service in September, 2002 of CIA's ''reservations'' about the inclusion of references to Iraqi efforts to obtain uranium from Africa in the British intelligence service's September 24 dossier?

Five, given the doubts of the U.S. Intelligence Community, why didn't the President say in his State of the Union speech not only that ''The British Government has learned that Saddam Hussein recently sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa'' but that ''our U.S. intelligence community has serious doubts about such reporting''?

Six, how and when did the U.S. Government receive the forged documents on Niger, and when did it become aware that they might be bogus?

And, seven, what role did the Office of the Vice President have in bringing about an inquiry into Iraq's purported efforts to obtain uranium from Niger? Was the Vice President's staff briefed on the results of Ambassador Wilson's trip to Niger?

These and many other questions underscore the critical importance of a bipartisan, open, and thorough inquiry into the objectivity and credibility of intelligence concerning the presence of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq immediately before the war and the alleged Iraq al-Qaida connection, and the use of such intelligence by the Department of Defense in policy decisions, military planning and the conduct of operations in Iraq.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the Defense appropriations bill.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, morning business is closed.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 10:30 having arrived, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 2658, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2658) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I compliment the distinguished Senator from Michigan for his thorough and thoughtful statement involving many of the questions that need to be asked and need to be answered. His recommendation to the Senate and to our country that there be a thorough investigation, a bipartisan investigation, where these questions can be answered and the information provided, in my view, is essential.

We have become more and more confused over the course of the last several days with regard to the conflicting information provided by the administration on these and other key questions. We must find a way with which each of these questions can be clarified and for the administration to come forth with a clear acknowledgement of the need for this clarification is essential.

The American people deserve a thorough, complete, open review of each and every one of these questions. The Intelligence Committee has begun its work, and I commend the distinguished ranking member for his efforts and his persistence in bringing it to this point. I think this has now gone beyond the matter of just intelligence, as the Senator from Michigan has pointed out with questions and the concerns he raised in his speech this morning.

We will address these questions both legislatively and rhetorically over the course of the next several days. But I have very fundamental questions with regard to the bill itself. Others have raised them.

Why is it that there is not one dime requested for the Iraqi operation in the Defense appropriations bill? Why is it that there is not one dime requested for the Defense Department's efforts in the war on terror? Not one dime. I am just baffled. It is sort of legislative never-never land for us to be involved in a war that we are already told by the Secretary of Defense—at least with regard to Iraq and Afghanistan—is costing this country $5 billion a month, and there is not $1 requested in this bill for that operation.

How in the world can we be on the Senate floor talking about something as consequential as this—not only to us but to the world—and not have a better appreciation of what the costs and implications and fiscal consequences are? So that, too, will be a matter that I hope will be the subject of great debate in the Senate Chamber.

We admire the work done by our military. We are grateful for the extraordinary effort and sacrifice made by the Armed Forces. Many of our National Guard and Reserve personnel have been in that country now for over 6 months. The sacrifice and the extraordinary effort they have made on behalf of their country ought to be commended. But another question comes to mind as we consider that sacrifice: Why are we doing it alone? And why is it the administration continues to refuse to request additional resources, officially, from NATO? Why is it they are unwilling to ask the United Nations to urge its members to provide military force and civilian police? Why is that not a part of the administration position?

We find ourselves in a very unusual set of circumstances. We are debating the single largest Defense appropriations bill in history but a bill that does not in any way reflect the cost of our presence and the effort being made at this very moment in Iraq or in Afghanistan or the war on terror.

We know it is going to continue to cost this country billions of dollars each and every month, but we do not know why the administration refuses to ask others officially for help, especially NATO, and we certainly do not know the answers to the questions raised by the distinguished Senator from Michigan just moments ago.

We must have those answers, and I hope during the course of this debate we can find mechanisms and subscribe to procedures that will ensure that the American people have all the facts.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I do not mean to be disrespectful and interrupt the distinguished leader, but I wonder if the Democratic leader knows that I am responsible for not having more money for Iraq in this bill. We met with the President and the Secretary of Defense and pointed out the enormous amount of money we had provided in the supplemental passed earlier this year for that action in Iraq. We had to have money to meet some of the problems caused by my interpretation of the budget resolution in not having enough money for some of the other subcommittees.

We worked out the arrangement whereby we took $3.1 billion out of this bill and allocated it to other subcommittees with the understanding that if additional moneys are needed in Iraq because of our actions there, beyond what we have already provided, that we will have a supplemental in the spring.

We anticipate the moneys we provided in the massive supplemental, $62.6 billion, is sufficient to carry them forward. As a matter of fact, there are not only sufficient funds, but in this bill we actually rescinded about $3 billion of the supplemental to make it available to other areas of defense, not having it totally earmarked to Iraq.

We are trying to manage this money. The distinguished Democratic leader is exactly right. The costs are running somewhere around $4 billion to $5 billion a month. We expect that to start tapering down as this involvement in Iraq continues. It is certainly not the same as when we were building up forces and transmitting personnel and material to Iraq. We have tried to manage this situation and keep a firm hand on the expenditures in Iraq. In doing so, we made more money available to other subcommittees because they have problems related to homeland security and other matters.

