

did provide a way forward. In doing so, he withheld millions of dollars for our troops and for our veterans and ignored the advice of military leaders and the Iraq Study Group and, importantly, the will of the American people.

Today the President stands alone against the vast majority of Americans desperately seeking a new direction in Iraq. It is now up to him to come to the negotiating table and provide the American people with a real strategy for success.

Mr. President, we also have before us today a bill on the FDA.

Can I ask how much time I have remaining?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has only about a half a minute remaining.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I see another colleague on the Senate floor, and I ask him how much time he is going to need.

Mr. BROWN. Five or ten minutes. Go ahead.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for an additional 5 minutes to speak to the FDA bill that is in front of us today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator is recognized.

FDA REAUTHORIZATION

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, all of us in the Senate share the same goal of making sure the Food and Drug Administration stays as the gold standard for drug safety and effectiveness, and the legislation that is before the Senate today moves us toward that goal.

Throughout our country, researchers, scientists, and doctors are making 21st century medical advances, and the legislation we are looking at will ensure we have a 21st century FDA. It provides the resources, the authority, and the oversight to ensure that safe drugs move from the lab to our medicine cabinets without delay.

Like other Members of the Senate, I worked on the FDA reforms back in the 1990s. Those reforms responded to the challenges we faced then. The bill before us now responds to the challenges we face today.

In recent years, we have seen a lot of problems at the FDA with drug approval and postmarket surveillance. The bill we have addresses those challenges and ensures the FDA has the resources and the tools to promptly and thoroughly review new drugs and medical devices.

The bill reauthorizes and improves two pieces of legislation that will be critical in providing a timely review process. It creates a new system to actively monitor drugs after they have been approved by the FDA. It strengthens science at the FDA and, importantly, improves transparency. It improves oversight and information about clinical trials, and it works to prevent potential conflicts of interest among advisory committee members.

Like many Americans, I was shocked at the recent revelations concerning drugs that posed risks to public safety but remained on the market for far too long. This legislation moves to address those concerns by instituting strong, new protections, including postmarket studies that will be made available to the public. I believe this new transparency and vigorous oversight is the right path toward restoring public confidence in the FDA.

The bill takes critical steps also to improve medical care for our children. The Best Pharmaceuticals for Children Act that is included in this bill uses incentives and regulations to put America's children first. It builds upon the legislation we enacted back in 1997 that ensures pediatric medicine is a priority and that information on pediatric drugs is readily available. It extends and improves a program that has undertaken nearly 800 studies and has helped to provide pediatric labeling information for 119 drugs.

The Pediatric Research Improvement Act included in this bill is another critical component of improving pediatric care. It provides needed safety measures through mandatory clinical trials. It will help to continue pediatric oversight programs that have required trials for more than 1,000 pediatric drugs since 1998. All too often, doctors are not given guidance on the proper dose of prescription drugs for children. This bill is going to eliminate that guesswork so our children get the right doses for safer, more effective treatment.

The bill also provides help to our Nation's children through the Pediatric Medical Devices Safety and Improvement Act. Every year, we see these wondrous technological improvements in medical devices. However, sometimes those improvements do not account for the needs of the children and the pediatricians who treat them. What that means is essential, often lifesaving devices do not meet the size or the scope or the needs of sick children. This bill will push manufacturers to develop and produce devices that are safe and effective for children and infants. Through incentives and investor outreach, this bill will ensure that exciting advances in lifesaving devices are not just limited to adults.

This legislation also delivers greater safety while providing better access. I believe it will improve the way we deliver safe innovative health care in America, and it is really my hope it will also begin to restore confidence in the institutions that safeguard our public health.

The American public deserves nothing less than the gold standard of care from our FDA. When a nervous parent or worried senior visits their corner pharmacy, they deserve to know the product they buy on that shelf has been approved by a thorough and complete process. When a patient begins to take a new drug, they deserve a system that has actively tracked that drug and pro-

vides the patient with information on any risks they might face. Everyone—drug companies, researchers, patients, and doctors alike—deserves a system that supports an efficient and timely FDA approval process.

