like to know how the administration will handle the immediate extra burden placed on other transportation modes. Rather than put $200 million into Amtrak, it appears they would prefer to continue to spend billions more on already-clogged highways and skyways.

We must remember that this Nation has spent less than 4 percent of our Nation's transportation budget on inter-city passenger rail over the life of Amtrak. We've spent more than $300 billion spent on highways, nearly $200 billion on airports and just $35 billion on inter-city passenger rail in 32 years.

As Amtrak's ridership has increased despite its financial condition, that is not good enough anymore.

I would also add that Amtrak's place in the $2-trillion Federal budget is tiny. We spend $150 billion per year on debt service alone, but just $521 million on inter-city passenger rail. The Commerce Committee's bill, authorizes full funding for Amtrak's security, operating and capital needs. For the first time in its 30-year history, we would appropriately fund passenger rail.

I think a lot of criticisms frequently raised about Amtrak are indeed warranted. Its management structure is top-heavy and unwieldy. The company's new president has already announced plans to restructure management. That is a positive step, but we can and should reserve judgment on the success of that restructuring until it is fully implemented.

Amtrak is not sufficiently insulated from political pressures. That is also a legitimate concern, and one that must be addressed. Language inserted in the National Rail Defense Act would take a step toward ensuring that decisions about route terminations are made based on objective financial criteria. Still, we must do more to ensure that Congress provides oversight of the company, without unduly burdening it.

Clearly, the company's fiscal problems have been exacerbated by the Congress's unrealistic requirement that Amtrak meet an ''operational self-sufficiency.'' As a result, Amtrak explored a wide variety of revenue options, with varying degrees of success. The new CEO, David Gunn, has expressed a desire to return Amtrak to its fundamental mission of moving people.

As these changes in the company are implemented, I believe it would be a grave mistake to allow the termination of Amtrak. And make no mistake, that is the road we are headed down. So I urge my colleagues to work toward an appropriation that will allow Amtrak to stand on solid financial ground in the short term, and toward passage of reauthorization legislation that allows our country to develop high-speed rail corridors without sacrificing traditional rail service. Unfortunately, the administration's plan does neither of those things.

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

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

THE PRESIDENTIAL INITIATIVE TO REDUCE AIDS TRANSMISSION

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, Wednesday I was asked by a member of the press about the President's announcement of an initiative to spend $500 million, including $200 million Congress has already approved for the current fiscal year, to fight the global AIDS pandemic by targeting the transmission of the disease from mothers to infants.

I applauded the President and his decision. His participation in the bipartisan campaign to combat this international health crisis is welcome and significant.

It is important to understand, however, that the President does not pledge any new resources until 2004. And the overall amount of resources he does commit to, while important, isn't enough.

The human toll this health crisis has already inflicted on this country and the world is staggering.

Every twelve seconds, one person dies due to complications from AIDS. Every minute, one of those people is an infant.

Each day brings 14,000 new infections, with half of those infected under the age of 25.

There are currently 30 million people with HIV in Africa, and the National Intelligence Council estimates that number could double in the next five years.

And, as if these numbers are not tragic enough, there is one more staggering statistic: by the end of this decade forty-four million children will have lost their parents to AIDS.

It is also important to understand that, as these statistics demonstrate, the international community doesn't have the luxury of time in reversing the spread of AIDS worldwide. Good intentions must be matched by commensurate resources if we are to reverse current trends.

Earlier this month, against the backdrop of those horrific—and mounting—numbers, the Senate debated its version of the FY2002 emergency supplemental appropriations bill. Prior to the Senate's consideration of this important legislation, a bipartisan group of Senators urged the Appropriations Committee to provide additional resources in this bill to combat AIDS so that funds to address this problem could be released right away.

The committee responded by including $100 million to fight AIDS and other diseases in the supplemental. And before the Senate could take up the committee's work, a group of senators—Democratic and Republican—proposed that this bill not leave the Senate floor with less than $500 million for this purpose.