While I am honest in the fact that I do not think we have enough money yet for some of those subcommittees, I do think we have more money available for nondefense matters, for homeland security matters, than we would have had had we continued with the approach that was in the budget to start.

I congratulate the Democratic leader for stating frankly his feelings about the overall involvement in terms of our being in Iraq almost alone. We do have support from other nations, but we do not have the involvement of other troops to the extent I, too, would like to see take place. I hope that will occur. But I hope the leader will understand, one of the reasons the money is not there now, in terms of asking for more money for Iraq, is that I pleaded with the President and the Secretary to give us a little running room on those other bills and to realize that we thought there was adequate money to carry us through this calendar year—that means at least the first quarter of this next fiscal year—for the involvement in Iraq.

It is my hope that by the time we get to January and February, we will find the amount of money we are spending in Iraq is much less than it is right now, and that we can, in fact, shift gears a little bit as far as that involvement.

Iraqis should have, I am told, somewhere around $7 billion of income from oil by the end of this year. If that cashflow starts going into their economy and into their own local security rather than into the military budgets, as it was in the past, I think we will achieve the constraints we need in terms of the expenditures of Federal U.S. dollars in Iraq. I hope the Senator understands that point.

I just happened to be here at the time the Senator made his statement. I do, as a matter of fact, take pride in the fact the President and his people did listen to us. Chairman YOUNG and I explained the problems of this budget resolution and its impact on the other subcommittees which, as the Democratic leader knows, the budget resolution was less than the President had requested in this year's appropriations process.

I hope we will await the developments in Iraq and we can all see whether the administration will ask for more money in 2004, starting some time after the first of next year, if that is necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, if I may respond, as the Senator from Alaska knows, I am a big admirer of the distinguished Senator from Alaska, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. There are no two more able Members of this Senate than the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Hawaii, his ranking member.

I appreciate, first, the chairman's explanation, and I also appreciate the fact that he could foresee the budgetary and appropriations problems that could have been generated as a result of the allocation made initially by the administration. We are able to address some of the other concerns in other subcommittees on appropriations in part because he saw the problems arise and took action to avoid them.

I guess I go back to a fundamental question of management, not by him but of the administration, a fundamental question about what it is they anticipate will be the costs involving fighting the war in Iraq—not for this year but for the next fiscal year that this particular appropriations bill addresses.

It will take $60 billion to address those concerns in the next fiscal year. We appropriated in the supplemental $68 billion in this fiscal year. Obviously, that will take us into the first part of the next fiscal year. The question from us to the administration ought to be: Why have you not made a specific proposal with regard to the commitment that will be required in Iraq for the next fiscal year? If it is $60 billion, request it. If it is $60 billion, defend it. If it is $60 billion, give us some appreciation of how it will be spent and why we are the only ones spending it. Why is it that other countries are not more engaged? Why have you not asked? Those are the questions that any appropriations bill ought to address.

I supported the supplemental and most likely, whenever another one is requested, if it comes, I will support it. But it is not good fiscal management to take these matters piecemeal, to expect through a supplemental process—which, I might add, is not offset, which simply adds to the deficit. We now see a deficit of some $450 billion. If we take Social Security out, it is $600 billion, and we are still not at the end of this fiscal year.

We have serious management and budget considerations that have to be taken into account but are only exacerbated by these supplemental budgets that are offered, considered, and voted upon throughout the year.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

AMENDMENT NO. 1232

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I will make a statement while I am trying to locate the amendment I am going to offer. The 2004 budget request included no funding for the establishment of additional weapons of mass destruction civil support teams. There are currently 32 teams that are certified and operational. The plan is to field a total of 55 teams to ensure there is at least 1 team established in each State and territory.

The Senate Armed Services Committee included additional manpower and funding to establish 12 additional teams in fiscal year 2004. We included additional National Guard manpower for these teams, but we did not provide operation and maintenance or procurement funding.

I will send an amendment to the desk and ask that we consider it. This amendment conforms our bill to that of the Senate-passed national defense authorization bill regarding what we call CSTSs of the funds provided to the Department of Defense. This amendment would earmark $39.3 million in operation and maintenance funds, $25.9 million in procurement, and $1 million in research and development funds. I present the amendment as one that is offset and merely allocates funds to these teams as required by the Senate-passed authorization bill. I believe it has the support of my colleague Senator INOUYE.

Mr. INOUYE. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for himself and Mr. WARNER, proposes an amendment numbered 1232.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide funds for 12 additional Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Teams)

On page 120, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8124. Amounts appropriated by this Act may be used for the establishment and support of 12 additional Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Teams, as follows:

(1) Of the amount appropriated by title II under the heading ''OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY'', up to $23,300,000.

(2) Of the amount appropriated by title II under the heading ''OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD'', up to $16,000,000.

(3) Of the amount appropriated by title III under the heading ''OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY'', up to $25,900,000.

(4) Of the amount appropriated by title IV under the heading ''RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE'', up to $1,000,000.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask for the immediate consideration and adoption of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1232) was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Does the Senator wish some time?

I say to the Chair, in about 20 minutes we will have a package of amendments we have cleared and we are prepared to offer under unanimous consent.

I ask unanimous consent that we have a period for routine morning business until the hour of 11:15 with Senators being permitted to speak therein.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we have Senators who want to speak on the bill.

