

business in this Senate if our colleagues mislead us?

The current Presiding Officer, who happened to be the Chair at the time, was surprised, as were the rest of us.

Fortunately, we keep a transcript of our remarks, and I went back and I quoted from it again. I do not in any way criticize the right of any Senator to propose an amendment at any time that is under the parliamentary rules. But to stand up on the floor of this Senate and say you are going to do one thing and then you do another is not only inappropriate, but it risks—it risks—a breakdown of the kind of courtesy we have to extend to each other if we are going to function as a body.

So now the larger issue. The Senator from Nevada and the Senator from New York are dead set on an amendment to negate the agreement concerning the leasing of terminals in the United States by the United Arab Emirates. I understand the passion they feel on that issue. I respect their views on that. But do we have to—knowing full well it would tie up the Senate—the Senator from Nevada has been around here as long as I have. Knowing full well it would tie up the Senate, bring to a halt any action we might take on ethics and lobbying reform, still we are insistent upon that.

Now, the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Nevada will stand up: It is our right, it is our right to propose any amendment that is in a parliamentary fashion acceptable. I agree with that. I do not dispute their right. I do dispute stopping—which it has; now we are not going to move forward until after the cloture vote—stopping our progress on the issue which is more important to the American people or as important in an orderly fashion.

The Senator from Nevada knows full well if we are going to act legislatively in this body he is going to have an opportunity to propose this amendment. If we are going to act legislatively, we could stop, we could not do anything in the Senate for 45 days or a month or until the upcoming elections.

But my point is—and I want to, in fairness, say I see a lot of the same thing on this side of the aisle quite occasionally, quite frequently, that we will propose amendments to gain some kind of political advantage. That has always been part of the way we have done business. But hasn't it gotten out of proportion to our first obligation, and that is to do the people's business? Isn't that the reason why only 25 percent of the American people approve of what we do and how we do it? Aren't we concerned? Aren't we concerned about how the American people feel about us, the people we purport to represent?

What we need to do here is for the leaders on both sides, with others, to sit down and map out an agenda we can all agree to. But to bring this process of ethics and lobbying reform and earmark reform to a halt for the sake of

an amendment that has nothing whatsoever to do with the businesses at hand, which is highly contentious, I think is not doing the people's business.

I want to emphasize again, I do not dispute the right of the other side of the aisle to act in a parliamentary fashion. There is nothing illegal they are doing. But I would hope that perhaps the greater good would prevail here, and we could sit down and work these things out, which would require concessions made on both sides, which has been the case of the way the Senate functions.

So I must say, I have only been here since 1987, but I have never seen anything like I saw yesterday in the years I have been here. But it is also symptomatic of the bitter partisanship that prevails here, which prevents us from doing anything meaningful or doing very much meaningful for the American people.

If my friends on the other side of the aisle want to give this side of the aisle some of the blame for this partisanship we experience here, I accept it. I accept it. I do not debate it. My point is, it is time we sat down and mapped out an agenda we can all agree to, and start doing the business of the people of this country first and our parties' business and political advantage second.

I do not mean to be contentious in these remarks. I do not mean to be too critical. But I did happen to be on the floor yesterday and see something, as I said, I have never seen before. We have to stop, take a deep breath, sit down together, and start working together. That sounds a bit utopian or Pollyannaish, but it is not. And in the many years I have been here, I saw people able to sit down—even if they had strongly held feelings—together and work things out. We are not able to do that today. It is time we changed course.

I thank my colleagues for their patience. I hope I was not in any way condescending in my remarks concerning my concern about this body.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MURKOWSKI). The minority leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Schumer amendment be withdrawn and that it be immediately considered as a free-standing bill, with a time limitation of 2 hours equally divided; no amendments or motions in order; and that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate then vote on passage of the bill.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I object.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Who yields time?

The Senator from Connecticut.

LEGISLATIVE PROCESS

Mr. DODD. Madam President, let me, if I may, respond to some of the things that have been said. I see my good friend from New York is here as well. I expect he may want to share some thoughts. I will not be long. First, let me say to my good friends from Maine and Arizona, they are truly wonderful friends, and I have worked on countless occasions with both of them. I regret we are in this situation as well. I say to my friends, this is a matter that is extremely important. We have all worked very hard in a bipartisan fashion to bring up both this lobbying reform and ethics reform package. So I am still confident, despite the differences that occurred yesterday, that we are going to achieve that goal.

