

most Members would know me as somewhat liberal and Jack as being somewhat conservative, we were really good friends, because Jack was the kind of person you could sit down and talk to, and no matter what your political views were, he would sit and talk about whatever it was on your mind.

He told me a lot about his decisions to run for both the legislature and for the U.S. Senate, and he told me about how his first campaign worked.

Jack went out and planted a whole field full of pumpkins, and he took an instrument that was like a cookie cutter and had it made in his name, Jack Metcalf. He took all these pumpkins when they were small and scored them on the outside, and as the pumpkins grew, the name "Metcalf" appeared on the pumpkins. So by the time of the election, Jack went around and gave a pumpkin to every house in his district.

That is Jack Metcalf. That is the guy that was here, very unassuming, no airs about him whatsoever. He was a solid conservative, don't have any doubt about that, and he stuck to his principles. He was the kind of conservative you could talk to and find out what he thought. He would tell you exactly where he was, and that is where he was. You could try to convince him, and maybe it would work.

I had one experience with Jack which I have to tell about. I was the ways and means chairman of the State senate when Jack was there in the minority, and I had a bill that I needed an extra vote on. I needed somebody in the Republican Party. So I went over and I talked to Jack about it.

He listened to me and acknowledged that maybe that wasn't such a bad idea. But he was really concerned about the economic situation of the United States, and he really thought that we ought to be on the gold standard. So Jack and I had this long discussion about the gold standard, and I said, "You know, Jack, we ought to have a hearing in the State senate on the gold standard."

Well, as you might guess, this would have been about 1983, the gold standard wasn't exactly very high on most people's agenda, but we had a hearing, and we listened and we talked and we asked the questions and had a great long discussion about this issue, and a few days later, when I needed a vote, Jack was there.

That is the kind of person he was. He was somebody who would listen to you, he would tell you what he was concerned about; and if you listened to him, you made a friend, and you were able to work with him.

His wife and kids, I know, perhaps tonight are watching. You should have nothing but pride for your father and your husband.

They list all the bills that he got involved in. Jack was a very, very dedicated environmentalist and did many things here. But what will always remain will be he was a guy who came here and said, I believe in term limits;

he served 6 years, and he left. No fuss, no muss. He didn't ask anybody. He had made a commitment to his people in 1994 that he would leave, and he did surely as soon as the time came.

So we will miss Jack. He is the kind of person that makes this place a really humane place. Jack I don't think had an enemy in this place, because, as Norm says, even if he was going to say something against you, he would either before or after come and talk to you about it and say, "I didn't mean that personally, but I just think you are wrong on that matter." He had that way, and we would do well to have that spirit come back to this House.

We will miss you, Jack.

64TH DAY OF INCARCERATION FOR BORDER PATROL AGENTS RAMOS AND COMPEAN

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, today is the 64th day of incarceration for two U.S. Border Patrol agents. Agents Ramos and Compean were convicted last spring for shooting a Mexican drug smuggler who brought 748 pounds of marijuana across our border into Texas.

These agents never should have been sent to prison. There are legitimate legal questions about how this prosecution was initiated and how the prosecutor's office proceeded in this case. To prosecute the agents, the U.S. Attorney's Office granted immunity to a known drug smuggler. While the Mexican drug smuggler waited to testify against our agents, DEA reports confirmed that he brought a second load of marijuana, 752 pounds, into the United States. But this information was kept from the jury and the public.

Over the past 8 months, dozens of Members of Congress and thousands of American citizens have asked President Bush to pardon these agents. In December of 2006, the President granted pardons to 16 criminals, including 6 who were convicted of drug crimes, but he would not pardon Agents Ramos and Compean.

The difference, Mr. President, is that these people you pardoned were criminals, and these two Border Patrol agents are Hispanic Americans who are heroes, heroes who were doing their job to protect our borders. Mr. President, it is not too late for you to use your authority to pardon these two men.

