the last throes, if you will, of the insurgency.

By then, 1,000 U.S. soldiers were dead.

USA Today, November 24, 2005, the headline is: Officials more hopeful on Iraq drawdown. Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice told Fox News on Tuesday that the U.S. would probably not need to maintain its current troop levels in Iraq ''very much longer.''

By then, there were 2,000 Americans dead.

USA Today, January 4, 2006, the headline is: Bush, Cheney stump seeking public support. Bush met with military leaders at the Pentagon and reiterated previously announced plans to cut U.S. troop strength in Iraq. ''The adjustment is underway,'' he said, suggesting further cuts would come if Iraqi security forces improved.

By then, 2,200 Americans were dead.

USA Today March 26, 2006, the headline is, Rice speaks of possible troop drawdown. ''I think it is entirely probable that we will see a significant drawdown of American forces over the next year. It's all dependent on events on the ground,'' the chief American diplomat said.

By then, 2,300 Americans were dead.

The Washington Post, June 15, 2006, the headline is: Bush Sees Progress in Iraq. In a Rose Garden news conference just over 6 hours after his surprise whirlwind visit to Baghdad, Bush said, ''I sense something different happening in Iraq,'' and predicted that ''progress will be steady'' towards achieving the U.S. mission there.

By then, 2,500 Americans were dead.

USA Today, October 1, 2006, the headline: Bush Sees Progress in Iraq War Effort. President Bush said Saturday he is encouraged by the increasing size and capacity of the Iraq security forces, touting progress on a key measure for when U.S. troops can come home.

By then, 2,800 U.S. soldiers had died.

Fox News, Sunday, January 11, 2007, Chris Wallace interviewed the vice president:

Mr. Vice President, why should we believe you this time that you have it right?

Mr. CHENEY responded, Well, if you look at what has transpired in Iraq, Chris, we have in fact made enormous progress.

By then, 3,000 Americans were dead.

In the months since the Vice President saw enormous progress, another 600 U.S. soldiers had died in Iraq. Over 3,600 U.S. soldiers are dead, 26,000 seriously wounded, and 40,000 will suffer with post-traumatic stress disorder, and the White House keeps telling the American people that we are making progress.

There is no credibility left whatsoever in the White House. None. The White House cannot whitewash the truth any longer. The American people are exasperated by a Commander in Chief who is blind to what is happening in Iraq.

U.S. soldiers have not failed, but this President has. U.S. commanders have not failed, but this administration has. The American people know it and they want only one new order given: Get U.S. soldiers out of Iraq. That means by early spring next year. It would be a travesty of justice if it takes until the general election of 2008 for the American people to throw every Republican out in order to stop the war. We are 17 months away from a new President being sworn into office. That is another 2,000 U.S. casualties if we follow this President. Ten soldiers are dying every day. Ninety soldiers are gravely wounded every day. A hundred civilian Iraqis die. How many more must die before we stand up for our soldiers? Before we stand up for our national interests and get our soldiers out of Iraq? Bring them home.

Mr. Speaker, we have got to get the President to bring them home. We also ought to think about how many Iraqis have died in this whole thing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HONORING DR. BILL MCGAVRAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Bill McGavran for his 30 years of service as a neurosurgeon in Midland, Texas.

Thousands of citizens in West Texas owe Dr. McGavran a debt of gratitude for his tireless work. Nearly every night for 25 years Dr. McGavran served as the on-call neurosurgeon in the ER, saving countless lives.

Dr. McGavran's commitment to helping others reaches beyond Texas. He has shared his skills with colleagues and patients half a world away in impoverished communities in South America.

Prior to his residency, he served in the United States Navy off the coast of Vietnam and Japan. Dr. McGavran is also an active member of the Midland community as deacon of the First Presbyterian Church and member of the symphony and chorale board of directors.

He is devoted husband to Gloria McGavran and father of two daughters, Catherine and Melissa.

The 11th District of Texas owes great thanks to Dr. McGavran for his exemplary service to the community and his patients, and I am proud to represent him in the Congress of the United States.