I had hoped we would be able to finish it by this week so we would not end up having an elongated debate about the subject matter. I do not think it needs that much time. I am sorry that is not going to occur.

Let me also quickly say to my friend from Arizona, much of what he has said I agree with. I am a product of this place in many ways. I have been here a long time. I sat here on the floor as a page back—I think Jefferson was President when I sat on the floor here, that is how long ago it was—watching Lyndon Johnson sitting as Vice President of the United States, and with the all-night civil rights debates, and so forth. So I am very much a product of this institution. My father served here, and so I have great reverence for the Senate.

I too regret what has happened in many ways, that we do not spend the time to work out matters, as we have done on this bill. I think this bill has been a good example of how the Senate ought to function in many ways. That is not to say we are all going to agree on every amendment offered, but we created a process by which this can be done. I am disappointed we come here on Tuesdays and leave on Thursdays. There was a time when we used to come on Monday and stay until Friday, and there was ample time during the week for consideration of matters.

Part of the difficulty is, today, when you know you have to come in on a Tuesday at about 5 and leave on Thursday at about 5, then in order to deal with all the matters in front of you, you start doing things or offering things in a fashion you might not otherwise were there more of an opportunity to deal with it.

I counted up last night. I suspect, if I am correct, that there are about 60 legislative days left in this session. Assuming we will probably adjourn sometime in September for the fall elections, we have 60 days left to deal with a variety of issues.

My colleague from Arizona is right. Look, the numbers are there. The American public is not happy with how they see their national legislative body

functioning. There are many reasons for that, not the least of which is there are issues out there which they confront every single day that are staggering to them—their health care problems, employment issues, the education quality in our country. We all know what the issues are. We do not have to do a survey. They want to know whether we are going to pay attention to the matters they grapple with every single day.

This is also an important issue because it has to do with how we are perceived as a body. So I am not going to minimize this at all. I am not going to stand here and suggest we are all—at one time or another we have done things that I suspect if we had the chance to do them again, we would do them differently.

I will let my colleague from New York address and express what his intents were and what his purposes were, but he raised what, as my colleague from Arizona said, is a very important issue. All of us know that. We have had major hearings. My friend from Maine has had major hearings on this question already. The Banking Committee has had hearings. The other body has already passed, at least out of the Appropriations Committee—my good friend Congressman JERRY LEWIS has passed—I think 60 to 2 was the vote, something like that yesterday, a similar proposal dealing with this question about our port security.

So none of us minimize this issue. This is not some extraneous matter that has marginal importance to people here. It is timely. It is important. It is critical. People are worried about it.

I would hope, because the hour of 2:15, or whatever the time for this cloture vote is to occur, has not arrived, that there might still be an opportunity for us to find some way to be able to say—next week, the week after, whenever it is here—that we have a chance for an hour or two to raise an important issue, have a good debate in the Senate—in fact, the leader mentioned 2 hours; I think 3 or 4 or 5 hours—for us to discuss an issue of that importance, and with that agreement being reached, we then would agree there will be no other extraneous matters brought up on this bill, and then we could move forward with it so we do not end up tying ourselves in a knot with cloture motions and voting against or for and whatever we are going to do here, delaying the consideration of this bill.

I will leave it to my colleague from New York to explain what his intentions are, what he would like to do. But having talked to him, I believe he is going to suggest we have something like that. I realize that causes some heartburn for others. But nonetheless, my hope is that we can get away from this, get back to where we were yesterday morning, moving rather smoothly through a process that Senator COLLINS and my colleague from Con-

necticut, Senator LIEBERMAN, and Senator LOTT and I were trying to create, with having one amendment going back and forth from either side, and getting down to a number where we actually had a good possibility of concluding the consideration of this bill by this evening.

That may not happen now because of the delay here. But my appeal would be to the Republican leader—I just heard the Democratic leader—to see if in the next hour or so we can't come to some agreement here to get back on this bill. Let's avoid the cloture votes and get through this legislation. Let's keep it a clean bill, if we can, despite the temptation to bring up other issues. Set aside some time for this debate, and discuss it here on the floor, dealing with the port security issues. That way I think we have satisfied our roles to deal with timely questions, to deal with this important matter, and avoid the kind of acrimony that can truly cause this place to crater again.

