to any disaster. In other words, redirecting these funds will enhance the effectiveness of every disaster relief fund dollar directed toward response and recovery and ensure we get the biggest bang for the buck when it comes to Federal disaster relief funding.

Again, there are some other funds in the Homeland Security appropriations. It was our best judgment that going after the disaster relief fund was the most logical way to pay and add this $10 million to the EMPG program.

As I mentioned, this amendment is sponsored by both the chairman and ranking member of the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee which has the oversight responsibility for homeland security, as well as 17 other Senators, including Senator Grassley, chairman of the Finance Committee, which is significant.

In my judgment, we are fighting for terrorist attacks in addition to natural disasters. The EMPG program is a proven method of doing this. It is my strong belief that by enhancing the EMPG funding, we increase the capacity of state and local emergency management agencies to get the job done when the needs of our citizens are the greatest.

Once again I applaud the efforts of Senator Gregg and Senator Byrd, and I ask my colleagues to support increased funding for the EMPG program.

Mr. President, I was going to ask for the yeas and nays, but the fact is, we are negotiating now with Senator Gregg’s staff and Senator Gregg and perhaps we can find some other language that might be more acceptable to them. I am not going to ask for the yeas and nays now. If we are unable to reach an agreement, I will ask for the yeas and nays at a later date.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator will withdraw, does the Senator wish to request that the pending amendments be set aside so his amendment can be called up?

Mr. VOINOVICH. Yes, I do request that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be considered. The Senator will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH) proposes an amendment numbered 1075.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To increase funds for emergency management performance grants, with an offset.)

On page 82, line 12, strike “$180,000,000” and insert “$190,000,000.”

On page 85, line 17, strike “$2,000,000,000” and insert “$1,900,000,000.”

Mr. VOINOVICH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate stand in recess until 4 o’clock. There being no objection, the Senate, at 3:02 p.m., recessed until 4 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. COBURN).

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I will speak to the amendment I offered a moment ago. I find it interesting in debating this Homeland Security appropriations bill, there have been many colleagues come to the floor expressing the intention to amend the bill to add more resources here or there or someplace else. I think it is imperative that the chairman of this subcommittee has this year determined it is beyond the time that we need to begin fully funding some of the particular accounts that enable us to better control our border and that my colleagues are now coming, I suggest in the case of some later than I would like, but at least to the realization that we have not begun to put the resources to controlling our border and some of our other homeland areas of need that we should have.

This is a good development in the sense that we are finally beginning to realize we have a way, done what we should do. But I am troubled a little bit that there still is not adequate funding available to do everything we need to do on the border that I am concerned about, and that is our southwest border.

Compliments to the subcommittee and to the Appropriations Committee for substantially increasing the funding for more Border Patrol agents, for more detention space for people whom we have to detain who should not be in the United States and who cannot be returned to their country of origin immediately, for the technology which is funded here, and for all the other things we are trying to do on our border. Congratulations to Chairman Gregg and to the other members of the committee for doing this. For my colleagues who would like to add more, I appreciate their efforts as well because we all know that whatever we are able to do this year, it is still not going to be enough to actually gain control of our border.

One of the problems that has arisen is the problem of what the control call “other than Mexican” illegal immigrants. As we all know, most of the people coming across our southwestern border are from the country of Mexico, but a lot of them are simply transiting through Mexico. This population is of increasing concern to us. In fact, we were recently informed that already this fiscal year over 119,000 third-country nationals, that is third country other than Mexico, have been apprehended crossing the border. We know there is a rough rule of thumb that three or four are not apprehended for every one that is apprehended, so you get a situation here where it is pretty clear that we have a huge influx of people coming into the United States from countries other than Mexico.

What does this mean? We know most of the people coming into Mexico are coming for work. Perhaps some have criminal backgrounds or other nefarious purposes, but at least we don’t suspect most of them are coming here for purposes of harming us. In the case of these “other than Mexican” nationals, the same thing cannot be said because many of these countries are countries of special interest to the United States; in other words, countries from which terrorists have come. The question is both on the southern and on the northern border, how many of the folks coming into this country from countries other than Mexico mean us harm?
We all know, for example, that in the days of testimony from former DHS Deputy Secretary Loy, advising the Senate Intelligence Committee, that:

"recent information from ongoing investigations, detentions and emerging threat streams indicates that al-Qaeda continues to consider using the southwest border to infiltrate the United States. . . . Several al-Qaeda leaders believe operatives can pay their way into the country through Mexico, and also believe illegal entry is more advantageous than legal entry for operational security reasons."

Secretary of State Rice commented later that:

"We have from time to time had reports about al-Qaeda trying to use our southern border. . . . [it] is no secret that al-Qaeda will try to get into this country . . . by any means they possibly can. . . . [t]hat's how they managed to do it before and they will do everything they can to cross the borders.

There is at least one specific case of a terrorist having been apprehended coming into the United States.

There is more we can discuss here, much of it involving intelligence, but on both the northern and southern border there is a threat that people could come into this country and we would not be able to stop them. We wouldn't even know they were here. And because of that means of entry as opposed to coming, say, from an airplane from London or another city, you could at least be carrying contraband here that could be instrumental to us in the form of chemical or biological agents. It is even conceivable you could bring nuclear material in as well.

So the security of our borders is critical to homeland security, yet up to this year we have not had the kind of appropriations necessary to begin making a dent in the problem. I am, again, exceedingly grateful to the chairman this year for seeing to it we are able to get that funding to begin this effort.

One of the concerns about these ‘other than Mexican’ detainees mentioned is that, unlike the case in Mexico where we can simply send people back to the border to be returned, to be repatriated to their country, it is not that easy in the case of people from other countries. Obviously Mexico will not take them because they are not Mexicans, even though they transited through Mexico. So you have to begin a long, drawn-out process of contacting the country of origin and trying to get the border to see if you can get the country to take the individual back, to begin that repatriation process. Some countries will not even take their people back. Other countries take a long time. What do we do in the meantime?

Obviously we need to detain those people. So we detain them—right? Wrong. There is not adequate detention space. So we give them a piece of paper and say, Come back in 90 days or 30 days, whatever the time period is, and report. We can remove you from the United States.

Guess how many of them voluntarily return for removal to their country of origin? The percentages differ, but you get my drift. A very high percentage choose to simply meld into American society and become part of our illegal population here.

That cannot continue. We have called repeatedly on the Department of Homeland Security to come up with a plan to ensure that we can detain these individuals until their time for removal. It has yet to come to us.

One very worthwhile program is called the US VISIT Program. The chief of the Border Patrol, David Aguilar, testified before my Terrorism Subcommittee recently that it is their intention and hope to begin to expand this expedited removal program to all of the Border Patrol sectors on the southern and southwestern border. There are 20-some sectors, but only two have expedited removal today, the Laredo, TX and Tucson, AZ sectors. Here is why that is important. In most cases the average time to remove one of these individuals from this country is at least 3 months. It is about 90-some days. In the case of expedited removal we can actually accomplish this within less than 30 days, so at least you lessen the time for detention. You cut that in half. You cut it in half of the time you would have to house someone in a detention space that is federally owned, you don't have to kick somebody else out in order to detain this person. If you have to rent the space from somebody else, it is going to cost you about three times as much. It costs about $90 a day to house one of these detainees, and you can do that in State and local detention facilities.

The bottom line is we don't have enough of that detention space. So even today people are not being detained. They are being released on their own recognizance, told to come back when they can get the country to take the fight to the enemy, to try to provide the protection that we both want and need, to protect security reasons.

I will close by noting that part of our experience with this bill, in order to control the border itself, is to provide a thousand new Border Patrol agents at the border, also 300 new Immigration and Customs investigators, the new enforcement agents. This bill provides 460 of those, all of these are in addition to numbers provided in the supplemental appropriations bill. So we have added to the number that we already acted on at the end of last year.

We fund over 40,000 positions dedicated to protecting our borders and enforcing immigration laws. To break it down, over 12,000 Border Patrol agents, 18,000 Customs and border protection officers, nearly 6,000 criminal investigators, nearly 1,300 deportation officers, 2,700 immigration enforcement agents and detention officers. We also have money for more training of Border Patrol and immigration enforcement personnel.

We have money to support the deployment of the US VISIT Program, which will help us better track the people who both come into our country and leave the country. We have over a half billion dollars for air and marine operations, as I mentioned before, money for over 2,000 new detention beds for these apprehended illegal aliens, and with the supplemental, that adds about 4,000 new detention spaces for this purpose.

We more than double the number of ports that have our container security initiative, 41 that take part in that, and nearly $1 billion for biological countermeasures. These things, by and large, are in place to try to prevent the capability of the terrorists from pulling off an attack in the first place. They are not responding to an attack after it has occurred. We have to have responses, but our primary goal here should be to take the fight to the enemy, to try to provide the protection that we both want and need, once they are in the United States, to protect every bit of this wide-open and liberty-loving society. So it is better to
try to stop them before they get here, and it is better to try to degrade their ability to attack us by taking the fight to them.

That is why later on we are going to get into things such as reauthorizing the PATRIOT Act, or which—just heard a critical component in our war on terror and protecting our homeland and other ways in which we can take the fight to the enemy. For now, this appropriations bill provides us a significant capability to stand and fight our war, as well as providing some internal protection in those areas that have the highest priority and for which we can get the biggest bang for the buck in terms of protection.

Again, I compliment the members of the Appropriations Committee, particularly the chairman of the Subcommittee on Homeland Security, for their attentiveness to this issue, their willingness to make a significant effort to help fight this battle.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after I be recognized to speak for 10, no more than 15 minutes, Senator CLINTON of New York be recognized to speak at that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after I be recognized to speak for 10, no more than 15 minutes, Senator CLINTON of New York be recognized to speak at that time.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Chair...

Mr. President, I just returned from a week back in my State of Illinois traveling from Chicago through downstate southern Illinois meeting with many people at Fourth of July parades, the usual standard procedure in scheduling for many Members of the Senate and Congress. Many people came to say hello, but there were a couple who stand out in my memory of that week. One woman in southern Illinois who pulled me aside and in very quiet tones said, “Bring our troops home.” And another, a man standing at O’Hare Airport, as I walked by, recognized me and said, “Support our troops.”

I think in those two brief sentences we really have a lot of the public sentiment of America. Support our troops. That is clear. These are our sons and daughters. If you have been there, as I was this last March, and seen them, in Iraq, in Baghdad, risk their lives, see those fresh-faced young people who are standing there so proudly on behalf of our country, you can’t help but support these men and women. You must. And we have. We should continue to do so.

But there is a growing sentiment as well that they should come home. Some say bring them home right now. I am not one of those people. I do not believe we can just end our commitment today and leave Iraq. I am afraid what would be left behind would be chaos and a condition for terrorism that would threaten not only the Middle East but the entire world. But yet I do believe all of us feel, even the President, that we should be looking to the day when our troops do come home and how we will reach that day because every single day we wait in anticipation of those troops coming home we are losing soldiers.

The report that was mandated by that supplemental appropriations bill was due in 60 days after it was enacted. The due date was July 11. Today is July 13, and we still have not received the report required by law. Some media reports the Pentagon is still working on it. Others say the report is on Secretary Rumsfeld’s desk. When we call the Pentagon, the answers are conflicting.

Congress has approved over $200 billion for the war in Iraq. Although I have had serious misgivings about the initial invasion of Iraq as to whether we had a plan for success, not just for deposing Saddam Hussein but for building a peace, while I was concerned that we did not have allies to stand with our troops—and in fact, in many cases, the British came forward with any substantial numbers—and while I was concerned about the American burden of this war not only in human life but in treasure, I have decided, and I think most of my colleagues agree, we will not shirk our responsibilities for the field.

The last time we had a supplemental appropriations bill, $82 billion for our troops passed unanimously in the Senate. Many of us who had voted against the war voted for that money. If it were my son or daughter, I would want them to receive every single penny they needed to perform their mission, to perform as they have, and come home safely.

Despite having voted for this money, I stand here today with my colleagues in the Senate uncertain as to our progress because this report from the Pentagon which we had asked for, one which attempts to measure how we are progressing, how the Iraqis are progressing, has still not been delivered, and it is a concern to me because I think this report really goes to the heart of what we are trying to achieve. And I ask today to the Members of the Senate who stand in Iraq, how soon our troops are likely to come home. There have been a lot of claims—150,000 Iraqi soldiers ready to come into battle—and yet when it comes to the real battles it is the American soldier, not the Iraqi soldier—risking their lives. That is why we have asked for the Pentagon to tell us what progress is being made.

The conference report to the supplemental stated that a new assessment is necessary because the Pentagon’s existing performance indicators and measures of stability and security in Iraq are not adequate. We have heard about these claims, how many Iraqi police and policemen are ready. Police have been recruited by the tens of thousands, according to reports from the Pentagon, but many are just missing in action.

The report that we require under law asks for a detailed assessment of Iraqi military, political and economic progress. Iraqi battalions must be able to operate on their own against the insurgency, and Iraqi forces must be able to secure their own borders. The draft of the new constitution in Iraq is due next month. The Iraqis have made some progress toward creating a new political system of government, and they had an absolutely historical election with turning out a thirst for new leadership in their country, but Iraqi unemployment may be as high as 50 percent, and some of the most fundamental things of civilized life are not there, whether it is electricity, sewage treatment, water, security in your home.

The report we asked for demands an assessment on how far we progressed toward our goals. The fact that this report has not been filed is a source of real concern. Progress in Iraq is critical to bringing America’s soldiers home with a victory. This report asks our Pentagon what U.S. force levels will be needed by the end of next year. We say that if there is any part of it that needs to be classified, do so. Don’t disclose anything that could jeopardize the security and safety of our troops.

An amendment has been offered by Senator RINDE of Nevada and Senator KENNEDY and myself to the Homeland Security bill before us, asking that this report be provided to Congress on a timely basis. It is long overdue. This is an administration which has measured many things in terms of performance. So many different agencies of our Government were held to the standard of what are you producing for the money that is being provided. What we are asking is the same type of accountability and the same type of metric when it comes to our progress in Iraq.

I would agree with many who say setting a timetable for withdrawal may be...
counterproductive, but it is not unreasonable to hold the Iraqis to a timetable, a timetable to develop their government and their security force and their defense so that American soldiers can come home. I think that is reasonable. It was passed overwhelmingly on a bipartisan basis by Members of Congress.

The fact that there has been such a delay in providing this information is troubling, but I am hoping that even as I speak here today, the Secretary of Defense is preparing this report and sending it so we can learn as quickly as possible how soon our soldiers can come home to their families and those of us who love them.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I thank the Chair. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1105

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I would like to call up amendment No. 1105.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mrs. CLINTON] proposes an amendment numbered 1105.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require an accounting of certain costs incurred by, and payments made to, New York City, the State of New York, and certain related entities, as a result of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

Sec. 619. (a) Not later than 15 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security, acting through the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (including the Emergency Preparedness and Response Directorate and all other staff located in the direction of the Secretary) (referred to in this section as the "Secretary"), shall provide to the Subcommittee on Homeland Security of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate—

(1) a detailed list that describes, as of the date of enactment of this Act, all associated costs (as determined by the Secretary) incurred by New York City, the State of New York, and any other entity or organization established by New York City or the State of New York, as a result of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, that were paid using funds made available by Congress; and

(b) the report required by subsection (a) shall include cost estimates associated with implementing each of the measures recommended in the report.

AMENDMENT NO. 1106

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 1106 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mrs. CLINTON] proposes an amendment numbered 1106.

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require the Secretary of Homeland Security to report to Congress regarding the vulnerability of certain facilities and measures to provide greater security, and for other purposes)

On page 100, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

SEC. 519. (a) Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of Transportation, shall assess and report in writing to the Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs, and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate on the following:

(1) The vulnerability posed to high risk areas and facilities from general aviation aircraft that could be stolen or used as a weapon or armed with a weapon; and

(2) The security vulnerabilities existing at general aviation airports that would permit general aviation aircraft to be stolen.

Low-cost, high-performance technology that could be used to track general aviation aircraft that could otherwise fly undetected.

(4) The feasibility of implementing security measures that would disable general aviation aircraft while on the ground and parked to prevent theft.

(5) The measures that would be implemented, the potential threat that all of our citizens face from the theft or misuse of general aviation aircraft.

(6) An assessment of security precautions in place at general aviation airports to prevent breaches of the flight line perimeter.

(7) An assessment of whether unmanned air traffic control towers provide a security or alarm capability to the security of general aviation aircraft.

(8) An assessment of the measures that should be adopted to ensure the security of general aviation airports.

