

S. RES. 99

Whereas for over 100 years, the Olympic movement has built a more peaceful and better world by educating young people through amateur athletics, by bringing together athletes from many countries in friendly competition, and by forging new relationships bound by friendship, solidarity, and fair play;

Whereas the United States Olympic Committee is dedicated to coordinating and developing amateur athletic activity in the United States to foster productive working relationships among sports-related organizations;

Whereas the United States Olympic Committee promotes and supports amateur athletic activities involving the United States and foreign nations;

Whereas the United States Olympic Committee promotes and encourages physical fitness and public participation in amateur athletic activities;

Whereas the United States Olympic Committee assists organizations and persons concerned with sports in the development of athletic programs for amateur athletes;

Whereas the United States Olympic Committee protects the opportunity of each amateur athlete, coach, trainer, manager, administrator, and official to participate in amateur athletic competition;

Whereas athletes representing the United States at the Olympic Games have achieved great success personally and for the Nation;

Whereas thousands of men and women of the United States are focusing their energy and skill on becoming part of the United States Olympic Team and aspire to compete in the 2002 Olympic Winter Games in Salt Lake City, Utah;

Whereas the Nation takes great pride in the qualities of commitment to excellence, grace under pressure, and good will toward other competitors exhibited by the athletes of the United States Olympic Team; and

Whereas June 23, 2001 is the anniversary of the founding of the modern Olympic movement, representing the date on which the Congress of Paris approved the proposal of Pierre de Coubertin to found the modern Olympics: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of the Olympics;

(2) calls upon the President to issue a proclamation recognizing the anniversary of the founding of the modern Olympic movement; and

(3) calls upon the people of the United States to observe such anniversary with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

NATIONAL ALCOHOL AND DRUG ADDICTION RECOVERY MONTH

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 147 and that the Senate proceed to its consideration.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 147) to designate the month of September of 2001 as “National Alcohol and Drug Addiction Recovery Month.”

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

AMENDMENT NO. 1723

Mr. REID. Mr. President, Senator WELLSTONE has an amendment at the

desk, and I ask that the amendment be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], for Mr. WELLSTONE, proposes an amendment numbered 1723.

The amendment is as follows:

In the preamble, strike the second Whereas clause and insert the following:

Whereas, according to a 1992 NIDA study, the direct and indirect costs in the United States for alcohol and drug addiction was \$246 billion, in that year.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the amendment be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, as amended, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statement relating thereto be printed in the RECORD.

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

The amendment (No. 1723) was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 147) was agreed to.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

CONDEMNING BIGOTRY AND VIOLENCE AGAINST ARAB-AMERICANS, AMERICAN MUSLIMS, AND AMERICANS FROM SOUTH ASIA

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration and the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H. Con. Res. 227.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 227) condemning bigotry and violence against Arab-Americans, American Muslims, and Americans from South Asia in the wake of terrorist attacks in New York City, New York, and Washington, D.C., on September 11, 2001.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating thereto be printed in the RECORD.

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

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 227) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business.

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

AN INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, first of all, I want to share with my colleagues my expressions of gratitude to our President, President Bush, and his team as they have conducted the affairs of our state over these last number of days since the tragedy of September 11. As has been said over and over again, both in this Chamber and elsewhere, they have done, I think, a superlative job. They have done so with the complete, total cooperation of the distinguished majority leader, Senator DASCHLE, the Democratic leader in the House, RICHARD GEPHARDT, along with Speaker HASTERT and, of course, the minority leader, Senator LOTT, and others.

The past days have been a wonderful expression of the kind of unity and support that the country expected, and, I think, deserved. We are on the right track, in my view. None of us knows, as the President said so eloquently just a few feet from here in the other Chamber almost a week ago, if we can say with any certainty what course this response of ours will take or how long it will take—but we know the outcome. And the outcome for certain is that democracy will trump terrorists. It may take us weeks or months—even years—but I stand with those who say that in the final analysis, maybe long after those of us who are Members of this Chamber today are gone from our service here, we will prevail. And to those who share our values and commitment to the eradication of international terrorism, we stand with them.