Again, I say I will let my friend from New York explain what he did. But I understand his motives to at least bring up this very important matter, and one that all of us care deeply about. We are hearing about it from our constituents.

Again, to my friend from Arizona, for whom I have the greatest respect and admiration—I have loved working with him over the years on many matters—I too worry. If more committees conducted themselves as the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee does—my Committee on Banking, by the way—with oversight, looking at issues—I think the Armed Services Committee is doing a pretty good job on a lot of these issues. That is the role of the Senate: to be engaged in the debate, the discussion, to provide the time here on the floor, with that Monday through Friday, so we have a good opportunity here to discuss the important issues of the day.

Again, the leadership has to work this out. A lot of us are at fault because we ask the leaders, we say: I can't be around on Friday. I can't be here on Monday. Can you wait until 6 o'clock on Tuesday? All of a sudden, you are arriving on Tuesday and leaving on Thursday night. No other job in America allows you to come for a couple days a week in order to do business.

So I am sorry in a way we are finding ourselves in this truncated situation. I regret we are in this situation, but we can get out of it as well. My hope would be we would find an opportunity to provide a window to discuss port security, which is critical, and clean this bill up. Let's deal with the issues before us. My friend from Maine said it well earlier: We need to get back on this question. I agree with her on that point. That appeal is out there. I will leave it up to the leaders to decide how to proceed, but I hope that will be the case.

Madam President, I see my friend from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I thank my colleagues, particularly my good friend from Connecticut, as well as the minority leader, for laying out our position. Before I begin, I do want to thank the Senator from Maine, the Senator from Connecticut, his colleague, the other Senator from Connecticut, as well as the Senator from Mississippi for their hard work on this issue. Nobody gainsays the importance of doing ethics reform. I certainly have been a member of the Rules Committee and involved in it. The bottom line is very simple: Doing ethics reform and dealing with the Dubai issue are not mutually exclusive. We can do both. We can do both this week. The motion made by the minority leader makes that perfectly clear. The two are not mutually exclusive. Nothing would make us happier on this side of the aisle than working out an agreement where we would be given time to debate this amendment, separately or as part of the bill, whichever would be the majority's preference, and then move back to the very important, thoughtfully worked-out legislation on ethics reform.

We have to deal with the Dubai ports issue not in April or May but now. That is not only what the American people want, it is important to every one of us. I come from New York. We went through 9/11. Ever since that day, ever since the next day, when I put on this flag which I wear every day in memory of those who were lost, I have said: We have to do everything we can to make sure it doesn't happen again. That doesn't mean it should be No. 16 or No. 17 or even Nos. 3 or 4 on the list. It should be No. 1.

When we heard that Dubai Ports World was going to take over our ports, it naturally raised alarms, not because the country was an Arab country but because the country had had a long nexus with terrorism. The more you look at the deal, the worse it gets. That is the problem.

First, we find out that the review done by the CFIUS committee was cursory, quick. They didn't even call the port authorities, such as New York, New Jersey, and ask about it. The letter that my friend from South Carolina first procured, Senator GRAHAM, given to Senator REID and myself, lays out very clearly how an operator of a port can have a great deal to do with security. Then not only did we find out that the review was cursory and casual, it seemed that the wheels were greased to let this deal go through. Everything was quick. Everything was secret. Everything was quiet.

A group of us—myself, my colleague from North Dakota, both colleagues from New Jersey, my colleague from New York, both colleagues from Connecticut, many others from the metropolitan areas—said: We have to do something. We have to move because we can't wait. The bipartisan legislation that we introduced said: Put the deal on hold. Do the 45-day review.

Make sure the report goes to Congress. We get to see it; a nonclassified version goes to the American people. And then we get the right, if we choose, to disapprove.

The 45-day review was going forward, but none of the other conditions have been met. Right now the law would be such that the 45-day review would go forward. We wouldn't know how thorough it would be because it would be secret. The Congress and the American people would never know the results of the review, and the President would get to say "yes" or "no." The President has already said "yes." If the President had said: I am going to take a new look at this after the 45-day review, it might give us some hope. But he didn't. It is Alice in Wonderlandlike—verdict first, trial second.

