Mr. Speaker, I have a conflict making it impossible for

me to remain for the very important hour that the Congressional Black

Caucus has taken on Iraq. I am about to go to the Senate floor

tomorrow, though, as there is a test on whether there will be a

filibuster on the D.C. voting rights bill even as D.C. residents are on

the ground in Iraq fighting, even as I have gone to funerals at

Arlington Cemetery because of this war.

We have a President who has announced a token drawdown at the same

time he is Koreanizing the war, making sure we remain there at least as

permanently as we have been in some parts of the world, like Korea and

Germany already. He wants to make a piggy bank of the Congress of the

United States, and the test is whether we are willing to go along with

these now-clear goals of the President.

I want to devote my 5 minutes to asking a question that really needs

to be asked. We are looking at the battle. I want to ask, is there

really still an Iraq? Three million refugees have left the country

since 2003. Another 3 million have been internally displaced. Some have

called it ethnic cleansing. I believe it is involuntary ethnic

cleansing, because in a civil war you want to win, not chase the other

people out. We

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