

newspapers where all of the players in the debate, from the White House to the Senate, the House of Representatives, have now opened themselves to discuss a trigger in the immigration reform bill to ensure that when we have immigration reform, it is truly comprehensive because I would suggest to them that in the absence of border security, there can be no comprehensive reform.

Only when people know that the door is closed will they cooperate with not only the spirit but the letter of the law and the reforms that we make.

Just to remind us in the Senate, we were very specific in title I. The specifics of title I said we will train the 6,000 Border Patrol agents and put them online. That takes 2 years to do. It said we will build the barriers where necessary geographically and the roads where essential. That is doable in 2 years. We will deploy the 27 UAVs, the eyes in the sky, to surveil the entire 2,000-mile southwestern border. That is doable, and it is doable within a year. We will build the detention facilities to end the catch-and-release practice and to begin to have true enforcement on the border. And we will have a verification program for guest workers and immigrants that is verifiable and not forgeable. That takes 2 years. So as a practical matter, as people have backed up from the original debate, they have looked forward. They now are seeing through the forest to look at the trees, and they say, yes, if we secure the border, it will take 2 years, but it is going to take 2 years to implement whatever else we would do on worker reform as well.

So folks are coming together. People are beginning to talk, and I am pleased with that—pleased with that because I am the grandson of an immigrant who came to this country, became a naturalized citizen, and I honor our immigration process. I am glad to see that because we depend on a workforce that is vibrant and dependable. And I am pleased to hear that because I believe the American people consider our border an emergency. And now that all the players are beginning to talk, hopefully we can close the deal.

Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished Senator from Alabama, Mr. SESSIONS, offered two amendments to the Homeland Security bill. Although they failed, they laid the groundwork for what I think is an important step for us to take and that is to go ahead and move forward with what all of us agree are the necessary steps for border security. That is the foundation upon which we can reach the final agreements on guest worker, on green cards, on quotas, and on citizenship, but only after the American people are convinced we have made the commitment to secure our border will the American people want us to make any deal on reform of immigration.

We pass emergency supplementals for various things in this body. We have done it in response to Katrina; we have done it in response to Iraq. I submit the American people would tell you there is no greater emergency than securing our border. If the White House sent an emergency supplemental to this Senate for the money to fund the UAVs, the 6,000 Border Patrol agents, and the rest of title I, I doubt we would see maybe one or two dissenters because everybody knows it is an emergency, they know it needs to be done. And if it is, in fact, correct, that border security first is the trigger for comprehensive reform which is necessary, then let's declare it an emergency. Let's have the proposal come to the floor, let's debate it, and let's fund it, so as the year progresses, as the hearings are done, as we come back in session in September, we in this Congress can deal with comprehensive reform built on the foundation of comprehensive border security first.

Mr. President, I appreciate your cooperation and that of all the colleagues in this body as we work dealing with a very difficult and complicated but a very doable reform of our immigration laws. I appreciate the commitment of those so far in border security first, and I think in the end all of us together—the executive and legislative branches—can come together on comprehensive reform that is built on securing our border to ensure the reforms we make are lasting and agreed to.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 728

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I will soon ask for several unanimous consent requests and then probably go back into a quorum call for little bit, and I will have a final statement on stem cells that will be very brief.

Mr. President, as I mentioned this morning, there has been an objection to proceeding on the unanimous consent request of last night, or late yesterday afternoon, on the Water Resources Development Act. At this point, I want to turn my attention to that.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader, in consultation with the Democratic leader, on Tuesday July 18, the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 93, S. 728.

I further ask that the committee-reported amendments be withdrawn and the managers' substitute amendment at the desk be agreed to as original text for the purposes of further amendment and that the only other amendments in order be the following, the text of which is at the desk, with the specified time agreements equally divided in the usual form:

Boxer, Folsom Dam, 1 hour; Feingold-McCain, mitigation standards, 1 hour; Feingold-McCain, peer review, 4 hours; Inhofe-Bond, independent reviews, 1 hour; Inhofe, fiscal transparency, 1 hour; McCain-Feingold, prioritization report, 2 hours; McCain-Feingold, chief of engineers, 1 hour; Nelson of Florida, water projects, 1 hour; Specter, Federal hopper dredges, 1 hour.

I ask unanimous consent that there be 2 hours of general debate on the bill, and that following the disposition of amendments and the use or yielding back of time, the bill, as amended, be read the third time and the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 166, H.R. 2864, the House companion, and that all after the enacting clause be stricken, and the text of S. 728, as amended, be inserted in lieu thereof; that the bill be read the third time and the Senate proceed to a vote on passage, and S. 728 be returned to the Senate calendar. I further ask that no points of order be waived by virtue of this agreement.

