line in Iraq, I do not know anyone who is not filled with gratitude for their sacrifice. Where I part with many of my colleagues is in my belief that the best way to support the troops is to bring them home as soon as possible, a position shared by a majority of the American people.

Helping war veterans is a top priority for me. But ironically, one that in an ideal world would hardly be necessary if the United States adopted what I call a SMART Security plan. War would be an absolute last resort, something we turn to reluctantly, only after every diplomatic channel has been pursued. The smart in SMART Security stands for Sensible Multilateral American Response to Terrorism.

As the tragedy in London demonstrates, our belligerence has not made America or the world safer; and it is time, I believe, that we had a new approach, one that relies on multilateral alliances and improved intelligence to track and detain terrorists, one that renews our commitment to nuclear nonproliferation, one that invests aggressively in international development to attack the poverty and hopelessness that breed terrorism in the first place.

SMART is tough, pragmatic, and patriotic. It protects America by relying on the very best of American values: our commitment to freedom, our compassion for the people of the world, and our capacity for global leadership.

Criticism of the Iraq policy must never be misinterpreted as criticism of those on the ground carrying it out. We must stand with our veterans, the fearless Americans literally wearing the scars of a war that they did not choose. Just because a policy may be flawed, and I believe it is, does not detract from the remarkable job they do. We must show the same selflessness toward them that they have showed toward our Nation.

COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CONAWAY) recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to issue a challenge to my colleagues who have criticized the comprehensive immigration reform that has been offered as legislation. In the last Congress, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and myself and Senator MCCAIN in the Senate offered comprehensive immigration reform. We have offered a similar bill this year.

People say, let us secure the border first, enforce the current law, and then if we need a guest worker program. I have already explained what it means to enforce the current law. If you believe that is what we need to do, please proffer a bill. Write legislation. If that is what we need to do, then, please, stand here and suggest it. Otherwise, join us. Join us in our quest to actually enforce the current law, enforce the current law unless we have a temporary worker program.

The current immigration laws that we have, it would mean that we would literally round up between 10 million and 15 million illegal aliens who are here presently, uproot them from their jobs, often from their families, and ship them home from their home country. They would then be subject to a 10-year ban from reentry. After that 10 years, then they would get in line to go through the legal orderly process, which would probably take another 20 years.

Now, when I explain that to those who are critics of our immigration bill, they often say, well, we do not mean to enforce the current law as it is. Let us selectively enforce it. Let us go after the criminals, not after those who are legally law-abiding here. Well, that is called selective enforcement, and some will actually use that term. We need to selectively enforce the law. I ask the critics of comprehensive immigration reform, how is that any less of an amnesty than has been proposed?

Under our legislation, anyone here illegally, who has broken no other law than crossing the border illegally, would be required to register, pay a fine, and wait as many as, at least 6 years until the current backlog of those going through the legal orderly process in their home country is complete. Then they would be forced to pay another $1,000 fine. How is that an amnesty, when simply selectively enforcing the current law is not?

Please explain. For those who are criticizing comprehensive immigration reform, how are you going to secure the border and enforce the law without a temporary worker program? Our legislation realizes that there are many here, probably around 8 million, that are in the workforce currently. Unless we are willing to uproot them and send them all home, then we have to have a temporary worker program or a guest worker program, and there is one that renews our commitment to freedom, our commitment to global leadership, will come to a vote some time this month. The Central American Free Trade Agreement was signed 13 months ago by President Bush. Every other trade agreement voted on in this Congress has been voted on within 2 months of the President's signature. That is, those trade agreements with Chile, Singapore, and Australia, all passed the Congress comfortably by wide margins within 60 days of the President affixing his signatures to them.

This trade agreement, CAFTA, was signed by President Bush in May of 2004, and it has not been brought to this Congress for a vote for one simple reason. One simple mathematical reason: the votes simply are not there to pass this agreement. The votes are not there because of the opposition from dozens of Republicans and Democrats, opposition from small manufacturers and labor unions, and the deep and broad opposition from small farmers and from family farmers and ranchers and environmentalists.

The opposition to CAFTA comes from Catholic bishops in Central America and Lutheran and Presbyterian and Jewish leaders in our country.

It is clear this agreement would not pass the House of Representatives today because Americans, in larger and larger numbers, including Members of Congress, representatives of the American people, understand our trade policy simply is not working.

As I have stated before this Congress in 1999, the year I was first elected to Congress, we had a trade deficit. That means we exported less than we imported. We had a trade deficit of $28 billion. Last year, our trade deficit was $618 billion. From $28 billion to $618 billion trade deficit is not too much. To clear our trade policy is not working when we have these kinds of trade deficits, coupled with the budget deficits we have seen in the last 5 years.

Now, these might just be numbers to economists, these numbers about the trade deficit, but here is what they really translate into. The States in red are States which have lost 20 percent of
their manufacturing jobs in the last 6½ years. The States in blue have lost 15 to 20 percent of their manufacturing jobs. Now, again, those are numbers, but think about this. My State, and the State of my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND), has lost 217,000; and the gentleman from North Carolina and South Carolina and Georgia, Mr. Speaker, this trade agreement does not work. Defeat this CAFTA and renegotiate a better trade agreement for all Americans and all of Central America.

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

Mr. NORWOOD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.

PUBLIC HEALTH

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

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to talk on a subject which is not often addressed on the floor of the House, which is public health, particularly public health as relates to threats of bioterrorism or naturally occurring events.

Today, and I am a member of the Committee on Homeland Security, we had some rather disturbing revelations of the lack of progress with Operation BioShield, which seems to have done more to enhance the profits of the pharmaceutical industry, to engage in some exotic forms of research, to ignore some off-the-shelf remedies which could deal with very real and horrible threats, such as the potential for a nuclear device or a radiological aftermath and things of that nature.

Now, the Committee on Homeland Security will continue to investigate those areas and deliberate in those areas, and that is good, because we need to improve how we target those funds, how they are spent, and how we assess the threats to the people of the United States. More than $12 billion was spent on smallpox and anthrax, the anthrax attack apparently perpetrated by somebody who perhaps stole that from Ft. Detrick, Maryland; and smallpox, of course, is not yet known to be a threat.

The administration, however, has ignored a very real threat to the American people. Many of us experienced the fact that last year there was not enough flu vaccine, because we have left it to the private sector, free markets, and competition to provide flu vaccine; and it is not working real well. This is not the first shortage in recent years, not the first series of price gouging for vulnerable people. It has become recurrent year after year.

Last year, I did not get a flu shot, as many other Americans did not, in order to give up my chances for those who might be more at risk.

OUTSOURCING MILITARY TO SOLDIERS OF FORTUNE

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, this evening, I would like to talk about a