So I am very eager to move this legislation forward and get it to a vote so we can begin to deliver what the American people deserve. I hope this Senate moves quickly on this bill and we are able to move it along in the process very shortly in the Senate.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

TRANSEA ACT

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, our trade policy is fundamentally flawed. Years of wrongheaded trade pacts have sent millions of jobs overseas, devastated our communities, and opened our Nation too often to serious homeland security concerns.

When we open our borders to trade, as we should, we open them to national security threats. Congress must assure the American people we have done everything within our power to protect their safety and their health and their welfare and to promote fair trade.

It is estimated that less than 10 percent of foreign cargo is inspected before entering our country. We must both ensure that our ports are operated securely and with clear lines of accountability, unlike the deal to transfer operation of six U.S. ports to a state-owned company controlled by the United Arab Emirates that this administration approved just last year.

The decision to allow a UAE-controlled company to run our ports had significant national security implications. The UAE was, and still may be, a financial and travel outlet for known terrorists. It was not until leaders in both parties in the Senate and in the House of Representatives called attention to this enormous blunder that this deal was stopped.

It is imperative Congress take steps to ensure our homeland security needs are secured every bit as much as our economic well-being.

Today, I am introducing, with Senator BYRON DORGAN of North Dakota, the Trade-Related American National Security Enhancement and Accountability, TRANSEA, Act.

This act requires the Office of the United States Trade Representative, in collaboration with the Departments of State, Homeland Security, and Justice, to submit a report to Congress detailing the national security considerations of proposed trade agreements prior to commencing and after concluding those trade negotiations.

The bill also requires future trade agreements negotiated by the administration to include a national security waiver that allows the President to suspend any terms of the agreement should it be required in the interests of U.S. national security.

Lastly, as a final safeguard, the legislation creates a new Congressional Executive Commission on Trade Security, requiring the appointment of Commissioners by both political parties in both Chambers of Congress.

The Commissioners will be charged with annually certifying that the terms of the free-trade agreement do not pose a threat to our Nation's national security interests. Should the Commission find that compliance with the agreement would pose a threat, the President will be obligated to exercise his or her waiver to the extent necessary to ensure the safety and the security of the United States of America.

In a post-9/11 world, U.S. economic policy can simply no longer be viewed in the narrow scopes of bottom lines and profit margins. Homeland Security Secretary Michael Chertoff said, in 2006:

We have to balance the paramount urgency of security against the fact that we still want to have a robust global trading system.

We can do both. It is the responsibility of our Government to ensure that while opening markets for our exporters, as we should, our first priority remains the safety and the security of the American people.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

IRAQ

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I rise today to address the war supplemental which was vetoed last night at 10 minutes after 6 by the President. It is my understanding that today leaders from both sides of the Senate will go to the White House, this afternoon, to begin talking about where we go next.

I rise today to talk a little bit about what has got us to where we are, why we are where we are, and what, in my judgment, as one Member of the Senate, we need to be focused on.

I am glad the President vetoed the war supplemental with timelines for withdrawal. It is absolutely wrong to tie the money to support our troops to arbitrary timetables that have nothing to do with success or failure but only to do with the declaration of a cause being lost. We should never declare, as Members of the Senate, our cause to have been lost. And we should never hold hostage the money for our troops based on arbitrary deadlines or thresholds.

It is, however, important for us to debate the war on the floor of the Senate. I hope when the next supplemental

comes, it will be a supplemental that goes to support our men and women who have been deployed in defense of freedom, to give them everything they deserve and everything they need without strings and complication. To do so will not keep us in the Senate from debating the war, but it will clearly separate the money to support our troops from whatever the course that debate may take.

