

antiterrorism legislation because of the work of the House.

Senator DASCHLE has been exceptionally supportive, as have Senator HATCH and Senator LEAHY. The Senate is united on this matter. The Senate has agreed in its entirety. For reasons that are inexplicable to this Member of the Senate, the House has been unwilling to untie the hands of Federal prosecutors in my home State.

The question then is: Why should every Senator care about what is happening in the State of Oregon? The reason I feel so strongly about this is that if we learned one thing on September 11, it is that if the terrorists get sanctuary anywhere, Americans are in trouble everywhere because we saw on September 11 the terrorists set up shop in New Jersey, they set up shop in Florida, and they ended up murdering Americans in New York City and in the Pentagon and in Pennsylvania.

As a result of the work that was done on the foreign operations appropriations legislation, again, to the credit of Senator DASCHLE, Senator LEAHY, and Senator SMITH, Senator LEAHY added the original bill that I authored. Senator SMITH and I have teamed up on this, and it is now in the foreign operations appropriations legislation that passed this body.

What is different tonight and why I am not objecting is that the White House has now indicated for the first time that they will support in the foreign operations appropriations legislation what Senator SMITH and I have crafted.

We have also been able to, in discussions with Senator DASCHLE, have an opportunity to let him discuss his views on it. He has renewed his commitment to me that we will have the united support of the Senate on the foreign operations appropriations bill, and if, in fact, the House junks this on the foreign operations appropriations bill in spite of the administration's effort, Senator DASCHLE, to his credit, has renewed his support for this effort and has been kind enough to give me this time to state my reservation.

I would like to have him briefly describe his views on this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I say to both my colleagues from Oregon how much we appreciate their extraordinary efforts. I do not know of many pieces of legislation that pass unanimously not once but twice, and not only twice but within a matter of weeks. But that is the case.

This legislation passed unanimously as an amendment to the counterterrorism bill. This amendment has just now been passed unanimously as part of the foreign operations appropriations bill. That would not have happened were it not for their tenacity and their decisive leadership. I am grateful to them, first of all, for their willingness to continue to pursue this effort until they are successful.

I was involved in these discussions and negotiations with our colleagues from the House as we negotiated the various pieces. There were various reasons this legislation was not kept as part of the counterterrorism legislation, but I will tell my colleagues what I have said publicly: We will continue to pursue this; we will continue to persist until this becomes law.

As the Senator from Oregon has noted, the White House indicated they are prepared to join us in that effort. With that additional assistance, with those assurances, we are in a much stronger position now than we have been at any time in recent months to ensure our success. But if for whatever reason we are not successful, this will come back again and again, and we will continue to send it to the House again and again until it is done successfully.

I am confident we will complete our work successfully on this amendment. I am confident that with their partnership and the effort they have already made, we will be successful. I will pledge my support, and I know Senator LEAHY feels every bit as strongly as I do. We will work in concert with them to ensure the maximum level of success as we go into conference on the foreign operations appropriations bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Madam President, I say to the majority leader, I will not object, but I want to be included in the colloquy and be entirely supportive of my colleague, Senator WYDEN. I want to state publicly for the record, Senator WYDEN and I began working on this issue together in great earnest this last weekend because it was apparent that the good bill we had passed to the House was coming back as something less than that bill.

Because of the unique circumstances described by Senator WYDEN, every American should know that the bill we are about to pass tomorrow puts a stake in Oregon that says Oregon is open for business to terrorism. That is a stake we want to pull out because right now no undercover work is going on in Oregon for a whole variety of unusual reasons. That is where it is, and that must be fixed, or every American should know that the bill we will pass tomorrow is an illusion until it includes all 50 States.

In my State, whether it is environmental terrorism, child pornography, drug runners, methamphetamine producers, or al-Qaida terrorist groups, they are finding aid and comfort from the absence of law enforcement when it comes to undercover activities. That must end or we are kidding the American people.

I thank the majority leader for his commitment. I thank Senator LOTT and the managers of this bill for their commitment, and I say for the record,

I have the assurances of Carl Rove with the White House, John Ashcroft in Justice, and I am awaiting a call from the Speaker of the House to work in earnest to get this resolved quickly so that we can in good faith face the American people and say: We have passed a terrorism bill that includes all Americans. But right now, it does not include Oregonians.