IRAQ POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SESTAK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SESTAK. Mr. Speaker, even for those convinced the surge in Iraq is a mistake, or at a point where our goals cannot realistically be attained, the manner in which we implement a decision to leave that country is critical to our Nation. How the United States manages its transition from a major war to the aftermath of our withdrawal is crucial for our strategic security.

And therefore, a Congress mandating a new security policy through the force of law owes a careful explanation to the country why and how it is to be done, including dealing with what would occur in the aftermath.

Americans may be tired of this war, but as a group they still expect it to be brought to an end that salvages as much as possible from the situation and protects our broader interests in the region and the world.

This strategic approach is not just about ''getting the troops home.'' Rather, the important concept to pursue is a strategic redeployment from Iraq that enhances our security by giving us the leverage to begin to unify Iraqis and bring about a regional accommodation that works toward that nation's stability.

However much Americans may desire to reduce forces in Iraq quickly, this Nation must still face the aftermath of what will happen in the region after redeployment by the force of law. And while some may try to characterize this as President Bush's war, it is the whole country's war in terms of how its consequences will affect us. For example, a careless redeployment due to haste most endangers our 160,000 troops and estimated over 100,000 civilian contractors in Iraq.

Withdrawal is when military forces are at their most vulnerable, something our Nation paid heed to when it took the 6 months necessary to redeploy less than 10,000 troops safely from Somalia in the 1990s. In Iraq, there is one road to Kuwait for thousands of convoys and much planning left to do for such a redeployment to occur safely.

And some ideas for a drawdown will prove less viable than some assume. For instance, maintaining residual forces to train Iraqis may well not work for the safety of U.S. troops embedded in an Iraqi military whose loyalty is suspect at best and fighting motivation questionable. Would we then need to retain large combat forces for their protection, and if so, how many?

Let's therefore understand the full limitations of such ideas before supporting them without careful strategic thought.

Such strategic considerations suggest that the precise shape of a strategy to redeploy matters a great deal. Responsibility should be assigned: To the Iraqis to assume accountability for their country; to regional nations to demonstrate accommodations towards

stability; and to Congress for the consequences of the aftermath which it will have dictated.

A realistic timeline of a year that is needed for a safe redeployment of our troops also serves well to protect our regional interests. It provides the time needed for a strategy of regional accommodation to take effect with Iran, Syria and Saudi Arabia, a strategy that rightly relies upon their long-term interest in a stable aftermath.

But in the end, we most importantly must make it clear that we will not be made hostage to the permission of our Iraqi friends. This is the crux of the strategic approach to enhancing our global strategic security: That while Iraqis will have ultimate say over their country, we as a Nation need to send a strong message that we are no longer willing to support it in a futile pursuit.

Only by a date that defines the end of our open-ended commitment can we force the Iraqis and regional nations to assume responsibility in working towards a stable Iraq. We will then, in the eyes of the world, leave with the Iraqis and regional nations having clearly helped choose the aftermath by their decisions or indecision.

We cannot afford an inconclusive, open-ended involvement within a country where the long-term security benefits do not match what we need to reap, and where the trade-off in benefits of not focusing elsewhere is harming our strategic security, including a significant negative impact on the readiness of our Armed Forces here at home. Nor can we afford a nonstrategic approach to the end to our involvement in this war, also undermining our future strategic security. Rather than leading to a spiral of violence, redeploying from Iraq under a strategic timeline of a year will serve as the necessary catalyst for the Iraqis to assume responsibility for their country, with regional nations then interested in ensuring stability when the United States is outside that nation, but remaining with strength in the region.

The needed accommodation will only come about when the Iraqi political leaders are forced to take the difficult political steps required to cease the violence in their country, such as building cooperation among competing sects and sharing oil revenues among all regions in Iraq. And regional nations' incentives, particularly Syria's and Iran's, change toward stability when the United States is no longer there in the midst of a civil war. And these nations will have to bear the consequences of further strife, with refugee flows to their countries and the possibility that these relatively allied nations could then be joined in a proxy battle to their detriment.

