

The bill was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, for the information of our colleagues, the next vote is the last vote of the week. We will begin consideration of welfare reauthorization on Monday. There will be no rollcall votes on Monday. Any votes ordered will be stacked on Tuesday of next week.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Both sides having yielded back their time and the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COLEMAN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 61, nays 38, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 63 Leg.]

YEAS—61

Alexander	Dayton	Miller
Allard	DeWine	Murkowski
Allen	Dole	Nelson (NE)
Bennett	Domenici	Nickles
Bingaman	Dorgan	Pryor
Bond	Ensign	Reid (NV)
Breaux	Enzi	Roberts
Brownback	Fitzgerald	Rockefeller
Bunning	Frist	Santorum
Burns	Graham (SC)	Sessions
Campbell	Grassley	Shelby
Carper	Hagel	Smith
Chambliss	Hatch	Specter
Cochran	Hutchison	Stevens
Coleman	Inhofe	Sununu
Collins	Kyl	Talent
Conrad	Landrieu	Thomas
Cornyn	Lott	Thomas
Craig	Lugar	Voinovich
Crapo	McCain	Warner
Daschle	McConnell	

NAYS—38

Akaka	Feingold	Levin
Baucus	Feinstein	Lieberman
Bayh	Graham (FL)	Lincoln
Biden	Harkin	Mikulski
Boxer	Hollings	Murray
Byrd	Inouye	Nelson (FL)
Cantwell	Jeffords	Reed (RI)
Chafee	Johnson	Sarbanes
Clinton	Kennedy	Schumer
Corzine	Kerry	Snowe
Dodd	Kohl	Stabenow
Durbin	Lautenberg	Wyden
Edwards	Leahy	

NOT VOTING—1

Gregg

The bill (H.R. 1997) was passed.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I support enhanced penalties for criminal acts of violence against pregnant women.

My concern with the DeWine bill is that it unnecessarily seeks to weigh in on the abortion controversy with the definition of "unborn child" and "child in utero."

I voted for the Feinstein amendment because it accomplishes the substantive criminal law objectives of the

DeWine bill without raising a potential issue on a possible challenge to *Roe v. Wade*.

When the Feinstein Amendment lost, I voted for final passage of the DeWine Bill in order to impose appropriate double sanctions for the murder or assault of a pregnant woman that interferes with a pregnancy.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, am I right that we are in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

DRUG TRAFFICKING AND TERRORISM

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, since the tragic events of September 11, we have all strived mightily to ensure that our great homeland is never subjected to a terrorist attack by the evildoers again. But everyday those very evildoers weaken the fabric of our country, their enemy, by flooding our great society with addictive and deadly drugs. While the link between terrorists and drugs has been made countless times publically, we, as a Nation, have yet to attack the problem with an approach that is consistent and successful.

On March 13, 2002, Rand Beers, Assistant Secretary for International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs, and Francis Taylor, Ambassador-at-large for Counterterrorism, made the points in joint testimony prepared for a hearing on "Narco-Terror: The Worldwide Connection Between Drugs and Terror" held by the Judiciary Committee Subcommittee on Technology, Terrorism and Government Information. Taylor, who delivered the opening testimony, told us that "relations between drug traffickers and terrorists benefit both."

"Drug traffickers benefit from the terrorists' military skills, weapons supply, and access to clandestine organizations. Terrorists gain a source of revenue and expertise in illicit transfer and laundering of proceeds from illicit transactions," he said.

Taylor listed terrorist groups with known links to drug trafficking around

the world—from the South American nations of Colombia, Peru, Bolivia and Paraguay to Afghanistan, which, he said, accounts for more than 70 percent of the world's supply of opiates.

Mr. President, we know that 12 of the 25 major terror organizations identified by the State Department in 2002 have ties to drug traffickers and we know that drugs are a major source of funding for these terrorist groups. We know these groups sometimes work as conspirators to carry out their evil purposes.

