilitate the financial transactions that keep their organizations in business. While we do not know with 100 percent certainty that Saudi-born militant Osama bin Laden is the mastermind of this latest tragedy, we know

full well based on past experience that he is fully capable of doing so. The President has directed that all of our intelligence resources be brought to bear to develop credible evidence as to who was in fact responsible. I am confident that we will have much better information in that regard in the very near future. And, when that moment arrives I believe we will act appropriately, consistent with our principles and values.

Sadly Osama bin Laden is not the only individual who harbors irrational hatred against the United States. Many others around the globe do as well. I would call to the attention of my colleagues a very important article that appeared in today's Washington Post entitled "Zinni Urges Economic and Diplomatic Moves." In that article, ret. General Anthony C. Zinni cautions against an approach that is single pronged in attempting to eradicate terrorist organizations. An approach of simply bombing them back to the stone age may have appeal to some, but will, according to General Zinni, only perpetuate the problem by inflaming Anti-American sentiment in the Muslim world. Zinni urges the Bush administration to accompany any military action taken against Afghanistan or other states that harbor terrorists, with economic and diplomatic measures as well. Other governments in the region, Pakistan, Iran, Yemen, and Saudi Arabia, must be prepared to assist the United States in this multifaceted strategy.

There is another element to the problem of countering international terrorism over the longer term, namely the Middle East conflict. That conflict has fueled the hatred, sense of injustice, and hopelessness that has provided and will continue to provide the foot soldiers of the Osama bin Laden's of this world. The Bush administration must make resolution of the Middle East conflict a higher priority than it has to date. Only with United States leadership will we galvanize our allies in Europe, and moderate Arab States to bring sufficient pressure to bear on the Palestinians to stop the violence and come back to the bargaining table so that a formula can be found that will permit Israelis and Palestinians to live in peace. Only with peace will we be able to prevent the emergence of another generation of terrorists imbued with a burning hatred of the United States.

REIMBURSEMENT FOR NEW JERSEY

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, I want to thank the President and the leadership of the Congress for their support and immediate response to the tragic events that have transpired over the past few days. While the attack on the World Trade Center physically occurred in New York City, the emotional physical, and financial tolls will be felt throughout the Metropolitan area but especially in northern New Jersey.

I have heard estimates that over 50 percent of the people employed at the

World Trade Centers were New Jersey residents.

The Port Authority which is headquartered at the centers is a joint, bi-State New York/New Jersey agency that coordinates infrastructure needs for the airspace, mass transit, and commuter needs of our area. When the port rebuilds, it will rebuild as a joint entity.

Fire, medical and emergency personnel and equipment, as well trades workers and their heavy equipment, hospitals and triage centers as well as transportation equipment shuttling the wounded and rescuers all have emanated from New Jersey communities.

Let me share with my colleagues a few examples.

Six hundred wounded were transferred to New Jersey hospitals for treatment. Jersey City Medical treated 150 people; 21 were admitted overnight; St. Francis Hospital/St. Mary's in Jersey City treated 50 people and UMDNJ in Newark treated and released 17 victims.

The New Jersey State Police mobilized 40 boats to ferry victims across the Hudson River and State Troopers have been sent to sort through rubble. New York Waterway has put all 24 of its ferries into service, transferring free of charge an estimated 200,000 people.

The New Jersey National Guard established a field hospital at Liberty State Park that evaluated 2,600 people. At the Meadowlands, a makeshift hospital with hundreds of ambulances and 50 surgeons was created.

The Jersey City Fire Department sent 4 fire trucks and Union County has sent 24 fire trucks and over 100 firefighters. The city of Trenton has sent 10 ambulance/paramedic teams. Middlesex County send 42 ambulances, 20 fire trucks and 70 police officers. Burlington County in southern New Jersey sent 20 ambulances.

The Elizabeth Urban Rescue Team which specializes in confined spaces rescue has been there from day one on 24-hour rotating duty because the heroic New York City teams were wiped out in the first minutes. The cost of this effort has already reached \$150,000. Regular fire personnel from Elizabeth have been dispatched to Staten Island to free Staten Island Fire personnel to go to the World Trade Center site to help.

The Sheriff's and Prosecutor's Office in Hudson County which is directly across from New York City has conservatively incurred \$50,000 in expenses. In Jersey City there are 60 officers working full time and countless numbers of fire fighters and equipment manning a major supply effort to New York via the Jersey City waterfront. The North Hudson Regional Fire Co. has spent over \$150,000 on overtime, personnel, and equipment.

Mr. BYRD. There are many more examples of the selflessness and sacrifice taking place, not just from New Jersey but across the country.

I appreciate that the physical attack did not occur on New Jersey soil and that is why New Jersey is not referenced in this emergency appropriation as a location where the terrorist attack occurred as New York, Virginia, and Pennsylvania are listed.

However, it is important to acknowledge and fully appreciate the human and financial expenses being incurred by the neighboring areas and that these areas be able to apply directly to the Federal Government for reimbursement.

Mr. President, it is my understanding that the specific State listings in the supplemental specifically refer only to the physical locations where the attacks occurred and do not establish an exclusive list of areas eligible for financial assistance from this Federal aid package.