The report required by subsection (a) shall include cost estimates associated with each of the measures recommended in the report.

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I ask that Senators Lautenberg, Corzine, and Schumer be added as cosponsors of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, this is a commonsense amendment regarding the potential threat that all of our cities and States face from the theft or misuse of general aviation aircraft by criminals or terrorists.

This amendment would require the Secretary of Homeland Security, in coordination with the Secretary of Transportation, to assess the dangers posed to high risk, large population, and critical infrastructure areas should general aviation aircraft be stolen and used as a weapon by a criminal or terrorist.
This study would require the two Secretaries to assess the vulnerability of general aviation airports and aircraft and study what low-cost, high-technology devices could be available to better track general aviation aircraft.

Last month, a 20-year-old young man, while intoxicated and accompanied by two other individuals, breached a perimeter fence of an airport in Danbury, CT. He and his companion, a man identified as Cessa 172 aircraft, departed from the airport without detection, flew across the eastern border of New York, and eventually, thankfully, landed without incident at the Westchester County Airport in New York very near to my home.

What is alarming about this is that this happened, and it happened without detection. So far as we know, no one knew the aircraft had been stolen or that the joyride was taking place. This incident occurred very close to New York City, very close to Indian Point, the nuclear facility in the county. Thankfully, this particular incident ended without any damage, destruction, or death, and the individuals were eventually detained by law enforcement.

Following the incident, which, as you might imagine, happening so close to New York City involving stolen aircraft raised a great deal of concern among my constituents, I wrote to Secretary Chertoff and Secretary Mineta asking for an investigation into this incident, and I hope to hear back from them both soon. But this incident should be a forewarning of the types of threats we still face from aircraft. We have been very focused on the big commercial aircraft that many of us use on a regular basis, but we cannot forget that most aircraft are in private hands in locations many of them privately owned or privately leased, and that they still pose a potential danger to key infrastructure, to populated areas, and we need to be more aware of what the threat could be.

The 9/11 Commission, which looked at this, concluded:

Major vulnerabilities still exist in cargo and general aviation security. These, together with inadequate screening and access controls, continue to present aviation security challenges.

In addition, the 9/11 Commission told us that we needed to be imaginative, we needed to think outside the box. Unfortunately, we needed to think like those who wish us harm about what the new and emerging threats could be.

The Transportation Security Administration, known as TSA, issued security guidance for airports in May of 2004, and they outlined some guidelines that general aviation airports should follow in order to secure the aircraft and the airfield. There are more than 19,000 landing facilities nationwide, including heliports, lakes, and dirt strips, and without detection any aircraft could be launched and more than 200,000 general aviation aircraft in our country.

Of course, it is impossible to avoid every threat that is posed to the public or that we can imagine, but we should be vigilant to make sure we have a partnership so that local communities, private individuals, and private businesses can all take necessary steps to be vigilant and to stay secure.

My amendment requires the Secretary of Homeland Security, in coordination with the Secretary of Transportation, to conduct a threat assessment posed by security breaches at general aviation airports. It requires the Secretary to protect the potential impact such threats could pose to a number of potential targets if an aircraft were used as a weapon or were loaded with explosives by terrorists.

The Department of Homeland Security would assess low-cost technologies to track general aviation aircraft, the feasibility of implementing additional security measures and background checks, an analysis of airports with unmanned air traffic control towers and what can be done with implementing necessary additional security measures.

We have been very blessed that we have not suffered another terrorist attack. That is due to the hard work and vigilance of the Americans who have responded not just heroically but in a very steadfast, daily way to prevent, detect, deter, and defend against potential threats.

In this building, we have experienced evacuations which, thankfully, were caused by either false alarms or as a result of errors by pilots. Recently, another general aviation aircraft breached the airspace over Camp David while the President of the United States was present.

It is important to evaluate the threats that could be posed. In its 2004 report, the TSA stated that as many vulnerabilities within other areas of aviation have been reduced, general aviation may be perceived as a more attractive target and consequently more vulnerable to misuses by terrorists.

I have flown in just about every little kind of plane you can imagine—medium-sized plane, big plane, crop dusters. I have had doors blow off, windows blow off, I have had emergency landings in pastures and cow fields and roads. I have been in so many airports at all hours of the day and night when no one was around except those getting in or out of the airport or those just landing. I have a good idea how available these airfields are.

I appreciate the work the Aviation Security Advisory Committee Working Group did in advising the TSA. However, given the heightened vulnerability that we all are aware of, given some of the recent events—including the evacuations of our own Capitol involving general aviation aircraft—we need to roll up our sleeves and take another hard look at this. I hope we can do it hand in hand with the general aviation fixed-base operators, pilots, owners, airport managers, and others who have been working hard to increase security measures at so many of these small airports.

I believe in general aviation. I take advantage of it practically every week. It is a significant and important contributor to our national economy. I want to be sure we are doing everything possible to make sure it is not in any way affected by any potential criminal or terrorist activity.

This amendment does not mandate any new costs for general aviation. It simply requires the study of the strength of our current measures on vulnerabilities and a report made to Congress within 120 days. Most people who own these airports, most people who own these general aviation aircraft, want to be safe. They want to do what is necessary to protect their investment. But we need to have a good analysis of what the threats might be so we can be smart about how we address them. We certainly do not want to wait until an incident happens.

I appreciate Chairman GREGG and Senator BYRD who have agreed to accept this amendment.

I ask unanimous consent amendment 1106 be agreed to.

Mr. GREGG. I ask unanimous consent the amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1106) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

AMENDMENT NO. 1104

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, I ask that the pending amendment be set aside to call up amendment 1104.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada (Mr. ENSIGN) proposes an amendment numbered 1104.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require the Transportation Security Administration to implement the use of multi compartment bins to screen passenger belongings at security checkpoints)

On page 69, line 12, after “presence:”, insert the following: “Provided further. That of the amount made available under this heading, an amount shall be available for the Transportation Security Administration to develop a plan to research, test, and implement multi compartment bins to screen passenger belongings at security checkpoints:”

AMENDMENT NO. 1104, AS MODIFIED

Mr. ENSIGN. I send a modification to that amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

The amendment will be so modified.

The amendment (No. 1104), as modified, is as follows:

On page 69, line 12, after “presence:”, insert the following: “Provided further. That of
the amount made available under this heading, an amount shall be available for the Transportation Security Administration to develop a plan to research, test, and potentially implement multi compartment bins to screen passenger belongings at security checkpoints:"

Mr. ENSIGN. I understand both sides have agreed to the amendment, as modified, and I ask unanimous consent this amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified.

The amendment (No. 1104), as modified, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1124, AS MODIFIED

Mr. ENSIGN. I call up amendment numbered 1124 for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is pending.

Does the Senator wish to call for regular order with respect to that amendment?

Mr. ENSIGN. Yes. I send a modification to the desk to that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is so modified.

The amendment (No. 1124), as modified, is as follows:

On page 77, line 20, insert "of which $975,500 may be transferred to Customs and Border Protection for hiring an additional 1,000 border agents and for other necessary support activities for such agency; and"

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President; last year when the Senate was considering the national intelligence reform bill, we adopted several recommendations of the 9/11 Commission.

One of those recommendations was to hire an additional 2,000 new customs and border protection agents each year for the next 5 years.

This body agreed with the recommendation. We agreed that our national security depended on such an investment, and we enacted that recommendation into law.

We are now considering the Homeland Security appropriations bill. The bill that was reported out of committee includes funding for 1,000 new agents in the coming fiscal year. I understand there are problems with training 2,000 agents.

My amendment as modified would provide the Secretary of Homeland Security with the discretion to shift $367 million to hire 2,000 new agents next year. This amendment is fully offset. I rise today to urge the Senate to adopt my amendment so that we can keep the commitment that we made to the American people last year. I thank John McCain for cosponsoring our amendment.

The threat of illegal border crossing by people who wish to kill us is very real.

The 9/11 Commission found that many of the 19 hijackers who attacked on 9/11 could have been placed on watch lists. But without adequate staff and coordinated efforts, the terrorists were allowed to enter the United States. Once here they learned how to fly airplanes at American flight schools. They conducted surveillance to assess our weaknesses. And they attacked.

In order to prevent another terrorist attack on American soil, we must improve every aspect of our Nation’s security. Our security is truly only as strong as our weakest link.

For too long, the lack of funding for border agents has been a weak link. By funding additional agents, we protect both the lives of innocent Americans and the security of our ports, our seaports, our airports, and our national borders.

We agreed that our national intelligence reform bill, we endorsed the recommendation of Senator KOURANI to enter the United States, I believe that my amendment is imperative to our national security.

My amendment does not require any additional spending. It gives the Secretary of Homeland Security the authority to make the decision as to where the money should go, whether it should stay in the area of first responders or whether it should be moved over to the Border Patrol. That is a very important decision.

The second thing I think that needs to be noted, however, is the reason we arrived at the number 1,000 that we funded—myself and Senator Byrd—in this bill for new Border Patrol is because when you combine that number with the supplemental, where there were 500 new Border Patrol agents added, you are up to 1,500 Border Patrol agents, and we know, through efforts of the Department, that because of the facilities' restrictions—we moved most of the training from South Carolina over to
New Mexico—we can only train probably about 1,300 agents a year right now.

Now, this bill has money in it to get those facilities up to a position where they can do a much more robust effort in the area of training. In fact, my hope is next year we can train upwards of 2,500 when we expand these facilities. But right now they have, basically, limits on the number of people they can train. So it is not clear these additional Border Patrol agents would be able to be trained should we want to bring them on line. We do want to bring them on line; it is just a question when we can bring them on line. So that is a concern I think Members should know about.

In addition, the physical effort of hiring Border Patrol agents has become a problem for the Border Patrol. One of the reasons they were not able to hire up to the 2,000, which was originally requested a few years ago, was because they could not find qualified people to meet the enlistment rolls. We are not sure whether they are going to be able to find more Border Patrol people. We hope they will. It will put a lot of pressure on them to try to find 2,500 new people, which is what this number will be if this amendment is adopted.

But, again, this is an issue of policy. I think the body has the right to make a decision on this issue. I do not intend to make any points of order against it. I will leave it to the majority of the body to decide where they want to have this money spent and how they want to set the policy on this issue when the amendment comes up for a vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, the amendment that the minority leader offered on my behalf would provide an additional $1.33 billion above the underlying bill for security funding needed for our transit systems, intracity buses, intercity rail, and freight rail.

Our thoughts and prayers are with the victims of the London bombings. For all of us, the pictures were all too graphic reminders of how quickly disaster can strike and how deadly terrorist strikes can be. The horrific attacks in London a few days ago were eerily similar to the attacks in Madrid, Spain, in March 2004: targeted, coordinated, and timed bombings.

Mr. BYRD. The alarms do not stop there. Mr. President, According to the RAND Corporation, between 1998 and 2003, there were 181 terrorist attacks on rail targets worldwide. The Congressional Research Service has reported that passenger rail systems in the United States carry about five—five times—as many passengers each day as do the airlines. Yet the administration has continuously opposed funding to increase security on our trains, subways, and buses.

Public transportation is used nearly 32 million times a day—think of that: 32 million times a day—which is 16 times more than travel on domestic airplanes. According to the Government Accountability Office, nearly 6,000 agencies provide transit services by bus, subway, ferry, and light rail to about 113 million Americans each weekday. Amtrak carried an all-time record ridership of 25 million passengers in fiscal year 2004. Are these lives not worth protecting? How about it?

What about the dangerous and hazardous materials that are transported by rail? We simply are not doing enough. Without proper security measures in place, these transports are vulnerable to attack or sabotage. Many of these shipments travel to or through major urban areas, such as Washington, DC, and, frankly, only minutes down the road from where we stand today.

The Homeland Security Council released a report in July 2004 indicating that a chlorine tanker explosion in an urban area could kill up to 17,500 people. According to a New York Times editorial on June 20, 2005:

One of the deadliest terrorist scenarios the Department of Homeland Security has come up with is an attack on a 90-ton tanker rail train filled with chlorine. As many as 100,000 people could be killed or injured in less than 30 minutes.

Yet only 2 out of every 100 transportation security dollars in this bill will be spent on rail and transit. What does this mean? This means that 98 percent of transportation security funding is going—for what?—going for aviation security.

Sadly, crowded subway systems and trains have become inviting targets for terrorists. We have witnessed the hysteria and the chaos that these events can trigger. Could it happen here? Of course. Are our systems more secure? I wonder.

Last week, when asked if additional funding was needed to secure mass transit, Homeland Security Secretary Chertoff responded by saying:

I wouldn’t make a policy decision driven by a single event.

Well, with all due respect to the Secretary, the alarm bells have been ringing for years.

On July 8, the Washington Post printed a chart that provides a chronology of bombings with al-Qaeda links. This chart shows that, starting in 1993 at the World Trade Center in New York City, there have been 16 bombings worldwide linked to al-Qaeda.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this chart be printed in the RECORD.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Attack type</th>
<th>Dead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/11/04</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Car bomb</td>
<td>Bombs in sachels</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/12/03</td>
<td>Riyadh</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>Car bomb</td>
<td>Car bombs</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/26/93</td>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>World Trade Center</td>
<td>Truck bomb (some evidence of al Qaeda)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/02</td>
<td>Bali</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>World Trade Center, Pentagon, Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Truck bomb</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/11/04</td>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Car bomb</td>
<td>Car bomb</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/13/02</td>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Car bomb</td>
<td>Car bomb</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/12/02</td>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>World Trade Center</td>
<td>Truck bomb</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/25/96</td>
<td>Dhahran</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>World Trade Center, Pentagon, Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Truck bomb</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/3/03</td>
<td>Jakarta</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Car bomb</td>
<td>Car bomb</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/29/02</td>
<td>Riyadh</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>Car bomb</td>
<td>Car bomb</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/11/04</td>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>World Trade Center</td>
<td>Truck bomb</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Finally, on Tuesday, the Department notified Congress they intended to allocate the funds. But an announcement does not make Americans safer. It takes time for transit and rail systems to actually put these security improvements in place, so there is no excuse for these bureaucratic delays in Washington.

Within very limited allocations, Congress has taken the lead by providing $265 million between fiscal years 2003
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and 2005 for transit security. Unfortunately, the administration has let the money sit in Washington far too long. It was all of 8 months before all of the 2003 funding was awarded, and 6 months before the 2004 funding went out the door. And now we are again, 9 months after the fiscal year 2005 transit funding was enacted, and what happens? Well, it is deja vu all over again. It is still sitting—where?—in Washington, right here in Washington. The administration must overcome the hurdles that have led to these delays. Clearly, the administration is not taking this threat seriously. It certainly would not appear to be. So we must press the administration to do more. The horrific events we witnessed just a few days ago ought to serve as a call to action by this Government to protect our citizens from future attack. For far too long, the administration has put its head in the sand where rail and mass transit security are concerned.

We should be taking steps right now to improve deterrence in our transit and rail systems by investing in surveillance cameras, investing in locks, in gates, in canine teams, in sensors, and other tools.

Last October, the Senate passed two bipartisan rail security authorization bills, S. 2273 and S. 2884, that authorized additional funding for securing mass transit and rail systems, but the bills did not make it to the White House.

The bill that is before the Senate reduces funding from $150 million in fiscal year 2005 to $100 million. The amendment would increase the $100 million to $1.43 billion. That is the amendment that I offer. Let me say it again. The amendment would increase the $100 million to $1.43 billion. The $1.43 billion includes $1.166 billion for transit security and $265 million for rail security. These bills are taking care of both transit security and rail security. That seems to meet both needs, at least part way.

Our security efforts cannot be delayed, Mr. President, and must not be underfunded. The lives of the American people depend on strengthened security. And whose life is it? It may be your own. It may be your relative’s. It may be your friend’s. The time for hand wringing is over. It is time to act.

So I urge all Senators to support the amendment.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, for Mr. Feingold, himself, Mr. Sununu, Mr. Leahy, and Mr. Corzine, proposes an amendment numbered 1120.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with and valuable to the stated goals and efficacy of the data-mining technology in plans for the use or development of such technology. The amendment requires the Department of Homeland Security to report to the Congress on the use of data-mining procedures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, does the modification need unanimous consent? The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modification? Without objection, the amendment is so modified.

Mr. BYRD. The amendment, as modified, prevents funds from being used for wasteful expenditures. I urge adoption of the amendment, as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment? If not, without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Amendment No. 1155, as modified

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator Boxer, I call up amendment No. 1155, with a modification which I send to the desk.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. GREGG. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment? If not, without objection, the amendment is so modified.

