

should be cutting off relations with Pakistan? I don't think so. They say there were concerns about what they did, but now they work with us.

I believe we have about 500 to 700 naval ships that are docked in the UAE on a regular basis. Our ability to fight the war on terror is dependent in part on the partnership we have with the UAE. They support us in the war in Afghanistan. We have a changed situation in the post-9/11 world. We have an ally whose policy I don't like when it comes to boycotting Israel. That is something that deeply troubles me, and it should be a factor that we look into. But the bottom line is you can't pick out all the negatives and not recognize in this post-9/11 world that we have a country that has been an ally, that does billions in trade with us. We put the safety of our sailors in their hands at their ports.

I think we have to look at the whole picture and allow the review to go forward with an understanding that nothing is going to happen within 45-days—no change of ownership and no increase in security problems.

Let me briefly try to address the overall issue of port security and container security. Some of us have been working on that before the issue became the issue de jour, the issue of the day. I have been to Hong Kong and looked at the operation. I have been at the Port of L.A. I have looked at the radiation portals, the radiation portal monitors that we have in various places throughout this country.

The reality is that today there are 11 million cargo containers coming into this country, and we actually closely look at perhaps 1 in 20—5 percent. That is what we look at. We have a system. It is not a random system. It is a targeted system. These are things that are based on the manufacturer, where the cargo came from, and a range of things—who the shipper is and who the receiving company is. We are looking at 1 in 20. We need to do better.

One of the things we should be doing—and I had a chance to review this when I was in Hong Kong. They have part of their operation in which they have put in place American technology. They are actually able to literally, almost like a moving CAT scan—as the trucks come from mainland China with the goods being sent to the United States, they don't stop. They just keep coming in. They go through two portals. You get a screening. You can see what is inside the vehicle. At the same time, right at the very end, there is a radiation portal monitor which gives us an indication of whether there is any nuclear material in that cargo.

At the same time, the operators—the folks who are watching this—have a manifest of what is in it. If the manifest says X-thousand DVDs and all of a sudden you see a big, solid kind of cylindrical object, you have a problem. You stop it and do further inspection. You take a look at it. They have an op-

portunity to screen 100 percent of that. That should be the standard we set.

I am introducing this morning a bill that will require the Department of Homeland Security to put in place a system to screen each and every one of the cargo containers that come into this country. That is the kind of security we need. In addition to that—and I believe the UAE deal represents a concern, even though security is being done, certainly, at home by the Coast Guard and Homeland Security, even though the reality is that cargo security starts at overseas ports, it is not when it comes into our waters—we have, I believe, 41 agreements called the "Container Security Initiative." We have the Department of Homeland Security sitting side by side in foreign countries with personnel who run their ports looking at every manifest that comes in, making some judgments about what is inspected and not inspected. At the same time, we have an agreement with private security, CTPAT, Partnership Against Terrorism. We work, then, on the private side to have measures in place that will increase the measure of safety and security that we have regarding these containers coming in.

The bottom line is, I am concerned if we have a foreign entity that is owning or operating an American port, that they would have access, then, to our security procedures. That raises concerns.

The other reality is that 80 percent of the terminals in the United States are foreign owned—either foreign companies, or in some cases—by the way, I say to my colleague from California, there are four port operations on the west coast that are foreign owned by foreign countries—three by Singapore and one by China.

Do we feel any safer that China owns a major American port operation? The reality is there hasn't been a problem, by the way, until this deal. Now we hear there is a crisis. Now we have to hear we have to act today.

What is happening today is it is about politics. That is what is happening today. We had an understanding that we should have a 45-day review, that we should have access to then participate in that and look at the information as it comes in. And we should have a clear opportunity to make a judgment about that 45-day review.

We have something else today. But the bottom line, again, is that part of the bill that I will introduce today will require a separation of ownership, and we can't unravel 80 percent of the terminals that are foreign owned, foreign operations. Each of these operations should have an American company, folks who are operating these ports who understand the security procedures. They should be vetted. They should be cleared. We should know who they are.

