

don't think the American public trusts the Federal Government to do the job of securing the border and reforming the immigration service.

But we know that the Federal Government does have the capability to grant amnesty to people that are here illegally. So, hopefully, Congress will do its job, get organized, pass three separate bills so that we have border security; that we have an efficient, workable immigration services; and then down the road, we deal with what to do with the people that are here illegally in the U.S.

The American public expect it. They have expected it for a long time, and it's time for us to get about the people's business and resolve these three problems as efficiently and quickly as we can.

And that's just the way it is.

---

**PRESIDENT SHOULD OVERRULE PROPOSED NEW STRATEGY OF GIVING WEAPONS TO SUNNI ARAB GROUPS**

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, tonight I rise to demand that President Bush take immediate action as Commander in Chief to overrule a proposed new strategy in Iraq, a proposal that may put our troops in even greater danger in the days ahead.

The New York Times reported this morning that our commanders in Iraq are now planning to give weapons to Sunni Arab groups, weapons that may turn around and be used against our very own troops.

In the past, these Sunni groups have been allied with al Qaeda and have actually been suspected of being involved in attacks upon our troops. So why are we doing this? According to the Times, our commanders have reason to believe that the Sunnis have split with al Qaeda and are now ready to fight on our side. Well, it could be true, but this strategy is fraught with terrible peril for our brave men and women in combat.

The Times reports, "Critics of the strategy, including some American officers, say it could amount to the Americans arming both sides in a future civil war. The United States has spent more than \$15 billion in building up Iraq's Army and police force, whose manpower of 350,000 is heavily Shiite. With little sign of a political accommodation between Shiites and Sunni politicians in Baghdad, there is a risk that any weapons given to Sunni groups will eventually be used against Shiites." And I must mention, our troops will be stuck in the middle, dying for what? Because there is the possibility, says the Times, the weapons could be used against the Americans themselves.

Let me repeat that last sentence, "There is also the possibility the weapons could be used against the Ameri-

cans themselves." That's what the Times had to say.

But first, Madam Speaker, we sent our troops into battle without the proper body armor or vehicle armor. Then we put them in the middle of a bloody civil war they were never trained to fight. Then, when many of them got wounded, we gave them terrible medical treatment at home. Now this is the latest outrage.

Madam Speaker, I do not condemn our commanders in the field for making this decision. They are taking this risk because they are desperate to implement President Bush's hopeless, foolish surge policy, but the surge has not worked, is not working and will not work.

As the Times reports, "An initial decline in sectarian killings in Baghdad in the first two months of the troop buildup has reversed, with growing numbers of bodies showing up each day in the capital. Suicide bombings have dipped in Baghdad, but increased elsewhere, as al Qaeda groups, confronted with great American troop numbers, have shifted their operations elsewhere."

There's only one way, Madam Speaker, out of this. We must bring our troops home, and then we must work with the Iraqi people and we must work with them in a peaceful way to reconstruct their devastated Nation.

Last month, a bill that called for starting the withdrawal of our troops within 90 days received 171 votes in this House. Some pundits were surprised that it received that much support. I wasn't. Opposition to this President's failed foreign policy is growing all over America, and those voices are eventually being heard in this body more and more every day.

Madam Speaker, if American troops are harmed by this new war strategy, then the American people will hold the President accountable. But if we in this House condone it as well, or remain silent, then we will be responsible, too.

Our job is to force this administration to fully fund the plan to bring our troops and our contractors home, home where they are not positioned in the middle of a civil war.

---

**SUPPORTING THE PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE FOR ACCUSED CAMP PENDLETON TROOPS**

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. Madam Speaker, only those who have been to war can truly understand the hell of war. I have not been to war, but I have spoken to those who have served our country in both Iraq and Afghanistan. I know enough to understand that those who serve in harm's way face grave dangers, and they are under extreme pressure.

Most of us cannot imagine the stress that those in uniform undergo when

they have to make a split-second decision whether to fire or be fired upon, to kill or be killed.

In June 2006, seven Marines and one Navy corpsman from Camp Pendleton were charged with murder in an April 2006 incident involving the death of an Iraqi man. The troops were staking out an intersection while looking for insurgents placing explosives along the road.

The squad of eight is accused of kidnapping the Iraqi man from a nearby home, killing him, and then staging the scene to frame him as an insurgent planting a bomb.

Four of the troops struck plea deals and received sentences of 21 months or less in exchange for their testimony against their squad mates. One of the troops also pled guilty to lesser charges but received an 8-year sentence. The three remaining Marines all face courts martial this summer and life in prison if convicted of premeditated murder.

One of these three Marines is a constituent of Congressman BILL DELAHUNT, who brought the details of this case to my attention.

Madam Speaker, 3 years ago, I came to this floor night after night to speak about what I felt was an unfair prosecution of Lieutenant Ilario Pantano, a Marine who was charged with shooting an insurgent in Iraq. Not because of my concern, but because the charges against Lieutenant Pantano were not justified, the Marine Corps dropped the charges.

Because of my great respect for the men and women who serve in the United States Marine Corps, it is my hope that these Marines will receive the due process and justice they deserve as American citizens and as heroes.

President Teddy Roosevelt once said, "A man who is good enough to shed his blood for his country is good enough to be given a square deal afterwards. More than that no man is entitled, and less than that no man shall have."

The same men and women who risk their lives to preserve the rights of all American citizens deserve the protection of those same rights. Those who fight for justice deserve justice in return.

Madam Speaker, our military servicemembers, the military family, and certainly these Marines, deserve no less.

And Madam Speaker, with that, I close by saying, God, please continue to bless our men and women in uniform and their families, and please, God, continue to bless America.

---

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.)

