

involved. I believe the government should steer clear of even being perceived as sanctioning these types of tests until there is a complete review of the risks involved. A moratorium like the one provided for in Senator BOXER's amendment is the prudent and reasonable course for us to take at this time.

As noted earlier, I would have supported Senator DORGAN's amendment No. 1024 because it finds additional funding in an otherwise unnecessary account for health care on tribal lands. There is a need for additional money to meet the increasing demands for mental health care and other health care programs designed to meet the unique concerns of Indian Country. Though the motion to waive the Congressional Budget Act to make this amendment possible did not pass, I look forward to working with Senator DORGAN and my colleagues on this very important issue.

I would have supported the efforts of Senators SUNUNU and BINGAMAN in amendment No. 1026 to halt Federal subsidies for logging roads in the Tongass National Forest.

I also support the efforts of Senators MURRAY and SANTORUM in proposing legislation that meets the critical and immediate needs of our veterans. Providing health care to our veterans is a promise we make to our servicemen and servicewomen when they agree to protect our country. We must continue to fulfill that promise by fully funding the veterans health care system at a level that meets the medical needs of all of those who have so valiantly and bravely served our country in the war on terror, in Iraq, in Afghanistan, and in all previous wars and conflicts.

I would like to thank the Appropriations Committee for their work on this legislation and join my colleagues in supporting its final passage.

On Thursday, June 30, the Senate voted on S. 1307, the implementing bill of the Dominican Republic and Central American Free Trade Agreement, DR-CAFTA. Had I been in Washington on June 30, I would have voted for the motion to proceed to consider and for the bill, because I believe that, as is the case with most free-trade agreements, DR-CAFTA overall is good for Connecticut and good for the country.

I must raise two concerns that affect not only this bill, but our future efforts to expand trade. My first concern is with the way in which this agreement addresses—or fails to address—labor and environmental standards. Second, we may need to adjust our priorities when it comes to trade in order to resolve certain key issues in our relationship with China.

When NAFTA was negotiated in the early 1990s, labor and environmental issues were dealt with in a side agreement; the parties' treaty obligations were that they enforce their own labor standards. When, in 2001, the Jordan Free Trade Agreement was adopted, the labor and environment provisions

were included in the body of the agreement. As a result, they were fully subject to sanctions through the agreement's dispute resolution process. This was the culmination of crucial progress through the 1990s, not just for workers in Jordan who happened to benefit from the Jordan trade agreement, but also for import-sensitive industries in the U.S.—and for fostering broad bipartisan support for trade expansion. Unfortunately, the more recent trade agreements have retreated from the strong provisions in the Jordan Free Trade Agreement and I believe that in order to garner support of Congress, at a minimum, future trade agreements must include strong enforcement provisions that would prevent countries from backsliding or ignoring labor and environmental standards.

As to my second concern, while we now focus on DR-CAFTA, our constituents continue to be concerned about China. They are right to do so since China is a country with almost ten times the gross domestic product of the Dominican Republic and Central American countries combined. Trade with, and support for, the democracies in Latin and Central America is important. That said, we must focus on the growing need to address trade pressures from China, including China's approach to manipulating its currency and subsidizing its manufacturing sector, as well as its failure to enact strong labor standards. The lack of a comprehensive U.S. trade policy results in a reactive, muddled trade agenda, rather than a focus on issues that will grow our economy, lower the trade deficit, and create jobs.

On Friday, July 1, the Senate voted on H.R. 2419, The Department of Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act. Here are my positions on the amendment that was offered and on the vote on final passage of the bill.

I would have supported Senator BOXER's amendment No. 1085 because the administration has failed to make the case for why the mission of this potential weapon can not be achieved by current weapon systems and America's nuclear arsenal already serves as an effective deterrent. We do not need to launch a new nuclear weapons program at this time.

I would have supported final passage of the bill, which includes support for some important programs in my State.

HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the fiscal year 2006 Homeland Security appropriations bill. The Senate passed this measure nearly unanimously and I voted in support of it.

I would like to begin by thanking the principal authors and managers of this legislation: Senator GREGG and Senator BYRD. It is no easy task to write a bill that provides for our domestic security needs. I commend both of our colleagues and their staffs for the hard

work they put into crafting this legislation.

