withdrawing the United States from an international treaty. Nor did it prohibit the Department of Defense from undertaking any activity in violation of the treaty. Rather, it simply enabled the Congress to exercise its rightful power of the purse to approve or disapprove the use of funds for any DoD activity barred by a major U.S. treaty.

I believe that the President has the constitutional authority to withdraw from a treaty in the face of congressional silence. I also believe, however, that Congress must exercise its appropriate responsibility. That is why it was also a mistake, in my view, to delete the missile defense transparency provisions in this bill.

Finally, in my view, there is no question how marginal dollars must be spent. The threat posed by the uncontrolled, unguided attacks of September 11, 2001, have thrust upon us a war that we absolutely must win, not only for our own sake, but for all civilized nations. The wisdom of any element of defense spending must be evaluated in that light.

As President Bush has made clear, this war will be complex. The battle to dry up terrorist funding will be as crucial as any military offensive. Both battles may hinge on the support we receive from other countries.

President Bush has done a wonderful job of turning world reaction into positive and specific support for an effective campaign against international terrorism and those who aid and abet it. That is precisely what is needed.

Today, that international support is broad and strong, at least in words. It extends from NATO to Russia, Pakistan, and South Korea. We must maintain and strengthen that international coalition, however, in the months, and years, to come.

Russia may very well play a crucial role in any military action against Osama bin Laden or those who aid him in Afghanistan. By virtue of both geography and its involvement in the region, Russia can do much to aid or hinder our operations. Already, some of its military leaders are cautioning against military action that we may find essential to the defeat of terrorism.

What will happen, if the President chooses this time to walk away from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty in the face of Russian objections? Russia’s official stance is that anti-terrorism is a separate issue, and that cooperation will continue. But I fear that both military and public opinion in Russia could shift substantially against co-operation with the United States.

Neither can we take our European allies for granted. Their governments overwhelmingly oppose any unilateral abandonment of the ABM Treaty. Even Prime Minister Tony Blair, the leader of our staunchest ally, warned that Great Britain’s support was not a “blank check.”

Alliance cohesion requires our willingness, too, to cooperate with other nations in pursuit of a common aim. Our leadership role in the battle against terrorism is clear today, but will be maintained in this conflict only by convincing others of both our wisdom and our care to take their concerns into account. That is why precipitate actions to deploy a missile defense, and unilateral withdrawal from the ABM Treaty, could undermine our vital war efforts.

A defense against ICBM’s will have little impact on international terrorism. Terrorists are not likely to develop or acquire such weapons and the complex launch facilities that they require. Rather, terrorists are likely to seek to attack the United States through infiltration, smuggling in a nuclear weapon in a ship into a city’s harbor or carrying lethal pathogens in a backpack.

A national missile defense would do nothing to defend against these more likely threats. Indeed, too much investment in it now could drain needed resources from the war effort, not just in money, but also in technical manpower and production capability.

Let me give some examples of how $1.3 billion could be used to further the war on terrorism: The greatest threat of a nuclear weapons attack on the United States is from a weapon smuggled into the United States. Terrorists cannot build such a weapon, but they could hope to buy one. According to the bipartisan Baker-Cutler task force report issued earlier this year, Russia has tens of thousands of nuclear weapons, sensitive nuclear materials and components. Some are secure, but others are not. Some nuclear facilities don’t even have barbed wire fences to keep out potential terrorists. The task force called for spending $30 billion over ten years to address one of what it called “the most urgent unmet national security threat to the United States today.”

Biological terrorism is a real threat to both our military personnel and our civilian population. It is a challenge we can sensibly face, but only if we invest in the necessary preparation today. For instance, the Department of Defense should produce or acquire the necessary vaccines and antibiotics to protect our armed forces against a range of pathogens. It should assist civilian agencies in procuring and stockpiling similar medicines for emergency use. According to Dr. Fred Iklé, who testified at a Foreign Relations Committee hearing earlier this month, $900 million allotted just to $50 billion needed to ramp up our vaccine stockpile. This is a common-sense response to an otherwise frightening threat.

The Department of Defense should also test and procure inexpensive biological masks that could save lives both in the event of a terrorist attack and through everyday use in military hospitals. By conducting the necessary testing and creating an initial market for such masks, the Defense Department will pave the way for use of these weapons in our civilian health care system.

A more immediate step to help our armed forces would be to improve the security of our domestic military bases and installations. Many of them lack the basic anti-terrorism protections that our overseas bases have.

Another war-related need is to speed up the Large Aircraft Infra-Red Counter-Measures program that gives our military transport aircraft increased protection against surface-to-air missiles. We gave Afghan groups hundreds of Stinger missiles in the 1980’s, and scores of them could be in the Taliban’s inventory today. We owe it to our fighting men and women to give them maximum protection as they move into combat or potentially hostile staging areas.

Winning the war on terrorism, a war that we face here and now, is infinitely more important than pouring concrete in Alaska or an extra $1.3 billion into combating the least likely of threats.

We can take the time to perfect our technology and to reach understandings with Russia and China that will minimize the side-effects of missile defense. But we have precious little time to do what is essential: to win the war against terrorism, to dry up the supply of Russian materials or technology, or to prepare our military, our intelligence community, our health care system, and our first responders to deal with a chemical or biological weapons attack by the terrorists of tomorrow.

In the fury of the moment, Congress will let the President have the final say on the use of these funds. So be it. It will be up to the President to take the right course.

In the midst of a war, let us not be diverted by the least likely threat. Let us turn our attention, our energies, and our resources to winning the war that is upon us, and to building our defenses against terrorism of all sorts.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a unanimous consent that there now be a unanimous consent that there now be a unanimous consent that there now be a...

Mr. WELLSTONE. Madam President, I would like to, in 10 minutes, cover three topics. First, I want to talk a little bit about September 11 and now. And I want to just say, in an ironic way—not bitterly ironic—the days I have had in Minnesota have maybe been some of the better days I have had.