

Iraq trumps all other needs. The American people do not agree with this administration's priorities. They want action, they want real solutions to our domestic problems, and they want to fight a real war on terrorism, not the phony war on terrorism the administration is fighting in Iraq.

When the President signed the No Child Left Behind Act, Madam Speaker, he said it was the most important piece of legislation most of us will ever work on. The education of our children is far more important to the future of our country than an endless and counterproductive occupation of another country.

That is why Congress must finally stand up to the administration and say no, no to supplemental funding that would bring our total spending in Iraq this fiscal year alone to \$160 billion. Madam Speaker, that's over \$13 billion a month, or nearly \$450 million per day.

Almost exactly a year ago, the American people sent us to Congress to end the occupation of Iraq. It's time that we do it. We must use our power of the purse to fully fund the safe, orderly and responsible redeployment of all of our troops out of Iraq, and that includes the withdrawal of all of our military contractors as well.

As if one occupation army weren't enough, these independent contractors comprise a second occupation army that is angering the Iraqi people and actually making life much harder for our very own troops.

Madam Speaker, we can't afford to keep throwing money into the bottomless pit of Iraq. That appears to be what our leaders in the White House want us to do. But their policy is bankrupting all of us politically, economically, and morally. It is time that we come to our senses; it is time to end this madness.

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

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

#### DARFUR

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, tonight this House passed House Resolutions 740, 573 and 726 with regard to Darfur and Sudan.

Madam Speaker, decades from now our children's children will look back on these times as an ugly blemish on human history. They will remember a time when innocent people were senselessly slaughtered in the Darfur region of Sudan. The question is whether they will look back and see that this Nation and this Congress stood up for what is

right and just, or did we sit idly by and watch from the sidelines.

Madam Speaker, we must be on the right side of this issue. That's why I'm so glad that we have passed these resolutions today. Although much work remains to be done, they represent a step in the right direction.

The passage of these bills rightfully pressures the Sudanese Government to end civil strife and ongoing human rights violations in Darfur, which threatens stability in the region and the very fabric of Sudanese life.

As you know, Madam Speaker, Darfur remains in great peril. Hundreds of thousands of Sudanese have lost their lives since the conflicts spiraled out of control in February of 2003. Over 2 million civilians have been internally displaced, and an estimated 215,000 more persons have been externally displaced in such neighboring states as Chad. Even for those who are internally displaced persons, they have experienced anything but a safe haven outside of Darfur while ongoing killing, torture, rape, looting and the unlawful destruction of their property by all parties continues, mainly by the janjaweed, associated militia groups, and the institution that should be protecting them, the Sudanese Government.

Indeed, as House Resolution 726 points out, it has become treacherous for women or young ladies in Darfur or eastern Chad to leave their villages to collect firewood or food from the market. They are at risk of being raped and assaulted, which, unfortunately, to date is exactly what has occurred to thousands.

Although some strides have been made in reducing the government's participation in continued human rights abuses in Darfur, militia groups remain a very real and present threat for the civilians in Darfur and eastern Chad, despite peace negotiations.

Particularly, as reported by the United Nations, these systematic human rights violations have been and continue to be committed with total impunity throughout Sudan, especially in Darfur. It is clear that the Government of Sudan has taken to turning a blind eye to such atrocities, choosing instead to provide strikingly few prosecutions, sentencing or even adequate examinations of war crimes or crimes against humanity, whether by criminal courts or those courts established to investigate the violations.

These failures by the Sudanese Government to respect and abide by customary international norms, international humanitarian and human rights laws embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Geneva Conventions and the Convention on the Rights of a Child that it is a party to demonstrates a lack of respect for international law and responsibility that it has to protect its citizenry from unacceptable levels of abuse.

Meanwhile, this Bush administration has held tightly to a hands-off approach by failing to send any troops to Sudan, despite there clearly being a lack of an adequate and capable number of African Union troops, amounting to a mere 7,000.

The President promised to not allow another Rwanda-style atrocity to occur; however, it appears to be happening once again, with little being done about it. Even the peace negotiations that recently occurred in Libya appear to be faltering, with two key militia groups failing to show up for the meeting.

As such, I congratulate my colleagues in passing these three vital resolutions this evening. And I thank the Congress, which has chosen to answer the pleas for help by the people of Darfur while the administration has failed to adequately respond.

We must act with a great sense of urgency. History will judge whether we have synchronized our conduct with our conscience.

□ 1945

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WATERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WATERS addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

#### THE PERU TRADE AGREEMENT

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

Mr. MICHAUD. I thank Madam Speaker. This weekend, Senator John Edwards announced his opposition to the Peru Trade Agreement. The reason? As his statement says, "All of these agreements replicate the terrible features of NAFTA." Senator Edwards is right. It is more of the same old, same old. A leading Presidential candidate is saying it. The American people are sick of it. And so why is Congress pushing for it? Why would we push for a steady stream of lost jobs that gives incentives to multinational

corporations to move overseas? Why would we agree to an agreement that would displace peasant farmers who would be forced to migrate to the United States?