Then, this weekend, a few more things occurred. The head of Dubai Ports World was on national television in America on a CNN show. And when asked by Wolf Blitzer, chief correspondent in Dubai, how many containers do you inspect here in Dubai, he answered: I don't know.

When asked what kind of security guarantees do you have about the employees who might work on the perimeter or with the cargo manifests, he didn't even care. He simply said: We have to make our British shareholders happy. That has been the whole trouble with this process. That has been the trouble with the CFUS process. It seems that economics and diplomacy trump security.

In fact, I have been around the CFUS process for a while, being a member of the House Banking Committee and now the Senate Banking Committee. I have been on the Banking Committees for every one of my 26 years in Congress. Basically, it was passed before I got here, but the CFUS process was basically done to give national security cover and allow economic deals to go forward. Because in the 1980s and the 1990s, the greatest concern we had was not security but economics. After 9/11, all that changed, but the CFUS process did not.

Many of us have come to the same conclusion that JERRY LEWIS in the House came to, and I guess 62 of the 64 Appropriations Committee members, bipartisan, in the House Appropriations Committee, that this deal should be stopped.

We don't have the luxury of waiting. That appropriations bill may not get over here until April, the supplemental. It may not be voted on until May. The deal will be consummated and done. And then they will say: You can't undo it. There will be constitutional and legal problems.

We have to act now. There are a variety of ways to act. I have chosen one. There is no monopoly on that. Maybe there is another. And certainly there are a variety of procedures. We can vote, as Senator REID offered, as a separate standing bill today, tomorrow,

early next week. We can do it as part of this bill. We can make an arrangement and make it somewhere else. But the voice of the Senate must be heard. Lobbying reform is important, yes, but so is security. Lobbying reform has some time urgency, given everything we have seen, yes, but not more time urgency than this deal which might endanger our security.

Let me be clear: We can do both. This Chamber can walk and chew gum at the same time. We can spend some time debating this, go back to lobbying reform and accomplish both our goals. But let me make one thing clear: We will use whatever parliamentary means we can to make sure there is a vote on this issue. In recent months and years, the Senate has changed. It is much harder to offer amendments. The tree is filled up. There are agreements that amendments cannot be germane. Closure is filed. Our job, my job, as I represent 19 million New Yorkers, is to see that they are secure, above all. Therefore, I believe that we must vote on this amendment soon, quickly, and move on to other business.

I tell my colleagues, certainly this Senator from New York and, I think, many of my colleagues, will do everything we can to make sure that there is a vote on Dubai Ports World, a meaningful vote that ends the deal before it is too late.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, I have listened to the thoughtful comments this morning. I understand there is some controversy, some passion and anxiety about all of this. It is not partisan. There is nothing partisan about an amendment dealing with the Dubai Ports World issue. This is a significant issue. As my colleagues have said, the bill that is on the floor is also a significant issue. Both need to be dealt with. Both should be considered by this great deliberative body. But this is not about partisanship at all.

I understand partisanship. I regret that there is too much of it in this town. I left the House many years ago, decided I was going to leave the House. I did run for the Senate, but I was done with the House of Representatives. What did it for me was when they established, through then-Congressman Gingrich—I guess it is all right to say his name—something called GOPAC. And they word-tested through polls and then sent out a missive to everyone in his political camp that said: Here is the way we deal with this. When you are describing your opponent in a political election, use the words "sick," "traitor," "pathetic," "antifamily," "antiflag." That was sent all over this country by an organization that said: This is the way you should engage in politics. Here are the words you should use to describe your opponents. And we poll tested them. They work. Describe your opponents as sick, pathetic, traitor, antiflag. That

was sent around the country. That is what polluted the House of Representatives. I had been there long enough when I saw that sort of thing.

I love the Senate. I respect the Senate. I like being here. It is a great privilege to serve in the Senate. I regret there is probably too much partisanship here as well. I don't think we have had the kind of partisanship that infected the House beginning in the late 1980s, but I realize that this body and the House and the President, for that matter, are not in good standing with the American people these days. That circumstance exists because the American people take a look at us and they say: Here is what we face in our daily lives, and you are not addressing it. You are doing nothing about it. Why aren't you sinking your teeth into the significant issues of the day? The issue that faces me when I pull up to the gas pump, why aren't you sinking your teeth into that issue?

