Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMPLETING THE WORK OF THE SENATE

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I understand we are about to recess for the day. I want to discuss for just a moment, if I may, my observations about the week and the lack of any activity or communication with the Democratic caucus. I am told that the majority leader has indicated to his caucus members that there won't be a vote tomorrow and that the vote will be postponed on the Agriculture appropriations bill until Thursday.

I am surprised by that announcement, first, because I had not been forewarned or informed in any way that this would be the schedule for the week. I also am disappointed because I have indicated to a lot of people that they needed to ensure they would be here tomorrow at 11:30. They have all made plans accordingly. A lot of people have arranged their entire week around the fact that tomorrow at 11:30 there would be a vote. I am told that our Republican colleagues may simply go into a quorum call at some point and force the Senate into a vote on Thursday, which is, of course, their right. We will insist on a vote on adjournment tomorrow. There will be a vote tomorrow.

We think we ought to be here, working, resolving the outstanding differences. The longer we are gone, the less likely it is we will finish our work. It is that simple. How many days do we have to go with absolutely no business on the Senate floor? We could be taking up an array of issues. We could be taking up unfinished business that begs our consideration. Yet we sit day after day holding hands and wondering when, if ever, we will adjourn sine die. This isn't the way to run the Senate.

At the very least, there ought to be a minimum amount of communication between Republicans and Democrats with regard to the schedule. To read an announcement that there will be a vote postponement and not to give forewarning to all of our colleagues who are making travel plans is, again, just another departure from what I consider to be good will and common sense.

We will delay the vote at least until 4 o'clock tomorrow afternoon because of the Cole funeral. We understand there will be Members who need to travel to Virginia for that very important matter. We will delay the vote until at least after 4 o'clock. I want colleagues to know there will be a vote tomorrow and we will force that vote. We will continue to force votes to keep people here to do what they are supposed to do.

I have also just been in consultation with a number of our colleagues from the White House, and they have indicated they will begin insisting on much shorter continuing resolutions, 2 or 3 days at the maximum. I hope the President will veto anything longer than a 3-day CR. Why? Because it is ridiculous to be taking 7-day CRs, leaving 5 days for campaigning and 2 days for work—if that. We should be working 7 days with a 7-day CR. We should be finishing the Nation's business with the CR. To give every single candidate, whoever it is, the opportunity to campaign while leaving the people's business for whenever they can get around to it and delay it to another occasion when it is more convenient for them to come back is unacceptable, inexcusable, and will not be tolerated.

I put our colleagues on notice that in whatever limited way we can influence the schedule, we intend to do so. That will at least require perhaps a little more consultation but, at the very least, a little more forewarning to all colleagues with regard to the schedule and what it is we are supposed to be doing here.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DASCHLE. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. REID. I ask the Democratic leader if he has ever seen in his many years in the Congress, both the House and the Senate, the casual attitude, with so few appropriations bills having been passed? We have less than 3 weeks left until the elections of this cycle, and we are here doing nothing. Has the Senator ever experienced anything such as this?

Mr. DASCHLE. I have seen recesses that are more productive than what we have experienced since we started passing CRs. These recesses, as I like to call them—7 days of continuation of a resolution, and then 2 days, if that, of work, maybe 1 day of work—are mind boggling.

There ought to be some urgency here. We ought to express the same level of urgency that a continuing resolution implies. But I don't see any urgency. I see no sense of determination to try to finish our work. If we take a poll of where our colleagues are today, they are cast out over all 50 States, with very little appreciation of the need to finish our work, to come back and do what we are supposed to do.

(Mr. ROBERTS assumed the Chair.)

Mr. DASCHLE. I know the Presiding Officer is required to move on and is being replaced again by a very distinguished Presiding Officer from Kansas, our colleague, PAT ROBERTS, but I appreciate very much the question posed by the distinguished assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. REID. If I could ask the Senator one more question; that is, I don't know what will happen this weekend, but I can only speak for myself and a number of other Senators with whom I have had the opportunity to speak on the phone and in person today. We should be working this weekend. For us now to not have votes until late Wednesday or maybe even Thursday, and to take Friday, Saturday, Sunday, and maybe Monday off? I want the leader to know that there are a number of us on this side who feel the urgency is here; we should press forward and work through the weekend.

Mr. DASCHLE. Let me respond to the distinguished Senator from Nevada. First, I would like to see if we could work on Tuesday. I would like to see us work on Wednesday. But as he has noted, given the urgency of completing our work, Saturday and perhaps even Sunday would be a real departure from current practice. But just working on the weekdays of the week would be a startling revelation for some of our colleagues.

