

owned outlets are more sensitive to community standards and are less likely to broadcast indecent material. Congress, I think, needs to reverse this trend towards concentration and move back to that 35 percent of the market that was originally the standard.

Our children are paying a price. The average young person by the age of 18 witnesses 200,000 violent acts and 40,000 murders on television. They average roughly 6 hours of media exposure per day. Research by the Congressional Public Health Summit in 2000 indicated that children exposed to media violence are more violent later in life; more apt to commit crimes of violence. Studies show that children watching sexually explicit programming adopt more permissive attitudes towards premarital sex and become more promiscuous.

Our out-of-wedlock birth was 5 percent in 1960, and today it is roughly 33 percent. One out of every three children coming into our culture are born with a huge disadvantage. They have two strikes against them. These children, and really all of us in our culture, pay a great price. So what I would urge, Mr. Speaker, is that Congress needs to stay the course, play its part, and hold the FCC to its charge.

The gentleman from California (Mr. BACA) and I have started a caucus, the Sex and Violence in Media Caucus, which we hope people will join. Several weeks ago, Bono uttered an obscenity four times during prime time, and the FCC refused to penalize the broadcast network because they said he used the obscenity as an adjective. As a result, the gentleman from California (Mr. OSE) has introduced the bill Clean Airways Act, H.R. 3687, which defines eight obscene words, and it says if these words are used, no matter whether used as adjectives, verbs, adverbs, pronouns, whatever, they are still subject to penalty. Also, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) has introduced H.R. 3717, the Broadcast Decency Enforcement Act, which increases penalties for obscenity from \$27,500 to \$275,000, a tenfold increase, which may get some people's attention.

I urge my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to hold the broadcast media to a higher standard and to require the FCC to enforce commonly held standards of decency.

THE PRESIDENT'S BALLOONING CREDIBILITY DEFICIT

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

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, in addressing the Republican Governors Association fund-raiser last night, the President, in a much-touted speech, decided to unveil his reelection strategy. He pointedly accused the current front-runner for the Democratic nomination of having a record of flip-flopping, waffling and temporizing.

Since the State of the Union and since Meet the Press, I have been waiting for this President to offer a vision and an agenda for this country. His strategy has got America stuck in an endless occupation and a jobless economy. I thought last night we were going to hear a strategy of how to move forward, yet the President of the United States, after 3 years of governing, has decided his strategy is to tear down his opponent rather than to offer America a vision of tomorrow and what we can do to build something tomorrow.

I thought it was very ironic for a President of the United States, who has a growing credibility gap, where people question the validity and the very truthfulness of his words, to begin to question the consistency of the front-runner for the nomination of the Democratic Party. I thought it was very interesting because, if I am not mistaken, this was the President of the United States who has flip-flopped on steel tariffs. That has been this President's record. He flip-flopped within 18 months of having imposed the tariff.

This is a President who, although promoting tax cuts for the very wealthy, called them a middle-class tax cut. We now find out, in Paul O'Neill's book and Ron Suskind's book, the President of the United States knew that his tax cut went to the top end. He went into a meeting, said, "Haven't we done enough for the top end?" And yet he went out and sold his tax cuts as something else and then accused Democrats of class warfare for asking the very same question he had asked. And he wants to accuse the Democratic nominee, or near nominee, of being a flip-flopper?

He has a very interesting economic strategy. He is trying to wage three wars with three tax cuts and tell us the deficit is a result of something else; spending on veterans, police, education, and health care. Ever since his tax cuts for \$3 trillion, America has added \$521 billion to the deficit, 3 million Americans have lost their jobs, 5 million additional Americans are without health care, and over \$1 trillion worth of corporate assets have been foreclosed on.

His economic report has now told us that the middle class of India, where they are outsourcing jobs, is the primary concern of the President's economic report rather than the shrinking middle class in Indiana. This is a President who then walked away from that. In Ohio, he said manufacturing was his top priority, yet year after year his budget cuts the manufacturing extension program which helps small businesses.

