Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, the way we treat our enemies speaks volumes about our character as a Nation, and I am embarrassed to say that America's treatment of prisoners over the last several years does not speak highly of our national integrity.

Since 9/11 and especially over the last 2 years, news of prisoners being mistreated, beaten, sexually assaulted, and even killed while in U.S. custody has become all too commonplace. Prisoners have been tortured in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Guantanamo Bay. Considering the widespread use of torture, no one can claim that these are isolated incidents, that it is merely the work of a few bad apples.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I fear there will be more appalling news about American abuses of Iraqi people coming. The fact that torture occurred in separate places and under the command of different interrogators leads me to believe that a more systemic failure took place.

One could say that the turning point, the day torture became a routine tactic employed by the United States, was August 1, 2002. That is the day the Justice Department sent a memo to the White House stating that torturing terrorists in captivity ''may be justified.'' It is just not that physical abuse has taken place under our watch. That is bad enough. What is just as appalling is that legal abuses have taken place here at home. We have kept people in prison for more than 3 years without charging them with a crime, and the administration has affirmed this practice through legal memos.

This approval of torture by the White House, the Pentagon, and the Justice Department is not only shameful; it also endangers the United States. At a time when the United States is courting the support of the international world, particularly the Arab world, the torture of foreign prisoners along with our invasion of Iraq gives the world's extremists what they believe to be a legitimate reason to hate the United States. There has been no better recruiting tool for al Qaeda than the events at Abu Ghraib and in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, there must be a better way to conduct foreign policy than by beating, torturing, and sexually assaulting our enemies. The United States has other options than to engage in the sadistic practices of torture. We in the United States are better people than that.

That is why I have reintroduced the SMART Security legislation with the support of 50 of my colleagues. SMART Security is a Sensible, Multilateral, American Response to Terrorism for the 21st Century; and it will help secure the United States for the future. SMART Security will ensure America's security by reaching out and engaging the Iraqi people. Instead of rushing off to war for the wrong reasons and then engaging in torture once we are there, SMART Security encourages the United States to work with other nations to address the most pressing global issues.

Not every international problem has a military answer, and that is why SMART Security will prevent terrorism by addressing the very conditions which give rise to terrorism in the first place: poverty, despair, resource scarcity, and lack of proper education.

The situation in the Middle East requires the best America has to offer. SMART Security relies on the very best of America: our commitment to peace and freedom, our compassion for the people of the world, and our capacity for multilateral leadership. This is the best way to encourage democracy in countries like Iraq. Not through wars that cost thousands of unnecessary deaths, not by throwing billions of dollars at our problems, and certainly not by torturing our enemies.

We have a responsibility to set a positive example for the rest of the world. We can end this shameful chapter in our Nation's history by pledging that the United States does not condone acts of torture.

To show the world that we mean business, we need to create a plan to begin bringing home the soldiers serving in Iraq. By ending the military occupation of Iraq, we will demonstrate that America is committed to peace in the Middle East and the rest of the world. It is time to start this process. We need to start it today.

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.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the Special Order time of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

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

There was no objection.

THE USA PATRIOT ACT AND THE BORDERS

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

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I came to have a little chat with the Members about immigration, and I intend to do that. But I cannot help but point out from the previous speaker that torture means many things. Perhaps the people who can best define torture would be prisoners of war in Vietnam, in Korea, and World War II. And I can say to the mothers of America that the people that we are accusing of torturing are people who want to kill their children as fast as they can. I would say to the fathers of America that the soldiers we are accusing of torturing are people that would like to kill their family as fast as they can. And I can assure the Members, having been in Vietnam, that pouring water on somebody, playing loud music, and lowering the air conditioner is not torturing anybody. It, though, however, may save an American GI.

Mr. Speaker, like most of the Members of the body, on October 24, 2001, I voted for the U.S. PATRIOT Act, which passed with an overwhelming bipartisan majority of 357 to 66.

At the time many of us had concerns about whether or not the bill crossed the line on infringing on our constitutional liberties. We were assured that it did not. And when the new protections against terrorism were in place, we could actually see for ourselves that it did not.

So we approved that bill, based on the fact that our Nation had just suffered 3,000 dead in New York and Washington at the hands of illegal immigrant terrorists.

Since then we have put up with library and bookstore records examined by Federal agents. We have endured having our personal e-mail scanned by intelligence agents. We have seen our grandmothers forced to take off their shoes at airports, with no probable cause other than they have chosen to travel. All of these things are aggravating. We have been willing to put up with it as patriots if it means we can better defend ourselves against another 9/11.

But we have also seen nearly 200,000 American troops sent to war in Iraq and Afghanistan, where over 1,800 of them have given their lives.

All the while we have seen the administration and the Congress turn a blind eye to the continuing hordes of millions of illegal immigrants pouring across our northern and southern borders. There is no amount of eavesdropping, searches, or overseas military actions that will protect us against another 9/11 while we leave our borders wide open to terrorists with suitcase nuclear weapons or biological agents.

We can secure our borders within months. We can secure our borders within months with a simple executive order or an agreement between our border State Governors and the Secretary of Defense. Congressional investigators say somewhere between 36,000 and 48,000 troops would do the job. The Secretary of Border Control and Immigration says maybe it will take 50,000. Since we are in agreement on needing somewhere between 36,000 and 50,000, there is no reason not to start deploying these forces soon.

And that is just the first step. We then need to build up our border patrol to a level at which we do not need help and we can send our troops back home.

