

program where those dollars follow the child. But, unfortunately, you, Milwaukee, today, under our law today, cannot take Federal dollars and follow the child. Your Federal dollars have to go to the public school system. They have to go to the public schools, and it is not in relation to how many low-income kids there are in the schools—and there can be some low-income kids who do not get any dollars for education—but, rather, it is in relationship to some arbitrary formula settled back in 1976 that simply happens to be a formula based on political expediency today.

Why shouldn't we say to Milwaukee: We are not going to do that any longer, Milwaukee. You have made a decision as to how you think you can educate your children. We are going to let the Federal dollars follow the local and State dollars. Specifically, in Milwaukee, if you decide to do it, we are going to allow you to use these dollars with portability, so the parents can have options; the same with Arizona.

That is what we are proposing. It is really not radical at all. It is not a Federal initiative demanding we have a national program on "vouchers," a word that has been made a pejorative term. It is a program that suggests that local communities and States may decide that parents, who have their kids in failing schools, where those schools have failed year in and year out, can do something for their children that will create some competition in the educational market, something which is fundamental to the American society in producing quality. It is a program that suggests that those school districts which have made those decisions locally or statewide, through their elected leaders, will have the option, with our Federal dollars, to do the same.

That idea has retained huge resistance; the resistance isn't rational. The resistance is political. It is driven by a desire basically not to allow competition, not to allow creativity in our local school districts, but to drive the process of education from Washington, so that an elite few can decide for many how education is pursued nationally.

We are going to discuss this at greater length as we move down the road on the education bill. But I thought it would be appropriate at this time to at least lay down the foundation for the predicate of the debate because it is grossly misrepresented in the press, not because the press does not understand the issue but because the presenters to the press maybe want to misrepresent. I believe it is appropriate to maybe begin to make clear for the record what is being proposed.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, in his capacity as the Senator from Wyoming, asks unanimous consent the calling of the quorum call be rescinded.

Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now stand in recess until the hour of 2:15.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:30 p.m. recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. INHOFE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

TARGETING CHILDREN

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I want to draw the attention of this body to a report that was released just today by the Federal Trade Commission. It is a followup study to one that was done last year on the issue of the marketing of violent, adult-rated entertainment material to children. It was a groundbreaking Federal Trade Commission study last year that found that much of our adult material, adult-rated entertainment material—movies, video games, music—was adult rated by the companies themselves, entertainment companies, the conglomerates, and then target-marketed back to children, for example, in the Joe Camel advertisement. It was said this was an adult-rated product, cigarettes, but using an image to target-market that then back to children. It turns out the entertainment community—entertainment companies and movies and music and video games—was doing the exact same thing.

That report was released last fall, and it was very discouraging and disappointing that they would do this, particularly at a time when we have so much difficulty with violence in our society, violence among kids in our schools, killings among our teenagers.

There was a followup study released just today to that September FTC study. What came forward is that the movie industry is doing somewhat better about not target-marketing the adult-rated material to children, the video game industry is doing better than the movie industry in not target-marketing their adult-rated fare to children, and the music industry that is putting forward these hyperviolent, suicide, violence-towards-women lyrics has actually done nothing to change its marketing practice and continues to directly target-market adult-rated material. This is material the music companies themselves deem to be inappropriate for children. They put an adult sticker, parental advisory, on this material, and they turn around and con-

tinue, with millions of dollars in marketing campaigns, to target children.

They are saying: Yes, we got the study last fall. We saw that. Yes, we were target-marketing adult-rated, parental-advisory-stickered material to children last fall. Do you know what. We are going to keep doing it. And they have continued to do that, as shown in this study that was just released today.

I asked that industry to come forward and change its marketing practices: If you believe this material is inappropriate, to the point it needs a parental advisory label on it, don't spend millions of dollars to try to bypass parents and get the kids to buy them.

What the FTC study found is deeply disappointing. There have been some efforts made at progress, mostly, as I noted, in the video game industry, and more modest attempts in the movie industry. For those efforts I offer both praise and encouragement to step up the progress. But the report also found, as I stated, that the recording industry has made no effort to implement any reforms—either those mentioned in the report or the reforms that they, the recording industry themselves, told Congress they would do. This is even more disappointing.

Before we had the hearing last fall on the marketing of violent material to children, the recording industry stepped up and said: We are going to change. Here is a three-point, five-point, seven-point plan we are putting forward; we will implement these as an industry to change our marketing practices.

They volunteered. Now what they have done is they have said: We are not even going to do what we volunteered to Congress we would do—change our marketing practices.

I want to read just a few statements from this report because it is deeply disturbing:

The Commission's review indicates that the entertainment industry had made some progress in limiting advertising in certain teen media and providing rating information in advertising. The industry must make a greater effort, however, if it is to meet the suggestions for improvement included in the Commission's Report as well as its own promises for reform.

Specifically, the report found, "ads for R-rated movies still appeared on the television programs most popular with teens . . ."—even though they are supposed to be a restricted audience for the movie—"and the ratings reasons in ads were either small, fleeting or inconspicuously placed."

That was the good part of the study. The report reserved its harshest criticism for the music industry and stated:

The Commission found that the music recording industry, unlike the motion picture and electronic game industries, has not visibly responded to the Commission's report, nor has it implemented the reforms its trade association announced just before the Commission issued its report. The Commission's