

Board of Directors of the Vietnam Education Foundation:

Upon the recommendation of the majority leader:

Mr. BLUMENAUER, Oregon.

Upon the recommendation of the minority leader:

Mr. PITTS, Pennsylvania.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

RAMOS/COMPEAN CASE

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, a long awaited Senate judiciary hearing on the prosecution of border agents Ramos and Compean occurred today. I was impressed with the Chair, Senator DIANE FEINSTEIN from California, and the questioning of Senator JOHN CORNYN of Texas at the hearing.

The hearing brought to light the overzealous, overreacting and overreaching prosecution of these two Border Patrol agents, Ramos and Compean. It also showed us and the American public the difficulty our border protectors have on the U.S.-Mexico border.

Chief Aguilar of the Border Patrol said today that violence against border agents has increased. In just the first 4 days of last week, 11 assaults occurred against border agents. Over 2,000 assaults have occurred in the last 2½ years, and 12 officers have been killed in the last few years.

Not only is the border violent because of drug cartels, but violence occurs against these border agents. The border is not Disneyland, but the U.S. Attorney's Office showed they are living in Never Neverland by their relentless determination to see that these agents went to prison for 11 and 12 years a piece for just doing their job on the U.S.-Mexico border.

Much was said today, but I want to concentrate on the U.S. Government's main witness, the drug dealer who appears to have been a bought-and-paid-for witness that received immunity from prosecution. He received a get-out-of-jail-free card, received free med-

ical attention for his wounds at the taxpayers' expense, and blanket amnesty to cross and recross the Texas-Mexico border whenever he wished. All this so he would testify against the two border agents, Ramos and Compean.

Mr. Speaker, as a former judge, it has been my experience that when prosecutors make deals with criminals in return for testimony, they usually get the testimony they want from the criminal, and the same is to be said in this case here.

These agents were sent to prison because one of them shot a drug dealer bringing in \$1 million worth of drugs into the United States. The agents probably violated some Homeland Security policies, and maybe they should have been sanctioned or even fired, but to let the drug dealer go free because the agents violated a policy was an error in judgment on the part of our own government.

And the U.S. Attorney's Office had two choices, Mr. Speaker. They had the choice to prosecute a drug dealer bringing in \$1 million worth of drugs, or they had the choice to prosecute two border agents that violated some policy, and our government chose poorly.

Of course, the Mexican Government got involved in this case and wrote an arrogant letter demanding prosecution by our government. It seems to me this may be the basis for the prosecution.

Let me tell you a little bit about this drug dealer. He received immunity from prosecution, but part of his deal was that he would cooperate with the U.S. Border Patrol and Federal prosecutors. The cooperation? Well, he never would tell who he was working for. He named no names of the drug cartels. He did not cooperate at all. And while he was waiting to testify in this case, he criss-crossed the Texas-Mexico border and brought in another load of drugs worth almost \$1 million, and the Feds kept that from the jury.

Why wasn't it important to know about this second case? Because the entire prosecution was based on the testimony of the government's star witness, and the jury had the right to know that this drug dealer brought in another load of drugs while waiting to testify. So to judge his credibility as a witness, the jury had the right to know that, and that evidence was kept out at the insistence of the U.S. prosecutors.

The U.S. prosecutor made this drug dealer Aldrede to be some poor mule from Mexico that brought in a load of drugs for a little money for his sick mother down in Mexico, and that was not the case. He was an operative that moved back and forth across the Texas-Mexico border, and we know he brought in at least two loads of drugs just in a short period of time in this case.

This second load of drugs should have been brought to the attention of the jury. The prosecutors never prosecuted this Aldrede for that. They even had a DEA report that recommended prosecution. I've seen that DEA report, and

based on my experience, a third-year law student could have prosecuted that case even though the U.S. Attorney's Office says, oh, there's not enough evidence. The jury should have known about this so as to have judged the credibility of this star witness.

So the government chose between border agents to be prosecuted doing their job or a drug dealer testifying and then bringing in drugs into the United States. Our government should be embarrassed about this case.

And that's just the way it is.

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

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE ADMINISTRATION'S CASE FOR WAR AGAINST IRAN

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, for years the administration has been rigging its case for war against Iran with posturing, finger-wagging and name calling. Those are not my words. One of my hometown daily newspapers, the Seattle Post Intelligencer, authored those words as the first sentence of an editorial they published this morning entitled: "Iran: No, not again." I will insert the Seattle PI editorial into the RECORD at this point.

[From the Seattle Post-Intelligencer
Editorial Board, July 17, 2007]

IRAN: NO, NOT AGAIN

For years, this administration has been rigging its case for war against Iran, with posturing, finger wagging and name-calling.

And now, just as Iran has struck an agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency for inspection of its nuclear plants, and just as the IAEA chief, Mohamed ElBaradei, has said that country is slowing progress on one of those facilities, the United Kingdom's Guardian newspaper reports that Vice President Dick Cheney is pushing for a military "solution" in Iran. Naturally, President Bush is backing him, going against Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice and Defense Secretary Robert Gates, both of whom favor diplomacy over military action (heck, it worked with North Korea).

In May, Cheney paid a visit to the USS John C. Stennis in the Persian Gulf, 150 miles off Iran's coast, for no other reason than to deliver threats. The New York Times reported that while Cheney said nothing new, he "stitched all of those warnings together, and the symbolism of sending the administration's most famous hawk to deliver the speech so close to Iran's coast was unmistakable."

The U.S. rode roughshod over ElBaradei's insistence that Iraq didn't have weapons of mass destruction (he was right). And look where we are now. More than 3,000 American troops and tens of thousands of Iraqis dead in war that defies reason and sees no end. We fear the same might happen in Iran.

The fact is, the mainstream newspapers at home and around the world