followers, other terrorists will appear from all corners of the world for an indefinite period of time if we do not understand the issues.

Changing our current foreign policy with wise diplomacy is crucial if we are to really win the war and restore the sense of tranquility to our land that now seems to be so far in our distant past. Our widespread efforts of peacekeeping and nation-building will only contribute to the resentment that drives the fanatics. Devotion to internationalism and a one-world government only exacerbates regional rivalries. Denying that our economic interests drive so much of what the West does against the East impedes any efforts to diffuse the world crisis that already has a number of Americans demanding nuclear bombs to be used to achieve victory. A victory based on this type of aggressive policy would be a hollow victory indeed.

I would like to draw analogy between the drug war and the war against terrorism. In the last 30 years, we have spent hundreds of billions of dollars on a failed war on drugs. This war has been used as an excuse to attack our liberties and privacy. It has been an excuse to undermine our financial privacy while promoting illegal searches and seizures with many innocent people losing their lives and property. Seizure and forfeiture have harmed a great number of innocent American citizens.

Another result of this unwise war has been the corruption of many law enforcement officials. It is well known that with the profit incentives so high, we are not even able to keep drugs out of our armed prisons. Making our whole society a prison would not bring success to this floundering war on drugs. Sinister motives of the profiteers and gangsters, along with prevailing public ignorance, keeps this futile war going.

Illegal and artificially high priced drugs drive the underworld to produce, sell and profit from this social depravity. Failure to recognize that drug addiction, like alcoholism, is a disease rather than a crime, encourage the drug warriors in efforts that have not and will not ever work. We learned the hard way about alcohol prohibition and crime, but we have not yet seriously considered it in the ongoing drug war.

Corruption associated with the drug dealers is endless. It has involved our police, the military, border guards and the judicial system. It has affected government policy and our own CIA. The artificially high profits from illegal drugs provide easy access to funds for rogue groups involved in fighting civil wars throughout the world.

Ironically, opium sales by the Taliban and artificially high prices helped to finance their war against us. In spite of the incongruity, we rewarded the Taliban this spring with a huge cash payment for promises to eradicate some poppy fields. Sure.

For the first 140 years of our history, we had essentially no Federal war on drugs, and far fewer problems with drug addiction and related crimes was a consequence. In the past 30 years, even with the hundreds of millions of dollars spent on the drug war, little good has come of it. We have vacillated from efforts to stop the drugs at the source to severely punishing the users, yet nothing has improved.

This war has been behind most big government policy powers of the last 30 years, with continual undermining of our civil liberties and personal privacy. Those who support the IRS's efforts to collect maximum revenues and root out the underground economy, have welcomed this intrusion, even if the drug underworld grows in size and influence.

The drug war encourages violence. Government violence against nonviolent users is notorious and has led to the unnecessary prison overpopulation. Innocent taxpayers are forced to pay for all this so-called justice. Our eradication project through spraying around the world, from Colombia to Afghanistan, breeds resentment because normal crops and good land can be severely damaged. Local populations perceive that the efforts and the profiteering remain somehow beneficial to our own agenda in these various countries.

Drug dealers and drug gangs are a consequence of our unwise approach to drug usage. Many innocent people are killed in the crossfire by the mob justice that this war generates. But just because the laws are unwise and have had unintended consequences, no excuses can ever be made for the monster who would kill and maim innocent people for illegal profits. But as the violent killers are removed from society, reconsideration of our drug laws ought to occur.

A similar approach should be applied to our war on those who would terrorize and kill our people for political reasons. If the drug laws and the policies that incite hatred against the United States are not clearly understood and, therefore, never changed, the number of drug criminals and terrorists will only multiply.

□ 1345

Although this unwise war on drugs generates criminal violence, the violence can never be tolerated. Even if repeal of drug laws would decrease the motivation for drug dealer violence, this can never be an excuse to condone the violence. On the short term, those who kill must be punished, imprisoned, or killed. Long term though, a better understanding of how drug laws have unintended consequences is required if we want to significantly improve the situation and actually reduce the great harms drugs are doing to our society.

The same is true in dealing with those who so passionately hate us that suicide becomes a just and noble cause in their effort to kill and terrorize us. Without some understanding of what has brought us to the brink of a worldwide conflict in reconsidering our policies around the globe, we will be no more successful in making our land secure and free than the drug war has been in removing drug violence from our cities and towns.

