

He said: My wife has been fighting breast cancer for 3 years, and we have driven to Canada for 3 straight years, every 3 months, to get her medicine, and we have saved 80 percent on her medicine bill; the same pill I could have gotten on the North Dakota side of the border, but it is priced much higher in the United States.

So for several years now, we have had proposals that are bipartisan to allow for reimportation, but we have been prevented from having an opportunity to vote on it on the floor of the Senate, despite the fact that the majority leader at midnight one night made a commitment to do it. He thinks he didn't. It is written in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and somebody can look at it and see whether or not the commitment was made. But we didn't get a vote on it. So it is frustrating.

The Senate is a place where you ought to get a vote. The complaint now, I guess, is that the amendment was offered. It wasn't offered in violation of the rules. The rules allow it to be offered. Perhaps if somebody says let's not vote on it this afternoon but tomorrow, or let's vote on it next Tuesday, my guess is they can make an arrangement to have that happen. But this is a voluntary rest for the Senate. Deciding not to move forward with the bill is a decision by the majority leader. He has decided that he doesn't want to vote on an amendment offered under the rules and which deals with a very relevant issue that was voted on yesterday in a House Committee by the majority party on a piece of legislation that had nothing to do with the amendment. It was OK in the House to do that.

But the majority party in the Senate, even though it was offered under the rules of the Senate, said: No, no, if you are going to force us to talk about and vote on this issue of whether a UAE company should be managing America's ports, we are going to stop the process, stop progress of the Senate, and we are going to sit around and look at each other. That doesn't make any sense. Let's run the Senate the way it ought to be run. If you have amendments, let's debate the amendments and vote on the amendments. This isn't rocket science. If somebody offers an amendment, you have a debate. If you think the people are talking too long, get an agreement on restricting the debate, or get a time agreement and, at the end of the debate, you vote and count them. You don't weigh them; you just count them. It is very simple.

Apparently the majority leader wants to run this body like the House Rules Committee. They would have kind of a Rules Committee on the floor of the Senate that says you can offer this amendment, but you cannot offer that one. They have been doing that for a long while now. This body is run by people who want to emulate the House Rules Committee and prevent people from offering amendments that

are perfectly allowable under the rules of the Senate. We are told, if you offer an amendment under the rules, we are going to shut the place down. We are going to stop and complain. So now that the majority party has decided that it doesn't want to move, it complains that we are not moving. A very strange complaint. They can fix this in 5 minutes.

I said the other day it doesn't take me 45 days to figure out the UAE ports issue. We have a 45-day review period—paradoxically requested by the company rather than our country. Our country should insist on that because it is our security. But the company asked our country to do a 45-day review. My point is I don't need 45 days, or even 45 minutes, to figure this out. Nor do most Americans. This deal erodes America's security. It should not take us 5 minutes to get this place back on track.

The underlying bill is important. It is brought to us by four pretty distinguished legislators. Let's proceed with that bill. How do you do that? Let's vote on this amendment in the next half hour or so and then move ahead. If you say there is a scheduling issue, then let's not vote on this amendment today and give us time on Tuesday. That would be all right.

I want to make one other point. I don't know how this is going to turn out, but I am on the Appropriations Committee, and on the emergency supplemental bill, when we mark that up, I intend to offer the identical amendment that a Congressman offered in the House Appropriations Committee so that we can have a vote on it and go to conference with the House on the emergency supplement with identical amendments. I think the Senate should pass an identical amendment in the emergency supplemental, no matter how this comes out, as a backstop. I intend to offer that in the future when we mark up the emergency supplemental bill.

Madam President, I wish to take an additional minute to talk about the news this morning about the \$68.5 billion trade deficit, and then I will yield to my colleague from Connecticut, or whoever wishes to speak. The news is once again devastating: our trade deficit last month was \$68.5 billion, which is the highest in our history. This relates to a trade policy that is fundamentally bankrupt and a Congress and a President that are not only asleep at the switch but have their heads buried deeper in the sand every month. And the trade deficit widened substantially with China again. I will not go through all the stories about unfair trade. But if this Congress and the President continue to ignore this issue, at some point, this country's currency will suffer a fate that I don't want to see. It will have enormous economic consequences.

