

suing the Border Patrol for \$5 million for violating his civil rights. He is not an American citizen. He is a criminal.

Although it is clear that the agents fired shots in self-defense, Ramos and Compean were convicted mainly on the testimony of a habitual drug smuggler who claimed he was unarmed. Despite my repeated requests for an investigation of this case and a request by more than 50 Members of Congress for the President to pardon these agents, this administration has ignored the concerns of countless citizens who have cried out against this injustice.

Mr. Speaker, the indifference of this White House will long be remembered by the American people and by those of us in Congress who tried to come to the aid of these two heroes.

WHERE DEMOCRATS REALLY STAND ON THE ISSUES

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, the gentleman from North Carolina who preceded me in the well was saying, "Those Democrats, they just want to raise taxes and spend." I would look at the legislation we passed today with 124 Republican votes as an example of where Democrats really stand on the issues.

Just about 1 year ago today, almost exactly a year ago today, the Republican Party passed legislation called reconciliation that actually raised the cost of student financial aid, dramatically raised the cost of student financial aid. It also did one other thing to "save money" or "create revenue," which is it cut medical care for needy Americans.

Now, we have got to be fiscally responsible, but what they did with this money was cut taxes for wealthy investors, extend tax cuts for wealthy investors that were going to expire in the year 2008, not exactly an immediate problem, to 2010. They paid for that by raising the cost of student financial aid; i.e., taxing students and cutting medical care for poor Americans; i.e., taxing poor people or taking away needed health care. That is his model. He says we are the "tax and spend" folks.

Well, look at what we did today in legislation that passed with 124 Republican votes. We said it was wrong for the Republicans to jack up the cost of student financial aid. The cost of a higher education is beyond reach of too many Americans and we think people should have a chance at the ladder of success. Key to that is education, and we want to make education more affordable and more accessible. Today was the first step, and only the first step in our plan to help make higher education more affordable.

So I guess he would say we are taxing the banks; i.e., we are asking the banks to pay part of the cost here to lower

the interest rate on student financial aid.

Now, these bank private loans are losers for the taxpayers. We have in fact a government study that says if we converted the whole loan program in this country to national direct student loans administered by the universities and overseen by the government, we would make money, even with the defaults. But in order to continue the subsidized bank program which he was up here defending, we are getting back 84 cents on the dollar.

The American taxpayers are subsidizing banks to offer loans on which they make a pile of money, and now he is aggrieved that we have asked the banks to lower the interest rate over 5 years. I would like to lower them tomorrow, and they shouldn't have been raised. The Republicans shouldn't have raised the cost of student financial aid to fund tax cuts for wealthy people.

Now, if they want to have more tax cuts for wealthy people, then they ought to find a way to responsibly finance that. Personally, I don't think wealthy people need more tax cuts. In fact, I think they have gotten way too many.

And he did not talk about the fact that we are borrowing money to finance tax cuts for the wealthy, that we are dinging people who need medical assistance to finance tax cuts for the wealthy, that we are heaping the costs onto students to finance tax cuts for the wealthy. If that is what he calls tax and spend, then that is what I am.

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.)

AMNESTY NEEDED FOR BORDER PATROL AGENTS RAMOS AND COMPEAN

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 Federal Government, this body, the body down the hallway, for some time has been talking about amnesty, amnesty for anywhere between 12 million and almost 20 million illegal people in the United States.

Well, I would like to talk about amnesty, but not for people who are illegally in the country, because I am opposed to that. But I would like to talk about amnesty for Americans, citizens, and I only want to talk about amnesty for two of those citizens. They are border agents who have been convicted of so-called civil rights violations of an illegal drug smuggler bringing drugs to the United States.

□ 1800

Two border agents, Compean and Ramos, today went to the penitentiary for 11 and 12 years for doing this. They work on the Texas-Mexico border, a volatile war zone. The border is the second front, and while on duty patrolling the sovereignty of our country, they come across a drug dealer driving a van full of about 780 pounds of marijuana. That does not mean anything, but it is worth a million dollars. That does mean something, something we can relate to.