Mr. STEVENS. I am misinformed. I withdraw that request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee for his forbearance. I thank my colleague, Senator REID, for making this arrangement for me to speak out today on the 2004 Defense appropriations bill as a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

As I begin my remarks today, I am cognizant that a funeral service is about to begin in Minnesota. It is the funeral of the first Minnesota soldier to die in Iraq this year, PFC Edward J. Herrgott of Shakopee, MN. Private Herrgott was only 20 years old. He said he joined the Army so he could earn some money to go to school and become a police officer. He was patrolling in front of the Baghdad Museum on September 3 when a sniper's bullet ended his life.

Private Herrgott is an American hero. He stood guard in 115-degree heat, in the most dangerous city in the world, because his commanding officer assigned him that duty. He went to Iraq because his Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, assigned him that duty.

It took extraordinary courage and patriotism for him to perform that duty, to stand guard in that sweltering heat in the midst of that ever-present danger. Private Herrgott lost his life performing his duty. He lost his life 63 days after his Commander in Chief declared that major hostilities were over in Iraq. They did not end on May 1 for Private Herrgott, nor for the 77 other American soldiers who have died in Iraq since then, nor for the hundreds more who have been wounded, nor for the 145,000 other American soldiers who still risk their lives in Iraq every day and every night and wonder when will they come home.

Congress also bears responsibility for sending Private Herrgott and those 145,000 other brave men and women to Iraq. Last October, Congress voted to give their constitutional responsibility to declare war over to President Bush. Congress gave the President what he wanted, what he insisted then he must have, a blank check, a blank check signed in advance, authorizing the President to use whatever means necessary, including the use of force in Iraq, whenever, and with whomever, for however long, at whatever cost, until the President decides to end that war. Congress gave the President all of that authority and all of that responsibility. I did not vote for it, but a majority did, and now we must pay for that war.

Last week in the Senate Armed Services Committee, we were told by the Secretary of Defense that the war in Iraq is costing $3.9 billion per month and that the continuing military operations in Afghanistan are costing $900 million per month. That is a combined $4.8 billion a month, totaling $57.6 billion over 12 months. That is $57.6 billion which I thought was going to be in this 2004 Defense Appropriations bill, and the distinguished chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, who has been engaged in these matters for far more years than I have been around, has clarified the circumstances why that money is not in there now.

But I point out that the estimate of over $1 billion a week is probably way too low. According to this week's Newsweek magazine:

> That billion a week is just the beginning. It doesn't include the cost of running Iraq's government and rebuilding it, which could be an additional billion a month—according to pre-war United Nations estimates.

Nor does it include presumably, as this article details, the $1.2 billion which Ambassador Bremer's budget says must be spent up front in capital improvements if Iraq's oil production is to get under way again. Nor does it include the $680 million given to the Bechtel Corporation for infrastructure improvements; nor, I suspect, the $3 billion to $5 billion that it is estimated is necessary to make emergency repairs to Iraq's electrical power system.

So why is it that we cannot get from the administration a clear, direct, and reliable accounting about the cost of this war? I am guessing it has something to do with today's report that the Federal budget for fiscal year 2003 is expected to run a $450 billion deficit, and the next year's deficit may be as high as $500 billion, without even including all of the costs of the war efforts.

Those are staggering deficits. This year's deficit will be over 50 percent greater than the largest annual deficit in U.S. history, and it results from the most colossal financial mismanagement that has ever been witnessed in this country's history, the worst ever.

Just 2 years and 2 months ago, President Bush submitted his administration's first budget for fiscal year 2002 and the years beyond. It was a proud document dated April 9, 2001. The President stated:

> This budget offers a new vision of governing for our Nation.

His budget projected a $5.6 trillion surplus for the 10 fiscal years from 2002 through 2011. It promised to save the entire Social Security surplus of $2.6 trillion; to spend every penny, it said, of Medicare tax and premium collections on Medicare; to achieve historic levels of debt reduction, $2 trillion over 10 years; to provide $1.6 trillion in tax relief; and set aside a $1.4 trillion reserve for additional needs, debt service, and contingencies.

As we all know, there have been big contingencies since then, but not enough to justify the total destruction of all of those promises, not enough to warrant the abandonment of a fiscally responsible Federal budget, which was bequeathed to this administration by the administration which preceded it.

For fiscal year 2003, the fiscal year we are in presently, just 2 years and 2 months ago President Bush predicted a $262 billion surplus in the combined Federal budget for that year. The on-budget operating fund surplus was expected to be $49 billion; the off-budget Social Security surplus, $193 billion.

The Social Security surplus now is expected to be slightly less than was predicted then, but still $160 billion. But combined, the Federal budget deficit of $450 billion means the operating fund, the main operating account of the Federal Government, this year will run a deficit of over $600 billion. A $49 billion surplus was expected 2 years and 2 months ago and a $610 billion deficit is expected today.

The non-Social Security revenue for this year, in personal and corporate income taxes, capital gains tax, estate tax, and the excise tax was projected to exceed expenditures in fiscal year 2002, as they did in the year 2000 under President Bill Clinton—for the first time in 40 years. But now in actuality, those progressive taxes, which have constituted almost the entire tax base of the operating accounts of the Federal Government for all these years, those revenues generated will only amount to two-thirds of expenditures. The two tax bills of 2001 and 2003 have decimated the progressive tax base of the Federal Government. And 2004 is expected to be no better. If anything, it is projected to get even worse. The change from expectations to now the projection of a $500 billion deficit means a change of over $750 billion in projections.

