aditionally, 130 briefings for special interest groups, 25 newsletters, at least 6 sets of public meetings in 46 locations with over 4,000 people in attendance. There are some who say we ought to study it some more. Give me a break. To say that this has been a very long transparent and representative process, and while we have been studying, our competitors have been building.

One of the saddest sights I have seen recently is a picture of exports from New Orleans. Rather than exporting American commodities, do you know what they are exporting? Barges. They are exporting barges and tow boats that couldn’t operate efficiently on the existing lock system to Brazil and other areas so they can have modern transportation means that will eat our lunch both literally and figuratively.

Given the extraordinary delay so far and given the reality that large-scale construction is not weeks but months but decades, further delay is no longer an option. That is why I am very pleased to join a bipartisan group of Senators who agree we must improve the efficiency and the environmental sustainability of our great resources.

The transportation efficiency provisions are supported by a broad-based group of States, farm groups, shippers, labor, and those who pay taxes into the trust fund.

Of particular note, I appreciate the strong support from the carpenters, corn growers, farm bureau, soybean growers, energy and construction materials industry.

Additionally, I thank Senators McCaskill, Durbin, Obama, Grassley, and Harkin for their strong bipartisan support as well.

As for the budget, for some, this bill is too small; for others, it is too big. It is important to understand the budget implications of this legislation in the real world. We are contending with difficulties. It is critical that we be mindful of those realities as we make investments in the infrastructure that supports those who manufacture, grow, buy, and sell products so we can expand our economy, create jobs, secure our future, and pay the taxes our Government needs to continue providing support for the infrastructure.

This is an authorization bill. It does not spend $1—not $1. It makes projects eligible within budget constraints. With the Appropriations Committee, the Congress and the President will fund projects deemed to be of the highest priority. The remaining will not be funded because of budget issues. This WRDA process has allowed for projects to be considered during the process of appropriations. Some will measure up, some will not, although the ones in this bill have gone through rigorous examination to get this far.

I believe we strike a balance that disciplines the new projects to criteria fairly applied while addressing a great number of water resource priorities.

This legislation is supported by the National Waterways Alliance, the American Shore and Beach Preservation Association, the California Coastal Coalition, AASHTO, and 250 other organizations.

My thanks to the Environment and Public Works Committee, its leadership, its staff, the staff of the Subcommittee on Transportation and Infrastructure for their hard work and the commitment to bring WRDA to the floor in a timely manner.

Again, I particularly thank Chairman Boxer and Ranking Member Inhofe for their forbearance. I look forward to debate and final passage. I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Nelson of Nebraska). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, we have made some good progress on the bill today. A number of our colleagues have come forward. I particularly wanted to thank Senator Feingold for coming and debating his amendment on prioritization with me. We are going to have a vote on that, if all goes well, on Tuesday. That has not been finalized, but it looks as if that is what is going to happen.

I would say to colleagues that we did have a good, fair debate so far today, and we are going to continue this tomorrow and on Monday. I hope that those who have not come forward with their amendments would be so kind as to do that. We don’t have very many because we did take care of many issues between both sides of the committee, but if there are amendments, we urge our colleagues to please come forward and talk about those amendments. This way, they can have as much time as they want and we can hopefully get one.

We keep adding to the letters of support. I was just handed a letter from the National Association of Manufacturers, grow, buy, and sell products so we can expand our economy, create jobs, secure our future, and pay the taxes our Government needs to continue providing support for the infrastructure.

This is an authorization bill. It does not spend $1—not $1. It makes projects eligible within budget constraints. With the Appropriations Committee, the Congress and the President will fund projects deemed to be of the highest priority. The remaining will not be funded because of budget issues. This WRDA process has allowed for projects to be considered during the process of appropriations. Some will measure up, some will not, although the ones in this bill have gone through rigorous examination to get this far.

I believe we strike a balance that disciplines the new projects to criteria fairly applied while addressing a great number of water resource priorities.

