

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

OUR ECONOMY

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, this book has not hit the best seller list yet, but it should. This lays out the agenda of the President for the future of our economy, jobs, Social Security, and other programs. Actually, we have got to give the principal author, Mr. Mankiw, the President's chief economic adviser, some points for extraordinary honesty.

A quote from page 229, in reference to trade, of course, the United States of America is running a huge and growing trade deficit. We will borrow more than one-half of \$1 trillion, \$500 billion, from overseas to finance this. We are hemorrhaging jobs. U.S. corporations flee overseas to exploit cheap labor and Mr. Mankiw says that is all to the good. "When a good or service is produced more cheaply abroad, it makes more sense to import it than to make or provide it domestically."

He went on to say that exporting trade jobs realizes the dream of free trade that economies have talked about for 2 centuries.

□ 2000

But then he says not to worry, because, of course, we have a comparative advantage. Well, the question would be, a comparative advantage in what?

Well, since they told us first we are going to lose those obsolete manufacturing jobs, which I disagreed with, because I do not think you can be a great Nation if you do not make things anymore, but then they said, do not worry, we are going to go to the intellectual jobs. We will do those sorts of things, and we will protect those through these trade agreements. Well, we now find we are exporting those intellectual jobs, and, in fact, we are also losing them to unfair trade.

But, remember, this President supported Most Favored Nation status for the bloody dictators of Beijing, the Communist Government of China, because of the insistence of U.S. corporations. It says here, do not worry, we will defend our intellectual property against countries like China, which regularly steal it. It said that if you bring intellectual property into China, within 24 hours it will be on the streets in counterfeit form; but yet this administration, which says if a country is found to be in violation of their obligations under a trade agreement, the United States could retaliate against those countries, against the entire

range of transactions covered by the agreement.

That is right. Could. But guess what? Will not. How many trade complaints has the United States filed against the Communist Government of China for wholesale theft of American intellectual property, which is leading to our \$124 billion trade deficit with China and the flood of U.S. jobs into that country? None. Zero. None.

A company in my district, Videx, an American dream. The guy started with Hewlett-Packard and came up with a new scanner technology. It is all made in America. All of it. He employs 160 people directly, and even in Texas he has contractors making this good. He has also developed an electronic lock. One day he found out, and he is operating in 44 countries, that he had been cloned. His company had been entirely cloned in China, including the Website, including the software language that says U.S. copyright or patents, translated into Chinese. The Chinese had even gone one better. They took the Videx Website and put a little waving American flag up in the corner on this phony Website for a Chinese company, and condoned by the Chinese Government.

I thought, well, certainly the Bush administration, who say they want rules-based trade, they will help this company. They are for small business; they will help this company. We went to the Commerce Department and the answer was, nope, sorry, you are out of luck. In fact, in a conference call just 2 weeks ago, this company, Videx, Corvallis, Oregon, was told by the Bush Commerce Department, those great defenders of free trade, intellectual property and rules-based trade, that, in fact, they would do nothing to enforce their intellectual property rights or prevent the theft of their entire company and product in China, as is happening to dozens of other American firms, because the big corporations do not want such complaints filed against China because it might make them mad, and they might lose access to the cheap labor to produce the goods that they export back here.

That is what this administration is all about. They talk about small business, but they are just there for a few multinational corporations. They have a real chance here to help an American company to save hundreds of American jobs, to stop the Chinese from stealing that product and the product of many other American firms and stop stealing those jobs. All they have to do is file a complaint.

The company cannot file the complaint at the World Trade Organization. The Bush people stacked the deck. The only way it can be filed is by the United States Government and the Commerce Department, and they are refusing to do that. If they care about jobs, if they care about the future of this country, they will eschew these radical free trade policies. And they are not only free trade, they are theft

policies being pursued by other countries against the U.S.

This is not a level and fair trade field, and it is time that things changed. But I doubt very much under this administration that they will, because small companies cannot afford to contribute the millions of dollars to the reelection campaign that the big ones can.

CONGRESS SHOULD HOLD BROADCAST MEDIA TO A HIGHER STANDARD OF DECENCY

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

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, 100 million people viewed this year's Super Bowl. It was a great football game. Unfortunately, most of the publicity did not focus on the football game, it rather focused on the half-time show and a few ads. Matter of fact, there were 200,000 complaints concerning some of the indecency that were filed. I think this illustrates the culture war we are currently experiencing, because most in the entertainment industry really could not understand the outcry. This is pretty much business as usual. Yet those in middle America were not quite so enthralled. They were hit right between the eyes by the media content that our children are immersed in almost daily.

Many Members of Congress, myself included, were concerned and somewhat outraged, and I just am concerned that this outrage may be short-lived if we look at the history of such things. In 2003, 240,000 complaints were filed with the FCC concerning indecent and obscene programming, yet there were practically no responses by the FCC or by Congress. Few of these complaints were even answered by the FCC. Complaints are often bundled, they are not counted separately, so there may have been well over 240,000 complaints filed. Only a handful of citations were issued, which resulted in minimal fines, roughly four or five citations. No TV station has ever been fined in the history of the FCC for broadcasting indecent material. Since the FCC began in 1934, no broadcast license has ever been suspended.

The FCC receives \$278 million from Congress annually, yet it is largely derelict in the enforcement of its duties. On June 2, 2003, the FCC increased the market share media conglomerates can control from 35 percent to 45 percent. What does that mean? It means in a major media market, one conglomerate can own three TV stations, one newspaper, and eight radio stations. So there has been a huge amount of concentration in the media industry.

As media control is more centralized, and there is less local control, there is more emphasis on indecent programming. There is a focus on the bottom line; simply what will sell. Locally-

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