

of the million U.S. workers have lost their jobs.

I urge my colleagues to vote down these two agreements.

AVOIDING ENTANGLING ALLIANCES AND INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF OTHER NATIONS

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

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, the truth about whether or not Saddam Hussein was trying to buy uranium from Niger has dominated the news for the past several weeks. Many of those challenging the administration on this issue are motivated more by politics than by policy. Some doing the challenging were strongly in favor of going to war against Iraq when it appeared politically popular to do so, but are now chagrined that the war is not going as smoothly as was hoped.

I am sure once the alleged attempt to buy uranium is thoroughly debunked, the other excuses for going to war will be examined with a great deal of scrutiny as well. It is obvious that the evidence used to justify going to war is now less than convincing.

The charge that Saddam Hussein had aluminum tubes used in manufacturing nuclear weapons was in error.

A fleet of unmanned aerial vehicles capable of dispensing chemical and biological weapons did not exist.

The 63,000 liters of anthrax and botulism have not been found, nor have any of the mobile germ labs. There are no signs of the 1 million pounds of sarin, mustard and VX gasses.

No evidence has been revealed to indicate Iraq was a threat to anyone's security, let alone ours.

The charge that Saddam Hussein was connected to the al Qaeda was wrong. Saddam Hussein's flaunting of the UN resolutions regarding weapons of mass destruction remains unproven.

How could so many errors have occurred? Some say it was ineptness while others claim outright deception and lies. There are some who say it was selective use of intelligence to promote a particular policy already decided upon. This debate, I am sure, will rage on for a long time, and since motivations are subjective and hard to prove, resolving the controversy will be difficult. However, this should not diminish the importance of sorting out the truth from the fiction, the errors from the malice.

One question, though, I hope gets asked is why should we use intelligence cited by a foreign government as a justification for going to war? One would think that with the billions we spend, we could fully rely on our own intelligence-gathering agencies.

Another point of interest, lacking a coherent foreign policy, we have support for war coming from different groups depending on circumstances unrelated to national defense. For in-

stance, those who strenuously objected to Kosovo promoted war in Iraq. And those who objected to Iraq are now anxious to send troops to Liberia. For some, U.N. permission is important and necessary. For others, the U.N. is helpful as long as it endorses the war they want.

Only a few correctly look to the Constitution and to the Congress to sort out the pros and cons of each conflict and decide whether or not a declaration of war is warranted.

The sad fact is that we have lost our way. A threat to national security is no longer a litmus test for sending troops hither and yon, and the American people no longer require Congress to declare the wars we fight. Hopefully, some day that will be changed.

The raging debate over whether or not Saddam Hussein tried to buy uranium, as important as it is, distracts from the much more important strategic issue of what is the proper foreign policy in a republic.

Hopefully, we will soon seriously consider the policy of noninterventionism in the affairs of others. Avoiding entangling alliances and staying out of the internal affairs of other nations is a policy most conducive to peace and prosperity and one the Founders endorsed. Policing the world and nation building are not part of a constitutional republic.

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

(Mr. GRIJALVA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the special order time of the gentleman from Arizona.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

IN SUPPORT OF INDEPENDENT COMMISSION TO INVESTIGATE DISTORTION OF EVIDENCE OF IRAQ'S WMD PROGRAMS

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I first thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) for his intellectual honesty and consistency and his clear vision on so many foreign policy issues.

A hundred sixty-five years ago, Madam Speaker, the United States Congress, amazingly enough, the House of Representatives, passed a rule prohibiting its Members from debating the great issue of slavery, the greatest

blemish on American history. In those days, John Quincy Adams, former President, then elected to the House of Representatives, came down to the well of the House week after week reading letters from his constituents, reading what he called petitions from groups in his State of Massachusetts, many of them written by women in women's clubs, women who actually could not in those days, as we all know, vote in American elections. He read these letters protesting this rule prohibiting the discussion of slavery and protesting the institution of slavery itself.

