

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 can-

cer, 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

million in 1996 to \$4.2 billion in 2006. This increase of Chinese food imports over the last 10 years has not been followed by an equal increase of inspector activity. Therein lies the problem. Less than 2 percent of what comes over our border for human consumption is inspected. Yes, you heard me right, less than 2 percent.

As the Chinese share of American agricultural imports continues to grow, our domestic markets are impacted. For instance, unlike closely regulated domestic food additives, products like wheat gluten and vitamin C from China continue to flood our market. The last American vitamin C producer recently closed its doors, unable to compete against the flood of poorly regulated Chinese additives. So, when you take your vitamin pills, ask where the ingredients came from.

Earlier this year, Europe narrowly avoided disaster when a batch of vitamin A was contaminated with an additive which has caused infant deaths. Luckily, the additive was removed before it contaminated infant formula.

In a matter of weeks, the Chinese government went from denying the problems with their food chain to executing their lead food regulator and closing down almost 200 food factories. Estimates indicate that it will cost up to \$100 billion over the next 10 years to build an infrastructure capable of certifying and protecting against Chinese agricultural goods. This should cause any American sitting down at the dinner table to think about drawing arms. We simply must do better.

And that is what my bill, the Assured Food Safety Act of 2007, does. It uses a simple approach and puts the burden of keeping food safe on the producers and the country of origin. The bill will require countries exporting food products to the United States to provide a certificate of assured safety for each class of items. If safe certified food is found to cause consumer illnesses or deaths, producers can be held liable through our Federal courts. Producers liable for damage they cause? What a sensible idea.

As a condition to accessing the American market, a producer must be willing to stand behind the quality of their product. Instead of relying on an inconsistent patchwork of international food standards, our consumers will be given the power to manage abuses directly through our legal system.

The United States government has a duty not only to protect the American population from the bad apples of the world but to restore the American people's confidence in the food we eat. Next time you go to the grocery store to buy pet food or pick up onions, remember our bill.

Mr. Speaker, the Assured Food Safety Act closes a serious loophole in our food safety regimen. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor our bill and help the American people regain confidence in our system.

[From the Washington Post, April 23, 2007]

#### IT'S NOT JUST PET FOOD

(By Peter Kovacs)

Lost amid the anxiety surrounding the tainted U.S. pet food supply is this sobering reality: It's not just pet owners who should be worried. The uncontrolled distribution of low-quality imported food ingredients, mainly from China, poses a grave threat to public health worldwide.

Essential ingredients, such as vitamins used in many packaged foods, arrive at U.S. ports from China and, as recent news reports have underscored, are shipped without inspection to food and beverage distributors and manufacturers. Although they are used in relatively small quantities, these ingredients carry enormous risks for American consumers. One pound of tainted wheat gluten could, if undetected, contaminate as much as a thousand pounds of food.

Unlike imported beef, which is inspected at the point of processing by the U.S. Agriculture Department, few practical safeguards have been established to ensure the quality of food ingredients from China.

Often, U.S. officials don't know where or how such ingredients were produced. We know, however, that alarms have been raised about hygiene and labor standards at many Chinese manufacturing facilities. In China, municipal water used in the manufacturing process is often contaminated with heavy metals, pesticides and other chemicals. Food ingredient production is particularly susceptible to environmental contamination.

Equally worrisome, U.S. officials often lack the capability to trace foreign-produced food ingredients to their source of manufacture. In theory, the Bioterrorism Prevention Act of 2001 provides some measure of traceability. In practice, the act is ineffective and was not designed for this challenge. Its enforcement is also shrouded in secrecy by the Department of Homeland Security.

Even if Food and Drug Administration regulators wanted to crack down on products emanating from the riskiest foreign facilities, they couldn't, because they have no way of knowing which ingredients come from which plant. This is why officials have spent weeks searching for the original Chinese source of the contaminated wheat gluten that triggered the pet food crisis.

That it was pet food that got tainted—and that relatively few pets were harmed—is pure happenstance. Earlier this spring, Europe narrowly averted disaster when a batch of vitamin A from China was found to be contaminated with *Enterobacter sakazakii*, which has been proved to cause infant deaths. Thankfully, the defective vitamin A had not yet been incorporated into infant formula. Next time we may not be so fortunate.

Currently, most of the world's vitamins are manufactured in China. Unable to compete, the last U.S. plant making vitamin C closed a year ago. One of Europe's largest citric acid plants shut last winter, and only one vitamin C manufacturer operates in the West. Given China's cheap labor, artificially low prices and the unfair competitive climate it has foisted on the industry, few Western producers of food ingredients can survive much longer.

Western companies have had to invest heavily in Chinese facilities. These Western-owned plants follow strict standards and are generally better managed than their locally owned counterparts. Nevertheless, 80 percent of the world's vitamin C is now manufactured in China—much of it unregulated and some of it questionable quality.

Europe is ahead of the United States in seeking greater accountability and traceability in food safety and importation.

But even the European Union's "rapid alert system" is imperfect. Additional action is required if the continent is to avoid catastrophes.

To protect consumers here, we must revise our regulatory approaches. The first option is to institute regulations, based on the European model, to ensure that all food ingredients are thoroughly traceable. We should impose strict liability on manufacturers that fail to enforce traceability standards.

A draconian alternative is to mount a program modeled on USDA beef inspection for all food ingredients coming into the country. This regimen would require a significant commitment of resources and intensive training for hundreds of inspectors.

Food safety is a bipartisan issue: Congress and the administration must work together and move aggressively to devise stricter standards. Rep. Henry Waxman (D-Calif.), chairman of the House Government Reform Committee, has deplored dangerous levels of lead in vitamin products originating in China. We must get to the bottom of this pressing public health issue, without self-defeating finger-pointing.

The United States is sitting on a powder keg with uncontrolled importation and the distribution of low-quality food ingredients. Before it explodes—putting more animals and people at risk—corrective steps must be taken.

The writer was president of NutraSweet Kelco Co. from 1994 to 1997. He is a management consultant to many large food ingredient companies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### ARMENIAN GENOCIDE—HENRY MORGENTHAU

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, the Armenian genocide that was orchestrated by the Ottoman Empire from 1915 to 1918 is an irrefutable fact. Looking at the history of this catastrophic event, it is impossible to deny that this was genocide on all accounts.

Now, one way to bear witness to the truth is to make reference to firsthand accounts which were made at the time that the Armenian genocide occurred. Henry Morgenthau served with dignity as U.S. ambassador to the Ottoman Empire from 1913 to 1916. In the wake of surging nationalism in Turkey and alarmed at reports of the Armenian genocide, he repeatedly appealed to the U.S. Government to intervene, without success. Morgenthau addressed the genocide of the Armenians in a 1915 dispatch to the State Department in which he warned that "a campaign of race extermination is in progress."

He then appealed to Ottoman rulers, also without result, and finally, he published his opinions in his 1918 book of memoirs, "Ambassador