The amendment is so modified.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I move that the vote be reconsidered by which the amendment was agreed to.
Mr. GREGG. I move to lay that motion on the table. 

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1201

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I call up my amendment numbered 1201.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The amendment (No. 1201) was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. 

The amendment is as follows: 

(Purpose: To require State and local governments to expend or return grant funds)

Page 81, strike line 20 and insert the following:

Award: Provided further, That any recipient of Federal funds granted through the State Homeland Security Program, the Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Program, and the Urban Area Security Initiation Program, or any predecessor or successor programs, as appropriate, in fiscal year 2004 and fiscal year 2005, shall expend funds pursuant to the relevant, approved State plan by September 30, 2007; Provided further, That any recipient of Federal funds granted through any program described in the preceding proviso, as appropriated in fiscal year 2006, shall expend funds pursuant to the relevant, approved State plan by September 30, 2008; Provided further, That any funds not expended by September 30, 2007 or September 30, 2008, respectively, as required by the foregoing provisos shall be returned to the Department of Homeland Security to be reallocated to State and local entities based on risk and in conformance with the assessments now being conducted by the States under Homeland Security Presidential Directive 8.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this amendment requires that States and localities spend their first responder funds pursuant to approved State plans within 2 years of the end of the fiscal year that they received the funds. I urge adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment?

If not, without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1201) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, we are in the process of trying to reach an understanding on votes. It is not clear what that understanding will be, but we do intend to have votes this evening, maybe as many as five. In addition, I understand the Senator from Nevada wishes to be recognized on an amendment. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

AMENDMENT NO. 1121 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1121

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, what is the pending amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending amendment is the Senator’s amendment No. 1121.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, I send a second-degree amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The amendment from Nevada [Mr. ENSIGN], for himself and Mr. MCCAIN, proposes an amendment numbered 1121 to amendment No. 1124:

(Purpose: To transfer appropriated funds from the Office of State and Local Government Coordination and Preparedness of the U.S. Customs and Border Protection for the purpose of hiring 1,000 additional border agents and related expenditures)

Strike all after the first word and insert the following:

On page 77, line 20, insert "of which $367,551,000 may be transferred to Customs and Border Protection for hiring an additional 1,000 border agents and for other necessary support activities for such agency; and" after "local grants."

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the yeas and nays be made the record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Assistant Legislative Clerk read the yeas and nays.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] proposes an amendment numbered 1201.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require State and local governments to expend or return grant funds)

Page 81, strike line 20 and insert the following:

Award: Provided further, That any recipient of Federal funds granted through the State Homeland Security Program, the Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Program, and the Urban Area Security Initiative Program, or any predecessor or successor programs, as appropriate, in fiscal year 2004 and fiscal year 2005, shall expend funds pursuant to the relevant, approved State plan by September 30, 2007; Provided further, That any recipient of Federal funds granted through any program described in the preceding proviso, as appropriated in fiscal year 2006, shall expend funds pursuant to the relevant, approved State plan by September 30, 2008; Provided further, That any funds not expended by September 30, 2007 or September 30, 2008, respectively, as required by the foregoing provisos shall be returned to the Department of Homeland Security to be reallocated to State and local entities based on risk and in conformance with the assessments now being conducted by the States under Homeland Security Presidential Directive 8.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this amendment requires that States and localities spend their first responder funds pursuant to approved State plans within 2 years of the end of the fiscal year that they received the funds. I urge adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment?

If not, without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1201) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment proposed by Senator Byrd.

Earlier this year, as a result of a historic, and massive, reorganization that created the Department.

As I have said, we do need to do more. The Federal Government has no laurels to rest on when it comes to border security or immigration.

The problem of illegal immigration has grown...
to crisis proportion, with an estimated 10 million undocumented persons now living here in this country. During much of the 1990s, and at different times in preceding decades, the Federal Government simply paid lip-service to the law without really being  

Our Nation’s immigration system and laws are broken. Whether we are talking about more money, more law, or both, a policy that focuses exclusively on more enforcement is not enough, and it will not work. It is a part of the total picture. The United States has 7,458 miles of land borders and 88,600 miles of tidal shoreline. We can secure those frontiers perfectly if we have stepped up border enforcement, we have locked persons in this country at least as effectively as we have locked them out of the country. Even as we have increased border enforcement, net illegal immigration is estimated at 300,000 to 400,000 a year. Fellow Senators, that is a figure worth repeating. Net illegal immigration in our country still, today, at this moment, in this year, will be between 400,000 to 500,000. To search door to door, as some would advocate, to find 10 million persons and flush them out of their homes, schools, churches, workplaces, and other areas is simply something the American people, in the end, would never tolerate. The question of civil liberties would grow and, that effort would fall apart. We fought a revolution once in this great country of ours against search of our homes and, once again, I think the American people would react to that as not only unconstitutional, but dramatically intrusive. So what do we do? This bill is a major step in the right direction. First and foremost, we secure our borders. As I have said, that is step one. Step two, to me, is change the character of the law to deal with the problem that clearly is at hand: provide incentives for those inside our borders to come forward and identify themselves; laws that ensure there is a supply of legal guest workers to take the jobs that don’t want or won’t take. For example, when American agriculture briefly had a widely used legal guest worker program in the 1960s, illegal immigration plummeted by more than 90 percent. That program was called the Bracero Program. It worked well, but it had lots of criticism for the way the foreign nationals were treated inside this country. As a result, it fell apart. We were then given the character of the law to begin to focus on this a good number of years ago, I recognized there was a significant problem that had to be dealt with. It is not a popular thing to do, but immigration and immigration reform is never popular. Those of us who direct the immigration policy and immigrants and immigrants do not, sometimes hold the attitude, close the border and let no one in. Yet, today, in the American workforce we know that at a growing high record of employment we still have well over 10 million foreign nationals, undocumented, working in our economy in jobs that Americans oftentimes choose not to work in. That is what I treated the bill AgJOBS, now supported by well over 60 Senators. We got a vote this year of 53 to 45 on a procedural motion to allow that Agricultural Job Opportunity and Benefit Security Act to come to the floor and ultimately work through the process to become law. Other colleagues of mine are working on types of reform. So what are we doing today with the Homeland Security Appropriations bill is making a quantum leap in the right direction, because it is the investment we make, no matter how forward-looking, how flexible, and how reasonable it might be to identify those who are in the country, to allow the ebb and flow necessary to meet both the economic needs and humanitarian needs that are all fore to you cannot do it without controlling your borders, without controlling the flow that comes across them. That is what this bill makes a major step in doing. I am pleased to be a member of the subcommittee and to join with Chairman Greggs and the ranking member, Senator Byrd, whom I have worked with on this issue before. I believe this bill is described as a successful joint-use plan.

MidAmerica and Scott Air Force Base have a successful joint-use plan.

MidAmerica is classified as a foreign trade zone and is a finalist to be classified as a foreign trade zone.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. Durbin] proposes an amendment numbered 150.

Mr. Durbin. Mr. President, this is a very brief and simple amendment. It designates MidAmerica St. Louis Airport in Mascoutah, Illinois, as a port of entry.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. Durbin] proposes an amendment numbered 150.

Mr. Durbin. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators Boxer and Kerry have their names added to the Byrd transit amendment No. 1218.

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

Mr. Gregg. Mr. President, I have no problem agreeing to this amendment if
On page 77, line 15, strike all through page 79, line 6 and insert the following:

"For grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other activities, including grants to State and local governments for terrorist 

prevention activities, notwithstanding any other provision of law, $3,860,300,000, which shall be allocated as follows:

(1) $1,518,000,000 for the purposes of (A) grants to States and local governments, of which $425,000,000 shall be allocated such that each State and territory shall receive the same dollar amount for the State minimum as was distributed in fiscal year 2005 for formula-based grants: Provided, That the balance shall be allocated by the Secretary, of Homeland Security to States, urban areas, regions, risk-based threats; vulnerabilities; and unmet essential capabilities pursuant to Homeland Security Presidential Directives 8 (HSPD-8).

(2) $600,000,000 for law enforcement terrorism prevention grants, of which $355,000,000 shall be allocated such that each State and territory shall receive the same dollar amount for the State minimum as was distributed in fiscal year 2005 for law enforcement terrorism prevention grants: Provided, That the balance shall be allocated by the Secretary, of Homeland Security to States based on risks, to States and local governments.

(3) $3,131,300,000 for transit security grants; and

(4) $155,000,000 shall be allocated such that each State and territory shall receive the same dollar amount for the State minimum as was distributed in fiscal year 2005 for transit security grants; and

(5) $155,000,000 shall be allocated such that each State and territory shall receive the same dollar amount for the State minimum as was distributed in fiscal year 2005 for transit security grants; and

(6) $155,000,000 shall be allocated such that each State and territory shall receive the same dollar amount for the State minimum as was distributed in fiscal year 2005 for transit security grants; and

(7) $1,166,000,000 for transit security grants, of which—

(A) $790,000,000 shall be for grants for public transportation agencies for allowable capital security improvements;

(B) $353,000,000 shall be for grants for public transportation agencies for allowable operational security improvements; and

(C) $45,000,000 shall be for grants to public or private entities to conduct research into, and development of, technologies and methods to reduce and deter terrorist threats or mitigate damages resulting from terrorist attacks against public transportation systems.

The amendment is as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1205

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment, and I call up amendment No. 1205.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is as follows:

Purpose: To appropriate funds for transit security grants for fiscal year 2006 equal to the amount authorized in the Public Transportation Terrorism Prevention Act of 2005.

On page 77, line 18, strike “$2,694,300,000” and insert “$3,760,300,000.”

On page 78, strike line 25 and all that follows through line 12, insert “$3,760,300,000,” and strike the following: “security grants; and” and “(D):”

On page 79, between 22 and 23, insert the following:

(7) $1,166,000,000 for transit security grants, of which—

(A) $790,000,000 shall be for grants for public transportation agencies for allowable capital security improvements;

(B) $353,000,000 shall be for grants for public transportation agencies for allowable operational security improvements; and

(C) $45,000,000 shall be for grants to public or private entities to conduct research into, and development of, technologies and methods to reduce and deter terrorist threats or mitigate damages resulting from terrorist attacks against public transportation systems.

The amendment as modified is as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1205, AS MODIFIED

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I further ask to modify the amendment with a modification that I sent to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is so modified.

The amendment (No. 1205), as modified, is as follows:

On page 77, line 15, strike all through page 79, line 6 and insert the following:

"For grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other activities, including grants to State and local governments, of which $425,000,000 shall be allocated such that each State and territory shall receive the same dollar amount for the State minimum as was distributed in fiscal year 2005 for formula-based grants: Provided, That the balance shall be allocated by the Secretary, of Homeland Security to States, urban areas, regions, risk-based threats; vulnerabilities; and unmet essential capabilities pursuant to Homeland Security Presidential Directives 8 (HSPD-8).

(2) $600,000,000 for law enforcement terrorism prevention grants, of which $355,000,000 shall be allocated such that each State and territory shall receive the same dollar amount for the State minimum as was distributed in fiscal year 2005 for law enforcement terrorism prevention grants: Provided, That the balance shall be allocated by the Secretary, of Homeland Security to States based on risks, to States and local governments.

(3) $3,131,300,000 for transit security grants; and

(4) $155,000,000 shall be for public transportation agencies for allowable capital security improvements;

(5) $353,000,000 shall be for grants for public transportation agencies for allowable operational security improvements; and

(6) $155,000,000 shall be for grants to public or private entities to conduct research into, and development of, technologies and methods to reduce and deter terrorist threats or mitigate damages resulting from terrorist attacks against public transportation systems.

The amendment (No. 1205) as modified is as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1205

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that amendment numbered 1205.

Mr. DURBIN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senate from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY], for himself, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. REED, Mrs. DOLE, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. STABENOW, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. BYRD, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Ms. MIKULski, Mr. LUTCHENBERG, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. KERRY, proposes an amendment numbered 1205.

The amendment is—

Amendment No. 1205, as modified

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment, and I call up amendment No. 1205.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY], for himself, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. REED, Mrs. DOLE, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. STABENOW, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. BYRD, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Ms. MIKULski, Mr. LUTCHENBERG, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. KERRY, proposes an amendment, numbered 1205.

The amendment is as follows:

Purpose: To appropriate funds for transit security grants for fiscal year 2006 equal to the amount authorized in the Public Transportation Terrorism Prevention Act of 2005.

On page 77, line 18, strike “$2,694,300,000” and insert “$3,760,300,000.”

On page 78, strike line 25 and all that follows through line 12, insert “$3,760,300,000,” and strike the following: “security grants; and” and “(D):”

On page 79, between 22 and 23, insert the following:

(7) $1,166,000,000 for transit security grants, of which—

(A) $790,000,000 shall be for grants for public transportation agencies for allowable capital security improvements;

(B) $353,000,000 shall be for grants for public transportation agencies for allowable operational security improvements; and

(C) $45,000,000 shall be for grants to public or private entities to conduct research into, and development of, technologies and methods to reduce and deter terrorist threats or mitigate damages resulting from terrorist attacks against public transportation systems.

The amendment as modified is as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1205, AS MODIFIED

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I further ask to modify the amendment with a modification that I sent to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is so modified.

The amendment (No. 1205), as modified, is as follows:
Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

AMENDMENT NO. 1205, AS MODIFIED

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I send a second-degree amendment to the desk and ask it be reported.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The amendment number 1220 to amendment number 1205, as modified.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment as follows:

Strike all after the first word and insert the following:

grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other activities, including grants to State and local governments for terrorism prevention activities, notwithstanding any other provision of law, $2,694,299,000, which shall be allocated as follows:

1. $1,417,999,000 for State and local grants, of which $25,000,000 shall be allocated such that each State and territory shall receive the same dollar amount as was distributed in fiscal year 2005 for formula-based grants: Provided, That the balance shall be allocated by the Secretary to States, urban areas, and regions based on risks; threats; vulnerabilities; and unmet essential capabilities pursuant to Homeland Security Presidential Directive 8.

2. $400,000,000 for law enforcement terrorism prevention grants, of which $155,000,000 shall be allocated such that each State and territory shall receive the same dollar amount for the State minimum as was distributed in fiscal year 2005 for homeland security grants:

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee. The need to improve security throughout our Nation’s public transportation systems has been apparent for quite some time. In fact, last month in my home State, I worked closely with Chairman SHELBY and with Senator RHODE ISLAND who have been leaders on this issue both within the committee and throughout the Senate, on the Public Transportation Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004.

That legislation came out of the committee unanimously and was approved in the Senate last October 1 by unanimous consent. So every Member of this body, in effect, validated that legislation. That bill authorized $3.5 billion over 3 years in security for our Nation’s mass transportation systems. Of that amount, $1.16 billion was scheduled for fiscal year 2008.

This fund is authorized to begin to address the critical security needs that exist throughout the thousands of public transportation systems in our country. The amendment offered by the chairman of the committee, which I have joined in cosponsoring, along with my able colleague from Rhode Island, Senator REED, and others, seeks to provide the appropriations level to sustain the authorized level, which this body has heretofore approved.

In the wake of the tragic attack in London last Thursday, which has claimed over 50 lives and left hundreds more injured, we clearly need to move fully fund transit security, and going to the previously Senate-authorized level seems to make imminent good sense. The Senate anticipated this problem in the authorization, and the committee brought out well-considered legislation which this body passed unanimously. We have not provided the wherewithal to support the authorization, and this amendment seeks to do exactly that.

The threat to transit is not new. We have had terrorist attacks against transit systems in South Korea, and London. In fact, in 2002, the GAO found that one-third of all terrorist attacks worldwide were against transit systems. Despite this significant threat, security funding has been grossly inadequate. Our Nation’s transit systems have been unable to implement necessary security improvements, including those that have been identified by the Department of Homeland Security. In an editorial last Friday, the Baltimore Sun stated that the Federal Government has spent $18 billion on aviation security. Transit systems, which carry 16 times more passengers daily, have received about $250 million. That is a ridiculous imbalance.

They go on to state:

Transit officials estimate it would take $6 billion to make buses and rail systems safe.

And Congress has in the past considered authorizing $3.5 billion over three years for the same purpose.

That is a direct reference to the Public Transportation Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004, which, as has been noted, passed the Senate unanimously. These moneys will be used for such necessities as: security cameras, radios, front-line employee training, and extra security personnel. They are not extravagant requests.

