

times. This time I think we can get it past the Senate as well.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my Special Order at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUHLMANN of New York). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

SMART SECURITY AND REACHING OUT TO THE MUSLIM WORLD

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, the Bush administration has done a woefully inadequate job of reaching out to the Muslim world. To quote an oft-used phrase, "They never seem to miss an opportunity to miss an opportunity."

I believe that fundamentally they fail to understand that most Muslims do not want to blow up Western sites and buildings; they want to live in a free society, one which allows them to worship the God of their choosing and raise their children in safety, much like every American.

Unfortunately, the Bush administration because of this lack of understanding has twisted the September 11 attacks in order to achieve a veritable clash of societies. The President uses phrases like "us versus them" and "you are either with us or against us." Quotes like these cause many non-violent Muslims to oppose the United States as they see a U.S. engaged in a war not against terrorism but against Muslims. They see the United States as a colonial occupier, not as a liberating government.

This has encouraged radical Muslim groups to step up their recruiting and their tactics. The net result is 3½ years after September 11, Americans are much less safe, not safer than they were. Instead of responding by reaching out to the Muslim world to address the root causes of terrorism, deprivation, resource scarcity and lack of educational opportunities, this administration invaded Iraq, a country that was not previously a haven for terrorists and had no relationship whatsoever to the events of September 11.

Regardless, in April 2003, the United States invaded Iraq with the support of a weak coalition of nations. Most countries, even those that fought in the first Gulf War in 1991, chose not to enter the second war in Iraq. They could not legitimize a war based on such faulty and wavering premises as the ones we heard in late 2002 and early 2003.

The war has been a disaster from nearly the beginning. Since April 2003, more than 1,600 American soldiers and at least 24,000 Iraqi civilians have paid for this arrogant foreign policy with

their lives. At least another 12,000 American soldiers have been seriously wounded and of course the U.S. has incurred a tremendous financial burden, so far a \$200 billion IOU.

Instead of addressing the threat of future terrorism by engaging the Muslim world through smart national security policies, the Bush administration took the fight to a country that became a terrorist enclave only after the U.S. invaded. It is quite clear that the war in Iraq was the worst possible response to the 9/11 terrorist attacks. Instead of stopping terrorism, the war has actually hindered our efforts, including any effort to capture Osama bin Laden.

But fortunately, there is another way. Over the last 2 years, I have developed and refined a national security platform called SMART Security. SMART is Sensible, Multilateral American Response to Terrorism for the 21st Century. Unlike our current policies, it will achieve real results. SMART Security will ensure America's security by reaching out and engaging the Muslim world. Instead of rushing off to war for the wrong reasons, SMART Security encourages the United States to work with other nations to address the most pressing global issues.

There is a demonstrated link between debt relief and lack of support for terrorism, which is why the SMART platform will encourage wealthy nations to provide debt relief and developmental aid for the world's poorest countries.

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.

SMART Security also encourages democracy building, human rights education, conflict resolution through nonmilitary means, educational opportunities for women and girls, and strengthening civil society programs in the developing world.

Programs like these are the best way to encourage democracy in countries like Iraq, not through wars that cause thousands of deaths, cost billions of dollars. The SMART approach is a way to reach out to the Muslim world. It is time we stop putting all of our eggs in the military basket and start getting smart about our national security.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my Special Order at this time.

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

There was no objection.

CHARGES DROPPED

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. Mr. Speaker, my intent tonight was to come to the floor and talk about my opposition to CAFTA, which I think is a bad policy for the future of America.

But tonight I am glad to come to the floor after 4 weeks of coming and talking about Lieutenant Ilario Pantano, a Marine who was charged with murder for actions he took as a Marine officer in Iraq over a year ago. I have been on the floor for 4 weeks saying this man should never have been charged. He did his job as a Marine officer. But because of circumstances of a sergeant who did not like the gentleman, he filed charges 2½ months later.