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

CORRECTION IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I understand there was an inadvertent clerical error in Chairman INHOFE's statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD last night. I ask unanimous consent that the correct statement be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point and that the permanent RECORD reflect this correction.

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

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, if the unanimous consent request goes through, we will be able to move to the Water Resources Development Act of 2006, WRDA. We have not done a WRDA since the year 2000. As chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, I have been working on this for 3 years. We have had incredible cooperation, as everybody in the Chamber knows. It is always difficult to get something like this through, but it is necessary to keep this country moving.

All members of the Environment and Public Works Committee: Senators Thune, DeMint, Vitter, Warner, Isakson, Chafee, Murkowski, Senator Voinovich, Jeffords, Baucus, Lieberman, Boxer, Carper, Clinton, Lautenberg, and Obama have been particularly helpful. Senator Bond, who is chairman of the subcommittee, has been very helpful,

along with Senator Voinovich who has a concern for maintaining our Nation's infrastructure.

The big four in this case, of course, would be Senators Bond, Baucus, Jeffords, and myself. We have worked closely together to overcome some of the obstacles. Early on, there were several holds on this bill because it is complicated. It is one that almost is of the magnitude of the Transportation reauthorization bill. But we had several people who had concerns and we worked with them, including Senator Snowe, who was nice enough to help us with some of the facets she had objections to; Senator Sessions; Senator McCain. Everybody was there working together. It was quite an undertaking to get us to the point where we are today.

I will single out several others. Senator Gregg had some concerns also. Probably one of the persons I was really gratified to work with is Senator Feingold, the Senator from Wisconsin. I thank him for his cooperation. He had a number of amendments that I thought would be more than we could really handle. We had to get the number down to a certain number that is workable so we could have a time agreement to get this bill passed. I thank Senator Feingold for his cooperation and for agreeing to offer limited amendments under short time agreements. If he wanted to be hard to get along with, he could have had long agreements and this would have gone into many nights. He didn't do that. He agreed to short time agreements, which will make this possible to pass. His willingness to work with us is very much appreciated by me.

Over the past few months, he consistently has been helpful and responsive in working on the WRDA bill. For anyone to suggest that Senator Feingold has not been helpful in keeping this process moving would be wrong. He has been a great partner with me in moving things forward and I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his cooperation.

We have a lot that we need to authorize the Corps of Engineers to do in navigation, flood control and environmental restoration. This bill will allow us to do that. I thank everybody for his or her cooperation. Let's go forward.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues, especially Chairman INHOFE, for, as I mentioned this morning, doing an outstanding job in putting together a package, a mechanism by which we can develop this important water resources development bill. It is a very important bill which affects the United States, our economy, our infrastructure, in a very dramatic way.

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. FEINGOLD. Because all amendments that can be considered to S. 728, the Water Resources Development Act of 2006, had to be filed prior to the bill coming to the floor, I would like to inquire of the bill managers whether or not they would agree with me that reasonable modifications by the authors to their amendments would be acceptable as is the normal Senate practice.

Mr. INHOFE. The Senator is correct. We asked Senators to agree to a procedure that limits amendments and have requested that they file them in ad-

vance. Because these amendments have been filed prior to floor consideration, I would agree that it may be necessary to modify them once we are given floor time.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. Chairman, I see that as a possibility and would, with the concurrence of the four bill managers, support reasonable modifications to be allowable.

Mr. BOND. As the subcommittee chairman and cosponsor of two amendments to be considered, I foresee that possibility and would not object to reasonable modifications to the filed amendments.

Mr. BAUCUS. I agree with my fellow bill managers.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I thank the managers and agree with them.

HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the fiscal year 2007 Homeland Security appropriations bill. The Senate passed this measure yesterday 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 \$32.8 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 counterterrorism 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 two areas arguably form the backbone of our efforts to prevent and effectively respond to ter-

rorist 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 spends roughly \$4 billion to protect our critical infrastructure, equip our first responders, 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 21st century. Furthermore, the number is actually less than what has been provided in the past. While on par with what was provided last year, it is approximately \$500 million less than what was provided 2 years ago and approximately \$700 million less than 3 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 2 years ago, in London last year, in India earlier this week, 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 11, our critical infrastructure remains largely exposed and our emergency first responders are spread too thin. Our port authorities have identified \$8.4 billion for meeting Federal security requirements; transit agencies have identified \$6 billion for making trains and buses safer for passengers; and firefighters have identified over \$4 billion for performing their critical duties safely and efficiently.

As the Senate considered this legislation, I was offered an amendment that increased resources to our Nation's firefighters by \$25 million above the bill's allocation of \$655 million. This amendment was cosponsored by colleagues, Senators DEWINE, MIKULSKI, and SNOWE, and was agreed to by unanimous consent.

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 3 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.