

district, and I am therefore unable to be present for legislative business scheduled for today, Monday, July 10, 2006. Had I been present I would have voted "yea" on H.R. 2563, a bill to authorize Idaho Water Studies, (Rollcall No. 358); and "yea" on H.R. 5061, the Paint Bank and Wytheville National Fish Hatcheries Conveyance Act, (Rollcall No. 359).

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote during the following rollcall votes. Had I been present, I would have voted as indicated below:

Rollcall 358, H.R. 2563—To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct feasibility studies to address certain water shortages within the Snake, Boise, and Payette River systems in Idaho, and for other purposes, I would have voted "yea."

Rollcall 359, H.R. 5061—Paint Bank and Wytheville National Fish Hatcheries Conveyance Act, I would have voted "yea."

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from Washington on Monday, July 10, 2006. As a result, I was not recorded for rollcall votes 358 and 359. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall 358 and 359.

□ 1915

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEARCE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

#### VIDEO GAME RATING SYSTEM

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

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, the average time spent playing video games for the average young person age 8 to 18 years is 49 minutes a day, just a little bit less than an hour a day.

Ratings of video games are made by the Entertainment Software Ratings Board, also known as the ESRB. The ESRB assigns ratings without first playing the games, based on surveys, which is really a rather unusual way of doing surveys.

The ESRB is actually a part of the video game industry; so in essence, the industry is rating itself, which is inappropriate.

Ratings are often used as marketing tools to increase sales. They are subjective. There are no quantifiable standards in these ratings.

Research done by Dr. Elizabeth Caril of the American Psychological Association and other researchers indicate the following:

Number one, exposure to violent video games increases aggressive behavior, thoughts and anger.

Number two, sexualized violence in video games increases violence toward women and acceptance of rape.

Number three, video games enhance stereotypes of minorities and women.

Number four, violent antisocial behavior is often necessary to win the game, often with no negative results to the aggressor.

Other findings were as follows: often these games employ stalking and killing of victims, and these videos are similar to what the military uses in training soldiers to kill enemy soldiers.

The ratings for the ESRB are as follows: E is a rating which means E for everyone. Yet 64 percent of E-rated games contain violence that reward the player for injuring other people.

T is the next rating, for teenagers, yet 48 percent of the videos did not describe on the label objectionable material contained in the game. And much of the material was as follows: it had violence, blood, sexual themes, profanity, alcohol use. Sixty-nine percent of those games required the player to kill people to win the game. The average was 61 human deaths per hour in these video games.

The next rating is M for age 17 and older, meaning mature. And these ratings contain profanity, drugs, sexual themes, violence, blood and gore. Eighty-one percent of such games did not describe content accurately on the label. Seventy-seven percent of boys under age 17 own an M-rated game, which, of course, would be against the rating system.

And so the final rating is AO, for adults only. But we find this is a seldom-used rating, even though video games are more violent, sexually explicit and profane than ever.

According to David Walsh, president of the National Institute on Media and the Family, psychological and behavioral studies show that violent video games increase real-world aggression in young people. And this is a little bit different than watching television or listening to music because this actually requires you to interact, to do something actively and play in the game. So it has a very definite impact on behavior.

Such games are particularly damaging, as children are developing and maturing and their brains and emotions are maturing.

As technology advances, video games are increasingly realistic, more violent and sexually explicit. More and more games will be sold online, making regulation even more difficult.

So far legislative efforts to rein in the video game industry have been largely negated by the courts. First amendment, free speech, tends to trump the welfare of our young people.

Walsh and others recommend this: they recommend one rating system for all visual media. As most people know, movies have G, PG, PG13, R and X. And yet video games have an entirely different rating system. So the current

system is confusing, and each media outlet now has their own rating system, which is inconsistent and makes no sense.

Secondly, the industry should label products harmful if so deserved, such as cigarettes which are harmful and are labeled as being so.

Also, we need to keep M-rated, or mature, video games out of children's hands. As mentioned earlier, 77 percent of boys under age 17 have M-rated videos, and yet there are no penalties at the present time for vendors of these materials if they sell to an underage young person. If you did this in the alcohol industry, of course, you would be fined or penalized in some way.

Also, AO, or adult-only ratings, need to be used on explicit material, and they seldom are.

Independent raters should validate ratings, not industry representatives. The industry should not be rating itself.

And also, parents need to be educated about the rating system.

So, Mr. Speaker, Mr. BACA and I have introduced legislation attempting to bring these rating systems into compliance with normal standards, and we hope that Members of Congress would be willing to take a look at this legislation.

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 addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### IT'S TIME FOR A CHANGE IN OUR ECONOMY

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCHENRY). Without objection, the gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read a few excerpts from yesterday's Washington Times editorial entitled "New Job Numbers."

Now the Washington Times, everybody knows, is not exactly a progressive or liberal paper, very conservative.

And I quote: "For the third consecutive month, the Labor Department reported disappointing numbers for job growth. June payroll employment increased by only 121,000 jobs, well below the median projection of 200,000 jobs. And that is on top of May's payrolls increased by only 92,000 jobs, which follows a disappointing 112,000 in April. Altogether, job growth during the second quarter was a disappointing 325,000 jobs, the lowest quarterly increase since 2003."

"The net increase in payroll employment since August has averaged 160,000 jobs. This is to contrast throughout the

Clinton administration where employment increased on average 237,000 jobs per month.

"On average, 25,000 private sector jobs have been created each month since January 2001. That is 25,000. During the Clinton administration, private sector employment increased on average 217,000 jobs per month.