The American public aren't fooled. Campaign finance reform hasn't stopped the incredible financial influence of multinational corporations. These corporations are weighing in with the candidates, even Citibank. Take, for example, the provisions hidden in the Peru FTA. As Senator Edwards points out, "Buried deep in the 800-page text of the Peru FTA are ambiguous provisions that could allow U.S. banks to demand compensation if Peru reverses its disastrous social security privatization."

The Peru FTA contains provisions that could allow Citibank to demand compensation in FTA foreign investor protection tribunals from the Peruvian Government if Peru seeks to reverse its failed social security privatization. The Peruvian archbishop and both labor federation presidents asked the Ways and Means leaders to fix this problem. And it hasn't been fixed.

The House floor will be voting on this in a couple of weeks. As a Democratic Party, we have stood united against privatization of Social Security. We have not backed down. That is why it shocks me to hear that Senator OBAMA supports the Peru FTA. Yes, Senator OBAMA does support the Peru FTA.

Senator Edwards has it right. It is time to stick up for the American workers. It is time to reject the same NAFTA model that has devastated our industry. It is time to listen to the broad list of groups who do not support the Peru FTA. Not one union, environmental, consumer, small business, faith, family farm group supports the modified Bush Peru NAFTA Expansion FTA. So why would any Presidential candidate?

It is important to hear what the candidates are saying about protecting our jobs and fighting for fair trade deals. It is important that we stick together in this fight to keep our jobs here at home. I encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on the Peru FTA.

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

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

#### THE PERU TRADE DEAL

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The Peru trade deal will also be bad for U.S. agriculture and all farmers in our country and, amazingly, in Peru. So both here at home and abroad it will result in more harm.

Let's look at the facts. This current trade deficit chart with Peru tells us we are already in the red with Peru, as we are in the red with China and in the red with Mexico and in the red with almost every other trading country, Japan, et cetera. The U.S. vegetable trade deficit with Peru is already a part of this. According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Foreign Agricultural Service, just the vegetable deficit component is already over \$200 million in 2006. So America's vegetable farmers will lose more market share. They have already lost market share, especially those who farm asparagus, onions and peas. Their situation will be similar to the plight of America's tomato, bell pepper and cucumber farmers who learned well what happened after NAFTA was signed. They all lost production as it relocated.

Several global corporations have already indicated what they are going to do. They are already putting their processing plants in Peru. Green Giant has done it. Del Monte has done it. The pattern is the same, the same as under NAFTA. As was the case with Mexico where millions of peasant farmers were upended under NAFTA with no adjustment provisions for them, Peru's farmers will also be hurt when these same global corporations take over their farming operations and flood their markets with rice, corn and chicken.

We expect that an additional 3 million Peruvian agricultural workers will be directly affected and millions of Peruvian farmers, as Mexico's farmers well know, will be upended. This will force increased migration of those individuals to cities that are already swelling with large numbers of poor, and it is projected expanded illegal drug production as people try to stay in their home countries with no crops to sell, they turn to those illegal choices.

Similar to the lack of protection for Mexico's corn and bean farmers under NAFTA, which that corn and bean tariff is going to phase out at the end of this year, and another 2 million of Mexico's farmers will be hurt, we know that what happens is that they either emigrate to adjoining cities or to the United States, many of them illegally, or they turn to the illegal sector where they literally risk their lives in order to survive.

What kind of a plan is this that would treat the people of developing countries with such derision? What kind of a plan is it that would hurt our farmers to that extent? Why does it always have to be a negative? Why can't trade be a plus plus? Importantly, Peru was the world's top coca producer in 1996, and coca production remains a viable alternative for farmers forced to give up their legal crops.

Is anybody listening? Is anybody thinking? It is pretty clear what is going to happen because there is nothing in the agreement to help Peru adjust. We saw what happened when that didn't occur under NAFTA. There were no adjustment provisions for Mexico's

farmers. CAFTA, the same thing, and now we add Peru on top of the pile. There is nothing in the Peruvian agreement for adjustments inside of Peru. The displaced farmers have few options. If they do not turn to coca production or other illegal industries, they will be forced to move. And we can ask where. To the overcrowded cities of Peru, further straining those resources? To another country? With the debate raging about illegal immigration and with us unable to reach a civil accommodation across this continent, wouldn't it be truly cruelly irresponsible to support another trade agreement that could result in more devastation to small holders?

Shouldn't we be helping these farmers adjust inside their own homelands? That is long overdue inside of Mexico, in order to help people earn money in their own countries, rather than wipe out hundreds of thousands of people as if their lives and their cultures didn't matter. And then we get the added problem of illegal labor trafficking into this country, which we can't control.

The Peru agreement doesn't do anything to address these serious human concerns. It does have some of the glossy language like NAFTA and CAFTA did that ends up toothless in terms of enforcement.

Madam Speaker, why would the American people be given more of the same out of this Congress? We ought to be changing these trade agreements to development agreements and treating people with the respect they deserve.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman 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 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.)

#### PERU FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California. Thank you, Madam Speaker. Tonight I rise to address the House and the American people regarding the U.S. Peru Free Trade Agreement and its effect on working families. But before I launch into my remarks, I want to be clear. I am committed to trade. I believe trade is an essential component to the development and strengthening of our economy.