Someone stood up in North Dakota recently from a human service nonprofit organization and said: I just had an 81-year-old woman come in looking for a job. She just lost her last job. Do you know what her last job was at age 81? Cleaning office buildings starting at 1 a.m. Then they cut back that employment, so now she needs another job because her Social Security is \$170 a month. So at age 81 she is looking for a second job to clean buildings. Why aren't you doing something about that? Why isn't the Congress addressing that?

An hour ago, this Government announced that last month's trade deficit was \$68.5 billion in 1 month, the highest in the history of the human race. What does that mean? It is not just 68.5 billion dollars, it is jobs, massive numbers of jobs moving overseas, and it is the selling of this country piece by piece; at a rate of \$2 billion a day we are selling America. Why don't we sink our teeth into that? Stem cell research, reimportation of prescription drugs, why don't you sink your teeth into that, they wonder.

At least part of the reason in the Senate that we can't sink our teeth into these issues is because we are prevented from offering amendments to do so. My colleague has offered an amendment on a controversial issue, I understand. The issue of whether a United Arab Emirates company called Dubai Ports World should be managing America's seaports. Should they manage some of America's largest seaports? Is this issue controversial? I suppose it is. Is it urgent that the Congress address this? Of course, it is urgent. The House Appropriations Committee, controlled by the President's own political party, yesterday by a vote of 62 to 2 slapped an amendment on an emergency supplemental appropriations bill designed to provide money for the Department of Defense and for Hurricane Katrina recovery. They slapped an amendment on there to stop this ports deal. Good for them. So there has been offered in

the Senate an amendment to stop the ports deal. All of a sudden the Senate is stopped, dead cold in its tracks. Why is it that a proposal such as this becomes a set of brake pads for the Senate? Who decides it should shut things down because someone offers an amendment to stop this takeover of the management of U.S. ports by a company from the United Arab Emirates? Why wouldn't we vote on it? How about yesterday when it was offered, after people got over being upset that we had to deal with it, how about voting on it and then moving ahead?

The underlying bill by Senator COLLINS and Senator DODD is a bill we should do.

I am enormously pleased with their leadership. That has not been easy to bring that bill to the floor. Senator LIEBERMAN, Senator LOTT, the two I have mentioned should be commended. Look, this is leadership. They have brought a bill to the floor that is important. We need to do it. But there is nothing that suggests that just because an amendment was offered dealing with Dubai Ports World, it ought to shut down the Senate. It didn't shut down the House yesterday when Congressman LEWIS offered it to an emergency supplemental appropriations bill. They just voted. Why have we not voted? Senator FRIST, I guess, has decided we won't vote on it. So we will stop the Senate cold in its tracks. We will pull down on the side of the road and hang out for while.

Does that make any sense to anybody? This doesn't make sense to me. Seventy, seventy-five percent of the American people—polls tell us—think that it is stark raving nuts to have a company owned by the United Arab Emirates manage our major ports. I know we have some people who are the elitists in Washington and who think they know better than all of the American people. They think they have greater wisdom and the American people just don't get it. These elitists think that the American people are isolationist xenophobes and cannot see over the horizon. So we have people in Washington who think this deal with Dubai Ports World is fine. It is not fine with me. It is not fine with 70, 75 percent of the American people.

If we get a vote on it in the Senate, it will not be fine with an overwhelming majority of the Senate. The question is, Will we be able to do in the Senate what the House did? That is, have an opportunity to vote on this proposition: Should a company owned by the United Arab Emirates be managing America's ports?

Well, it is interesting to read some of the things that have been written in recent days about this. United Arab Emirates, to the extent they have cooperated with us since 9/11, good for them. We hope they will continue. But there are questions about the extent to which they were involved in 9/11—yes, two of the hijackers were from there; yes, a substantial amount of evidence

exists that the financing for the 9/11 plots went through financial institutions in the UAE. Dr. Khan from Pakistan was moving nuclear materials that were being pirated and shipped around the world to North Korea and Iran and other countries, and that was accommodated by the UAE ports.