Saving the Social Security surplus—that is gone. Every year—this year, next year, every year in the foreseeable future—it is going to be wiped out to nothing.

Reducing the national debt by $2 trillion? That is gone. In fact, according to the President's own Office of Management and Budget, if we adopt his budgets as he has proposed them, we will increase the national debt by $2 trillion over the next 10 years.

Setting up a reserve fund? Forget that, too.

Lowering the growth in discretionary spending to 4 percent a year? Not yet. The President's request for the last 3 years has increased that by 9 percent, 10 percent, and 11 percent, and that does not include these so-called supplemental appropriations, which is maybe one of the reasons that is the preferred approach—come back in, in the middle of the year, and ask for the increased money everybody knows is going to be needed to fund the operations in Iraq and Afghanistan.

It is very frustrating, I find, to not be able to get clear, reliable facts from this administration. They act as though this is their government, that we in Congress do not even exist, or that we are an unnecessary and unwanted intrusion into their affairs. So much for a new vision of government. So much for a new tone of bipartisanship. It has become worse, not better. Instead of facing up to these realities, the administration is trying to hide them.

When I returned from Minnesota last night, I was given a book, by a colleague, Senator BENNETT of Utah: ''Reagan, Man Of Principle,'' by John Harmer, a former State senator in California. I just glanced through the beginning pages of it.

I was struck by this anecdote from the senator. He had been involved as the majority leader there, trying to work out the redistricting bill for 1971. California was going to set the lines for the legislative districts for the State for the next 10 years. They finally, after all this thrashing back and forth and cutting deals and making arrangements, got agreement. Governor Reagan—President-to-be—vetoed that bill.

So in frustration, the State senator came to President Reagan. He said, reading now directly:

> ''What exactly do you want?'' I asked, in total frustration.
>
> His response was so purely honorable that I dared not repeat it to my senatorial colleagues, knowing that they would hoot me out of the room. Yet, though I did not fully appreciate it at the time, the response was just one of many examples of Reagan's strength as a political leader. Reagan, like Thomas Jefferson, had a fundamental faith in the American people and their ability to make the right decisions if only they had all the facts. Not just the Republicans among the people, but of all the people, once they had all of the facts. . . .

I am skipping ahead here, but Governor Reagan said to State Senator Harmer:

> ''I am really disappointed . . . that individual Republicans are so willing to sell out the best interests of the people in order to save themselves. That is not what I regard as worthy of my signature.''
>
> ''John,'' he said, ''I'm as dedicated to the Republican cause as you are. Our party's core philosophy represents the best assurance for the continued freedom and prosperity of the nation. But I am not the governor of just the Republicans. There are millions of people out there who, whether they voted for me or not, expect me to represent them with good judgement and integrity. The issue is not one of protecting what you call the Republican base. The issue is to do that which is right in principle.''

That could apply to the Democratic majorities in other States. There is no monopoly, I have learned here, in truth or wisdom or virtue. But that principle, ''to do what is right,'' and that principle, ''to present all the facts forthrightly to the American people,'' are principles that are certainly needed even more in Washington today, and that stands in marked contrast to what we experience in Washington today.

We are not being trusted with the facts: Not about the budget, not about the timetables for troop deployments and bringing the troops back home, and not about the circumstances that led up to this war in Iraq. We have a right to those facts here in the Congress. More important, the American people have a right to those facts. We have a right to know how much this war is costing and how we are going to pay for it. We have a right to know how long our troops are going to be over there in Iraq. We have a right to know how we got into that war in Iraq and how what we were told over the last months squares with the truth as it was known at the time.

What were the facts that led President Bush to say before the Nation, in a televised speech last October 7, that Saddam Hussein could have a nuclear weapon in less than a year when we now know there was no such program in evidence there? Or that Iraq is exploring using unmanned aerial vehicles for missions, targeting the United States, when in fact it was known back then and certainly is known today that those missiles, which were not even used against our invading forces, thank God, had a range of only a few hundred miles and were no threat to the United States?

What facts led Vice President CHENEY to say last August 26 that there is no doubt Saddam Hussein now has weapons of mass destruction, there is no doubt that he is amassing them to use against our friends, our allies, and against us? What caused National Security Adviser Condoleezza Rice to say last September that Iraq had provided chemical weapons training to al-Qaida members? What prompted Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld to say last fall that the United States must act quickly to save potentially tens of thousands of citizens? What led the President to say that Saddam Hussein could strike the United States first and inflict massive and sudden horror?

These are the questions I have. These are some of the facts that need to become known, as the distinguished ranking member of the Senate Armed Services Committee said just before me on the floor. We need a bipartisan investigation into all these circumstances, into what was known by the intelligence community, what was reported to members of the administration.

What was reported in top secret briefings to members of the Armed Services Committee which I was invited to attend, 20 or more such briefings over the course of last fall and early into this year?