Not only are there concerns about the U.S. attorney's prosecution of these two border agents, but the same prosecutor's office in western Texas has just persecuted another law enforcement officer.

Deputy Sheriff Gilmer Hernandez was sentenced this week to a year in jail for shooting at a vehicle that was transporting illegal aliens. Hernandez stopped the car for running a red light and asked the driver to step out of the

car, but the driver pulled forward to flee and turned the car toward the deputy. The deputy fired shots at the car's tires to protect himself.

Hernandez was charged for violating the civil rights of one of the passengers, an illegal Mexican national who was struck in the lip by fragments of a bullet or other metal. None of the vehicle's occupants were charged.

Mr. Speaker, there are many questions and concerns about the prosecutor's office that need to be answered. I want to thank Chairman JOHN CONYERS for considering my request and those of other Members of Congress for a hearing on the overzealous prosecution of these law enforcement officers.

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

(Mr. PAUL 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 California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DREIER 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 Washington (Mr. INSLEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

REASONS FOR SUPPORT OF EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL BILL

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this evening to voice my support for an emergency supplemental bill that will produce a significant change in the way the war in Iraq is being waged. This is not an easy decision on my part. Back in 2002, I opposed giving President Bush the authority to wage the Iraq war, and ever since, I have opposed every supplemental bill that has come to this floor to pay for the war in Iraq.

During each supplemental debate, I voiced concern that Congress was essentially giving President Bush a blank check to wage the war as he saw fit. I voiced frustration that the Bush administration was unwilling to face the realities on the ground in Iraq and that Republican Congresses refused to provide proper oversight of billions of dollars that were handed out to contractors like Halliburton.

Last November, the American people sent a clear message that the status quo in Iraq was no longer acceptable.

They entrusted Congress to Democrats in the hopes that we would help take our Iraq policy in a new direction so that we could bring our troops home soon.

Mr. Speaker, the emergency supplemental addresses the concerns of the American people. It is a serious piece of legislation that brings together into one bill the recommendations of the nonpartisan Iraq Study Group, military generals, the Pentagon, and even the President himself. It provides us the first real opportunity to change course, and therefore it deserves the support of anyone who believes the *status quo* is no longer acceptable.

The supplemental takes into consideration the views of military generals and military experts who have said for months now that there is no longer a military solution possible in Iraq. Instead, they say the only way to end the civil war that is raging in Iraq is through political and diplomatic means.

Tomorrow this House will have the opportunity to send the President a strong message that the war in Iraq will not continue indefinitely. The legislation states that American troops will be out of Iraq no later than August 31, 2008, and if the Iraqi Government does not meet certain benchmarks in the coming months, our troops will be home by the end of this year.

With this legislation, the fate of Iraq now truly belongs to the Iraqis themselves. It is time the Iraqi Government stepped forward and takes some responsibility. The Maliki government must realize that it has to meet political, economic and diplomatic benchmarks that the President himself set, and that if serious improvements are not seen in the coming months, then we will begin the process of redeploying our troops out of Iraq.

This only makes sense, Mr. Speaker. If the Iraqi Government continues to believe that U.S. involvement there is indefinite, what kind of pressure are they going to have to make the necessary political reforms? They are not, and that is why both this pressure and a date certain for responsible redeployment are so important.

This legislation also begins the process of redirecting the Bush administration's attention to the forgotten war in Afghanistan by adding \$1 billion to the Defense Department's request for military activities there. This increase supports our efforts to suppress a likely spring offensive by the Taliban. In addition, it will reinforce our humanitarian efforts in that war-torn country. We must work to give poor farmers an alternative to the illicit opium trade that is rampant throughout Afghanistan.

Finally, the legislation provides more money than the Pentagon requested for critical health care needs for veterans and wounded soldiers. Specifically, the legislation provides \$1.7 billion more for defense health care and \$1.7 billion more for veterans

health care in the hope that we can eliminate the horrific conditions and the treatment our wounded soldiers receive at Walter Reed. The brave men and women who fought on behalf of this country should not now have to endure bureaucratic delays in order to receive the health care services that they were promised.