I yield to my colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, if I may continue briefly on my reservation, Senator SMITH has summed it up very well. At this point in the State of Oregon, there are no wiretaps; there are no sting operations; you cannot infiltrate dangerous criminal groups no matter how dastardly their plans. We are not talking about some kind of abstract proposition.

The bill that is going to be passed tomorrow is essentially a bill that deals with terrorism in 49 States. As I say, it just seems to me once you allow a sanctuary, a launch pad for terrorist groups anywhere, everyone is at risk. What is different tonight is we have been able to secure a commitment from the White House.

The majority leader, as is his tradition, has worked very closely with me and has made a similar commitment to Senator Smith, and tonight—and I will say this is very hard for this Member of the Senate to do because I think the people of my home State are going to be at risk tonight—but because of the commitment we have secured from the majority leader—and it is a renewed commitment; again and again he has been in these meetings fighting to change the McDade law and give our prosecutors the tools to deal with this problem.

With the new commitment tonight from the White House and with the continued commitment and assurance of the majority leader tonight, I withdraw my reservation.

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

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I thank both of my colleagues from Oregon for their willingness to work with us. I have already said how strongly I feel about this matter, and the passion expressed by both Senators from Oregon I think is a clear indication of their determination to see this through to ultimate success. We will see success. I am grateful to them tonight.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT
AGREEMENT—H.R. 2330

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that upon disposition of H.R. 3162, the Appropriations Committee be discharged from consideration of H.R. 2330, the Agriculture appropriations bill; that the Senate then proceed to its consideration; that immediately after the bill is reported, the majority manager, or his designee, be recognized to offer the

Senate-committee-reported bill as a substitute amendment; that the substitute amendment be agreed to; that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; that the amendment be considered as original text for the purpose of further amendment; and that no points of order be considered waived by this agreement.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. I have had a number of questions asked today. It is my understanding we are going to try to complete the counterterrorism bill tomorrow and also go to the Agriculture appropriations bill tomorrow. Is that right?

Mr. DASCHLE. The Senator from Nevada is correct. It is my hope once we have completed the counterterrorism bill, we could immediately begin debate on the Ag appropriations bill, and if it is possible to complete our work tomorrow night, it is my intention to have no votes on Friday.

Obviously, if we are unable to complete our work Thursday night, then there would have to be votes on Friday because we need to finish this bill. That would be the possibility, that if we complete our work, it would be my intention not to have votes on Friday. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BIDEN. Madam President, while the majority leader is in the Chamber, I ask unanimous consent that I be able to proceed as in morning business for 5 minutes and have his attention for the first 60 seconds of my remarks.

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

SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT

Mr. BIDEN. Madam President, I rise today to clarify a matter that has been somewhat taken out of context. I know my good friend, the majority leader, was asked this morning about comments the Senator from Delaware allegedly made speaking to the New York Council on Foreign Relations, which surprised me the question was asked.

I was informed that a high-ranking Republican on the House side put out a statement—and I am sure he did not understand the context—suggesting I implied Americans were high-tech bullies who were bombing Afghans, and we should be fighting on the ground and not bombing.

I want to assure my friend from South Dakota, in his response to the question, he was correct. I did not say anything like that. I will read from the transcript from the New York Council on Foreign Relations speech.

I was asked by a gentleman, whose name I will not put in the—well, his name is Ron Paul, whom I do not know, who says: I concur with everybody else in commending you on your comments, and he goes on.

Then he says: With regard to the bombing, every day it goes on the harder it may be for us to do something next, referring to rebuilding Afghanistan. He said: What do you see as the situation if we do not defeat the Taliban in the next 4 weeks and winter sets in in Afghanistan?

The context of the question was, Is it not a hard decision for the President to have to choose between bombing, knowing it will be unfairly used for propaganda purposes by radical Muslims in that area of the world, and bombing to make the environment more hospitable for American forces to be able to be successful on the ground?

I said it was a hard decision. The question was repeated, and my answer was: I am not a military man—I will read this in part.

The part that I think flies in the face of and plays into every stereotypical criticism of us—

Referring to the radical Muslims, that part of the world that is radical—

is we're this high-tech bully that thinks from the air we can do whatever we want to do, and it builds the case for those who want to make the case against us that all we're doing is indiscriminately bombing innocents, which is not the truth.

