

UNIVERSAL RIGHT TO VOTE BY
MAIL ACT OF 2005

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Universal Right to Vote by Mail Act of 2005, a bill to allow any eligible voter to vote by mail in a Federal election if he or she chooses to do so.

In my home State of California, voters already have this right. California is one of 25 States that already provides this convenient alternative to voting.

While I personally love the ritual of going to the polls to vote, I know that getting to the polls on Election Day is often difficult. And for some, it is impossible.

That is why I have introduced a bill that builds upon the growing trend of States to bring the polls to the voters. I believe we should try to meet our constituents halfway by increasing access to the electoral process.

What I am proposing is not new or even untested. States ranging from my home State of California to Wisconsin to North Carolina to Maine have already adopted this voter-friendly policy.

Citizens can vote from the convenience of their own homes. They will have more time to mull over their choices and make informed decisions. And they will be able to do so on their own terms, potentially avoiding long lines at the polls.

Not surprisingly, studies have shown that some of the bigger supporters of voting by mail are parents who must schedule time to go to the polls around so many other obligations.

Studies have also indicated that adding the option to vote by mail does not create a partisan advantage for one political party over the other. Republicans and Democrats both benefit from similar increases in voter turnout when voters are given the choice to mail in their ballots.

In fact, overwhelming support for voting by mail is consistent across nearly every demographic, be that age, income level, race, education, employment status, and ideology. It is a win-win for all Americans.

After adopting a universal right to vote by mail system in 1978, California saw a 30 percent increase in the use of mail-in ballots.

In my district of San Diego, 40 percent of voters opted to mail in their votes during the 2004 election. And other States that have implemented this policy have seen the same degree of support from voters, which is why it is hardly surprising that States offering the option of mail-in ballots often experience greater voter participation.

States providing universal access to mail-in ballots during the 2004 election saw a 6.7 percent increase in voter turnout. And again, this increase was uniform across all demographics, including political affiliation.

There is also extremely low incidence of fraud with voting by mail when compared to other methods of voting. The State of Oregon, which runs its elections entirely by mail, has prosecuted only four cases of fraud over the last six elections.

Mr. Speaker, as the former president of the League of Women Voters of San Diego, I care deeply about the integrity of our electoral system. Twenty-five States have already proven this option works and it is safe. It is time to give voters in the remaining States this convenient, secure, and affordable alternative.

While I am proud to be from a State where citizens already have this right, I believe democracy works best when all citizens have an equal opportunity to have their voices heard. Right now, an uneven playing field exists between States that already offer the option of mail-in ballots and States that do not.

□ 2030

When the same election is more accessible to voters in California than it is to voters in Maryland, the system is unfair.

States that fail to offer this choice stand to compromise their leverage in Federal elections by curbing the greatest level of voter participation. We should follow the lead of half of our Nation's States and ensure a uniformity of rights for all voters.

I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in supporting this effort to strengthen the Democratic process and give American voters the choices they deserve.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCAUL of Texas). 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.)

PRESSING ISSUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this evening I wanted to share my thoughts with my colleagues on some of the pressing issues that I think we have missed, particularly with the schedule that we now have. I think the world is crying out for this Congress to act and to act constructively and productively. There are several issues, both international and domestic, that we simply have failed to address.

I want to associate myself with the remarks of my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from the great State of Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) on the progress that India and Pakistan have made. I have congratulated both Ambassadors from Pakistan and India personally for the great leader-

ship shown by the Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan, two countries that have been known to be in conflict, sitting down around the table of friendship, talking about energy resources, opening consular offices, solving problems such as Kashmir, working with cultural exchange.

Why should this Nation not applaud them? I hope my colleagues will join me in a resolution that will support and applaud the works of both the President and the Prime Minister of the respective nations. I agree with my good friend from Washington, why should we, with our politics against Iran, eliminate the opportunities for two nuclear giants to begin to solve their energy problems and maybe, by chance, both of them striving towards democracy, having a positive influence on Iran?

So I hope that my resolution offered to the Congress and signed on by a number of my colleagues will be on the floor of the House to emphasize peace.

Today completed the 60-city tour of the President of the United States regarding the issue of Social Security. I am glad, however, that we joined many thousands on Capitol Hill to emphasize that Social Security does not belong to the debate of one single party. In actuality it is an American debate. That debate requires an open mind, but particularly we need to focus the American people on what Social Security is and is not. It is not the private savings account or the bank account for Wall Street. It is not the proof that we are in a capitalist society. It is an insurance program. It provides survivor benefits, disability benefits for those disabled Americans who want to live independently.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to stop going on the road. Come back to Washington, sit down at the table of negotiation with Democrats and Republicans talking about one issue, and that is how to make Social Security solvent. We did it in 1983 with President Reagan and Tip O'Neill, and it was solvent for now 42 years.

There is no reason why we cannot sit down and solve the problem with Social Security without a private savings account that dips into your pocket, takes the money to Wall Street and provides the hugest deficit that you could ever imagine. In fact, to make a private savings account, you need to take \$1.7 trillion out of the Social Security account. We are already in terrible straits with the deficit that is spiraling down and creating a burden on our children and grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak very quickly about the work that we need to do on the Committee on the Judiciary. We need to protect our State courts and Federal courts. We had a very informative hearing before our committee today, but we need to work to ensure that there are more U.S. marshals and Federal laws that will protect and prevent violence against State courts and Federal courts; new laws,

new mandatory sentences to do it, but real preventative measures, which more law enforcement, more training does.

