

Product Safety

Prepared by ChaCha Chen

INTRODUCTION

America in the late 19th century was a dangerous time for the everyday shopper. The **Industrial Revolution** gave rise to hordes of untrustworthy consumer goods, ranging from the inconvenient, such as shoddily made mechanical objects, to the deadly, such as food products contaminated with **botulin**. Furthermore, “**snake-oil salesmen**” abounded, swindling a naïve public with counterfeit medicines. Not only were these products directly harmful to consumers, they also made consumers wary of safe products offered on the market. The dangers of poisoned goods became so intense that Congress eventually passed the Pure Food and Drug Act in 1906, eventually leading to the creation of the **Food and Drug Administration (FDA)**.

China today is in a similar predicament. With a rapidly developing economy and light-speed manufacturing growth, money seems to have no room for morals. Factory owners, exporters, and retailers all seem more interested in making a profit than in ensuring that their products are safe. Aside from the mundane problems of freshness or sterility, the New York Times reported in April of 2007 that China’s food manufacturers have also given the public soy sauce made from human hair and eels fed with contraceptive pills to make them grow long and slim. In 2004, the Chinese public was in uproar over the deaths of 50 to 60 babies in the city of Fuyang, who all died from malnourishment after being fed a milk formula that consisted of little more than starch, flour, and sugar.

Tragedies such as these have not only inflamed Chinese concerns over product safety, but have also prompted international worries. Within the last year, **lead** paint has been found in children’s toys, protein has been replaced by nutritionally devoid filler, and poisonous chemicals were discovered in toothpaste. In light of the fact that the US is one of the world’s largest importers of Chinese goods, with total imports in 2007 estimated at \$325 billion, the US must face the problem of unregulated and unsafe Chinese products. With so many product recalls and warnings issued by US firms manufacturing in China, some believe the American government must take action to protect the consumer. Not only do US policymakers need to question the adequacy of China’s regulatory system to ensure that exports meet US standards of safety and quality, lawmakers must also consider how US government regulators, private importers, and retailers identify and take action against unsafe



Harvard Model
Congress Asia

Industrial Revolution

—a period in the late 1700s and early 1800s when manual-labor intensive industries began to use machines. This had major effects in agriculture, manufacturing, and transportation and greatly increased productivity.

Botulism—a toxin produced by bacteria often times found in contaminated food., which can cause a rare but serious paralytic illness.

Snake-oil salesman—late 19th century slang term for untrustworthy salespersons.

FDA—government agency responsible for the safety regulation of most types of foods and medicines.

Lead—exposure to high levels of lead, especially for infants and young children, can lead to lead poisoning, which leads to irreversible nerve damage as well as kidney, heart, lung, and reproductive disease.



imports—from China as well as other countries—before they reach the American consumer.

EXPLANATION OF THE PROBLEM

History of the Problem

Increasing Trade between US and China

US-China trade increased rapidly after the two nations established diplomatic relations in January of 1979. In July of the same year, China and the US also signed a **bilateral** trade agreement providing mutual most-favored-nation (MFN) status beginning in 1980. MFN means that nations receiving the status will be granted all trade advantages that any third nation also receives—in other words, one nation will not be treated worse than any other nation. After these developments, **total trade** between the US and China was \$1 billion. Since 1980, total volume of US-China trade (again, exports plus imports) has risen from \$5 billion to \$20 billion in 1990 to \$343 billion in 2006, and now to an estimated \$389 billion in 2007.

Consumer Safety Legislation in the US and China

The Food and Drug Administration began regulating human and animal food, cosmetics, and drugs in 1906, but general consumer products were relatively unregulated. However, in 1972, after Congress passed the Consumer Product Safety Act, the **Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC)** was created. The CPSC developed as an independent **federal regulatory** agency to protect the public from product risks, injuries, and deaths. Since the creation of both the FDA and the CPSC, many laws have been passed to ensure product safety.

