

surrounding region, and consequences for U.S. interests.

On December 6th 2006, the Iraq Study Group presented a report to Congress containing 79 specific recommendations in support of three broad equally important strategies designed to reinforce each other:

A change in the primary mission of U.S. forces in Iraq that will enable the United States to begin to move its combat forces out of Iraq responsibly.

Prompt action by the Iraqi government to achieve milestones—particularly on national reconciliation; and

New and enhanced diplomatic and political efforts in Iraq and the region. Significantly, the ISG specifically rejected proposals for a precipitous withdrawal of U.S. combat forces or a major sustained increase in troop levels.

Unfortunately; the ISG report recommendations, which I immediately endorsed, was equally immediately rejected by both advocates of withdrawal and proponents of continued engagement. President Bush announced plans to “surge” 21,500 combat troops to Iraq and Democrats in Congress announced plans to cut off funding for the troops in the field unless the President agreed to an almost immediate withdrawal. I opposed both of these policies when they were announced, oppose them now and will continue to oppose them in the future.

President Bush and the Democrats in Congress both need to step back from their respective ideologically driven positions and focus on developing bipartisan legislation, based on recommendations of the Iraq Study Group, that will refocus U.S. operation in Iraq on helping the Iraqi people reconcile with each other and achieve a level of internal security that will make our continued presence unnecessary. We must shift the emphasis of U.S. military efforts from conducting combat operations to training the Iraqi security forces. We must demand that Iraqi government leaders set aside their sectarian differences and cooperate in governing their country for the greater good of all its citizens. Finally, we must work with governments in the region to eliminate the external threats to Iraqi security, particularly the foreign terrorists infiltrating from Syria and Iran.

Both President Bush and the Democrat leadership have paid lip service to the recommendations of the Iraq Study Group while steadfastly avoiding or actively opposing any effort to actually implement them. In early January 2007 President Bush took a single line in the ISG report regarding possible support for a SHORT TERM redeployment of U.S. combat forces to stabilize Baghdad and used it to justify a long term escalation of troop levels by over 20,000 soldiers. I immediately joined with several of my colleagues in sending a letter to the President expressing our opposition to this policy and shortly thereafter voted in favor of a Congressional resolution disapproving the surge. At almost the same time, the democrats in Congress seized upon another line in the ISG report acknowledging the United States should not make an open-ended commitment to keep large numbers of American troops deployed in Iraq and used it to justify a series of resolutions to cut off funding for the troops in the field. I have voted against each and every one of these efforts.

Neither President Bush nor the democrats in Congress has ever made any serious effort to

implement the ISG recommendations. In fact, the Democrat leadership in the House has consistently used a series of parliamentary maneuvers to prevent the subject from even being discussed. On June 6, 2007, I joined 45 of my colleagues as an original cosponsor of H.R. 2574, legislation to implement the recommendations of the Iraq Study Group. This legislation would establish as United States policy:

A new diplomatic offensive in the region that includes the creation of the Iraq International Support Group;

Giving the highest priority to training, equipping and advising the Iraqi military and security forces;

Assessing the full budgetary and personnel impact of the war in Iraq on the U.S. military;

Accelerating and increasing oil production and accountability including equitable distribution of oil revenues in Iraq;

Implementing and oversight of economic reconstruction programs in Iraq with the creation of a new Senior Advisor for Economic Reconstruction;

Ensuring that the President includes the cost of the war in his annual budget request; and

Setting conditions that could lead to redeployment of U.S. combat brigades not needed for force protection as early as the first quarter of 2008 if diplomatic, infrastructure and security benchmarks are met.

Last night I joined with Congressman WOLF to ask the Rules Committee to make in order an amendment that would substitute the proposals in The Iraq Study Group Recommendations Implementation Act for the fatally flawed language in H.R. 2956. On the directions of the Democrat leadership the Rules committee refused to even allow discussion of these proposals by voting 9–4 along party lines to not allow our amendment.

In the absence of cooperation between President Bush and the democrat leadership in Congress, our enemies have been emboldened and our allies have become discouraged. Sectarian violence continues to plague the Iraqi people. Iranian special operations forces are openly training insurgent forces, Turkey has massed nearly 140,000 troops on Iraq’s northern border and Syria continues to serve as a conduit for both illicit arms and foreign fighters. Meanwhile the democratically elected Iraqi government, in which our leaders took such pride just 18 months ago, has degenerated into a state of near paralysis. President Maliki becomes increasingly more marginalized with each passing day. The various ministries are riddled with corruption, incompetence and tribal rivalries. Finally, the Iraqi parliament has become so terrified of retribution they refuse to enact, or even vote on, any legislative proposal that cannot command the support of 100 percent of all sectarian leaders. This is a recipe not for progress but for disaster.

