

presidential palace and appointed ministers and governors, all from his Islamist party. More troubling, the Northern Alliance opened the doors to Russian and Iranian advisers and intelligence operatives, who arrived in Kabul on a steady stream of air transports. Fahim, now the defense minister, garrisoned his forces in the capital and staffed the military high command exclusively with his political cronies and former Communist officers selected by his Russian allies.

Though international pressure forced the creation of a coalition government in late December, all of the powerful ministries—defense, interior, and foreign affairs—remained in the hands of the Northern Alliance. Qanooni, again the interior minister, and Fahim proceeded to use their power to harass political opponents, with several senior officials reportedly taking part in the assassination in January of a cabinet minister associated with the Rome group.

The Northern Alliance's winner-take-all approach threatens U.S. interests. First of all, the interim government has not been much help to U.S. forces against al-Qaeda in the south and east, where Pashtuns remember all too well the atrocities of the Rabbani government and seek to hold the new government at arm's length. Second, its Iranian allies have established two Hezbollah-style clandestine networks, Sepah-e-Mohammed and Sepah-e-Sahaba, to wage a campaign of Lebanon-style attacks designed to bog down the U.S. or even force it to withdraw. Third, Northern Alliance leaders have sought to delay or subvert the scheduled June meeting of the national assembly, or *loya jirga*, which is the key event in the planned transition to a more representative government. Fourth, if the dominance of the Northern Alliance persists, the Pashtuns (40-45 percent of the population) could rise up in a renewed civil war, and offer Pakistan's intelligence service an opportunity to reestablish its pernicious practice of supporting Taliban-style movements in Afghanistan.

The Bush administration must act carefully—but quickly. First, the U.S. must assert itself as the dominant foreign power in Afghanistan until the transition is completed (when elections take place in about two years). Bush has made excellent statements indicating that the U.S. will remain engaged over the long haul. In practical terms, this means that the U.S.—even as it moves on to other theaters—must retain sufficient strike power in the region to cow the Afghan factions. The U.S. also must check the roles of Russia and Iran. Although Bush encouraged Russia's President Putin to bolster the Northern Alliance as it fought to topple the Taliban, he must now explain to Putin that stability can only come from pluralism in an open political process—and that Moscow needs to rein in its client. The U.S. must also insist that the Afghan authorities cut off incoming flights from Iran.

Second, the U.S. must signal a shift away from its excessive reliance on the Northern Alliance. It should emphasize the need to pluralize Afghan politics and to distribute important cabinet seats more broadly: The stacking of ministries with Northern Alliance appointees—often incompetent and in many cases illiterate—must not be allowed to stand. The coalition should further insist that—with the deployment of the International security assistance Force (ISAF) in Kabul—Northern Alliance troops begin to be redeployed back to their native provinces. At the same time, the U.S. and its allies must try to level the playing field for the *loya jirga*. Russia and Iran have provided vast amounts of money to the Northern Alliance to buy political support; the U.S. should assist pro-Western parties, just as it did in Europe after World War II.

Third, the U.S. should insist that the *loya jirga* end the current imbalance of power favoring the Northern Alliance. We should also demand that every new minister be professionally qualified for his position and that no minister have a history of massive human-rights abuses. These criteria would preclude reappointment of Qanooni and Fahim, who were deeply involved in massacres in the early and mid 1990s. This step is essential to opening a new chapter in Afghanistan's troubled recent history.

Fourth, the U.S. should take the lead—but with the smallest possible footprint—in solving the security problem in Afghanistan. The ISAF should not be drawn into policing Afghanistan. If its mission expands geographically, a larger deployment—even one with as many as 20,000 additional troops—would be spread so thinly as to be militarily meaningless. The primary U.S. goal should be, rather, the creation of professional, nonpolitical, and ethnically balanced police and military services. This would require playing an intrusive role in rebuilding Afghan security services, similar to the one the U.S. played in El Salvador in the 1980s. Qualified Afghan personnel are available, at home and abroad, and many were not involved in factional politics during the 1990s. Even before the defeat of the Taliban, members of the Rome group had organized an association of former officers of the Afghan armed forces and police in anticipation of the need to rebuild the government; the U.S. should use these professionals to form core groups in each agency or service who would then recruit and train their subordinates and line officers.

Because of its poverty, Afghanistan should have a military limited to approximately 50,000 troops, though these forces must have sufficient mobility to deploy rapidly anywhere in the country. This limits the scope of the task of rebuilding the armed forces, and the process could readily be completed in two to three years. Only by creating such a professional military force can the U.S. have a local ally sufficiently able to hunt down remaining Taliban and al-Qaeda elements and preclude their return after the U.S. moves on to other theaters.

