

pled guilty to four felony counts for smuggling drugs while under immunity to testify against the border agents. Ramos and Compean were doing their job to protect America and to protect our border. Yet through a questionable prosecution, the agents were convicted and sentenced to 11 and 12 years in prison, respectively.

Despite the efforts of the American people and Members of Congress in both parties, nothing has been done to reverse this injustice. Members of Congress and outside groups have filed court briefs to support these agents, and on December 3, 2007, the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals in New Orleans heard oral arguments for their appeals. The only glimmer of hope for these agents and their families rest with the Fifth Circuit Court's decision.

The American people have not forgotten Ramos and Compean. The more time these men spend behind bars, the longer it takes for a decision on their appeal, the more frustrated the American people become. Madam Speaker, as millions of Americans eagerly await a ruling by the Fifth Circuit Court. My prayers are with the agents and their families. I hope that the judges' decision will rectify this gross miscarriage of justice and faith in our judicial system may be restored.

I thank Congressman ROHRBACHER for calling for a national day of prayer last Sunday on behalf of these two decorated U.S. Border Patrol agents. In addition to Mother's Day, this past Sunday marked the beginning of National Police Week. This week is a fitting time for the American people to join in prayer not only for agents Ramos and Compean, but for all men and women in uniform who risk their lives each day to protect our communities. Agents Ramos and Compean were willing to risk their lives to defend our border and protect America from illegal drug smugglers.

Madam Speaker, before I close, again, we call on this White House to please listen to the pleas of the American people and the Congress to say let these men go for doing their job to protect the American people from a drug smuggler. I pray that justice will finally prevail for these men and their families.

And with that, Madam Speaker, again, I call on this White House to listen to the American people.

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.)

REQUIRING A VOTER'S PHOTO ID WILL DENY MANY AMERICAN CITIZENS FROM THEIR RIGHT TO VOTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, it was on May 7, the day of the Indiana primary election just last Tuesday, I believe that was May 5, excuse me, May 5, that 12 nuns came to the voting booth to cast a ballot in the election. These nuns, women of the cloth, women who have dedicated their lives to prayer and service, only wanted to vote but were barred from doing so by Indiana's photographic identification law. This law, which is the most stringent in the United States, the most stringent of any State, requires that before you can cast a ballot, you must present a government-issued photographic identification card. This 98-year-old nun, American citizen, devoted to her country and her faith, was denied along with 11 of her colleagues.

I'm disappointed to tell you, Madam Speaker, that this problem didn't have to happen. Only a few days before this Indiana photographic ID law was put in place, the United States Supreme Court reviewed this law and found that it was reasonable for Indiana to force citizens to provide such identification.

Now, Madam Speaker, you might say, well, isn't this designed to just stop voter fraud? The answer is "no," Madam Speaker. In the United States Supreme Court decision, the Justice that wrote the majority opinion admitted and acknowledged that there was no evidence of voter impersonation. And in fact, Madam Speaker, this bill was a bill to solve a problem that simply did not exist at all. This bill was confronting a mythical voter fraud that worked only to stop 12 nuns and many others from voting.

The bill that required the photographic ID clearly would disenfranchise people who were low-income and didn't have a photographic ID. It clearly would, and did, disenfranchise older Americans who may not have an ID or maybe were born at home and can't even find a birth certificate, which is what they would need to get such a photographic ID. It would clearly bar college students, who maybe haven't gotten a driver's license yet, from voting.

In effect, this bill prohibited people from voting who need a change in America. It stopped seniors who are against the donut hole of the prescription drug, Prescription Medicare Part D that is hurting our seniors. It's barring their way to the ballot box. It's barring our students' way to the ballot box as they struggle to confront galloping tuition increases and mounting debt. It's barring the rights of our citizens who cry for greater civil and human rights in our country. And it's basically standing in the way of voters who need a fairer, more equal, more just society.

The fact is, Madam Speaker, I wish those people who pushed this law forward would have simply admitted that they don't want to debate the ideas, they just want to stop voters from get-

ting to the ballot box. They don't want to debate whether or not it makes sense to help rich people get even richer, to help big corporations get even bigger. They don't want to debate that. They just want to stop the people who would be opposed to their ideas from them ever being able to cast a ballot.

