

you see gasoline go from \$2 to \$2.50, \$2.80, \$3, you say: Something is going wrong. The increase in natural gas price from where it was a year ago to where it was Monday of this week, if you transfer that into gasoline prices, gasoline would be priced at \$7 a gallon. Think of what would happen to the American economy and to everyday people if gasoline were \$7. Everybody who uses natural gas, in particular the industries that use it, are suffering from that kind of an increase. Two years ago gasoline was at \$1.69. What if it went to 7? That is what has happened to natural gas.

I am going to include in the RECORD a statement that gives further details about this problem. But I suggest that we must come to grips with the conservation. We are going to put some ideas together.

Let me say, if the American people this winter were to reduce their thermostats by 2 degrees, do you think it would be hard on everybody? I mean just imagine, unless somebody is sick and the doctor prescribes it, it would be an enormous savings of natural gas for the United States and for this pipeline to deliver natural gas. Do you know the pipelines that come out of Louisiana down there in that gulf, these two giant pipelines go all the way from Louisiana up into the United States, with legs off in Ohio, all the way to New York, delivering natural gas from that area so loaded with hydrocarbons? They put them in these pipes and have generating pusher stations all the way up into America and deliver it.

If we conserve the way I have described and other ways, which we are coming to grips with, it will make a big impact on how much those pipelines have to deliver to meet the demand. We have to find a way to do the best we can by American industry or they are going to close. And while we have some natural gas to heat our houses, we will be without jobs for the people who live in those houses.

The one thing they all suggested, when they were sitting around that table talking to us, was: There is one major source of natural gas that is American that we ought to get. I must say to those States who are coastal States, they must understand they are Americans first and coastal States second. The largest supply of American natural gas is off the coasts of our country. No doubt about it. The United States cannot sit by with the technology we have developed—we can go way offshore so that you cannot even see them. So those States that are worried about their visibility, if they are worried about oil spills, there are no oil spills from those platforms that drill.

Do you know that during the time we had this crisis not one major oilspill occurred. Those giant platforms with 20 wells drilled underground, with drilling that goes parallel and with one that was turned upside down, the oil

did not come out. So nobody has to worry about that. We can handle that. That is where the natural gas is.

I close by saying that we have been told by the experts that the best way to reduce this crisis would be to have an immediate supply of natural gas. That is not possible. We are going to have to open a substantial number of liquefied natural gas platforms or ports around our country. And where they are being delayed, we have tried to solve that in our Energy bill. We are going to push those local governments to quit the delay for delay sake and get on with letting us put some of those in so natural gas can come from foreign countries, which I hate to say, but at least we can look at it and expect it.

In the meantime, it is said that if we were to say to those who pay for natural gas that we are opening parts of the Outer Continental Shelf, just the section 181 off the coast of Florida and Alabama, which I say now to the President of the United States, Mr. President, you ought to sit down and figure out a way through your Executive order, through your pen, to open section 181, or portions of it, off the coast of Alabama and Florida. Do it, Mr. President. It might take a couple years to produce. It is ready, so it will be very quick.

We are told that the mere fact that the market understands that is ready, that huge entrance of natural gas into the areas for delivery, the pipeline system, that it will reduce the pressure on the cost of natural gas. I think the occupant of the Chair can understand that. The marketplace will say: Oh, it is not going to continue in this crisis state because here comes this huge natural gas that is now released and is ready to come. We must do that. Until it is done, at least this Senator—I have to worry about my State, but I am also a Senator for America, and I am not going to let up until that is done.

Secondly, the States in this country that refuse to recognize that we can drill off their shores on land that is owned by the Federal Government—it is not their land; they only have a few miles, and then it belongs to Americans—you can drill way out there, do no harm, and bring gas into this country to get us through the next 10 or 12 years while other sources of energy that are clean, such as nuclear and very clean coal, come on to keep America alive.

The next thing we are going to do is to find out how we can pass legislation to get those other coastal States in the position where they are either willing to accommodate this in exchange for us giving them substantially more royalties, or we are just going to have to bite the bullet.

It is going to come down here, and the people are going to have to say no, or filibuster, but they are going to have to know what they are doing. They are adding to the crisis status of our country and job market and to one of the few major industries that is left

in this country that we are great at. We are not going to be there very long. China is going to catch up, and then it is not going to be cheap labor. It is going to be high technology and national gas. India is doing the same.

I was at an event last night. We used to say how powerful we were. We know where it is; it is in India. Reliance Energy has the largest refinery of crude oil to refine into gasoline-related products. We sit here thinking we are the leaders of the world in everything. We have been sitting somewhere for a long time. I hate to say on what. But we surely have not been doing anything. If anything, we have been going backwards. There have been no new refineries in the United States for more than two decades. That is almost incredible.