So it is with that as a backdrop, in a way, that I rise to speak this afternoon, because I was so disheartened to be in my office a little while ago to hear the proposal of an amendment or two that would be offered next week to the Department of Defense authorization bill.

I listened just about 2 hours ago to my President speak to the employees of the Central Intelligence Agency, along with George Tenet, the Director. The President's words were once again eloquent, and certainly captured my feelings, my sense of gratitude to the men and women who work in our intelligence-gathering agencies for the tremendous job they do, under tremendous pressures, with tremendously high expectations.

The President, once again, reminded his audience there, as he has the American audience, and the audience of this world, that the ultimate outcome of this effort we are now undertaking will absolutely, without any equivocation, depend upon international cooperation.

The idea, somehow, that the United States, with all of our strength—economically, militarily—will be able unilaterally to seek out, find, and destroy international terrorism is a myth.

I know there are those who suggest we may be left with no one else but ourselves to deal with this. That may be the case. I doubt it, but it may be the case. But the idea that somehow we

are going to be able to, on our own, go after terrorism, in what the President has described as at least 60 other nations that harbor these groups, is totally a myth. What is going to be absolutely essential, if we are going to succeed—and I have no doubt we will—in dealing with this problem, for however long it takes, will be cooperation by our allies, by friends, by even some who may not be our friends today but who share the common goal of eradicating the scourge of terrorism.

That is going to require a herculean effort, on behalf of our people, by very bright, sophisticated leaders. I happen to think we have those leaders. I have great confidence in General Colin Powell, the Secretary of State. We have not always agreed over the years on various matters, but he is a patriot, a person who understands the kind of world in which we live.

I think Don Rumsfeld demonstrated, beyond any question of a doubt, his courage and patriotism on September 11, as he stayed in the bunker of the Pentagon during the assault on that institution.

I have no doubt that Condoleezza Rice too will serve our country well—I continue down the list. I think these are not just good people, they are bright people. They are competent people who can do a good job to go out and develop and build those relationships.

Whether this problem is solved diplomatically, militarily, or by a combination of the two, it is going to require international cooperation.

Mr. President, why do I focus on this? Because I hear that we are about to vote and consider an amendment to the Department of Defense authorization bill that would absolutely prohibit the United States from being involved in developing a court of international justice, an international criminal court.

I cannot believe that at this hour this great body of the U.S. Senate is about to go on record, at the very moment we are asking the world to join us in apprehending the thugs and criminals who took 6,000 lives in New York and several hundred here in Washington, that this Chamber, this body, this Government, at this hour, would say we will have nothing to do with the establishment of an international criminal court. So I come to the Chamber to express my outrage that we might consider such a proposal. I do not object to the notion that, as presently crafted, the treaty of the Rome statute, which would establish the court, is flawed. In fact, if, for some reason, miraculously the proposal were brought to this Senate Chamber this afternoon, and I were asked to vote on it as is, I would vote against it because it is a flawed agreement. But that is not to say we should not stay at the table to try to work it out so that it becomes a viable product which we can support and gather behind.

So when I hear, on the one hand, how we need to develop international cooperation to go after these people, and

we turn around and walk away from an institution which could make a significant contribution to dealing with this problem, I find it stunning. My fervent hope would be if, for whatever reason, this matter, as it is presently structured, comes up for a vote, that we would vote against it.

I do not know what vehicles may be available to me, but I am going to strenuously object to the idea we would consider such a proposal. God knows that the horrific acts we witnessed 2 weeks ago suggest that an international forum for bringing to justice those who commit terrorist acts or acts against humanity is now more needed than ever.