Madam Speaker, I want to commend the New York Times which, on May 13, submitted this editorial: The Myth of Voter Fraud. And what this editorial shows is it is not just Indiana but many other States which are requiring this absolutely unneeded, unneeded photographic ID requirement. States like Missouri, Kansas, Florida, South Carolina, and now others are considering these bills. They must and should be stopped. They're not intended to stop fraud. In fact, if there's any fraud going on, Madam Speaker, it is that people in the category that I mentioned, the senior citizens, communities of color, low-income people, students, those people are being defrauded because actively in almost every election, we've seen schemes and devises reminiscent of Jim Crow to bar them from the ballot box.

And so, Madam Speaker, I ask you and all of the Members of this House to consider a bill that will preempt the Supreme Court's decision in the decision that upheld the Indiana voter law. It's what we need. It would improve the quality of democracy in our country.

And as I close, Madam Speaker, I just want to say our country is a great one not because of bombs and guns and a huge economy, it's a great country because this country has been advancing liberty ever since its inception.

In the beginning of this country, Madam Speaker, you and I know that only white men of property were able to vote. Just being a white male would not get you the vote. But then we saw the Jacksonian Revolution, and people without property could vote; and then we saw the Civil War come, and then black men could vote; and then we saw the 19th amendment, and then women could vote. And then we saw the barring of the 24th amendment which said that no more poll taxes could stand in the way of people voting. And then we saw the amendment that allowed people 18 years old to vote. Every generation we've seen increases in the right to vote except for this one. It's a sad day, Madam Speaker.

I yield back, and I call on this Congress to keep the doors to the voting booth open for all Americans.

□ 2000

OPPOSE THE FARM BILL

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

Mr. FLAKE. Madam Speaker, tomorrow we're going to be voting on a very important piece of legislation. This is the farm bill, something that we reauthorize every 5 years or so, and I would

have hoped that we could have a good debate tomorrow. But I just learned a few minutes ago that the bill will come to the floor under a structured rule which will not allow anybody opposed to the bill to claim time in opposition.

So, if you can believe this, this is one of the most expensive, most important pieces of legislation to come before this body in years, and it will come to the floor under a structured rule that does not allow those opposed to the rule to claim time in opposition. This is a bill that the President has said that he will veto. This is a bill that has opposition. But those who favor this farm bill do not want those who oppose the bill to be heard. Imagine that.

There is time under the rule, as with any bill that comes to the floor, for what's called general debate. If you can think of this, general debate tomorrow will mean that time will simply be split between the majority party, which favors the bill, and those on the minority party who also favor the bill. If you oppose the bill, you cannot claim time in opposition, and you must go and get time, which you may or may not be able to get from your respective party officials or those who are controlling the time.

That is simply wrong. We shouldn't run the House this way, under Republicans or Democrats. A bill of this importance should be debated, should be debated fully.

Let me explain a few parts of the bill that I think led to the decision to make this a structured rule where those opposed to the bill cannot claim time in opposition.

We have said we had heard that we were going to have some reform in this farm bill. Those who are on farms making millions of dollars on farms in the past have been able to claim massive subsidies. We were told that this was going to change. In fact, what the President said is that we should have a limit of \$200,000 adjusted gross income, or AGI. Anything above that and you should not be able to receive subsidies. That sounds reasonable.

But instead, in this piece of legislation, you can make in farm income \$750,000 in adjusted gross income. As an individual, a single farmer can make that. Remember, that's adjusted gross income. That's your income minus expenses. That's after all expenses are taken out. You can still make as a single farmer \$750,000 and receive subsidies. If you're married and you structure it properly, your spouse can also make \$750,000. That means you can have adjusted gross income as a couple of \$1.5 million and still receive thousands and thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars in subsidy payments from your government.

What's more, if you're a farmer and the farmer's spouse making up to \$1.5 million in adjusted gross income, if you have non-farm income, that can amount to \$500,000 in addition, and then if your spouse has non-farm income, that's another \$500,000. So you

can have a couple making \$2.5 million in adjusted gross income. Again, adjusted gross income is your income minus your expenses.

