

generations have grown up with him, four have been profoundly influenced. His has been a voice of civility, reason, thoughtful exchange, and good humor, exactly why most of us are not just devoted fans of public broadcasting, but heavily dependent upon it.

Thank you, Bob Edwards, for almost a quarter century of enriching our lives. The last show was poignant and insightful, everything we have come to expect from you. With profound sadness and regret at your departure, we have great expectations about what you will do next.

Best wishes, Bob Edwards.

PRESIDENT EXPLAINING AWAY TERRIBLE ECONOMIC RECORD IN OHIO

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, President Bush came to Ohio today on about his 20th trip to campaign for reelection in our State, and the reason he comes back so often in Ohio is to try to explain away his terrible economic record.

Since George Bush became President, Ohio has lost one-sixth of its manufacturing jobs; 177,000 manufacturing jobs alone have left the State. Every single month of the Bush administration, we have lost manufacturing jobs.

The President's answer? More tax cuts for the most privileged people. If you make \$1 million, you get a \$123,000 tax cut, hoping that will trickle down and create jobs. It is not working. His other solution is more NAFTA-like trade agreements that hemorrhage jobs, that send jobs overseas.

We need to change the direction of this economy, to change the direction of this country. Workers should get their unemployment compensation extended. We should be giving breaks to those companies that manufacture in the United States, not ship jobs overseas.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLE). 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.

MAKING THE BAN ON ASSAULT WEAPONS PERMANENT

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

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, this Sunday is Mother's Day; and while many of our colleagues will be spending time with their families and their wives, thousands of women will be coming down here to Wash-

ington again to have their voices heard. We are going to have an Assault on Washington to make sure the assault weapons ban stays in place. We only have until September 13 to make sure a vote comes up on this floor.

As you can see by the poster, when our children go back to school, when your kids go back to school, will assault weapons be going back too?

Mr. Speaker, on Sunday of last week, I went to a memorial service for our police officers that have died in the line of duty, and they were put on the Wall. Many of those police officers came up to me and they said, What is going on in Washington? Why in heaven's name would anyone down there want to have assault weapons back on the streets?

Well, the million moms, the grandmothers, their husbands, grandfathers will be here on Sunday. Our voices will be heard once again. But this is only going to be the kickoff; because from Sunday on, throughout the United States we are going to be touring the country and raising our voices and awareness. The American people have to realize, come September 13, assault weapons, Uzis, AK-47s, Bushmasters will be back on the street.

Do we want to go back there? Do we want to go back to the time when these guns were gunning down children in our communities, gunning down our police officers? Does anybody remember why we banned the assault weapons in the first place? Because too many people were dying.

The American people do not want assault weapons back on their streets. They can do something about that. Call the Speaker of the House. Call the President, who has promised to sign the bill if it gets on his desk. That is an empty promise. If we cannot have a vote here in the House to make sure the assault weapons ban is renewed and made permanent, they will be back on our streets. Even gun owners across this Nation agree that assault weapons should not be on the streets.

Mr. Speaker, we have to do an awful lot of work between here and the end of this session, but I am saying to my colleagues that we must all come together to make sure the assault weapons ban stays in place. We have to do this. It is common sense. It is not taking away the right of anyone to own a gun.

I know there are people out there that feel they should have an assault weapon. Well, unfortunately, when we see gangs in our communities growing every day, when we see drug lords coming into our communities every day, when they talk about having terrorists in our communities waiting who can go to a gun show or go into your local gun store now and buy assault weapons, is that what we wanted?

When I first got involved in this issue, it was for personal reasons. Many of the people that will be here on Sunday are victims. Many have lost their children, many have lost their husbands, many have lost their wives.

This is something the American people can do, but we must hear from you.

Again, the American people on a grassroots level can make a difference. There are so many nurses out there, teachers out there, doctors out there that are behind us on making sure it gets through. But you cannot just say you want this. You have to call.

□ 1930

You have to call your Representative. You have to call your Senators. You have to make sure that they hear from you.

With this election season coming up, this should be an issue. We can save lives. We can save an awful lot of lives. Why should we go forward and let these assault weapons back on our streets, and then, all of a sudden, a tragedy happens in our school yard or on a train, or anywhere in this country? And again, the panic that comes here. We have to do something; we have to do something.

This is a bill that has worked. This is a bill that does work. I happen to think we should make it stronger by making it permanent. I happen to think the gun manufacturers should be held accountable for making copycats. But the main issue should be assault weapons of any kind should not come back onto our streets. This is something that we can do. I need your help. I need the American people's help. Come out on Sunday. Come out and support the assault on assault weapons bans. Protect our children.

ALCOHOL AWARENESS MONTH AND H. RES. 575

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

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, this evening we honored the Connecticut men's and women's basketball teams for winning national championships, a truly remarkable accomplishment to have two teams from one school do this. Not long ago, the National Academy of Science released a report on preventing underage drinking. This seems like disparate events, but they are actually connected.

The National Academy of Science report recommended that colleges and universities ban alcohol advertising and promotion on campus in order to discourage alcohol use among underage students.

Research points out the problem of alcohol consumption on college campuses. First of all, 1,400 college students are killed annually in alcohol-related accidents, and we have all anguished over the fatalities in Iraq, over 700. Well, more than double that number will be killed on college campuses this year because of alcohol abuse.

The proportion of college students who say they drink to get drunk is rising. In 1993, roughly 40 percent of college students reported binge drinking.

By 2001, that figure had risen to 48 percent. Mr. Speaker, 70,000 students are victims of alcohol-related sexual assaults each year. Most of these are date rapes. More than 500,000 students suffer alcohol-related injuries annually.

Despite these statistics, a total of \$53 million in 2001 and \$58 million in 2002 was spent to place ads in college sports programs by the alcohol industry.

