

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR,
HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES,
AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED
AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS
ACT, 2006

SPEECH OF

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 24, 2005

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3010) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes.

Ms. McCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express the overwhelming support that hundreds of my constituents have demonstrated for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. I share their concern about the partisan attacks to eliminate funding and undermine the Corporation's commitment to providing objective and educational programming.

As a member of the Congressional Public Broadcasting Caucus, I have learned how critical Federal funding is for CPB in order to ensure the continued availability of educational, innovative, objective, and locally-relevant programming provided by public radio and television stations across the country. This Republican appropriations bill proposes to strip 51 percent of CPB's total Federal funding—a cut so drastic it will negatively impact every public television and radio station's ability to provide the free and unbiased programs that millions of Americans count on every day. Currently, Federal funding for CPB totals just \$1.50 per American per year. In addition, this Federal funding successfully leverages more than five additional dollars from private sources. For these reasons, I am pleased to support Mr. OBEY's amendment to restore \$100 million to CPB.

Public broadcasting is an essential source of information for millions of Americans. America's educators depend on public broadcasting—it's their top choice for classroom video, and a leading source of online lesson plans. Nationwide surveys find that public broadcasting is the single most trusted national institution. And, public broadcasting is exceptional because it's local. Unlike the large media conglomerates that dominate commercial TV, the 348 PBS stations across the country are locally owned and operated—accountable to the local communities they serve.

In my home State of Minnesota, we are proud of the high quality public broadcasting our State has known for years. Minnesota Public Radio and Twin Cities Public Television are treasures that provide balanced news, insightful information, and exceptional entertainment over the public airwaves. They deserve our support and the support of the Federal Government. Nearly 900 constituents have e-mailed, phoned, and written to my office regarding their support for public broadcasting.

It is with a commitment to ensuring that my constituents continue to have access to high quality, unbiased information, as well as thoughtful and educational programming, that I rise today in support of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JULIA CARSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 2005

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, due to a long-standing appointment in my Congressional District, I was unavoidably absent for the legislative day of Monday, June 27th, 2005.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall vote 322 and "yea" on rollcall vote 323.

HONORING FOREST HILL FIRE-
RESCUE

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 2005

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Fire-Rescue station of Forest Hill, Texas. The Forest Hill department will soon be unveiling state-of-the-art equipment to help assist in widespread disaster.

The equipment to be unveiled was purchased with the funds issued by Texas State Homeland Security Grant and the Federal Assistance to Firefighters Grant of \$523,000 and \$37,600 respectively. On the morning of July 12th, Forest Hill Fire-Rescue will unveil the newest purchases in "specialized equipment" that will help serve during times of natural or man-made disasters. In addition to using the grant money in such sensible and viable means, the Forest Hill Rescue Department employed their newly acquired resources as means to establishing the much acclaimed Southern Emergency Response and Preparedness Association, SERPA. SERPA was designed to develop relationships with other local departments and to create standard operating guidelines in the case of widespread emergencies.

Mr. Speaker, as their Congressman, I want to congratulate Fire Chief Pat Ekiss and his department for allocating the grant funds in a useful manner and to thank them for their dedication in assisting and saving others. It is with the service and dedication of department's such as the Forest Hill Fire and Rescue that ensure the continuing protection and prominence of our communities and nation.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR,
HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES,
AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED
AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS
ACT, 2006

SPEECH OF

HON. AL GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 24, 2005

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3010) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes:

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, nearly 70 years ago, Franklin Delano Roosevelt stated in his second inaugural address that "the test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little." The FY06 Labor, Health and Human Services Appropriation bill has failed that test.

Although I commend Chairman REGULA and Mr. OBEY, our ranking member, for their tireless efforts to provide deserving citizens with necessary programs, this bill is a product of having too little to fund valuable initiatives. The tax cuts enjoyed by the wealthiest 1 percent of our population have left this Congress unable to continue funding essential programs that directly impact the least, the last, and the lost. The cuts in education, energy assistance, and healthcare services are signs of what I believe are an unraveling of our economic tapestry.

Our youngest and most vulnerable citizens will be disproportionately affected by Federal fiscal budget constraints in this Labor, Health and Human Services bill. Even at birth, this bill is putting some at a disadvantage. The Maternal and Child Health Block grant program has been cut even though scientific evidence proves the importance of prenatal care. Despite the fact that we recognize the need to provide access to care for young people whose families are unable to provide other sources of treatment, this valuable program has suffered a \$24 million cut.