People will point out farming's an expensive venture. There are a lot of expenses, but those are taken out, and you can still have adjusted gross income of \$2.5 million and collect subsidies under this bill. Is it any wonder that those who favor this farm bill didn't want anybody to be able to claim time in opposition to the bill tomorrow when we debate it?

A few other things that should be discussed here. I should mention that over the past couple of years, since we passed the last farm bill, farm incomes have shattered all kinds of records. We have net farm income that will reach \$92.3 billion in 2008. That's a 56 percent increase over 2006.

Average household farm income significantly exceeds the national average. In fact, average household income for farmers is \$89,434. Why do we have these kind of subsidies for those who are far better off than the average American? It simply doesn't make sense.

There are also some pretty severe budget gimmicks in this bill to make it look like it's coming in under budget when it really isn't. The Congressional Budget Office, or CBO, identified numerous gimmicks in both the House and the Senate versions of the bill that, for example, they shift costs outside the 10-year window and unrealistically assume that some of these programs will be ended in 5 years, and we know that they won't, just to fit them under the budget window.

Also under this legislation, for the first time that I've seen this, those writing the bill were able to go baseline shopping where you basically say I don't like this year's baseline funding or baseline limit so I'm going to go off last year's baseline limit; that will allow me to spend more. It's like if I were filling out my taxes and I said, well, you know, I could pay less if I claimed last year's income instead of this year's and I would be able to choose that.

That's what the sponsors of this legislation have done. They've shopped for a cheaper baseline so they could fit more spending. That gimmick should be exposed, and it's no wonder they didn't want anybody to claim time in opposition.

Madam Speaker, I don't know how anybody in America thinks that we're going to be serious enough to address the entitlement problem we have in this country with Social Security and Medicare if we can't say no to millionaire farmers. How will we ever address entitlements if we can't say no to millionaire farmers?

SUNSET MEMORIAL

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

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Madam Speaker, I stand once again before this House with yet another Sunset Memorial.

It is May 13, 2008, in the land of the free and the home of the brave, and before the sun set today in America, almost 4,000 more defenseless unborn children were killed by abortion on demand. That's just today, Madam Speaker. That's more than the number of innocent lives lost on September 11 in this country, only it happens every day.

It has now been exactly 12,895 days since the tragedy called Roe v. Wade was first handed down. Since then, the very foundation of this Nation has been stained by the blood of almost 50 million of its own children. Some of them, Madam Speaker, died and screamed as they did so, but because it was amniotic fluid passing over the vocal cords instead of air, no one could hear them.

And all of them had at least four things in common. First, they were each just little babies who had done nothing wrong to anyone, and each one of them died a nameless and lonely death. And each one of their mothers, whether she realizes it or not, will never be quite the same. And all the gifts that these children might have brought to humanity are now lost forever. Yet even in the glare of such tragedy, this generation still clings to a blind, invincible ignorance while history repeats itself and our own silent genocide mercilessly annihilates the most helpless of all victims, those yet unborn.

Madam Speaker, perhaps it's time for those of us in this Chamber to remind ourselves of why we are really all here. Thomas Jefferson said, "The care of human life and its happiness and not its destruction is the chief and only object of good government." The phrase in the 14th Amendment capsulizes our entire Constitution, it says, "No State shall deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law." Madam Speaker, protecting the lives of our innocent citizens and their constitutional rights is why we are all here.

The bedrock foundation of this Republic is the clarion declaration of the self-evident truth that all human beings are created equal and endowed by their Creator with the unalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Every conflict and battle our Nation has ever faced can be traced to our commitment to this core, self-evident truth.

It has made us the beacon of hope for the entire world. Madam Speaker, it is who we are.

And yet today another day has passed, and we in this body have failed again to honor that foundational commitment. We have failed our sworn oath and our God-given responsibility as we broke faith with nearly 4,000 more innocent American babies who died today without the protection we should have given them.

Madam Speaker, let me conclude in the hope that perhaps someone new who heard this Sunset Memorial tonight will finally embrace the truth that abortion really does kill little babies; that it hurts mothers in ways that we can never express; and that 12,895 days spent killing nearly 50 million unborn children in America is enough; and that the America that rejected human slavery and marched into Europe to arrest the Nazi Holocaust is still courageous and compassionate enough to find a better way for mothers and their unborn babies than abortion on demand.