about, well, if you redeploy, change course here or there, you are surrendering, that is not looking truth in the eye at all. The television commercial I saw this morning—put together, I am sure, by some big money interests that are suggesting somehow we are in Iraq because they attacked us on 9/11—is the perpetration of the same dishonesty we have seen for years.

We have had soldiers in Iraq longer than we were fighting in the Second World War. I want Iraqis to be free. Saddam Hussein is gone. He is dead. He was executed. They now have a new Constitution and a new Government. Now the question is, Will the Iraqi people have the will to provide for their own security?

We are going to leave Iraq. The question is not whether; it is when. We cannot keep 160,000 American troops in the middle of a civil war in Iraq for any lengthy period of time, especially while Osama bin Laden and al-Zawahiri are in the mountains training additional terrorists whom they then send to Germany and perhaps to our country. We have to change course. That is a fact. I am not giving you my opinion. I am telling you what the National Intelligence Estimate tells us about the greatest threat to our country.

The greatest threat to our homeland, according to the National Intelligence Estimate, is the leadership of al-Qaida, and they are in a safe and secure haven, and they are planning additional attacks against our country. If one does not understand that by reading that which we should read, go back to just prior to 2001 and take a look at the headline on the PDF briefing given to the President in August 2001: ''Bin Laden determined to strike in the U.S.'' It is time we read and it is time we understand. Regrettably, that has not been the case recently. I hope it will as we turn to this debate in a serious way.

The change in course has to be, in my judgment: Fight the terrorists first. That ought to be this country's policy.

That was not why I came to the floor of the Senate today, but I was inspired to remember the television commercial I saw the first thing this morning and then inspired by my colleague's statement about Iraq, once again.

TRADE AND CONSUMER SAFETY

Mr. DORGAN. If I might, in a separate part of the RECORD, I wish to talk about something that showed up in the newspapers this morning as well. I wish to tell you first—this was not in the papers this morning—about something that was a while back. I wish to tell you about a 4-year-old boy named Jarnell Brown. Jarnell Brown was from Minnesota. Jarnell is now dead. Jarnell is dead because he was visiting a friend's house, and he swallowed a small heart-shaped charm that came on a bracelet that came with a pair of Reebok tennis shoes. It turns out that little charm, that little jewelry charm contained 99 percent lead, and it killed Jarnell Brown. It was 99 percent lead.

It came from China, which probably should not surprise us. It suggests, once again, in this global economy—in which we decide we are going to produce elsewhere and ship here, after we spent a century developing standards to protect workers, protect consumers, the kinds of things Americans basically expect to be protected for and from—we decide we are going to outsource all that so we will have all these products made elsewhere and shipped into our country.

So we get tennis shoes, and we get a charm bracelet, and we get a heart attached to the end of the bracelet that is 99 percent lead, and the young boy accidentally swallows that little heart and dies from lead poisoning.

Now, let me talk a bit about this morning's news. Mattel is announcing this morning a product recall. They are recalling 848,000 Chinese-made Barbie and Fisher-Price toys that have excessive amounts of lead. Toys are being pulled from store shelves, including Barbie kitchen and furniture items, Fisher-Price train toys, and Bongo Band drums.

These are innocent enough looking products. But the surface paint on these products contains excessive levels of lead, prohibited under our Federal laws because of the serious threat they pose to human health, particularly the health of young children.

I do not suggest that Mattel has any response this morning other than being heartsick and heartbroken over this situation. Mattel is a good company. But what has happened to Mattel has happened to many other companies. They outsource production and then ship the product into this country, and there is no determination of whether those products are produced under the same conditions we would require in this country.

We only inspect 1 percent of the products that come into this country. So whether it is food or toys or jewelry or other things we require certain kinds of standards with respect to its production here, yet there are no such standards required with respect to production elsewhere. Oh, I know the people who outsource these contracts will say: Well, we require this and that of them. But there is no enforcement, and everyone knows that.

Let me describe a few of the circumstances. I talk about the lead paint. As we know, lead paint is used because it is bright, durable, flexible, fast drying, and, above all, it is cheap. So the Chinese, we now know from products that are being pulled from the shelves, have used lead paint. They mass produce lead paint and coloring agents such as lead chromate that are generally cheaper than other pigments, so we are now seeing the effect of that on store shelves.

This poor 4-year-old boy felt the effect in the most extreme way. He died.

It is not just China, and it is not just toys. FDA inspectors recently intercepted shipments of black pepper with salmonella from India, intercepted crab meat from Mexico too filthy to eat, and produce from the Dominican Republic was stopped 813 times last year for containing traces of illegal pesticides—this is a country with whom we just signed a trade agreement.