The Lebanese Hezbollah group is increasingly involved in drug trafficking and terrorist organizations in Europe and Southeast Asia also are tied to illicit drugs.

The Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia, commonly known as the FARC, protects cocaine laboratories and clandestine airstrips in southern Colombia and some FARC units directly control local cocaine base markets.

As evidence that terrorist groups cooperate and work together, the Colombian National Police arrested three members of the IRA in July, 2001, who are believed to have used the demilitarized zone to train the FARC in the use of explosives.

While we know these connections, we have not taken full advantage of the vast resources and knowledge available to exploit this connection. The link between terrorism and drug trafficking that may take many forms, ranging from facilitation—protection, transportation, and taxation—to direct trafficking by the terrorist organization itself in order to finance its activities. Traffickers and terrorists have many of the same needs in terms of the secret movement of goods, people and money.

There are no swans in the sewer, and the relationships between drug traffickers and terrorists benefit both. As Mr. Beers stated, "Drug traffickers benefit from the terrorists' military skills, weapons supply, and access to clandestine organizations. Terrorists gain a source of revenue and expertise [from drug traffickers] in illicit transfer and laundering of proceeds from illicit transactions." Corrupt officials who are influenced by the dirty money of the narco-terrorists make it easier for the groups to get access to fraudulent documents, including passports and travel documents. This allows the terrorists to travel abroad under the stealth and protection of a shadowy network that is virtually undetectable.

Terrorists and drug traffickers also use the same methods to hide their illegal profits and conduct fundraising to feed their evil plans. The schemes used by the terrorists for the transferring and laundering of drug money for general criminal purposes are similar to those used to move money to support terrorist activities. The use of "charities" and informal networks such as "hawalas" are easy and efficient ways to launder money.

Yet these are the only methods we know about. Congress is in the process

of crafting a budget for the 2005 fiscal year. We have some tough choices ahead of us. But as we move forward, I would urge my colleagues to keep in mind the lessons we have learned in our efforts to go after drug trafficking organizations.

First, to be successful, we need the assistance of other nations. Though many countries have been quick to update their regulations, few have the law enforcement structure in place to carry out interdiction. Law enforcement capabilities must improve globally. In addition, communication between law enforcement agencies nationally and internationally, must become seamless in order to rapidly and effectively identify, target and eradicate terrorists and their drug trafficking brothers before they eradicate us.

Second, our various law enforcement efforts within the United States must be coordinated. As our efforts to catch drug traffickers have taught us, no one agency has all of the tools, information, resources or skills to get the job done alone. Encouraging interagency cooperation, then, must be a priority.

And third, the efforts made at the State and local level to go after drug traffickers are also an important piece of our war on terror. We cannot, should not, and must not, overlook the efforts and expertise of our State and local law enforcement officers. They know best what's going on in their communities and often have the best, most effective approach to stem the flow of crime within their borders.

I will say more about the links between drug trafficking and terrorism in the future. But the connection is there and should not be ignored. Whether we discuss the financing or smuggling by terrorists, document fraud or corruption by drug traffickers, the sewer where the individuals bent on these activities dwell needs to be cleaned up. Let's not overlook the other filth in the water just because the sewer rat floats by.

A STEW POT OF TROUBLE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I think we have a bubbling stew pot of trouble brewing in Afghanistan, and we need to take stronger action action requested by President Karzai, by the way—soon, or much of our effort to root out lawlessness in Afghanistan may be undercut.

What am I talking about? Narcotics—particularly about the significant increase in opium production and trafficking in Afghanistan. I am not challenging the significant progress which has been made in the past 2 years. Removing the Taliban and preparing the groundwork for a democratically elected government is no small feat. Working with our allies, we have gathered all of the right ingredients together to build a new Afghanistan that will benefit everyone—particularly the people of Afghanistan. But the out-

come is far from certain, and it doesn't seem as if we are paying enough attention to the danger signs.