What was being told to the administration that was at variance with that information? What caused the administration to speak so emphatically, with certainty, about acts which it seems were not so factual and which were not even presented as absolute facts in the briefings which I attended at the time? We have a right to those answers. Thus far it has been very difficult to get the agreement from colleagues on the other side to undertake these investigations or inquiries, whatever euphemism we use.

The Senate Intelligence Committee evidently, and hopefully, has agreed to undertake such an inquiry. We have not been able to obtain that consent in the Senate Armed Services Committee. In fact, we are being told such a bipartisan investigation is not going to be forthcoming.

What recourse does that leave? How do we get to the truth when those in possession of the facts and the information will not provide them? How can we get to the truth when we cannot conduct a bipartisan inquiry or intelligence into obtaining that truth? What does it say about those who would not provide that information or that opportunity to seek the truth? What do they have to hide? What are they afraid we might find out? Why is it we cannot know the circumstances that caused the Commander in Chief to send 150,000 U.S. troops to Iraq, including PFC Edward Herrott being buried in Minnesota this morning, to whom I pay my greatest respects.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENZI). The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I remember reading a book I enjoyed very much by James Michener called ''Caravans,'' an excellent history of Afghanistan. Of all the books he wrote, the only one I enjoyed more than that was ''Hawaii.'' When I read ''Caravans,'' I knew very little about Afghanistan. After I finished the book, I knew a lot more about Afghanistan and the constant struggles of the Afghan people.

America first focused on Afghanistan during the Cold War. The Soviets came in and brutally tried to take over that country. As we know now, American forces supplied arms to the Afghan people, who courageously drove the Soviets out of Afghanistan. Many scholars believe that defeat marked the beginning of the end of the Soviet Union. After almost 80 years, the impoverished country of Afghanistan was the reason for the fall of one of the greatest powers in the history of the world.

I will return to the subject of Afghanistan in a moment, but first I want to comment on what some of my colleagues have said this morning about the situation in Iraq. I supported the resolution that authorized the use of force in that country, and my vote was based on more than the evidence of Saddam Hussein's weapons of mass destruction. Still, the controversy that has arisen concerning these weaspons has hurt America in the international community. All the turmoil going on now, the accusations of coverups, the exaggerations and half truths, which persuaded some of my colleagues to vote for the resolution—it has damaged our country's credibility. It could take a long time to repair that damage.

The ongoing fight against terrorism has challenged our military as never before. But I think all my colleagues would agree that our men and women in uniform have risen to the task and performed heroically.

As pointed out by the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota, Mr. DAYTON, American soldiers are still dying in Iraq. Another was killed just yesterday.

I was impressed with the statement of the Senator from Minnesota because he mentioned not only a fallen soldier,

but also the other casualities of war; that is, people who have lost limbs, people who are paralyzed, people who are disfigured as a result of incendiary devices, people who are scarred permanently—and I'm referring also to the psychological scars that will be with these men and women for the rest of their lives.

All of our troops have performed heroically. It is our constitutional responsibility to ensure that our military gets the resources it needs to remain the strongest in the world. The bill we are considering today does that. It was not an easy task, and it is a tribute, as I have said already, to the two managers of the bill, the senior Senator from Alaska and the senior Senator from Hawaii, and of course their fine staffs. But, interestingly enough, as the Democratic leader mentioned today, this bill does not fund continuing operations in Afghanistan or Iraq. I have great admiration for the two managers of this bill, as I said on the floor yesterday. These two Senators are role models for me. These Senators have distinguished careers and represent their States as well as they can be represented. They both understand Defense issues from personal experience.

They both served their country in war. The Senator from Hawaii earned the highest honor that our country can confer upon an American military hero—the Congressional Medal of Honor. We sometimes take this great man for granted, but I try never to do that.

I can remember traveling with the distinguished Senator from Alaska to Czechoslovakia when the Iron Curtain was still down. I can remember in Prague, Czechoslovakia, encountering a man in a World War II flight jacket. It led to a conversation with the Senator from Alaska because that is the kind of jacket he wore.

I have the greatest respect for these two fine men. But I think this bill should have money in it to fund military operations for the next fiscal year in Afghanistan and Iraq. I say, as one of the appropriators, that I think it was genius how the chairman of the Appropriations Committee has allowed the appropriations bills to go forward this year. I think we are going to finish all of the appropriations bills in a reasonable period of time. It was genius how the Senator from Alaska found the money. It was enough to set what we call 302(b) allocations. Those are allocations for the 13 subcommittees. But for his ability to take some money from defense and put it into domestic programs, we could not have gotten that done. I acknowledge from a legislative standpoint how important it was to do that.

But I think we should fund these bills prospectively as we do with everything else.

I heard an exchange between the Senator from Alaska and the Democratic leader about the decision being made by the President and the Republican leaders on enough money to take the military in Afghanistan and Iraq probably up to the first of the year. But we can't fund appropriations bills based upon one-quarter of a fiscal year. We have to fund them for a full year.

The reason this is done, of course, is that we have a supplemental appropriations bill for emergency expenditures. They don't count against the budget rules we have around here. As a result of that, they add to the deficit. I wish that were not how we had to do things this year. But I accept that it has been done. Unless there is some magic that occurs, or something that I don't see which is untoward, I will support the supplemental appropriations bill. We have to support the military.