In China, there are four main laws governing consumer protection. They are discussed below.

Law of the People's Republic of China on the Protection of Consumer Rights and Interests (CRIL)

The CRIL became effective in January of 1994, and is China's principal consumer protection statute. It lists the basic rights of consumers in China, which include the right to obtain true information regarding the goods and services received, the right of free choice of goods and services, the right to form public organizations for the maintenance of consumer's rights, and the right to raise charges against state organs to criticize consumer rights and protections. It also requires business operators to listen to consumers, guaranteeing that goods and services meet safety requirements, and that products offer accurate information regarding products. Despite these guidelines, the CRIL provides only weak legal consequences for businesses that fail to comply with these obligations.

Bilateral—*political and cultural relations between two states. If agreements are made bilaterally, they are made between two actors. This is in contrast to a multilateral agreement, which involves many states, and unilateralism, which involves one state acting on its own.*

Total trade—*exports plus imports*

Federal regulatory—*a description of a federal government agency that is in charge of regulating a specific task or responsibility.*

Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC)—*an independent US federal agency created in 1972 to protect the public against unreasonable risks of injury with consumer products*



Law of the People's Republic of China on Product Quality (PQL)

The PQL, adopted in 1993, outlines the safety requirements that products must meet. It specifies that a product must conform to national standards for ensuring health, that the seller is liable for compensation when personal injury or property loss result from a **defective** product, and that the seller must compensate the buyer if the product does not meet advertised properties.

Defective—*flawed, damaged, faulty.*

Advertisement Law of the People's Republic of China

In October of 1994, the Advertisement Law was enacted to prohibit **false advertising**. However, certain provisions of the law reflect China's strict government. For example, the general requirement for advertisers is that ads be "in compliance with the requirements for the socialist cultural and ideological development." This gives the state a great deal of control of advertising content, as compared to advertisements in the United States. Article 7 of the law states that advertisements should not use the national flag, use the names of State officials or offices, or have violent or sexually suggestive content.

False advertising—*ads that are untrue, misleading, or deceptive in nature*

Contract Law of the People's Republic of China (CCL)

The CCL went into effect on October 1, 1999. This law does not shape its provisions to accommodate a consumer's special needs or concerns, but instead offers general protection to any type of contract between businesses or consumers. However, some parts of the law do apply to consumer protection.

China's Grassroots Movements for Consumer Safety

In 1995, Wang Hai began buying fake products and then claiming compensation under the CPL. After achieving national celebrity, Wang established the DaHai Commercial Consultancy Corporation, a company that finds fake products and then sues the responsible manufacturers and retailers. He was so successful that by 1998, he had become the country's most high-profile consumer activist and in 1998 was interviewed with President Clinton in a discussion on how to shape China for the 21st century. Since then, other citizens have engaged in similar personal initiatives to raise consumer rights.

China and the World Trade Organization

China entered the **World Trade Organization (WTO)** in 2001, after an accession negotiation that lasted 15 years and 5 months. During these lengthy negotiations, China insisted that it was a developing country and should be allowed to enter under lenient terms. The US insisted that China could enter the WTO only if it substantially liberalized its trade regime. In the end, the two countries compromised and China immediately reduced some trade and investment barriers, while it was al-

World Trade Organization—*international organization that seeks to lower trade barriers and promote economic prosperity among nations.*



lowed to maintain some protections for certain parts of its economy. The WTO does not allow measures to prevent trade if the measures are discriminatory or protectionist. However, one of the trade reducing measures that the WTO does allow its member nations is importation restriction for health and safety reasons, so long as the concerns are based in science. Both the US and China have accused each other of using health and safety concerns as an excuse to impose protectionist measures.

Memorandum of Understanding—a legal document describing a bilateral or multilateral agreement that shows two parties agree on a common line of action. A memorandum of understanding does not necessarily imply a legal commitment.