So I want the majority leader to know, and I am sure when the gentleman on the House side sees the comments, he will be able to put it in the proper perspective because the irony is anyone who has been in the Senate knows I was the first, most consistent, and the last calling for the United States to bomb in Bosnia, bomb in Kosovo, use the full force of our air power.

I have been around long enough to know unless someone stands up and clarifies something, it can get out of hand very quickly.

I thank my colleague for his response this morning to the press and for his faith in his chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. I assure him, in this case at least, it was well placed.

I ask unanimous consent that my entire speech—which I would not ordinarily do because it is my own speech—to the Council on Foreign Relations be printed in the RECORD, along with the question and answers that follow.

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

[Remarks By Joseph R. Biden, Jr., United States Senator—Delaware]

FROM TRAGEDY TO OPPORTUNITY: ACTING WISELY IN A TIME OF UNCERTAINTY

(Council on Foreign Relations, New York City, October 22, 2001, (As Prepared))

When I accepted this invitation I expected to be talking about the ABM treaty, about our military priorities in the context of an evaporating budget surplus, or about missile defense versus the more urgent threats we could face—and now, in fact, do face.

I thought the questions I might be asked would be about strategic doctrine, about relations with traditional adversaries like Russia and China, and whether the Yankees will win another World Series.

I certainly did not, for one instance, think we'd be here today wondering about our short-and long-term goals in a war against terrorism: Will we succeed? How long will it take? What constitutes victory?

But those are, in fact, the questions facing the United States, and, I confess, they're not easy to answer.

First, our immediate goal is to cut off the head of Al Qaeda, break up the network, leave them no safe haven. That means the removal of Osama bin Laden, Mullah Omar, and the Taliban leadership.

I don't know how long it will be before the regime is toppled. I wouldn't want to guess. But the handwriting is on the wall. They've lost the support of their key sponsors and are essentially isolated. But some of these sponsors may need reminding that they've got to make a clear break with the past, and we should not hesitate to spell that out.

After Al Qaeda and the Taliban fall, and—to use the phrase of the day—we drain the swamp, the medium-term goal is to roll up all Al Qaeda cells around the world.

Then, with the help of other nations and possibly with the ultimate sanction of the United Nations, our hope is we'll see a relatively stable government in Afghanistan—one that does not harbor terrorists, is acceptable to the major players in the region, represents the ethnic make up of the country, and provides a foundation for future reconstruction.

In the long term, our goals are easy to articulate, but much more difficult to achieve.

We'll need to deter any potential state sponsors of terrorism from providing support or haven to future bin Ladens.

We'll work with others and try to help rebuild a politically and socially stable Afghanistan that does NOT export terrorism, narcotics, or militancy to its neighbors and to the wider world—more like it was in the 1950s.

We'll need to stabilize Southwest and Central Asia and prevent the Taliban-izing, if you will, of Pakistan and other countries.

And we'll need to address some of the economic and political forces that can be manipulated by men like bin Laden. We must do this with the full awareness that attention to social and political development alone won't prevent another bin Laden from emerging. But, at least, it will severely limit the pool from which he can draw recruits and support.

If we're successful in prosecuting this effort in Afghanistan, it ups the ante for other nations harboring or sponsoring—directly or indirectly—other terrorist groups.

The President believes, and I agree, that we must stay involved in the region, not necessarily with American troops, but with American leadership, and resources.

The President has repeated many times, and it's important that we say it over and over again: This is not a war against the Afghan people or any one faith. This is a war between nation states and transnational terrorist organizations, between civilization and chaos.

We need to remind the world's 1.2 billion Muslims—the vast majority of whom are sickened by the attempted hijacking of their faith—that our beef is with bin Laden and Al Qaeda, not with them.

American policy has long been marked by a blend of the Wilsonian trend and realpolitik, but whatever our motive, it has not been guided by religious imperatives.

When we sought to bring peace and stability to the Balkans, the Muslims in Bosnia and Kosovo were the primary beneficiaries.

When we went into Somalia, our aim was to feed starving people who happen to be Muslims.

And, when we provided 170 million dollars in humanitarian assistance to the Afghan