Beyond health care, our most vulnerable citizens will continue to bear the brunt of enormous tax cuts in education. Title I funding, aimed at helping low-income children in failing schools improve their reading and math skills, will be \$9.9 billion below the No Child Left Behind funding promise. And to make matters worse, the same children who will be unable to benefit from enrichment programs due to a lack of funds will go home in the winter months to cold and uncomfortable temperatures because the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program has been cut by almost \$200 million.

It is time to take a step back to re-evaluate the path we have chosen for the people of this Nation. I will continue to work tirelessly with my colleagues, community partners, and concerned citizens to ensure that all people are able to receive excellent care at an affordable rate—because one must not place a price tag on the health and well-being of our nation's most vulnerable citizens, our children. I would like to leave you all with some other valuable words that Mr. Roosevelt imparted to us: "It is common sense to take a method and try it. If it fails, admit it frankly and try another. But above all try something." I urge all of my colleagues to try another method.

GAMBLING

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 2005

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, gambling is no longer just limited to the casinos in Las Vegas and Atlantic City. There are now more than 400 tribal casinos in 30 States, online gambling is booming and ESPN and other cable

networks bring high-stakes poker tournaments into our living rooms on a regular basis.

I am deeply concerned about the impact this is having on our society. Gambling destroys families and preys on the poor. More and more youth are also being seduced by gambling. According to a recent PBS NewsHour report, recent studies indicate that more than 70 percent of youth between the ages of 10 and 17 gambled in the past year, up from 45 percent in 1988.

The promotion of gambling is not a proper role of government. I share the concerns of National Coalition Against Gambling Expansion, NCAGE, that as a school of government, Harvard ought to use more discretion in allowing of its credentials to support gambling, which corrupts and addicts government at all levels. As you may know, Harvard Medical School Division of Addictions, Institute for Research on Pathological Gambling and Related Disorders, sits on the board of the National Center for Responsible Gaming, part of the American Gaming Association. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share a recent letter from the NCAGE to the Harvard University leadership outlining the coalition's concerns about what many might regard as an inappropriate relationship between the university and the gambling industry.

THE NATIONAL COALITION
AGAINST GAMBLING EXPANSION,
Washington, DC, June 23, 2005.

President LAWRENCE H. SUMMERS,
Harvard University,
Cambridge, MA.

HARVARD ALUMNI ASSOCIATION,
University Place,
Cambridge, MA.

HARVARD MEDICAL SCHOOL, DIVISION ON ADDICTIONS,
The Landmark Center,
Boston, MA.

DEAR SIRs AND MADAMs: It is with considerable disappointment that, after much study and thought, we come to the point where we must challenge the integrity of your work and the great name of Harvard.

We have listened and tried hard over the last few years to understand the logic and scientific protocols cited in the protestations of your scholars as they defend their "neutrality" on the subject of gambling. Frankly, we have never believed that Harvard should be "neutral" on issues that threaten public health. More importantly, we have come to the earnestly considered opinion that even this professed "neutrality" has been widely breached and replaced by academic activism for and in behalf of gambling interests.

In support of our charge, we cite the attitudes and activities of the Business School, Addictions Department and School of Government.

The Harvard Business Review lauds and publishes the success of business school faculty expatriate Gary Loveman who has guided Harrah's to its position as the Nation's largest casino business—by utilizing loyalty-marketing techniques to promote an addictive substance. It is as if the philosophy and ethics departments have been buried at the far end of the campus from the School of Business. Is there no duty to customers ever mentioned in the MBA programs of this generation at Harvard? Are our future CEOs being taught that the highest "loyalty" to the market is to sacrifice humanity on the altar of corporate expansion?

If not, then why does Harvard continue to celebrate such behavior?

If the business classes have no feeling for humanity, one would think a division of the

medical school might. Not so. The head of the Harvard Medical School Division of Addictions, Institute for Research on Pathological Gambling and Related Disorders, now sits on the Board of Directors of the American Gaming Association's "responsible gaming" team. This AGA front organization, titled the National Center for Responsible Gaming, has been so pleased with Harvard's industry apologetics that it now exclusively funds "research" through the Harvard facility. The AGA repeatedly proffers the assumption that only "peer reviewed" materials filtered through this new association can be considered "valid." The veracity of that notion is irrelevant. The relevance is that the AGA is counting on Harvard to deliver its good name.