We have a long history in this country of many great Americans taking exactly the same position. One of those great Americans, Walter George, a Member of the Senate, from Georgia, a Democrat, in 1955—when Dwight Eisenhower was President of the United States of America and Adlai Stevenson had been his first opponent, and would be his second opponent in the 1956 Presidential election—the big issue of the day was the issue of Quemoy and Matsu and Red China's attempt to expand its influence on those islands and the policy of the United States of America and our President, Dwight Eisenhower. In *Time* magazine, April's issue, 1955, Walter George, Senator, Democrat from Georgia, a man in whose legacy and in whose shadow I now serve, said the following:

If it would advance the cause of peace, I would be happy for the President to declare his policy. But how would it advance the cause of peace to inform the enemy of what we intend to do?

I know one thing—

George said, and I continue to quote—

if we do fulfill our high mission and our high destiny, it will be because we have resolved to do our dead level best to advance peace, to advance security, to shore up a shaky world. Only by doing that can we vindicate the sacrifice of those who died on land and at sea, and fulfill the hopes of men and women in every free land.

It has been 52 years since that statement was made, but it could never ring more true than it rings today. Walter George was absolutely right, and Walter George, a Democrat, came to the defense of Dwight Eisenhower, a Republican who was President, when Dwight Eisenhower was being forced to play our hand in a critical issue of the day. We should never force our chief executive officer, nor should we force our generals, nor our troops in the field, by declaring our hand before the cards are dealt.

There are a few other quotes I wish to share with my colleagues as I lead up to the point I want to make this morning, and these are contemporary quotes and these are quotes about Iraq. These are quotes about the supplemental. These are quotes about our brave men and women in harm's way. The first is by General Lynch, the commanding officer of the third ID. When asked about whether funding should be tied to an arbitrary timetable for withdrawal, he said:

Ultimately, a precipitous withdrawal would increase the probability that American troops would one day have to return to Iraq and confront an enemy that is even more dangerous than today.

He is absolutely correct. Every time this country waited or every time it determined to withdraw from a conflict or looked the other way from a challenge of evil, it only had to muster itself in greater numbers and fight with greater losses at a greater day in the future.

General Lynch continued:

No matter how frustrating the fight can be and no matter how much we wish the war was over, the security of our country depends directly on the outcome in Iraq. The price of giving up there would be paid in American lives for years to come. It would be an unforgivable mistake for leaders in Washington to allow policies and impatience to stand in the way of protecting the people of the United States of America.

I could not say it better myself.

Lastly, for quotes from contemporaries, Gary Kurpius, commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, said the following:

The time to debate the war is not in front of a microphone making irresponsible statements, and it's certainly not in the funding bill that keeps our troops alive. If our troops need funds, it is the responsibility of Congress to provide them the money. Debate the war elsewhere.

My last quote is from an e-mail I got from Captain Schrott, on the ground with the U.S. Army in Baghdad right now, a couple of weeks ago when this debate was going on. He e-mailed me and said: I see they are debating whether or not they can not support the war and still support me. He said: Please tell them I am the war.

That is the truth. Our troops are the war. They are deployed and they are fighting and their funding should not be restrained or constrained or in any way hinged on political gymnastics. Those gymnastics belong in the speeches on this floor and the dialogue we have with our administration.

Now, it is my understanding there are some who are talking about a second supplemental to come, to be an incremental supplemental, maybe 60 days at a time. I would implore the Senate to consider not doing that because that brings uncertainty to our troops in the field and only partial funding on a daily or on a 60-day basis, which is wrong. There are others who are talking about maybe benchmarks—not timetables for withdrawal but benchmarks for the achievement of the Iraqi people. That may or may not be wise, depending on what those are, and I will reserve judgment, but I will tell my colleagues one thing. A lot of us around here have selective memories and have forgotten the fact that we have had some benchmarks.

In fact, when we went into Iraq, the President of the United States, George W. Bush, declared three succinct benchmarks. He said: When we deploy our troops, we will do the following: A, we will search and find the weapons of mass destruction that the U.N. and the entire world believed were there, and in fact we found the remnants and the evidence, although never the smoking gun. Then, second, he said: We are