

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

with regard to this resolution after 7 legislative days.

Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate that what is at issue with House Resolution 131 is, in fact, whether the House of Representatives is going to continue to have a credible ethics process that can be effective in protecting the reputation and the integrity of this great institution. And for at least two reasons, the House will not and cannot have a credible ethics process unless the Republican-inspired rules changes made earlier this year are repealed.

First, there cannot be a credible ethics process in the House unless it is genuinely bipartisan. By definition, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct was created as a bipartisan organization within a very partisan body, and its rules have always been fashioned through a bipartisan task force.

□ 2045

Until this year, the House clearly and repeatedly recognized that bipartisanship must extend to the creating of the rules under which the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct conducts its business; and in the past, changes in those rules were made in an open, in a thoughtful, and in a genuinely bipartisan manner.

But this year, Mr. Speaker, in contrast to past tradition, the rules changes were drafted solely on the recommendation of the majority, in a partisan, in a closed, in a secret process in which no one on the Democrat side of the aisle was even consulted. So the rules were adopted on a strict party line vote: all the Republicans voting for; all the Democrats voting against.

Mr. Speaker, this is the most partisan vote we cast in the House of Representatives. Never in the history of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct has there been an attempt to impose rules in this manner on the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

Mr. Speaker, the second concern about these rules changes is there has been an attempt to impose them on the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct in a very partisan way, but the rules in and of themselves are extremely damaging. The fact is that, at a minimum, these rules changes will seriously undermine the ability of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to perform its key responsibilities of investigating and making decisions on allegations of wrongdoing.

These rules changes fall into three categories.

First, there is the so-called automatic dismissal rule under which a complaint against a Member that is filed with the committee can be dismissed solely with the passage of time, no consideration of its merits. Under this automatic dismissal rule, that period of time can be as brief as 45 days from the date that the complaint is deemed to satisfy the procedural requirements of the rules. Previously, a complaint could be dismissed only by majority vote of the committee.

The effect of this automatic dismissal rule will be to give the committee members a means by which they can avoid their responsibility to give thoughtful, reasoned consideration to every complaint and to all of the charges in every complaint. Its ultimate effect will be to provoke partisanship and deadlock among committee members as they wait for the clock to run out. Does the majority really want this result?

Another of the rules changes is that it grants certain so-called due process rights to Members. One of those rights is the right to demand that the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct conduct a trial on a matter on which it has not even conducted a formal investigation. This so-called right would place the committee in the position of having to hold a trial on a matter in which it has not issued a single subpoena. Does the majority really want this result?

The third rule change, Mr. Speaker, is the so-called right to counsel provision which might be better characterized as the right to orchestrate testimony provision or the right to allow collusion among the accused and the witnesses. It would provide that one lawyer can represent the accused and all of the witnesses. Does the majority really want this result?

Mr. Speaker, I continue to urge my colleagues to look closely at the rules changes and the partisan manner in which they were adopted. By adoption of House Resolution 131, the House can begin to undo the damage that has been done to the ethics process, and we will be able to have once again an ethics process that commands the confidence and respect of both the Members of this body, and Mr. Speaker, most importantly, the American people, who, I believe, on a bipartisan basis want a bipartisan Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE TO UNITED STATES CAPITOL PRESERVATION COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOHMERT). Pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 188a, and the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the United States Capitol Preservation Commission:

Mr. LEWIS, California
Mr. SHUSTER, Pennsylvania.

COMMUNICATION FROM HON. NANCY PELOSI, DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, Democratic Leader:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER,
Washington, DC, April 26, 2005.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to (40 U.S.C. 188a), I hereby appoint Representative MARCY KAPTUR of Ohio to the United States Capitol Preservation Commission.

Best regards,

NANCY PELOSI.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, votes on motions to suspend the rules postponed earlier today will be taken tomorrow.

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, once again, it is a pleasure to be before the House along with my colleagues of the 30-something Working Group. We would like to thank the Democratic leader for allowing us, once again, to address the Members of the House and the American people on issues that are facing the 30-somethings and the entire population of the United States.

I think it is important as Members of Congress that we understand our obligation to the American people, making sure that they fully understand what happens in their house of democracy.

Many times in Washington, D.C., we are here, we are making decisions that are going to affect all of our constituents and even ourselves and our families. So I think it is important we take it very seriously.

We come back again tonight. Of course, we have the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) and also the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), my good friend from south Florida; and we are here to talk about Social Security. So I think we will just start off just kind of talking about some of the things and some of the events that took place today.

This was a very eventful day for Social Security and making sure that Americans are able to get what they deserve as it relates to their full benefits on Social Security and making sure that we do not gamble with their retirement.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Absolutely, this was a unique day.

Apparently, we reached the 60th day that the President has been out in America trying to sell the American people on his vague outlines of his proposal to privatize Social Security; and quite honestly, at the conclusion of the