I think it is time we get the job done. It is time we recognize how important it is we finish our work. It is time we bring people back. Let's keep people here. Let's require they negotiate. Let's work and get our business done before we have to continue this charade that seems to be a common practice of being in session but doing no work.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD. I ask unanimous consent that further actions under the quorum call be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator is recognized.

MARKETING VIOLENCE TO CHILDREN

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, Americans are rightfully horrified and alarmed at the news reports and stories about so-called ''child soldiers'' pressed into service in paramilitary armies around the world. In Cambodia, the Sudan, Lebanon, and elsewhere, we gaze into the hard-eyed stares of barefoot ten-year-olds cradling well-worn rifles and machine guns. These children have known nothing but violence. It is hard to imagine how they will ever be able to move beyond such violence, should peace ever be established in their homelands. They do not know how to live under the rule of law, only under the rule of might makes right. They have a very casual attitude about killing other human beings.

We certainly would not want our own children to experience such a life, and we would not want such a generation of casual killers to grow up amongst us. Yet, in the midst of all of our affluence, we are rearing a generation that is appallingly casual about violence, a generation that is appallingly self-centered about getting—or taking—what they want. Too many of our children live lives heavily influenced by a completely unrealistic set of expectations and examples. In the movies, when something bad happens to someone, does he or she turn to the police for help and then retire to the background

while the police deal with the problem? No, of course not. Our hero grabs a gun and gives chase. Bullets fly, explosions and car crashes ensue, and the audience is treated to every gory detail. There is no fading to black anymore to let our imaginations fill in the details. No, our hero leaves a bloody trail of death and destruction in his wake and goes home with the girl—and none of those details are left to our imagination, either.

Now, instead of the aforementioned action-adventure, one could opt instead for some other movie genre but many are worse. Horror movies have taken violence against the innocent to new, ever-more-squeamish lows. The realistic and grisly visuals are, no doubt, a tribute to the talents of makeup and special-effects artists, but, nevertheless, I remain unconvinced that putting these nightmares on the silver screen does anything but tarnish the screen and the imaginations of the viewers. Some of the subject matter in these films is so misogynistic, so filled with contempt for societal order, and so filled with invective and hate, that it should set the alarm bells ringing in peaceable folks and incite them to demand greater responsibility from the entertainment industry.

I have always instinctively, intuitively felt that people who can look with equanimity on this kind of violence, even on screen or on the radio, might themselves be open to such action. In fact, this does seem to be the case in practice. We surround our children with these so-called ''role models,'' and then, for amusement—and I use that term lightly—we let our children play games in which they get to act out this lifestyle.

What are we doing? We send our children the message that real life is dull, and that this is what we do for fun. We allow them to watch so-called movie stars create mayhem without ever facing the consequences. Then we allow our children to listen to music that may also be filled with violent lyrics. Then we let our children amuse themselves by play-acting that they are the killers. We allow them to have hours, sometimes, of simulated target practice—and we pay for the privilege. Should we then be surprised when our children come to believe that violence against others is just one stop along the continuum of acceptable behavior?

Our children may go to school every day. They may have a roof over their heads at night. Perhaps they have nice clothes to wear. They may have parents who love them. They may have, in short, everything, but they have, in too many cases, developed the same hard-eyed stare that those Cambodian child soldiers have. They have developed the same casual attitude about violence and in far too many cases, they act out these violent impulses, with tragic results.

I have long shared the concerns of many parents and grandparents that young people are being exposed to far too much violence through the media—through the movies, through television, rock music—if you can call it music—and video games. The entertainment industry, however, has generally rebuffed criticism about the content of its programs and products, and about concerns that too much exposure to violence is harmful to our young people. The industry, in fact, has repeatedly claimed to be making efforts to reduce the exposure of young people to violence, including instituting a system of labeling program content so that parents are supposedly better able to evaluate the programs, and video games and what goes for music that their children watch and play.

Now it seems as though the entertainment industry has been caught with its hand in the cookie jar.

Just a few days ago, the Federal Trade Commission—the agency responsible for enforcing consumer protection laws—released a report finding that the entertainment industry aggressively markets violence-ridden materials directly to young people. This report details how companies, on the one hand, stamp ''mature audience'' ratings on their products that contain violent material, while on the other hand, these same companies peddle these ''mature''-rated products to young people.

