

Mr. Speaker, it is very important for the United States to continue to funnel resources into Afghanistan. We must also ensure that none of our troops in Afghanistan are redeployed to bolster the President's plan to escalate the war in Iraq. We cannot let ourselves forget where the real war on terror started and continues to this day.

#### TWO U.S. BORDER PATROL AGENTS IN FEDERAL PRISON

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COURTNEY). 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, the pages are helping me put up the portrait of an injustice. The picture shows two U.S. Border Agents on January 17, 2007, turning themselves in to United States marshals to begin serving 11 and 12 years respectively in Federal prison.

U.S. Border Agents Ramos, who is at the bottom of this portrait, and Compean, at the top, were convicted last spring for wounding a Mexican drug smuggler who brought 743 pounds of marijuana across our southern border into Texas. These men never should have been prosecuted, yet they are now handcuffed in Federal prison.

Mr. Speaker, after months of silence, the President said in a television interview last week that he would take a sober look at the case and a tough look at the facts to see whether the agents should be pardoned. For the agents' sake, I am hopeful that the President will look into this case as soon as possible. The facts will tell the President what countless citizens and Members of Congress already know, that the U.S. Attorney's Office was on the wrong side in this case.

The agents fired shots during a foot chase with the smuggler who had fled in a van they were pursuing. The van contained approximately \$1 million worth of marijuana.

Compelling physical evidence, the angle of the bullet that struck the drug smuggler, makes it clear that the smuggler was pointing something at the agents as he ran away, and the agents fired in self-defense. Yet the U.S. Attorney's Office prosecuted the agents almost exclusively on the testimony of an admitted drug smuggler who claimed he was unarmed.

The U.S. Attorney's Office prosecuted the agents and granted immunity to the drug smuggler for his testimony against our Border Agents. This drug smuggler received full medical care in El Paso, Texas; was permitted to return Mexico; and is now suing the border patrol for \$5 million for violating his civil rights. He is not an American citizen. He is a criminal.

Since the agents were convicted, three of the 12 jurors have submitted sworn statements that they were misled into believing that there could be no dissent in the jury's decision and

therefore believe that they had to give in to the majority opinion of guilt. Still, the judge refused to overturn the verdict.

Mr. Speaker, the extraordinary details surrounding the prosecution of this case assure that justice has not been served. The Department of Homeland Security Inspector General in this case has outrageously claimed that Agents Ramos and Compean admitted they were out to shoot Mexicans and confessed to knowingly shooting an unarmed suspect. But the Inspector General has failed to make good on his promise to deliver documents to Members of Congress to support these claims.

Nearly 2 years after the conclusion of the agents' trial, the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Texas has answered repeated requests for transcripts of the trial with nothing but excuses.

Mr. Speaker, real justice does not fear the truth. For the sake of the agents and their families and for the sake of the American people who they were working to protect, I encourage the President of the United States to review the facts on this case as soon as possible. The President alone can immediately reverse this injustice by pardoning these two innocent men.

With that, Mr. Speaker, before I yield back, I want to say to the families of Border Patrol Agents Ramos and Compean that there are Members on both sides of the political aisle in this House of Representatives that will not sit still until the President pardons these two men. They deserve the best of America, not the worst, and God bless America.

#### PEACE MARCH ON THE MALL

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, this weekend there was an extraordinary event right outside these windows. I come to the floor this evening to celebrate the hundreds of thousands of people who gathered on the Mall this Saturday because they have had enough of this immoral occupation in Iraq.

Groups like Code Pink, United for Peace and Justice, Win Without War, and Peace Action did an exceptional job of organizing the march and rallying their members. We were fortunate to have many celebrity activists in attendance, as well as several Members of the Congress.

But what made the event successful was the energy and the passion in the crowd. It was a testament to the power of the grassroots.

Hundreds of thousands, from the stage as far as the eye could see, packed on the mall, standing together to send a powerful message that Americans want to bring our troops home from Iraq.

Hundreds of thousands standing together to say that 4 years of bloodshed

is enough, that over 3,050 lost American lives is over 3,050 too many for a war we never should have started in the first place.

