

didn't want the Southerners to go; we just wanted to win the Civil War.

There is a kind of ethnic cleansing going on in Iraq, and let me show it and urge Members to focus on it. Thousands leave every month, and 95 percent remain in the Middle East. What kind of a cauldron are we making in the Middle East?

Syria has been best in taking them, and they are full up. Iraqis are the leading nationality seeking asylum in industrialized countries. Three hundred Iraqis returned after the fall of Saddam Hussein. So encouraged were they that they came back to their land, many of them from Iran.

By 2006, hundreds of thousands of new refugees were fleeing the country, and last week we heard there is less violence? Sure, those people that are leaving. They are being driven out of their own country as a result of a civil war.

What is most shameful as I looked at the data was to find who was taking the refugees. We know who is responsible for them leaving. We know who invaded their country. Well, the U.K. has taken 22,300, a much smaller country than we. Australia has taken 11,000, and the United States has taken 6,000. And they say if we leave, there will be a major fratricide. So why aren't we taking some of these people? Why are our allies willing to take them, even though they had less to do with the fleeing in the first place.

The number of people displaced internally is shocking. It has risen in 2006 alone by 50 percent. Let me show you how we are failing in our duties. In 1992, 1993 and 1994, we were taking over 4,000 Iraqi refugees and settling them. Now in 2005, we report settling 200. This is a moral failing when you invade somebody else's country and you won't take their refugees and you insist upon staying there and fomenting violence when 80 percent say they want you out of the country.

Let me read from an independent journalist. I don't think you can say Iraq exists any more. There has been very effective systemic ethnic cleansing of Sunnis from Baghdad, of Shias from areas that are now mostly Shia, but the Sunnis especially have been a target, as have mixed families. With a name like "Omar," a person is distinctly Sunni. It is a very Sunni name. You can be executed for having the name "Omar" alone, and Baghdad is now firmly in the hands of sectarian Shiite militias, and they are never going to let it go.

The refugee story alone is reason enough to begin the exodus from Iraq tomorrow. That is what they want. That is what the majority of the American people want. That's what we must see happen before we leave this Congress this year.

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

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will ap-

pear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

CONSTITUTION RATIFIED 220 YEARS AGO

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

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 220th anniversary of the ratification of one of the greatest documents written in the history of man.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, it is safe to say that other than the Bible and our Declaration of Independence, no other document has so impacted the course of human history and freedom throughout the world.

That is because 220 years ago, the Framers of our Constitution did something singular in the long account of tyrannies, governments, and institutions invented whereby man sought to govern his fellow man.

A small courageous set of soldiers, farmers, aristocrats and tradesmen banded together and forever threw off the yoke of the crown of England to "secure the blessings of liberty to themselves and their posterity."

Their resolve was ratified with the Declaration of Independence that was in fact a promise to future generations to never again subject our children to the unchecked tyranny of arbitrary human government.

In those tumultuous days, there was perhaps no better or more justifiable case for establishing a permanent monarchy than under the noble and flint-like leadership of General George Washington. Many urged the general to do just that. But, Mr. Speaker, instead those first Americans took it upon themselves to do something completely revolutionary. Those men, who had seized for themselves potentially unlimited power over a nascent state completely vulnerable to the dictates of tyranny, chose instead to place immovable checks and limitations upon their own power and upon all those in government who would follow them.

The European model of life said that God gave authority to kings and a government of kings who would hold the rights of men in their hands. The American model encapsulated the divine message of human dignity: We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created, that they are all equal, and that they are all endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights and that government exists to secure those rights.

Mr. Speaker, those first Americans understood that all men were individ-

ually accountable to God and that he first gave each of them the right to live. Without this first right of life firmly secured and clearly understood, they knew that all other rights would become meaningless; but with it, all other rights would follow.

They were right, Mr. Speaker. The Constitution of the United States built upon the Declaration of Independence and its proclamation of a self-evident truth that all men are created equal, and laid upon that foundation the rights of freedom of all kinds, of speech and religion, the right to own property, the right of individuals to bear arms, and the right to choose a government of the people, for the people, and by the people.

Mr. Speaker, the Constitution of the United States is a statement of eternal truths as much as it is a statement of principles that govern a nation. Now more than ever as we take this day to commemorate the framing and establishment of that Constitution that for 220 years has served as the archetype of free democratic nations and governments all over the world, it is absolutely incumbent upon all of us to desperately remember the meaning of those words and to renew our commitment to guard against every erosion of that document and the liberties it embodies. But most importantly, the protection of the right to live.

Daniel Webster's admonition to all of us is so appropriate. He said: "Hold on, my friends, to the Constitution and to the Republic for which it stands. Miracles do not cluster and what has happened once in 6,000 years may never happen again. If the American Constitution should fall, there will be anarchy throughout the world."

Mr. Speaker, Senator Webster's voice no longer sounds in these Chambers, but I pray that we hear his message anew in our hearts, and I hope we can renew our own oath to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States, that miraculous document that has so valiantly and nobly served the cause of humanity for 220 years.

□ 2000

OPPOSE PERU AND PANAMANIAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENTS

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

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the pending Peru and Panama free trade agreements. Over 3 million American manufacturing jobs, one out of every six jobs, have been lost during the fast-track era. How many more manufacturing jobs will be lost with the passage of these two trade deals? How many more?

My district in particular has suffered the loss of 1,600 jobs when NAFTA forced Maytag to leave Galesburg, Illinois, for Sonora, Mexico. Every aspect of that town was hurt: its spirit, the

economy, the schools, and the small businesses that supplied goods to Maytag.

