

strategies, Senator REID and I are pleased to put forward this new initiative that fully acknowledges the role that safe water plays in health and development. In the future, we must find the additional resources to fully fund the Safe Water Act of 2005, without decreasing our support for existing safe water and other foreign assistance programs.

Mr. REID. I fully agree that the initiatives set forth in this act should be fully funded, but not with funds taken from existing and ongoing foreign assistance programs. I look forward to working with Senator FRIST and the White House to obtain full funding for this program in the President's fiscal year 2007 budget and in subsequent years so the United States can implement pilot programs that can eventually be expanded to other countries in the future.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will be a period for the transaction of morning business for up to 60 minutes, with the first 30 minutes under the control of the Democratic leader or his designee and the second 30 minutes under the control of the majority leader or his designee.

Who seeks recognition?

The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

(The remarks of Mr. SALAZAR and Mr. CORZINE pertaining to the introduction of S. 496 and S. 497 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VITTER). The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

(The remarks of Mr. CORZINE and Mr. DURBIN pertaining to the introduction of S. 495 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

THE PRESIDENT'S TRIP

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky has yielded to me his time. I will take about 7 or 8 minutes.

It is so important for Members of this body to reflect on the President's most recent trip to Europe. Without being presumptuous, in my judgment, I think it was one of his best, maybe his finest, and in the years to come, I hope he can parallel the achievements of this particular trip.

My views are important, perhaps, but more important are the views of the representatives from nations in Europe

to the United States. I had several of the ambassadors visit in my office this week to discuss the President's trip.

I would like to read some quotes from television programs on which these three ambassadors appeared recently. Jean-David Levitte is France's Ambassador, and I have had a particularly warm and productive relationship with this ambassador since he was posted. He has had an extraordinary career. He has been here in Washington a number of times in previous positions.

It is well known he is very close to President Chirac. When asked a question about the relationship between our country in the context of the President's trip, he said as follows:

Yes, I do think so. Wolf, I participated—I was privileged to participate in the dinner in Brussels between the two Presidents, and it worked very well.

That is his appraisal.

Then Wolfgang Ischinger, Germany's Ambassador, when asked the question, Has the relationship, based on what you know, Mr. Ambassador, improved? he replied:

Oh, I certainly think so, Wolf. In fact, I don't really think we really needed the meeting in minds, President Bush's visit to Germany this past week, to improve this relationship between the two governments. I think we've been doing quite well over the last year already.

He continued when pressed again:

I think there has also been substantive movement and change, not only because President Bush, by visiting the European Commission, put to rest the suspicions in this country and in Europe that America might no longer be supportive of the European Union, of the idea of European integration, but also because in the meeting with the German side, in which I had the chance of participating, President Bush, I believe, enhanced the degree of U.S. support. He went a step further in terms of expressing his support for European efforts on Iran.

Then Sir David Manning of Great Britain. I have had a warm and productive relationship through the years with this fine individual, another individual who has been posted to this country on a number of occasions. When asked a similar question about the President's trip, he replied:

Well, I think we're all very encouraged by the President's visit and, indeed, by Secretary Rice's visit, because this has been an issue that's been discussed by all our heads of government, and much more widely than the three of us here.

The point I make is, as I read through the press reports from these three ambassadors in the United States, they were all very strong on the issue of the success of the President's visit, together with our distinguished Secretary of State.

Then to another subject that President Bush quite properly raised, it is one of concern to this Senator and I think a number of us here in the Senate. I would like to quote from the President on his trip. He said as follows:

Well, I talked about this issue with President Chirac last night, and Prime Minister Blair.

The issue, if I might step back, is:

Mr. President, European countries are talking about lifting their 15-year arms embargo on China. What would be the consequences of that? And could it be done in a way that would satisfy your concerns?

The President replied:

Well, I talked about this issue with President Chirac last night, and Prime Minister Blair, and I intend to talk about it in a couple of hours at the European Union meeting. We didn't discuss the issue at NATO, by the way. And here's what I explained. I said there is deep concern in our country that a transfer of weapons would be a transfer of technology to China, which would change the balance of relations between China and Taiwan, and that's of concern. And they, to a person, said, well, they think they can develop a protocol that isn't—that shouldn't concern the United States. And I said I'm looking forward to seeing it. . . .

Referring to the protocol.

I discussed this with several ambassadors when they came into my office and, indeed, a team is to be forthcoming from the European nations to visit the United States. I think we should hold final judgment until we have had the opportunity, in a courteous way, to reflect on those precautions that the European countries will take in the context of lifting this ban.

But I point out that in my study of the relationship between China and not only the United States and Taiwan but the entire region, they are on a very fast pace to modernize a wide array of weapons—weapons that could, for the first time, begin to pose in the out-years a threat to our fleet units.

I select the fleet units because our concept of the projection of our force forward is dependent on the protection of naval components, particularly our carriers. I see on the horizon grave concerns about lifting this embargo in terms of China's capability militarily in the outyears.

A third subject I would like to cover in the context of the President's visit is he was addressing the challenge to, indeed, all free nations as we participate to try and give support to Israel and the Palestine Government to come to a final consensus to resolve their problems and to bring about a cessation of the turmoil in that region.

I am so deeply grateful the President made the following statement:

President Bush on his recent trip to Europe stated, "America and Europe have made a moral commitment. We will not stand by as another generation in the Holy Land grows up in an atmosphere of violence and hopelessness."

Yesterday, the Armed Services Committee had a hearing. General Jones, the NATO Commander, was on the stand. I questioned him regarding a concept which General Jones and I have discussed on a number of occasions over the past several years, and that is the possibility of NATO playing a role of peacekeeping on behalf of the Palestinian and Israeli interests. That would have to be at the invitation of both of those Governments.

Why NATO? Our country is very proud of a very long relationship with