Ending this war is necessary but insufficient, and Mr. Speaker, how we end it and by what means is of even greater importance for the troop's safety and our own security.

□ 2130

CELEBRATING THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF RICHARD L. AYNES, DEAN OF THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON SCHOOL OF LAW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, today it's my honor to rise to recognize Richard L. Aynes.

On June 30, Richard Aynes concluded his term as dean of the University of Akron School of Law after 12 complete years, the longest tenure of any current law dean in the great State of Ohio and longer than 184 of the 196 deans at ABA accredited schools. His dedicated service is especially gratifying to me, as I earned my juris doctorate from the University of Akron School of Law.

Since 1921, I and more than 6,000 people have selected the University of Akron for law school. With Richard Aynes serving as dean, newspaper headlines acclaimed our law school as ''on the move'' and as having ''raised the bar.'' Today, as Richard ends his service as dean, he leaves the University of Akron School of Law as one of the top 50 law schools in the Nation. That is a great accomplishment.

Under Dean Aynes' leadership, applicants to the School of Law increased from 1,621 in 1995 to 2,230 in 2006, while the student-to-faculty ratio decreased. Those of us fortunate enough to live near Akron have always known and recognized the greatness of our law school, but Dean Aynes successfully spread that appeal throughout the Nation.

The 2006 student body is composed of students from 37 States. He also oversaw the expansion of innovative programs to deal with our changing world. The School of Law now boasts the world-renowned Center for Intellectual Property Law and Technology, and I'm proud that my alma mater is the first school in the State of Ohio to offer a master of law in intellectual property law and one of only 17 such programs across the country.

In a true testament to his devotion to both law and education, I'm pleased to report that Dean Aynes will return to the law faculty in the spring semester of 2008 to teach and publish. In this role, he will continue his tireless efforts towards the progress of the school and will profoundly touch the lives of future lawyers and our community. It is in recognition and gratitude that I rise today to honor this great man.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, on a personal note, I want to express my deep personal appreciation for the compassion he extended to me during a challenging time that I faced during my experience at the University of Akron School of Law. You see, Mr. Speaker, during the first year of my legal studies, we received the sad, sad news that my father was suffering from lung cancer, and I shall always appreciate the compassion and the help that Dean Aynes and other caring professional faculty at the law school extended to me. It was that compassion and encouragement that made it possible for me to spend precious time with my dad in those precious final days of his life while continuing on with my legal studies and on a path that would lead me here to the United States House of Representatives, where I have the extraordinary honor to put that education to work in service to the fine people of the 13th District of Ohio.

Thank you, Dean Aynes, and may your commitment and achievements continue to inspire and motivate countless generations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE ASSURED FOOD SAFETY ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, today, I'm introducing legislation to bring our food safety system into the 21st century by stopping the influx of unsafe food from countries like China.

Mr. Speaker, over the last several months, the American public has begun to tune in on an issue which should have every American at the edge of their seats, the danger of tainted food from abroad. Food imports are constituting a larger and larger share of what we eat and what is sold at stores across our Nation.

In 1996, our Nation had a huge positive agricultural trade balance of over $27 billion more exports going out than imports coming in. Today, that balance has dropped to only $8 billion, and we have wracked up enormous trade deficits of nearly $800 billion around the world, $230 billion with China.

With China constantly engaging in practices like unfairly manipulating their currency, the yuan, our agricultural trade policy is in dire need of change. For instance, individual shipments of food from China have recently been quoted as going from 82,000 shipments in 2002 to 199,000 in 2006. This is a staggering increase. Unless we act to protect our consumers, the United States will become dangerously dependent on foreign agricultural imports while our domestic market falters.

Take Chinese seafood imports. While they account for 22 percent of the domestic import market, Chinese goods account for 63 percent of seafood refused by inspectors at the border. Overall, Chinese food imports have quadrupled in 10 years, increasing from $880