Solutions to Similar Problems with Korea

In February of 2006, the US Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) signed a **Memorandum of Understanding** with the Republic of Korea to improve the safety of consumer products exported from South Korea to the US. The memorandum included agreements to exchange information between the two countries on consumer product safety issues, to develop training programs dealing with consumer product safety, and to exchange safety professionals to carry out the consumer safety programs. The goal of these agreements is to heighten awareness of the global aspect of consumer product health and safety issues and to foster the exchange of information that will help reduce the incidence of death and injuries associated with consumer products. The CPSC has signed similar memorandums with Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, the European Commission, India, Israel, Mexico, and Taiwan to improve the safety of consumer products. Interestingly, the CPSC signed a Memorandum of Understanding with China in 2004, that expressed a commitment to share information, educate Chinese manufacturers and importers of their obligation to produce safe products bound for the US, and train laboratory and inspection personnel in China. However, as recent events show, the CPSC has not been effective enough in regulating these agreements.

One possible explanation for why the CPSC has been unsuccessful in enforcing these agreements, with China especially, is the lack of funds allocated to the CPSC in recent years. The 2007 budget for the CPSC was only \$62 million, roughly 1/7 the size of the Food and Drug Administration's funding for food safety alone. With this budget, the CPSC is expected to watch 15,000 types of consumer products. These products pose diverse dangers—fire, electrical, chemical, and mechanical hazards—and also encompass a huge variety of products, such as toys, power tools, cigarette lighters, and household chemicals.

Recent Developments

Contamination Examples in China

In June 2004, the Chinese government-sponsored newspaper *People's Daily* reported that unsafe baby formula killed 50 to 60 infants in Anhui Province in China. The formula had 1.5% protein in it, well



under the 10% required for infant formula. The lack of nutrients in the powder resulted in severe malnutrition in the babies, resulting in major swelling of the head and weight loss in the limbs and body. The Chinese government offered the parents, mostly poor, rural residents, some monetary compensation.

In 2006, two major instances of poisoned drug supplies killed almost 20 people and sickened many others. 11 people died from a tainted injection used to treat gall bladder illnesses, and a defective antibiotic killed seven people.

In 2007, a nationwide inspection of food production discovered that dangerous raw industrial chemicals were used in the production of flour, candy, pickles, biscuits, tofu, and seafood. The government closed 180 food processing factories making unsafe products or fake food. It also closed 152,000 unlicensed food businesses. In addition to this inspection, a government survey in July 2007 found that 19.1% of products made in China for domestic consumption in the first half of 2007 were substandard. Additionally, the government also blacklisted 429 Chinese export companies for violating quality standards.

FDA Recall Of Pet Food, Toothpaste, And Foods

In March 2007, the FDA issued a warning and voluntary **recall** of certain Chinese-made pet foods containing wheat gluten. The wheat gluten was secretly supplemented with a substance called melamine, a cheap additive that looks like protein in nutrition tests but does not supply any nutritional benefits. Melamine was responsible for 60 million packages of recalled pet food, and the deaths of 16 pets in 2007. Melamine is not believed to be toxic, so no one is sure why the animals died from ingesting the substance, but the presence of melamine in any form of food is illegal in the United States. Also, as it is devoid of nutrients, animals relying on pet food for nutrition would face a major protein deficiency.

The FDA also recalled toothpaste that was found to contain diethylene glycol, a chemical that can lead to kidney failure. The FDA also implemented importation controls on all farm-raised catfish, shrimp, carp, and eel from China after antimicrobial agents, which are not approved for use in farm-raised **aquatic** animals, were found.

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration Recall of Tires

In June 2007, Foreign Tire Sales, Inc., an importer of foreign tires, reported to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration that up to 255,000 tires made in China could have a major safety defect, such as a missing gum strip on the inside of the tire. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration then ordered Foreign Tire Sales, Inc. to issue a product recall. However, the Chinese government and the tire manufacturer both maintain that the tires meet US standards.