Today, we find ourselves in a Congress where this Congress has refused to discuss and investigate what exactly the President did and said about weapons of mass destruction. As the gentleman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) said earlier in the evening, an organization called MoveOn.org, an organization of 1½ million Americans, tens of thousands in my State of Ohio, asked its members to sign an on-line petition saying that we believe Congress should support an independent commission to investigate the Bush administration's distortion of evidence of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction program.

Tens of thousands of those members, in addition to signing the petitions, wrote letters to Members of Congress. And similar to John Quincy Adams's coming to the House floor to expose the Congress' inability and unwillingness to discuss issues of national import, many of us have come to the House floor every night to share the concerns, not just our concerns, Members of Congress, but to share the concerns of people in my district in my State. And I would like to share a handful of those letters.

Dennis Gadel of Akron, Ohio wrote: "What makes this tragedy especially difficult for freedom-loving people to come to terms with is that, unlike September 11, this tragedy was self-inflicted. In order to have a strong democracy, we must hold leaders accountable for their deception."

Ms. Barbara Hanselman from Wadsworth wrote: "I consider it my patriotic duty to give my informed support to those who represent our people. When I cannot trust my government to speak the truth," Ms. Hanselman wrote, "our very basic freedoms are eroded. To lead a country to war, when many U.S. citizens and millions of people around the world were against this act of aggression without clear evidence, by calculated misrepresentation of the facts, is so beneath what my country stands for."

Jim Miraldi of Lorain, Ohio, my hometown, writes: "Our leaders must respect democracy. If our leaders lie or mislead their own people to support military action to make an immense change in foreign policy, then this greatly undermines our country" "... Saddam Hussein was" "... "evil," certainly. "Maybe we should have gone

ahead with this invasion. But that decision should have been based on accurate reporting by our leaders and not by deceiving the American people."

Patrick and Sandra Garrett, Mr. and Mrs. Garrett of Avon, Ohio, in northern Ohio, write: "Democracy cannot endure without truth and integrity from its leadership. Look at what the Vietnam war, the Iran Contra scandal, and Watergate did to the public's confidence in government," the Garretts wrote from Avon.

Cheryl Elman from Akron, Ohio, wrote: "You and a handful of others may truly be all that stand between public ignorance about possible manipulations of policy in the Iraqi war. An enlightened public is a prerequisite for functioning democracy." Please continue your commitment "to free flow of information. Do what you can to shed light on this issue."

Teri Egan from Shaker Heights, Ohio, writes: "As the toll rises daily in Iraq with our troops in harm's way, we need to know if there is any credible reason for continuing in this manner."

Wanda Crawford from Cincinnati, Ohio, in the other end of the State, writes: "With American soldiers' lives at risk and American soldiers' lives lost already, the American public needs to know the true reason for our entry into war with Iraq. Covering up the truth dishonors the sacrifice of those in uniform. As a daughter and a sister of veterans," Ms. Crawford writes, "I am appalled that soldiers may have been lied to about the reasons they were sent to Iraq. Please support an independent, bipartisan investigation to get to the truth of the administration's call to arms."

Norma Roberts from Lexington, Ohio, writes: "I was alarmed at recent reports that our government led us into war without honest justification. President Bush responds by saying that such reports are attempts to 'rewrite history,' but the point is that the American people do not know the real history. If this country is to be a model of democracy, the people must be informed."

Madam Speaker, it goes on and on. We ask for this investigation. Literally hundreds of thousands of Americans have written to their Members of Congress asking for an investigation into the Bush administration's distortion of evidence of weapons of mass destruction.

MEETING FUTURE LABOR SHORTAGES WITH TEMPORARY FOREIGN WORKERS

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

Mr. FLAKE. Madam Speaker, for the past few weeks, I have come to the floor of the House of Representatives to address an issue that I believe has to be addressed with a comprehensive legislative solution. The issue is illegal

migration and our current immigration policies.