Under these circumstances, the democrat leaders in Congress bring us a partisan political statement masquerading as a not very substantive legislative proposal. I for one refuse to participate in their tawdry charade and will therefore vote NO on this legislation.

TRIBUTE TO THE UNITED STATES TENNIS ASSOCIATION BOYS’ 18 AND 16 NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIPS ON ITS 65TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. FRED UPTON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 2007

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the United States Tennis Association Boys’ 18 and 16 National Championships on the occurrence of its 65th Anniversary. Hosted at Kalamazoo College since 1943, the tournament has earned a reputation of prestige and excellence, offering the finest in men’s junior tennis anywhere in the world.

Over the past six and a half decades, most of the great names in American tennis—Agassi, Ashe, Connors, Courier, McEnroe, Roddick, Sampras, and Young, among many others—have competed at Kalamazoo’s Stowe Tennis Stadium for the coveted title of USTA junior champion. The Championships have not only been witness to many record achievements in junior athletics, but also many of the most exhilarating moments in sports history.

The continued success and popularity of this event can only be attributed to the hundreds of volunteers and sponsors throughout Southwest Michigan, who have generously given of themselves year after year. Special recognition is also accorded to Kalamazoo College and Western Michigan University, whose hospitality in hosting and organizing the tournament has been essential. Not least, for their exceptional contributions, Kalamazoo’s own Rolla L. Anderson, Timon Corwin, David R. Markin, and Allan B. Stowe are to be praised for providing the leadership and commitment necessary for the tournament to flourish.

Hosting the USTA Boys’ 18 and 16 National Championships for so many years has been a tremendous honor for my district. On this momentous occasion, we look back to those whose legacies are manifest in the present, as well as those future generations of volunteers and athletes that will build upon this tradition.

THE IMPACT OF AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT ON FOOD SECURITY IN AFRICA

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 2007

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, this morning the Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health held a hearing on the impact of agricultural development on food security in Africa. Living in a country of plenty as we do, at least for most of us, where local grocery stores have aisles of fresh produce, cereal and even pet food, one can easily forget that other parts of the world are not similarly blessed, and what undernourishment that results from food insecurity means in practical terms.

UNICEF estimates that undernutrition is a leading cause of mortality of children under the age of five, contributing to the death of about 5 million children every year. One to two

percent of all children under 5 in the developing world, or almost 13 million, suffer from severe acute undernutrition. These children are far more susceptible to dying from childhood illnesses including diarrhea and pneumonia.

Of course, undernutrition does not affect only children. Twenty-five percent of all undernourished persons in the world, or about 218 million, live in Sub-Saharan Africa. This constitutes about 30 percent of that region's population.

Agriculture production is essential for addressing this crisis on both the local and national levels. And yet Africa faces numerous challenges in meeting the basic need of food and nutrition for its people. These include the simple lack of food in markets or fields; poor food delivery mechanisms; many people's inability to buy food or agricultural resources due to poverty; obstacles to food access due to social status; lack of sanitation and clean drinking water; and natural and man-made natural resources.

I can attest to at least one aspect of these challenges from my own experience in Africa. I have traveled along a segment of the Pan-African Highway, which is one of Africa's primary transportation routes. The part that I rode on is a narrow, paved, two-lane road with numerous bicyclists, pedestrians and animals walking along the shoulder. I was told that another major segment was a dirt road that was taking far longer than anticipated to be repaved. One often encounters open-air trucks overloaded with bananas or other produce broken down in the middle of the road, exposed to the sun and heat. I am told that they can remain there for hours or even days at a time. No one can travel this major road after dark, as the road is not lit and the danger of hitting one of these disabled vehicles or some other object on the road is too great. Even if a community is growing bumper crops of high quality agricultural produce, it would be next to impossible to transport food in a timely manner under these conditions.

As we are noting time and again during the subcommittee hearings, inadequate infrastructure is a major obstacle to development generally in Africa, and that certainly applies in the case of agricultural development. African leaders recognized this when they named increased agricultural trade capacity and infrastructure as one of the four pillars of the Comprehensive African Agricultural Development Program of the African Union's New Partnership for Africa's Development. The Subcommittee heard just three weeks ago how the Millennium Challenge Corporation is working to address this need. Congress should be looking for additional measures to create the infrastructure necessary to support agriculture businesses and rural farming populations.

It is unfortunate that some attribute Africa's food crisis, at least in part, to the Continent's population growth rate, and name people themselves, especially children, as a cause of the problem of food insecurity. At a recent hearing on the shortage of safe water in Africa, the Subcommittee learned that the United Nations Development Programme has found that the global water crisis is attributable to power, poverty and unequal access to safe drinking water, not shortages in quantity resulting from population increases.