Let me give one example of a critical need right here with respect to Washington’s Metro. Their greatest security need is a backup control operations center. The amendment which this body passed in its initial security assessment and then identified again by the Department of Homeland Security in its subsequent security assessment. This critical need remains unaddressed. In effect, it has been unfunded. This amendment provides the funding to match what was set out in the authorization.

We know that transit systems are potential targets for terrorist attacks. We know the vital role these systems play in our Nation’s economic and security infrastructure. We can wait no longer to address these critical security needs of the transit systems throughout the Nation. This amendment begins the important process of providing these critically needed funds.

Again, I thank the able chairman of the committee for his excellent leadership on the transit security issue and Senator REED for his strong and continued commitment on this issue and his perseverance over a sustained period of time. I thank all of our colleagues who have joined as cosponsors of this amendment. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Baltimore Sun of July 8 referenced in my statement be printed in full at the end of my statement.

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

SECURITY DERAILD

Yesterday’s attack on London’s transit system was frighteningly familiar. Just 16 months ago, terrorists in Madrid killed nearly 200 people and wounded more than 1,500 by setting off bombs in commuter trains. Both demonstrated the potential vulnerability of buses and rail systems. Yet, until yesterday, many in Washington seemed unconcerned that something similar could happen in the United States.

Last month, the Senate Appropriations Committee voted to reduce the Department of Homeland Security’s budget for transit security funding. (The amount spent annually now) to $100 million in the upcoming fiscal year. Certainly, no one knew terrorists would target London, the Baltimore Sun stated, but they have been fresh in senators’ minds. What does it take for Congress to grasp this issue?
Since Sept. 11, 2001, the federal government has spent $18 billion on aviation security. Transit systems—which carry 16 times more passengers daily—have received about $250 million. This painful imbalance. Transit officials estimate it would take $6 billion to make buses and rail systems safe. And Congress has in the past considered authorizing $1 billion over three years for the same purpose.

How would those in charge of the nation's public transit systems spend the extra money? Chiefly for necessities like security cameras, radios, training and extra security personnel. Those aren't extravagant requests. Local governments have spent $2 billion to train transit systems safe over the past four years, according to the American Public Transit Association.

The Bush administration originally asked for significantly more than $350 million to create a Targeted Infrastructure Protection Program that would not only increase transit security but also assist vulnerable shipping ports and energy facilities, too. And though transit and rail systems might have been shortchanged by that arrangement, it is not unreasonable to let DHS officials set their own priorities— if an adequate budget is made available to them.

Transit advocates are hopeful that the $50 million cut can be restored. The attacks in London left many more people more aware of the critical need to protect $1 billion for transit and rail security in the fiscal 2006 budget (not counting the amount needed to protect Amtrak). Suddenly, that doesn't seem so unreasonable an expenditure.

Still, the failure to address transit security in the wake of last year's bombings in Madrid underscores Capitol Hill's inability to set appropriate spending priorities in matters of domestic security. As the 9/11 commission pointed out, Congress has trended portions of the DHS budget like so much bacon, apportioning more per capita to Wyoming than to New York. Between the costly war in Iraq and record budget deficits, the nation can ill afford to be so foolish with its security resources.

Mr. SARBANES. I yield the floor. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I rise to commend Chairman SHEELBY for his leadership on this issue and Senator SARBANES for his leadership. I am proud to be a co-sponsor of this amendment along with Chairman SHEELBY and Senator SARBANES. They have said it very well. We understand that transit systems are threatened by terrorists. That understanding was developed after 9/11, but certainly it was sharpened last week with the attack in London that left 52 dead and over 700 injured.

We recognize that we have to protect these vulnerable transit systems, and the purpose of this amendment is to provide the resources to do that. There are 6,000 transit systems in the United States that carry passengers, although it seems significant, will barely keep up with the demands for security improvements to transit systems across the United States.

Each day, 14 million riders use transit to get to work, to get to appointments, to get to hospitals, to do what they must do. Let me disabuse the notion that this is just the province of New York City. In Dallas, for example, on a yearly basis, 55 million trips a year on transit; Houston, 96 million trips a year; Atlanta, 137 million trips per year; Portland, 95 million; Charlotte, NC, 16 million trips per year; Philadelphia, PA, 267 million trips per year; and Minneapolis, 56.9 million trips per year.

Millions of Americans each day get on a subway or a bus and use the transit system. They are today not as well protected as they should be. The point of this amendment is to get the resources together to start those sensible investments in capital equipment, in operational techniques and training and in consequence management that are so important for transit security.

As Senator SARBANES pointed out, the GAO has found that one-third of the terrorist attacks in the last several years have been directed against transit systems. We know it is a target.

So after 9/11, as I was acting as chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing and Transportation, I held a hearing—in fact several hearings—about the need for improvement of transit security. Today, that evidence is even more compelling based upon what has happened in London, Moscow, and Spain. All of these things should compel us to support this amendment enthusiastically.

One final point: Not only is transit important, not only is it a target for terrorists, but in terror attacks transit is an important aspect in consequence management. People were evacuated from the Pentagon because of the subway systems and the Metro systems in Washington. Transit trains moved underneath the World Trade Center. In fact, cool action by some of the transit police and transit dispatchers was able to minimize casualties. That will not happen if they do not have the communication equipment, the training, and the ability to tell and react to a possible terrorist attack.

So not only is transit a likely target, but it is an essential means of managing the consequences of an attack in any urban area anywhere in the United States.

So I again urge my colleagues to join Senator SHEELBY, Senator SARBANES, and our other colleagues who support this amendment. It is important. It is more than timely; it is, frankly, after last week, overdue.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, it appears we will be unable to vote on a substitute to the President's amendment, as it is on a roll call vote. I think we can tell the story that today that these are extraordinary times with extraordinary events. Since 1983, when the bombing of the Marine barracks took place in Beirut where we lost 242 Marines, 221 major terrorist attacks have occurred around the world. Fifty-eight of those attacks, almost 25 percent, were carried out in transit systems, with the use of trucks or cars or in seaports.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURD). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1202, AS MODIFIED

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I have cleared this with the distinguished manager of the bill. I send a modification of the Dodd amendment, amendment No. 1202, to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modification? Hearing none, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 77, line 20, strike $1,518,000,000 and insert $1,653,232,019.

On page 77, line 21, strike $425,000,000 and insert $2,830,311,000.

On page 78, line 13, strike $365,000,000 and insert $514,544,668.

On page 78, line 16, strike $200,000,000 and insert $1,029,089,337.

On page 78, line 22, strike $5,000,000 and insert $5,000,000,000.

On page 79, line 1, strike $1,000,000,000 and insert $514,544,668.

On page 79, line 5, strike $50,000,000 and insert $514,544,668.

On page 79, line 7, strike $50,000,000 and insert $357,272,344.

On page 79, line 9, strike $40,000,000 and insert $205,817,867.

On page 79, line 21, strike $321,300,000 and insert $321,300,000.

On page 81, line 24, strike $150,000,000,000 and insert $1,047,210,000.

On page 89, line 3, strike $194,000,000 and insert $334,491,000.

On page 82, line 12, strike $180,000,000 and insert $926,284,000.

On page 83, line 12, strike $203,499,000 and insert $1,047,210,000.

On page 89, line 3, strike $194,000,000 and insert $357,272,344.

Mr. DODD. Let me begin once again by expressing my appreciation to the chairman and the manager of this bill, Senator Gregg, and my colleague from West Virginia, Senator Byrd. They have done a good job with this bill. This bill deals with several complicated issues. The events during the past few days in London have highlighted the importance of these issues concerning our homeland security. I want to express my appreciation to Senator Gregg and Senator Byrd for operating within the constraints of the budget caps.

I realize by offering an amendment so large—50 percent of the entire amount in this bill—I am offering an extraordinary amendment. I tried to make it clear today that these are extraordinary times with extraordinary events. Since 1983, when the bombing of the Marine barracks took place in Beirut where we lost 242 Marines, 221 major terrorist attacks have occurred around the world. Fifty-eight of those attacks, almost 25 percent, were carried out in transit systems, with the use of trucks or cars or in seaports.
We know today in our own country that we are glaringly lax in providing the security we need within our transit systems, harbors, and ports.

The amendment I am offering is not one that I have crafted on my own. It was suggested recently from the recommendations Senator Warren Rudman, our former colleague, had suggested in a report sponsored by the Council on Foreign Relations that included many distinguished Americans who have worked in areas of national security, public health, intelligence, and bioterrorism. They suggested strongly in their report that we spend some $20 billion a year in order to fully invest in what we need to make our country more secure.

Let me quote, if I can, once again, because I think his comments are worth repeating, the language of Senator Rudman in that report. Senator Rudman said at that time:
The terrible events of September 11 have shown the American public how vulnerable they are because attacks on that scale had never been carried out on U.S. soil. The United States and the American people were caught underprotected and unaware of the magnitude of the threat facing them.

He goes on to say:
In the wake of September 11, ignorance of the nature of the threat or of what the United States must do to prepare for future attacks can no longer explain America’s continuing failure to allocate sufficient resources in preparing local emergency responders. It would be a terrible tragedy indeed if attacks in the near future caught us by surprise, with catastrophic attack to drive that point home.

Let me also, if I can, read once again the language of Les Gelb, in preparing the foreword of that report. Les Gelb wrote, on the occasion of this report being filed:
As I sit to write this foreword, it is likely that a terrorist group somewhere in the world is developing plans to attack the United States and/or American interests abroad. These plans could be biological, radiological, nuclear or catastrophic conventional means. At the same time, diplomats, legislators, military and intelligence officers, police, emergency medical personnel and others in the United States and across the globe are working feverishly to prevent and prepare for such attacks. These two groups of people are ultimately in a race against time with one another. This is a race we cannot afford to lose.

I think those words ought to be taken to heart. Since that report was filed, of course, we have seen the attacks in Madrid on their transit systems, and the people there who lost their lives in March of 2004 and we have seen the attacks in London, the suicide bombings that we now know occurred there at first time suicide bombers appeared in the West. What kind of attack will it take for us to realize we can no longer wait to do what needs to be done to prepare our transit systems, our ports, our harbors—what more needs to be done to make America more secure?

Is my amendment a large amendment? It is. Is it extraordinary in its size? It is. But I strongly suggest to my colleagues the events we are facing as a people are no less extraordinary and demand, I think, extraordinary action.

While there will be a move here, obviously, to raise the point of order on the budget against this amendment because of its size, I do ask that point of order. Some point we are going to be faced again with these tragedies. I only hope we have the resources at hand to minimize them. How many events will it take? What catastrophic occurrence is going to have to occur before we realize we need to make these investments?

I know all the bureaucratic arguments that are being made here, but I don’t think they apply. I think when we are faced, as we have been historically, with major events, major problems, this body, this Congress, the American people have responded accordingly. I think the American people expect nothing less of us at this hour. So I urge my colleagues to support this measure. I urge my American Senate to pass this amendment so we can do what needs to be done to make our country more secure.

Again, I appreciate immensely the efforts of the Senator from New Hampshire. I understand it was just passed in Senate, catastrophic attack to drive that point home.

There being no objection, the material is ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**SIGNIFICANT TERRORIST INCIDENTS, 1961–2003: A BRIEF CHRONOLOGY**

- **Bombing of U.S. Embassy in Beirut, April 18, 1983:** Thirty-six people, including the American tourists and a Lebanese police officer, were killed and 120 were injured in a 400-pound suicide truck-bomb attack on the U.S. Embassy in Beirut, Lebanon. The Islamic Jihad claimed responsibility.
- **Naval Officer Assassinated in El Salvador, May 25, 1983:** A U.S. Navy officer was assassinated by the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front (FMLN) in the Zona Rosa district of San Salvador, killing four Marine Security Guards assigned to the U.S. Embassy and nine Salvadoran civilians.
- **Kidnapping of U.S. Officials in Mexico, June 30, 1985:** In a move here, for those who may be interested, the 221 signifi-
cant terrorist incidents in that period are too numerous to mention. They are because attacks on that scale had never been carried out on U.S. soil. The American people were caught underprotected and unaware of the magnitude of the threat facing them.

Mr. President, I list here, for those who may be interested, the 221 signifi-
cant terrorist incidents in that period are too numerous to mention. They are because attacks on that scale had never been carried out on U.S. soil. The American people were caught underprotected and unaware of the magnitude of the threat facing them. While there will be a move here, obviously, to raise the point of order on the budget against this amendment because of its size, I do ask that point of order. Some point we are going to be faced again with these tragedies. I only hope we have the resources at hand to minimize them. How many events will it take? What catastrophic occurrence is going to have to occur before we realize we need to make these investments?

I know all the bureaucratic arguments that are being made here, but I don’t think they apply. I think when we are faced, as we have been historically, with major events, major problems, this body, this Congress, the American people have responded accordingly. I think the American people expect nothing less of us at this hour. So I urge my colleagues to support this measure. I urge my American Senate to pass this amendment so we can do what needs to be done to make our country more secure.

Again, I appreciate immensely the efforts of the Senator from New Hamp-
shire. I understand it was just passed in Senate, catastrophic attack to drive that point home.

As I sit to write this foreword, it is likely that a terrorist group somewhere in the world is developing plans to attack the United States and/or American interests abroad. These plans could be biological, radiological, nuclear or catastrophic conventional means. At the same time, diplomats, legislators, military and intelligence officers, police, emergency medical personnel and others in the United States and across the globe are working feverishly to prevent and prepare for such attacks. These two groups of people are ultimately in a race against time with one another. This is a race we cannot afford to lose.

I think those words ought to be taken to heart. Since that report was filed, of course, we have seen the attacks in Madrid on their transit system and the people there who lost their lives in March of 2004 and we have seen the attacks in London, the suicide bombings that we now know occurred there at first time suicide bombers appeared in the West. What kind of attack will it take for us to realize we can no longer wait to do what needs to be done to prepare our transit systems, our ports, our harbors—what more needs to be done to make America more secure?

Is my amendment a large amendment? It is. Is it extraordinary in its size? It is. But I strongly suggest to my colleagues the events we are facing as a people are no less extraordinary and demand, I think, extraordinary action.
West Germany. In retaliation U.S. military jets bombed targets in and around Tripoli and Benghazi.

Kimpo Airport Bombing, September 14, 1986: North Korean agents detonated an explosive device at Seoul’s Kimpo airport, killing 5 persons and injuring 29 others.

1987

Bus Attack, April 24, 1987: Sixteen U.S. service personnel riding in a Greek Air Force bus near Athens were injured in an apparent bombing attack, carried out by the revolutionary organization known as November 17. Downed by North Korean agents planted a bomb aboard Korean Air Lines Flight 858, which subsequently crashed into the Indian Ocean.


1988

Kidnapping of William Higgins, February 17, 1988: U.S. Marine Corps Lieutenant Colonel W. Higgins was kidnapped and murdered by the Iranian-backed Hizballah group while serving with the United Nations Truce Supervisory Organization (UNTSO) in southern Lebanon.

Naples USO Attack, April 14, 1988: The Organization of Jihad Brigades exploded a car bomb outside a USO Club in Naples, Italy, killing one U.S. sailor.

Attack on U.S. Diplomat in Greece, June 28, 1988: The Defense Attaché of the U.S. Embassy in Greece was killed when a car bomb detonated outside his home in Athens.

Pan Am Flight 103 Bombling, December 21, 1988: Pan American Airlines Flight 103 was blown up over Lockerbie, Scotland, by a bomb believed to have been placed on the aircraft by Libyan terrorists in Frankfurt, West Germany. All 259 people on board were killed.

Assassination of U.S. Army Officer, April 21, 1989: The New People’s Army (NPA) assassinated Colonel James Rowe in Manila, the Philippines. The NPA also assassinated two U.S. government defense contractors in September.

Bombing of UTA Flight 772, September 19, 1989: A bomb explosion destroyed UTA Flight 772 over the Sahara Desert in southern Niger during a flight from N’Zérékoré to Paris. All 170 persons aboard were killed. Six Libyans were later found guilty in absentia and sentenced to death in imprisonment.


1990


Sniper Attack on the U.S. Embassy in Bonn, February 13, 1991: Three Red Army Faction members fired automatic rifles from across the Rhine River at the U.S. Embassy Chancery. No one was hurt.

Assassination of former Indian Prime Minister, May 21, 1991: A female member of the LTTE targeted Tamil President Rajiv Gandhi, and 16 others by detonating an explosive vest after placing a grenade at the Indian Prime Minister during an election rally in the Indian state of Tamil Nadu.

1992

Kidnapping of U.S. Businessmen in the Philippines, March 24-31, 1992: Hijack official of the corporation Philippine Geothermal was kidnapped in Manila by the Red Scorpion Group, and two U.S. businessmen were killed. Pakistan’s National Liberation Army and by Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC).