Let me step back a little bit in history, if I can. It was the United States, at the end of World War II, under our leadership, that created the U.N. system. With all of its warts, with all of its shortcomings, with its mounds of bureaucracy that infuriate from time to time, I do not know of any sensible person who believes that the world would be a safer or better place in the absence of that building on the East River in New York, where the world can gather to resolve, or attempt to resolve, some of the most difficult disputes and problems we face. It has not solved all of them by any stretch—and I can't prove a negative; I don't know how many were avoided because of its existence—but I happen to believe that most people—reasonable people—believe that the establishment of a U.N. system has been a worthwhile endeavor. It has made the last 50 years, with all of its various problems around the globe, a safer 50 years than it would have been had that institution not existed.

What a great irony it is that the very people who understood the value of having a U.N. system—people such as General George Marshall, people such as Harry Truman, people who came after in terms of the wisdom of our foreign policy, the John Foster Dulles giants, who said we really do need to establish these forums to try to act as a buffer, as a place where some of these efforts can be resolved without using the historic means of resolution; and that is armed confrontation—how ironic, indeed, that this great Nation, which fought tooth and nail to establish the U.N. system, the genocide convention is now shirking its international duty.

In fact, you will forgive me if I indulge in a little personal observation. As some of my colleagues here are aware, I was a 1-year-old child in 1945 when my father left my mother and five of us to go to a place called Nuremberg where for the next year and a half he was an executive trial counsel at the first Nuremberg trials.

I grew up as a child, after my father returned, hearing about what that tribunal had tried to accomplish, what it had been able to do, and how my father in many ways regretted there had not been in the 1930s such a forum in exist-

ence where we might have been able to bring a thug like Adolf Hitler to justice. He would often say the existence of a criminal tribunal that could take the Hitlers and Milosevics to task might just have avoided the problems that later emerged.

It is stunning to me, as I have said already, that at this very moment where we have watched the most significant and historic attack on innocent civilians in our Nation's history, and where we are calling with one voice for international cooperation to help find not only those responsible but to develop a system that would minimize these events from occurring again, that we might take a step away from the establishment of a forum that would be a place where those who are responsible could be brought to a bar of justice.

We saw the difficulty that occurred when we finally were able to determine who was responsible for the terrorist attack on Pan Am Flight 103, and we know how hard it was to find a forum where those people could be tried. It ultimately took a Scottish court and significant negotiations to bring those criminals to justice. Had we had an International Criminal Court as we do today in the Hague for other such matters, we might have had a forum where that matter could have been resolved without going through the difficulties we saw.

One of the arguments that has been raised is that we don't want young men and women in uniform, who are going out today to the far corners of the world to deal with this issue, to be apprehended and tried before some kangaroo court. I do not want that either. But whether we are a part of drafting this agreement or not, it may get established—in fact, it is likely to—with our participation. And our young men and women in uniform are going to be subjected to that jurisdiction whether we like it or not.

The fact that we are not a signatory to the court doesn't mean that somehow our servicemen and women are exempt from its jurisdiction. All it means is that when we retreat from helping craft this court our ability to structure it in a way that would minimize the threat of innocent men and women in uniform being brought before it is gone. The message we are sending right now is that we are going to walk away from this process and leave our young men and women subjected to the potential vagaries of such a court because we do not want to be involved in the discussions surrounding its creation.

This amendment is called, ironically, the American Servicemen's Protection Act. It is anything but. The establishment of this amendment places our men and women in uniform in greater jeopardy than they would be if we were to participate in trying to develop the structures of this court to minimize problems.

We are simply sticking a finger, at the very hour we ought to be doing otherwise, in the eyes of our friends.

Clearly, war criminals and terrorists must be thrilled at the notion that an international bar of justice continues to be blocked by their arch enemy, the United States of America.

