

I am hopeful there will be political breakthroughs. Sunday a week ago the five major players in Iraq recommitted themselves to a plan to come back together, reform the government, and reconcile the Iraqi people, passing major legislation. Debaathification, the ability of Sunnis to hold jobs in the government, is a big piece of legislation that would transform Iraq. Local elections, allowing local people to pick their governors and representatives rather than Baghdad politicians making those appointments, if there were local elections, the Sunnis would participate in large numbers. In 2005, they boycotted the election. Now they are ready to engage in politics.

I predict that based on the success of the surge militarily, the efforts of local reconciliation are real, that they are going to move up to the national level, and soon, very soon, we will have some breakthroughs in Baghdad in terms of political benchmarks that will transform the country. That is my hope, my desire. The way we can achieve that is to pour it on, continue the surge, let it run its course. It has been in place now, I think, since April. Let's keep pouring it on militarily, politically, and economically. We have the enemy on the mat. Let's don't let them up. Morale is sky high. Now is the time for America to exercise good judgment, long-term thinking, and reinforce Iraq instead of withdrawal.

The message to withdraw, no matter how well intended, will not push Iraqi politicians to do anything faster. It will encourage an insurgency that is not being diminished.

Those are the issues that face the Senate as we await news from Iraq. Let's concentrate on the long term. The year 2008 will be here before we know it, but the decisions we make about Iraq will have consequences long after the election of 2008.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TESTER). The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Am I recognized for 20 minutes under morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, let me talk for a moment about the issue of what is our national security. This morning, as I was getting ready for work, I saw another television advertisement put together by people who have accumulated some money and put ads on television. The advertisement is one that says: We have to stay in Iraq. We can't surrender in Iraq. We have to finish the job in Iraq. It says they attacked us on 9/11. The whole implication of the ad is, we are in Iraq because we are fighting the people who attacked us on 9/11. It is the same dishonesty we have heard for a long time.

Let me describe again our national security interests and who attacked us on 9/11. We know who did because they

bragged about it. They boasted about attacking America. It was Osama bin Laden, al-Zawahiri, and others, the leadership of al-Qaida. And where are they? Are they in Iraq? No, they are in Pakistan, we believe, somewhere between Afghanistan and Pakistan. Let me describe the connection of all of this and our national security interests.

This morning in the newspaper we see that in Copenhagen, Denmark, the police have arrested some terrorists engaged in a terrorist plot with links to al-Qaida. They say these terrorists had traveled to Pakistan for training, and the case against them involves links to militants in Pakistan. Separately, last night a German Federal prosecutor had three suspects picked up and arrested late Tuesday. The suspects were members of a terrorist organization, presumably with connections to al-Qaida. There is evidence the men had trained in camps in Pakistan.

So let's understand, whether this is a surprise to any of us. Here is what we learned in February of this year. Senior leaders of al-Qaida operating from Pakistan over the past year have set up a band of training camps in the tribal region near the Afghan border, according to American intelligence and counterterrorism officials. There was mounting evidence that Osama bin Laden, and his deputy, al-Zawahiri, had been steadily building an operations hub in the mountainous Pakistani tribal area of northern Waziristan. That is from the New York Times, quoting top intelligence sources.

In June: Al-Qaida regroups in new sanctuary on Pakistan border. While the U.S. presses its war against an insurgency linked to al-Qaida in Iraq, Osama bin Laden's group is recruiting, regrouping, and rebuilding in a sanctuary along the border between Afghanistan and Pakistan, according to senior U.S. military and intelligence officials. The threat from the radical Islamic enclave in Waziristan is more dangerous than from Iraq, which President Bush and his aides call the "central front" of the war on terrorism, according to some current and former U.S. officials and experts.

The National Intelligence Estimate from July of this year says: Al-Qaida is and will remain the most serious terrorist threat to our homeland. We assess the group has protected or regenerated key elements of its homeland attack capability, including a safe haven in Pakistan's federally administered tribal areas.

Is it a surprise that we pick up the newspaper this morning and see terrorists picked up in Germany, threatening to launch attacks against the largest U.S. base in Europe, and that we read that they trained in Pakistan, likely at an al-Qaida reconstituted training camp? Is that a surprise to us?

We are engaged in a war in Iraq. The television commercial this morning, my colleague this morning, and others,

continue to say that is the central fight of the war against terrorism. It is not. It is a civil war. There is widespread sectarian violence. Yes, there are some terrorists there. Yes, al-Qaida is there. But that is not the central part of what al-Qaida has been about.

Al-Qaida did not have a presence in Iraq prior to 9/11. The television commercial this morning says they attacked us on 9/11. Implying that this is why we are in Iraq fighting that war ignores a whole body of truth, the body of truth I have just described. Those who attacked us and boasted of killing innocent Americans on 9/11 are now in a secure hideaway or a safe haven somewhere in Pakistan, not in Iraq.

I ask this question of the President and the Congress: Why should there be any square inch on the face of this planet that is safe or secure for the leaders of the organization that boasted about attacking America? Why should there be any place on this Earth that is safe or secure for those who the intelligence estimate now tells us are plotting new attacks against our country? Why are they safe and secure? Because this country is engaging door to door in Baghdad in the middle of a civil war. That is a fact.

We have people say: You can't surrender. If you try to redeploy, you are surrendering. I say this: What we ought to do is redeploy and understand that our policy is to fight the terrorists first. When we talk about redeploying, we are not talking about not being able to fight terrorists, even in Iraq, to the extent they exist there. We are talking about leaving enough troops for training of Iraqi forces, about fighting terrorists who exist in Iraq, and about force protection. But you redeploy the troops to fight the terrorists first. Why on Earth should we be debating in the Senate, and the President be in Australia today talking to his counterpart in that country about continuing the fight in Iraq, when Osama bin Laden, al-Zawahiri, and others are planning additional attacks against this country? While, at the same time, bin Laden and his henchmen are "safe" and "secure" in or near Pakistan? That is unbelievable.

We need to change tactics. We need a change in course. When we pick up the paper this morning and read about terrorists being picked up in Germany, plotting attacks against the largest American military base in Europe, and they are trained in Pakistan, likely at an al-Qaida training camp, we are experiencing the fruits of bad policy and dishonest representation about where the fight exists. The central fight against terrorism, it seems to me, is to eliminate the leadership of al-Qaida, the very leadership who boasted about killing innocent Americans on 9/11 and the very leadership who our National Intelligence Estimate now tells us are planning additional attacks against our homeland.

We need a change in course. If we stand here and debate this question

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 inter-

cepted 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