

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

of their power or authority to the central government in Kabul, preferring to fight for their own fiefdoms.

They have no interest in enforcing edicts from Kabul, or in taking any action that might give the central government additional legitimacy. Profits from opium production and trafficking are a key method for continuing to fund their war clan.

These efforts are not as blatant or as well organized as what we have in Colombia today, but the ingredients are there. It is time we start connecting the dots.

Today, several thousand U.S. and coalition soldiers are hunting down terrorists. These terrorists are receiving physical and financial support from somewhere. Meanwhile, the Karzai government is working furiously to establish the police, judicial, and military systems necessary to ensure that the people of Afghanistan can equitably govern themselves. But they must overcome the chaos created by 20 years of occupation and civil war. The last thing that they need is a well funded rebellion in their backyard.

The Karzai government recognizes the dangers posed by bumper crops of opium. They know the profits being generated by this drug production go not to the Afghani people, but to the few powerful enough to move the opium out of Afghanistan. These drug traffickers flourish in the same kind of lawless environment where terrorists train.

We need to start connecting the dots. We cannot continue to separate terrorism and narco-trafficking. I fear that if the United States narcotics policy in Afghanistan does not catch up to that of the Karzai government, we will be facing the same mess that we are working to clean up in Colombia. We have watched this pot before. We need to begin looking at our options now, before it boils over and we have a real mess.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for up to 20 minutes.

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

LEWIS AND CLARK MOUNT HOOD WILDERNESS ACT OF 2004 DRAFT LEGISLATIVE PROPOSAL

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss a draft legislative proposal I have developed and am soliciting comment from people in my State to add 160,000 acres of new wilderness in the Mount Hood National Forest.

The year 2004 is momentous for wilderness in Oregon. It marks the 40th anniversary of the 1964 Wilderness Act and the 20th anniversary of the last Oregon wilderness bill. Perhaps most importantly, 2004 marks the bicentennial of the single most important exploratory committee ever launched by the

Federal Government and that is the Lewis and Clark Expedition.

One way to mark this very special time would be to enact a new Oregon wilderness bill, which I could conceive of as the Lewis and Clark Mount Hood Wilderness Act of 2004. In tribute to the great river-dependent journey of Lewis and Clark, I believe it would also be appropriate to add four free-flowing stretches of rivers to the National Wild and Scenic River System.

In the last few years, Congress has protected some of my home State's most important treasures: Steens Mountain is now home to 170,000 acres of wilderness. The Little Sandy watershed is now part of the Bull Run Management unit and will help provide drinking water for over 700,000 Oregonians. Soda Mountain has been designated a national monument. Fort Clatsop National Memorial has been expanded, and this year it may be designated as Oregon's second national park.

The draft I have been discussing with my constituents would take a fresh look at protecting the lower elevation forests surrounding Mount Hood and the Columbia River Gorge. These forests symbolize the natural beauty of my home State. They provide the clean water for the biological survival of threatened steelhead, Coho, and Chinook salmon. These forests provide critical habitat and diverse ecosystems for elk, deer, and of course the majestic bald eagle. These are the forests that provide unparalleled recreational opportunities for millions of Oregonians and all of our visitors.

Mount Hood is the highest mountain in my home State. Captain Clark described it as "a mountain of immense height, covered with snow," while John Muir described Mount Hood a bit more poetically as "one glorious manifestation of divine power."

"Wy'East" is the American Indian name for Mount Hood. Before Lewis and Clark came to what we now know as my home State, these forests and species they supported in turn supported native Indians for thousands of years. These are the forests that connect the high elevation snowfields with the rich, diverse lower valleys that produce our famous salmon which were described as so plentiful one could walk across the river on their backs.

Although the history of Mount Hood and her environs are fascinating, the need to designate these areas as protected wilderness and wild and scenic rivers is best expressed by the very modern stories of increased pressures from development and recreational use that are at the heart of our State's future.

The need to protect and build on Oregon's wilderness system that is as important now as it was in 1804, 1964, or 1984. There are currently 189,200 acres of designated wilderness on the Mount Hood National Forest. I believe it would be appropriate this year, 2004, to discuss a draft bill which would almost

double that amount by designating approximately 160,000 new acres of wilderness thereby lessening the pressures of overuse while also staving off the threat of development.

Today, the economic role of these important public lands has shifted. Communities on the highway to Mount Hood often market themselves as the "Gateway to Mount Hood," and see this as a special opportunity to improve their tourism.

They should. On weekends, crowds of Oregonians come out of the cities seeking a natural and often wild experience. In the 20 years that has elapsed since any new wilderness has been designated in the Mount Hood area, the population in the local counties has increased significantly—20 percent in my home county of Multnomah, 24 percent in Hood River County, and 41 percent in Clackamas County.

With increasing emphasis on wild scenery, unspoiled wildlife habitats, free flowing rivers, wilderness, and the need for opportunities for diverse outdoor recreation, it seems to me that very often we are in jeopardy of loving our wild places to death. A few years ago, the Forest Service made a proposal to limit the number of people who could hike the south side of Mount Hood. I can tell you the public outcry was staggering.

So it seems to me, rather than to tell people they are going to be restricted from using our public lands, the solution lies in providing more opportunities for them to enjoy our great places. I have heard from community after community that they fear a threat to their local drinking water or the need for further protections from development. Congressional statutory designation as wilderness provides the only real protection of the historic, scientific, cultural, environmental, scenic, and recreational values that contribute to the quality of life of which the people of my State are so proud.

The protection of the special Oregon places is going to depend on the hard work and dedication of all Oregonians, and especially my colleagues in the Congress.

I have had a chance already to discuss this with Senator SMITH. He and I always work in a bipartisan way. As always, he has been very gracious with respect to saying he would work with me and will join me in listening to the people of Oregon.

I have also been pleased today to be able to talk to Congressman WALDEN, who is the new chair of an important subcommittee who will be in a position to listen to the people of our State, take their ideas, and take their input on this draft. I also have talked to Congressman BLUMENAUER today, who represents the congressional district that I was so proud to represent for 15 years in the House of Representatives.

I believe the four of us in particular will take the time now to listen to the people of our State, the county commissioners, the environmentalists, the