I am prepared to take whatever steps I can in the next few days to see to it that this amendment is defeated. It was in this very Chamber on the night of September 10 that I stood and objected to the Craig amendment, which eliminated all funding for us to get involved in establishment of this court. I was urged not to ask my colleagues for a recorded vote. I didn't. I regret so now.

Within less than 24 hours of that night, we saw an international act of terrorism take the lives of many of our fellow citizens. I am not suggesting the adoption or the defeat of that amendment would have changed the course of history, but how ironic that on the eve of the September 11th attack, this body went on record as saying we are not even going to finance a commission of the United States to go in and try and improve the Rome treaty, to try to make it more workable and more acceptable to the United States.

That amendment was adopted as part of the State-Justice-Commerce appropriations bill. The question now is whether or not we are going to take the language under this so-called American Servicemen's Protection Act and incorporate it as part of the Department of Defense authorization bill.

I am disheartened because I understand that the administration, despite the fact they had expressed some opposition to such an approach only a few days ago, has now decided to give their endorsement to this proposal in exchange for which apparently the Republican leadership in the House are going to release the U.N. arrearages. That is the tradeoff apparently.

To their credit, the administration has negotiated some waiver authority in these proposals. But the overall message we are sending to the international community is a terrible one, in my view. On the one hand, the Secretary has called on everyone to stand with us, while on the other hand, we are once again suggesting that we can go it alone. It is contradictory, to say the very least.

It is just like the approach we have taken on too many other issues. I won't go into all of them here. But if we are going to be asking the world to cooperate, we have to send a better message on some of these other issues. I favor increased security measures here at home as well as additional authorities for law enforcement. I will take a back seat to no one in our common determination to improve the quality of safety in this country. But as all of my colleagues, I believe it ought to be done thoughtfully so that we don't wake up one day and find that our Nation as we know it exists no longer.

I don't want my country to become a gated community internationally. I

don't want to have to go through all sorts of walls and metal detectors to get in to visit some friends. I want my country to still be a free and open place. I want us to be engaged in the world. You can't be a gated community in the international sense and also be a major player globally and economically. You certainly are not going to be successful in going after terrorists if you decide we are going to become a gated community and retreat from international agreements. Then the terrorists victory is vastly in excess of what it was on September 11.

That day they destroyed buildings and took lives and we will never forget their actions. But if beyond that they are also able to do things to cause us to walk away from international agreements and create that gated community here at home, then their victory is far beyond the terrible success they had only a few short days ago.

I hope my colleagues over the weekend will give some thought to this amendment. Don't be deceived by the title. It is anything but protecting our service men and women.

Finally, it seems to me that it is time to be honest with ourselves about why international terrorism has become such a growing threat. We need only look into the oppressed faces of citizens of some of the governments we, frankly, have supported despite their less than acceptable treatment of their own citizenry over the years. The children, teenagers, of many of these countries grow up hating their leaders and, frankly, our own country for keeping them in power, supporting them as they stay in power. These young people become foot soldiers who are all too readily persuaded by the likes of the Osama bin Ladens of this world that violence is the answer to their grievances. And I would hope, as we analyze what we need to do at home to protect our security and how we can play a more constructive role internationally and build those coalitions that are essential for our long-term success in overcoming this threat, that we also take time to stand up to some of these regimes and be on the side of humanity everywhere.

Our Founding Fathers did not only talk about those in the United States when they talked about inalienable rights; they wisely wrote about all people, not only those who lived within the borders of the then-Thirteen Colonies of what would constitute the United States. They spoke to the aspirations and hopes of other people as well.

We are that legacy, if you will. We are the generations that will come after to perpetuate those very values. This is a vastly different world than those who founded this country faced. Today, we are talking about billions of people around the globe, and about a nation whose power is vastly in excess of what it was 220 years ago. If we are going to live up to the ideals incorporated in the Declaration of Independ-

ence and the Bill of Rights and the Constitution, then we need to understand and hear those voices out there who cry out for some leadership, cry out for advocates. We ought to step back and look and see whether or not our short-term policy needs are satisfying the long-term security needs of the Nation.