I thank the Senate for listening. I will say again, this is probably the most significant event confronting us. I regret to say there are no easy answers. If there were, we would have done it, but we finally have come to the understanding that it is major, it is big, it is serious.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. DODD. 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. DODD. Mr. President, what is the business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in morning business.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Chair.

#### HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise this afternoon to discuss the fiscal year 2006 Homeland Security appropriations conference report. The Senate passed this measure earlier today by a voice vote. Frankly, I would have liked to have had a recorded vote on this measure. If a recorded vote had been ordered, I would have expressed my opposition to this conference report.

Nevertheless, I would like to begin by recognizing that the authors of this conference report, Senator GREGG and Senator BYRD, do a tremendous job each year. I have served in the Senate long enough to know how hard it is to pull these types of appropriations bills together. I also acknowledge the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Senator COCHRAN. It is no easy task to write and manage a bill that provides for our domestic security needs. I further commend all of our colleagues and their staffs on the Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittee for the hard work they have put into this legislation.

However, I feel compelled, notwithstanding these efforts, to express my disappointment over the adoption of this conference report. I have very deep

concerns about how this measure funds our country's vital homeland security activities.

In many crucial respects, I believe this conference report continues a pattern of failure on the part of the administration and the leadership of our Congress to address the acute and ongoing needs of our Nation's homeland security infrastructure.

Allow me to read a letter I received 3 days ago from the Republican Governor of my State, a good friend and someone with whom I work all the time. I think it is important to hear—even after we adopted this measure—from a Governor of a State that is grappling with providing the necessary security to protect its citizens.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my comments.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. DODD. The Governor says:

... [I]n a time when the threat of terrorism remains elevated and natural disasters such as the recent hurricanes have reminded us all of the staggering power of nature, [the cuts in this bill] simply [defy] rational explanation.

The conference report inexplicably contains cuts that exceed those in the original House or Senate bills or the President's proposed budget. Funding for the State Homeland Security Grant program is halved, from \$1.1 billion to \$550 million, while funding for the Urban Area Security Initiative is reduced from \$885 million to \$765 million. Those programs, along with the Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Program, have accounted for the bulk of [homeland security] funding that our state has received.

Of the money available for the State Homeland Security Grant program, states will receive a mere 0.75 percent in guaranteed funding. The balance is to be distributed by the Department of Homeland Security based on risk, though how—or when—that assessment is to be made is not clear.

Under the conference report, guaranteed funding for Connecticut in fiscal year 2006 would amount to barely \$7.13 million. This is down by two-thirds from the \$21 million in fiscal year 2005—itsself a reduction from the \$46 million in 2004.

My Governor concludes her letter by saying:

The funding contained within the conference report is utterly insufficient to support the actions needed to protect the people of our State, to say nothing of the millions of travelers and tons of truck, train and barge cargo that pass through Connecticut every year.

In an age when terrorism continues to be a threat to our country, one would think that the Congress of the United States would be doing everything it could to shore up our domestic security, to make it as impregnable as possible against those who would do us harm. Yet when we look at this conference report, I do not believe it does enough to protect our people from terrorism. We are simply not investing in the resources required to make this Nation as safe as possible.

Instead of filling in the cracks that continue to exist within our homeland

security foundation, we are letting those cracks grow.

I was particularly disturbed to see that the FIRE and SAFER grant programs—vital firefighting assistance initiatives that I was pleased to author with Senators DEWINE, WARNER, and LEVIN—was cut by \$60 million over fiscal year 2005 levels. As the Governor of my State says, funding cuts of this nature defy rationality when one considers the devastation recently wrought by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, and the unprecedented burdens placed on emergency first responders who are on the domestic frontlines in the fight against terrorism.

For the past 3 years, I have come to the floor and offered legislation that would implement the recommendations made by the Rudman Commission.

As we all know, our former colleague Warren Rudman, a former Republican Senator from New Hampshire, chaired a blue ribbon commission sponsored by the Council on Foreign Relations that included George Schultz, William Webster, Harold Varmus and other distinguished Americans.

The Rudman Commission concluded that our country's homeland security infrastructure was "drastically underfunded" and that our Nation was "dangerously unprepared" to respond effectively to a terrorist attack.

The Commission recommended that our Nation invest no less than \$20 billion a year for 5 years to take the minimum steps necessary to protect all Americans from natural and manmade threats. Regrettably, this conference report neglected to implement the recommendations of the Rudman Commission, providing only \$3.4 billion of the \$20 billion that the Commission identified as essential each and every year for 5 years.

I would point out that in the last 3 years I have offered an amendment on the Rudman Commission report, it has been regrettably defeated.