Bombing of the Israeli Embassy in Argentina, July 19, 1992: The attack claimed responsibility for a blast that leveled the Israeli Embassy in Buenos Aires, Argentina, causing the deaths of 29 and wounding 242.


World Trade Center Bombing, February 26, 1993: The World Trade Center in New York City was badly damaged when a car bomb planted by Islamic terrorists exploded in an underground garage left 6 people dead and 1,000 injured. The men carrying out the attack were followers of Umar Abdul-Nur, an Egyptian cleric who preached in the New York City area.

Assassination of President Bush by Iraqi Agents, April 14, 1993: The Iraqi intelligence service attempted to assassinate President Bush in December 1992 during a visit to Kuwait. In retaliation, the U.S. launched a cruise missile attack 2 months later on the Iraqi capital Baghdad.


Air France Hijacking, December 24, 1994: Members of the Armed Islamic Group seized an Air France Flight to Algeria. The four terrorists were killed during a rescue effort.


Tokyo Subway Station Attack, March 20, 1995: Twelve persons were killed and 5,700 were injured in a Sarin nerve gas attack on a crowded subway station in the center of Tokyo, Japan. A similar attack occurred nearly simultaneously in the Yokohama subway system. The Aum Shinri-kyo cult was blamed for the attacks.

Bombing of the Federal Building in Oklahoma City, April 19, 1995: Right-wing extremists Timothy McVeigh and Terry Nichols detonated a bomb that killed 168 and injured hundreds more in what was up to then the largest terrorist attack on American soil.

Kidnapping of Zekharya, May 15, 1995: Kidnappers believed to have been placed on the aircraft by Islamic terrorists exploded a car bomb that killed 6 and injured 16 others. The Aum Shinri-kyo cult was later found beheaded.

Jerusalem Bus Attack, August 21, 1995: A senior official of the corporation Philippine Geothermal was kidnapped in Manila by HAMAS and the Palestine Islamic Jihad (PIJ) both claimed responsibility for a bombing outside of Pol-E-Shima, a shopping mall that killed 20 persons and injuring 75 others, including 2 U.S. citizens.

Dizengoff Center Bombing, March 4, 1996: HAMAS and the Palestine Islamic Jihad (PIJ) both claimed responsibility for a bomb attack on the Dizengoff Center, a shopping mall in Jerusalem, killing a dual U.S./Israeli citizen and wounding three Israelis. No one claimed responsibility for the attack, but HAMAS was suspected.

AID Worker Abduction, May 31, 1996: A gang of former Contra guerrillas kidnapped a worker of the U.S. Agency for International Development (AID) who was assisting with election preparations in rural northern Nicaragua. She was released unharmed the next day after members of the international community overseeing the preparations intervened.

Attempted Iraqi Attacks on U.S. Posts, August 8, 1996: Unidentified assassins fired a rocket at the U.S. Embassy compound in Athens, causing minor damage to three diplomatic vehicles and some surrounding buildings. Circumstances of the attack suggested it was an operation carried out by the 17 November group.

ELN Kidnapping, February 16, 1996: Six alleged National Liberation Army (ELN) guerrillas kidnapped a U.S. citizen in Colombia. After 9 months, the hostage was released.

HAMAS Bus Attack, February 26, 1996: In Jerusalem, a suicide bomber blew up a bus, killing 26 persons, including three U.S. citizens, and injuring some 80 persons, including the other U.S. citizen.

Dizengoff Center Bombing, March 4, 1996: HAMAS and the Palestine Islamic Jihad (PIJ) both claimed responsibility for a bomb attack on the Dizengoff Center, a shopping mall in Jerusalem, killing a dual U.S./Israeli citizen and wounding three Israelis. No one claimed responsibility for the attack, but HAMAS was suspected.

AID Worker Abduction, May 31, 1996: A gang of former Contra guerrillas kidnapped a worker of the U.S. Agency for International Development (AID) who was assisting with election preparations in rural northern Nicaragua. She was released unharmed the next day after members of the international community overseeing the preparations intervened.

Jerusalem Bus Attack, August 21, 1995: A senior official of the corporation Philippine Geothermal was kidnapped in Manila by HAMAS and the Palestine Islamic Jihad (PIJ) both claimed responsibility for a bombing outside of Pol-E-Shima, a shopping mall that killed 20 persons and injuring 75 others, including 2 U.S. citizens.

Dizengoff Center Bombing, March 4, 1996: HAMAS and the Palestine Islamic Jihad (PIJ) both claimed responsibility for a bomb attack on the Dizengoff Center, a shopping mall in Jerusalem, killing a dual U.S./Israeli citizen and wounding three Israelis. No one claimed responsibility for the attack, but HAMAS was suspected.

AID Worker Abduction, May 31, 1996: A gang of former Contra guerrillas kidnapped a worker of the U.S. Agency for International Development (AID) who was assisting with election preparations in rural northern Nicaragua. She was released unharmed the next day after members of the international community overseeing the preparations intervened.

Jerusalem Bus Attack, August 21, 1995: A senior official of the corporation Philippine Geothermal was kidnapped in Manila by HAMAS and the Palestine Islamic Jihad (PIJ) both claimed responsibility for a bombing outside of Pol-E-Shima, a shopping mall that killed 20 persons and injuring 75 others, including 2 U.S. citizens.

Dizengoff Center Bombing, March 4, 1996: HAMAS and the Palestine Islamic Jihad (PIJ) both claimed responsibility for a bomb attack on the Dizengoff Center, a shopping mall in Jerusalem, killing a dual U.S./Israeli citizen and wounding three Israelis. No one claimed responsibility for the attack, but HAMAS was suspected.

AID Worker Abduction, May 31, 1996: A gang of former Contra guerrillas kidnapped a worker of the U.S. Agency for International Development (AID) who was assisting with election preparations in rural northern Nicaragua. She was released unharmed the next day after members of the international community overseeing the preparations intervened.

Jerusalem Bus Attack, August 21, 1995: A senior official of the corporation Philippine Geothermal was kidnapped in Manila by HAMAS and the Palestine Islamic Jihad (PIJ) both claimed responsibility for a bombing outside of Pol-E-Shima, a shopping mall that killed 20 persons and injuring 75 others, including 2 U.S. citizens.

Dizengoff Center Bombing, March 4, 1996: HAMAS and the Palestine Islamic Jihad (PIJ) both claimed responsibility for a bomb attack on the Dizengoff Center, a shopping mall in Jerusalem, killing a dual U.S./Israeli citizen and wounding three Israelis. No one claimed responsibility for the attack, but HAMAS was suspected.

AID Worker Abduction, May 31, 1996: A gang of former Contra guerrillas kidnapped a worker of the U.S. Agency for International Development (AID) who was assisting with election preparations in rural northern Nicaragua. She was released unharmed the next day after members of the international community overseeing the preparations intervened.

Jerusalem Bus Attack, August 21, 1995: A senior official of the corporation Philippine Geothermal was kidnapped in Manila by HAMAS and the Palestine Islamic Jihad (PIJ) both claimed responsibility for a bombing outside of Pol-E-Shima, a shopping mall that killed 20 persons and injuring 75 others, including 2 U.S. citizens.
Kobar Towers Bombing, June 25, 1996: A fuel truck carrying a bomb exploded outside the U.S. military's Kobar Towers housing facility in Dhahran, killing 19 U.S. military personnel and injuring 515 newspaper workers, including 230 U.S. personnel. Several groups claimed responsibility for the attack.

ETT Bombing, July 20, 1996: A bomb exploded in front of the British Embassy in Tunis, killing a British diplomat and injuring 35 tourists, including British and Irish tourists. The Basque Fatherland and Liberty (ETA) organization was suspected.

Bombing of Archbishop of Oran, August 1, 1996: A bomb exploded at the home of the French Archbishop of Oran, killing him and his chess partner. The explosion occurred at the Archbishop's meeting with the French Foreign Minister. The Algerian Armed Islamic Group (GIA) is suspected.

Sudanese Rebel Kidnapping, August 17, 1996: Sudan People's Liberation Army (SPLA) rebels kidnapped six missionaries in Mapourkuit, including a U.S. citizen, an Italian, three Australians, and a Sudanese. The SPLA released the hostages 11 days later.

PDK Kidnapping, September 13, 1996: In Iraq, Patriotic Union of Kurdistan (PUK) militants kidnapped four French workers for Pharmaciens Sans Frontieres, a Canadian Union for Latin Haiti Homeless Refugees (UNCHR) official, and two Iraqis.

Assassination of South Korean Consul, October 1, 1996: In Vladivostok, Russia, assassins ambushed a South Korean consul near his home. No one claimed responsibility, but South Korean authorities believed that the attack was carried out by professionals and that the assassants were North Koreans. North Korean officials denied the country's involvement in the attack.

Red Cross Worker Kidnappings, November 1, 1996: Two groups kidnapped the Sudanese People's Liberation Army (SPLA) kidnapped three International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) workers, including a U.S. citizen, an Australian, and a Kenyan. On 9 December the rebels released the hostages in exchange for ICRC supplies and a health survey for their camp.

Paris Subway Explosion, December 3, 1996: A bomb exploded aboard a Paris subway train as it arrived at the Port Royal station, killing two French nationals, a Moroccan, and four others injuring 90 persons. Among those injured were one U.S. citizen and a Canadian. No one claimed responsibility for the attack, but Algerian extremists are suspected.

Abduction of U.S. Citizen by FARC, December 11, 1996: Five armed men claiming to be members of the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC) kidnapped and later killed a U.S. geologist at a methane gas exploration site in La Guajira Department.

 Tupac Amaru Seizure of Diplomats, December 29, 1997: Thirty-three members of the Tupac Amaru Revolutionary Movement (MRTA) took several hundred people hostage at a party given at the Japanese Ambassador's residence in Lima, Peru. Among the hostages were several U.S. officials, foreign ambassadors and other diplomats, Peruvian government officials, and Japanese businessmen. Konsomocod, one of the hostage-takers, claimed the release of all MRTA members in prison and safe passage for them and the hostage takers. The terrorists released most of the hostages in December but held Peruvian and Japanese citizens for several months.

Egyptian Letter Bombs, January 2-13, 1997: A series of letter bombs with Alexandria, Egypt, postmarks were discovered in Hayat newspaper warehouses in Washington, New York City, London, and Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. Three similar devices, also postmarked in Egypt, were found at a prison facility in Leavenworth, Kansas. Bomb disposal experts defused all the devices, but one bomb exploded, injuring two American journalists and their Tajik interpreter. The kidnappers demanded safe passage for their supporters from Afghanistan to Tajikistan. In four separate incidents in February, two Garm, and Zakhurov. Venezuelan Abduction, February 14, 1997: Six armed Colombian guerrillas kidnapped a U.S. oil engineer and his Venezuelan pilot in Apure, Venezuela. The kidnappers released the Venezuelan and the American. According to authorities, the FARC is responsible for the kidnapping.

Empire State Building Sniper Attack, February 22, 1997: A gunman opened fire on tourists at an observation deck at the Empire State Building in New York City, killing a Danish national and wounding visitors from El Salvador, Argentina, Switzerland, and France before turning the gun on himself. A handwritten note carried by the gunman claimed this was a punishment attack against the "enemies of Palestine."

ELN Kidnapping, February 24, 1997: National Liberation Army (ELN) guerrillas kidnapped two U.S. businesspeople from a Las Vegas gold corporation who was scouting a gold mining operation in Colombia. The ELN demanded a ransom of $25 million.

FARC Kidnapping, March 7, 1997: FARC guerrillas kidnapped a U.S. mining employee and his Colombian colleague who were searching for gold in Colombia. On November 16, the rebels released the two hostages after receiving a $50,000 ransom.

Hotel Nacional Bombing, July 12, 1997: A bomb exploded at the Hotel Nacional in Havana, injuring three persons and causing minor damage. A previously unknown group calling itself the Military Liberation Union claimed responsibility.

Israeli Shopping Mall Bombing, September 4, 1997: Three suicide bombers of Hamas detonated bombs in the Ben Yehuda shopping mall in Jerusalem, killing eight persons, including the bombers, and wounding nearly 200 others. A dual U.S./Israeli citizen was among the dead, and 7 U.S. citizens were wounded.

QAS Abductions, October 23, 1997: In Colombia ELN rebels kidnapped two foreign members of the Organization of American States (OAS) human rights official at a roadblock. The OAS claimed that the kidnapping was intended "to show the international community that the elections in Colombia are a farce."

Yemeni Kidnappings, October 30, 1997: Ali Shiaf tribesmen kidnapped a U.S. businessman near Aden. The Yemeni government sought the release of two fellow tribesmen who were arrested on smuggling charges and several public works projects they claim the government promised. They released the hostages on November 27.

MURDER OF U.S. BUSINESSMEN IN KABUL, AFGHANISTAN, OCTOBER 18, 1998: A National Liberation Army (ELN) planted bomb exploded on the Occena pipeline in Cundinamarca Department and killed an 11-year-old son after stealing money, jewelry, one automobile, and two cell phones. The kidnappers demanded $1 million in ransom. On January 21, 1999, the kidnappers released the boy.
Angolan Aircraft Downing, January 2, 1999: A UN plane carrying one U.S. citizen, four Angolans, two Filipino nationals and one Namibian citizen was shot down. Three Ethiopians and four Ugandan nationals were among the 35 killed. One Ethiopian and four Ugandan nationals died in the blast, and one U.S. citizen working for USAID, two Swiss nationals, one Pakistani, one Israeli and one Canadian citizen were wounded. Ugandan authorities blamed the attack on the Allied Democratic Forces (ADF). Greek Embassy Seizure, February 16, 1999: Kurdistan protesters stormed and occupied the Greek Embassy in Vienna, taking the Greek Ambassador and six other persons hostage. Several hours later the protesters released the hostages and left the Embassy. The attack followed the Turkish Government’s announcement of the successful capture of the Kurdistan Workers’ Party (PKK) leader Abdullah Ocalan. Other leaders of the PKK and the Kurdistan Freedom Party were also arrested in Jordan, Israel, and other Greek diplomatic facilities in France, Holland, Switzerland, Britain, and Germany over the following days.

FARC Kidnappings, February 23, 1999: FARC kidnapped three U.S. citizens working for the Pacific Council on Security International. On March 4, the bodies of the three victims were found in Venezuela.

Hutu Abductions, March 1, 1999: 150 armed Hutu rebels attacked three tourist camps in Uganda, killed four Ugandans, and abducted three U.S. citizens, six Britons, three New Zealanders, two Canadian citizens, one Thai, two French nationals, and one Canadian national. Two of the U.S. citizens and six of the other hostages were subsequently killed by their abductors.

ELN Hostage-taking, March 23, 1999: Armed guerrillas kidnapped a U.S. citizen in Boyaca, Colombia. The National Liberation Army (ELN) claimed responsibility and demanded $400,000 ransom. On November 12, ELN released the hostage unharmed following a ransom payment of $350,000.

ELN Hostage-taking, May 30, 1999: In Cali, Colombia, armed ELN militants attacked a church in the neighborhood of Ciudad Jardin, kidnapped a Nigerian and a Colombian citizen and one French national. The rebels released approximately 80 persons, including three U.S. citizens, later that day.

Shell Platform Bombing, June 27, 1999: In Port Harcourt, Nigeria, armed youths stormed a Shell oil platform, kidnapping one U.S. citizen, one Nigerian national, and one Australian citizen, and causing undetermined damage. A group calling itself “Enough is Enough in the Niger River” claimed responsibility. Further seizures of oil facilities followed.

AFRC Kidnappings, August 4, 1999: An Armed Forces Revolutionary Council (AFRC) faction kidnapped 33 UN representatives near Occra Hills, Sierra Leone. The hostages included one U.S. citizen, five British citizens, one Canadian citizen, one representative from Ghana, an army officer from Russia, one from Kyrgyzstan, one officer from Zambia, one officer from Malaysia, a local bishop, two UN officials, two local journalists, and 16 Sierra Leonean nationals.

Burmeese Embassy Seizure, October 1, 1999: Burmese dissidents seized the Burmese Embassy in Bangkok, Thailand, taking 89 persons hostages, including one U.S. citizen.

PLA Kidnapping, December 23, 1999: Colombian People’s Liberation Army (PLA) forces kidnapped a U.S. citizen in an unsuccessful ransoming effort.

Indian Airlines Airbus Hijacking, December 24, 1999: Five militants hijacked a flight from New Delhi carrying 189 persons. The plane and its passengers were released unharmed on December 31.