Fifth, the U.S. must be willing to fund the operations of the Afghan government—and particularly its police and military services—until its capacity to raise revenues has been reestablished. Providing sufficient pay for troops is crucial, because it enables the government to draw the best personnel away from factional armies, such as those of the Northern Alliance, and from regional warlords.

Together, these actions can, over time, secure a political outcome commensurate with the victory won by American arms last fall. But the adjustment in policy is badly needed. If we stay on the present course, the most likely outcome is a Northern Alliance-dominated government—a result that will leave Islamists like Rabbani in power, extend Iranian and Russian influence, and set the stage for renewed civil war when Pakistan eventually reengages in Afghanistan's politics. If the United States wisely recalibrates, it can establish a moderate and pro-Western state in Afghanistan, an outcome that will have a powerful and unmistakable demonstration effect for those who seek positive political change in the members of the Axis of Evil.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I wish to discuss my absence during the vote to table the Senate amendment No. 3419 offered by my colleague Senator LIEBERMAN. Although my vote would

not have affected the outcome, I would have voted to table the amendment. The language in the legislation, which was also included in the Jordan Free Trade Agreement signed into law on September 28, 2001, is vital to ensuring that Congress preserves its exclusive right to establish and enforce U.S. labor and environmental standards.

During the vote I was attending a White House signing ceremony for H.R. 169, the Notification and Federal Employee Anti-discrimination and Retaliation Act, "No FEAR" Act. I was the sponsor of this legislation in the Senate, S. 201—the Federal Employee Protection Act.

The press has referred to the No FEAR Act as "the first civil rights bill of the new century." It significantly strengthens existing laws protecting Federal employees from discrimination, harassment, and retaliation for whistle blowing in the workplace. It is an unfortunate fact that too many federal employees are subjected to such treatment with alarming regularity.

I am pleased that President Bush has signed this important legislation and honored I was invited to the Oval Office for the signing ceremony. No FEAR will promote a more productive work environment by ensuring agencies enforce the laws intended to protect Federal employees.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2001

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about hate crimes legislation I introduced with Senator KENNEDY in March of last year. The Local Law Enforcement Act of 2001 would add new categories to current hate crimes legislation sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I would like to describe a terrible crime that occurred in January 1998 in Springfield, IL. A gay man was abducted, tortured, and robbed. The attacker, Thomas Goacher, 27, was charged with a hate crime, aggravated kidnapping, armed robbery, and aggravated battery in connection with the incident.

I believe that government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act of 2001 is now a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation and changing current law, we can change hearts and minds as well.

COMMEMORATING MAY 15TH AS PEACE OFFICERS MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, today more than 15,000 peace officers are expected to gather in Washington, D.C. to join with and honor the families of federal, state, and local officers who were killed in the line of duty.

On March 17, I was joined by Senators LEAHY, HATCH, ALLARD, CANTWELL, GREGG, ROCKEFELLER, BINGAMAN, BIDEN, BUNNING, COCHRAN, ALLEN, THOMAS, and HUTCHINSON in introducing S. Res. 221, to keep alive in the memory of all Americans the sacrifice and commitment of those law enforcement officers who lost their lives serving their communities. Specifically, this resolution would designate May 15, 2002, as National Peace Officers Memorial Day. These heroes have established for themselves an enviable and enduring reputation for preserving the rights and security of all citizens. This resolution is a fitting tribute for this special and solemn occasion.

As a former deputy sheriff, I know first-hand the risks which law enforcement officers face every day on the front lines protecting our communities. Currently, more than 700,000 men and women who serve this nation as our guardians of law and order do so at a great risk. Every year, about 1 in 9 officers is assaulted, 1 in 25 officers is injured, and 1 in 4,400 officers is killed in the line of duty. There are few communities in this country that have not been impacted by the words "officer down."

On September 11, 2001, 70 peace officers died at the World Trade Center in New York City as a result of a cowardly act of terrorism. This single act of terrorism resulted in the highest number of peace officers ever killed in a single incident in the history of this country. Thirty-seven of those fallen heroes served with the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey Police Department; twenty-three were New York City police officers; three worked for the New York Office of Court Administration; five were with the New York Office of Tax Enforcement; one was an FBI special agent; and one was a master special officer with the U.S. Secret Service. Before this event, the greatest loss of law enforcement life in a single incident occurred in 1917, when nine Milwaukee police officers were killed in a bomb blast at their police station. Yet the incredible bravery and selfless sacrifice our officers displayed that day was no different than any other day of the year in communities across America.