I would also say I have asked the Committee on the Judiciary today to hold a hearing on a horrific video that I saw, a 5-year-old being handcuffed in Florida. A 5-year-old who does not have the intent, cannot go into a court of law and even be judged to have the appropriate intent to be prosecuted or to be able to testify. Two large police officers, one large teacher, and I love teachers, but this, excuse me, administrator, I believe this was a deputy principal, could not handle a 5-year-old. A mother, a working mother on a job that could not get there quickly, but got to school and they would not let her see her 5-year-old. What an outrage.

I believe that school system and that district and the State of Florida needs to be penalized for the kind of reckless, irresponsible stigmatizing of a 5-year-old. You could have called the mental health authorities. You could have waited. You could have given her a toy and a television set to calm her down; but yet two big police officers put her in the police car with handcuffs for a little girl who was disruptive. What an outrage.

I think we can do better than this and I am going to write legislation to punish school districts who do not understand how to deal with 5-year-olds, particularly those who do not understand that 5-year-olds do not need to be handcuffed. Did she have a gun in her hands? A knife in her hands? A 5-year-old.

I hope we can do further work on prescription drugs and meth labs, since even in my local schools we are facing that, Mr. Speaker.

Finally, let me conclude by saying, Mr. Speaker, I think the national ID, the bill that will pass in the Senate that gives us a national ID card with a driver's license, which the 9/11 Commission did not say, we need real immigration reform. Giving national ID cards does not keep the terrorists from the border. We need to protect the borders. We need more border patrol agents. That is how we secure the homeland, not national ID cards invading the privacy of Americans.

POWERFUL PHARMACEUTICAL LOBBYISTS

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

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, today on the front page of USA Today's business page, there was a headline, "Pharmaceutical Industry Goes Furthest to Sway Congress."

Last year the pharmaceutical industry spent \$158 million, just last year, to lobby Members of the United States Congress and Senate.

Now, I know you may be shocked to know that it may not have been in your interest, \$158 million to lobby the Members of the United States Congress and Senate. Since 1998, in 6 years, they have spent three-quarters of a billion dollars lobbying, wining, dining Members of the United States Congress, taking them on golf trips, taking them on vacations, taking them to conferences, taking them out to meals, all to tell them about their industry.

There are 1,300 pharmaceutical registered lobbyists. There are only 535 Members of the United States Congress and Senate. There are 2½ lobbyists for every Member. Three-quarters of a billion dollars in 6 years, \$158 million last year alone, and 1,300 lobbyists working on behalf of the industry.

About 475 of them, according to this article, are former Federal Government employees; 40 of them are former Members of Congress. It is the most influential and well-financed lobbying operation in Washington.

Challenging the drug companies is always a costly undertaking, and, more often than not, it is a very difficult one and a losing one. But I want you to know what you are getting for your \$158 million.

Congress, when it passed a prescription drug bill last Congress, the 108th, we prevented the United States Government from negotiating prices like the Veterans Administration does, like Wal-Mart does, like Sam's Club does when they want to negotiate. When they want to deal with a supplier they negotiate best prices, not the United States Government. It explicitly prevents the United States Government from negotiating on behalf of Medicare for 43 million seniors for the lowest possible price.

What does it say to our taxpayers? What does it say to our senior citizens? We are not going to do best business practices like Sam's Club, like Lowe's, like other people who negotiate price. We will send you out there and make you pay the highest price possible, which is why the United States taxpayers and senior citizens pay the highest pharmaceutical prices of any major industrialized country in the world. That is what you got for their \$158 million.

What else did we get for that \$158 million that they spent lobbying Members of Congress? We got a bill that prevented the reimportation of pharmaceutical products from Canada and Europe so we could not get competition and choice in the marketing of prices. That is why people in Canada pay 50 percent cheaper prices than we do here in the United States.

What else did that \$158 million get? It does not allow generic medications to come to market to compete against name-priced drugs. Every principle of the free market, whether you negotiate prices based on Medicare, just like Sam's Club, whether you allow competition through the free market and allow people to buy their drugs in Can-

ada and Europe and use competition for Lipitor and for other types of products, or whether you allow generics to come to the market in a speedier time to compete against the name brand, every principle in the free market was prevented.

We have a captive market in this country. We pay the most expensive prices. And the irony of ironies is that the American taxpayer through the R&D, Research and Development tax credit, subsidizes the research for the products that we buy, and we pay top dollar. That is why somebody has to do something about the \$158 million, the three-quarters of a billion dollars, in 6 years, spent on behalf of an industry that has got the best government they can get for their resources they spend; 1,300 lobbyists working for the pharmaceutical industry; 2½ lobbyists for every Member of Congress.

When you are working on their legislation, if you work down the halls of Congress and you see a shadow, it is usually theirs, not yours. Three-quarters of a billion dollars in 6 years, \$158 million last year alone.

It is estimated that the United States Congress, when it passed the prescription drug bill last Congress, that it resulted in an additional \$150 billion over 10 years to the industry's profits. They know what they are doing. They know what they are getting for their money. They know what they are getting for their meals, for their lobbying, for their trips; but it is time that this Congress spoke up on behalf of the American people, the people that elected us, both the taxpayers and the senior citizens, and get them the types of medications they need at prices they can afford, and stand up to the lobbyists from the pharmaceutical industry who are only representing their narrow interests and have lost sight of what we have to do to represent the American people.

CREDIBLE ETHICS PROCESS

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, on March 1 of this year I introduced a resolution, House Resolution 131, that would repeal the ill-conceived amendment to the House ethics rules that were included in the rules package adopted at the beginning of this Congress.

Although this resolution has now gained 208 co-sponsors, the Committee on Rules to which it has been referred has not yet taken any action on it. Accordingly, it now becomes necessary to begin to invoke the procedures provided by House Rule 15, to discharge a measure from the committee.

To that end, today I am introducing a resolution that provides terms for the consideration of House Resolution 131 by the full House. Under House Rule 15, a discharge petition may be filed