

H.R. 3183, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

[Spending comparisons—Conference Report (in millions of dollars)]

	Defense	General Purpose	Total
Conference Report:			
Budget Authority	16,629	16,836	33,465
Outlays	18,391	24,563	42,954
Senate 302(b) Allocation:			
Budget Authority			33,465
Outlays			42,954
Senate-Passed Bill:			
Budget Authority	16,886	16,864	33,750
Outlays	18,571	24,630	43,201
House-Passed Bill:			
Budget Authority	16,367	16,931	33,298
Outlays	18,219	24,508	42,727
President's Request:			
Budget Authority	16,548	17,845	34,393
Outlays	18,345	24,269	42,614
Conference Report Compared To:			
Senate 302(b) allocation:			
Budget Authority			0
Outlays			0
Senate-Passed Bill:			
Budget Authority	-257	-28	-285
Outlays	-180	-67	-247
House-Passed Bill:			
Budget Authority	262	-95	167
Outlays	172	55	227
President's Request:			
Budget Authority	81	-1,009	-928
Outlays	46	294	340

Note: The table does not include 2010 outlays stemming from emergency budget authority provided in the 2009 Supplemental Appropriations Act (P.L. 111-32).

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I submit pursuant to Senate rules a report, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISCLOSURE OF CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS

I certify that the information required by rule XLIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate related to congressionally directed spending items has been identified in the conference report which accompanies H.R. 3183 and that the required information has been available on a publicly accessible congressional website at least 48 hours before a vote on the pending bill.

(At the request of Mr. REID, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent for the vote to invoke cloture on the conference report to accompany the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010, H.R. 3183. If I were able to attend today's session, I would have supported cloture. •

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:40 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Acting President pro tempore.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010—CONFERENCE REPORT—Continued

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

AFGHANISTAN RESET

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, few subjects weigh more heavily upon a Presi-

dent of the United States than the decision to send America's sons and daughters into war. Such a commitment demands the clearest of clear thinking, including a thoroughly dispassionate assessment of goals—objectives, in other words—risks and strategies. This is difficult, very difficult terrain for any American President, especially when faced with conflicting views from advisers, from Congress, and from the American public.

I have become deeply concerned that in the 8 years since the September 11 attacks, the reason for the military mission of the United States in Afghanistan has become lost, consumed in some broader scheme of nation building, which has clouded our purpose and obscured our reasoning.

General McChrystal, our current military commander in Afghanistan, has requested 30,000 to 40,000 additional American troops to bolster the more than 65,000 American troops already there. I am not clear as to his reasons and I have many questions.

What does General McChrystal actually aim to achieve? So I am compelled to ask: Does it take 100,000 U.S. troops to find Osama bin Laden? If al-Qaida has moved to Pakistan, what will these troops in Afghanistan add to the effort to defeat al-Qaida? What is meant by the term "defeat" in the parlance of conventional military aims when facing a shadowy, global terrorist network? And what of this number 100,000? Does the number 100,000 troops include support personnel? Does it include government civilians? Does it include defense and security contractors? How many contractors are already there in Afghanistan? How much more will this cost? How much in terms of dollars? How much in terms of American blood? Will the international community step up to the plate and bear a greater share of the burden?

There are some in Congress who talk about limiting the number of additional troops until we surge—where have I heard that word before—until we "surge to train" more Afghan defense forces. That sounds a lot like fence straddling to me. I suggest we might better refocus our efforts on al-Qaida and reduce U.S. participation in nation building in Afghanistan.

Let me say that again. I suggest we might better refocus—in other words, take another look—our efforts on al-Qaida and reduce U.S. participation in nation building in Afghanistan. Given the lack of popularity and integrity of the current Afghan Government, what guarantee is there that additional Afghan troops and equipment will not produce an even larger and better armed hostile force?

Let me ask that question again. Given the lack of popularity and integrity of the current Afghan Government, what guarantee is there that additional Afghan troops and equipment will not produce an even larger and better armed hostile force? There is no guarantee. The lengthy presence of for-

eign troops in a sovereign country almost always creates resentment and resistance among the native population.

I am relieved to hear President Obama acknowledge that there has been mission creep in Afghanistan, and I am pleased to hear the President express skepticism about sending more troops into Afghanistan unless needed to achieve our primary goal of disrupting al-Qaida. I remain concerned that Congress may yet succumb to military and international agendas. General Petraeus and General McChrystal both seem to have bought into the nation-building mission. By supporting a nationwide counterinsurgency and nation-building strategy, I believe they have certainly lost sight of America's primary strategic objective; namely, to disrupt and defang—in other words, pull the teeth right out of the bone. I believe they certainly have lost sight of America's primary strategic objective to disrupt and defang al-Qaida and protect the American people—protect the American people—from future attack.

President Obama and the Congress must—I do not say "should," I say "must"—reassess and refocus on our original and most important objective; namely, emasculating—I mean tearing it out by the roots—emasculating a terrorist network that has proved its ability to inflict harm, where? On the United States.

If more troops are required to support the international mission in Afghanistan, then the international community should step up and provide the additional forces and funding. The United States is already supplying a disproportionate number of combat assets for that purpose.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2644

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I rise to talk about my pending amendment to the Commerce-Justice-State appropriations bill, amendment No. 2644. Apparently, this has created some interest and some opposition. It apparently is one of the major, if not the major, reason the majority leader felt the need to file cloture on the Commerce-Justice-State bill rather than simply come to an agreement regarding pending amendments and votes. It saddens me that—although that agreement was all worked out, basically—it was out the window, and he just decided to file cloture and bar votes on all of those amendments, including my amendment No. 2644. I think we should have a reasonable debate on my amendment and