Consumer Product Safety Commission Recall on Many Products

Recall—*a request to return an entire batch of a product to the maker, usually due to unsafe products.*

Aquatic—*Living or growing in water*



The Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) has issued alerts and recalls, with over 80% of the recall notices in the period from January to December 2007 involving Chinese products. 17.6 million of the recalled products were toys pulled for excessive levels of lead. Another 9.5 million Chinese made toys were recalled for the danger of loose magnets, 4.2 million for beads that contained ingested toxic chemical, and 1 million toy ovens recalled due to potential finger entrapment and burning. During this period, China was America's largest supplier of toys, with 86% of all American toys manufactured in China.

Congressional Action

HR 4040

HR 4040 is the Consumer Product Safety Modernization Act, and was introduced in the House in the 110th Congress, on November 1 of 2007. The bill included major protections for children, including lowering the lead level at which a product is banned, requiring independent testing of consumer products for children under 12, and requiring products to display ingredients and product warnings prominently on packaging. The bill also offers extensive Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) reform. It authorizes appropriations for increased funding for the CPSC to further research and testing. It also authorizes the CPSC to order the manufacturer, distributor, or retailer to cease distribution of any products with a substantial hazard. Along with this, the party responsible for the hazard will be required to give notice of the problem through their website, through third party websites that sell the product, or through radio and television broadcasts. The bill passed the House on December 19, 2007 and passed the Senate on March 6, 2008.

S 2045

This bill is similar to H 4040 in that it boosts CPSC funding and authority, bans the sale of children's products that contain more than minute levels of lead, requires independent, third-party inspections of children's products, and mandatory labels of these products.

Certification—a product that receives certification meets the standards set by the agency in charge.

S 1776

Introduced in July 2007, the Imported Food Safety Act of 2007 requires the Department of Health and Human Services to establish a **certification** system for all imported food in the United States. Before granting a certificate of importation to any foreign government, the Department would review, audit, and certify that the foreign country's food inspection program is as rigorous as a safety inspection conducted by the US government. Certifications would be valid for no more than five years, and **Health and Human Services** would be required to audit foreign governments and establishments every five years to determine their

Health and Human Services (HHS)—a Cabinet department of the US government that is responsible for protecting the health of Americans and providing social services relevant to health.



continued compliance. Health and Human Services would be authorized to withdraw certification of a food if it is linked to outbreaks of human illnesses, if the foreign program is no longer equivalent to a US inspection program, or if US officials are not permitted to conduct an audit or investigation of the foreign program. 50% of funds will be used for border inspections and no more than 50% would be used for research programs, focusing on improved testing and sampling techniques.

S 1082

Introduced in April 2007, the Food and Drug Administration Revitalization Act was passed in the Senate in May 2007. It requires Health and Human Services to establish within the Food and Drug Administration an “**Adulterated** Food Registry.” Responsible parties and importers would be required to report detailed information about cases of actual or suspected food contamination. If the registry shows a reported food has been associated with “repeated and separate outbreaks of illness or has been repeatedly determined to be adulterated” the responsible manufacturer, importer, or retailer would have to allow an FDA inspection. Recalls of pet food and human food would also be collected and posted on an accessible FDA website.

Adulterated —
contaminated

FOCUS OF DEBATE

Republican Perspective

While Republicans are normally staunch supporters of expanding trade, with regard to issues of safety and security of products from China, some Republicans are more willing to compromise some trade for the sake of ensuring consumer safety. However, Republicans would be most open to plans that make products safe without losing free trade.

Additionally, Republicans would probably be wary of any plans to increase government regulation and monitoring of private production. It is likely that they would see quality control and oversight as a **private business** issue, with individual companies in charge of ensuring that their products are safe, rather than putting the issue in the hands of a federal bureau or agency. It is evident from current and past Republican presidents’ decreasing of budget and size of the Consumer Product Safety Commission that Republicans think the issue is best handled privately.