This is a strategy that is unsustainable. It is hurting Americans and is shifting Americans' jobs over-

seas and selling part of America. By the way, this is related to the Dubai Ports World deal because all of this offshoring and outsourcing and globalization and the decision that anybody could do anything, anywhere, and there really are no rules. And the minute somebody says maybe there ought to be rules, they are xenophobes and isolationists. And I will talk about that at another time.

If this \$68.5 billion is not a wake-up call, if this doesn't wake up the Congress and the President—and it likely won't—then I suggest this coma is probably irreversible, and I worry about the future of this country.

This country needs to stand up for its own economic interests. Whether it is trade with Japan or trade with China, trade with Europe, trade with Canada, trade with Mexico—we have very large deficits with all of them—and if we don't find a way to address this issue, this country's economy will not remain a vibrant world-class economy in the long term.

Again, we are in this deep sleep, or probably a coma, wanting to either deny or ignore the central facts of a trade policy that is awful. It is trading away American workers, trading away the middle class. We are hollowing out the center of this country. We are saying to this country's workers: If you can't compete with Chinese wages, if you can't compete with Indonesia, Bangladesh, or Sri Lanka wages, shame on you; your job is gone.

I have gone on at length talking about Huffy bikes, Radio Flyer, little red wagons—a whole host of products and companies that have moved offshore.

By the way, the thank-you for moving offshore from this Congress is to give them a big tax break. We voted to end this tax break four times, four amendments I have offered. All four have lost. I will continue to offer those amendments because I still believe that the last thing we ought to do is offer tax breaks to those who shut their American plants and move their jobs overseas. It is pretty unbelievable we do that, but it is part of the willingness to both ignore the circumstances of our trade deficit and the willingness to believe that a completely bankrupt strategy remains workable.

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

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

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT
AGREEMENT—S. 2349

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, the Democratic leader and I have been in consultation over the course of the morning, and I come to the floor now with a

unanimous consent request. I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the cloture vote occur at 2 o'clock today and that second-degree amendments be filed not later than 2 p.m. on Monday, March 13. I further ask that the mandatory quorum be waived.

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

Mr. FRIST. 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.

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

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, is there any limit on the time for Senators at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 5½ minutes remaining on the minority side.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask unanimous consent that be extended on both sides by an additional 5 minutes.

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

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, if you would let me know when I have used up 9 minutes so I can wrap up?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will so advise.

PORT SECURITY

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I have been watching the developments on the Senate floor with, let's say, much surprise. It is very hard for me to understand why this Senate would not want to go on record in opposition to the Dubai ports deal when we have an opportunity to do that, to dispose of that amendment by Senator SCHUMER and go right back to the ethics reform bill that is before the Senate.

I thank Senator SCHUMER for his courage because I know how it is around here sometimes. You need courage to say: Look, this is so important I am not going to back down. Senator SCHUMER explained that he and his colleagues from New York and New Jersey and Connecticut suffered the biggest blow on 9/11, although, believe me, the whole country suffered a blow—certainly in Pennsylvania directly and in my home State of California, where all those planes were going. We lost many people on that day.

But Senator SCHUMER explains that when you tell the people at home: I am going to do everything in my power so that we never have another 9/11, you better mean it. You better mean it. That means you have to step up to the plate. If you believe this deal presents a danger to our security, you have to step up to the plate, you have to use

every legislative prerogative at your disposal, and you have to say to your colleagues: I am sorry, we are going to take 5 minutes out, we are going to take 10 minutes out, we are going to take 15 minutes out of this bill, and we are going to vote on this.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle, God bless them—I know they must have a reason for this—they have stopped us from voting. They have stopped us from voting to stop this Dubai ports deal. Why is it important? There are so many reasons. This deal involves a port operator that is fully owned and controlled by a foreign country. Do we, in a post-9/11 world, want to have our very important infrastructure controlled by another country? I say no. Pre-9/11 we didn't think this way so much.