Car bombing in Spain, January 27, 2000: Police officials reported unidentified individuals set fire to a Citroen car dealership in Itarreta, causing extensive damage to the building and killing 12 persons. The attack bore the hallmark of the Basque Fatherland and Liberty (ETA).

RUF Attacks on U.N. Mission Personnel, May 29, 2000: In Sierra Leone, Revolutionary United Front (RUF) militants killed 20 members of the United Nations Assistance Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL) and surrounded and opened fire on a UNAMSIL facility, according to press reports. The militants killed five UN soldiers in the attack. RUF militants kidnapped 300 UNAMSIL peacekeepers throughout the country, according to press reports. On May 15 in Foya, Liberia, the kidnappers released 139 hostages. On May 28, on the anniversary of the 1990 coup, armed UNAMSIL peacekeepers killed the last remaining hostages. The Indonesian and one U.S. citizen were killed in a May 25 car bombing in Freetown for which the RUF was probably responsible. Subsequently, RUF rebels also kidnapped 21 Indian UN peacekeepers in Freetown on June 6. Additional attacks by RUF on foreign personnel followed.

Diplomatic Assassination in Greece, June 8, 2000: In Athens, Greece, two unidentified gunmen killed British Defense Attaché Stephen Iturreta, causing extensive damage to the British Embassy.

Philippines Hostage Incident, May 27, 2001: Muslim Abu Sayyaf guerrillas seized 13 tourists and 3 staff members at a resort on Palawan Island and took their captives to Basilan Island. The captives included three U.S. citizens: Guellermo Sobero and missionary Robert Lawrence and his wife. The kidnappers held the captives for 25 days before releasing them.

Bus Stop Bombing, April 22, 2001: A suicide bomb attack in Cebu killed 3 persons and wounded 65. HAMAS later claimed responsibility.

ETA Bombing, March 9, 2001: Two policemen were killed by the explosion of a car bomb in Hernani, Spain.

Airliner Hijacking in Istanbul, March 15, 2001: Three Chechens hijacked a Russian airliner during a flight from Istanbul to Moscow and forced it to fly to Medina, Saudi Arabia. The plane carried 162 passengers and a crew of 12. After a 22-hour siege during which more than 40 Saudi security forces were killed, Saudi security forces stormed the plane, killing a hijacker, a passenger, and a flight attendant.

Philippines Hostage Incident, May 27, 2001: Muslim Abu Sayyaf guerrillas seized 13 tourists and 3 staff members at a resort on Palawan Island and took their captives to Basilan Island. The captives included three U.S. citizens: Guellermo Sobero and missionary Robert Lawrence and his wife. The kidnappers held the captives for 25 days before releasing them.

Philippines Hostage Incident, May 27, 2001: Muslim Abu Sayyaf guerrillas seized 13 tourists and 3 staff members at a resort on Palawan Island and took their captives to Basilan Island. The captives included three U.S. citizens: Guellermo Sobero and missionary Robert Lawrence and his wife. The kidnappers held the captives for 25 days before releasing them.

Silverado Hills, Sierra Leone. The hostages included one U.S. citizen, one Nigerian, and one Canadian national. Two of the U.S. citizens and six of the other hostages were subsequently killed by their abductors.

ELN Kidnapping, June 27, 2000: In Bogota, Colombia, ELN militants kidnapped a 5-year-old U.S. citizen and his Colombian mother, demanding an undisclosed ransom. Kidnappings in Kyrgyzstan, August 12, 2000: In the Karasu Valley, the Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan took four U.S. citizens hostage. The Americans escaped on August 12.

Church Bombing in Tajikistan, October 1, 2001: Unidentified militants detonated two bombs in a Christian church in Dushanbe, killing one person and injuring 70 others. The church was founded by a Korean-born U.S. citizen, and most of those killed and wounded were Korean. No one claimed responsibility.

Helicopter Hijacking, October 12, 2000: In Cumbios Province, Ecuador, a group of armed kidnappers led by former members of the Ecuadorian National Liberation Army (EPL) took hostage 10 employees of Spanish energy consortium Repsol. Those kidnapped included five Italians, one Argentine, one Chilean, one New Zealander, and two French pilots who escaped four days later. On January 30, 2001, the kidnappers murdered American hostage Ronald Sander. The remaining hostages were released on February 23 following the payment of $13 million in ransom by the oil company.

Attack on U.S.S. Cole, October 12, 2000: In Aden, Yemen, a small dingy carrying explosives rammed the destroyer U.S.S. Cole, killing 17 Americans and injuring 39 others. Suspected al-Qaeda sympathizers believed to be US. citizens, one Korean, and one German national.

Manila Bombing, December 30, 2000: A bomb exploded in a plaza across the street from U.S. embassy in Manila, injuring nine persons. The Moro Islamic Liberation Front was likely responsible.

Srinagar Airport Attack and Assassination Attempt, January 17, 2001: In India, six members of the LeT-terrorist group were killed when they attempted to seize a local hotel. Members of Hizbul Mujahideen fired two grenade launchers at Faproo Abdal, Chief Minister of Jammu and Kashmir. Two persons were wounded in the unsuccessful assassination attempt.

BBC Studios Bombing, March 4, 2001: A car bomb exploded at midnight outside of the British Broadcasting Corporation’s main premises, killing two persons. One of those injured was shot by police. The police claimed responsibility.

South Africa Airlines Flight Bombing, June 27, 1999: In South Africa, a bomb exploded on board a South African Airways flight. Forty-nine persons were killed.

Hamas-Linked Bombing, March 11, 2001: A suicide bomb attack in the Gaza Strip killed 3 persons and wounded 65. HAMAS later claimed responsibility.

ETA Bombing, March 9, 2001: Two policemen were killed by the explosion of a car bomb in Hernani, Spain.

Airliner Hijacking in Istanbul, March 15, 2001: Three Chechens hijacked a Russian airliner during a flight from Istanbul to Moscow and forced it to fly to Medina, Saudi Arabia. The plane carried 162 passengers and a crew of 12. After a 22-hour siege during which more than 40 Saudi security forces were killed, Saudi security forces stormed the plane, killing a hijacker, a passenger, and a flight attendant.

Philippines Hostage Incident, May 27, 2001: Muslim Abu Sayyaf guerrillas seized 13 tourists and 3 staff members at a resort on Palawan Island and took their captives to Basilan Island. The captives included three U.S. citizens: Guellermo Sobero and missionary Robert Lawrence and his wife. The kidnappers held the captives for 25 days before releasing them.
crashed into a field in southern Pennsylvania. The attacks killed 3,025 U.S. citizens and other nationals. President Bush and Cabinet officials indicated that Usama Bin Laden is the prime suspect and that they considered the United States in a state of war with international terrorism. In the aftermath of the attacks, the United States formed the Global Coalition Against Terror.

Attack on the Jammu and Kashmir Legislature, October 1, 2001: After a suicide car bomb exploded at the state legislature in Srinagar, two gunmen entered the building and held off police for seven hours before being killed. Forty persons died in the incident. Pakistani officials claimed responsibility.

Anthrax Attacks, October–November 2001: On October 25, the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) reported that investigators had detected evidence that the deadly anthrax bacterium was present in the building where a Florida man who died of anthrax on October 5 had worked. Discovery of a second anthrax case triggered a major investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). The two anthrax cases were the first to appear in the United States in 25 years. Anthrax subsequently appeared in the mail received by television networks in New York and the offices in Washington of Senator Tom Daschle and other members of Congress. Attorney General John Ashcroft said in a briefing on October 16, “When people send anthrax through the mail to hurt people and invoke terror, it’s a terrorist act.”

Assassination of an Israeli Cabinet Minister, October 17, 2001: A Palestinian gunman assassinated Israeli Minister of Tourism Rehavam Ze'evi in the Jerusalem hotel where he was staying. The Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP) claimed to have avenged the death of PFLP Mustafa Zubari.

Attack on a Church in Pakistan, October 28, 2001: Six masked gunmen shot up a church in Bahawalpur, Pakistan, killing 15 Pakistani Christians. No group claimed responsibility, although various militant Muslim groups were suspected.

Suicide Bombings in Jerusalem, December 1, 2001: Two suicide bombers attacked a Jerusalem shopping mall, killing 10 persons and wounding 70.

Suicide Bombing in Haifa, December 2, 2001: A suicide bomb attack aboard a bus in Haifa, Israel, killed 15 persons and wounded 40. Hamas claimed responsibility. With this attack and those on December 1 to avenge the death of a HAMAS member at the hands of Israeli forces a week earlier.

Attack on the Indian Parliament, December 13, 2001: Five gunmen attacked the Indian Parliament in New Delhi shortly after it had adjourned. Before security forces killed four of the gunmen, a fifth gunman killed six security personnel and a gardener. Indian officials blamed Lashkar-e-Taiba and demanded that Pakistan crack down on it and on other Muslim separatist groups in Kashmir.

2002

Ambush on the West Bank, January 15, 2002: Palestinian militants fired on a vehicle in Beit Sahur, killing one passenger and wounding two. The dead claimed U.S. and Israeli citizenship. The Al-Aqsa Martyrs’ Brigade claimed responsibility.

Shooting Incident in Israel, January 17, 2002: A Palestinian gunman killed 6 persons and wounded 25 in Hadera, Israel, before being killed by Israeli police. The al-Aqsa Martyrs’ Brigade claimed responsibility for the revenge for Israel’s killing of a leading member of the group.

Drive-By Shooting at a U.S. Consulate, January 22, 2002: Armed militants on motorcycles fired on the U.S. Consulate in Calcutta, India, killing 5 Indian security personnel and ainxed their leader. The Harakat-ul-Jihad-I-Islami and the Asif Raza Commandoes claimed responsibility. Indian police later killed two suspects, one of whom confessed to belonging to Lashkar-e-Taiba as he died.

Bomb Explosion in Kashmir, January 22, 2002: A bomb exploded in a crowded market in Kashmir, killing one person and injuring nine. No group claimed responsibility.

Kidnapping of Daniel Pearl, January 23, 2002: Armed militants kidnapped Wall Street Journal reporter Daniel Pearl in Karachi, Pakistan. Pakistani authorities received a video-tape on January 25 depicting Pearl’s murder. His grave was found near Karachi on May 16. Pakistani authorities arrested four suspects, Ringleader Ahmad Omar Saeed Sheikh claimed to have organized Pearl’s kidnapping to protect Pakistan’s subservience to the United States, and had belonged to Jaish-e-Muhammad, an Islamic separatist group. Four suspects were convicted on July 15. Saeed Sheikh was sentenced to death, the others to life imprisonment.

Suicide Bombing in Jerusalem, January 27, 2002: A suicide bomb attack in Jerusalem killed one person and wounded 100. The incident was the first suicide bombing made by a Palestinian suicide bomber in a public place.

Suicide Bombing in the West Bank, February 16, 2002: A suicide bomber in an outdoor food court in Karmei Shomron killed 4 persons, including 2 U.S. citizens. The dead and two of the wounded were U.S. citizens. The Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP) claimed responsibility.

Suicide Bombing in Jerusalem, March 7, 2002: A suicide bombing in a supermarket in the settlement of Ariel wounded 10 persons, one of whom was a U.S. citizen. The PFLP claimed responsibility.

Suicide Bombing in Jerusalem, March 9, 2002: A suicide bombing in a Jerusalem restaurant killed 11 persons and wounded 52, one of whom was a U.S. citizen. The al-Aqsa Martyrs’ Brigades claimed responsibility.

Drive-By Shooting in Colombia, March 14, 2002: An armed gang killed 2 U.S. citizens who had come to Call, Colombia, to negotiate the release of their father, who was a captive of the FARC. No group claimed responsibility.

Grenade Attack on a Church in Pakistan, March 17, 2002: Militants threw grenades into the Protestant International Church in Islamabad, Pakistan, during a service attended by diplomatic and local personnel. Five persons, two of them U.S. citizens, were killed and 46 were wounded. The dead Americans were from Los Angeles, California. One was Barbara Green and her daughter Kristen Wormsley. Thirteen U.S. citizens were among the wounded. The Lashkar-e-Taiba group was suspected.

Car Bomb Explosion in Peru, March 20, 2002: A car bomb exploded at a shopping center near the U.S. Embassy in Lima, Peru. Nine persons were killed and 32 wounded. The dead included two police officers and a teenager. Peruvian authorities suspected either the Shining Path rebels or the Tupac Amaru Revolutionary Movement. The attack occurred 3 days before President George W. Bush visited Peru.

Suicide Bombing in Jerusalem, March 21, 2002: A suicide bombing in Jerusalem killed 3 persons and wounded 86 more, including 2 U.S. citizens. The Palestinian Islamic Jihad claimed responsibility.

Suicide Bombing in Jerusalem, March 27, 2002: A suicide bombing in a noted restaurant in Netanya, Israel, killed 22 persons and wounded 140. One of the dead was a U.S. citizen. The Islamic Resistance Movement (HAMAS) claimed responsibility.


Suicide Bombing in the West Bank, March 31, 2002: A suicide bombing near an ambulance station in Efrat wounded four persons, including a U.S. citizen. The al-Aqsa Martyrs’ Brigades claimed responsibility.

Armed attack on Kashmir, April 2, 2002: Armed militants attacked a residence in Gujranwala, killing five persons and wounding four. No group claimed responsibility.

Synagogue Bombing in Tunisia, April 11, 2002: A car bomb detonated a truck loaded with propane gas outside a historic synagogue in Djerba, Tunisia. The 16 dead included 11 Germans, one French citizen, and three Tunisians. Twenty-six German tourists were injured. The Islamic Army for the Liberation of the Holy Sites claimed responsibility.

Suicide Bombing in Jerusalem, April 12, 2002: A female suicide bomber killed 6 persons in Jerusalem and wounded 90 others. The al-Aqsa Martyrs’ Brigades claimed responsibility.

Car Bombing in Pakistan, May 8, 2002: A car bomb exploded near a Pakistani navy shuttle bus in Karachi, killing 12 persons and wounding 20. Eleven of the wounded were French nationals. Al-Qaida was suspected of the attack.

Parade Bombing in Russia, May 9, 2002: A remotely-controlled bomb exploded near a May Day parade in Kaspiisk, Dagestan, killing 42 persons and wounding 130. Fourteen of the dead and 50 of the wounded were soldiers. Islamists linked to al-Qaida were suspected.

Attack on a Bus in India, May 14, 2002: Militants fired on a passenger bus in Kalachak, Jammu, killing 7 persons. They then entered a military housing complex and killed 3 soldiers and 7 military dependents before they were killed. The Al-Mansooran and Jamiat-ul-Mujahedin claimed responsibility.

Bomb Attacks in Kashmir, May 17, 2002: A bomb explosion near a civil secretariat area in Srinagar, Kashmir, injured citizens. In Jammu, a bomb exploded at a fire services headquarters, killing two and wounding 16. No group claimed responsibility for either attack.

Hostage Rescue Attempt in the Philippines, June 7, 2002: Philippine Army troops attacked Abu Sayyaf terrorists on Mindanao Island in an attempt to rescue U.S. citizen Martin Burnham and his wife Gracia, who had been kidnapped more than a year ago. Burnham was killed but his wife, though gravely wounded, was freed. A Filipino hostage, Pedro was killed, as were four of the guerrillas. Seven soldiers were wounded.

Bombing in Pakistan, June 14, 2002: A car bomb exploded near the U.S. Consulate and the Marriott Hotel in Karachi, Pakistan. Eleven persons were killed and 51 were wounded, including 11 Japanese citizens. Al-Qaida and al-Qain were suspected.

Suicide Bombing in Jerusalem, June 19, 2002: A suicide bomber detonated a bus at a shopping street in Jerusalem, killing 7 persons. The Israeli police claimed responsibility.

Bombing in Kuwait, July 7, 2002: Two suicide bombers attacked the old bus station in Tel Aviv, Israel, killing 5 persons and wounding 38. The dead included one Romanian and one Czech. The main suspect was wounded. The Islamic Jihad claimed responsibility.
Bombing at the Hebrew University, July 31, 2003: A bomb hidden in a bag in the Frank Sinatra International Student Center of Jerusalem’s Hebrew University killed 9 persons and wounded 16. Six of the dead were in 11 persons; 11 were wounded, and wounded 50. One of the dead was a Romanian. HAMAS claimed responsibility.

Suicide Bombing in Israel, August 2, 2003: A suicide bomb attack on a bus in Safed, Israel, killed 9 persons and wounded 50. Two of the dead were Philippine citizens; many of the wounded were soldiers returning from leave. HAMAS claimed responsibility.