Their reliance is sadly valid.

We see the Harvard journal espousing its own self-aggrandized superiority as it smugly chides other scholars, pontificating, "The Wild West had its snake oil salesmen and the field of gambling studies is no different. . . Unfortunately, some contemporary authorities fail to adequately understand the principles of scientific inquiry and sustain conventional myths and unfounded casual relationships. . . Unpublished evidence that has not been subject to peer review has been presented as definitive. Preliminary evidence has been summarized in public testimony or press releases without necessary documentation, including methodological details that must be available for scrutiny. In each instance, this public behavior violates professional standards of conduct and tarnished the work of legitimate scientists.

The assumed antidote, of course, is to publish only through Harvard's brand of "peer review." The AGA uses that language to bolster its own propaganda. "Over the last five years, a small group of anti-gaming university professors have created, out of whole cloth, a series of economic models which purport to show that any economic benefits from gaming will be exceeded by the social costs caused by the industry. These professors, whose theories cannot stand the test of academic peer review, have created a circle of disinformation wherein they continually cite each other as sources to validate their erroneous theories. Three of the professors are from the University of Illinois and have testified before the National Gambling Impact Study Commission (NGISC) in Chicago. They are: Earl Grinols, Richard Gaze (now with the Federal Reserve Bank but formerly was Grinols's assistant) and John Kindt.

Curiously, it is Harvard's scholars who have been promulgating the self-citing circle of obfuscation. Despite editorial insistence on notational integrity and peer review, Shaffer and Korn, writing for Shaffer and Korn and repeatedly citing Shaffer, Korn and others in the Harvard sanctum, come to completely undocumented hypothesis that "Until Korn and Shaffer formally introduced the idea of healthy gambling, health care, addictions and public health officials professionals had not considered the possibility of positive health benefits."

Their paper, "Gambling and Public Health," draws lines between dissociated dots arriving at the hypothesis that gambling is healthy for individuals and communities.

"Like going to a movie, sitting in a pub, or participating in physical activity, going to a casino or horse race may provide a healthy change and respite from everyday demands or social isolation. This may be particularly important for older adults . . . (not annotated—but then where would one find a footnote to show feeding a slot machine is equal to physical activity).

"Gambling is a form of adult play. While importance of play has been recognized for

the healthy development of children (annotated), play also is important for adults (annotated). For example, whereas children play card, board and video games, adults play blackjack, bingo and video slot machines. In addition to providing fun and excitement, some forms of gambling can enhance coping strategies by building skills and competencies such as memory enhancement, problem solving through game tactics, mathematical proficiency, concentration and hand-to-eye physical coordination. (Note how annotated concepts of play being good for children and adults proceed to the unannotated suggestion that gambling must be good as well. Good for adults, good for children? (Shaffer, et al, eschew logic in favor of empiricism as a basis for scientific inquiry. Given their command of logic, this is self-explanatory. (Play is good. Gambling can be called play. Gambling is good.—Communists wear red. Santa wears red. Santa is a Communist)).

This tome further suggests, "Health benefits can accrue to communities through gambling-related economic development . . ." and suggests without annotation that gambling created jobs and economic development accrue to the benefit of collective mental health.) (Jobs and money make people happy, so gambling makes people happy. Sadly, no footnotes elucidate the chasms between these dots either.)

Since co-morbidity is a generally accepted feature of addiction, this paper even suggests gambling addiction may "catch" people from progressing to a more serious addiction, like heroin. (Gambling addiction may preclude a worse addiction and is therefore a "benefit."

Within a handful of lines, this same paper sneers, ". . . An unsupported but commonly cited estimate for the annual cost to society of each pathological gambler is \$13,200." Like numbers have been meticulously recalculated and duplicated, but because they weren't published in the proper Harvard-edited journal, apparently they are "unsupported." Because they did not emanate through halls funded by the American Gaming Association, they have not been appropriately "peer reviewed."

In this context, "Peer reviewed" has come to mean "gambling lackeys vouching for gambling apologists."

If the addictions group's advocacy of, or at least affinity for, the gambling industry is transparent, then the gambling industry association with Harvard's Kennedy School of Government is vivid.

