



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 148

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2002

No. 12

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested.

S. 1206. An act to reauthorize the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 23, 2002, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member except the majority leader, the minority leader or the minority whip limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) for 5 minutes.

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS EXTENSION

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in the first 6 months of 2002, 2 million American workers are expected to exhaust their unemployment benefits. Even when we account for growth in the workforce, this means more workers are expected to exhaust their benefits in the next 3 months than in any first quarter since the early 1970s.

Of those exhausting benefits over the next 6 months, only 4 percent, 4 percent, are expected to receive extensions through State unemployment programs.

This extraordinary number of anticipated exhaustions is due to the huge number of job losses that occurred in the last 6 months of 2001. These job

losses were caused by a slowing economy, by unsound trade policies and by the devastating attacks of September 11. To make matters worse, many of the jobs lost in 2001 were good-paying, high-skilled manufacturing jobs that have probably been lost forever.

In my home State of Ohio and across the country, the steel industry has been devastated by a combination of foreign dumping and the current recession. According to the Department of Labor, the U.S. has lost 1.4 million manufacturing jobs since President Bush took office, 1.4 million manufacturing jobs. Total job losses from 2001 reduced our manufacturing base by 8 percent, 8 percent in 1 year, diminishing our industrial capacity to 1964 levels.

In each of the last five recessions, the Federal Government stepped in to provide additional benefits to those temporarily out of work. This recession, Mr. Speaker, should be no different.

Last week efforts to craft a bipartisan stimulus package failed in the Senate. The Senate did, however, approve a 13-week extension of unemployment benefits.

For the last 5 months, however, the Republican leadership in this House has repeatedly promised to help laid-off workers. They made that promise during the debate of the initial disaster relief bill; then they did nothing. They made that promise during the debate of the \$5 billion airline bailout bill; then they did nothing. They made that promise in the two economic stimulus bills passed by the House; again, Republican leadership did nothing.

The question is, were their promises to help laid-off workers, to help America's unemployed, were their promises contingent upon simply obtaining new and permanent tax breaks for America's wealthiest companies and wealthiest individuals? To prove this is not the case, I urge the Republican leadership to bring a simple, clean 13-

week unemployment benefit extension to the House floor as soon as possible. Our workers have waited long enough.

NBC LIQUOR AND ADVERTISEMENTS ON THE OLYMPICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON). Pursuant to the order of the House of January 23, 2002, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, as many know, NBC recently announced its decision to begin airing hard liquor advertisements. This decision abruptly terminates over 50 years of corporate responsibility and effective self-regulation.

Now more troubling is that NBC is not even abiding strictly to its own guidelines. For instance, NBC has promised that they will not extend their decision to advertising hard liquor on the Olympics. Well, as this recent article from USA Today says, and I will submit for the RECORD, they are skating on thin ice.

Mr. Speaker, NBC plans to allow the advertisement of products such as Bacardi Silver. Yes, the Olympics, perhaps one of the most youth-oriented sporting events ever, will have promotions for Bacardi Silver and other alcohol advertisements.

Technically, Bacardi Silver is not a distilled spirit since its alcohol content is approximately that of beer; however, we all know the reality of such an advertising tactic. Bacardi is a name people associate with hard liquor, period. Simply put, this appears to be a subterfuge to actually market hard liquor. NBC is allowing direct marketing to youth of a well-known brand of hard liquor by piggybacking onto another product.

This is outrageous. For all the protestations by NBC about their responsible policy of alcohol advertising, it is

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H233

a sham. Young people, 13-, 14-, 15-year-olds, will be watching the Olympics and see the ads for products such as Bacardi Silver. Does anyone responsible think there will not be any association?

We are just now making progress with regard to dealing with drunk driving by young people.

The Center on Alcohol Advertising conducted a pilot study that demonstrates beer commercials and attendant brands were recognizable by children as young as 9 to 11. That is the exact type of advertisements we are talking about for the Olympics.

What will the consequences of this policy be? In short, more young people drinking will result in increases in drunk driving, teen deaths and alcoholism. Alcohol is a factor in the four leading causes of death among persons age 10 through 24: motor vehicle crashes, unintentional injuries, homicide and suicide. Alcohol-related car crashes are the leading cause of death among teenagers 15 to 24. Young people who begin drinking before age 15 are four times more likely to develop alcohol dependence than those who begin drinking at age 21.