The bill that passed the Senate funds our country's homeland security activities at \$31.9 billion for the upcoming fiscal year. These activities include port security, rail security, truck security, aviation security, emergency first responders, customs and border patrol, immigration, the Coast Guard, and counter-terrorism research. Taken together, these initiatives form the foundation upon which our country depends for its internal security.

In an age when terrorism continues to be a growing threat to our Nation, one would think that the Congress of the United States would be doing everything it could to shore up that foundation—to make it as impregnable as possible against those who wish us harm. Yet, when we look at the legislation passed by the Senate, I do not believe it does enough to protect our people from terrorism. We are simply not investing the resources that are required to make this Nation as safe as possible. Instead of filling in the gaps that continue to exist within our homeland security foundation, we are letting those gaps and cracks grow in several critical respects.

One does not have to look further than protecting our critical infrastructure and funding our emergency first responders. These 2 areas arguably form the backbone of our efforts to prevent and effectively respond to terrorist attacks at home. They encompass protecting our ports, our railroads, our transit systems and our commercial vehicles. They encompass quickly and effectively responding to real or perceived threats in all parts of our country.

The bill that passed the Senate provides \$3.9 billion to protect our critical infrastructure, equip our first responders, and assist local governments in planning and coordinating their homeland security activities. While this may seem like a large number to many Americans, it has been cited by numerous national security and public health experts, along with first responders themselves, as being wholly inadequate to meet the homeland security demands of the twenty-first century. Furthermore, the number is actually less than what has been provided in the past. It is approximately \$500 million less than what was provided last year and approximately \$700 million less than 2 years ago. Clearly, we are heading in the wrong direction—doing less to protect our country adequately when we ought to be doing more.

As we have seen in Madrid last year, in London 2 weeks ago and in Iraq almost every week, terrorists have become adept at exploiting weak points in critical infrastructure, particularly transportation systems. I question what it will take for us to realize that we need to be investing more in our domestic critical infrastructure and in our first responders.

Although we have taken steps to boost our homeland security since the

attacks on September 11th, our critical infrastructure remains largely exposed and our emergency first responders spread too thin. Today, less than 5 percent of commercial cargo arriving at our seaports is screened for threats; our rail systems and bus systems remain largely open and unsupervised. Meanwhile, our first responders lack both the staff and resources they need to protect lives and property. Hundreds of police departments—both large and small—have experienced alarming personnel shortages. A super majority of fire departments in this Nation does not have the manpower required to meet the 21st century needs of their districts or municipalities.

As the Senate considered this legislation, I was pleased to lend my support to several amendments that sought to raise resources for critical infrastructure protection and first responders. Among these measures were those to simplify homeland security grants, increase resources to local homeland security programs, enhance air cargo security, increase truck security, ensure greater protection of our rail and transit systems and provide first responders with advanced communication systems. I also offered an amendment that would have increased critical infrastructure security and first responder funding by \$16 billion to a total of \$20 billion. My amendment would have codified a recommendation made 2 years ago by a task force chaired by our former colleague, Warren Rudman, along with a distinguished panel of national security, intelligence, military and public health officials.

Regrettably, none of these measures was adopted. They were largely rejected because they exceeded the budget caps placed on the bill. Members who spoke in opposition to these amendments argued that we could not afford the extra cost. Instead of finding new resources, they suggested using existing resources already in the bill to boost infrastructure protection and first responders.

For this reason, I had to cast my vote against two amendments that would have increased funding for first responder and border patrol security by decreasing State homeland security grant and Coast Guard funding. This kind of bureaucratic shell game is a wholly inadequate means to protect our critical infrastructure, our first responders and our borders. It entails investing in new resources to do what it is right to put our country on a more secure and sound footing.

Ironically, many of the Members who opposed these amendments have supported permanent tax cuts for the most affluent of Americans—tax cuts that have been projected to cost \$1 trillion over the next 15 years. If we can afford to give such a generous tax break to the few thousand wealthiest Americans, then why can we not afford adequately to safeguard 281 million Americans from terrorist attacks at a mere fraction of that cost?

We are living in extraordinary times. Never before in our history has there been a period of time when the threat of harm to Americans on their own soil has been so high. While it has been almost 4 years since terrorists attacked the World Trade Center, the more recent attacks in Madrid and London tell us that we must remain vigilant about our domestic security. They tell us that we must renew and redouble our efforts to prevent and respond to terrorism here at home.