Without some understanding why terrorism is directed towards the United States, we may well build a prison for ourselves with something called homeland security while doing nothing to combat the root causes of terrorism. Let us hope we figure this out soon.

We have promoted a foolish and very expensive domestic war on drugs for more than 30 years. It has done no good whatsoever. I doubt our Republic can survive a 30-year period of trying to figure out how to win this guerilla war against terrorism. Hopefully, we will all seek the answers in these trying times with an open mind and understanding.

LONG-TERM TERRORIST STRATEGY SHOULD BE DEVELOPED WITH HIGH-LEVEL STATEMENT OF NATIONAL OBJECTIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, on September 11 we were brutally awakened to the harsh realities we dreamed might never reach our shores. With the thousands of dead, we buried forever any illusion the scourge of transnational terrorism could not strike here.

Former Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu called it our ''wake-up call from hell.'' We have awakened to a recurring nightmare of escalating brutality and carnage unfettered by moral or political constraints.

Each attack is practice and prelude for the next. Global terrorism turns our strengths against us, exploiting the freedom, pluralism and openness we cherish to spread hate, fear and death.

On that day, our world changed in ways we are still struggling to understand, our vision still blurred by disbelief and tears of grief.

Since then, there have been times I find myself longing for a return to the Cold War. The numbing calm of mutually assured destruction seems in retrospect more tolerable than the unnerving wait for the next random act of barbaric terrorist mayhem.

But if the global upheavals of the last century yield one lesson, it is this: the dynamic triumphs over the static, and we dare not indulge the urge to pause and reminisce.

To be sure, the post-Soviet Pax Americana is not quite what we expected. The Cold War is over, yet the world is a more dangerous place. Hard on the heels of hope, we are entering a new world order of growth and cooperation, intractable regional conflicts and the rise of radical Islamic militancy

bringing, instead, the prospect of chronic, even cataclysmic disorder.

On the 50th anniversary of Winston Churchill's ''Iron Curtain'' speech at Westminster College, former British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher described these ''other, less appealing consequences'' of the global situation.

She said, ''Like a giant refrigerator that had finally broken down after years of poor maintenance, the Soviet empire in its collapse released all the ills of ethnic, social and political backwardness which it had frozen in suspended animation for so long.''

In 1996, she was prescient enough to warn of the threat posed by radical Islamic movements and the middle-income countries, Iraq, Iran, Syria and others, shopping for chemical and biological weapons in the post-Soviet toxic bazaar.

The Iron Curtain has been replaced by a poison veil that shrouds the world in dread and terror. We also find our economic, military and cultural dominance fostering vocal, sometimes violent resentment to which we seem unaccustomed and unprepared to rebut. Former Senator Warren Rudman, who served as the co-chairman of the U.S. Commission on National Security 21st Century, recently said acknowledging and managing that resentment would have to become a central element of U.S. public diplomacy in the years and decades ahead.

That is not all that will have to change. The Nation's fight against terrorism will remain fragmented and unfocused until there is a thorough assessment of the threats we face and overarching national strategy articulated to guide planning, direct spending and discipline bureaucratic balkanization.

President Bush instructed the Director of the White House Office of Homeland Security, former Governor Tom Ridge, to formulate that strategy based on the most current threat intelligence.

When pressed for a national strategy, the previous administration pointed to a pastiche of event-driven Presidential decision directives and the Department of Justice's 5-year spending plan.

Reactive in vision and scope, that strategy changed only as we lurched from crisis to crisis, from Khobar Towers to the Cole, from Oklahoma City to Dar es Salaam.

President Clinton's National Security Council Coordinator for Counterterrorism, Richard Clarke, scoffed at our committee's request for a comprehensive threat assessment. He told us the threat came from the groups on the State Department's list of designated terrorists and the strategy was to hunt them down like criminals.

As recently as a month ago, threat assessment and security strategy were still viewed in some quarters as academic or bureaucratic exercises.

Today, as we worry about access to crop dusters and anthrax exposures by mail, a clear-eyed, fully informed view of the threat, particularly the threat posed by chemical agents and weaponized pathogens, is a national security imperative.

Assessing the threat of bioterrorism requires a sober judgment about the motives, intentions and capabilities of people so intoxicated with hate and evil they would kill themselves in the act of killing others.

These are the questions that confound the assessment process: When and where will terrorists use biological weapons against us? How will the agent be dispersed? For what type and magnitude of attack should we be prepared?