Hundreds of thousands standing together to register the disgust with the President's Iraq policy, the staggering civilian casualties, the billions upon billions of dollars wasted, human rights abused, our global credibility shattered, terrorists emboldened rather than defeated.

Every objective measure we could possibly use leads to the conclusion that what we are doing in Iraq has been a tragic failure.

And everyone can see that, Mr. Speaker, except the President, the President of the United States, who is asking us to sacrifice more of our tax dollars and more lives and limbs so he can win in Iraq.

You know what they say: The definition of insanity is doing the same thing and expecting different results. Fortunately, we have an antidote to this insanity. It is not another Iraq study group. It is not another bipartisan committee to debate and deliberate while more people die. It is not a non-binding resolution.

It is comprehensive legislation that would have all of our troops home safely, out of Iraq, and contractors out of Iraq within 6 months.

It is H.R. 508, the Bring Our Troops Home and Iraq Sovereignty Restoration Act, which I introduced with my colleagues, Congresswomen BARBARA LEE and MAXINE WATERS, earlier this month.

But the real authors of this bill, Mr. Speaker, were the hundreds of thousands of people marching on the Mall this Saturday and the millions more Americans who they represent. By offering H.R. 508, we are giving voice to their will.

Many of the marchers came back to Congress today to share their views in person. They want their elected representatives to know how strongly they oppose the continuing occupation and how strongly they support H.R. 508, which would fully fund a safe military withdrawal.

The President has challenged us to issue a plan. We have, and people gathered on the Mall this weekend showed their support. Enough is enough.

In the name of national security, fiscal sanity and common decency, I ask my colleagues, sign on to H.R. 508 and bring our troops home.

#### GLOBALIZATION

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, if we take a look at the last half century, it is clear that there has been no greater force for positive economic and political change than globalization. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I said globalization.

Greater integration of the world's economies has lifted hundreds of millions of people out of poverty in the developing world, nearly doubled the middle class population in Mexico and expanded our economy into a \$13 trillion global leader for greater economic and political freedom.

The benefits of globalization can be seen every single time that a Chinese blogger gets past government censors or a U.S. company trains factory owners in Thailand in worker rights and protections.

So how did the greatest engine of global prosperity become so maligned? How did this poverty fighting, democracy enhancing force get blamed for all of the world's evils, from job losses in Michigan to poor water quality in Guatemala?

In part, Mr. Speaker, this can be explained by the fact that globalization has improved so many aspects of our lives, but it has done so in very subtle ways. As a result, we do not always recognize its benefits.

When you go to the grocery store and find fresh grapes in the dead of winter, you might not know that the fact that they are there and fresh and reasonably priced is that they come from Chile. You just know that you get to enjoy those winter grapes.

When you buy educational software for your second grader, you might not know that it was developed by a small business in Pennsylvania, assembled in Malaysia and serviced by a technical support firm in India. You just know that your daughter is starting to do a better job at reading.

When you buy a new TV because Wal-Mart finally had it at a price you could afford, you might not know that they cut costs by developing and implementing a revolutionary operational structure. You may not know that they source, ship and track goods to and from every corner of the globe by using such innovative practices that they have transformed the entire retail industry. You just know that you get to watch this Sunday in the Super Bowl the Colts and the Bears play away on an amazing screen.

Globalization has impacted us in countless ways, with improvements that range from a better MP3 player to a better job, and together they contribute to a better life.

But, Mr. Speaker, while the improvements to our standard of living often go unnoticed, the challenges that come with change are painfully clear. When a factory closes down, the hardship is very real and very visible. For the individuals who face those tough times, winter grapes and flat-screen TVs seem absolutely meaningless.

□ 1945

When confronted with the difficult challenges change can bring, it is very natural to condemn change itself. But like all hard things in life, it is just not that simple. While one company suffers from competition from China, several

others thrive by utilizing low cost, high-quality Chinese goods. A tech company contracts with a call center in India; and as a result of the cost savings, they can afford to hire new programmers here in the United States.