If we can separate operations from ownership, if we can make sure we have in place a system whereby each

and every piece of cargo in a container that is coming into this country—the 11 million that come in by ship, and then if we can reform the CFIUS process so it is more transparent, so Congress has a chance to review these things before they happen, we will be much better served. That is the way this deliberative body should act rather than playing with the politics, to demand that we have to do something today when, in fact, we have a process, a review process. We should let it go forward and not allow anything to change until our will has been heard, then do the things that we have to do to check out each and every piece of material coming into this country, require Homeland Security do that, and, as I said before, separate the operation of ports, where we have folks we can vet, who we can check out, those who own it.

By the way, we have, I believe, about \$100 billion of foreign investment in this country. That is a good thing. It is called jobs for Americans, economic security, national security. Let us strengthen our national security when it comes to cargo container security, but let us not act on politics at the moment.

IRAN

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. President, I want to move on to what I intended to talk about today, and that is Iran.

I will not speak that long.

I think it is important to respond to the outrageous comments made by the Government of Iran this week and this latest stunt by the despotic Iranian regime that said: The United States may have the power to cause harm and pain, but it is also susceptible to harm and pain. If the United States wishes to choose that path, let the ball roll.

First, there is a method to this madness. There is a method to this, with what this regime needs and is seeking to do. It needs crisis. It needs to raise the level of tension to justify its own increased militarization in the harsh security measures at home. That is what it is intending to do.

On the other hand, we have to take them at their threat, at their word. If they are threatening the United States, take them at their word. Hitler told us in "Mien Kampf" what he was going to do. We did not listen, and there was a terrible price to be paid.

The Iranian mullahs and the President are telling us they intend to destroy Israel. They are very clear that they are on a path to obtain nuclear weapons. We know it. Let's take them at their word. Let's say: Yes, this is what you want to do, we know it, and we will not let you do it.

When the President of Iran issued the first threat about the destruction of Israel, behind him was a huge banner, with good graphics. It was a big hourglass. The hourglass ball is dropping. That glass ball, which is very fragile, is Israel, about to be destroyed. But if

you look very closely on the floor, already destroyed is the USA. That is their intention, what they intend to do. We have to understand we take them at their word, and we have to make sure they do not have the opportunity to develop a nuclear weapon. It is time for the international community to act stronger than it has acted, maybe call their bluff. Strong words from the Iranians require a strong response from the Security Council. Iran has threatened the United States with harm because we are looking to hold them accountable for their actions or to endorse their international commitments.

In light of this situation, no sound-minded diplomat can claim the purpose of the Iranian program is benign or that it can be trusted to uphold any part of a compromise agreement. They do not want agreement. We talk about continuing the discussions with the Russian plan they laid out. We have to presume that the other side really wants an end to the crisis, but there is no rational basis to presume they want an end to the crisis. They want the crisis. They want to push it forward. They want to engage in dialog as they continue their efforts to obtain nuclear materials. So there is no incentive for us to engage in the negotiation.

If you look at proposals—some unacceptable, to flatout dangerous—all require enormous concessions to the Iranians to get their buy-in. Again, we have to say, does the other side want an end to the crisis? Do they want to do a deal? The answer is “no.”

The Iranians already rejected a Russian proposal to jointly enrich uranium on Russian soil. There has also been talk of a deal where Iran will be allowed to conduct small-scale research enrichment in exchange for postponing industrial-scale research. This is ludicrous to be talking about.

Our friends on the Security Council must recognize compromise with Iran is not an end to itself but only used when it is seeking to reach an objective, to prevent them from producing nuclear weapons. Any deal that allows Iran to retain uranium does not serve this objective.

This week, the IAEA must refer—and I use the word “refer”—Iran to the Security Council with a strongly worded IAEA resolution that will lead to robust Security Council action, not to rest on what was a weak IAEA resolution passed last month which reported Iran to the Council. Under the chart of the U.N., the Security Council is granted jurisdiction over “threats to international peace and security.” There is no more evident, obvious threat to international peace and security than the attempt of Iran to obtain nuclear materials and to develop a nuclear weapon.