A confrontation occurs, drug dealer abandons the van, tries to flee back to Mexico, has an altercation with the border agents, shots are fired, he runs to Mexico.

The next thing we find out, our Federal Government chooses to go to Mexico, find this drug dealer, learns that he has been shot, bring him back to America, treat his wounds at American expense, give him a deal, a backroom deal, to testify against the border agents because they did not follow some policy of reporting shots being fired. So they go to court, give the drug dealer amnesty, give the drug dealer immunity.

While waiting to testify, the old drug dealer goes back to Mexico and picks up another load of dope, almost 1,000 pounds of drugs, gets caught by different border agents. Once again, not prosecuted by the Federal Government because the Federal Government is so determined to prosecute border agents, not drug dealers; and after the trial, the border agents were convicted, and now they went to the penitentiary.

Our Federal Government had a choice to make in this case, whether or not to stand on the side of the lawless drug dealer or stand with our border agents who try to enforce the rule of law. Our government chose poorly. They sided with the enemy. They sided with the outlaws. They sided with illegal drug dealers and prosecuted our border agents. I ask the question, why?

If the border agents violated some policy or rule, suspend them, give them days off, demote them, but send them to the penitentiary for 12 years when the drug dealer goes free? This does not pass the smell test or, as we say in Texas, that dog just don't hunt, Mr. Speaker.

So we are asking a very simple thing, some of us from Congress, about 55. We are asking the President to grant amnesty to these two border agents. The administration, Federal Government, talks about amnesty. We just want it for two folks, and the President has the constitutional power to pardon and parole. The President exercised that power, that is his right under the Constitution, almost 100 times in the last 6 years. We are simply asking that the administration exercise the pardon power and pardon these two border agents and send the message to the Border Patrol and all these sheriffs who work on the border, trying to enforce the law, that we will stand beside

you when you try and enforce the law; and also send the message to drug dealers that we are not going to work with you, we are not giving you a deal, we do not work backroom deals with drug dealers; we support our Border Patrol on the Texas-Mexico border.

So, Mr. Speaker, we hope that we get a response from the Federal Government on this pardon. So far, we have not received anything. I think the Federal Government is blissfully indifferent to the plight of these two border agents, and so we would hope that this gets some attention from folks across the country. Over 200,000 people have signed petitions asking that the President pardon both of these border agents; and we hope that that does occur because justice in this case did not occur, because our government chose to be on the wrong side of the border.

And that's just the way it is, Mr. Speaker.

BRING OUR TROOPS HOME AND SOVEREIGNTY OF IRAQ RESTORATION ACT

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, I joined with my good friends, distinguished colleagues and fellow Californians, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE and Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS, in introducing landmark legislation that would bring our troops home from Iraq within a 6-month time frame.

The Bring Our Troops Home and Sovereignty of Iraq Restoration Act is the first comprehensive legislative proposal to end the military occupation and provide a framework to help bring stability back to Iraq.

One week ago, when he addressed the Nation, President Bush demonstrated to the world that he continues to remain blind to the realities on the ground in Iraq. Instead of putting forth a plan that will withdraw our troops, the President is increasing our military presence, escalating the number of troops by over 20,000. What President Bush fails to grasp is that our military presence is only fueling the insurgency, plunging Iraq further into chaos and civil war.

Mr. Speaker, the November elections showed just exactly how fed up Americans are with the President's failed Iraq policy. It is time now to honor that mandate. It is now up to the Congress to catch up with the will of the people.

During his weekly radio address on Saturday, President Bush challenged those of us who disagree with him to offer a plan of our own. Today, we have taken up his challenge.

The Congress has already appropriated funding that will support our troops and keep this occupation going for at least another 6 months, possibly

longer. That funding, instead, should be used to finance an aggressive withdrawal plan that brings our troops home to their families; and our bill would do exactly that.