I applaud Homeland Security Secretary Chertoff's decision earlier this week to streamline his department's administrative bureaucracy. I believe that this will enable the Department to respond more effectively to the needs of our States and localities. At the same time, I am deeply disturbed by the Secretary's comments yesterday which suggested that transit security should be paid for entirely by States. I find this view to be dangerously outdated and incongruous with the one needed to combat terrorism effectively. If the events of last week did not remind us already, we no longer live in the 19th century but in the 21st. Our very survival depends on planning and coordination that involves all levels of government. No one entity should bear the enormous financial burden of protecting Americans from terrorist attacks.

On balance, I voted for this legislation because the funding it appropriates is much better than nothing. However, I look forward to working with my colleagues in the coming years to find and provide the necessary resources that can make our Nation as safe and strong as it can possibly be.

PETITION TO DISCHARGE

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 802(c), I have submitted a petition to discharge the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works from consideration of S.J. Res. 20, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the rule relating to the delisting of coal and oil-direct utility units from the source category list under the Clean Air Act, submitted by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency under chapter 8 title 5, United States Code, the Congressional Review Act.

DISCHARGE PETITION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with Chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, hereby direct that the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works be discharged from further consideration of S.J. Res. 20, a resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the rule submitted by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency relating to the delisting of coal and oil-direct utility units from the source category list under the Clean Air Act, and further, that the resolution be placed upon the Legislative Calendar under General Orders.

Patrick Leahy, Jim Jeffords, Barbara Boxer, Joe Biden, Tom Carper, Jon S. Corzine, Susan Collins, Olympia Snowe, John F. Kerry, Maria Cantwell,

Jay Rockefeller, Mark Dayton, Harry Reid, Hillary Rodham Clinton, Russell D. Feingold, Tom Harkin, Herb Kohl, Frank R. Lautenberg, Joe Lieberman, Patty Murray, Paul Sarbanes, Chris Dodd, Dick Durbin, Dianne Feinstein, Ted Kennedy, Barack Obama, Carl Levin, Barbara A. Mikulski, Jack Reed, Charles Schumer, Ron Wyden, Daniel K. Akaka.

NOTICE OF INTENT

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I submit the following notice in writing: In accordance with rule V of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill H.R. 3057 the following amendment:

S.A. 1256

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Oil and natural gas resources are strategic assets critical to national security and the Nation's economic prosperity.

(2) The National Security Strategy of the United States approved by President George W. Bush on September 17, 2002, concludes that the People's Republic of China remains strongly committed to national one-party rule by the Communist Party.

(3) On June 23, 2005, the China National Offshore Oil Corporation Limited (CNOOC), announced its intent to acquire Unocal Corporation, in the face of a competing bid for Unocal Corporation from Chevron Corporation.

(4) The People's Republic of China owns approximately 70 percent of CNOOC.

(5) A significant portion of the CNOOC acquisition is to be financed and heavily subsidized by banks owned by the People's Republic of China.

(6) Unocal Corporation is based in the United States, and has approximately 1,750,000,000 barrels of oil equivalent, with its core operating areas in Southeast Asia, Alaska, Canada, and the lower 48 States.

(7) A CNOOC acquisition of Unocal Corporation would result in the strategic assets of Unocal Corporation being preferentially allocated to China by the Chinese Government.

(8) A Chinese Government acquisition of Unocal Corporation would weaken the ability of the United States to influence the oil and gas supplies of the Nation through companies that must adhere to United States laws.

(9) As a de facto matter, the Chinese Government would not allow the United States Government or United States investors to acquire a controlling interest in a Chinese energy company.

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON SALE OF UNOCAL TO CNOOC.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the merger, acquisition, or takeover of Unocal Corporation by CNOOC is prohibited.

EDDIE ALBERT: IN MEMORIAM

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I rise to honor an extraordinary actor, entertainer, and humanitarian. Upon his passing, Eddie Albert leaves a legacy of talent, determination, and good will.

Eddie Albert Heimberger was born in Illinois on April 22, 1906, and moved to Minneapolis as a child. It was there