

Prior to the war, the Iraqi police had a well-deserved reputation for being corrupt. Reports continue to indicate this remains a problem and, as I mentioned, there are indications the security forces have been infiltrated by terrorists. At the same time, many of the honest policemen are being targeted by terrorists. On Tuesday, 11 were killed in an ambush. So one should view numbers with a healthy skepticism and focus on quality.

I also had the opportunity to visit Balad, about 25 miles north of Baghdad. This will become the future center of air operations in Iraq, and we are now preparing a major airbase to service American troops for the next 3 to 5 years.

Elsewhere, there is the intent to move American troops out of Baghdad and consolidate forces in fewer installations on the periphery, thus reducing the visibility of the American footprint. This is going to be a very delicate maneuver. Reducing the American presence in Baghdad has to be balanced by an increase in the effectiveness of Iraqi security forces inside the city. We could run the risk of having that city of about 6 million become an even safer haven for terrorists while we hunker down in bases on the outskirts.

It also means we are planning for an extended stay in Iraq. While the administration indicates 33 countries are now contributing troops to Iraq, the bulk of the troops is American, and unless there is a change in strategy by the administration or a change in attitude by the international community, those troops for the foreseeable future will remain largely American.

Will there be American troops in Iraq by the time of the next Presidential election in 2008? Right now the answer is yes.

I was able to visit Kabul as well. So much attention and money have been focused on Iraq that I believe Afghanistan has been neglected to the detriment of our goal of defeating the terrorists who attacked us on 9/11.

One example: in Iraq we hope to field an army of 27 battalions in 12 months at a cost of \$1.8 billion, while in Afghanistan we hope to field an army of 15 battalions in 26 months at a cost of \$569 million. Yet, in Iraq, there is a military infrastructure of garrisons, facilities, and a history of a national army that Afghanistan lacks. There are huge cultural barriers to overcome in linguistics and ethnicity that make Iraq look homogenous in comparison. Our military is doing a great job in trying to stand up an army in Afghanistan, but it is an enormous job, and so far the international community is not providing sufficient resources either to rebuild the country or create a sustainable and professional security force.

Afghanistan has an even greater problem in the lack of a civic administrative infrastructure. Without the creation of a strong local and central government, we run the risk of creating a well trained army that the government

cannot pay for or sustain, further increasing the risk that the Taliban and al-Qaida terrorists could return to power.

We need to give more attention and make a greater commitment to Afghanistan. In Kosovo, for example, 25 times more money was pledged on a per capita basis than to Afghanistan and 50 times more troops per capita were sent. Afghanistan needs an estimated \$20 billion in assistance over the next 5 years but so far only \$7 billion has been pledged and even less received. I worry that, 2 years after the fall of the Taliban, Afghanistan has become the forgotten war even as al-Qaida terrorists and Taliban remnants continue to make it their sanctuary and regroup their forces.

I opposed going to war in Iraq when we did. I did not think that the threat posed by weapons of mass destruction was imminent, nor did I think we had taken sufficient time to prepare for the consequences of a prolonged occupation of Iraq. I was concerned that starting another conflict before we had squashed the al-Qaida terrorist threat in Afghanistan would disperse our forces and expose us to even more terrorist problems. To be successful in both, with the least cost to the United States in terms of lives and resources, required an international coalition and consensus along the lines of the one created in the first gulf war. We have yet to achieve that either in Afghanistan, where there is international support but insufficient resources, or in Iraq where the bulk of resources and personnel are being provided by the United States.

We need to rebuild support for American foreign policy both abroad and at home. A recent Pew Foundation poll indicates that the U.S. image abroad remains negative in most nations. This cannot be good. For Americans to be secure, we need to be respected, and, as both Iraq and Afghanistan demonstrate, we cannot go it alone unless American citizens want to bear the full burden of sacrifice. We need international support. This does not mean sacrificing American interests to foreign interests, but it means working with other nations to gain a consensus in support of our objectives. In many we are one.

At home, too, we need to rebuild bipartisan support for American foreign policy. This has been lost in the last few years. Healthy debate requires a willingness to listen to arguments and to accept those that are valid in order to develop a consensus on American foreign policy. This ability has been lost.

Earlier this week, our former colleague, Bill Cohen, spoke before the 9/11 Commission. He talked about "the kind of poisonous atmosphere that existed then that continues today," referring to the questioning of President Clinton's motives when he launched attacks against al-Qaida in Afghanistan and Sudan. Constructive criticism of

strategy and oversight of its implementation are essential tools in sharpening the tip of our policy weapons. But they need to take place in an atmosphere where such debate is not just another arrow in the quiver of partisan politics.

I pray that one of the successes of the 9/11 Commission and other discussions in this very political year will be a determination to restore comity in foreign policy.

My recent travels in Iraq and Afghanistan have convinced me that, if we are to succeed in either country, we need to be prepared to remain in both countries for a long time, and we need to be prepared for additional sacrifices in terms of lives and financial resources. To accept that burden, there has to be a consensus in foreign policy. To bear that burden will require a determination to establish international support for our policies.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DEWINE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is now closed.

UNBORN VICTIMS OF VIOLENCE ACT OF 2004

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 10:30 having arrived, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of H.R. 1997, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1997) to amend title 18, United States Code, and the Uniform Code of Military Justice to protect unborn children from assault and murder, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. DEWINE. Madam President, I come to the floor this morning to begin the debate on the Unborn Victims of Violence Act. I would like first to thank our 40 cosponsors for their leadership and support on this issue.

Let me also thank specifically Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM, who championed this issue on the House side for a number of years before he joined us here in the U.S. Senate. He has worked tirelessly to see to it that the most vulnerable members of our society are, in fact, protected.

Let me also thank our lead House sponsors, Congresswoman MELISSA HART from Pennsylvania, and my friend and colleague from the State of Ohio, Congressman STEVE CHABOT. They have both been great champions of this great cause. They worked tirelessly to help get this important bill passed in the House of Representatives.