I am pleased to say this past Friday I was notified by the attorney for Lieutenant Pantano that the hearing officer, Major Wynn at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, in my district, has decided that he will recommend these charges be dropped: two charges of premeditated murder that should never have happened. But Major Wynn will now send his recommendations to General Huck who is in Iraq, and it is my hope and prayer that General Huck will agree with the hearing officer and drop these charges.

Mr. Speaker, what has been said about this is Lieutenant Pantano loves America. He had been a soldier during Desert Storm, came back, went back to his home State of New York, went to college and graduated in 3 years. He went into the stock market selling energy stocks making six figures. But shortly after September 11, he felt a passion because he had his brother and sister killed in the Twin Towers by terrorism, so he went back into the Marine Corps and was made an officer.

Shortly after the shooting in Iraq, he was actually recommended for promotion by the officer in charge, that he was competent and a real leader and the type of person that they needed to promote in the Marine Corps. But 2½ months later, a sergeant who was demoted by Lieutenant Pantano weeks before is the one who made the charges 2½ months later. But the good news tonight is that the hearing officer has made a recommendation that the charges of murder be dropped against Lieutenant Pantano.

Mr. Speaker, last Friday I had the pleasure to speak with Mary Pantano who stood by her son for months, and I had the pleasure to talk with her. I was convinced, even before I met her son, who is a wonderful man, I would love to have as a son or son-in-law, and she convinced me her son could not have done anything more than what he should have done as a Marine officer.

So tonight, as I begin to close, I thank God Almighty that he has helped the Pantano family, both the mother; wife, Jill; and the two cute boys who are his sons; and also Lieutenant Pantano.

Mr. Speaker, I close tonight by asking God, I think about our men and women in uniform in Iraq and Afghanistan, how difficult it must be for them

to do their job. But yet they are there and they are willing to do their job, and they are proud to be American soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines.

Mr. Speaker, tonight I close by asking God to please bless our men and women in uniform, bless their families, bless the job that they are doing for this world to bring peace. I ask God for the families that have lost loved ones, that they be remembered with our blessings and prayers.

With that I ask three times, God please, God please, God please continue to bless America.

FAILED TRADE AGREEMENTS

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. Mr. Speaker, nearly a year ago, President Bush signed the Central American Free Trade Agreement, a one-sided plan to benefit multinational corporations at the expense of the United States and Central American workers, small farmers, and small business people. Every trade agreement negotiated by this administration has been ratified by Congress within 60 days of its signing.

But CAFTA has languished in Congress for nearly 1 year. Why? Because this wrong-headed trade agreement offends both Republicans and Democrats. Just look at what has happened with our trade policy. In 1992, the year I first ran for Congress, was elected later that year, that year our trade deficit, meaning the amount of dollars we imported versus exported, our trade deficit was \$38 billion in 1992. Last year in 2004, it was \$618 billion. It is hard to argue our trade policy is working when the deficit goes from \$38 billion to \$618 billion in just 12 years.

Opponents to the Central American Free Trade Agreement know it is an extension of NAFTA, which clearly did not work for our country. It is the same old story. Every time there is a trade agreement, the President says it will mean more jobs for Americans, more manufacturing done in the United States, it will mean more economic prosperity and profits for U.S. companies. It will mean a rising standard of living in the developing world; it will mean more involvement, a higher standard of living in the developing world, and more workers working.

□ 1945

But it never works that way. So now they are trying this year because our trade policy clearly is not working, those promises every year, every trade agreement, never pan out.

This year the administration is tying the Central American Free Trade Agreement, saying it is not just going to ensure growth, it is going to help democracy in the developing world. Both Deputy Secretary of State Robert Zoellick and Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld have said CAFTA will help in

the war on terror, but 10 years of the North American Free Trade Agreement has done nothing to improve border security between Mexico and the United States, so that argument simply does not sell.