I would propose that the same analysis applies with respect to the availability of food

and levels of food security. Many researchers on this issue attribute food insecurity not so much to an absolute deficit of food, particularly at the national and international levels, as to the failure of socioeconomic systems, including markets and political processes, to distribute food equitably or efficiently. Many are of the opinion that better functioning and open market systems are equally or even more important to providing adequate food supplies as absolute increases in food production. While we should and must seek to increase the quality and quantity of food supplies, we must also address longer-term challenges of policy and infrastructure to attain a permanent solution for food security. People themselves should be considered not a source of the problem, but a valuable resource in achieving this goal.

THE LAW LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 2007

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, the Law Library of Congress was created by an Act of Congress in 1832. That year, President Andrew Jackson signed the bill into law stating that: ". . . be it enacted by the Senate and House . . . that it shall be the duty of the librarian to prepare an apartment near . . . Congress . . . for the purpose of a law library." Since then the Law Library's mission has expanded beyond service to Congress, to include making its resources available to the Supreme Court, other branches of the U.S. Government, the American public and the global legal community.

The Law Library's first systematic effort to collect legal documents from foreign nations began soon after the U.S.-Mexican War, when Congress directed the Law Library to obtain all available laws of Mexico; later, the laws of the major European nations were also added to the collection. The Law Library grew significantly during the 20th century, developing a much larger and well-cataloged collection, and publishing many authoritative reference works on U.S. and foreign laws. A sustained program for the acquisition of foreign legal material began after World War II, reflecting the expanding number of foreign jurisdictions, as well as the changing position of the United States in world affairs. The Law Library now has an unparalleled collection of 2.6 million volumes and is staffed by more than 100 lawyers, librarians, and other professionals.

The mission of The Law Library of Congress, the de facto national law library, is to make its resources available to Members of Congress, the Supreme Court, other branches of the U.S. Government, and the global legal community, and to sustain and preserve a universal collection of law for future generations.

Unique among libraries, the Law Library is a repository of legal and legislative documents from around the world, and the most comprehensive, current, and reliable resource of its kind. In addition to housing some of the world's rarest legal sources, the Law Library stands as the primary resource for legal research for the United States Congress in U.S. law as well as foreign, comparative, and international law. The Law Library also conducts

legal research for other branches of the U.S. Government and provides resources and services for the national and global legal community.

Dr. Rubens Medina has been the Law Librarian of Congress, since 1994. He holds a law degree from the National University of Asunción, Paraguay, a Ph.D. in Law and Sociology from the University of Wisconsin and has practiced and taught law in Paraguay and Chile. As Law Librarian of Congress, Medina manages and directs the government's only general legal research library and the largest law library in the world.

Medina also serves as Chair of the Executive Council of the Global Legal Information Network (GLIN), an international cooperative information system developed and maintained by the Law Library to serve the United States Congress. The recipient of numerous awards and fellowships, Medina recently was presented with a 2007 Federal 100 Award for shepherding the 2006 upgrade of GLIN, thereby providing citizens and nations with a means of accessing laws and related legal material from nations across Asia, Africa, Europe and the Americas, in 13 searchable languages. Medina first came to the Library of Congress in 1971, when he was appointed Chief of the Hispanic Law Division. He held the position until 1994, when he was appointed the 21st Law Librarian of Congress.

On July 14, 2007, the Law Library of Congress celebrated its 175th anniversary with a Gala Dinner in the Great Hall of the Library of Congress' Jefferson Building. Over 130 of the most respected and influential individuals in the political, legal, and educational world were present, including the Law Librarian of Congress, Dr. Rubens Medina, and the 175th Anniversary Honorary Chairperson, Jeffrey Toobin (from CNN).

Madam Speaker, I had the distinguished privilege of being the gala's keynote speaker. The Honorary Committee consisted of members from the Library of Congress, the Supreme Court, Congress, and representatives from AT&T, Hewlett-Packard Corporation, Real Networks, Inc., Microsoft, The World Bank, Apple, Sony Corporation and Google. Additional Friends of the Law Library sponsorship came from: Thomson West; Beirne, Maynard & Parsons, L.L.P.; Burton Foundation for Legal Achievement; HeinOnline; LexisNexis; Roll Call Group; American University and Congressional Quarterly, Inc. All of these society individuals were present to pay homage to the institution that serves as the world's largest law library.

The Law Library of Congress is truly one of the greatest resources available to this Nation. Enriched in years of history, it allows individuals from across the world to search for and research hundreds of years of legal advice, opinions, and case decisions, providing these individuals the opportunity to create laws for the future society. I salute the Law Library of Congress on its 175th year anniversary and all its achievements. Here is to another 175 years.

And that's just the way it is.