Madam Speaker, this is certainly a very complex issue. Unfortunately, it involves a historical policy of turning a blind eye to the reality of the demand for workers for certain jobs in this country. Our migration policy has also not done a very good job of recognizing the way that people organize and lead their lives.

We must recognize that the U.S. economy and standard of living are better than that of Mexico. Mexicans migrate to the United States not simply because wages are higher, but because Americans are willing to hire them. The demand for these workers will not diminish for the foreseeable future. In a recent report published by Dan Griswold of the Cato Institute, we know that the Labor Department has reported that the largest growth in absolute numbers of jobs will be in those categories that require "short-term on-the-job training" of 1 month or less.

In fact, of the top 30 categories with the largest expected job growth between 2000 and 2010, more than half fall into that least-skilled category. These are all occupations where low-skilled immigrants can be expected to help meet the rising demand for workers. Across the U.S. economy the Labor Department estimates that the total number of jobs requiring only short-term training will increase from 51 million in 2000 to 61 million in 2010. That is a net increase of 7.7 million jobs. Meanwhile, the supply of American workers suitable for such work continues to fall because of an aging workforce and rising education levels.

The median age of U.S. workers continues to increase as baby boomers approach retirement age. From 1990 to 2010, the median age for the American worker is expected to rise from 37 years to 41 years. Further, younger and older American workers alike are now more educated. The share of adult native-born men without a high school diploma has plunged from 54 percent in 1960 to just 9 percent in 1998. During the same period, the share of workers with college degrees has gone up from 11 percent to 30 percent.

Certainly we recognize the fastest growing occupations in the next decade in percentage terms will require high degrees of skill and education. But as the economy continues to pick up steam, we have to recognize the realities of labor market demands. The demand for lower-skilled workers is growing while the American workforce is aging and increasingly well-educated.

Madam Speaker, I would argue that it is no coincidence that the number of low-skilled jobs in this country is expected to grow by more than 700,000 a year. That is precisely the number of new illegal immigrants that the Federal Government now estimates are entering the U.S. job market every year. If this is not an affirmation of this power of the market, and simple supply

and demand, I do not know what is. We have to consider that for an illegal worker, the prospect of unemployment in the United States is far more expensive than a similar situation in his or her home country. If jobs are not available, the treacherous journey across the border is simply not worth the risk.

□ 2045

To conclude, permitting immigrants to enter the country as part of a temporary worker program will eliminate a huge segment of the illegal traffic coming across and within our borders. At the same time, such a strategy will recognize that our economy continues to expand, and, as such, the expansion will require new workers.

GETTING AMERICA BACK ON TRACK

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

Mr. STRICKLAND. Madam Speaker, I would hope that government could learn from its mistakes, and, if there ever was a mistake, it was America's entry into the North America Free Trade Agreement.

The victims of that colossal disaster reside in all of our Congressional districts. They are the unemployed auto workers, the steelworkers, the truckers and the textile workers. They are families who are struggling just to get by. They remember better times. They remember life before America entered the "race to the bottom," before their jobs moved overseas.

Let us consider where NAFTA has brought us. The U.S. trade deficit in 2002 was \$500 billion, the highest deficit ever recorded, and the combined trade deficit with Canada and Mexico is now more than ten times what it was before NAFTA went into effect. Think of that; our combined trade deficit with Canada and Mexico is now ten times more than it was before NAFTA went into effect.

But, sadly, Madam Speaker, it seems that some either did not learn, or just simply do not care, because this Congress is now being presented with more free trade agreements, this time with Chile and Singapore, and they are just more of the same; more jobs lost, more hard times for Americans. It is *deja vu* all over again. I will be voting against both the Chile and the Singapore Free Trade Agreement Implementation Acts, because they mean nothing but hardship for American workers.

Oh, but now we are being told that these agreements may require Chile and Singapore to meet international standards on workers' rights. Oh, but, of course, they provide absolutely no enforcement mechanisms. Foreign labor costs and practices will continue to undercut those of America's workers in this global race to the bottom, which simply means more jobs lost right here at home.