According to the latest International Narcotics Control Strategy Report, released by the State Department at the beginning of this month, Afghanistan had the potential to produce 2,865 metric tons of opium in 2003. This represents almost two-thirds of the total potential opium production in the world. We know the havoc that drug use creates in a society. We know the corruption that drug trafficking encourages wherever it occurs. Experience has shown us that ignoring drug production and trafficking has only made things worse. These factors alone should be a reason for concern.

We should also be concerned about who is profiting from this resurgence. The difference between what the Afghan farmer is getting and what an eightball of heroin is worth on the streets of Paris is astronomical. And I am certain those reaping this enormous profit are not the same individuals who support the Karzai government, or who are happy to see coalition troops there.

The profits and instability that follow drug production wherever it occurs should be raising alarms for everyone involved. What is most worrisome, however, is we have seen these ingredients thrown together before, in Colombia. We can go down that same road, or we can take action now, before events boil over into chaos.

Earlier this week I spoke on this floor about the connections between drug trafficking and terrorism. The clearest nexus between drug trafficking and terrorism is in Colombia, where there are three major terrorist organizations using drugs to fund their efforts to overthrow the government.

The State Department has designated these three groups, the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia, FARC, the National Liberation Army, ELN, and the United Self-Defense Groups of Colombia, AUC, as Foreign Terrorist Organizations. But these terrorist organizations began with more ideological roots, and more localized objectives.

Together, these three terrorist organizations have killed thousands of innocents. Three American civilians are currently being held hostage by the FARC, and have not been allowed any contact with the outside world for over a year.

For nearly 40 years the FARC have been pressing a pro-Marxist ideology. Similarly, the ELN held a more Maoist philosophy, but also strove for the same revolutionary objective. Initially these efforts were supported by donations from both the Soviet Union and Cuba. But that support ended with the fall of the Soviet Union.

While not as old, the AUC began as a series of para-military groups initially funded by the wealthy landlords in Colombia. These groups, initially endorsed by the government, were cre-

ated because the government was unable to protect these rural landlords from attacks by the guerrillas.

But the end of the cold war did not mean an end to the guerrilla activities in Colombia. Instead, all three of these organizations were able to turn to the narcotics trade for funding. Because of this, their membership and the violence associated with each of these organizations has increased dramatically. It is now estimated that these groups receive a significant portion of their operating revenues from narcotics.

With that move, much of the ideology and even the pretense of being a guerrilla group disappeared as well. At first, they just provided security and other support to the drug lords and were paid for their services. But that was not enough.

Today we know that both the AUC and the FARC fight each other for access to the best smuggling routes into and out of Colombia. They fight the government to protect their drug production and transportation networks. They have also begun reaching out to foreign terrorist organizations as well, using narcotics as currency in exchange for guns and training.

Until recently, these terrorist organizations were able to move freely throughout a significant portion of rural Colombia, forcing the displacement of millions of Colombians as they battled the government and each other over drugs and politics. Only after coming to the conclusion that both drug trafficking and terrorism must be addressed equally has there been progress in restoring the control of Colombia to the legitimate government.

Fast forward to Afghanistan. Like the FARC, there are groups within Afghanistan, primarily operating in the remote areas of the country, who for ideological reasons would like to overthrow the government. The Taliban is perhaps the best known, but there are others as well. Numerous warlords also operate throughout the countryside, some whom have even had the blessing of the government.

The Taliban, like the FARC after the fall of the Soviet Union, need to secure an alternative means of financing their operations if they are to survive. Our success in choking off their traditional funding sources has created this necessity. Opium—like coca for the FARC—is an easy, local, and available opportunity to do exactly that, and will not be a new source of revenue for the Taliban. While the Taliban banned opium production for a period of time when they controlled Afghanistan, they also taxed the trafficking and resulting profits from the sale of stored opium after the ban.

Add to this equation some of the many warlords that control various areas of Afghanistan. Some of these warlords even worked with coalition forces to oust the Taliban. But most have no intention of surrendering any