Mr. CORZINE. I want to first associate myself with the remarks of my colleague from New Jersey and I would further appreciate the opportunity to clarify one additional point with my colleague from West Virginia. I understand that New Jersey was not listed because an attack did not physically occur there; however as my colleague, Senator TORRICELLI has stated, our State and communities have incurred significant human and financial costs in responding to this disaster.

I would appreciate your acknowledgement that the State of New Jersey or its local communities who have incurred expenses in the relief effort, will be able to apply directly to the Federal Government for the assistance provided under this aid package.

Mr. BYRD. It is my understanding that New Jersey is eligible to apply for any authorized disaster relief program in the same manner and under the same conditions as New York, Connecticut, Virginia, and other affected States.

Mr. TORRICELLI. I appreciate Senator BYRD's statement and the opportunity to clarify this issue.

Mr. CORZINE. I similarly appreciate Senator BYRD's statement clarifying this concern, as well as all his work.

MOMENT OF SILENCE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will now, in memory of those whose lives have been lost and those who still live but who suffer from the loss of loved ones and friends, entertain a moment of silence.

(Moment of silence.)

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will stand in recess awaiting the call of the Chair.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:02 p.m., recessed subject to the call of the Chair and reassembled at 2:10 p.m., when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. JEFFORDS).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for morning business, with Senators allowed to speak for up to 5 minutes.

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

A UNITED RESPONSE

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, this morning the Senate passed a historic resolution. The resolution passed granting the President broad authority and power to prosecute a war against terrorism and those who house terrorists.

It is important we talk about that from the standpoint that this is a war as no other we have been in where the enemy is one who can attack and has attacked on our soil, who will use means and methods of terror, which is the tool of choice for the terrorists, and try to debilitate us by fear.

We should not succumb to fear. We should not allow fear to take over but, rather, have faith in our system and faith in God above that we will prosper and persevere.

Many terrorists have networks that are headquartered throughout central Asia, South Asia, and the Middle East. It is wise for us to go after these terrorist organizations. It is absolutely right for us to do so.

We need to build alliances with people throughout these regions, and they are available to us if we move wisely and successfully. The State Department has done a nice job thus far, and I congratulate Secretary Colin Powell and Rich Armitage, the No. 2 person in the Department, and others, for reaching out to many countries in that part of the world and saying: Look, it is time to stand up and be counted. You are either with us or against us, and we want to know what it is, and there will be consequences that will flow from that decision.

It appears a number of these countries are standing up and saying: We are with you; this global scourge of terrorism hits us on a daily basis as it just hit you with such a devastating force on September 11.

I think it would be wise for us to look at this very seriously, that before we move forward, we build these alliances with a number of nations that are willing to stand up with us and be heard. That is very possible for us to do.

We need to look to nations such as Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, nations that are not in the common lexicon perhaps of geography of the American student or maybe even the American political student. These are countries formed out of the fall of the Soviet Union, and they sit in direct proximity to Afghanistan, which has been the headquarters for some period of time of Osama bin Laden.

If these nations want to work with the United States, we ought to work

with them. It requires us to look at them with a new set of eyes and say: OK, we put a lot of demands and pressures on you at different points, and now we have one singular focus, and that is to deal with terrorism; we want to work with you on that. I think we will get their cooperation.

They also will say: We want the United States to work with us, building the economies and abilities of our people. So there is going to be an exchange and a push back and forth that, in many ways, will help strengthen our standing and our relationship with many of these nations.

We have recently been on a diplomatic effort with India. That is proper and good and should continue. There are sanctions that need to be lifted in this region. Pakistan is going to be a key country, as we have already seen, and discussions are taking place already. Pakistan will be a key country. We have gone to them and said: OK, stand up and be counted with us or be counted with the other side.

We believe Pakistan will strongly come along our way. We have had our share of differences, certainly after the cold war. Pakistan was there with us in bringing the Soviet Union down when the Soviet Union was engaged in Afghanistan. I think Pakistan will be with us again. We have to look at how we work with them. They are going to say: OK, there are a series of sanctions you have on us; we want to talk about that as well.

We should engage those discussions. Hopefully, that will be a way we can build these nations together. That would be a good and appropriate thing to do.

I want to point out some history regarding Afghanistan. Some suggest we go in and start bombing. There have been a number of nations, great nations over history, that have tried to go into Afghanistan, and there has been great difficulty going into Afghanistan, whether it was the British or whether it was the Soviet Union, which could merely drive into Afghanistan with huge amounts of weaponry and force and still was not able to put the proud people of Afghanistan under their pressure and army.

To think we can just drop bombs or drop a few troops into Afghanistan and that country will succumb to our pressure does not read correctly the history of that proud nation.

The Taliban has been a scourge on that country, as they have been on the world. We have to look very wisely and carefully at how we are going to deal with Osama bin Laden and other terrorist organizations that are headquartered in Afghanistan.

This is going to take some time, and I hope our people are cognizant of those lessons of history and are cognizant of what we are dealing with. This may take some time, planning, and thoughtfulness as we build the alliance with countries in that region, as we do the give-and-take to get them on