Interestingly enough, the 9/11 Commission report—I have cited the page in a previous discussion—talks about when we knew where Osama bin Laden was in 1999. We knew where he was, because our intelligence pinpointed his location. They readied the cruise missiles to shoot at this location. Overnight, they decided they had to withhold and would not do it. Why? Because George Tenet later said we might have wiped out half of the royal family of the UAE, who were visiting Osama bin Laden at the time.

The 9/11 Commission report puts it a bit differently. It says UAE royal family members were there. But it is written and spoken by the head of the CIA. The reason the attack wasn't launched when we knew where Osama bin Laden was that he was being visited by the royal family of the UAE.

My point is this: That country has had some ties to terrorism. It was one of three countries to recognize the Taliban government, which accommodated Osama bin Laden in Afghanistan. It has ties to terrorism. When the American people learned about CFIUS and all these goofy acronyms and the work these folks have done in secret that says it is OK for a company such as this, owned by UAE, to manage our ports, the people of this country ask: Why is it that a country such as the United States cannot manage its own seaports? If we are so concerned about national security—and we are—and if we are threatened by terrorists consistently—and we are—and if seaports and airports are two of the important elements of national security—and they are—and if you go to the airport and try to board a plane, they will have you take off your shoes and belt, and as you go through the metal detector you will see a 6-year-old kid spread-eagle and being wanded because we are concerned about security, and if that is the case, why then would we turn to seaport security and decide this? With 5.7 million to 5.9 million containers coming in every year to our seaports, we have decided it is OK for a Middle Eastern country—the UAE—with its history, to manage our seaports through a company owned by that government. Does that make sense?

My former colleague, Fritz Hollings, who used to sit at this desk, used to talk about seaport security a lot. We don't have any seaports in North Dakota. But we went back and checked the Record: I came to the floor 13 times from 2001 until the end of 2005 to talk about seaport security—13 times. Almost every time I was here, Senator Fritz Hollings was also here talking about seaport security. We offered and offered and offered amendments to

heighten and increase inspections and seaport security. Now we inspect only 4 to 5 percent of the containers that come in; 96 percent are not inspected. Does that make any sense?

This administration has not been willing to support the substantial enhancement that is necessary for real security at our seaports. One day, God forbid, there may be a terrorist attack that comes from America's seaports. We are spending somewhere close to \$10 billion a year now on the issue of anti-ballistic missile protection, thinking that a rogue nation or a terrorist will acquire an intercontinental ballistic missile, put a nuclear weapon on the tip of it and shoot it at us at 15,000 miles an hour. That is the least likely threat America faces. A much more likely threat is a ship pulling up to a port at 2 to 4 miles an hour, up to the dock in a major American city, full of containers, one of which might have a nuclear weapon in it. Then we are not talking about 3,000 casualties; we are talking about 100,000 or even 300,000 casualties.

So is seaport security important? It is critical. We need to deal with it. We need to send a message to this administration and to all those involved in what is called CFIUS the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States—that we don't improve security at our seaports by deciding we should have the UAE wholly owned company manage our seaports. Mr. Chertoff said it will actually improve security to have the UAE company managing America's seaports. That is so unbelievable that it is almost laughable. But you should not laugh when you are talking about national security issues.

This proposal is going to improve security at our seaports? Hardly. The reason the American people are concerned about it, the reason the Congress is concerned is that we understand this will diminish security. This will erode security at our seaports. Security is already too weak, and it must be dramatically strengthened.

Now, we are here in the Senate chambers with virtually nothing happening. The same thing happened yesterday afternoon. The bill is on the floor of the Senate and the Senate rules are such that you can offer amendments to that bill and they don't have to be germane prior to any cloture motion; they don't have to be relevant to the bill.

I will give you some examples of the problems of the Senate, the way the Senate works these days. I was promised—and others were as well—that we would have a vote on the issue of re-importation of prescription drugs. Re-importation would drive down the price of prescription drugs in the United States because we pay the highest prices in the world, and the same drug, made by the same company, put in the same bottle, made in the same manufacturing plant, is sent to Canada and is sold for one-tenth of the price. I recently sat on a hay bale talking with an old codger who is about 85-years-old.

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