Regrettably, according to news stories, the White House feels $500 million is too much for AIDS this year.

Under pressure from the White House, several Republican Senators withdrew their support for adding $500 million for AIDS this year, and the effort failed. The Senate was forced to settle for $200 million.

Just $200 million to fight a deadly disease that already infects 40 million people and is projected to infect millions more.

So, while I find Wednesday's announcement an encouraging indication of a growing awareness within the administration of the need to engage in the battle against the international AIDS crisis, the resources it is willing to commit to this challenge still fall far short of what is needed. And far short of what I believe this great nation is capable of and should be doing.

As for availability, the President's initiative sets aside $300 million in fiscal year 2004, 16 months from now.

Based on UN estimates, over those next 16 months, more than 1.1 million babies could contract HIV. The President's plan aims to prevent just 146,000 infections in 5 years.

Again, these resources are welcome, but I cannot help but feel that we have just missed a tremendous opportunity. When we wait to dedicate the resources necessary to fight this battle, we make our eventual victory against this threat harder—and more costly.

Does the administration truly believe that this $300 million could not be spent wisely and well now? If not, why?

So I come to the floor this afternoon to offer to work with the President and my colleagues to do two things with regard to the new initiative.

First, because the transmission of HIV from mother to child is an area where we know we can reduce the spread of HIV, it is vital that we increase funding in the area of mother-to-child transmission. But it is not enough to keep children from being infected with HIV *in utero*. We should commit to a major effort to treat the mothers and other family members already infected with the deadly virus so that children, free from the virus at birth, will grow up not as orphans, but with the support of their families.

Second, I do not believe we should wait until 2004 to put this initiative fully into action. We should include the full $200 million in this year's supplemental, and we must find significant, additional resources in the next fiscal year.

On a bipartisan basis during the last two years, Congress has significantly increased the amount of resources the President has sought for the global HIV/AIDS battle. And we must do so again.

In announcing Wednesday's initiative, President Bush said, ''The wasted

human lives that lie behind the numbers are a call to action for every person on the planet and for every government.''

He is right.

Our nation has begun to heed that call, but our commitment to beating back this disease and our compassion for the millions who now suffer—compel us to do much, much more.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CARNAHAN). The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I thank the distinguished leader for the assistance he has given, together with the Republican leader, in moving this bill forward. I am going to address the Senate momentarily on an aspect of this bill, I say to the majority leader, and then he can give us guidance as to when this bill can be set aside.

Parliamentary inquiry: It is this Senator's understanding the Senate is in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WARNER. I ask unanimous consent we return to consideration of the bill so I may address certain sections of the bill.

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

Mr. WARNER. At the conclusion of my remarks, I request we again lay aside the bill and return to morning business.

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

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2003—Continued

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, periodically I have addressed the Senate on my concerns regarding the tragic strife in the Middle East. I did so on May 2 of this year and in the RECORD of that day are my comments with regard to the situation as of that date. Regrettably, the situation has continued to worsen.

Our President is actively engaged with the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense. I have had the opportunity to speak to all of them about this situation and express my views.

I know of no conflict of recent times that is more serious, in terms of how its tentacles are far reaching throughout the world. It is affecting, in some way, our ability to pursue terrorism worldwide. It is affecting our ability to take further actions to bring about our goals in Afghanistan. It is affecting the planning that this Nation must make from time to time—not referring to war plans, but just planning—as to how we deal with Iraq. Iraq is continuing, under the leadership of Saddam Hussein, to manufacture and warehouse weapons of mass destruction. I think the facts are irrefutable.

At the core of all of this decision making is this continuing conflict in the Middle East. I have said and I will say again today that I urge those in positions of authority—whether in this country, in Israel, or in the Palestinian Authority—to look at this daily loss of life on both sides and do all they can to bring about a cessation of this tragic conflict.