In 2001, more than 230 federal, state and local law enforcement officers gave their lives in the line of duty. This represents more than a 57 percent increase in police fatalities over the previous year. And, in total, nearly 15,000 men and women have made the supreme sacrifice. We owe all of our police officers a huge debt of gratitude for the invaluable work they do.

As we gather on this special day here in Washington, D.C. and nationwide to honor our fallen heroes, we must be ever vigilant and remember those outstanding men and women who continue to put their lives on the line so that we may continue to enjoy the freedom we have.

RECOGNITION OF ALAN B. MILLER

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition today to acknowledge my constituent and friend Alan B. Miller of Gladwyne, PA, who on Sunday, May 19, 2002, will be honored with the George Washington University's prestigious President's Medal.

This award, which has been bestowed upon such distinguished and varied figures as Soviet statesman Mikhail Gorbachev, renowned journalist Walter Cronkite, and political humorist Mark Russell, will serve to recognize Alan's many achievements as a leader in the health services industry.

In 1978, Alan founded Universal Health Services, Inc., based in King of Prussia, PA, which was then the third-largest proprietary hospital management company in the Nation and now operates 100 facilities in 22 States, plus the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and in France. He currently serves as the company's president and chairman.

Alan is an authority on hospital management and has served as health care adviser to the Federal Mediation and Coalition Service. Among the pioneering activities developed under his direction was the founding of an industry mutual insurance company that provided malpractice insurance to over 200 hospitals at a substantial savings, thereby lowering health care costs.

He is a graduate of the College of William and Mary in Virginia and earned his M.B.A. at the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania, where he now serves on its executive board. He also holds an honorary doctorate from the University of South Carolina and is the recipient of the Federation of American Health Systems' Industry Award and the Anti-Defamation League's Americanism Award. He was named Entrepreneur of the Year in 1991 and C.E.O. of the Year in Hospital Management in 1992. He serves on the boards of Broadlane, Inc., CDI Corporation, the Penn Mutual Life Insurance Company, and is chairman of the Opera Company of Philadelphia. He served his country as Captain in the U.S. Army's 77th Infantry Division.

For his accomplishments and many contributions to the corporate community, I salute him, and I congratulate Alan for the distinctive honor that will be bestowed upon him this coming Sunday.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

MALMSTROM AIR FORCE BASE WINS THE 2002 BLANCHARD TROPHY

• Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the men and women of Malmstrom Air Force Base, AFB, Montana for being awarded the Blanchard Trophy as the United States Air Force's best intercontinental ballistic missile wing.

This is the eighth time Malmstrom has won this weeklong competition,

called Guardian Challenge. There are several areas scored in this competition including missile operations, satellite operations, remote space tracking, security forces, helicopter operations, food services, missile maintenance, communications, and missile codes.

The men and women who compete in Guardian Challenge are the best of the best from their respective Air Force Bases. This year marks the 35th anniversary of the competition, boasting some 200 participants. Besides the competition, Guardian Challenge helps sharpen the skills of and improve our military personnel's effectiveness and combat capability, while showing the world that the United States is the world's premier space force, second to none. The 341 Space Wing of Malmstrom AFB controls 200 Minuteman III missiles. This award is just one of several that Team Malmstrom has won over the years. They are truly the best of the best.

I am very proud of the men and women from Malmstrom AFB. As Operation Enduring Freedom continues, our military personnel are being tasked with increased missions and more time spent away from their families to support the war on terrorism. As a former member of the U.S. Marine Corps, I understand and appreciate the sacrifices these people and their families make in the name of freedom. Military people are special freedom-loving people.

Montana is fortunate to have Malmstrom AFB, and I know that I speak for all Montanans when I congratulate Malmstrom AFB for being the best intercontinental ballistic missile wing in the world.●

LEONARD KNIGHT AND SALVATION MOUNTAIN

• Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, there are areas of the California desert near the Salton Sea that can best be described as dry, desolate and forlorn. Indeed, there are those who describe the area around Niland off Highway 111 as godforsaken. But rising out of this sere, super-heated desert is the multi-colored and textured Salvation Mountain, a unique and visionary sculpture encompassing five acres. Salvation Mountain is Leonard Knight's personal statement on the love and the glory of God.

Leonard Knight, a one-time snow shoveler from Vermont, came to Salvation Mountain from the sky. His hot-air balloon crashed into the site and he decided to stay, believing the experience to be a sign from God. Here he produces his unique creation, using adobe, straw, and thousands of gallons of paint to color and reshape the desert landscape. Seen from afar, Salvation Mountain is an unlikely mass of technicolor shapes and textures. Up close, it is an iridescent fusion of doves, clouds, flags, flowers, hearts, streams, biblical messages and countless other images.