

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