"And then, on top of that, average real weekly earnings of the 80 percent of the private sector workers who are employed in production or non-supervisory capacity, approximately 91 million Americans, have increased by less than 1 quarter of 1 percent since January 2001. Average real weekly earnings for these same workers have actually declined by 1 percent since August in 2003."

American people, according to the Washington Times, neither have the jobs nor have they got an increase in their salaries. And that is all the while where energy prices are up, 75 percent, under President Bush, health care costs, the premiums for families are up 78 percent, college costs are up on average 45 percent, and incomes and wages are down. That is what it takes to make and maintain a middle-class life, all the basics, filling up your gas, health care, college education, all skyrocketing.

For the first time since World War II, American savings rates are in negative territory, and this, according to the Bush administration, is the best of times. I would hate to think what the worst of times look like.

And the Washington Times noted how under the President, Americans aren't getting the jobs at the incomes that they are expecting, and the costs for them are going up.

Now, I don't want to look back; but having been part of the Clinton administration, I don't want to have to just be a booster, I would like to remind people we had a surplus 3 years in a row. We eliminated deficit. We started paying down the Nation's debt.

What has happened under this administration? In fact, the debt has increased by nearly \$3 trillion in 4 years, the largest increase in the Nation's debt in the shortest period of time in all of American history.

Second, under President Clinton, we created the Hope Scholarship. Lifetime Learning Tax Credit gave middle-class families a tax cut so they could send their kids to college.

What has the Republican Congress with this President done? They have actually had the largest cut in college assistance in American history: \$13 billion.

President Clinton thought of actually negotiating a climate change, which would have given us our first energy conservation plan. This administration walked away from it; signed an energy bill. In June of 2005, gas was \$2.05. Today it is over \$3. Tomorrow will be the anniversary where energy in America, a gallon of gas, has doubled since President Bush has been in the White House. Doubled.

And what has happened to American family wages? Declined by 1 percent. Cost of energy, doubled.

During President Clinton's time, we actually expanded health care for all children whose parents worked full-time. Ten million children got health insurance. What has this Congress and this Republican President done? They cut 6 million kids from health care coverage. I cannot think of a worse thing to do, and this is the son of a pediatrician talking. I cannot think of a worse thing to do but to cut children from health care, from the ability to visit a doctor or a nurse.

Health care under President Clinton went up for coverage. Health care under President Bush, premiums are up and uninsured are up. Energy costs are up, incomes are down. College costs are up, college coverage is down under the Republicans.

In addition to that, there were many attempts, and we added 20 years to savings on Social Security. And this administration actually for the first time we are at a negative savings rate.

So it is time for a new direction for a Congress and a President who will take this country in a new place.

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

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

#### KENTUCKY RIVER

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. Mr. Speaker, I would like to continue a little bit on what my colleague from Illinois was talking about. We are seeing an assault on middle-income families across this Nation.

Today I would like to join my fellow nurses across the Nation in standing up against another assault against our rights.

The Bush administration National Labor Relations Board's rulings in three cases, known as Kentucky River, could strip nurses and thousands of other workers of their right to belong to a union.

Two years ago, Congress stopped the Bush administration's efforts to classify nurses and other employees as supervisors in order to prevent them from receiving overtime pay. Those classified as supervisors do not have protected rights under Federal law to join or to form unions.

Mr. Speaker, I spent 30 years as a nurse; and I can't tell you how many times I was appointed supervisor for the evening. Under the classifications that are coming down today, so many of our nurses would be losing their overtime.

When we see our nurses, we are finally getting people to go into the health care fields, and now we are doing this to them, where they are not going to have the protections.

As American families face record gas prices, rising interest rates and higher cost of living, the Bush Administration once again is trying to make people work harder for less money and for less benefits.

In recent cases the National Labor Relations Board has taken away workers' protections, workers' rights including the rights of disabled workers, temporary employees, and graduate employees.

This summer could bring more such decisions from the Bush labor board. The "Kentucky River" decisions could strip hundreds of thousands of workers of their rights under Federal labor law. These decisions could potentially affect workers in a wide range of industries, including health care, building, construction, energy broadcasting, and port shipping. Those at risk of losing these Federal law protections are skilled and experienced workers who, as part of their jobs, give instructions to lesser skilled and experienced workers.

As I said, I had done that for many years. Nurses and others should not be penalized for helping those with less experience.

If workers lose their protections as employees under Federal law, they may be fired or otherwise disciplined for union activity. They will lose the freedom to choose to join or remain a member of a union, and they will lose their ability to have a voice on the job.

For example, for nurses, union membership provides a voice on the job and protections needed to be effective patient advocates. A nurse with a union works with confidence to make tough calls to be a strong patient advocate when patient decisions need to be made. Patients need a strong voice to stand up to those who put the bottom line before a patient's health care.

But these decisions will not affect just nurses. Others affected include foremen on construction jobs like my brother, Tommy, or those who work with a team of workers who could lose their union rights under a broad definition of "supervisor." Many a time I have seen people like my father, who became a supervisor to teach the younger workers on how to weld something. This is what teachers do. It does not matter what field you are in. The older you are, the more experienced you are, you want to take the younger workers under your wing.

Thousands of painters, welders, sheet metal workers, plumbers, electricians, and others could lose their right to be in a union. Workers deserve to be heard on this issue, which is why tens of thousands of union members have asked their Members of Congress to appeal to the labor board for an opportunity to provide oral arguments. Uninterested in hearing from working