

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

are expressing grave concerns over what they fear may be the sequel to Iraq, namely, a military strike against Iran.

One of the sources used by the PI editorial is the Guardian newspaper of the United Kingdom which published a story yesterday with this headline: "Cheney Pushes Bush to Act on Iran."

The Guardian reports that: "The balance in the internal White House debate over Iran has shifted back in favor of military action before President George Bush leaves office in 18 months."

Ominously, the story adds: "Although the Bush administration is in deep trouble over Iraq, it remains focused on Iran. A well-placed source in Washington said, 'Bush is not going to leave office with Iran still in limbo.'"

Thoughtful newspapers and other worldwide people believe the Vice President is pushing for a military strike against Iran. The Vice President's presence and speech aboard an aircraft carrier near Iran in mid-May sent an unmistakable message, says the New York Times.

As the Guardian reports, The Vice President is winning the war for war inside the administration, and now the American people have to be brought along. That means the administration and its surrogates will make the data say what they need it to say.

We're already beginning to see how a new national intelligence assessment released just today will be manipulated. The report makes a persuasive and fact-driven case for getting our soldiers out of Iraq, because the President shifted away from the real war against terrorism to pursue his own agenda in Iraq.

But instead of a sober assessment of what's gone wrong in Iraq, we're hearing that terrorists have reconstituted their operations inside Iran. And the insinuation for military action is clear.

Like many, I would like to know what's really going on in Iran and what Iranian leaders are thinking and doing. Well, where can we turn for an assessment we can trust? We know the Vice President wants to use deadly force in Iran. We know that there are credible media reports that say the Vice President is winning the war to go to war with Iran. So how are we going to get accurate and reliable information from this administration or anyone associated with it?

Today, the State Department announced it wants a new meeting directly with Iran to talk face-to-face, government-to-government.

Ordinarily, I would see this as a welcome, even positive, sign that the administration has finally begun to see the wisdom in diplomacy.

Is that the case, or is an announcement that comes on the same day as the New Intelligence Estimate a sign that the Vice President is about to declare mission accomplished? We don't know the answer, and we don't know what happened in Iraq.

But we do know what happened in Iraq. The PI editorial board reminds us how the administration ran over the International Atomic Energy Agency, its chief, to make a war in Iraq, quoting the PI. Look where we are now, more than 3,000 American troops and tens of thousands of Iraqis dead in a war that defies reason and sees no end. We fear the same may happen in Iran. So do I.

Tell the President not to go after Iran.

□ 2130

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

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

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

OIL INDUSTRY WILL BE UNABLE TO MEET WORLD DEMAND OVER NEXT 25 YEARS

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the oil industry admitted this week that it will be unable to meet world demand over the next 25 years. In case anyone still needed a wake-up call about the importance of energy independence, surely, that is that call.

Yesterday's Wall Street Journal reported on page 2 that a U.S. government-commissioned study, a study conducted by the oil industry itself, reveals that oil and gas supplies will not keep pace with worldwide demand through the year 2030.

According to the oil industry study, demand is expected to increase between 50 and 60 percent due to mounting consumption in the developed world, plus the growing economies of China and India.

According to the Journal, the finding suggests that far from being temporary, high energy prices are likely for decades to come. The study's conclusions appear to be the first explicit concession by the petroleum industry itself that it cannot meet the burgeoning global demand for oil, which may rise as much as 120 million barrels a day by 2030 up from 84 million barrels a day currently.

These findings are consistent with what the United States Government already reported in February through the Energy Information Administration of the U.S. Department of Energy. They projected world liquids demand to

increase to 117 million barrels per day in 2030.

They also projected the real price of crude oil in 2030 to be about \$95 in nominal terms, which would be over \$59 a barrel in this year's dollars, and the price of natural gas to be \$9.50 per 1,000 cubic feet. In other words, the U.S. Government itself, through the Energy Information Administration, an arm of our Department of Energy, acknowledges we will become more dependent on foreign energy in coming years. Not less dependent, but more dependent. Not more independent, but more dependent. To me, that is not acceptable.

For the consumer, it means higher and higher gasoline prices. For the economy, it means higher trade deficits and slower growth. For our Government, for our Nation, it means less independence, greater entanglements and likely more wars.

President Bush has talked about energy independence. But what has he really done? In his most recent State of the Union, he talked about ending our addiction to oil and everybody dutifully applauded, but we are more dependent on foreign energy sources today than we were 6 years ago when he mouthed the words, indeed. Under his administration, this country is importing 1 billion more barrels of oil since he first took office. Today, we are importing three-quarters of the petroleum it takes to drive this economy.

Now, the Presidential candidates are criss-crossing our country, and each candidate has a piece in their stump speech that mentions the words, "energy independence." But will any of them deliver anything significant on these promises?

I have introduced a number of bills which will move America toward real energy independence. My Biofuels Energy Independence Act of 2007, H.R. 2218, protects our feedstocks from commodity price distortions, and we see what's happening in the ethanol market and the biodiesel market today. We ought to have broad ownership of that industry and not allow the cartelized structure that characterizes today's oil and gas industry to be repeated in this new biofuels sector.

I am proud to be part of a coalition here supporting H.R. 969, a bill to expand the renewable energy standard and the renewable energy portfolio to spawn new energy production in this country and new business and new jobs related to it, to capture all those dollars that we are siphoning up and sending to other countries, to turn those around and bring them back home.

I have a bill to supplement the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, H.R. 682, with domestically produced biofuels. Soon I will be introducing the Energy Smart Communities Act that encourages and aids local jurisdiction undertaking energy efficiency initiatives, including solar roofs and wind turbines across our country.

My goal has always been simple, to devote the resources it will take to reinvent our economy and transform our