Let me just read a passage of the FTC report: ''Two plans for games developed in 1998 described its target audience as 'Males 17–34 due to M rating. The true target is males 12–34.' '' In other words, not 17 to 34, but 12 to 34. There it is—in black and white! Video game marketers acknowledge that they are giving a quick wink to their own standards and then they state their true target. This is especially significant since only the electronic game industry has adopted a rule prohibiting its marketers from targeting advertising for games to children below the age designations indicated by their rating. So the FTC has knocked a huge hole in the industry's pious statements of concern by highlighting its hypocritical marketing practices.

You may recall to memory the story of Hansel and Gretel—a story that is not without its own share of violence. Just as Hansel and Gretel were enchanted by the evil witch's gingerbread house, our children are dazzled by the entertainment industry's lurid images. The industry beckons our children with advertising and once they are in the industry's clutches, the children are fattened up with more violent material. Of course, in the story of Hansel and Gretel, the children realize they are about to be cooked and eaten, and they trick the witch and shove her into the oven. Would we could do that with the entertainment industry. But I am not suggesting that we shove the entertainment industry into the oven—but perhaps we do need to turn up the heat!

The impact of media violence on our children is of great concern. Numerous studies conducted by the nation's top universities in the past three decades have come to the same conclusion: namely, there is at least some demonstrable link between watching violent acts in movies, television shows, or video games and acting aggressively in life.

As parents, policymakers, and citizens and legislators, we should all be worried about this. The amount of entertainment violence witnessed by American children is alarming.

Film makers, striving to turn profits in the competitive film industry, display more and more explicit violence, and programmers devise increasingly violent computer and video games that have children take on roles in which they are rewarded for the number of enemies they kill. Is it any wonder, then, that children become numb to the horrors they witness daily in their entertainment? Is it a surprise that these same children have a world view that incorporates violence as an acceptable means for settling conflict? Of course not.

If the industry is unwilling to address the concerns of parents by continuing to market inappropriate material to children, and then to broadcast that material at times when children are most likely to be watching, then I think it is incumbent upon Congress to act. We cannot be passive about this issue. We cannot say how awful it is—''How awful''—but then fail to take action. If the entertainment industry will not act responsibly, if the industry will not work with parents to craft commonsense approaches to curbing inappropriate programming, then it will fall to Congress to address the situation. Will it? Reducing the violence placed before America's children in the guise of entertainment is an important task. Images seen in childhood help to shape attitudes for a lifetime.

I know that I am not alone in recognizing the threat to our society created by producing our own generation of child soldiers, of young people indifferent to the suffering they cause by their violent acts. This FTC report merely provides evidence that, like the tobacco companies, the violent entertainment industry is targeting our children to build a nation, not of addicts, but of indifference to excessive violence. We cannot let this continue. But will we?

If the entertainment industry cannot abide by, and will not enforce, voluntary guidelines to regulate media violence, then it is time for the rest of us to insist that those guidelines be enforced.

That might be a good question for tonight's debate. I wonder if all the questions have already been determined. Why not some questions of this nature?

I realize that legislation to address this issue is unlikely to see action in the very few days remaining in this Congress. In fact, I would not like to rush such legislation and risk doing it poorly. Of course, it will not be done and cannot be done in the few days that remain. I would rather finish the

critical appropriations work that still remains. But I do hope that this report will not be lost in Olympic and election hoopla. I intend to revisit this issue next year, and I hope that other Members will join me in a sincere and bipartisan effort to find a way to protect our children and our society.

It is the same old story, Mr. President, the same old story. We talk about it. We wring our hands. We wail and gnash our teeth and moan and groan about the entertainment industry. But we welcome those contributions from the entertainment industry. They are great. They are great. But we are paying for it with the denigration of our children.

When will America awaken? When will the candidates be asked piercing questions about their stands on matters such as this? I would like to hear their answers. Tonight, in that townhall meeting, would be a good place for those, wouldn't it?

What are you going to do, Mr. Candidate, about the entertainment industry? How much money have you already accepted? Are you going to accept money from the entertainment industry? If you do, then how can you turn around and do something in the interests of our children? A good question.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GREGG). The distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

A CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS IN THE APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition to comment on the pending legislation, which will fund three major Departments in the United States: The Department of Labor, the Department of Health and Human Services, and the Department of Education.

I chair the subcommittee in the Senate Appropriations Committee which has the responsibility for this legislation. I am very concerned about what is happening to our constitutional process. I think it not an overstatement to say that we have a constitutional crisis in what is happening with the appropriations process in the relationship between the Congress and the President of the United States.