This is a President of the United States who on foreign policy took the Nation, regardless of whether you are for or against it, to war based on weapons of mass destruction, yet we have now found out in two State of the Union Addresses that he raises threats that are not true; in the State of the

Union to the United States, where the world was listening.

The President's credibility gap is stretched even wider by his budget that is filled with flip-flops and inconsistencies. He has pledged \$3.5 billion in new money for police and firefighters, yet his budget cuts \$1 billion out of existing grants to local police and firefighters. He told us the budget deficit would be manageable, but his plan to halve it by the year 2009 is an accounting fiction. Even Goldman Sachs and the IMF have blamed the Government of the United States for being a danger to the world economy, let alone employment growth here in the United States.

The President told conservatives of his own party that Medicare would cost only \$400 billion. Within 2 months, the bill was for \$537 billion. He promised to clean up the Great Lakes on one hand, so he increased the funding for \$35 million, but with the other hand he cut the State Revolving Fund for water cleanup by \$400 million. And this is an administration that wants to challenge people on the word of credibility, on their flip-flops and waffling?

The only thing this White House never waffles on is when you are a special interest and you need a special favor. They have been quite consistent if you are a pharmaceutical company, you are a polluter, or you are an insurance company or an HMO. So when this President says he wants to campaign on somebody's credibility and on their consistency, I as one Democrat welcome that, because we have 3 years of a record. This President has done a phenomenal job of getting America stuck in a jobless recovery and an endless occupation in Iraq.

This is an election about America's future, not offering the status quo that has put America in the position it is. So if credibility is a question we are going to have in this campaign, let us bring it on.

□ 2015

RISING COST OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk over the past few months and debate here in the Congress about the high cost of prescription drugs. I just got a letter from one of my constituents in Indiana, Joseph Neff. Joseph is 67. He and his wife buy a lot of prescription pharmaceuticals from Canada. In this letter he sent me, it shows a 3-month supply of the products he has been buying from Canada, and it shows he is going to save \$3,007 a year by buying pharmaceuticals from Canada, the very same thing he would buy here in the United States, the same identical prescription

drugs; and yet they cost less in Canada than if he bought them here in the United States. He is saving 50 percent on the prescription drugs he is buying from Canada. If he bought them through AARP on a discount card, it would be 10 percent. So he still saves more by going directly to Canada.

The pharmaceutical industry has been fighting day and night to stop reimportation of pharmaceuticals. They have gone to the FDA and HHS, and they have told them it is not safe to have reimportation; and our health agencies have been going along with it. And yet we held four hearings, and we asked them to give one example where people have been harmed by pharmaceuticals brought in from Canada. They could not name one example. So the pharmaceutical industry has unusual support at our health agencies. They have undue influence at our health agencies; and as a result, American people are paying exorbitant prices for prescription drugs compared to what they are paying in Canada, Germany, and other parts of the world.

Just recently there was a poll that was released by the Associated Press and stated that a third of American families struggle to afford their prescriptions, and 73 percent of those families have to cut their dosages by as much as half so they can take care of their health needs. Two-thirds of those polled felt that the Federal Government should open up this market and make it easier for people to buy prescription drugs from Canada and other countries at lower cost.

So why does our government not listen to the people we represent? There is no safety issue. That is a bogus argument. Yet the health agencies continue to walk in lock-step with the pharmaceutical companies saying it is a health risk, and it is simply about money. The big profits they make in the United States are huge compared to what they are making in other countries. We continue to let them do that when the price they charge should be fair and equitable throughout the world. All of their profits should not be loaded on the backs of the American people who are struggling to make ends meet.

In July of this year, we had a vote on this floor. The vote overwhelmingly passed saying that we wanted the reimportation of pharmaceuticals to be allowed so Americans can get the breaks that they are getting in other countries. Even though that passed, when the Medicare prescription drug bill came out of conference committee, they left that out.

