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