Available answers offer little comfort and less certainty in assessing the threat. Some conclude the technical difficulties of large scale production and efficient dissemination reduce the likelihood terrorists will use lethal agents to inflict mass casualties any time soon. Others think those barriers have been or will soon be overcome. Stills others believe neither large quantities nor wide dispersion are required to inflict biological terror.

From this cacophony of plausible opinions, those charged with formulating a national counterterrorism strategy must glean a rational estimate about the irrational possibility of biological attack.

Perhaps the most difficult dimension of the threat to assess is the deep-seated, almost primal fear engendered by the prospect of maliciously induced disease. For the terrorist, that fear is a potent force multiplier, capable of magnifying a minor, manageable outbreak into a major public health crisis. Failure to account for this unique aspect of biological terrorism understates the threat, increasing our vulnerability. Overstating the threat based on fear alone invites overreaction, in which we waste scarce resources and terrorize ourselves with Draconian security restrictions.

The changes wrought by the events of September 11 have also brought into sharper focus just how much of our national security apparatus is now irrelevant or ineffective.

Last week, Ambassador Paul Bremer, our Nation's first diplomat in 1986 to combat the spread of global terrorism, and chairman of the National Commission on Terrorism, noted that two of the four pillars of U.S. counterterrorism policy were already obsolete.

The first, to make no concessions to terrorists and strike no deals, has been made irrelevant by the rise of radical Islamic groups. Their only demand being the demise of the West, there can be no deal to strike.

The second pillar of our policy, bring terrorists to justice for their crimes, has been rendered ineffective by perpetrators willing to die with their victims. We can no longer indulge the tidy, familiar mechanics of solving the crime and punishing individuals when the crime offends humanity and the individuals are eager to be martyred.

That approach has been compared to battling malaria by swatting mosquitoes. To stop the disease of modern terrorism, the swamp of explicit and tacit state sponsorship must be drained and disinfected.

That leaves the final two precepts of current policy, isolate state sponsors of terrorism and enlist other Nations in that effort.

Like its totalitarian forebears, terrorism is not incorporal. Its practitioners must make anchor and draw sustenance through contact with the people, places and institutions susceptible to the pressures of military and political statecraft.

So building a coalition to punish state sponsors is now being pursued in earnest. But that was not always the case, and it is by no means clear what longer-term strategy should be pursued in this regard beyond Afghanistan.

That long-term strategy should be developed with a high-level statement of national objectives. It should be coupled logically to a statement of the means that will be used to achieve those objectives. Only then can we hope to resist the drift of the events thrust upon us by others and be prepared to confront terrorism in our time and on our terms.

It will not be easy. David Abshire, from the Center for Strategic and International Studies, CSIS, recently noted this critical strategic discussion occurs in the context of a greatly weakened State Department, a traumatized intelligence community, a disorganized NSC, and a reactive national security posture left over from the Cold War.

With regard to our intelligence capabilities, I would add the observation their trauma is in part self-induced. Self-satisfied and for the most part self-policed, intelligence agencies tend to see information as an end, not a means. We are partially blinded by the lack of human intelligence in key parts of the world. Classification standards and jurisdictional stovepipes all but guarantee critical observations, and analysis will not reach those who need them.

Ironically, a community so heavily dependent on technical means of intelligence-gathering has not been able to embrace the data mining and threat profiling tools others are using to glean important knowledge from open-source material.

Increasingly sophisticated terrorists are becoming adept at hiding their secrets in plain view. Our intelligence agencies are too busy protecting Cold War sources and methods to find them.

Similar institutional dynamics were present the last time the United States was coming to grips with a profound strategic paradigm shift: the emergence of the Cold War and the nuclear threat. President Eisenhower wisely tasked the bureaucracies to do what they often do best, compete with each

other. Strategic options were identified, studied and urged on the President. Conceived in the White House sunroom, the Solarium Exercise, as it came to be known, produced the long-range strategy that guided U.S. national security policy for the next 5 decades.

□ 1400

To meet the current threat, our strategy must be more dynamic and more open. Security is not a sedative, not a state of rest, but the level of vigilance required to protect, and advance, what we hold essential to life and liberty. Advocating for human rights and human freedoms is not cultural hegemony; it is our God-given right and duty.