In March of 2004, we watched the train system in Madrid, Spain, attacked by terrorists with nearly 200 dead. Earlier this year, we watched the London Underground and the double-decker buses attacked by terrorists, with dozens who were killed. Yesterday, the New York City subway system was placed on high alert. Yet in response to this clear and present danger to our Nation's largest transit system, the administration today and the leadership of both the House and the Senate have, in effect, cut funding for transit security in this bill, providing funding levels that do not keep pace with expected inflation.

There is an added irony to all of this. At a time when we are dealing with record high gas prices and the administration is encouraging Americans to conserve energy by taking public transportation when and where they can, it is actually doing less than it did last year to ensure that our public transit systems are as safe as possible.

What more is it going to take before the administration and the leadership

of this body realize that we are not investing nearly enough in our homeland security infrastructure and our emergency first responders?

When it comes to meeting the security needs of our country, this administration and leadership in Congress are pursuing a policy that, at best, in my view, can be called benign neglect. That has become painfully apparent in light of the inadequate response to meeting the needs and mitigating the suffering of hundreds of thousands of people along the Gulf Coast. And it has been reinforced by this conference report's failure to make essential investments to keep all Americans safe from the risk of terrorism.

#### EXHIBIT 1

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,  
EXECUTIVE CHAMBERS,  
Hartford, CT, October 4, 2005.

HON. CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, JOSEPH I. LIEBERMAN, JOHN B. LARSON, ROBERT R. SIMMONS, ROSA DELAURO, CHRISTOPHER SHAYS, NANCY L. JOHNSON

DEAR CONNECTICUT CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION: I have reviewed the Conference Report on H.R. 2360, the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act of 2006, and I am deeply disturbed by the woefully inadequate funding the bill would provide to Connecticut.

Under the Conference Report, guaranteed funding for Connecticut in Fiscal Year 2006 would amount to barely \$7.13 million. This is down by two-thirds from some \$21 million in FY2005—itsself a reduction from nearly \$46 million in FY2004.

This is incredibly unfair to Connecticut and, in a time when the threat of terrorism remains elevated and natural disasters such as the recent hurricanes have reminded us all of the staggering power of nature, simply defies rational explanation.

The threats have not abated. Nature has not gone away. The need for equitable and sensible funding has not ended.

The Conference Report inexplicably contains cuts that exceed those in the original House or Senate bills or the President's proposed budget. Funding for the State Homeland Security Grant (SHSG) program is halved, from \$1.1 billion to \$550 million, while funding for the Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI) was reduced from \$885 million to \$765 million. Those programs, along with the Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Program (LETTP), have accounted for the bulk of funding our state has received.

Of the money available for the SHSG program, states will receive a mere 0.75 percent in guaranteed funding. The balance is to be distributed by the Department of Homeland Security based on risk, though how—or when—that assessment is to be made is not clear.

In essence, the Conference Report reduces the vast majority of homeland security funding to a lobbying contest. States that are most successful in making their case before the Department of Homeland Security will get the bulk of the funding. Those that are not—will not.

This is unfortunate, to say the least. In previous years, after guaranteed SHSG and LETTP funding was distributed the remainder was apportioned on the basis of population. None of the UASI funding is guaranteed to states, and you will recall that despite the obvious need—the FY2004 grant for New Haven Harbor was not renewed in FY2005.

On September 11, 2001, America was awakened to the need for vigilance against security threats as well as natural disasters.

Connecticut, as you know, contains a number of major highways, a nuclear power facility, ports that are home to a regional depot for the U.S. Strategic Petroleum Reserve, shipyards, cargo operations and passenger and auto ferries.

The funding contained within the Conference Report is utterly insufficient to support the actions needed to protect the people of our state, to say nothing of the millions of travelers and tons of truck, train and barge cargo that pass through Connecticut every year.

I am urging you to seek an increase in the funding for Connecticut. We cannot sustain a two-thirds reduction in federal homeland security funding. It is unfair and unwise.

I will be contacting you shortly to discuss this matter further.

Sincerely,

M. JODI RELL,  
Governor.

#### RELIEF FOR GULF COAST STATES

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I will not take as much time as others have, but I would like to commend my colleague from Louisiana, Senator LANDRIEU, for her Herculean efforts over the last couple of days to try and convince this body to do everything it can to provide the needed relief for thousands of displaced individuals along the Gulf Coast, including, obviously, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and parts of Texas.

I am really stunned, in a sense, by the response we are providing to this situation so far.

On average we provide \$5 billion a week to fund our ongoing efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan. Obviously, this funding is critical to protect our troops and the work they continue to undertake overseas. When the President has been asked how he plans to pay for these ongoing efforts, he says that he plans to pay for them using additional Federal resources that are not taken out of other Federal spending priorities.

