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 million 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