Nor can we afford to be squeamish or patronizing in public discourse about the zealots who target us, or the weapons they wield. A naive or blurred perception of the threat fragments our defenses and leaves us avoidably vulnerable.

The inconveniences and sacrifices required to protect national security and maintain public safety will be more readily accepted if we are brutally honest about the true nature of our peril. The threat must be confronted with the same clear-eyed focus, steely intensity and unflagging vigilance with which the terrorists pursue their malignant cause.

Since September 11, we have shown we are up to the task.

In another age, another generation faced the prospect of another evil. Winston Churchill, addressing his besieged nation over the BBC in 1940, spoke to the timeless challenge of defending freedom. This is what Churchill said:

''And now it has come to us to stand alone in the breach, and face the worst that the tyrant's might and enmity can do. Bearing ourselves humbly before God, but conscious that we serve an unfolding purpose, we are ready to defend our native land against the invasion by which it is threatened.

''We are fighting by ourselves alone; but we are not fighting for ourselves alone. Here in this strong city of refuge which enshrines the title-deeds of human progress and is of deep consequence to Christian civilization; here, girt about by the seas and oceans where the Navy reigns; shielded from above by the prowess and devotion of our airmen, we await undismayed the impending assault.

''Perhaps it will come tonight. Perhaps it will come next week. Perhaps it will never come.

''We must show ourselves equally capable of meeting a sudden violent shock, or what is perhaps a harder test, a prolonged vigil. But be the ordeal sharp or long, or both, we shall seek no terms, we shall tolerate no parley; we may show mercy, we shall ask for none.''

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your willingness to take the dais and give me this opportunity.

APPOINTMENT OF HONORABLE FRANK R. WOLF TO ACT AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS THROUGH OCTOBER 31, 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON) laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 25, 2001.

I hereby appoint the Honorable FRANK R. WOLF to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions through October 31, 2001.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the appointment is approved.

There was no objection.

CORRECTION TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2001, PAGE E1911

The following extension of remarks was inadvertently attributed to Mr. SCHIFF.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. EHRLICH. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, October 16th, I was unavoidably detained from participating in floor proceedings. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following ways on the legislation the House considered:

H. Con. Res. 248, Expressing the sense of the Congress that public schools may display the words ''God Bless America'' as an expression of support for the Nation: ''Yea.''

H. Con. Res. 217, Recognizing the historic significance of the fiftieth anniversary of the alliance between Australia and the United States under the ANZUS Treaty, paying tribute to the United States-Australia relationship, reaffirming the importance of economic and security cooperation between the United States and Australia, and welcoming the state visit by Australian Prime Minister John Howard: ''Yea.''

H.R. 2272, The Coral Reef and Coastal Marine Conservation Act: ''Yea.''

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CROWLEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. INSLEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STRICKLAND, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ROHRABACHER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. RAMSTAD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROHRABACHER, for 5 minutes, today.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Jeff Trandahl, Clerk of the House reports that on October 17, 2001 he presented to the President of the United States for his approval, the following bill.

H.J. Res. 69. Making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2002, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, October 29, 2001, at 2 p.m.

OATH OF OFFICE

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

> I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Members of the 107th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

Honorable STEPHEN F. LYNCH, 9th Massachusetts.

Honorable JEFF MILLER, 1st Florida.

OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Members executed the oath for access to classified information:

Neil Abercrombie, Aníbal Acevedo-Vilá, Gary L. Ackerman, Robert B. Aderholt, W. Todd Akin, Thomas H. Allen, Robert E. Andrews, Richard K. Armey, Joe Baca, Spencer Bachus, Brian Baird, Richard H. Baker, John Elias E. Baldacci, Tammy Baldwin, Cass Ballenger, James A. Barcia, Bob Barr, Thomas M. Barrett, Roscoe G. Bartlett, Joe Barton, Charles F. Bass, Xavier Becerra, Ken Bentsen, Doug Bereuter, Shelley Berkley, Howard L. Berman, Marion Berry, Judy Biggert, Michael Bilirakis, Sanford D. Bishop, Jr., Rod R. Blagojevich, Earl Blumenauer, Roy Blunt, Sherwood L. Boehlert, John A. Boehner, Henry Bonilla, David E. Bonior, Mary Bono, Robert A. Borski, Leonard L. Boswell, Rick Boucher, Allen Boyd, Kevin Brady, Robert A. Brady, Corrine Brown, Sherrod Brown, Henry E. Brown, Jr.,