We ought to be able to do that over the next 5 years, as an adequate number of new border patrol agents are trained and placed on duty and we get new fencing, lighting, sensors, and other improvements in place.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to see us get to a point where we do not need the PATRIOT Act. We can let it quietly expire as we did with other internal security measures enacted during previous wars. But I would like for the Speaker and this Congress not to ask me to vote for any new so-called ''guest worker'' program while this outrage at our borders continues. The Members can count on me for a ''no'' vote right now.

When our borders are secure and we have absolutely stopped the invasion of our Nation by illegal immigrants, then and only then can we sit down and discuss how to solve this problem.

This week the Minutemen volunteers are heading back out into the Southwest desert to do the job the Federal Government is supposed to do. I do not want them to have to do that. As a matter of fact, they do not want to have to be doing that. But until Congress starts enforcing the immigration laws of this country, they will continue in growing numbers.

Mr. Speaker, protecting Americans against terrorists begins with illegal immigrants at our borders, not with our own citizens here at home.

□ 1530

CENTRAL AMERICAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT NOT GOOD FOR AMERICA

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, 13 months ago, President Bush signed the Central American Free Trade Agreement, a trade agreement among six Latin American countries with the United States. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the most powerful Republican Member of the House, said last year when the agreement was signed in May of 2004 that Congress would soon vote on it. We did not. Then the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) said we would vote on it before Memorial Day. We did not. Now the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) says we are going to vote on it before July 4. I think he means it this time.

But the reason we have not voted on the Central American Free Trade Agreement is pretty simple: A majority of Members of this House, Republicans and Democrats, large numbers of Members of this House simply do not think our trade policy is working.

Every single trade agreement that has come before this Congress that President Bush has signed has been voted on within 60 days: Morocco, Chile, Australia and Singapore. The Central American Free Trade Agreement has not been voted on in almost 13 months because Americans, represented by their Members of Congress, have said we do not like the way our trade policy is working.

Just take a look. In 1992, the year I was elected to Congress for the first time, our trade deficit, imports versus exports, was $38 billion. Last year, 2004, our trade deficit was $618 billion. From $38 billion to $618 billion in a dozen years.

Now, that is just numbers, that is just economics maybe. But look what that means. What that really means is a huge loss in manufacturing jobs. In the last 6 years, for example, the States in red are States which have lost 20 percent, at least one out of five, of their manufacturing jobs: New York, 222,000; Pennsylvania, 200,000; Ohio, my State, 217,000; Michigan, 210,000 lost manufacturing jobs alone; Illinois, 224,000; Mississippi and Alabama together, 132,000; North Carolina, 228,000. The States in blue have lost 15 to 20 percent, between one out of six and one out of five, of their manufacturing jobs. Texas, 201,000; California, 354,000 manufacturing jobs.

Our trade policy, Mr. Speaker, simply is not working. The Central American Free Trade Agreement is going to be more of the same. It is a dysfunctional cousin of the North American Free Trade Agreement, which helped to begin this trend of a huge burgeoning trade deficit and the continuing loss of more manufacturing jobs.

The President has said he wants us to pass the Central American Free Trade Agreement and he makes some promises. The President said the Central American Free Trade Agreement will mean more jobs for Americans, it will mean more manufacturing in the U.S. and more exports to the developing world, and it will mean an increase in the standard of living for all seven countries, not just us, but the six countries in the Central American Free Trade Agreement.

Unfortunately, that is the same promise that presidents have made for a decade and a half. They promise more jobs for Americans, they promise more manufacturing exports, they promise a higher standard of living in the developing world. And we end up with this: We end up with wages stagnant in the developing world, continued poverty in Mexico or China or wherever these trade agreements are, whichever countries these trade agreements affect, and more lost jobs in the U.S.

The people that have supported CAFTA like to tell us we will start selling more products to Guatemala, Honduras, Costa Rica, El Salvador and Nicaragua. What they do not tell us is that people in those countries simply cannot afford to buy American products.

The average wage in the United States is $38,000. The average wage in El Salvador is $4,800. The average wage in Honduras is $2,600. The average wage in Nicaragua is $2,300. People in El Salvador cannot buy cars made in Ohio. People in the Dominican Republic cannot buy software from Seattle. People in Nicaragua cannot buy textiles and apparel from North Carolina. People in Honduras cannot buy steel from West Virginia or Pennsylvania.

The fact is, these trade agreements are about one thing: These trade agreements are about exporting more U.S. jobs, outsourcing more U.S. work. That is why the largest companies in this country support CAFTA, because they want to move more production to these countries and continue to pay these very low wages instead of these higher wages.

When you see who lines up for this agreement, the people who support CAFTA are the largest companies in the United States. The people who oppose CAFTA are religious leaders in Central America, religious leaders in the United States. The people who support CAFTA, again, are the largest banks and the largest financial institutions in the United States. The people who oppose CAFTA are people representing workers, the environment, people who advocate for food safety. The people who support CAFTA are the most powerful people in our country. The people who oppose CAFTA are Central American trade unions and people who represent the poorest of the poor in Latin America.

This trade agreement simply will not work for Americans. It will mean more lost jobs for the United States. It will mean more manufacturing going offshore. It will mean a higher trade deficit with the United States, already going from $38 billion to $618 billion in just a dozen years. It will mean more stagnant wages in Central America. It will mean a pulling down of wages in the United States.

The fact is, we can pass a different CAFTA. We should defeat the Central American Free Trade Agreement and we should negotiate a CAFTA with labor standards, with protections for the environment, with protections for food safety.

Why do we have protections for the drug companies, and not workers in CAFTA? Why do we have protections for Hollywood films, but not for the environment or food safety?

Mr. Speaker, when workers in the developing world can buy American products, not just make them, then we will know finally that our trade policy is working.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Visitors in the gallery should not express approval or disapproval of House proceedings.