Mr. Speaker, this week we entered the fifth year of this unfortunate war. Tomorrow we must step forward and support a bill that brings our troops home within the next 18 months, exerts pressure on the Iraqi Government, prioritizes the forgotten war in Afghanistan and provides additional funds for veterans and military health care.

Tomorrow we have the opportunity to change the direction of the war in Iraq, and we should certainly take it.

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.)

MEXICAN GOVERNMENT NEEDS TO STAY OUT OF AMERICA'S BUSINESS

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, the Mexican Government needs to stay out of America's business. Let me explain.

Deputy Sheriff Gilmer Hernandez of the town of Rocksprings, Texas, Edwards County, the size of Delaware, one of three deputy sheriffs on patrol at any given time in this massive area of west Texas, is on patrol in the middle of the night, and he sees a van with the lights off running a red light. He does what he is supposed to. He attempts to pull the van over. He notices as he approaches the van that numerous people are laying down on the floorboards.

As he gets closer, the driver speeds off, turns around and tries to run over Deputy Gilmer Hernandez. Deputy Hernandez pulls out his pistol, blows out two of those tires, and the vehicle finally stops. One passenger in the van was slightly injured, but the people in the van jump out and take off running because they are all illegally in the United States, seven or eight of them.

□ 1945

Deputy Hernandez immediately calls the sheriff of the county to show up. The sheriff shows up; he calls the Texas Rangers to make an independent investigation of this shooting. The Texas Rangers—there is probably no finer law enforcement group in the United States, or in the world for that matter—make an independent investiga-

tion and determine that Deputy Hernandez acted lawfully and within the law when he fired his weapon. But then the Mexican government gets involved, and in their arrogance, demand in writing from their consulate general to our Federal Government that Deputy Hernandez be prosecuted. And our Federal Government, like the cavalry, shows up later and reinvestigates the case; basically uses the same facts, talks to all of the illegals, and prosecutes Deputy Hernandez for shooting his weapon in self-defense.

It is ironic that the consulate general wouldn't even allow our government to talk to the illegals until the consulate general got them all together in a room and apparently got their story straight. And once that happened, they talked to Federal prosecutors, and the Federal prosecutors prosecuted Deputy Hernandez, where they were saying he should have stopped firing his weapon after the van went on by. How ridiculous a statement that is.

Deputy Hernandez was convicted, and this week he was sentenced to 1 year and 1 month in the Federal penitentiary. The Federal judge apparently did everything he could to get the lowest possible sentence under the Federal guidelines, even though Deputy Hernandez should not have been prosecuted. The illegals in the van should have been prosecuted. The human smuggler driving the van, he should have been prosecuted. But no, they got a deal; they got green cards to stay in the United States. It seems like our government is prosecuting the wrong people.

It is interesting that Deputy Hernandez was also ordered to pay \$5,000 to the illegal who was slightly injured. That is nonsense. It is like someone who breaks into your home, you try to stop that person, they are injured in the scuffle, and the next thing you know you have to pay for their injuries when they illegally broke into your home. That is the same thing that Deputy Hernandez is supposed to do under this court order.

It sounds to me like the Mexican government ought to be paying restitution. They ought to pay restitution to the American taxpayers for the cost of the illegals that come into the United States and get all the social programs that the rest of us pay for. The Mexican government ought to pay restitution for their drug smugglers that come into the United States, bringing that cancer that has spread across our land.

Our Federal Government obviously needs to get on the right side of the border war, and that is the American side of the border war. It is interesting how our Federal Government is so relentless in prosecuting border protectors who are protecting the dignity of this country, doing everything they can to keep people from illegally coming into this country, while our Federal Government gives lip service to border control. Of course that is the