

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.

So tonight, Madam Speaker, may we each remind ourselves that our own days in this sunshine of life are also numbered and that all too soon each one of us will walk from these Chambers for the very last time.

And if it should be that this Congress is allowed to convene on yet another day to come, may that be the day when we finally hear the cries of innocent unborn children. May that be the day when we find the humanity, the courage, and the will to embrace together our human and our constitutional duty to protect these, the least of our tiny, little American brothers and sisters from this murderous scourge upon our Nation called abortion on demand.

It is May 13, 2008, 12,895 days since Roe versus Wade first stained the foundation of this Nation with the blood of its own children, this in the land of the free and the home of the brave.

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

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas 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 Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

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. Madam Speaker, just a little while ago, we voted to suspend the acquisition of petroleum for the Strategic Petroleum Reserve and for other purposes, a bill, H.R. 6022, which is going to take about 70,000 barrels of oil a day that would be going into the petroleum reserve and put it into the market for Americans to use in gasoline and other products.

It sounded very good and I voted for it because it is one small step, if you can call it a small step, in the right direction, but it's really not going to solve the problem.

The problem we have is that the United States is not energy independent. We have been talking about energy independence for the last 35 to 40 years, and we haven't done anything about it.

This House, and primarily the Democratic party, is being held hostage by the environmental lobby that won't allow us to drill in places like the ANWR in Alaska. Alaska is three-and-a-half times the size of Texas. It's huge. I've been up to Alaska. Drilling up there in the ANWR isn't going to hurt anybody or anything. And I cannot understand why we can't get 1 million to 2 million barrels of oil a day out of there that would help the American people see the

price of their gasoline and other fuel products reduced dramatically.

We can't drill off the continental shelf, even 100 miles out, because of the environmental lobby, and yet Fidel Castro, and his brother Raul Castro, 90 miles off of the Florida shore, can drill within 45 miles or 50 miles of the United States of America and actually drill into oil reserves that we have down in that area. In other words, taking our oil reserves and pumping them out of that area and into their coffers, and they're selling that under contract to China, our oil reserves that we could drill for down in the area between us and Cuba.

We also have such dependency on the Middle East it isn't even funny. We have dependency on Venezuela. One of our chief adversaries now is the President of Venezuela, and he controls in large part the price of oil and gasoline in this country, as do the people in the Middle East that have great oil reserves and are pumping it.

And it's extremely important, in my opinion, that we do something about becoming energy independent. We talk about it all the time. We talk about moving toward other forms of energy and I'm for that, but it's going to take time for that transition to take place. And in the meantime, the environmental lobby is blocking us from drilling in the ANWR, drilling offshore on the continental shelf, and allowing our enemies to make a huge profit at our expense.

The gasoline prices that the American people are paying today is a direct result of us caving in this country to the environmental lobby year after year after year. We could move dramatically toward energy independence if we could just pass an energy bill that would allow us to use our resources.

And we come to this floor and talk about it all the time, and the American people are getting a steady diet that President Bush is responsible for the high gas prices. That's absolutely absurd. The reason the gas prices are as high as they are today is because we can't drill the oil out of our country and get our reserves to the market so that the gas prices can be reduced.

We can't do it because the Democratic party primarily is caving in after year after year to the environmental lobby, and we can extract oil out of the ANWR and off the continental shelf in an environmentally safe way. So, if the people of this country are really concerned about gas prices, they ought to find where the fault really lies, and that is with this Congress and the liberals who are controlled by the environmental lobby and will not allow us to drill to get the oil reserves that we have in our country and off the continental shelf.

It's a tragic shame, and I just wish the American people could get the information and the drive-by media, as Mr. Limbaugh calls it, would report the facts as they are. We have the ability to move toward energy independ-

ence, and we don't do it year after year after year, and we continue to be dependent on foreign oil. That's one of the main reasons why the price of gasoline is approaching \$4 a gallon.

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

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

ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

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

Mr. TANCREDO. Madam Speaker, earlier a gentleman who addressed the House talked about the issue of voter fraud, and he was concerned about the fact that there were States that were actually trying to do something about it using voter IDs in order to make sure that the person who is at the polls is, in fact, who they say they are.

Now, we may think that there is no such thing as voter fraud. The fact is that unfortunately there's an enormous amount of voter fraud. I recalled as I was listening to the gentleman speak on this issue, and I cannot remember now the county, but I remember hearing about a county that sent out a notice to all of its citizens with regard to being empaneled as jurors. And of course, one of the questions they asked on this is whether or not you were a citizen, and if you checked that, then you were not eligible to sit on a jury.

Well, they then went and took the information apparently and looked at the voter information rolls, and there were hundreds of people that had identified themselves as not citizens for the purpose of serving on a jury because they didn't want to do that, because they were not citizens and they were willing to say so, and on the other hand, they had registered to vote because they also wanted to do that. That was okay with them.

Of course, this is in just one particular county, and as I say, I can't recall it now, but I just was thinking about that as I heard him because there are all kinds of things that are happening throughout this country and have been happening for a long time that attack the whole concept of citizenship.

We keep taking things away from that idea of what it means to be a citizen, bestowing these same privileges on anyone who happens to be here. Simply a resident, that's all it takes anymore.

There are cities, of course, that call themselves sanctuary cities and allow people who are not even legally present in this country the ability to have all kinds of services, to stay essentially hidden from the authorities because