We must also come to grips with the Muslim faith. That doesn't mean trying to keep secular governments in place in countries where the will of the people is otherwise. It means beginning to understand the underlying premises of that faith, and by conveying our respect. It means a commitment by our Government to spend resources so that we understand them better.

That is what President Kennedy was trying to do when he created the Peace Corps 40 years ago. The Peace Corps is a wonderful organization. I was proud to have been a member of the Peace Corps some 35 years ago. However, it has not been as active, in my view, as it could have been, particularly in Muslim countries where we might have been better served by having hundreds of thousands of young Americans working in those poor communities.

It is not an easy task for the Peace Corps to go everywhere, but the focus should be on those areas where the need is the greatest like Afghanistan and Pakistan and Indonesia. Taking the time to recruit the people with the language skills and ability and knowledge of these cultures could do an awful lot to change some of the anti-American attitudes we see, in my view. We should be getting started now so that in the aftermath of the military actions we are going to take, particularly in some of the Muslim countries, we will be ready to show a different face of our country, one that isn't simply militarily strong, but one that also incorporates justice and humanity and respect for religious faiths, in accordance with the true principles deeply imbedded in our own value systems that call for the exercise of freedom in our own Nation.

It is time to take a hard look at our path. Yes, we need to act in the coming days to address the immediate threats, as I mentioned already—the challenges confronting our Nation in the international community that stem from the tragedy at the World Trade Center and our Pentagon. But we have to take a longer and harder look at those actions at home and abroad that will make not only ourselves safer, but the world safer for our citizens and the citizens of this globe.

History will judge how we act, not only in the short term, protecting our shores, which is our primary responsibility, but also the kind of framework we establish and the kind of reaching out that will be necessary. So when the history of our generation is written on how we responded to this great crisis at home, historians will write about a great nation that did not close its doors and create a gated community,

but truly reached out to the international community and respected the rights of all human beings and made an effort to understand the grievances that built up in the ranks of these madmen terrorists that allowed them to carry out their savage attacks as they did on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. That is a complicated task.

The world is looking to us. We are the greatest power on the face of the Earth—economically, politically, and militarily. They are looking to see how we respond to this. If next week we adopt amendments here that walk away from international criminal courts, and we just go in militarily and don't understand what is behind some of these reactions we are seeing in these places, then I think history will judge us harshly. So our first responsibility is to protect our citizens—not just the generation we presently represent, but the generations we also represent who are yet unborn whose very fate may be determined by the actions we take in the coming days.

I have no doubt that President George Walker Bush and his team are not only competent but are dedicated and have the ability to lead us. They have a Congress and a nation that wants to follow them.

I only urge that they act wisely and not cut deals and make arrangements for short-term success that could do our Nation some very long-term harm.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, let me begin by thanking my colleague for those eloquent and passionate and insightful remarks, and for his extraordinary leadership, not only in this time but as he shows throughout all of our work in Congress. I thank him for his guidance on this issue which is so important. I look forward to joining him on this issue when we reconvene next week.

Mr. President, as the Senator from Connecticut so eloquently spoke about for the last half hour or so—about the importance of alliances at this time, the importance of international alliances, the extraordinary opportunity that has been given to us out of this tragedy to build a new framework of mutual trust and mutual cooperation for the benefit of all citizens of this world who love freedom, who hope for a better life, who want only for themselves, their children, and their grandchildren to live free of oppression, free from fear, free from hunger, free from want, it is really an extraordinary time.

I want to acknowledge the leadership that I have seen in this body in a way that I never thought I would. I am certain that most people in my State and in many States don't completely really understand yet the extraordinary length to which the Members of this body, both Democrats and Republicans, have worked to overcome some very difficult issues in trying to work so closely with the President, and have done this in a remarkable way under his tremendous leadership, as the Senator from Connecticut also pointed out.