Now let me describe—even as we have galloped globally to outsource production but not to develop and maintain the protections for the American consumers on the products coming in—the Food and Drug Administration. Under the Bush administration, the FDA's safety mission I think has been substantially reduced. In fact, the FDA is planning to close 7 of its 13 drug safety labs, and it would close or consolidate a number of its 20 regional offices.

The trend has been to inspect fewer, not more, imports into this country under the administration. The FDA tests, we are told, about 1 percent of imported food. Last year, the FDA took 50 percent fewer samples for testing from imported seafood than it did in the year previous.

The issue is not just China, but China has been in the news more than any other country. Let me describe the circumstance of China because that has become the most notorious offshore platform. Toys, dolls, games, for all of these products China ranks as our No. 1 source of imports; fish, seafood, China is No. 1. Tires, China is No. 1; also for pet food, and toothpaste; and the list goes on. In fact, we have such a giant trade deficit with China—this chart shows what is happening with our trade relationship with China, which I think demonstrates an incompetence that is almost breathtaking for this country, an incompetence with respect to the negotiating of trade agreements and an incompetence with respect to enforcing trade agreements. But aside from that, I describe a circumstance here, and we are seeing it now every day in the newspapers, of the danger to U.S. consumers.

Well, pet food—how many Americans had their pets die as a result of contaminated pet food coming into this country? It was discovered that animal food, pet food from China contained substances that are dangerous to pets. Sixty million packages of pet food under 150 brands were recalled after it was found that ingredients in pet food could be dangerous to pets.

Seafood—the U.S. FDA banned the import of five types of farm-raised fish and shrimp from China after they were found to contain unsafe drugs, some of which cause cancer.

Now, I am telling you what they have found and banned, and I am telling you they have only inspected 1 percent.

Toothpaste, Chinese-made toothpaste sold in dollar stores—the FDA has warned consumers to throw out any toothpaste made in China. In fact, they not only found some of the toothpaste was contaminated with a dangerous ingredient, they found other toothpaste

that was contaminated with the ingredient and did not list the ingredient on the toothpaste box.

Toys and jewelry—I mentioned Mattel. There are others. Mattel has had three very substantial recalls of Chinese-made toys in the last 5 months. Again, my guess is the executives of that company are heartsick about what is happening. But it is a result of exporting manufacturing and not having the protections with respect to the conditions under which that product is manufactured—the protections for American consumers that we have always come to expect.

I did not mention with respect to toys, the RC2 Corporation recalled 1.5 million of these little toys, Thomas & Friends from its Wooden Railway product line, made by Hansheng Wood Products Factory in China using lead paint.

According to a spot check recently, it was announced 20 percent of Chinese-made jewelry contains potentially poisonous chemicals, including lead.

Automobile tires—a tire importer called Foreign Tire Sales recalled 255,000 Chinese-made tires in August because they lacked a safety feature that prevents tread separation.

I do not need to go through much more but only to say this: These are real serious issues. I started by talking about a young 4-year-old boy named Jarnell Brown. He died. There are real consequences to these issues. We spent a century developing standards in this country to protect workers, to protect consumers, and we built something very special and very important in this country.

Now, under a galloping global economy, in which the rules have not kept pace, we are told: Well—do you know what?—we are going to outsource manufacturing because we can pay people 30 cents an hour in sweatshops somewhere around the world, and we can have it manufactured for less money.

Well, if that cheap product is unsafe for your health, if that product—whether it is food or vegetables or toys or jewelry—if that product is harmful to your health, we need to rethink the standards by which we engage in this global economy. Yes, it is a global economy, and I do not suggest we are going to retreat from the global economy. I do suggest this: We should participate in the global economy on our terms. We should describe what kind of participation we will have with respect to this economy in a way that is fair to our workers, that earns a decent wage in this country, and in a way that protects our consumers for whom we have established certain consumer protections.

I know someone will say that is regulation. Yes, it is regulation. I spoke on the floor of the Senate one day, when I held up a package of beef. I asked consent to do that. You have to have consent to hold up a package of beef on the floor of the Senate because it is an object to show. I said: I do not think anybody can tell me where this beef came from. I know they could not because it is not labeled.

So then I read the description of what the investigator found, the inspector found when he went to a plant in Hermosillo, Mexico, and inspected a plant that was processing beef, slaughtering cattle, processing beef and shipping it to the United States. He found carcasses hanging under a hot roof, with flies and feces all over the carcasses. He described horrendous things that I read on the floor of the Senate and led me to ask: Does anybody want to buy beef from that circumstance?

Well, guess what. It was the only time that plant had ever been inspected—the only time. As a result, the plant lost its license. It then was sold, then changed its name, and was relicensed. It is now selling beef to the United States and has never again been inspected.