We had a situation, Senator FEINSTEIN and I, in Long Beach, the Los Angeles port, where China took over the running of a terminal. We were very concerned. This was in about 1997, well before 9/11. We were concerned then, and we asked for a special report from then-Secretary of Defense Cohen and Sandy Berger—he was our National Security Adviser. We asked them to do a written report to us before we let that go through. I believe now it ought to be looked at again. Not only that, but for all of the other ports that are being operated by foreign countries, we ought to have a look back. We ought to see if that is the right thing to do.

But one thing I know for sure, today, this deal has to stop. We have a chance here, thanks to Senator SCHUMER, who took a lot of abuse—maybe not publicly but privately—for having the courage to do this. We have to have a vote. It is amazing to me that those on the other side would stop us.

This is the same group who said to the Democrats: You better step back and let us have a vote on every judge we want, you better step back and let us have votes on all these things, and they will not let us have a vote on the most sacred responsibility we have, which is to keep our country safe.

Let the American people understand what this is about. It is not as if we have done so much for port security in this Congress. We have gotten failing grades for what we have failed to do on port security. It is not for lack of trying.

I want to show you how many amendments we voted on, to try to increase port security, and what happened. In the 107th Congress, \$585 million increase for port security in the fiscal year 2003 appropriations; another vote, \$500 million increase for port security; another vote, \$200 million increase for the Coast Guard; \$1 billion for port security. Guess what happened in the 107th Congress. Every one of those amendments went down. Every one of those amendments went down because my colleagues on the other side pretty much voted party line, voted down.

What happened in the 108th Congress? An amendment for a \$460 million

increase for port security plus a \$70 million increase for the Coast Guard for homeland security was voted down; \$450 million increase for port security, voted down; \$100 million increase—we went at it again and again—voted down; \$324 million increase for the Coast Guard, voted down; \$80 million increase for the Coast Guard, voted down; \$150 million increase for port security grants, voted down.

My colleagues on the other side voted down every one of these while they voted for tax breaks for the most wealthy Americans who already earn \$1 million a year.

I hope the American people are catching on to what is going on. Had we done some of these things and you had the country, the United Arab Emirates, that had connections to 9/11—two of the hijackers were from there. We know that money was laundered for the operation through Dubai. We know that Dr. Khan, the Pakistani scientist who turned on the civilized world and smuggled nuclear components to Iran, to North Korea, and to Libya—how did he smuggle those? Through the port of Dubai. And what we are going to do is reward these people, is give them the right to operate a terminal.

Then you hear from my colleagues: Oh, the terminal operator has nothing to do with security.

Wrong. We have a letter from the No. 2 man at the Port Authority in New Jersey and New York. Do you know what he said? The terminal operator is one of the major players in port security. They are the ones who decide who gets hired. They are the ones who do the background checks.

I have that letter. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

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

To: Honorable Lindsey Graham U.S. Senator.
From: James P. Fox, Deputy Executive Director, Port Authority of NY/NJ.

Date: March 1, 2006.

Re: port security-terminal operators.

PORT SECURITY: FEDERAL AGENDAS VS. TERMINAL OPERATORS RESPONSIBILITIES

The main players in port security consist of Customs and Border Patrol, U.S. Coast Guard, Immigration and Customs Enforcement and the marine terminal operators.

Due to the recent DP World Ports acquisition of P&O Ports, reports have debated the level of responsibility that marine terminal facilities operators have for security at their facilities. Too clarify, marine terminal operators schedule the ship traffic in and out of their terminals and they are also responsible for handling the loading and unloading of the vessels cargo. In 2004 alone, the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey's terminal operators combined handled 4,478,480 (twenty-foot equivalent units) or TEUs.

Marine terminal operators, such as P&O, are also responsible for the perimeter security of their leasehold. They hire the security guards and purchase the technology that will protect the terminals property, therefore having control over who can enter and exit a facility. Currently, each port, and each operator within the port, has its own