This legislation is supported by the National Waterways Alliance, the American Shore and Beach Preservation Association, the California Coastal Coalition, AASHTO, and 250 other organizations.

My thanks to the Environment and Public Works Committee, its leadership, its staff, the staff of the Subcommittee on Transportation and Infrastructure for their hard work and the commitment to bring WRDA to the floor in a timely manner.

Again, I particularly thank Chairman Boxer and Ranking Member Inhofe for their forbearance. I look forward to debate and final passage. I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Nelson of Nebraska). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, we have made some good progress on the bill today. A number of our colleagues have come forward. I particularly wanted to thank Senator Feingold for coming and debating his amendment on prioritization with me. We are going to have a vote on that, if all goes well, on Tuesday. That has not been finalized, but it looks as if that is what is going to happen.

I would say to colleagues that we did have a good, fair debate so far today, and we are going to continue this tomorrow and on Monday. I hope that those who have not come forward with their amendments would be so kind as to do that. We don’t have very many because we did take care of many issues between both sides of the committee, but if there are amendments, we urge our colleagues to please come forward and talk about those amendments. This way, they can have as much time as they want and we can hopefully get one.

We keep adding to the letters of support. I was just handed a letter from the National Association of Manufacturers, grow, buy, and sell products so we can expand our economy, create jobs, secure our future, and pay the taxes our Government needs to continue providing support for the infrastructure.

This is an authorization bill. It does not spend $1—not $1. It makes projects eligible within budget constraints. With the Appropriations Committee, the Congress and the President will fund projects deemed to be of the highest priority. The remaining will not be funded because of budget issues. This WRDA process has allowed for projects to be considered during the process of appropriations. Some will measure up, some will not, although the ones in this bill have gone through rigorous examination to get this far.

I believe we strike a balance that disciplines the new projects to criteria fairly applied while addressing a great number of water resource priorities.
Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. KLOBUCHAR). Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUDAN

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I try to come to the floor each week to address the issue of the ongoing genocide in Darfur. I am troubled that so much time has passed and so little has been done. When a great nation such as the United States declares a genocide in some part of the world, I think we have a moral responsibility to do something.

Imagine, transport yourself back in time to the genocides that have occurred in the past. Imagine a declaration of the United States on the atrocities of a genocide involving Jewish people and others during the Holocaust of World War II. Imagine that we had recognized that was going on and announced that our Government knew it was going on and ask yourself, if we had done nothing at that point, having made the announcement, what it says about the United States.

President Bush and his administration have done the right thing in declaring the genocide in Darfur. The President, a few weeks ago, gave a speech in which he said we have to go beyond this declaration to do something. Yet it has not happened.

I want to give the President and the Secretary General of the United Nations adequate time to respond in a way that will save lives, but as we wait and negotiate and think about it, people suffer. Millions remain displaced, unable to return home. Humanitarian assistance coming into Darfur continues to hang by a thread. It could be snapped at any moment by escalating violence or chaos in the region.

There were several developments this past week that reflect the turmoil and complexity of the Darfur situation.

The shareholders at Berkshire Hathaway, in Omaha, NE, at their annual meeting, rejected a proposal that would have required this giant investment in its investment in PetroChina, the large oil company in the Sudan owned by the Chinese. PetroChina is a subsidiary of a Chinese Government firm known as the China National Petroleum Corporation. It is the largest company operating in the Sudan, drilling and exporting much of China's oil. Berkshire Hathaway is the largest independent shareholder in PetroChina in America.

The second development was the release of a report by Amnesty International detailing the transfer of arms to the Sudanese Government. Many of these arms have been supplied by Russia and China.

Another thing happened this week: China announced that it was sending a unit of military engineers to assist the African Union peacekeeping mission in Darfur.

I would like to speak for a moment about these developments.

First, the vote at Berkshire Hathaway was a disappointment. Warren Buffett is my friend. I respect him very much. I think he is one of the nicest people I have ever met and is certainly one of America’s great business leaders. I used to look forward, when I owned one share of his class B stock, to his annual report. I thought it was probably the most honest analysis of business and business decisions that one could read in the course of a year in America. I had hoped, when the shareholders came together in Omaha, they would decide to make an issue of this ownership of PetroChina.