The Security Council action was absolutely necessary in dealing with Iran. I am aware that several of our partners on the Council—namely, Russia and China—have yet to come to understand

the urgency of the crisis we face with Iranian’s nuclear program. For this reason, I support the administration’s efforts to build a coalition of allies who are willing to impose meaningful sanctions on Iran, should certain members of the Security Council fail to act responsibly by withholding support for sanctions. Action needs to be taken immediately. Sanctions need to be taken immediately. The international community cannot be constrained from action against imminent threat to peace and security by a few self-interested actors. We cannot be cowed and bowed by the threats of the Iranians.

We must move forward. This is a threat to peace and security of the entire world. We have to act now.

I yield the floor.

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

DUBAI

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, the focus today, as we look at reforming lobbyist activities, is trying to show that there is an honest face within the Senate and within the Congress. We must continue with those activities.

However, at the same time, we are looking at a situation that worries more than 70 percent of the American people today. There is no doubt about it, this deal is done. Today, Dubai Ports World owns shipping terminals throughout the United States and in my home State of New Jersey.

Frankly, it is an outcome we are all trying to prevent, and we need to do whatever we can to reverse it. I am not sure it is possible, despite the positive words from colleagues across the room. That is why I am a cosponsor of this amendment.

I know the port area very well in my State of New Jersey. It is called the Port of New York and New Jersey. It is the second busiest container port on the east coast. Millions of tons of cargo pass through it. It is strictly located to be near markets. It is less than 2 miles from the Newark Airport, one of the busiest in the country, and stretches almost to the shores of New York, 2 miles of land that the FBI says is the most dangerous 2 miles of territory in America for a terrorist attack.

The reason goes beyond the confluence of all kinds of activities. It also is an area where there is lots of chemical manufacturing, chemical transportation, and warehousing of chemical materials. And it is said that if an attack were successful in that area, we could be looking at millions of deaths. And we want to transfer the operation of that terminal container, the second biggest in the harbor, to Dubai? People are saying it is good business and something that we have to do in the interests of foreign trade and international economies.

The Dubai Ports deal has been mishandled by the administration from the beginning. President Bush gave the

deal a casual “thumbs up” when it deserved the highest scrutiny. As a matter of fact, it wasn’t even brought to the attention of senior Cabinet officials. Or if it was brought to their attention, they forgot it; they did not remember it.

Instead of a real investigation, the administration issued a document called a Statement of No Objection. We have heard the President’s determination to have this go through, even suggesting that he would veto it if there were any attempt to block the transaction. It is a simple statement, the Statement of No Objection, issued by the Treasury Department that said: No problem, go ahead and take over these terminals in our country. Frankly, it was an irresponsible move.

On September 11, longshoremen, people employed on the docks at Port Newark, could see the smoke rising from the World Trade Center across the river. Indeed, throughout New Jersey, people looked to the sky in disbelief. And now, the President is telling these people, my constituents, not to worry? That is not good enough.

The Bush administration has been playing a shell game on this issue from the very beginning. First, they said no thorough investigation was necessary and approved the deal. What they were saying, basically, is “mission accomplished.” “All done.” We have heard that before, and we know the consequences that came after that. There was a public outcry.

Now the administration is supposedly conducting a thorough investigation. Frankly, it is a meaningless gesture. The deal is done. The deal is closed. Its final moments are today. So now the Ports World Company from Dubai owns those terminals. Before this new investigation even began, President Bush announced he had made up his mind. Last week he said: My position hasn’t changed. That throws out the possibility of a truly objective investigation.

This is not simply a 45-day investigation. It is a 45-day stall while the administration hopes the American people will forget about the problem and they can go ahead with the business they plan. But we will not forget what happened on September 11 and we will not forget how much energy, resources, and prayers we devoted to keeping that kind of an incident from ever happening again in America, an attack that wounded us forever. We will not forget how the administration tried to rubberstamp this deal. Our constituents are alarmed. They should be.

I don’t think Dubai is a terrible place or the people are awful people. But they consort with people with whom we do not agree. They have a terrible record in Dubai of controlling their own ports. Dubai was a key transfer point for illegal shipments of nuclear weapon components that were sent to Iran, North Korea, and Libya. The relationship with Iran and Dubai is one that is unholy. Iran’s stated purpose,