

quantities. These chemicals are extremely hazardous and identical to those used as weapons during the First World War.

Today, there are 111 facilities in the country where a catastrophic chemical release could threaten more than 1 million people. These plants represent some of the most attractive targets for terrorists looking to cause widespread death and destruction.

Despite this, security at our chemical plants is voluntary—left to the individual plant owners. While many chemical plant owners have taken steps to beef up security, too many have not. In Illinois, there have been recent reports by ABC-7 in Chicago of chemical plants with dilapidated fences, insufficient guard forces, and unprotected tanks of hazardous chemicals. These plants are basically stationary weapons of mass destruction. Their security is light, their facilities are easily entered, and their contents are deadly.

Nearly five years after September 11, the Federal Government has done virtually nothing to secure chemical plants. It is one of the great failures of this administration that needs to be addressed this year.

The Lautenberg-Obama bill is a huge step forward. It protects our communities in a responsible, but balanced way. There are features of this bill that should be a part of any chemical security legislation passed by this Congress.

Our legislation is risk-based. While all chemical facilities would have to take a number of concrete steps to improve security, only the highest-risk facilities would be subject to bill's strictest scrutiny and regulation by the Department of Homeland Security. These high-priority facilities would have to perform vulnerability assessments, develop prevention and response plans, submit to unscheduled inspections, and perform practice drills.

Our legislation is strict, but fair. Our bill replaces volunteer security standards with clearly defined Federal duties and regulations. While plant owners would not be able to substitute their own security standards, they would be able to come up with security plans that are tailored to each facility. And while the bill includes tough penalties for noncompliant facilities including strict fines and the threat of shutting down plants, it also minimizes duplicative requirements under other Federal laws.

The Lautenberg-Obama bill also protects state and local rights to establish security standards that match their local needs. States like New Jersey have been leaders in chemical security, and we do not want to cut these efforts off at the knees. The legislation also gives employees a seat at the table, by creating employee security committees, ensuring that employees are part of the security planning process, establishing security training requirements, and establishing tough whistleblower protections.

Our bill also includes all the methods to reduce risk. Our legislation requires security forces, perimeter defenses, hazard mitigation and emergency response. These are the "guns, gates and guards" that prevent terrorists from attacking plants and minimize the impact of an attack. But there are other ways to reduce risk that need to be part of the equation. Specifically, by employing safer technologies, we can reduce the attractiveness of chemical plants as a target.

This concept, known as Inherently Safer Technology, involves methods such as changing the flow of chemical processes to avoid dangerous chemical byproducts, reducing the pressures or temperatures of chemical reactions to minimize the risk of explosions, reducing inventories of dangerous chemicals and replacing dangerous chemicals with benign ones. Each one of these methods reduces the danger that chemical plants pose to our communities and makes them less appealing targets for terrorists.

The concept of IST was created thirty years ago by chemical industry insiders, and it has been embraced at different times by the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Justice, the Environmental Protection Agency, foreign governments and states like New Jersey. Even the chemical industry itself has embraced IST, and many facilities across the country have already employed safer technologies.

Unfortunately, the chemical industry has been lobbying nonstop on this bill. They do not want IST, they do not want protection of state laws and they do not want strict regulations. So far, because the industry wields so much influence in Washington, it's been getting its way. For example, the Department of Homeland Security initially embraced the concept of Inherently Safer Technology in a 2004 draft chemical security plan, only to reverse itself after heavy industry lobbying in 2006. Secretary Chertoff's announcement last week, in front of an audience of chemical industry executives, very closely tracked the industry's talking points.

This is wrong. We cannot allow chemical industry lobbyists to dictate the terms of this debate. We cannot allow our security to be hijacked by corporate interests.

Senator LAUTENBERG and I will fight for strong legislation to pass the Senate. We believe that we can work with chemical plants so that new safety regulations are implemented in a way that is flexible enough for the industry yet stringent enough to protect the American people. I urge my colleagues to come together to pass meaningful security legislation this year.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 415—EX-PRESSING THE CONTINUING SUPPORT OF THE SENATE TO THE JUNIOR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS (JROTC), AND COMMENDING THE EFFORTS OF THAT VITAL PROGRAM AS IT CARRIES OUT ITS MISSION OF INSTILLING THE VALUES OF CITIZENSHIP AND SERVICE IN THE HEARTS AND MINDS OF THE YOUTH OF THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. ENSIGN submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

S. RES. 415

Whereas, since its inception in 1913, the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps has successfully functioned for over 90 years;

Whereas the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps has provided citizenship training, discipline, stability, and patriotic values to the youth of the United States throughout the Nation;

Whereas millions of students have benefited from the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps;

Whereas, in 2005, there were over 500,000 students enrolled in Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps programs in approximately 3,400 secondary schools; and

Whereas the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps is taught by a dedicated cadre of retired officers and staff non-commissioned officers of the Armed Forces who love the United States and who are working to secure its future: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) expresses appreciation to the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps for—

(A) the leadership training that the program provides to the youth of the United States; and

(B) the outstanding results that the program has achieved;

(2) commends the professionalism and dedication displayed daily by the retired members of the United States Armed Forces who serve as instructors in the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps; and

(3) proudly honors the modern-day members of the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps, who represent a promising group of young men and women who continue to strive to achieve their full potential.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3191. Mr. FRIST (for himself and Mr. REID) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for comprehensive reform and for other purposes.