Eventually the two sides will sit down and try to work out some agreement for a lasting and permanent peace. A number of us had the opportunity to visit with President Mubarak when he came to Washington a few weeks ago. Likewise, a number of us had the opportunity to visit with President Sharon when he recently visited. I recognize the Presiding Officer was involved in those consultations. However, it seems to this Senator that President Mubarak and President Sharon are miles apart in their views as to how to bring about a resolution of this conflict.

I read today that certain persons in our Government are trying to impress upon several nations, which have been actively involved in trying to bring about peace in the Middle East, to become more active—specifically with Arafat, to impress upon him the need to exercise his authority to stop this tragic killing.

At the same time, there are certain elements within the Israeli Government that want nothing to do with Arafat. So on the one hand, people are going to Arafat to try to get him to do something and, on the other hand, people are saying we would not deal with him even if he were to do something.

Much of his infrastructure has been eroded in this conflict. We know not, at least this country does not, what exactly is the political structure among the Palestinian people and their ability to convey through Arafat, or another leader, their views towards a cessation of hostilities.

But this brings me to the question regarding NATO and the admission of new countries. Yesterday I had the distinct privilege, along with other Senators, to welcome in the Senate all 19 Ambassadors from the NATO nations who have convened here in Washington for a series of meetings with our Government. It is a very interesting group.

I said to them, in all candor: I am now in my 24th year in the Senate and I am a strong supporter of NATO. I said that they are the trustees of the NATO of the future. That alliance has been the most successful military alliance in the contemporary history of mankind. It has achieved its goals.

On the 50th anniversary of NATO, the leaders of NATO convened here in Washington. At that time they added a provision to their charter which clarifies any doubt that NATO has the authority, subject to the concurrence of the member nations, to engage in this war on terrorism and to selectively go into areas of dispute to perform crisis response operations.

I said to them, quite candidly, that they should entertain the thought that, should NATO be invited by the Government of Israel, and such spokesmen or government as may exist amongst the Palestinians, to come in and provide a peacekeeping force, that they should seriously entertain whether or not NATO could carry out that mission.

NATO has done it with professional excellence in the Balkans, both in Bosnia and Kosovo. It is quite interesting that among the beneficiaries of those peacekeeping operations have been a significant proportion of the Muslim population. So NATO has clearly established in Kosovo and Bosnia, an opportunity for the people in those countries to come together and begin to form a government that will improve their quality of life, certainly an improvement from what I witnessed when I first went there in the fall of 1991 and saw of the ravages of war.

I explained this yesterday to those Ambassadors. I also said the following.

I can remember the days right in this Chamber when there were heated debates, particularly after the dramatic fall of the Berlin Wall. That wall came down. Ronald Reagan is to be credited in history for being instrumental in getting that wall to come down, ending the cold war and hastening the demise of the Soviet Union.

I can remember the people of the United States through their elected representatives saying, Should we not now lessen our contributions to NATO? And they are very significant dollar contributions, and leadership, manpower, and equipment.

In this bill that we are on right now is $200 million and a fraction of new taxpayer money—$205 million for the military budget of NATO. That follows approximately $50 million in assistance authorized and appropriated by this Chamber several months ago in the context of the Freedom Consolidation Act.

In this one fiscal year alone—it may be two, and I will have to check that—roughly $255 million. That is a significant contribution by our taxpayers. And, that doesn't even begin to capture the costs the American taxpayers bear in keeping over 100,000 military personnel permanently stationed in the European theater.

I said to those Ambassadors that this year there will be strong support for the NATO budget, as there should be. NATO is doing a remarkable job in the Balkans and elsewhere. We are strong supporters.

But also in the Senate yesterday, history was made. The Senate is roughly 214 years old. It was the first time that in one hearing room—the Armed Services Committee where I was present—under the advise and consent procedure, we were hearing from a prominent four-star officer nominated to become commander in chief of the Northern Command—a new command established primarily for the purpose of protecting the citizens of our 50 States, and coordinating the use of our U.S. military to protect our States. Stop to