However, this does not mean that Republicans are always against the idea of having government officials test items. As you will soon read, the President has made some strides in increasing the government’s role in maintaining product safety.

Private business—
business that is owned by individuals, not by the government.



Democratic Perspective

Generally, Democrats are in favor of supporting existing agencies to further their ability to monitor and test imported goods. In their view, the government is the appropriate agent to fairly assess the quality of goods entering the country, because private businesses could be biased in terms of how rigorous their standards are. Democrats argue that individual consumers do not have the information and the capability to determine whether the goods they purchase are safe and effective, and that monitoring product quality is a legitimate task for government. As a result, many Democratic leaders are in favor of bills increasing the role of the FDA and the CPSC in securing the public's interests. Representative Bobby Rush (D-IL) and Senator Mark Pryor (D-AK) are two of the many Democratic congressmen who have spearheaded bills relating to this issue. Representative Rush proposed HR 4040 and Senator Pryor proposed S. 2045. Both bills are discussed above.

Presidential Perspective

President Bush, like many of his predecessors, has made major cuts in the CPSC budget. However, due to product recalls and warnings mentioned in this briefing and elsewhere, President Bush has increased funding for the CPSC in the 2009 fiscal year budget. Additionally, President Bush has also created a new Import Safety Working Group under the Department of Health and Human Services. This deviates slightly from what is expected from most Republicans, but nonetheless, President Bush has shown a clear commitment to allowing government oversight in issues of product safety. However, some Democratic leaders have said that President Bush needs to dedicate more resources to existing acting agencies, not merely fund a study group. President Bush also met with Chinese officials to discuss the safety of their exports

Protectionism—*measures taken to reduce trade, such as setting maximum levels of trade and putting tariffs, or taxes, on imported goods in the interest of “protecting” domestically produced goods.*

INTEREST GROUP PERSPECTIVES

Cato Institute

The Cato Institute believes foremost in the value of free trade, and the problems that are associated with **protectionism**. It also believes that in a free-market system, business owners with well-defined **property rights** have a major stake in preventing dangerous products from being put into the market place. Losing a quality brand reputation, public shame, bankruptcy, and imprisonment are all risky enough that companies should be responsible and aware of product safety. The marketplace will not allow firms that cannot compete on price and quality to continue existing. However, in places like China where free-market institutions are underdeveloped, there is less private responsibility for product safety, as the government shoulders the burden of consumer safety. As the market grows, it is increasingly costly for governments to

Property rights—*rights that allow an individual or a group to exclusive control over something.*



monitor every product. The Cato Institute believes that government agencies are an important part of ensuring public safety, but that the FDA cannot be everywhere. As such, one possible reform might be to allow FDA certified independent public agencies to inspect companies, to increase the breadth of FDA oversight. For China, the Cato Institute recommends more emphasis on institutional change, particularly by increasing the reliance on a free market that would hold individuals responsible.

The Cato Institute warns, “The danger is that officials, in their pursuit of public safety, will lose sight of the virtues of the free market—and in doing so, use their power to protect special interest groups rather than the public.”

Heritage Foundation

The Heritage Foundation has voiced concerns over bills addressing consumer safety, such as S. 2045. In particular, the Heritage Foundation criticizes this bill for boosting criminal penalties for distributing products violating consumer protection guidelines, raising fines for violations, and giving state **attorney generals** powers to **sue** firms on behalf of citizens. The Heritage Foundation believes these provisions will negatively affect American manufacturers and distributors, especially because they provide incentives for states to bring up lawsuits in the name of public safety. Additionally, the Heritage Foundation has criticized the law from prosecuting corporate officials who “knowingly and willfully authorize or perform acts in violation of [CPSC regulations]” to more rigorous standards of allowing harsh punishments of even minor offenses.