And yet when it comes to providing the necessary relief to our own citizens in Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and Texas, we are being told by the President that we absolutely have to use existing Federal resources to pay for recovery and relief efforts. We are being told that Federal resources cannot be provided unless we reduce other Federal spending priorities.

I can understand the frustration of the Senator from Louisiana. She goes every week to community after community in her State and still sees the horrible circumstances under which thousands of people are living. Meanwhile, the Senate is about to take another week off. As literally hundreds of thousands of our fellow citizens are suffering, we are leaving town instead of working together to provide adequate long-term disaster assistance in areas such as public health, education, housing, transportation and homeland security.

The Senator from Louisiana took the floor over an extended period of time to talk about the importance of providing

this relief: to care for the thousands of displaced children, to assist people who lost their homes, their businesses, their very livelihoods. Nevertheless, we are told by this administration and the leadership in Congress that no adequate assistance can be provided unless we cut vital spending elsewhere.

If we do not have to find offsets for rebuilding Iraq and Afghanistan, then why do we have to find offsets to rebuild the Gulf Coast—our own soil? If this catastrophe were to happen in my State of Connecticut or anywhere else, we would all appreciate what our colleague from Louisiana has gone through and express our frustrations in the same way she has.

So I join with Senator LANDRIEU and others who have already spoken. I am also waiting to hear about what offsets we are going to be forced to come up with to pay for the recovery and relief efforts along the Gulf Coast. They will most certainly come from domestic investments such as Medicaid that aid the poor, not from repealing the estate tax or other tax cuts that have aided only the wealthiest of Americans.

I imagine that we will cut spending to services provided under Medicare and Medicaid—services that provide basic health care coverage to the poorest of our citizens who are the most dependent for their health care needs. There is a very sad irony to this. We are going to force the poor to bear the greatest burden on funding recovery and relief efforts along the Gulf Coast. In essence we are going to charge them to pay for this. What kind of logic is that? It is irrational, it is wrong, and we ought to be doing better by the people of our own country.

I am disappointed that this body had to rush out of town and could not spend the additional time necessary to get this right for the people of the Gulf Coast.

So I, again, applaud the Senator from Louisiana. I admire her courage. I certainly admire her tenacity in fighting as hard as she has been for the people of her State.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLEN). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### IRAQ ELECTIONS

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, on October 15, one week from tomorrow, the Iraqi people will cast their votes on a new, permanent Iraqi constitution, a social compact, which if ratified, will be unique in the history of the Arab Middle East.

Since the stunning January 30 elections, Iraqi leaders have worked tirelessly to draft this historic document.

Next Saturday, the Iraqi people will have the chance to formally express their support for this historic document.

Throughout the summer, we witnessed the complex and painstaking nature of the constitution drafting process. These negotiations included leaders from all of Iraq's ethnic and religious groups. The product is a result of patience, flexibility, and compromise.

As the President said yesterday in his televised speech, "By any standard or precedent of history, Iraq has made incredible political progress—from tyranny, to liberation, to national elections, to the writing of a constitution, in the space of 2½ years."

Indeed.

And they have made this progress under a hail of constant threats and violence from terrorist enemies within and without their borders.

American service men and women have sacrificed greatly to advance America's interests in Iraq, but many more Iraqis have been killed and injured in the pursuit of a free and democratic Iraq.

The draft permanent constitution lays a solid foundation for a stable and democratic Iraq in the heart of the Middle East. It establishes a true democratic system. The voice of all Iraqis will be heard. Human rights will be protected. The rule of law will be respected. And women will be full and equal participants.

It is critical that Iraqis from all walks of life and all segments of Iraq's diverse population participate in next week's referendum.

It is also important for Iraq's Sunni population to support this document and the democratic system of government that it establishes.

Sunni leaders have expressed strong reservations about several aspects of the constitution in recent weeks. Many will vote no; that is their right.

However, I believe that they also recognize the importance of participating in the referendum. Only through participation and integration into Iraq's new democratic system can Iraq's ethnic and religious groups ensure that their rights are secured and their interests are protected. They learned this hard lesson after avoiding the January vote. They will not make the same mistake again.

When several of my Senate colleagues and I met with Interim President Jalal Talabani last month, I was convinced that the Iraqi people recognize the magnitude of this moment.

And I am confident that when the time comes next week, they will once again show their courage and determination.

The enemy will try to intimidate and threaten them. But the Iraqi people are strong.

Eight and one-half million voters defied the killers last January, and Iraqis continue to volunteer for the Iraqi security forces, ready and willing to defend their new democracy. They do so