Now Galesburg is trying to rebuild its identity.

The November 2006 election showed that most Americans understand our past trade policies, which gave us NAFTA and the WTO, have failed; yet President Bush continues to bring more flawed trade agreements to this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, on May 10, Chairman RANGEL of the Ways and Means Committee reached a landmark deal with the Bush administration to include labor and environmental protection in free trade agreements. The deal requires our trading partners to adopt, maintain and enforce in their laws and practice the five basic international labor standards: freedom of association, right to collective bargaining, elimination of forced labor, abolition of child labor, and elimination of discrimination.

As positive as this deal was, I have absolutely no faith that this President will enforce any labor provisions included in any trade deal. In a statement released on May 11, AFL-CIO president John Sweeney reminded us of the Bush administration's enforcement failure in past agreements by saying, "The Bush administration's consistent unwillingness to enforce trade violations against nations like Jordan and China reminds us that there is no guarantee that this executive branch will enforce any new rights workers may gain through these negotiations."

This administration can't even enforce OSHA regulations here at home. How can we expect this President and this administration to enforce laws in these two countries? Recently, I received a letter from two Peruvian labor federations concerned about the labor provisions in the pending FTA between the United States and Peru. In reference to the May 10 announcement, the letter states, "These changes are important. Nevertheless, in order for there to be real progress that does not only exist on paper, it is necessary that the administrations of President Bush and Garcia adopt significant change that they do not appear willing to do."

Mr. Speaker, no one seems to have faith in this President or the Peruvian Government to enforce the law. The problem is that those who support the FTA in Peru are the same people that oppose labor reform in Peru.

Mr. Speaker, our trade policies must start to serve the interests of American working families and workers around the globe. I urge all of my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats alike, to say "no" to President Bush's trade agreement with Peru. We have a moral responsibility to save the manufacturing jobs that this Nation has lost and to try to regain those jobs that we have outsourced.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

PERU FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

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, I would like to follow on Mr. HARE's remarks this evening and also oppose the pending Peru Free Trade Agreement, which we think is scheduled to come up on this floor in early October.

My question really is: With the United States trade deficit galloping out of control, this year it is likely to hit a trillion dollars in the red, as we continue to outsource jobs across this country. Recently, Ford Mazda in Monroe, Michigan, just north of our district, announced another 2,000 to 3,000 jobs gone. Those are not counting all the supplier jobs outsourced. So why would we be considering another NAFTA-like trade agreement here in this Congress?

The trade deficit with Mexico after NAFTA's passage has gotten worse every single year, going deeper and deeper and deeper into debt, more of our jobs outsourced to that country. Right before NAFTA's passage, there was a positive balance and they tried to make it look good to convince Congress it is getting better. Then we fell into heavy deficit every single year.

We are already in deficit with Peru. In fact, every year it has been getting worse and worse and worse with that nation. So we are even in worse shape with Peru than we were with NAFTA when that was signed. Why would we want more of the same based on that trade model?

Now, one can ask what is happening down there that we have to do this now, with the communities across this country, some of them like my own with over 8 percent unemployment, and why should we sacrifice more U.S. jobs to these flawed trade agreements.

I think I put my finger on it with Peru. There is something called the Camisea Natural Gas Project. In 2004, that country started exporting through this mega gas project exports to our country and other places in the world. Two pipelines started to deliver natural gas from the Amazon River basin at that time. One of the problems with this project is the number of spills and the environmental degradation that is occurring in that region due to this pipeline.

With America so energy dependent, rather than using our power to become energy independent here at home, we are getting ourselves involved in these trade agreements to try to bring more and import more power to this country rather than investing those dollars here. The price of that import of power is a loss of more of our jobs. That is

not a trade-off this Member is willing to make.

In addition to that, the Peru Trade Agreement, as we understand it, has several really terrible provisions in it. First of all, the privatization of social security. In Peru, under their system, the agreement would allow private companies like Citibank or other U.S. investors to sue Peruvian taxpayers if Peru itself tries to reverse the partial privatization of the social security system that occurred in that country in the last decade. What a terrible, terrible provision to have for the people of Peru. We believe in the integrity of our Social Security system. Why should we impact theirs?

In addition to that, the Peru agreement as proposed would affect the access to generic medicines to people who live in a very impoverished country like Peru where over half of the people are poor. A number of nongovernmental organizations based in the United States and Latin America have confirmed that this agreement would reduce access to essential medicines by the poor population of Peru and that the agreement's provisions far exceed international standards established by the WTO. Why would we want to do that to the people of Peru?

Moving on to food safety, why would we want to harm the people of our country, because the agreement does not address serious food safety issues that currently plague our relationship with Peru. Indeed, it is one of the 20 top exporters of shrimp to the United States market, and FDA inspectors have consistently rejected seafood from Peru for numerous reasons, including filth, adulteration, misbranding, and presence of various dangerous food pathogens.

There has been poisonous swordfish, salmonella in shrimp, dangerous histamines in mahi-mahi. Shipment after shipment of dried, canned, frozen and fresh fish products from Peru have proven to be damaged. Why would we want to encourage more of that?

Let me also say one of my concerns about this Peru agreement, as with Mexico, it has no adjustment policies for the poorest of the poor. In other words, the Peru Free Trade Agreement does not take into account many farmers in Peru who are going to be displaced because, as other First World agricultural products flood in there, there are no provisions in the agreement to take care of the poor farmers who will be displaced. Why would we do this to our continent?

Mr. Speaker, there are many other reasons to oppose the Peru Free Trade Agreement which I will put in the RECORD and come to the floor in future days to discuss.