Attacks in Pakistan, August 5, 2003: Gunmen attacked a Christian school attended by children of missionaries from around the world. Six persons (two security guards, a cook, a receptionist, and a private citizen) were killed and a Philippine citizen was wounded. A group called al-Intiqami al-Pakistani claimed responsibility.

Attacks on Pilgrims in Kashmir, August 6, 2003: Armed militants attacked a group of Hindu pilgrims with guns and grenades in Pahalgam. Nine persons were killed and 32 were wounded. The Lashkare-Tayyiba claimed responsibility.


Suicide Bomb Attack in Israel, September 19, 2003: A suicide bomb attack on a bus in Tel Aviv killed 6 persons and wounded 52. One of the dead was a British subject. HAMAS claimed responsibility.

Attacks on a French Tanker, October 6, 2003: An explosive-laden boat rammed the French oil tanker Limburg, which was anchored about 5 miles off al-Dhabbah, Yemen. One person was killed and 4 were wounded. Al-Qaeda claimed responsibility.

Car Bomb Explosion in Bali, October 12, 2003: A car bomb exploded outside the Sari Club Discotheque in Denpasar, Bali, Indonesia, killing 12 persons and wounding 80 more. Most of the casualities, including 8 of the dead, were Australian tourists. Seven Americans were among the dead. Al-Qaeda claimed responsibility. Two suspects were later arrested and convicted. Iman Samudra, who had trained in Afghanistan with al-Qaeda and was suspected of belonging to Jemaah Islamiya, was sentenced to death on September 10, 2003.

Chechen Rebels Seize a Moscow Theater, October 23, 2004: The Chechen rebels, led by Movsar Barayev seized the Palace of Culture Theater in Moscow, Russia, to demand an end to the war in Chechnya. They seized more than 800 hostages from 15 countries and threatened to blow up the theater during a three-day siege, they killed a Russian policeman and five Russian hostages. On October 26, Russian special forces pumped in anesthetic gas through the ventilation system and then stormed the theater. All of the rebels were killed, but 94 hostages (including one American, 26 French, and 40 others) were freed. One of the dead was a Dutch citizen. The wounded included an American, a Canadian, an Australian, and two Chinese. Chechen authorities suspected the Jemaah Islamiya and the Taliban claimed responsibility.

Suicide Bombing in Haifa, March 30, 2003: A suicide bombing in a cafe in Netanya, Israel, wounded 38 persons. Only the bomber was killed. Islamic Jihad claimed responsibility, and called the attack a “gift” to the people of Iraq.

Successful Hostage Rescue Attempt in Colombia, May 5, 2003: The FARC killed 10 members of the Italian Ministry of Interior since the Chechen rebel attack. The kidnapped were released. The hostage rescue was carried out by the Italian Interior Ministry.

The hostage rescue was carried out by the Italian Interior Ministry.

Suicide Bombings in Tel Aviv, January 5, 2005: Two suicide bomb attacks killed 23 and wounded 70 in Tel Aviv, Israel. Six of the victims were foreign workers. The Al-Aqsa Martyrs’ Brigades claimed responsibility.

Night Club Bombing in Colombia, February 7, 2003: A car bomb exploded outside a night club in Bogota, Colombia, killing 32 persons and wounding 60. No group claimed responsibility, but Colombian officials suspected the Colombian Revolutionary Armed Forces (FARC) of committing the worst terrorist attack in the country in a decade.

Assassination of a Kurdish Leader, February 8, 2005: Members of Ansar al-Islam assassinated a Kurdish legislator, Rashid Haji Mushir, and three other Kurdish officials in Qamash Tapa in northern Iraq.

Suicide Bombing in Haiti, March 5, 2003: A suicide bombing a house in Haiti. Israeli, wounded 38 persons and wounded at least 40. One of the dead was an American and Israeli citizenship. The bomber’s affiliation was not immediately known.

Suicide Bombing in Netanya, March 30, 2003: A suicide bombing in a cafe in Netanya, Israel, wounded 38 persons. The only bomber was killed. Islamic Jihad claimed responsibility, and called the attack a “gift” to the people of Iraq.

Unsuccessful Hostage Rescue Attempt in Colombia, May 5, 2003: The FARC killed 10 members of the Italian Ministry of Interior since the Chechen rebel attack. The kidnapped were released. The hostage rescue was carried out by the Italian Interior Ministry.

The hostage rescue was carried out by the Italian Interior Ministry.

Suicide Bombings in Tel Aviv, January 5, 2005: Two suicide bomb attacks killed 23 and wounded 70 in Tel Aviv, Israel. Six of the victims were foreign workers. The Al-Aqsa Martyrs’ Brigades claimed responsibility.

Night Club Bombing in Colombia, February 7, 2003: A car bomb exploded outside a night club in Bogota, Colombia, killing 32 persons and wounding 60. No group claimed responsibility, but Colombian officials suspected the Colombian Revolutionary Armed Forces (FARC) of committing the worst terrorist attack in the country in a decade.

Assassination of a Kurdish Leader, February 8, 2005: Members of Ansar al-Islam assassinated a Kurdish legislator, Rashid Haji Mushir, and three other Kurdish officials in Qamash Tapa in northern Iraq.

Suicide Bombing in Haiti, March 5, 2003: A suicide bombing a house in Haiti. Israeli, wounded 38 persons and wounded at least 40. One of the dead was an American and Israeli citizenship. The bomber’s affiliation was not immediately known.

Suicide Bombing in Netanya, March 30, 2003: A suicide bombing in a cafe in Netanya, Israel, wounded 38 persons. The only bomber was killed. Islamic Jihad claimed responsibility, and called the attack a “gift” to the people of Iraq.

Unsuccessful Hostage Rescue Attempt in Colombia, May 5, 2003: The FARC killed 10 members of the Italian Ministry of Interior since the Chechen rebel attack. The kidnapped were released. The hostage rescue was carried out by the Italian Interior Ministry.

The hostage rescue was carried out by the Italian Interior Ministry.
person and wounded 14. The second, at a bus stop near the Ariel settlement in the West Bank, killed one person and wounded 3. The al-Aqsa Martyrs’ Brigades claimed responsibility. HAMAS claimed responsibility for the second.

Bombing of the UN Headquarters in Baghdad, August 19, 2003: A truck loaded with surplus agricultural equipment, thrown by the United Nations Headquarters in Baghdad’s Canal Hotel. A hospital across the street was also heavily damaged. The 23 dead included UN Special Representative Sergio Vieira de Mello. More than 100 persons were wounded. It was not clear whether the bomber was a Baath Party loyalist or a foreign Islamic militant. An al-Qaeda branch claimed responsibility for the attack.

Suicide Bombing in Jerusalem, August 19, 2003: A suicide bombing aboard a bus in Jerusalem killed 20 persons and injured at least 100, one of whom died later. Five of the dead were American citizens. HAMAS claimed responsibility, although HAMAS leader al-Rantisi said that his organization remained committed to the truce while preserving the right to respond to Israeli military actions.

Car Bomb Kills Shi’ite Leader in Najaf, August 29, 2003: A car bomb explosion outside the Sunni Al Hadi in Najaf killed at least 81 persons and wounded at least 140. The dead included the Ayatollah Mohammed Bakir al-Hakim, one of four leading Shi’ite and Sunni figures in Iraq. Mr. Bakir al-Hakim had been the leader of the Supreme Council for the Islamic Revolution in Iraq (SCRI) since its establishment in 1982. SCRI had recently agreed to work with the U.S.-sponsored Iraqi Governing Council. It was not known whether the perpetrators were Baath Party loyalists, rival Shi’ites, or foreign Islamic militants.

Suicide Bombing in Israel, September 9, 2003: Two suicide bombings took place in Israel. The first, at a bus stop near the Tarifin army base southeast of Tel Aviv, killed one person and wounded 3. The al-Aqsa Martyrs’ Brigades claimed responsibility.

A suicide bomber东南 of Tel Aviv, Israel. The first, at a bus stop near the 2003: Two suicide bombings took place in Islamists.

Suicide Bombing in Jerusalem, September 19, 2003: A suicide bombing outside the Shom Ali in Nablus killed at least 81 persons and wounded at least 140. The dead included the Ayatollah Mohammed Bakir al-Hakim, one of four leading Shi’ite and Sunni figures in Iraq. Mr. Bakir al-Hakim had been the leader of the Supreme Council for the Islamic Revolution in Iraq (SCRI) since its establishment in 1982. SCRI had recently agreed to work with the U.S.-sponsored Iraqi Governing Council. It was not known whether the perpetrators were Baath Party loyalists, rival Shi’ites, or foreign Islamic militants.

Mr. DODD. I know the Senate would like to vote quickly and I am prepared
to do so. I thank the Senator for his patience and indulgence.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. I appreciate the concern of the Senator from Connecticut and I know he is hard in this area, but the response to this amendment is not bureaucratic. The response to this amendment focuses on the fact that this bill, and our efforts as a Nation, must be threat based as we address terrorism.

I was interested today in a quote from Mayor Bloomberg in one of the New York papers. He essentially said if a professional terrorist, whose purpose was to kill Americans indiscriminately, wishes to attack the transit systems of New York, it is virtually impossible to stop that individual at the site of the attack.

Where do you stop that individual? You stop him by obtaining the intelligence necessary to interdict him before he can attack us. The energy we in this Nation are putting in the area of fighting terrorism is to do exactly that.

One of the primary reasons we are fighting in Iraq, one of the primary reasons we have the PA-TRIOT Act is to develop the intelligence necessary to interdict terrorists before we can attack us. The amendment dramatically exceeds the budget and is therefore subject to a point of order, which I have made, and the motion to waive has been made by the Senator from Connecticut, and we will have a vote on it.

So at this time, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 6:30 this evening, the following new amendments be in order to a series of votes in relation to the following amendments and the motions where pending; further, that no second-degree amendments be in order to any amendments prior to the vote, and that there be 2 minutes equally divided for debate prior to each vote. The first amendment will be the Dodd amendment, a motion to waive the budget point of order, and the second amendment would be Akaka amendment No. 1112, and on that amendment there will also be a point of order. If the vote will be on the motion to waive the point of order since that amendment also significantly exceeds the budget allocation of this committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Mr. COLEMAN. Is there an objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the quorum call to be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1112, AS MODIFIED

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask that the pending amendment be set aside and the amendment No. 1112 of Senator AKAKA be placed in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I raise a point of order under section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act that the amendment by Senator AKAKA provides spending in excess of the subcommittee’s 302(b) allocation.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, in accordance with section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I move to waive the applicable sections of that act for purposes of the pending amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be a sufficient second. The yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. GREGG. It is my understanding that we will now have a vote on Senator DODD’s amendment, on the motion to waive the Budget Act, followed by a vote on Senator AKAKA’s motion to waive the Budget Act. I should inform Members that we actually are going to have three other votes following those two votes as soon as we line them up. The first vote will begin at 6:30.

I think Senator AKAKA wanted time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. AKAKA. I thank the Chair. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator SARBAES be added as a cosponsor to my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I rise today to speak briefly on my first responder amendment to the Homeland Security appropriations bill.

The distinguished chairman of the Homeland Security Subcommittee has cited $7 billion in unspent first responder grants as justification for reducing first responder funding in fiscal year 2006. I wish to take a moment to respond to the statement. First, much of the $7 billion figure has been legally obligated for specific purposes or in some cases even already spent. As the DHS inspector general observed in a March 2004 report on the distribution of first responder grants, the amount of funds drawn down by States provide an incomplete picture of the progress States and local jurisdictions are making. A more accurate way to monitor progress would be to identify the amount of funds obligated and spent by the States and local jurisdictions.

Following this approach and looking at data received from DHS, virtually all the money that has been awarded to...
States in prior years under the three main homeland security first responder grant programs has been obligated.

Second, the $7 billion includes fiscal year 2005 grant funds which were only made available to States by DHS very recently and could not reasonably be expected to have already been spent in the middle of the same fiscal year.

We should not punish first responders for bureaucratic procedures and red tape, and then not afford to take resources away from its first responders at a time when we rely on them more than ever.

Mr. President, I urge support of our amendment. I have asked for the yeas and nays, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to support this amendment to the fiscal year 2006 Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill to provide additional funding for our first responders and preventers—the men and women who go to work every day to keep our communities safe, and who rush into the face of disaster when it happens.

Last Thursday, the world saw again with the despicable attacks in London that terrorists are still capable of killing innocent civilians. It is yet another wake up call to all of us, and a sign that we cannot let down our guard. We must stay vigilant.

Given these pronouncements, it is wrong to leave our police, firefighters, and emergency medical workers under-trained and under-equipped to protect American citizens. We would never consider denying the training and equipment needs of our men and women fighting in Iraq and we should not deny the training and equipment needs of those we rely on to protect us in the war on terror at home.

Yet that is exactly what this spending bill does. It sends the wrong message not only to first responders and the state and local officials struggling to continue to prepare for new threats. It also sends a dangerous message of complacency to the public.

The amendment that Senator AKAKA and I are offering today would boost our first responder spending by $587 million—to restore three key grants programs to last year’s funding levels. Those grant programs are the State Homeland Security Grant Program, the Urban Areas Security Initiative, and the First Assistance Grant Program.

The amendment that Senator AKAKA and I are offering today would boost our first responder spending by $587 million—to restore three key grants programs to last year’s funding levels. Those grant programs are the State Homeland Security Grant Program, the Urban Areas Security Initiative, and the First Assistance Grant Program.

Opponents of this amendment will argue that Congress has already appropriated billions of dollars for first responders and preventers since September 11, and that some $7 billion remains unspent in the pipeline. This is a common misperception.

First, that spending figure includes fiscal year 2005 grant funds—funds that were only made available to states by DHS very recently and that could not reasonably be expected to have already been spent in the middle of the same fiscal year. Second, the $7 billion refers to money that has not actually been “drawn down” from the U.S. Treasury. Much of this money, however, has been legally obligated for specific purposes or in some cases even already spent. As DHS’s inspector general observed in a March 2004 report on the distribution of first responder grants, “The amounts of funds drawn down by states provide an incomplete picture of the progress states and local jurisdictions are making.” A more accurate way to monitor progress would be to identify the amount of funds obligated and spent (outlays) by the states and local jurisdictions.”

Following this approach and looking at data we have received from the Department of Homeland Security, it appears that virtually all the money that has been awarded to States in prior years under the three main homeland security first responder grant programs—the Homeland Security Grant Program, the Urban Area Security Initiative, USASI, and the Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Program, has been obligated.

At any rate, the billions we have appropriated over the years still pale by comparison to what most experts—Republican and Democrat—say is needed to adequately prepare our first responders and preventers. In June 2003, a nonpartisan task force chaired by former Senator Bob Graham and former Senator Warren Rudman reported that—over the next 5 years—we will under fund the needs of critical emergency responders by nearly $100 billion. And that figure was arrived at based on maintaining 2003 funding levels.

The task force found that, on average, fire departments had enough radios to equip only half the firefighters on a shift, and breathing apparatuses for only one-third. Just 10 percent had the proper protective gear needed to respond to a building collapse; and police departments did not have the protective gear needed to secure the site of a WMD attack. These dismal numbers may have improved somewhat since 2003, but no one has suggested that our level of preparedness is near where it should be.

On the key issue of first responder communications interoperability—the top priority of State and local homeland security advisors—the task force recommended spending almost $7 billion over 5 years. And DHS estimates the cost of modernizing first responder communications infrastructure at $40 billion. No wonder most States have not yet achieved interoperability.

In March, New York’s Center for Catastrophe Preparedness and Response reported that emergency medical workers generally lack not only proper equipment but also proper training. At a Homeland Security Governmental Affairs Committee hearing in April, we heard disturbing testimony that first responders are often not prepared to respond adequately to accidents at chemical facilities, leaving the American public dangerously exposed, even more so if there is a deliberate release caused by terrorists.

I cannot say it often enough: our first responders are on the frontlines of the war on terror here at home, and we must equip and train them to do their jobs safely and effectively. Words of praise are useless. They need dollars—dollars to help train and equip State and local police, firefighters, and emergency medical technicians to help detect or disrupt terrorist activity before an attack occurs or to save as many lives as possible and contain the damage if an attack occurs.

This amendment is a modest proposal—$587 million—and it seeks primarily to halt to downward trend in funding for our Nation’s first responders, and important, and I hope achievable goal. Last year, we spent more on Mars exploration. I have consistently advocated that we spend much more to make sure that first responders have the training and equipment they need to keep the American people safe. For example, earlier this year, I proposed to the Budget and Appropriations Committee that we spend $1.2 billion more for first responders and preventers, consistent with the advice of experts who have told us that we need to invest billions more to secure our homeland security needs.