□ 1945

## FREE TRADE AGREEMENTS WITH PERU AND PANAMA

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, soon President Bush's administration will force upon this Congress consideration of free trade agreements with Peru and Panama under the fast-track process. That means no amendments allowed here in the Congress.

The bills they will bring before us are modeled on the flawed NAFTA model that have yielded growing trade deficits every year the Bush administration has been in office. We have seen how NAFTA sucked good jobs away from Americans, how it ravaged the Mexican countryside and triggered a flow of illegal immigrants, drugs and violence across our southern border.

Our staggering trade deficit with Mexico continues to grow. This year we already have a \$21.6 billion deficit with Mexico, and it will continue to swell as communities across the continent face job washout.

If we do not construct a new trade model that takes people into consideration and advocates free trade among free people, then it does not matter how many environmental provisions we may add to trade agreements or how unique the administration claims its labor provisions are.

We are simply extending NAFTA to the rain forest and to more sweat shops because there will be no reliable enforcement.

We have seen the NAFTA model fail in Mexico. We have seen it fail in CAFTA countries. Why should we assume it will be any less disastrous in Peru or Panama?

We cannot fall for empty promises again. When we were told that NAFTA would result in a trade surplus, when we were told that NADBANC would help communities that were faced with job loss with reinvestment, when we were told NAFTA would be beneficial for Mexicans, Canadians, and the legislation passed this Congress, what did we see? Billions and billions of trade deficit dollars racked up.

We have never had a positive trade balance with the NAFTA countries or the CAFTA countries. We saw a washout of jobs in our middle-class communities, and we saw huge and growing protests across Mexico. It's a mistake to pass NAFTA, and it will be a mistake to extend it to other countries without comprehensive and effective reform.

This time Congress must be smarter. We must realize the administration is feeding us empty promises without enforceability and clear benefits. We should have no reason to be fooled again.

Even if we succeed with some changes to the core text of these agreements, do we trust President Bush to

enforce them? We are still waiting for him to enforce the flagrant violations in the Jordanian agreement, where such language was included in the core of the trade agreement.

It is bad enough that his administration has the power to avoid any meaningful congressional amendment or any amendment at all. We cannot trust President Bush with fairly negotiating trade agreements, and we certainly cannot trust him to fairly enforce them.

If Congress passes these agreements with Peru and Panama, we only stand to perpetuate the race to the bottom cycle of lowered wages, reduced benefits worldwide, by taking these steps under the slippery slope of the Bush trade agreement that rewards Wall Street and its investors, but penalizes main streets across our Nation.

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 Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

## LET'S BRING OUR SOLDIERS HOME

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. Madam Speaker, earlier today I made mention of an interesting new theory that is being promoted through the Nation's newspapers, and, certainly, let me acknowledge the respect that we have in this Congress for the United States military and their never-ending challenge and acceptance of responsibility in their work in Iraq and certainly, of course, Afghanistan.

We know that both of those regions are becoming more difficult. In Afghanistan, the Taliban is rising, and, frankly, just recently, there was an attempted assassination attack on President Karzai in Afghanistan with a message from the Taliban saying that "We were involved" and, in essence, "We are on the rise."

In fact, that is where the root of terror is. After 9/11, that is where this Congress almost unanimously instructed the President on behalf of the American people to fight the war on terror, to fight al Qaeda, and to find Osama bin Laden. Unfortunately, this administration has failed, failed its duty to this Nation, and not represented itself to the American people and to this Congress as to what its next steps are with respect to fighting terror.

Now we find ourselves muddling around in Iraq, we are almost to the middle of June, and almost 30 Americans have died in Iraq. This is an unending mission without a mission, an unending story without an end.

Now we read in the Nation's newspaper America's strategy in Iraq to arm the Sunnis. But at the same time as we arm the Sunnis, we are in negotiations with them to promise us that they will not shoot American soldiers.

I believe that this may be a reasonable response to arm Sunnis to fight al Qaeda, to arm Sunnis to engage with the Iraqi National Army. But it is not a reasonable response with American soldiers sitting in the line of fire.

Again, I say, having visited with my constituents over the weekend, having visited with constituents in churches and grocery stores, in meetings, in civic meetings, everywhere I go, in religious institutions or houses of faith, everywhere I go in my congressional district, people are asking the singular question. That is, when are our soldiers going to come home from Iraq?

When I get the loudest applause is when I say that this Congress must bring our soldiers home, and that it is my intention to work with every Member of Congress who is willing to stand up to ensure that our soldiers come home, not because of our job has not been completed, not because our soldiers are not strong, not because our soldiers are wimps, but because, in fact, our soldiers are heroes.

I believe, as in my legislation H.R. 930, that we should bring them home under a military success. They have done their job. They have deposed Saddam Hussein. They have discovered that there were no weapons of mass destruction. They have finished the mission.

We should declare a military victory for those soldiers and those who lost their lives and begin to transfer the leadership of the efforts in Iraq to the Iraqi national Army and the Iraqi national police. I cannot understand this theory, this particular strategy, when our soldiers are still on the ground. All I can see is armed Sunnis, armed al Qaeda, armed Shiites, all pointing guns at our soldiers, who are there, simply, to follow the mission of a President who will not listen.

I am interested in military strategy. I want our military generals to be creative. If they believe that this is an effective tool, then this tool must be utilized without our soldiers, in essence, if I might say, without any disrespect, to be shooting targets or sitting ducks.

This does not seem to be the right kind of approach if our soldiers are still going to be in the midst. Even if they relocate the soldiers out of the particular area, they are still on the ground. Armed Sunnis are armed Sunnis. Armed Sunnis and armed Shiites move around. They don't necessarily have to stay in one area.

I expect that we will have a briefing tomorrow. I hope that they will discuss