AFL-CIO

The **AFL-CIO**, a large American **labor union**, is in strong support of China’s workers rights, but does not extend that support to allowing substandard products into the American marketplace. In the words of Senator Chris Dodd (D-CT), “When you take my jobs because you subsidize your currency, when you send contaminated food and poison to my country...you’re no longer a competitor, in my view. When you steal my jobs, you’re becoming an adversary.” The AFL-CIO believes that politicians need to push for legislation which sets standards for foreign products at the same level of quality as those of domestic products. This would mean all international imports would pass USDA inspections as well as any other domestic guidelines, in order to level the playing field of manufacturing between domestic and international producers.

Attorney general—each of America’s 50 states has a state attorney general who is the chief legal advisor to the state government and the chief law enforcement officers. In some states, the Attorney General is the head of the state’s Department of Justice.

Sue—the action of filing a lawsuit in a court of law.

Labor union—an organization of workers that bargains with the employer on behalf of the employees on issues such as wage, hours, benefits, rules governing hiring, and workplace safety.

AFL-CIO—a national trade union center that is made up of 54 American and international unions. The AFL-CIO represents over 10 million workers.

POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS

Establishing Independent Inspectors in Foreign Countries

The FDA currently sends inspectors to many nations to inspect facilities that manufacture medications, but some lawmakers believe that the FDA needs to have a permanent presence in countries like China, India, and those in South America and the Middle East. These stations would serve as gathering points for investigators and inspectors, but would also allow FDA representatives to look into laws and regulations that foreign companies could potentially implement to increase the safety of their domestic production. This would also be beneficial in that it would take some of the pressure off of FDA officials in the United States by already having a first round of inspections conducted in a controlled manner on-site.

Implementing Regulations on American Companies Producing in China

US News and World Report argues that “the image of shoddy Chinese-owned factories hoodwinking naïve American corporations is largely a myth. Most big American companies importing products from China own the factories where those products are made or partially own them through joint ventures. So the companies themselves are on-scene at the source of the problem—or should be—and they represent the first line of responsibility for dangerous components.” As an example, importers such as British department store Marks & Spencers and Dutch electronics company Phillips both test products while they are still in the factory, instead of waiting until products have been shipped to the United States. Nike has made similar strides, when it decided to replace some of its materials with more environmentally friendly alternatives, and needed to train and supply a large number of inspectors on-site. If US toy manufacturers like Mattel and others implicated in product safety disasters took more initiative in ensuring safety, their own brand reputations would be secured as well as the safety of the American public.

Increase Funding to the Consumer Product Safety Commission

Under the Bush administration, the Consumer Product Safety Commission’s funding has increased by just 2.8% in **real value**. Furthermore, the agency has seen major cuts in its **personnel**. The CPSC is normally overseen by three commissioners, but since 2000, has had just two, one Democrat and one Republican. There has been no permanent chairman of the commission since the summer of 2007. From a peak of 1000 employees in 1980, the CPSC now employs only 400 personnel. The CPSC is faced with a growing workload, as the number of products, ports used, and countries involved in US trade increases. Many experi-

Real value—the real value of a particular item is the value adjusted for price differences between years; in other words, it takes the value of the object into consideration without taking the value of the currency at that time into consideration.

Personnel—employees



enced staff members have left, due to **morale** problems and lack of funding. Morale, in general, has been low, as the agency must regulate tens of thousands of products arriving into the US through 326 seaports, airports, and land crossings. However, what the agency needs most is money. Acting CPSC Chairman Nancy A. Nord has said that Congress has not reviewed the CPSC resources and needs in 17 years. In light of the recent scares highlighted in this briefing, Senator Richard J. Durbin (D-IL) has proposed a bill to raise funding of the CPSC to \$100 million by 2012. This would enable the CPSC to boost fines for retailers selling recalled goods, hire more staff, oversee international shipments, and prevent major quality control problems from hurting the American public.