The other thing that bothers me is the American people realize that our government should be negotiating to make sure that Medicare prescription drug prices are as low as possible, and yet there is a prohibition in law passed by the Congress of the United States that does not allow our government under the Medicare prescription drug bill to negotiate with the pharma-

ceutical companies to get the best price for the American taxpayers. So we pay the highest prices for pharmaceuticals that the pharmaceutical companies want to charge, while in other countries there are negotiations taking place between their governments and the pharmaceutical industry. This just is not right. This is something my colleagues on both sides of the aisle feel very, very strongly about.

Mr. Speaker, we have to take our health agencies and anybody else to task who is trying to load all of the profits of pharmaceuticals on the backs of the American people. The American people need fairness; they need to know that they are going to be treated fairly. They should not have to cut their pharmaceutical products in half in order to stretch them out to take care of their health needs. They do not want to pay up to 300 percent more than they are paying in Canada for the pharmaceuticals products, and they should not be called criminals because they go across the Canadian border and buy the very same product up there for less than they can get it here in the United States.

In addition, governors of 25 States and a multitude of cities across the country are now trying to negotiate with Canadian pharmaceutical distributors to buy their pharmaceutical products through Canada because they will save so much money, and it will help their budgets at the State and local level. This is a problem that is not going to go away. The pharmaceutical industry and our health agencies need to address this problem; and, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to be quiet on this floor until this problem is solved.

JOBS RECESSION

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, after 3 years in the White House, President Bush still has not figured out how to create jobs for Americans here in the United States. The economy has yet to grow to the point where companies feel confident in hiring new employees. Accordingly, millions of Americans remain unemployed, some for so long they have actually given up their job search. If the jobs recession does not end soon and the economy does not create 2.1 million jobs this year, then President Bush will be the first President since President Hoover to preside over an economy in which he did not create one net job.

One of the major reasons for the current jobs recession is the increased exporting of high-paying white- and blue-collar jobs overseas. Fortunately, this phenomenon has not hit New Jersey as hard as States like Ohio, Michigan, North Carolina, and Georgia. However, New Jersey has still suffered.

I want Members to consider several examples from the township of Edison

in my congressional district. This week a Ford plant is scheduled to close, leaving more than 900 New Jersey employees without jobs. Last year, the Frigidaire air conditioning plant closed in Edison and shifted production to Brazil, leaving 1,600 people unemployed.

One would think that the Bush administration would be concerned about these job losses. Two weeks ago, however, we learned President Bush and his economic advisers view the movement of American factory jobs and white-collar work to other families as a positive transformation that will in the end enrich our economy.

The President's chief economist, Gregory Mankiw, made national headlines earlier this month when he said, "Outsourcing is just a new way of doing international trade. More things are tradeable than were tradeable in the past, and that is a good thing." President Bush supported this view in his annual economic report in which he wrote, "When a good or service is produced more cheaply abroad, it makes more sense to import it than make it or provide it domestically here in the United States."

It is no wonder the President thinks our economic forecast is so rosy. He is not concerned about creating jobs here in the United States; sending jobs overseas is fine with him. How can we have an economic success if we send jobs overseas, but do not create enough new jobs with comparable wages here in the United States? It is clear the President and his economic team are not concerned about that at all.

These statements from President Bush and his economic advisers are particularly worrisome after Congress narrowly approved legislation last year that would give the President free rein to negotiate trade agreements with foreign governments without the ability of Congress to amend the agreements.

I opposed the so-called fast track trading negotiation authority because I was concerned the Bush administration would use it to sacrifice American jobs for cheaper imports. In an attempt to further expand international free trade, the administration is now in the process of negotiating an agreement between the United States and Central America that could potentially begin another exodus of American jobs to the south.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that such agreements will do nothing to create jobs here in the United States, and perhaps that is why President Bush and some of his leading economic advisers are backing away from another statement in that same annual economic report of the President in which the administration predicted 2.6 million jobs would be created this year. Just 1 week after the release of the report, both Treasury Secretary John Snow and Commerce Secretary Donald Evans refused to embrace President Bush's own economic projections because they know that is not going to happen.