Our attached comments speak plainly to deliberate and blatant examples of that school's use of Harvard credentials to support gambling, specifically through Indian tribes. It is shameful for an institution upholding itself a "school of government" to endorse a phenomenon which corrupts and addicts government at all levels. To my knowledge, no heroic figure or revered writer on the subject of American democracy has ever suggested that the promulgation of gambling is a proper role of government.

We believe the good name of "Harvard" has been co-opted by the gambling industry. It is apparent to any serious observer that "Harvard" is the brand of choice for those seeking to buy credibility for a product that ruins lives.

If this was a car, or a drug that damaged, ruined or ended the lives of one of each 100 Americans, we suggest you would not be "neutral," and certainly you would not be advocates.

Because your performance is tainted and your reputation threatened, we respectfully ask your institution to stand down from this debate, and let it be carried forward by unsullied hands.

We ask for your support for a regeneration of the activities of the National Gambling

Impact Study Commission to assess the costs and benefits of legalized gambling in America from a less biased platform.

Sincerely,

DR. GUY C. CLARK,
Chairman.

Attached: Our bulletin article.

“HARVARD”—THE BEST NAME MONEY CAN BUY

Harvard, the venerable institution founded in 1636, is among America's most recognizable academic “Brands”. Its public reputation is among the highest of America's institutions.

Through association, the phrase “Harvard says,” becomes powerful validation, even when followed by statements Harvard didn't really make, or, perhaps, was paid to say. Thus it follows that when one of America's least reputable institutions—gambling—went shopping for a spokesman, they determined “Harvard” was the best name money could buy.

The American Gaming Association (AGA) opened shop in Washington, D.C. in 1995 to promote, in their own words, “better understanding of the gaming entertainment industry by bringing facts about the industry to the general public, elected officials, other decision makers and the media through education and advocacy.”

The AGA became the propaganda machine for the commercial casino companies that funded it. The casinos faced tough questions from politicians and anti-gambling groups as gambling proliferated across the nation in the early 1990s.

Those questions intensified in 1996, when Congress funded the National Gambling Impact Study Commission (NGISC). Despite gambling's expensive attempts to stack the commission and its success in stripping it of subpoena power, the commission's final report in 1999 posted strong warnings about gambling expansion. It called for a “pause” in the expansion of gambling until more information on addiction, bankruptcy, crime, job cannibalization and other topics could be studied.

But gambling proponents were already staging their response. The same year the NGISC started its research, casinos founded their own “gambling research” organization, the National Center for Responsible Gambling (NCRG). Boyd Gaming Corporation provided the start-up funds for the NCRG and made a 10-year pledge of \$875,000. Other leading gaming companies, including Harrah's Entertainment, Inc., International Game Technology, Mandalay Resort Group, MGM Mirage and Park Place Entertainment Corporation were “early and generous supporters,” according to NCRG's own web site.

The site notes, “Today, with the contributions of the casino gaming industry, equipment manufacturers, vendors, related organizations and individuals, more than \$13 million has been committed to the NCRG, an unprecedented level of funding for gambling research. This financial support has enabled the NCRG to attract the best minds from the most prestigious institutions to conduct research in this uncharted field.” (Emphasis added.)

They boast the group is run by scholars and health care professionals, but it is chaired by professional lobbyist and former Congressman Dennis E. Eckart, with William Boyd, chairman of Boyd Gaming, serving as president, and the AGA's senior vice president and executive director, Judy Patterson as secretary-treasurer. Only five of the 21 remaining directors represent health care or academic organizations. The rest are all gambling executives or lobbyists.

Among the five is Howard J. Shaffer, Ph.D. Director, Division on Addictions, Harvard

Medical School, which is funded by the gambling industry through NCRG.

Gambling interests funded the NCRG with, according to their own accounts, \$13 million. Of that they have contributed \$6 million to “research,” with that funding now going exclusively to the Harvard Project.

Harvard insists the NCRG board exercises no control over its research, but at least two noted treatment experts left the NCRG board because of their concerns about just such problems. Both indicated the NCRG would not likely allow researchers to tackle the big issues of proximity, high-speed addiction of machines and other factors that could be damaging to the industry.

Clinical psychiatrist Dr. Henry Lesieur from the Rhode Island Hospital's gambling treatment program and UCLA's Dr. Richard Rosenthal resigned from the NCRG board three years ago after concluding that the gambling industry wielded too much influence over the research.