But I have to say this is not the way to do things around here. I continue to believe that any operation that puts our young men and women at risk should be funded through the regular appropriations process which allows people an opportunity to weigh in on our priorities, policy judgments, and efforts.

Last week, I came to the Senate floor and urged my colleagues to support our neighbor, Mexico. I acknowledge and appreciate the Members of the Senate having supported that amendment. Today, as we consider our military priorities for the coming year, I want to speak today about what I fear has become another forgotten commitment, the reconstruction of Afghanistan.

Keep in mind, Mr. President, that we walked away from the people of Afghanistan once before. We supplied them with weapons. After the Soviets took tail and ran, the United States followed suit. We no longer were interested in Afghanistan after we won that battle of the Cold War. The chaos that ensued after we left led to the rise of the Taliban, one of the most brutal, repressive tyrannies in the history of the world. Remember. We walked away once before. We cannot allow history to repeat itself.

When U.S.-led forces defeated the Taliban more than 19 months ago, President Bush promised a ''Marshall Plan for Afghanistan,'' and he assured us that our Nation would help Afghanistan become a stable, self-governing state free from the clutches of terrorism. I welcome that commitment from the President. The people of Afghanistan deserve that.

In the months immediately after the war, Afghanistan appeared to be making progress. A council of Afghans elected Hamid Karzai, a very courageous man, to lead an interim government. But we haven't done much to help this courageous man. As hope returned to Afghanistan for the first time in many years, the administration redirected its focus toward Iraq. Afghanistan virtually fell off the radar screen. Now, the Afghan people are paying the price. In short, all is not well in Afghanistan.

What are the current conditions? The security situation is particularly threatening. I was in a meeting this morning. I asked my Senate friends to guess how many troops are in Afghanistan today. The answer surprises people. I got different estimates—40,000, 20,000. We have 9,000 troops in Afghanistan. Where are they? They are in Kabul. The rest of the country is a jungle.

Outside Kabul, there is no security unless you are on the good side of one of the warlords. Aid workers don't feel safe. They don't travel through the country anymore. Many of the organizations have pulled out. In some of the provinces of Afghanistan—particularly in the southeast region—there is anarchy. Where there isn't anarchy, warlords are in control. These warlords seek only to enrich and empower themselves instead of helping President Karzai to address the urgent needs of the people. They fight among themselves and hoard Afghanistan's precious resources. Afghanistan does enjoy the luxaries of fertile land, oil and riches. Afghanistan is a country that is driven by poverty. It is a desert.

On rare occasions when the warlords aren't battling each other, they are joining together to weaken the central government. The absence of central authority in Afghanistan isn't anything new. That is why we had to cooperate with some of these warlords when we fought the Taliban. But when the war ended, we promised the Afghan people we would help them develop a stable country. That came from our President. We are reneging on that promise.

We simply can't accept a warlord-dominated Afghanistan. That would spell certain defeat for a long-term war against terrorism.

I came to this floor and said there is a need for the interim government in Afghanistan to include women. The Taliban brutalized women, but in some areas of Afghanistan women are not doing much better now than they were under the old regime. Some warlords are imposing Taliban-like restrictions on women and girls.

What does that mean? This means they are treated like nonpeople. It means they cannot show their faces. It means they cannot go anyplace unless they have their husband with them. They cannot even go to school. Some of the schools that were opened just for girls after the war have closed up.

Border security in Afghanistan is nonexistent. Is Osama bin Laden in Afghanistan? Is he near the country's border with Pakistan? It does not matter. He's certainly not in Kabul, where most of our forces are stationed. The rest of the territory is controlled by warlords or is in complete anarchy.

Afghanistan's porous border with Pakistan has allowed pro-Taliban elements to slip in and out at will, on the rare occasions they need to escape U.S. forces searching remote areas. Iran continues to try to influence affairs in the areas around Kabul.

The Afghan army does not have the manpower, training, or the resources

to deal with these cross-border incursions. The hinterlands of Afghanistan are essentially up for grabs to the lethal, devious, and dangerous insurgents that were cast out of Kabul at the start of Operation Enduring Freedom some 20 months ago.

Economically, the landscape is bleak, to say the least. Fifty percent of the population in Afghanistan lives in absolute poverty. The average life expectancy in Afghanistan is 46 years. It goes without saying there are exceptionally high rates of malnutrition and child and maternal mortality. Up to 7.5 million Afghans are said to be dependent on external food aid. It is the only food they get. Unemployment—we don't know how high it is but we know it is well over 50 percent. Illiteracy—maybe one out of four can read and write; maybe one out of four. Seventy percent of Afghans cannot read or write.

But the real impetus for me to come here and say how I feel about this issue is the result of my reading Newsweek magazine last week. Newsweek had a feature story about the No. 1 product in Afghanistan: poppies, used in the production of heroin. Unfortunately, the development of illegal narcotics is the one sector of Afghanistan's economy that has experienced positive growth.

Last year, Afghanistan regained the dubious title of the world's largest opium producer, and it is on track this year to produce even more. Afghanistan accounts for almost 80 percent of the world's illicit opium production.

It has been a long time, but I used to do criminal law work. The first case I ever had—at that time Clark County, Las Vegas, did not have a public defender. I was appointed by Judge Zenoff, Department 1, the Eighth Judicial Court, Clark County, to represent a young man who was in jail. I can still remember his name: Humbert Gregory Torres, the first criminal case I ever had.