I think we have made great progress in the last 2 weeks, since September 11. We are on the right track and at the right pace. We just have to steady our course and continue to support our President and debate where we need to and not give up our right to judgment, and do it in a way that will strengthen our country and will honor the spirit that Americans everywhere are showing us around the world and move forward to win this war.

I want to spend a few minutes before we close today speaking about an important part of this effort, an important part of the Defense authorization bill, which we have been engaged in debating now under the great leadership of Senator LEVIN from Michigan and the Senator from Virginia, Senator WARNER.

In my mind, the cold war finally ended at 8:45 a.m. eastern time on Tuesday, September 11. Literally, up until that moment, this Congress had engaged in something akin to shadow-boxing.

We swung our arms about in search of enemies, and in search of a unifying purpose to our national security. Yet in life, it is often tragedy and crisis that lifts the fog from our eyes. Suddenly, we see the world with crystal-like clarity. We understand better that which is trivial and that which is absolutely essential. We look back on our priorities before this crisis, and I think many of us have been shaking our heads wondering: What could we possibly have been thinking?

One truth that should now be evident to America's collective world view is that we need a strong and practical relationship with Russia. There is a bond between the United States and Russia that defies coincidence. Of course, we share the common experience of the cold war. It was not a pleasant experience, it was not a good experience, but it was an experience that we shared. Now it appears we will share the experience of fighting in Afghanistan.

Russia itself has been attacked by terrorists, supported by elements of the Arab Afghan army, the very force that we trained during the cold war and now has unleashed its terror upon us.

In short, our countries have a history of lashing out at each other. Yet when we do, we inevitably hurt ourselves. It is an instinct we learned during the cold war, but we must unlearn that in-

stinct to succeed in this silent war. Hopefully, on September 11, we closed for good that chapter in our relationship.

There are many things that make me proud about this Defense authorization bill that we have been debating and will hopefully conclude that debate when we reconvene next week, but one of the things that makes me proudest about this year's Defense authorization bill is that even before the events of the 11th, we understood the importance of our relationship with Russia. Senators Nunn and LUGAR deserve the thanks of the whole of the American public for their extraordinary foresight. They realized that at the end of the cold war, in the tremendous vacuum that was created, we needed to be aggressive in forming a new relationship with Russia. It would not be a relationship based on fear, deception, and suspicion. Rather, it would be a relationship grounded in our common history, our common roles as great powers, and our mutual interest in establishing a world where our citizens could flourish.

The only way forward to this goal is up the trail blazed by Senators Nunn and LUGAR. The Cooperative Threat Reduction Program sponsored by the Department of Defense has been under assault in this Congress since I joined the Armed Services Committee. It was derided as welfare to ex-Communists. We slashed and hamstrung the programs, claiming to react to mismanagement.

With the hard work of my friend and now partner, Mr. ROBERTS, the Senator from Kansas, we reversed that trend this year. The subcommittee mark for the Emerging Threats included full funding for the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program at \$403 million. Of these funds, \$50 million is dedicated to chemical demilitarization of the Soviet Union.

The facts before us should be crystal clear to everyone. There should be no more urgent priority for this country than to secure and destroy the chemical, biological, and nuclear stockpiles of the former Soviet Union.

On that exact point, there was a beautifully written op-ed piece by former Senator Sam Nunn of Georgia. I ask unanimous consent to print the op-ed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Atlanta Journal-Constitution,
Sept. 16, 2001]

LIVING IN A NEW ERA OF INSECURITY
(By Sam Nunn)

The bitter events of last week will never pass from the American memory. But whether they are remembered as an isolated, unrepeated horror or the first nightmare in a new era of insecurity may well depend on what we do now.

The terrorists who planned and carried out the attacks of Sept. 11 showed there is no limit to the number of innocent lives they are willing to take. Their capacity for killing was restricted only by the power of their weapons.