Yet this appropriations bill reflects, once again, an ill-advised administration strategy to reduce funding for first responders for the second year in a row. This is no time to retreat. I urge my colleagues to support this modest but urgent effort to meet our homeland security needs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I appreciate the work of the Senator from Hawaii. He is always a very positive and effective spokesperson for the Senate for a variety of different issues. He brings this amendment forward. The simple fact is that you can’t disregard the fact that there is $7 billion in the pipeline for first responders—$3 billion from the year 2004, $4 billion from 2005—that hasn’t been spent. This bill puts another $4 billion into these accounts, so we are not shorting these accounts. One of the reasons the Senate has offered this bill is it takes money from first responders that is not going to be spent and moves it over to Border Patrol where we do need the money, moves it over to weapons of mass destruction where we do
need the money, and that is the priority we set as a committee, in a bipartisan way, because this has been, as I mentioned a number of times, a threat-based bill. This is the first time this bill has been brought forth recently, or ever, really, based on threat, and we determined the threat was weaponization of mass destruction and border porosity. The fact there were $7 billion in the pipeline, retaining $4 billion in this account we felt was an adequate amount, and those accounts for first responders, knowing that down the road we are going to put more money into first responders as it can be absorbed. But to put more in now would mean just holding it, and that money can be much more efficiently used as we propose to use it by adding more Border Patrol agents and detention beds, and more aggressive attempts to fight the use of a weapon of mass destruction against us. So that is why we are opposed to this approach.

Clearly, it breaks the allocation which we have received. Therefore, it would be $587 million to the deficit, which would also be inappropriate, and that is why the point of order lies against it and that is why we oppose it at this point.

I understand we are now on a minute equally divided on the Dodd amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The understanding is 2 minutes equally divided.

Mr. DODD. The chairman is very gracious. He has probably worn out his patience on this amendment.

This amendment is an extraordinary amendment. I fully understand that. I believe the events, particularly over the last week, have highlighted the extraordinary times we are in and the challenges we face.

The bulk of the $16 billion is not to first responders but to harbors, port and chemical plants where there is great vulnerability today.

Yesterday, I was in Seville, Spain, attending a conference. I rode the train from Seville to Madrid and arrived in the same station where the attacks occurred in March of 2004. My luggage, when I got on the train in Seville to go to Madrid, was quickly checked through a scanning system. We have nothing like that.

I am not suggesting had something like that existed in London the problem could have been avoided. I know terrorist groups have used other means to attack as they did that day, but it minimizes the possibility.

The vulnerabilities we have in our country today in the areas I have described demand attention. With all due respect this bill is a reduction in funding for these areas, not an increase. We ought to be doing more. This amendment is a large amount, but to do less would be a tragedy. I hope the waiver will be adopted.

Mr. GREGG. This is $16 billion, $16 billion into an account where there presently is sitting $7 billion in the bank.

We as a nation obviously have a lot of vulnerabilities because we are an open society. I wish we could cover them all. But the simple fact is there is not enough money to cover them all. We need to prioritize. This bill does that. This amendment basically flies in the face of good judgment of the dollars because we simply could not spend these types of dollars if they were appropriately effectively. They may get spent but not effectively, in our opinion.

It is much more appropriate to look at addressing weapons of mass destruction, border patrol, airline security, and to make sure we have in place the proper systems in order to protect the homeland through these assessment programs which are going forward before we put a large amount of money—$16 billion, which would be half the budget of the Homeland Security agency—into new spending initiatives or additional spending initiatives, the $4 billion in the bill and the $7 billion in the pipeline.

The point of order has been made. This is a motion to waive it. This amendment would add $16 billion to the deficit. We do not think it would accomplish what its purpose is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is now agreeing to the motion to waive the Budget Act with respect to Dodd amendment No. 1202, as modified. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MCDONNELL. The following Senators were necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT), and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), and the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) are necessarily absent.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, we have nearly $7 billion previously appropriated on the Akaka amendment. The Senator from Hawaii is recognized.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, we have been very concerned about first responders and funding they really need. My amendment simply seeks to maintain the fiscal year 2005 funding for first responders. Our country cannot afford to take the resources away from them. I urge support of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, this amendment adds $587 million in new spending to first responder grants, above the levels provided already in the bill. There is no offset. The bill already provides $3.4 billion for first responder grants. In addition, there is nearly $7 billion previously appropriated that State and locals have available to spend at this time for first responders. The funding pipeline is full of dollars. This amendment will cause the subcommittee to exceed its 302(b) allocation. The Budget Act point of order should be sustained.
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Have the yeas and nays been ordered? The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to the motion to waive the Budget Act with respect to the Akaka amendment No. 1122, as modified.

The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. The following Senator was necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), and the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) are necessarily absent.

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 319. It is the sense of the Senate that the Federal Emergency Management Agency or any other organization within the Department of Homeland Security, or any other organization within the Department of Defense, continues to coordinate with the American Red Cross in developing a mass care plan for the United States in response to a catastrophic event.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To authorize and direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to designate Natrona County International Airport, Wyoming, as an airport at which certain private aircraft in the United States from a foreign area may land for processing by the United States Customs and Border Protection, and for other purposes.

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 319. It is the sense of the Senate that the Federal Emergency Management Agency or any other organization within the Department of Homeland Security, or any other organization within the Department of Defense, continues to coordinate with the American Red Cross in developing a mass care plan for the United States in response to a catastrophic event.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment, as modified, be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment (No. 1173), as modified, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1171, AS MODIFIED

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order on Senator McCain’s amendment No. 1171, as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is now pending.

AMENDMENT NO. 1221 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1171, AS MODIFIED

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I send a second-degree amendment on behalf of Senator HATCH to Senator McCain’s amendment No. 1171.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows: The Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. GRANGE), for Mr. HATCH, proposes an amendment numbered 1221 to amendment No. 1171, as modified.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To clarify the source of funds allocated under amendment No. 1171 to H.R. 2360.

(A) On line 3, page 2, strike ‘‘..’’ and insert ‘‘..’’.

(B) Add at the end, ‘‘provided that the balance shall be allocated from the funds available to the Secretary of Homeland Security for States, urban areas, or regions based on risks; threats; vulnerabilities pursuant to Homeland Security Presidential Directive 8 (HSPD-8).’’

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the second-degree amendment offered by Senator HATCH be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 1221) was agreed to.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 10 a.m. tomorrow, the Senate proceed to a series of roll call votes in relation to the following amendments or motions where pending; further, that no second-degree amendments be in order to any of the amendments prior to the votes, and that there be two minutes equally divided for debate prior to each vote; finally, that the first vote in the series be 15 minutes, with the remaining votes in the series limited to 10 minutes each.

The first amendment will be Senators ENZIGN and MCCAIN second-degree amendment No. 1219; the second amendment will be Senator SCHUMER’s amendment No. 1189; third will be Senator SCHUMER’s amendment No. 1190; fourth will be Senator MCCAIN’s amendment No. 1171, as modified, as amended by the Hatch amendment; and fifth will be Senator STABENOW’s amendment No. 1217.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, 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.
Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1161

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 1161, which is at the desk. I wish to have it reported. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The Assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], for himself, Mr. BIDEN, and Mr. KENNEHY, proposes an amendment numbered 1161.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate on the submittal to Congress of a report on performance indicators in Iraq)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

Sec. 1. (a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:


(II) The report requires performance standards and goals for security, economic, and security force training objectives in Iraq together with a notional timetable for achieving these goals.

(III) In specific, the report required, at a minimum, the following:

(A) With respect to stability and security in Iraq, the following:

(i) Key measures of political stability, including the important political milestones that must be achieved over the next several years;

(ii) The primary indicators of a stable security environment in Iraq, such as number of engagements per day, numbers of trained Iraqi forces, and trends relating to numbers and types of ethnic and religious-based hostile encounters.

(iii) An assessment of the estimated strength of the insurgency in Iraq and the extent to which it is composed of non-Iraqi fighters.

(iv) A description of all militias operating in Iraq, including the number, size, equipment strength, military effectiveness, sources of support, legal status, and efforts to disarm or reintegrate each militia.

(v) An estimate of economic activity that should be considered the most important for determining the prospects of stability in Iraq, including—

(1) unemployment levels;

(2) electricity, water, and oil production rates; and

(3) hunger and poverty levels;

(vi) The criteria the Administration will use to determine when it is safe to begin withdrawing United States forces from Iraq.

(B) With respect to the training and performance of security forces in Iraq, the following:

(i) The training provided Iraqi military and other Ministry of Defense forces, goals for achieving certain capability and readiness levels (as well as for recruiting, training, and equipping these forces), and the milestones and notional timetable for achieving these goals.

(ii) The operational readiness status of the Iraqi military forces, including the type, number, size, and organizational structure of Iraqi battalions that are comprised by the extent to which it is composed of non-Iraqi fighters, and the equipment used by these forces.

(iii) The capability to conduct counter-terrorism operations independently;

(iv) The capability to conduct counter-insurgency operations with the support of United States or coalition forces; or

(v) Key indicators of economic activity, the number of candidates derived from other entry procedures, and the success rates of those groups of candidates; the number of Iraqi police forces who have received field training by international police trainers and the duration of such instruction; and

(vi) Attraction rates and measures of absenteeism and infiltration by insurgents.

(c) The Senate makes the following recommendations:

(I) The training provided Iraqi military and other Ministry of Defense forces, goals for achieving certain capability and readiness levels (as well as for recruiting, training, and equipping these forces), and the milestones and notional timetable for achieving these goals.

(II) The operational readiness status of the Iraqi military forces, including the type, number, size, and organizational structure of Iraqi battalions that are—

(i) capable of conducting counter-terrorism operations independently;

(ii) capable of conducting counter-insurgency operations with the support of United States or coalition forces; or

(III) not ready to conduct counter-insurgency operations on their own.

(IV) The criteria the Administration will use to determine when it is safe to begin withdrawing United States forces from Iraq.

(V) The availability of accurate data on key performance indicators, including the number of police recruits that have received classroom training and the duration of such instruction;

(VI) The number of police candidates screened by the Iraqi Police Screening Service, the number of candidates derived from other entry procedures, and the success rates of those groups of candidates;

(VII) The number of Iraqi police forces who have received field training by international police trainers and the duration of such instruction; and

(VIII) The effectiveness of the Iraqi military and police officer cadres and the chain of command.

(2) The report should be provided by the Department of Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Tsunami Relief, 2005 as soon as possible; and

(3) The Secretary of Defense should communicate to Congress and the American people why the report was not submitted to Congress by the original deadline for its submittal.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, in the 2005 Iraq Emergency Supplemental Appropriations bill, the House and Senate conferees agreed to an extensive set of Defense Department reporting and benchmarking requirements on Iraq that addressed the security, economic, reconstruction, and governance areas. This report was due on July 11, and has not been provided to Congress.

This amendment conveys the Sense of the Senate that this information is critical to formulating a strategy for success and that the report should be delivered to Congress as soon as possible.

Over the last few weeks, the American people have been assured by the administration that they have a strategy for success in Iraq. Unfortunately, too often the rhetoric and excesses of senior administration officials have left an impression with the American people of a credibility gap.

Overly optimistic statements such as that by the Vice President that the insurgency is in its ‘last throes’ have not matched what real experts, including the administration’s own intelligence analysts and senior military officers, have said about the challenges ahead.

With all this obfuscation, the American people are right to be concerned and right to demand that the administration report more cold, hard facts about Iraq on a regular basis. As the administration asks Congress for billions more in funding for the Iraq war in coming months, on top of the more than $218 billion we have provided so far, the American people are entitled to information measuring whether those resources are having an impact and moving the ball forward in Iraq.

Let me remind my colleagues that this is important not just for our debate about Iraq but for our debate about other priorities such as homeland security. We spend more on Iraq in one month than 57 percent of the first responders in an entire year. Since 9/11, we have spent $500 million on mass transit security—amount that we...
spend every 3 days in our operations in Iraq. This puts a premium on ensuring the taxpayers’ money is being well spent.

We won’t know whether our strategy in Iraq is making true progress until real results are coming in.

The amendment is a reminder that the first of these report cards from the administration was due this past Monday, and that the representatives of the people in Congress are waiting.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1075

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order with respect to amendment No. 1075. It is Senator Voinovich’s amendment.

Mr. GREGG. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order with respect to amendment No. 1151. It is Senator M. McConnell’s amendment.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1075

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order with respect to amendment No. 1075. It is Senator Voinovich’s amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is pending.

Mr. GREGG. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order with respect to amendment No. 1151. It is Senator M. McConnell’s amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is pending.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order with respect to amendment No. 1151. It is Senator M. McConnell’s amendment.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE FIRST QUARTER ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, as we return from the celebrations marking our Nation’s Independence Day, we should take a moment to mark the accomplishments of this Senate as we conclude the first quarter of the 109th Session of the U.S. Congress.

The list of accomplishments is impressive.

Judges to our circuit courts of appeals, stalled for years, now sit on the bench. Key legislative initiatives, once left to languish, are now the law of the land or on the brink of completion.

Class action reform protects plaintiffs from abusive coupon settlements while it prevents lawyers from gaming the system.

It had been delayed for at least a decade despite strong public support and legislative majorities. Now it has been signed into law by President Bush.

So too was a bankruptcy reform bill that ushers in a new emphasis on personal responsibility. It is another reform of our civil justice system that was long delayed, despite broad support.

We met our responsibilities to defend freedom, and the challenges of continuing to wage war on terrorism, with an emergency funding bill for Iraq.

We responded to the heart-breaking human cry for help by funding international relief efforts for victims of the Southeast Asian tsunami.

The budget resolution, which sets the vision of this nation, was completed and now permits smooth consideration of appropriations bills, tax relief measures, the highway bill, the energy bill and numerous other initiatives.

After failures to enact a budget in two of the last three sessions, getting this one in place means we are on course to meeting the President’s goal of cutting the deficit in half while funding our important priorities of health, education, veterans, and homeland security.

When we’ve found that our budget needed to be adjusted to meet the medical needs of veterans, we voted to make the adjustments to ensure veterans have the health care they need this year as well as next.

We now are poised to soon enact a highway bill that will help Americans get where they need to go more quickly and safely, and will help create jobs within our States as well. We have the chance to conference now on an Energy bill that will help reduce our national dependence on foreign sources of oil and prevent blackouts like the one that hit the Northeast United States in 2003.

We made the homeland safer by passing the Real ID provision. These provisions tighten our borders, reform our asylum system, and safeguard our identity documents so that terrorists cannot use them to avoid detection.

We’ve broken the unprecedented three-year filibuster of President Bush’s judicial nominees who finally received up-or-down votes. Now, Judges Owen, Pryor, Brown, Griffith, McKeague, and Griffin have each taken their oaths and assumed the Federal appellate bench.

Most recently, the Senate has expanded the benefits of free trade, economic opportunity, and political stability to new regions of our own hemisphere with Senate passage of the Central American Free Trade Agreement.

We’ve made a good down payment on the appropriations process by passing the Interior, Legislative Branch, and Energy and Water.

And finally, this week we have paid our respects and expressed our condolences to the victims of the London terrorist bombings, and are proceeding to work on funding our own homeland security needs.

Freedom never had a greater ally than the valiant United Kingdom, and the United Kingdom will never have a greater friend than America. Our prayers are with that great nation today.

That is an incredible body of achievement in just six months. Where once there was inaction there is now a wave of accomplishment. We have done what the American people sent us here to do.

I hope everyone enjoyed the Fourth of July weekend and paused for a moment to celebrate the fact behind those fireworks—that government of, for, and by the people can work, and that the accomplishments of this Senate show that it does work.

ETHIOPIA

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, today I rise to express concern about recent events in Ethiopia. On May 15, 2005, 90 percent of registered Ethiopian voters went to the polls in the country’s third election under its current constitution. Unfortunately, this historic election was marred by a disputed outcome. Because of the controversy over the election, civil unrest ensued. In responding to protests by opposition parties, the Government of Ethiopia acted with excessive force, killing 36 protestors and arresting large numbers of demonstrators.

Final results of the May election were due to be completed by the National Electoral Board first by June 8, then by July 8, and are still ongoing. Interim certified results from the Electoral Board indicate that approximately 40 percent of the vote is either still under investigation or in need of tallying.

Two regions of the country still to cast its ballots.

Let me be crystal clear that the Government of Ethiopia must respect the