I went to the jail. I was a new lawyer. I had my suit and tie on. I went to the jail and talked to a man through the bars. I thought: This guy's a criminal? He should be a movie star. He was so handsome. He was a heroin addict, and had been since he was 15 years old.

When I met him in that jail, he was 20 years old. He was smart, handsome but terribly addicted to heroin. I saw the life he led after that. Because it was my first case, I kept in touch with him, represented him in many different battles with the law. He went to prison. I don't know where Greg is now. I am sure he is not in a good situation. Last I heard, he was back in prison.

Heroin destroys people, families, neighborhoods, and societies. It is a horrible thing. That young man did not want to be addicted to heroin. He got addicted to it when he was a little boy in New York City. He could have done anything with his life had he not been addicted to heroin. Instead, he became a criminal.

Well, almost 80 percent of the product that gets to people like Greg Torres comes from Afghanistan. Drug laboratories are sprouting up across Afghanistan, producing heroin that eventually finds its way into our country, our cities, and our neighborhoods.

Most of the money from this deadly trade does not even go to the impoverished farmers, but instead to corrupt civil servants and drug lords. Look at the Newsweek article. It tells of a senior general in northern Afghanistan who brought in experts from Burma to help him operate a string of heroin labs, and of a senior police official in a northeastern province operating a heroin lab in the garden of his home.

The nexus between the illegal drug trade and civil servants is very clear but even more troubling is the link between the opium trade and the remaining Taliban extremists. It is no coincidence, according to the United Nations, that Taliban insurgents are most prominent in the poppy-producing provinces of Afghanistan. This ''unholy alliance'' serves the interests of the drug lords, who need the protection, and the Taliban, who want the money.

We have the Drug Enforcement Administration, of course. Its agents are very professional, and very well trained. We have really unloaded on Afghan drug lords with these agents. We have two in Afghanistan—two DEA agents in the entire country. Eighty percent of all the heroin in the world is produced in that country, and we have two Drug Enforcement Administration officers there. With that kind of manpower, I'm sure we'll get to the bottom of this. I am being a little facetious, but I don't know what two agents can expect to accomplish.

Amid the drug, economic, and security crises plaguing Afghanistan, we cannot forget that the key government and private financial institutions were all destroyed under the Taliban. The image I see when I think of the Taliban is of them destroying that huge, historic, religious monument, which had been there for more than 1,000 years, by shooting rockets from airplanes. That is what the Taliban is all about.

We can't forget that they destroyed key government and private financial institutions. Recovery and reconstruction in Afghanistan therefore is an enormous challenge, but if we fall short, the consequences will be enormous. We cannot afford to fail in Afghanistan, and yet we are not doing anything to address the problems there.

Some are saying: So what? Does it matter? I don't think it is possible to exaggerate the stakes in Afghanistan. It is, of course, the front line in the war on terrorism. That is why we went there in the first place. Terrorists had built training camps there. The September 11 attackers all had contact with terrorists in Afghanistan.

Although a diverse and committed international force is participating in the reconstruction effort—there are several thousand international people in Kabul—we can't pass the buck and say reconstruction in Afghanistan is somebody else's responsibility. It is our responsibility. We led the war there. We need to lead the reconstruction.

We have a responsibility to help Afghans create a stable, self-governing state with the resources for long-term economic development. If we succeed, we will have denied the terrorists a strategically located base. We will have put a long-suffering people in a position to lift themselves to freedom and prosperity. We will have created a model that can help the international community in reconstruction efforts elsewhere. And we will have silenced skeptics around the world who thought the United States would not fulfill its promise to Afghanistan and would cut and run a second time. These are the benefits of success.

The costs of failure are almost too troubling to imagine. Terrorists could again regain a foothold. The Afghan people would remain impoverished under a fundamentalist regime. And this confluence between a failed state in a strategically vital area and terrorist forces could result in lethal consequences, as we so painfully learned in 2001.

What can we do? As the President stands ready to deploy troops to Liberia—and I have been to Liberia and acknowledge that it deserves our attention—we cannot forget about Afghanistan. The President also is weighing options on what to do about force protection in Iraq. As important an issue as that is, I again implore him not to forget our promise to the Afghan people.

There is much more we can do. The report issued last month by Ambassador Frank Wisner and the Council on Foreign Relations provides an excellent roadmap. First, with regard to security measures, we need to maintain adequate military forces until Afghanistan can assume the responsibility itself. We should also be seeking ways to bolster the international security forces there as well as substantially expanding the proposed size of the Afghan Army, which at its peak will stand at 10,000 soldiers. This hardly seems adequate for a country of 28 million people. Reconstruction efforts cannot be effective until the territory beyond Kabul is secure.

Second, politically and diplomatically we need to support the Afghans as they organize presidential and parliamentary elections to be held next year. We need to continue to press Iran and Pakistan to secure the border region and end their interference in Afghan affairs, and we need to continue to assist the Afghans in developing a vibrant civil society that is inhospitable to extremism.

Third, reconstruction measures must resume fully. Despite the urgency of the situation, road building and other major reconstruction projects have stalled. Despite receiving billions of dollars in financial commitments from

the international community, President Karzai still faces a gap of $276 million in his very modest budget. Afghanistan will require $15 billion over the next 5 years in reconstruction funds, over and above humanitarian aid.