The Los Angeles Times, last Friday, details how Berkshire’s investments in PetroChina are particularly challenging for the Gates Foundation. Berkshire chairman, Warren Buffett, has pledged $31 billion—that is $31 billion—worth of Berkshire stock as a donation to the Gates Foundation. That is an amazingly generous donation now to an organization that is doing life-changing work for the world’s poor and suffering.

According to the L.A. Times, in its own investigation of the Gates Foundation also currently holds about $22 million in firms operating in Sudan that benefit the Sudanese Government.

A Gates Foundation spokesperson stated that:

Bill and Melinda [Gates] have initiated a process to assess the asset trust investments in Sudan.

These numbers really illustrate the complexities of this situation, when even mammoth foundations that do enormous good work across the world have to take an honest look at their own investments. I believe each of us should do the same. It is not an easy process. Subsidiaries may be hidden from open view, and it is difficult to know what exactly lies beneath the mutual fund statements we might receive.

My mutual fund statements certainly have far fewer pages than Mr. Buffett’s or Mr. Gates’. I have still wrestled with how to ensure that my investments do not include funds related in some way to companies operating in Sudan. I am trying to make this process honest but easier for all Americans.

The second development I mentioned that took place this week was the release of a new report by Amnesty International. The report states:

[In 2005, the most recent year for which data is available] Sudan imported $24 million worth of arms and ammunition from the People’s Republic of China, as well as nearly $57 million worth of parts and aircraft equipment and $2 million worth of parts of helicopters and airplanes from China. . . . During a meeting between Defense Minister of China reportedly told Sudan’s joint chief of staff that military relations had been “developing smoothly” and said: “[W]e are willing to further develop military co-operation between our two countries in all areas.” . . . [A Chinese company] recently delivered six K-8 multi-missile attack aircraft to the Sudanese Air Force and a further six will follow soon, according to a military magazine. . . . Amnesty International is concerned that these weapons . . . is highly likely to use these newly acquired jets, as it has other aircraft. . . . for indiscriminate attacks in Darfur in violation of the UN arms embargo and international humanitarian law.

This report from Amnesty International details the ways in which the Sudanese Government violates the United Nations’ arms embargo and disregards some of its military operations in Darfur. It offers a number of recommendations to close loopholes in the arms embargo and to better monitor the flow of goods into Sudan. The report also calls on all states to immediately suspend the transfer of all weapons, ammunition, and military equipment and “dual use” equipment likely to be used in the commission of human rights violations in Darfur. The report concludes that a global arms trade treaty is needed to prevent the flow of arms from Western countries that could make catastrophic conflicts in the future.

We must see what we can do to prevent future disasters like the one playing out in Darfur.

Finally, I would like to mention the third development of the week. The Chinese Foreign Ministry announced to the press and in a letter to Members of Congress that it was sending a unit of military engineers to participate in the peacekeeping operation in Darfur and assist the African Union. This unit is expected to number perhaps 300 engineers. It is a welcome gesture.

China has taken other positive steps as well, such as helping to convince Khartoum to agree to the deployment of 3,000 U.S. peacekeepers. These steps must be commended, however, against some realities: China helping Sudanese President Bashir build a new Presidential palace; against China investing billions of dollars in the Sudanese oil industry; against China reportedly transferring arms to Sudan and seeking expanded military cooperation; and against China’s opposition to sanctions against Sudan.

The international community has to do more to stop the killing in Darfur. China has to do more, and so do we as American individuals and as a nation.

On April 18, President Bush stated in his speech at the Holocaust Museum that Sudan had a short time to end its obstruction and accept a full-scale peacekeeping mission or face serious consequences. I applaud that statement.

I have spoken to the President personally about this statement, and I told him I believe the words will improve the world to understand President Bush did not impose a new sanction on that day because he wanted to give the Secretary General