NBC is being irresponsible. NBC will cause the hurt and pain and suffering in the families of many, many people in this United States. The public has spoken out on this issue, and NBC does not care. The National Center for Science in the Public Interest conducted a poll that shows 73 percent of the public believes hard liquor advertising will increase youth drinking. NBC does not care.

We are submitting a letter from 25 groups asking NBC to go back to the policy that it had for 52 years. I also want to close with an article from the Washington Post that illustrates the real consequences of drunk driving better than any set of statistics. Just this weekend in my congressional district in Sterling, Virginia, a drunk driver killed a boy and his grandfather. Mr. Speaker, imagine receiving that call from the State police if you were the boy's mother. NBC's hard liquor advertising will lead to more drunk driving and more of those phone calls.

I urge Members to speak out on this issue and let NBC know that it ought to do what the American people think appropriate. It ought to go back to its voluntary guidelines that it had for 50 years and do not advertise hard liquor to young people of the country and bring about pain and suffering for families.

The material previously referred to is as follows:

[From USA Today, Feb. 5, 2002]

MARKETING BY SPIRITS MAKERS GETS ICY RECEPTION

(By Michael McCarthy and Theresa Howard)

Figure skating won't be the only closely watched competition at the Salt Lake Games. Major marketing pushes by some big beer and spirits makers also may be dancing on thin ice.

Anheuser-Busch will use the Olympics to roll out a \$60 million campaign to launch its

Bacardi Silver. And Seagram's rum brand, Captain Morgan, will take to the slopes to tout its sponsorship of the U.S. Ski Team.

Just weeks after Olympics broadcaster NBC eased restrictions on spirits advertising, the debate over alcoholic beverage marketing during the Games is heating up.

"The Olympics are a youth-oriented event," says Kimberly Miller of the Center for Science in the Public Interest. "For the Olympic committee to make the connection between drinking and sports is irresponsible."

But executives from both A-B and Captain Morgan defend their right to be at the Salt Lake Games.

"It's a wonderful opportunity for us," says Bob Lachky, vice president of brand management at Anheuser-Busch. "We'll have a national and international audience."

A-B will air more than 130 commercials for its Budweiser, Bud Light, Michelob and Bacardi Silver brands. A-B is the exclusive malt-beverage sponsor and advertiser of the 2002 Games and has a seven-year deal with the U.S. Olympic Committee to serve as official beer sponsor of the U.S. Olympic Team.

The new Bacardi spots from Momentum in St. Louis are music-driven and heavily feature the sleek new silver bottle. The theme: "Your night just got more interesting."

But A-B will air most of the Bacardi Silver commercials during the evening to avoid targeting younger consumers. Still, A-B has paid millions for its Olympics sponsorships, and Lachky says the company won't avoid big events to mollify critics.

"There's always going to be critics of our industry. But we will do things in a respectful fashion. We're not worried about it," He says.

Captain Morgan is a team sponsor—not a sponsor of the Games themselves. So it's walking an even finer line than Anheuser-Busch, critics say.

"It's a dangerous marketing tactic," says Bob Prazmark, president of Olympic sales and marketing for sports marketing group IMG. "What they are doing is trying to share in some of the glory."

Captain Morgan officials insist they're doing no such thing. Team athletes Evan Dybvig and Shannon Bahrke are restricted from competing or making Olympics appearances while sporting any Captain Morgan-branded gear or apparel.

"We can do things tastefully and stay in the guidelines," says Captain Morgan's Scott Geisler. "Do we stand a risk of raising a little controversy? Perhaps."

**COALITION FOR THE
PREVENTION OF ALCOHOL PROBLEMS,
Washington, DC, February 6, 2002.**

Mr. ROBERT C. WRIGHT,
Vice Chairman and Executive Officer, General Electric, Chairman and CEO, NBC, New York, NY.

DEAR MR. WRIGHT: As leaders of organizations concerned with public health and the well being of young people and families, we are dismayed by your decision to begin airing hard liquor ads on NBC, ending five decades of responsible voluntary refusal of such ads.

We strongly urge you to reconsider NBC's policy and we respectfully request a meeting with you to discuss our concerns, including a number of gross deficiencies in NBC's guidelines governing the airing of liquor ads.

Too many influences already promote excessive and underage drinking and hard-liquor ads on NBC can only make that problem worse. Alcohol is by far America's number-one youth drug problem. It kills six times more kids than all illicit drugs combined and underage drinking costs our country an estimated \$52 billion per year. According to the latest government data, nearly one-third of

all 12- to 20-year olds report using alcohol within the past month. Of those youth, nearly 20 percent binge drink.