So they tried something else. Last week the U.S. Chamber of Commerce flew six Central American presidents around our country hoping they might be able to sell CAFTA. They went to Albuquerque, they went to Los Angeles, they went to Cincinnati, Ohio, in my State, trying to convince the media, trying to convince the public, trying to convince Members of Congress that CAFTA was a good idea.

Again they failed. The Costa Rican president after the trip announced his country would not ratify CAFTA unless an independent commission could determine the agreement will not hurt the working poor in his country.

The most powerful Republican in the House, Majority Leader TOM DELAY, even promised a vote on CAFTA by Memorial Day to try to drum up support in Congress. As you can see by this calendar, we are barely a week away from that deadline, the deadline to vote on the Central American Free Trade Agreement, set by Majority Leader Tom DeLay, the most powerful Republican in this Chamber. Echoed by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, BILL THOMAS, they said there would be a vote by the end of this month. That is the 1-year anniversary of CAFTA. Remember, every other trade agreement was voted on within 2 months. This one has been a year. As you can see by the calendar, it has simply not happened. That is again because of the failures of NAFTA.

Last month, two dozen Democrats and Republicans in Congress joined more than 150 business groups and labor organizations saying vote "no" on the Central American Free Trade Agreement. Last week, more than 400 union workers and Members of Congress gathered in front of the U.S. Capitol delivered the same message, vote "no" on the Central American Free Trade Agreement, because Republicans and Democrats, labor and business, know what the administration refuses to admit, that CAFTA is about one thing. It is not about more manufacturing in the United States. It is not about creating jobs in the United States. It is one thing only. It is access to cheap Central American labor.

That is why CAFTA, like NAFTA, is not a trade agreement, it is an outsourcing agreement. It will move more American jobs offshore. It will mean more profits for large businesses and more hurt for small businesses, more hurt for small farmers. Congress must throw out this dysfunctional cousin of NAFTA and negotiate a trade agreement that will lift up workers in Central America.

When students such as those I met with today at Longfellow Elementary School in Lorain, Ohio, are guaranteed good-paying jobs when they graduate

from high school, then we will know finally our trade policy is working.

JUDICIAL NOMINEES

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

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, this is a critical time in the life of America. Our colleagues in the United States Senate are imminently approaching a crossroads that will forever impact the future of this Republic. They will choose the road that will restore the constitutional balance of power that our Founding Fathers so carefully constructed, or they will travel down that path that rewards a shameless behavior that has deliberately injured this delicate balance by transferring the executive power of judicial appointment to the legislative minority.

The Constitution's advice and consent has been twisted into mockery by the Senate minority. Men and women of outstanding character have come forth as judicial nominees to be undeservedly maligned, smeared, ridiculed and then left in nominations limbo indefinitely by this unprecedented, unconstitutional and outrageous judicial filibuster.

Mr. Speaker, this is a show of disregard and contempt for the world's flagship of freedom and toward her people and toward the time-honored principles of the United States Senate. We will recapture the civility that once presided over judicial appointments or we will forever surrender what Abraham Lincoln called "the angels of our better nature" to this bitterly partisan tactic that threatens the constitutional prerogative of the President of the United States to appoint good, decent and honorable men and women to the Federal judiciary.

Advice and consent is clearly written in the United States Constitution. This judicial filibuster to prevent a fair up-or-down vote is neither advice nor consent and, Mr. Speaker, it is not in the United States Constitution. Never before 2003, in 214 years of U.S. Senate deliberations, has any judicial nomination supported by the majority of the Senate been denied a fair up-or-down vote. Yet the minority would have the public believe that the majority is the one trying to change the rules here, calling it the nuclear option. It is the Senate minority, Mr. Speaker, that has launched this unprecedented, quote, nuclear option by devastating the constitutionally required just consideration of judicial nominees duly appointed by the President of the United States.

What the majority seeks is the constitutional option that is totally in keeping with 214 years of the rules, traditions and dignity of the United States Senate. Senate Democrats have strongly and arrogantly and openly