I use that only to say it is exactly the same coin—the flip side of the same coin, of lead paint coming in a heart-shaped toy from China that a young child swallows and, as a result, dies.

I have introduced legislation dealing with the other side of this as well with respect to workers' rights, dealing with sweatshop labor and conditions under which people are working in sweatshops in other parts of the world; working in sweatshops and, in some cases, producing these kinds of products. Why? Because it is cheap. Cheap labor, cheap products. Use lead; it is cheap. The problem is it is harmful to your health and especially harmful to children. The legislation I have introduced dealing with the issue of sweatshops and being fair to American workers would ban the product of sweatshop labor coming into this country. That bill, which is S. 367, has 12 bipartisan cosponsors.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add Senator CLINTON today as a cosponsor to that piece of legislation.

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

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, if we look at these issues in the context not of trying to destroy the advantages of a global economy but in the context of trying to make certain the protections we have developed for our country—protections that have allowed us to create a wonderful place in which to work and consume—if we can, with respect to our participation in the global economy, raise standards rather than lower ours—if we can do that, then we will have done something significant. But that is not what has been happening. What has been happening in this country is a race to the bottom, and a rush to embrace the refrain by some who want to produce where it is cheap and sell here and run their income through the Cayman Islands to avoid paying taxes, and they say, You know, we don't want any more regulations. I understand that. They want to avoid regulations. They want to avoid paying a decent wage. They want to go to offshore manufacturing platforms some place and produce little bracelets with little hearts that are made with 99 percent lead to ship into this country. That doesn't work. It won't work anymore. Somehow, as a country, we have to find a way to stop it.

My colleague Senator DURBIN has a piece of legislation on the safety of food imports, which I am working on with him. I have also described the sweatshop labor bill I have introduced, and it is a bipartisan bill, and my hope is we can move and begin to address these issues.

I know there are others who are going to want to speak in morning business, and as soon as they come I will discontinue mine, but I do want to make a couple of other points about this country's economy.

When one looks at the last century or so, we created a place that is pretty unusual on this Earth and we did that because we cared about American workers, and we created a manufacturing base that was the strongest in the world. You cannot long remain a world economic power without a first-rate manufacturing base, and we are now seeing that some don't care about a manufacturing base. Let's outsource to wherever we can find the cheapest labor. Let's outsource to not only where we can find the cheapest labor, but also where we can combine that with the lack of regulations. We can allow that to exist in circumstances where those who produce and pump chemicals into the air, chemicals into the water. Well, the problem with that is you are not only confronted with what is called ''the China price,'' the China price with respect to goods—you have to compete with the China price—you also now understand the term ''the China haze,'' because we are breathing pollutants that come from China. We all live in the same fishbowl. Things we long ago abandoned in this country because we understand it causes cancer, causes terrible danger to human health, we are now breathing again in this country because of a phenomenon called the China haze.

I know I have described China at some length today. It is not only China we need to be concerned about with respect to what are fair rules and fair requirements with respect to our participation in the global economy. But I don't think we should any longer ignore the consequences about what we read in the paper this morning: the recall of hundreds of thousands of additional toys that are shipped into this country to be sold on store shelves and to be played with by American children when, in fact, they contain amounts of lead that are harmful or dangerous to our children. We can't ignore that.

I congratulate the companies that are recalling those products, but we shouldn't have had a reason to recall them in the first place. They should have been produced under conditions that we would have known in this country to be safe, that represent the

standards we long ago have required in this country. That has not been the case, and I think that because it is not the case, it raises a great many questions. I also, as I indicated earlier, believe at the very time we are seeing all of these products coming into this country that can cause serious problems for human health, at the very time we see that, to see this administration decide to retract on those issues and begin to actually inspect fewer rather than more products, at a time when we are inspecting only 1 percent of all of that which comes in, I think that is a serious step in exactly the wrong direction.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. 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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the situation in Iraq and the continuing efforts of this administration to paint a rosy picture and to cling to straws when the situation on the ground and common sense suggest just the opposite.

Some have argued that the surge in Iraq is working, but all you have to do is look at the facts to know that is not the case. The President went to Anbar Province, which at the moment he is touting as a place of success, but we all know what is happening in Iraq. Many other provinces are in terrible shape. In Iraq, in a certain sense, when you push on one end of the balloon and make things a little better, something pops out at another end.