In fact, the numbers overwhelmingly show that globalization has been an enormous net positive for job creation right here at home: over 20 million new jobs since the implementation of the North American Free Trade Agreement, including more than 7 million new jobs in the last 3½ years. Unemployment, as we all know, is at a near historic low of 4½ percent.

But, Mr. Speaker, while the benefits have been dispersed to all Americans, there is no denying that there are those who have faced great challenges. So do we try to halt the march of globalization? Let us set aside the question of whether we should deny the tremendous benefits for all in order to try to protect the few.

Let us ask the question, Can we do that? Can we protect an industry from losing jobs? If so, do we protect textile workers or the workers who design, market, and sell apparel? Do we protect manufacturers that make steel products or the manufacturers that use steel products? Maybe we should all buy American. Does that mean that we buy Fords that are made in Canada and assembled with Mexican parts? Or do we buy Toyotas made in Kentucky with American and Japanese parts? Do we buy iPods designed in California, but assembled in China? The fact is, globalization has made old ideas about protectionism absolutely obsolete.

Mr. Speaker, it is essential that we recognize the leading role that we as a country are facing. I urge my colleagues in a bipartisan way to join in support of this effort.

But like all hard things in life, it's just not that simple. While one company suffers from competition with China, several others thrive by utilizing low-cost, high-quality Chinese goods. A tech company contracts with a call center in India, and as a result of the cost savings, they can afford to hire new programmers. In fact, the numbers overwhelmingly show that globalization has been an enormous net positive for job creation: Over 20 million new jobs since the implementation of NAFTA, including 7 million jobs in the last 3½ years. Unemployment has dropped to 4.5 percent, a near-historic low.

But while the benefits have been dispersed to all Americans, there's no denying that there are those who have faced great challenges. So do we try to halt the march of globalization? Let's set aside the question of whether we should deny the tremendous benefits for all in order to try to protect the few. Let's ask the question of can we?

Can we protect an industry from losing jobs? If so, do we protect textile workers, or the workers who design, market and sell apparel? Do we protect manufacturers that make steel products, or the manufacturers that use steel products? Maybe we should all "Buy American." Does that mean we buy Fords, made in Canada and assembled with Mexican parts? Or do we buy Toyotas, made in Ken-

tucky with American and Japanese parts? Do we buy iPods, designed in California, but assembled in China? The fact is, globalization has made old ideas about protectionism obsolete. Its impact is wide, pervasive and irreversible. We simply do not have the option anymore of withdrawing from the world and denying ourselves the benefits of a global marketplace.

Our only option is to use the prosperity it has brought to help those who are struggling. It doesn't matter why a job is lost. Whether globalization played a part or not, what matters is that workers have the skills they need to find even better jobs than the ones that were lost. If we make a commitment to American competitiveness, including worker competitiveness, we can both enjoy the benefits and address the challenges of a global economy.

What we can't afford to do is demonize the source of our unparalleled prosperity. There's no question individuals will face hardship at times, and that naturally breeds anxiety. But anti-globalization rhetoric that exploits and preys upon the anxieties of working families is cheap, dirty politics. And it is dangerous. It risks the growing standard of living that the world's economic liberalizers are enjoying. I call on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject the politics of isolationism and continue to pursue the path of greater economic integration in the worldwide marketplace.

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

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

#### FIREARM TRACING DATA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. McCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. McCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, for the last several weeks you have heard me talk about gun violence in this country, and I happen to think there are solutions where we can reduce gun violence.

I would like to talk about firearm tracing data. Firearm tracing data gives law enforcement agencies the ability to retrieve useful data on guns used in crimes. Tracing data will let our police departments locate the gun dealers who sell guns used in crimes. Without this tracing data, local law enforcement will not be able to pursue civil action on suppliers that have been implicated in crimes without asking the ATF's permission first.

It is important that we use tracing data to single out the bad gun owners. One percent of gun owners sell 50 percent of the guns used in crime in this country. That is a staggering number. We can crack down on that 1 percent. We can make our streets and cities safer. The collection of tracing data does not prevent anyone from purchasing a gun. It simply gives law enforcement the tools that they need to solve crimes.