Still, Harvard's addiction department continues to disburse grants to other research applications. With Shaffer as editor and other Harvard staff on the editorial board, *The Journal of Gambling Studies*, served as a prestigious gathering point and filter for research. Harvard editors in turn spent considerable ink “debunking” other contributed research. As an adjunct to its publishing efforts, Harvard distributed the WAGER, an online review of current topics between 2004 and 2005. The typical WAGER review comprised an outline of a study's premise, followed by the study's findings. Typically the last WAGER paragraphs were dedicated to a repetitive disclaimer that results were not conclusive because of sample size or some other weakness.

A classic example was the August, 2002 examination of suicides and their relationship to gambling. “Do Casinos have Casualties? Mixed Evidence for a Gambling-Suicide Link.” Why Harvard would choose to review this study, which it concluded was inconclusive and flawed in many regards, is unclear. The Harvard editor dismissed the study's results for a number of reasons, including, “relationships between gambling settings and suicide rates could potentially be due to common features that influence suicide other than casino presence. For example, Nevada is home to a great number of retirees, a population which has demonstrated higher suicide rates.”

That would be interesting if it were true. Nevada ranks 44th in the nation for population over 65, Nevada has ranked first in the nation in suicide rates for 10 of the last 14 years, never coming in lower than fourth. In suicides per capita it was surpassed recently by Montana, which has more video lottery terminals and Gamblers Anonymous chapters per capita than any other state in the nation.

Still, AGA spokesman Frank Fahrenkopf traverses the country announcing that “peer reviewed” studies have “failed to prove” a relationship between gambling and suicide. In AGA logic, having “failed to prove” an assertion is equal to a “proof” of its antithesis.

Fahrenkopf and his peers have deceived numerous legislators with illusions of “peer reviewed” studies that “prove” there is no correlation between gambling and crime, no correlation between casino proximity and addiction, and that gambling takes money away from other businesses.

Harvard's addiction department is not the only tool of the gambling industry. The university's renowned Kennedy School of Government is deeply connected to Native American organizations dedicated to the economic and political development of Indian reservations. Unfortunately, those organizations

have adopted the NIGA mantra of gambling as the “New Buffalo” which will elevate the reservations to the status of economically and politically independent nations.

Again, the “Harvard” brand is a deliberate purchase of the gambling tribes. In 2003, just after *Time Magazine* published a blistering expose on the status of Indian casino development, NIGA commissioned Harvard to produce a study deliberately designed to show the benefits of Indian gambling.

News reports at the time quoted Deron Marquez, chairman of the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians saying, “NIGA's fellow trade organization, the AGA, constantly produces numbers to help its cause. The data bolsters policy decisions and helps make problems go away. Our study would allow the same to take place.”

The study was to be headed by Katherine Spilde, a former Director of Research for the NIGA, and an ardent proponent of gambling expansion. Spilde told reporters the study would help reverse “a bona fide public relations crisis,” for Indian gambling.

NIGA's Marguez said the study would be “the centerpiece of a public relations campaign” to promote Indian gambling. “The PR and the research go hand in hand. The study will provide the necessary data, and the campaign the necessary visibility.”

The study was funded to support an intended finding, with an advertising campaign as the intended result.

Spilde also played the “peer reviewed” card, noting the study would be “validated” by other academics. “A peer-reviewed report will have the highest integrity possible and insulate us from critics who may try to imply that funding from Indian Country has influenced the results,” she said.

“Gambling industry lackies vouching for gambling industry apologists,” fumes NCALG/NCAGE chairman Dr. Guy C. Clark. A dentist by trade, Clark said, “It reminds me of a mouthwash introduced some years ago with a claim that its in-house studies showed the product was highly effective at removing plaque. Later independent studies showed the product was slightly less effective than water.”

“Harvard's motives look about as transparent as water too, no matter what they claim for intentions. I would think they would want to be more protective of the school's heritage,” Clark concluded. “These so-called studies are no more than gambling industry in-house advocacy dressed up as academics.”

TRIBUTE TO THE HISPANIC CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF SILICON VALLEY

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 2005

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the achievements of the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of Silicon Valley as they celebrate 50 years as an advocate and resource for its members, business owners, professionals, students and the community in general by being the premier voice for Hispanic and minority businesses.

The Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of Silicon Valley, originally called the Mexican American Chamber of Commerce, was founded in 1955, and incorporated as a non-profit organization in 1975 when it began offering services to the Latino small business community.