Since the Government was closed in late 1995 and early 1996, there has been created a very significant imbalance between the Congress and the President with what is realistically viewed as practically a dictatorial system of the President saying what is acceptable and the Congress being held hostage, in effect, concerned about being blamed for shutting down the Government. That is not the way the Constitution was written.

The Congress is supposed to present the bills to the President. If the President vetoes, then there are negotiations and discussions as to what will happen. But the status of events today is that the President calls the tune and the Congress simply complies.

There is also a significant deviation because, contrary to constitutional provision, the President and the President's men and women participate in the legislative process. The Constitution says that each House shall pass a bill; there will be a conference committee; they will agree; and each House will then vote on the conference report; and, if approved, the bill is submitted to the President.

The constitutional process does not call for the executive branch to participate in deciding what will be in the bills. But for many years now, representatives from the Office of Management and Budget, OMB, sit in on the conferences, are a party to the process, and seek to determine in advance what will be acceptable to the executive branch, contrary to the constitutional setup where Congress is supposed to pass the bills and submit them to the President.

We have had a very difficult time in the last 3 years with what has happened with the appropriations bill covering Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education. I spoke at some length about this problem on October 14, 1998, as we worked for the appropriations bill which turned out to be an omnibus bill. I was so concerned about the process that I voted against that bill. That was a tough vote to make since there were so many items on financing education which were very important and with which I agreed, and on financing Health and Human Services, again, which were important and with which I agreed, and on financing the Department of Labor, again, which were important and with which I agreed; but I felt so strongly that I voted against the bill and spoke at some length, as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will reflect on page S12536, on October 14th of 1998.

Then on November 9, 1999, I again expressed my concerns about what the appropriations process comprehended as set forth in some detail on S14340 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

This year, again, I am very concerned about where we are headed. The President submitted requests for these Departments for $106.2 billion. The Senate bill has provided the total amount which the President requested, but we have established some different priorities. That, under the Constitution, is the congressional prerogative. The Constitution calls for the Congress to control the purse strings and to establish the priorities. Of course, the President has to approve. But here again, the Constitution does not make the President the dominant player in this process; the Congress is supposed to traditionally control the purse strings.

Working collaboratively with my distinguished colleague from Iowa, Senator TOM HARKIN, we produced a bipartisan bill. I learned a long time ago that if you want to get something done in Washington, you have to be willing to cross party lines. Senator HARKIN and I have done that. When the Democrats controlled the Senate, he chaired and I was ranking member; and with Republican control, I have the privilege, honor, to chair, and he is the ranking member. We have taken a very strong stand on appropriations for the National Institutes of Health, which I believe are the crown jewel of the Federal Government, maybe the only jewel of the Federal Government. This year we have increased funding for NIH by $2.7 billion, which is $1.7 billion more than the President's priority. Last year we appropriated $2.3 billion on an increase which, with an across-the-board cut, was reduced to $2.2 billion. The year before, it was a billion, and the year before that, almost a billion. So that we have added some—it is $2.7 billion this year, 2.2 last year, 2.0 the year before, a billion the year before that, and almost a billion the year before that. So that we have added $8 billion. I think it adds up to $8 billion; when you deal with all these zeros, sometimes they are not too easy to add up in your head.

The Senate approved that, and the House approved that. We think with the enormous progress made on Alzheimer's and Parkinson's and cancer and heart disease, and so many others, that is where the priorities should be. We also put in $1 billion more on special education than the President had in his budget, a matter of some concern to many in the Senate. With the leadership of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, who is now presiding, we put extra funding there because we think that is where the priorities ought to be. Then the President made a request for $2.7 billion for school construction and new teachers. There is a lot of controversy in the Republican-controlled Senate about whether these are appropriate Federal functions, but we ended up, in a carefully crafted bill, giving the President his priorities, with an addendum that if the local school district decided they did not need the money for construction, that the local school districts could allocate it to local needs. And if the local school districts decided they did not need the money for teachers, they would give it to local needs.

The President has resisted this. This is a very fundamental difference in governmental philosophy, a Washington, DC, bureaucratic straitjacket versus local control—according to the President, the first call for his own programs on construction of schools and on more teachers.

We worked very hard this year and the Senate returned a bill which was passed on June 30, which tied a record going back to June 30, 1976, when the fiscal year 1977 appropriations bill was passed. Then we completed the conference with the House, where we had it all set on July 27, which I think may have established a new record. I am not sure about that. And we did not add the final signature to the conference report