The 2002 NCAA basketball tournament had more alcohol ads than the Super Bowl, the World Series, college bowl games, and Monday Night Football combined. Alcohol advertising made up more than twice the percentage of ad spending on college sports of all other television programs in 2001 and 2002. Recent riots at the University of Connecticut and Iowa State, as well as some of the recruiting scandals we have heard about on college campuses, have been fueled largely by alcohol.

A spokesperson from the NCAA recently said, "Alcohol advertising is not inconsistent with our mission." I beg to differ. The NCAA handbook states that NCAA policy should exclude "advertisements that do not seem to be in the best interests of higher education."

As a result of the mixed messages our colleges and universities are sending, I have introduced House Resolution 575 calling upon NCAA member schools to voluntarily ban advertising on college sports broadcasts. This is simply a resolution. It is something I hope that Members of Congress will get behind because we think we need to call attention to the inconsistency of policies that our colleges and universities are promoting.

Dean Smith, the former North Carolina basketball coach who set all kinds of coaching records said this. He said, "If aspirin were the leading cause of death on college campuses, do you think chancellors, presidents, and trustees would allow aspirin commercials on basketball commercials on telecasts. They wouldn't, not for a minute."

I recently speak to Coach John Wooden, who won 10 NCAA basketball championships in 12 years; and he wholeheartedly endorses taking alcohol advertising out of college sports. So I would agree with Dean Smith and Don Wooden, because over 36 years on college campuses, I saw case after case where alcohol was the biggest problem that we encountered.

Apparently others agree: 84 percent of Americans think advertising beer on college games is not in the best interests of higher education; 71 percent of Americans support a ban of alcohol ads on college games; 77 percent of parents say it is wrong for colleges to profit from alcohol advertising while trying to combat alcohol abuse on their campuses.

The problem outlined by the National Academy of Science study goes beyond the college campus. I think this is certainly worthy of note, Mr. Speaker. Underage drinking is a serious issue in our middle schools, in our high

schools and, in some cases, in our elementary schools. We have over 3 million teenage alcoholics in our country today. By the end of the eighth grade, 47 percent of students have engaged in heavy drinking. Most eighth graders are 13 years old. Children who drink before age 15 are four times more likely to become alcohol-dependent than those who wait until after 15. Underage drinking kills 6.5 times more youth than all other illegal drugs combined; and yet this problem flies largely under the radar screen. Underage drinking costs the American taxpayers each year more than \$50 billion. Despite these numbers, the Federal Government spends 25 times more on combating drugs such as cocaine, marijuana, and heroin than on preventing underage alcohol use.

I urge my colleagues to pay attention to this serious problem, as we are going to shortly introduce some legislation to combat this particular issue.

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

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my Special Order out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

IMPORTATION, DISCOUNT CARDS, AND MEDICARE MISINFORMATION

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, I would like to review this week as it relates to the Medicare prescription drug bill.

It started with the Secretary of Health and Human Services announcing on Monday, given the confusion over the Web site that they had put up, that they were going to think about taking it down because there was such confusion out among seniors about the pricing and among the pharmaceutical companies about actually what, in fact, they were offering and whether there was a discount. The Web site was intended, as Tommy Thompson said, to drive prices down.

There was such confusion in the marketplace that on the first day, Health and Human Services Secretary Tommy Thompson said we are thinking of taking the Web site down. Then they launched the big discount card that is supposed to provide somewhere between a 10 to 20 percent discount on prices.

Every year for the last 6 years, prices of prescription drugs have gone up, on

average, 17 percent, somewhere around five times the rate of inflation; and this year it is projected to go up 18 percent, and next year it is projected to go up 20 percent. The card was so confusing that at the Speaker's own town hall meeting, he got into an argument with a senior citizen who said, why do we not just do what Canada does and offer and, in fact, allow us to buy drugs in Canada where they are 30 to 80 percent cheaper? In fact, if you compare the discount that the drug card would offer like on Lipitor versus what the price is in Canada or Europe, even with the discount card, the prices for Lipitor in Europe are 129 percent cheaper than they are even with the discount card. Celebrex, another common drug, even with the discount price from the card, in Europe and in Canada, the price is 85 percent cheaper. Seniors know that.

Third, just this week, the Congressional Research Service found that, in fact, the cost of the bill for prescription drugs was never \$400 billion, but \$534 billion, and that the administrator, Mr. Foster, who intended to tell Congress, was told he was not allowed to and withheld the information from Congress; that in fact the Members who told him that have broken the law; broken the law.

I will tell my colleagues today, if that bill was on the floor, it would go down in resounding defeat, because people in Congress who thought they were getting all of the protection from the pharmaceutical industry have realized finally, having talked to their constituents, what is wrong with this bill. It does nothing to affect price. So we can have all the discount cards we want, we can have a Web site that is a failure, and now we have information out there that, in fact, people broke the law trying to pass this bill, and we now know what seniors have always told us. Since the bill did nothing to affect price, nothing to affect affordability, nothing to give them world-class drugs at world-class prices, which is the cheapest prices we could get, that in fact Congress was deceived and not given the information that was required to deal with that legislation.

Just today, at 5:30 in the evening, Secretary Tommy Thompson, having fought tooth and nail to oppose the notion of allowing people to buy drugs in Canada and in Europe and to bring competition to the market and bring choice to the market, at 5:30 this evening Tommy Thompson announced that he believes in the reimportation of prescription drugs, that we should pass legislation, and he would recommend that the President sign that legislation. So in the last 48 hours, I just want my colleagues to review this with me.

The Congressional Research Service has found out that members of the administration broke the law by withholding information from Congress. The Web site that they put up to help bring competition to the market, they