We are hardly alone in our concern. NBC's decision to begin accepting hard liquor ads flies squarely in the face of public opinion. A survey conducted by Penn, Schoen & Berland Associates, Inc., in mid-December, 2001 found that 68 percent of respondents opposed NBC's action with half (48 percent) registering strong opposition to it. More than 7 of 10 (72 percent) surveyed supported network television policies that voluntarily keep liquor ads off TV, and 70 percent of Americans agreed that it is dangerous to have liquor ads on TV because they will introduce underage youth to liquor. Subsequently public opinion surveys by TV Guide and by Initiative Media North America similarly found that large majorities of Americans oppose NBC's acceptance of liquor ads.

We would like to meet with you at your earliest convenience, preferably in Washington, DC, in the hope of reaching a satisfactory resolution of this issue. We believe that NBC can truly show leadership in protecting young people and serving the public interest. We will follow up with your office in the near future to inquire about arranging a meeting. To reach us, please contact Mr. George Hacker, at (202) 332-9110, x343.

Thank you for your consideration. We hope to hear from you soon.

Sincerely,

GEORGE A. HACKER,
*Director,
Alcohol Policies Project.*

On behalf of the following: Lori Dorfman, Ph.D., Director, Berkeley Media Studies Group; Arthur T. Dean, Chairman, and CEO, Community Anti-Drug Coalitions of America; Joan Kiley, Executive Director, Community Recovery Services; Art Jaeger, Associate Director, Consumer Federation of America; Connie Mackey, Vice President of Government Affairs, Family Research Council; Tom Minnery, Vice President of Public Policy, Focus on the Family; Jim Winkler, General Secretary, General Board of church and Society of the United Methodist Church; David Rosenblum, Executive Director, Join Together; Patricia Harmon, Executive Director, Ohio Parents for Drug Free Youth; Judy Cushing, President and CEO, Oregon Partnership; Rev. Jesse W. Brown, Jr., Executive Director, National Association of African Americans for Positive Imagery.

Bill Burnett, President, National Association of Alcohol and Drug Abuse Counselors; Julie Novak, DNSc, RN, CPNP, President, National Association of Pediatric Nurse Practitioners; Rev. Richard Cizik, Vice-President for Governmental Affairs, National Association of Evangelicals; Vincent Hayden, Chairman, National Black Alcoholism and Addictions Council; Stacia Murphy, President, National Council on Alcoholism and Drug Dependence; Sue Rusche, Executive Director, National Families in Action; Peggy Sapp, President, National Family Partnership; David A. Walsh, Ph.D., President, National Institute on Media and the Family; Jeanette Noltenius, Executive Director, National Latino Council on alcohol and Tobacco Prevention; Shirley Igo, President, National Parent Teachers Association.

John Hutcheson, Executive Director, People Advancing Christian Education; William J. Murray, chairman, Religious Freedom Coalition; Richard D. Land, President, Southern Baptist Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission; Andrew McGuire, Executive Director, Trauma Foundation; William T. Devlin, President, Urban Family; The Most Reverend and Joseph A. Galante, Chairman, Committee on Communications, United States Conference of Catholic Bishops; and Maureen Sedonaen, Executive Director, Youth Leadership Institute.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 10, 2002]
CRASH KILLS TWO IN STERLING

Two people were killed after a two-car crash involving a drunk driver last night in Sterling, Virginia State Police said.

The crash happened on Route 28 near Route 625 about 8:30 p.m., police said. The victims were believed to be a man in his sixties and a boy.

One of the drivers was also injured in the crash and was flown to an area hospital, police said.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 23, 2002, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, not surprisingly in this political city the debate over campaign finance reform has taken the shape of people talking about which party would be advantaged, but there is a more profound issue, more profound even than the kind of subtle corruption that campaign money takes. It goes to the nature of democracy.

We have two systems in this country. We have an economic system, capitalism, which is based on inequality. It is inequality which drives that system which has been so productive of wealth and which is so broadly supported. If people are not unequally rewarded for their labor, if people are not unequally rewarded for the wisdom of their investment decisions, if people are not unequally rewarded because they respond to consumer demand, capitalism does not work. So inequality, some of us want to keep it from getting excessive, but it is at the heart of that system.

We also have a political system, and the heart of that political system is equality. That was the genius of the American Constitution, not fully realized at the time, a goal that we have been striving towards with some success ever since. What we have in our public policy is a tension between an economic system built on inequality where people are unequally rewarded and unequally powerful and a political system in which people are supposed to be equal, in which people's preferences are supposed to count each equally one for one.