SA 3192. Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2454, *supra*.

SA 3193. Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. FRIST, Mr. MCCONNELL, and Mr. MCCAIG) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, *supra*.

SA 3194. Ms. MIKULSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to

amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3195. Mr. ISAKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3196. Mr. ISAKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2454, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3197. Mr. ISAKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3198. Mr. ISAKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3199. Mr. ISAKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3200. Mr. ISAKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3201. Mr. ISAKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3202. Mr. ISAKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3203. Mr. ISAKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3204. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3205. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3206. Mr. KYL (for himself and Mr. CORNYN) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, supra.

SA 3207. Mr. CORNYN proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3206 proposed by Mr. KYL (for himself and Mr. CORNYN) to the amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, supra.

SA 3208. Mr. ISAKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2454, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3209. Mr. HAGEL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2454, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3210. Mr. BINGAMAN proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3192 sub-

mitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, supra.

SA 3211. Ms. COLLINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3212. Mr. BINGAMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3213. Mr. ALLARD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3191. Mr. FRIST (for himself and Mr. REID) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3192 submitted by Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) to the bill S. 2454, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for comprehensive reform and for other purposes; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ DEATHS AT UNITED STATES-MEXICO BORDER.

(a) COLLECTION OF STATISTICS.—The Commissioner of the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection shall collect statistics relating to deaths occurring at the border between the United States and Mexico, including—

- (1) the causes of the deaths; and
- (2) the total number of deaths.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Commissioner of the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection shall submit to the Secretary a report that—

- (1) analyzes trends with respect to the statistics collected under subsection (a) during the preceding year; and
- (2) recommends actions to reduce the deaths described in subsection (a).

SA 3192. Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. HAGEL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2454, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for comprehensive reform and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause, and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act of 2006”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Reference to the Immigration and Nationality Act.
- Sec. 3. Definitions.
- Sec. 4. Severability.

TITLE I—BORDER ENFORCEMENT

Subtitle A—Assets for Controlling United States Borders

- Sec. 101. Enforcement personnel.
- Sec. 102. Technological assets.
- Sec. 103. Infrastructure.
- Sec. 104. Border patrol checkpoints.

- Sec. 105. Ports of entry.
- Sec. 106. Construction of strategic border fencing and vehicle barriers.

Subtitle B—Border Security Plans, Strategies, and Reports

- Sec. 111. Surveillance plan.
- Sec. 112. National Strategy for Border Security.
- Sec. 113. Reports on improving the exchange of information on North American security.
- Sec. 114. Improving the security of Mexico’s southern border.
- Sec. 115. Combating human smuggling.

Subtitle C—Other Border Security Initiatives

- Sec. 121. Biometric data enhancements.
- Sec. 122. Secure communication.
- Sec. 123. Border patrol training capacity review.
- Sec. 124. US-VISIT System.
- Sec. 125. Document fraud detection.
- Sec. 126. Improved document integrity.
- Sec. 127. Cancellation of visas.
- Sec. 128. Biometric entry-exit system.
- Sec. 129. Border study.
- Sec. 130. Secure border initiative financial accountability.
- Sec. 131. Mandatory detention for aliens apprehended at or between ports of entry.
- Sec. 132. Evasion of inspection or violation of arrival, reporting, entry, or clearance requirements.

Subtitle D—Border Tunnel Prevention Act

- Sec. 141. Short title.
- Sec. 142. Construction of border tunnel or passage.
- Sec. 143. Directive to the United States Sentencing Commission.

TITLE II—INTERIOR ENFORCEMENT

- Sec. 201. Removal and denial of benefits to terrorist aliens.
- Sec. 202. Detention and removal of aliens ordered removed.
- Sec. 203. Aggravated felony.
- Sec. 204. Terrorist bars.
- Sec. 205. Increased criminal penalties related to gang violence, removal, and alien smuggling.
- Sec. 206. Illegal entry.
- Sec. 207. Illegal reentry.
- Sec. 208. Reform of passport, visa, and immigration fraud offenses.
- Sec. 209. Inadmissibility and removal for passport and immigration fraud offenses.
- Sec. 210. Incarceration of criminal aliens.
- Sec. 211. Encouraging aliens to depart voluntarily.
- Sec. 212. Deterring aliens ordered removed from remaining in the United States unlawfully.
- Sec. 213. Prohibition of the sale of firearms to, or the possession of firearms by certain aliens.
- Sec. 214. Uniform statute of limitations for certain immigration, naturalization, and peonage offenses.
- Sec. 215. Diplomatic security service.
- Sec. 216. Field agent allocation and background checks.
- Sec. 217. Construction.
- Sec. 218. State criminal alien assistance program.
- Sec. 219. Transportation and processing of illegal aliens apprehended by State and local law enforcement officers.
- Sec. 220. Reducing illegal immigration and alien smuggling on tribal lands.
- Sec. 221. Alternatives to detention.
- Sec. 222. Conforming amendment.
- Sec. 223. Reporting requirements.
- Sec. 224. State and local enforcement of Federal immigration laws.