The fallacy of the President's new policy is amazing. Are we placing our faith in the future of Iraq in the hands of some warlords, some tribal leaders who at the moment dislike al-Qaida more than they dislike us? Make no mistake about it: They are no friends of Americans. Is this the vaunted clarion cry for democracy in the Middle East that the President announced when he started the buildup in Iraq? Obviously not. This is a policy of last resort. This is a policy of desperation. To say at the moment that some warlords in one province in Iraq happen to be shooting at al-Qaida when 6 months from now they could easily turn around and resume shooting at Americans, which they did in the past, is nothing to base a policy on. What kind of policy is it? What are the odds that 6 months from now, the fragile and perilous situation in Anbar will reverse itself and collapse? We have heard of success stories every 6 or 8 months: This province, this town, this city—they are clear, they are safe. Then, because of the basic facts on the ground, we revert to the old situation.

Let me be clear. The violence in Anbar has gone down despite the surge, not because of the surge. The inability of American soldiers to protect these tribes from al-Qaida said to these tribes: we have to fight al-Qaida ourselves. It wasn't that the surge brought peace here; it was that the warlords took peace here, created a temporary peace here, and that is because there was no one else there protecting them.

As I said, we have heard about successes in the past. They are temporary. They are not based on any permanent structural change or any permanent change in the views of Iraqi citizens. We have heard about success in Baghdad. We have heard about success in Fallujah. We have heard about success in this province and that province, and it vanishes like the wind. So now, at a time when the people of America are crying out for a change in course, are some going to base a temporary situation in one province—Anbar—based on a few warlords who don't believe in democracy and who don't like America, as a way to continue the present misguided policy? It makes no sense.

It makes no sense because the fundamentals in Iraq stay the same. There is no central government that has any viability. The Shiites, the Kurds, and the Sunnis dislike one another far more than they like or want any central government, and these two facts doom the administration's policy to failure. Only 7 or 8 months ago when the President began the surge, he said it was to give the present Government breathing room, to strengthen the Maliki government. Today, we have more troops, more military patrols, more death, and the Iraqi Government grows weaker. How can we regard the Bush-Petraeus surge as a success when its central goal—to strengthen the Government—has failed? Again, more troops, more American deaths this summer than any other, and yet the Government is weaker, when the very purpose of the surge was to strengthen the Government and, in the President's words, to give it breathing room. By the President's own words, the Government is suffocating while the surge goes on. It doesn't have breathing room.

Why isn't it apparent to the President? Why isn't it apparent to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that the stated goal of the surge is failing? Strengthening the central government has not happened. As the surge and the number of troops goes up, the strength of the central government goes down. That equation says failure in the Bush-Petraeus surge.

The goal is not a military goal. In the President's own words, it is to give the Government of Iraq greater stability, greater breathing room, and that Government, by just about every standard, is worse off than it was before. Again, because a few warlords and tribal leaders are now temporarily on our side for the moment, even though they are not loyal to us, they don't like us and they dislike the central government, that is why we should continue the present course in Iraq? It makes no sense.

Then those on the other side of the President say, give us a chance; you are already declaring defeat. If this were 2003 or 2004 or 2005 or maybe even 2006, maybe those words would have some resonance with the American people. But there has been new plan after new plan, new hope after new hope, and they all are dashed within months. Why? Why? Again, because the fundamentals on the ground don't change. The Kurds, the Shiites, the Sunnis dislike one another more than they like any central government.

If you look at the benchmarks, they show that. The independent GAO report showed little progress being made in meeting the 18 military and political benchmarks set out by Congress. The draft report from last week showed only three of the benchmarks had been met. However, over the weekend, the Pentagon revised the report and now miraculously an additional four benchmarks were ''partially met.'' Despite the apparent efforts by the Pentagon to edit this independent report, it will sadly take much more than a red pen to correct the failures of the President's Iraq policy.

So the surge, by the President's own stated goal, has failed. The central government is weaker. The fundamentals on the ground continue to deteriorate. There continues to be no loyalty to a central government in Iraq and no loyalty to Maliki, who seems to almost revel in his incompetence. The bottom line is very simple: We are worse off, not better off, not even the same, in Iraq today than we were 6 months ago. The position of America, the position of democracy, the position of stability, continues to erode.

If there was ever a need for a change of course in Iraq, it is now. I plead with my colleagues from the other side of the aisle. You know we have to change course. The President has thrown you this magical sort of temporary solution—Anbar Province. Don't be fooled. It is no different than Fallujah was a few years ago, or Baghdad, or all of these other ''successes.'' They are not successes because the facts on the ground are the same.

The American people—three-quarters—cry out for a change of course in Iraq. The President doesn't hear them. The President doesn't look at the facts on the ground. The very same fallacies that led us into this war—that there were weapons of mass destruction and Iraq was at the center of a nexus of terrorism—are now blinding my colleagues on the other side of the aisle from changing course in Iraq—the same types of false statements and pretenses. It is time to change course for the sake of the soldiers who are valiantly defending us; for the sake of moving on and having America focus