Congress has authorized funds to cover one-third of this total. Authorizing it, as we have learned, doesn't mean much. We have to appropriate the money. It is great to issue press releases about all the things we are going to do with this program and that program, but in the Congress there is a two-step procedure: We authorize and appropriate. If we don't appropriate, the authorization is meaningless. We should fully fund the authorization so that, among other things, we can complete construction of the road linking Kabul and Kandahar.

The United States obviously can't cover reconstruction costs on its own. I don't expect us to do so. The reconstruction effort will fail unless we persuade other countries to live up to their financial commitments. But we cannot do that until we fulfill our own obligations.

President Bush has the power to place the reconstruction of Afghanistan back on the world agenda. But as I said earlier, the issue seems to have fallen off the White House radar screen. I say to President Bush: Fulfill the promise you made to the Afghan people and to the American people, and deliver on your Marshall Plan for Afghanistan. The Congress will support those efforts. We will do so not only for the Afghan people but also for the security and safety of the United States and its allies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the hour of 2:15 p.m. the Senator from West Virginia be recognized to offer an amendment.

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

AMENDMENTS NOS. 1233 THROUGH 1236, EN BLOC

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I have amendments from our side of the aisle which have been cleared.

The first is Senator ROBERTS' amendment to make amounts available for research, development, test, and evaluation defense-wide, $2 million for the development of integrated systems analysis capabilities for bioterrorism and response exercises.

Second is Senator LOTT's, to set aside Marine Corps procurement funds for use for the procurement of nitrile rubber collapsible storage units.

Next is for Senators GRAHAM and HOLLINGS of South Carolina to make amounts available for research, development, test, and evaluation, Navy, $6 million for Marine Corps communications systems for the Critical Infrastructure Protection Center.

Finally, another is for Senator LOTT to set aside other procurement, Army funds, for the procurement of TSC–750 computer systems.

I ask unanimous consent to offer the amendments en bloc and have them reported en bloc and considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] proposes amendments en bloc numbered 1233 through 1236.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendments?

Without objection, the amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to en bloc, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1233

(Purpose: To make available from amounts available for Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense-Wide, $2,000,000 for the development of integrated systems analysis capabilities for bioterrorism response exercises)

Insert after section 8123 the following:

SEC. 8124. Of the amount appropriated by title IV of this Act under the heading ''RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE'', up to $2,000,000 may be available for the development of integrated systems analysis capabilities for bioterrorism response exercises.

AMENDMENT NO. 1234

(Purpose: To set aside Marine Corps procurement funds for use for the procurement of nitrile rubber collapsible storage units)

On page 120, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 8124. Of the amount appropriated by title III under the heading ''PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS'', up to $1,500,000 may be used for the procurement of highly versatile nitrile rubber collapsible storage units.

AMENDMENT NO. 1235

(Purpose: To make available from amounts available for Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Navy, $6,000,000 for Marine Corps Communications Systems (PE#0206313M) for the Critical Infrastructure Protection Center)

Insert after section 8123 the following:

SEC. 8124. Of the appropriated by title IV of this Act under the heading ''RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, NAVY'', up to $3,000,000 may be available for Marine Corps Communications Systems (PE#0206313M) for Critical Infrastructure Protection.

AMENDMENT NO. 1236

(Purpose: To set aside Other Procurement, Army funds for the procurement of TSC–750 computer systems)

SEC. 8124. Of the total amount appropriated by title III under the heading ''OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY'', up to $1,500,000 may be used for for the procurement of TSC–750 computer systems.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. INOUYE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 1237 AND 1238, EN BLOC

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, if I may continue, on behalf of Mr. MILLER, the Senator from Georgia, I have sent to the desk an amendment to make available from amounts available for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Navy, $1 million for the Trouble Reports Information Data Warehouse; and for the Senators from Florida, Mr. GRAHAM and Mr. NELSON, an amendment to make available from amounts available for operation and maintenance, Navy, $2 million for night vision goggles in advanced helicopter training. I ask unanimous consent that these amendments be considered en bloc and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] proposes amendments en bloc numbered 1237 and 1238.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendments?

Without objection, the amendments are agreed to.

The amendments were agreed to en bloc, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1237

(Purpose: To make available from amounts available for Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation for the Navy, $1,000,000 for the Trouble Reports Information Data Warehouse)

Insert after section 8123 the following:

SEC. 8124. Of the amount appropriated by title IV of this Act under the heading ''RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, NAVY'', up to $1,000,000 may be available for Combat Systems Integration (PE#0603582N) for the Trouble Reports Information Data Warehouse.

AMENDMENT NO. 1238

(Purpose: To make available from amounts available for Operation and Maintenance, Navy, $2,000,000 for night vision goggles in advanced helicopter training)

Insert after section 8123 the following:

SEC. 8124. Of the amount appropriated by title II of this Act under the heading ''OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY'', up to $2,000,000 may be available for night vision goggles in advanced helicopter training.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 12:15 the Senate proceed to executive session and immediately vote on the confirmation of Calendar No. 295, Lonny R. Suko of Washington to be a U.S. District Judge for the Eastern District of Washington, without further intervening action or debate; and I further