What we have in America today is a corruption of that system in the broadest sense. As money has become more and more influential in politics, the inequality of the economic system has damaged the ability of the political system to function in a way that carries out equality. We cannot allow the inequality that is a necessary element of our capitalism to swamp the equality that is supposed to be the element of our political system.

That is why the Shays-Meehan bill is so important. It reduces the role of money. Soft money is a way that the unequal part of our system gains undue influence over the place where it is

supposed to be equal, and that, Mr. Speaker, is the profound philosophical reason why campaign finance reform ought to reduce the role of money, ought to reduce the extent to which inequality undermines formal equality.

Interestingly, some of those opposed to the bill have implicitly acknowledged this. I have heard people say, on the Republican side mostly, we cannot go ahead with that kind of a forum; if we get rid of soft money, the next thing we know, labor and environmentalists and all those people will dominate the election. We have, in fact, had people almost explicitly say that the danger in campaign finance reform is that the people will have too much to say.

Well, that is the way it is supposed to be in the political part of the system. The financial, the economic system has inequality, but in the political system people are supposed to have equality. That is also the answer to those who say that somehow this violates freedom of expression in the first amendment.

I should note, Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat interested to see Members that I have served with for a very long time who for the first time in their careers have become champions of free speech. That is, there are Members who have supported virtually every restriction on free speech, including censorship on the Internet and other rules that the Supreme Court has thrown out, and they have voted for them cheerfully, but when it comes to the power of money to swamp the equal part of our political system, suddenly they become advocates of free speech. Indeed, it seems that many of them are for free speech as long as it is not free. They are for free speech when it costs money, when they can buy it.

In fact, if we look at the purpose of our Constitution and our political system, if we look at the role that equality is supposed to play, we understand, because we do not just interpret the Constitution in the abstract, we interpret it in its context, our political system is meant to be one in which people are equal, and what we are doing with campaign finance reform is restricting the ability of money to swamp that equal sector.

It does not impinge on free speech as we have ever understood it. Everyone in this country will be as free as they ever want to say what they want to say, to speak out. We do say that they cannot use money, they cannot use the inequality that has accrued to them through the capital system to undermine the electoral system.

So, for that reason, precisely because the very heart of the democratic political system is at stake, I hope that we will pass the campaign finance reform bill in an appropriate form, in a form that can go right to the President's desk, because it is essential that we vindicate the equality principle against those who are the beneficiaries of inequality who are seeking to erode it.

TRIBUTE TO ABRAHAM LINCOLN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 23, 2002, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, it is February 12, 2002, and on this calendar date 193 years ago today, just scarcely two lifetimes ago, came into the world the 16th President of the United States of America, the father of the Republican Party, the leader who ended slavery and at the same time saved the Union.

□ 1245

I speak, of course, of President Abraham Lincoln, born humbly in Kentucky, raised proudly in Indiana, who then moved and pursued a public and adult career in Illinois.

The Bible tells us, "If you owe debts, pay debts. If honor, then honor. If respect, then respect. I thought today, in the midst of all our debates about other pressing national issues, as now having the privilege of being able to call Abraham Lincoln, the Congressman Abraham Lincoln from 1848, a colleague, that it would be all together fitting to rise today and remember the occasion of his birth, and to do so, Mr. Speaker, with his own words.

Abraham Lincoln spoke of many issues, but of course freedom and the abolition of the evil of human slavery were chief among them.

April 1859: "Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves; and, under a just God, cannot long retain it."

August 1858: "As I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master. This expresses my idea of democracy."

July 1858: "I leave you, hoping that the lamp of liberty will burn in your bosoms until there shall no longer be a doubt that all men are created equal."

And in June of 1858: "A house divided against itself cannot stand. I believe this government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free. I do not expect the union to be dissolved, I do not expect the House to fall, but I do expect it to cease to be divided. It will become all one thing or all the other."

Abraham Lincoln was also a man of very profound faith, which inspires many millions to this day, writing: "I have been driven many times upon my knees by the overwhelming conviction that I had nowhere else to go. My own wisdom and that of all about me seemed insufficient for the day."

In September of 1864, he wrote: "In regard to this Great Book, I have but to say, it is the best gift God has given to man. All the good the Savior gave to the world was communicated through this book." And in the creation of the very first proclamation of Thanksgiving and a national day of prayer in October of 1863, the President wrote: "I do therefore invite my fellow citizens in every part of the United States, and also those who are at sea and those who are sojourning in foreign lands, to set apart and observe this last day of