Morale—*excitement, spirit*

QUESTIONS A BILL SHOULD ADDRESS

Bills should address questions that fall into two broad categories: how the US can help China to make its regulations more effective, and what the US can change about its own regulatory agencies. Bills might want to consider how the FDA can tackle product safety when the marketplace literally has millions of products every year, what responsibilities private companies have in guaranteeing product safety, how US corporations operating in China can ensure compliance with regulation there, and how to strengthen existing regulatory agencies' effectiveness in certifying product safety. China also needs to make changes to its **regulatory environment**, including reducing corruption in the government agencies that are theoretically responsible for public welfare. In July of 2007, the former head of China's State Food and Drug Administration, Zheng Xiaoyu, was executed for corruption. During his tenure from 1998 to 2005, Zheng accepted bribes amounting to 6.5 million RMB from firms registering products without undergoing the necessary checks. China needs to consider how it can reduce such corruption, as well as how it can regulate its rapidly expanding manufacturing sector, which encompasses companies from all over the world.

Regulatory environment—*the system of regulations that a nation or organization operates in.*

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In the past year, more than 40% of all recalls by the CPSC have involved products from China. Simultaneously, the **volume of trade** between the US and China has increased steadily, and will probably only continue to grow. Faced with this problem, America's policymakers, businesspeople, and consumers must face the problem of dealing with potentially dangerous goods. Most believe that the government must do something to protect the public but not all; as Pietra Rivoli, a professor of Georgetown Business School, proposes, "This can't be the

Volume of trade—*the total quantity of contracts bought or sold over a specified period of time during a trading day.*



Federal Government's responsibility....It's really the responsibility of the importing companies. How many of them want to take on the reputation risk of children dying?" As a result, policymakers must keep in mind the limitations of the government in regulating a vast market with products from all over the globe.

However, one can still be optimistic: it is worth noting that over the past three decades, Japan, Korea, and Taiwan—countries that used to confront the US market with similar safety issues—now are considered first-rate producers with high-quality goods. Perhaps the same thing will happen in China. The US government and businesses working closely with China should work to ensure that the stories of babies dying from fake formula, toy trains causing illness from high levels of lead, and medications killing patients they should be saving will no longer plague the public conscience.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Bush Creates Imported Food, Product Safety Panel." *The Associated Press*. July 18, 2007.

Dorn, James A. "Open and Accountable." *Cato Institute Commentary*. August 9, 2007. <http://www.freetrade.org/node/735>

Overby, Brooke A. "Consumer Protection in China After Accession to the WTO." *Syracuse Journal of International Law and Commerce*. Spring 2006.

GovTrack.us. H.R. 4040--110th Congress (2007): Consumer Product Safety Modernization Act, *GovTrack.us (database of federal legislation)* <<http://www.govtrack.us/congress/bill.xpd?bill=h110-4040&tab=summary>> (accessed Mar 10, 2008)

Grossman, Andrew. "Senate CPSC Bill: A boon for Trial Lawyers at the Expense of Product Safety." The Heritage Foundation. Webmemo #1831. <http://www.heritage.org>

Becker, Geoffrey S. "Food Safety: Selected Issues and Bills in the 110th Congress." *CRS Report for Congress*. RL 34152.

Newman, Rick. "China Isn't the Villain Behind Dangerous Imports." *US News and World Report*. September 12, 2007. <http://www.usnews.com/blogs/flowchart/2007/9/12/china-isnt-the-villain-behind-dangerous-imports.html>



Thottam, Jyoti. "The Growing Dangers of China Trade." *Time*. June 28, 2007.

<http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1638436,00.html>

"CPSC Signs Memorandum of Understanding with Republic of Korea to Improve Consumer Product Safety." *PR Newswire US*. February 14, 2006.

Lowry, Tom and Lorraine Woellert. "More Paper Tiger than Watchdog? The Consumer Product Safety Agency is Overwhelmed and Underfunded." *Business Week*. September 3, 2007.