Our plan will also withdraw all U.S. troops and military contractors from Iraq within 6 months from date of enactment.

It will prohibit any further funding to deploy or continue to deploy U.S. troops in Iraq. The bill does, however, allow for funding to be used as needed to ensure safe withdrawal of all U.S. military personnel and contractors. Funding may also be used for the increased training and equipping of Iraqi and international security forces.

Thirdly, it accelerates during the 6-month transition training of a permanent Iraqi security force.

And fourth, it authorizes, if requested by the Iraqi government, U.S. support for an international stabilization force. Such a force could be funded for no longer than 2 years and be combined with economic and humanitarian assistance.

It guarantees full health care funding, including mental health for U.S. veterans and military operations in Iraq and other conflicts.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the bill would rescind the 2002 congressional authorization for the war in Iraq, prohibit the construction of permanent U.S. military bases in the country, and finally, ensure that the U.S. has no long-term control over Iraqi oil.

We believe that the oil in Iraq belongs to the Iraqi people, and we believe that when this oil goes into the world marketplace, the international marketplace, the U.S. will certainly have access to our share.

Mr. Speaker, excluding the veterans' benefits, our plan will cost the American people pennies on the dollar compared to continuing the occupation of 2 more years in Iraq. It will save lives, bodies and minds, and it will give Iraq back to the Iraqis.

The Bring Our Troops Home and Sovereignty of Iraq Act is an important step in regaining our country's credibility in the region and throughout the world, and it provides the President and Congress with a comprehensive strategy for responding to the majority of Americans who want our troops to come home.

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.)

HONORING THE LIFE OF BENNY PARSONS

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate a true inspiration whose perseverance showed the very best of the human spirit. Yesterday, Benny Parsons, a NASCAR legend, passed away after a difficult battle with lung cancer.

Parsons grew up in the foothills of North Carolina in Wilkes County, and his dedication and drive lifted him from poverty to national recognition. He became an inspiration to countless fans and individuals. He was a beloved character who brought passion to the sport. Today, we mourn and also celebrate the life of this beloved man in the 5th District of North Carolina.

The chairman of NASCAR, Brian France, said of Benny Parsons, who was affectionately referred to as BP, that "Benny Parsons was a true champion, both on the race track and in life. Benny loved our sport and the people that make it up and those people loved him. He will be remembered as being a great ambassador for the sport." Words such as these convey the deep admiration, respect and love of Benny and the effect he had on those with whom he connected.

After leaving Wilkes County, Benny first took a job as a cab driver in Detroit, Michigan, before he progressed to become a NASCAR champion. While faced with fame and admiration, Benny never forgot his roots and the importance of where he came from. He was often referred to as "The Professor" after he retired from racing in 1988 and began broadcasting and commenting on NASCAR races for NBC, ESPN and TNT. He had an uncanny ability to deliver information in a relaxed and informative way for the last 6 years, even when he was going through the rigorous treatment for cancer.

Michael Waltrip, who recently tested his car at the Daytona track, said of Benny, "When you talked to him, he brought out the human element. The cars are nuts and bolts, but he talked through that. He was able to deliver to people. He just tried to be passionate about what he believed, and he did a great job of explaining what people were seeing." To show his admiration of Benny, Waltrip painted on the side of his car, "We love you, BP."

Respect, admiration and inspiration among colleagues, fans and the public made Benny Parsons the amazing and inspirational figure that he was, but it was his personality that espoused all of these qualities so many came to admire. It was his passion and commitment to NASCAR and his love of the sport that made Benny such a lovable person and such a great inspiration. Even at his sickest moments, he had set up a Web blog for his fans, continually sharing his optimism that he would recover and that the will to fight is so important.

Besides the inspirational spirit and the continual drive to fight any obstacle in front of him, Benny Parsons was quite the accomplished NASCAR driver. He was a member of NASCAR's 50