



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 147

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 2001

No. 20

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 13, 2001.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHNNY ISAKSON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2001, 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 Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

CREATING LIVABLE COMMUNITIES IN THE MILITARY

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I came to Congress committed to having the Federal Government be a better partner in helping our communities be more livable, our families safe, healthy, and economically secure. Among the most important areas for the new Administration to reexamine is the quality of life, the livability of our enlisted people, and the relationship that the military plays in making all our communities more livable.

There are tremendous opportunities to continue some good things that started in the last Administration, and for the President and Secretary Rumsfeld to move even further. The bottom line is that the United States Department of Defense should be a leader at home and abroad, improving the quality of life for the men and women in uniform and their families.

The Department of Defense should be a world leader in building livable communities, whether it is improving environmental protection, sustainable development or partnerships with citizens at all levels.

There are some outstanding examples taking place within a stone's throw of our Nation's capitol.

The Navy Yard renovation is leading the revitalization of the District of Columbia's Southeast waterfront. It is recycling materials and land, developing green buildings, and proving that you can improve the quality of military life while making a difference for the community.

The Department of Defense is managing a massive problem dealing with the same Endangered Species Act that confronts American communities all across the country. To cite just one example, there are 17 endangered species that have been identified at Camp Pendleton, the only large green space remaining between Los Angeles and San Diego.

The Department of Defense is managing 12,000 properties that are listed on or are eligible to be listed on the National Register of Historic Places. This is the largest inventory in the United States and slated to grow even larger because over the next 30 years another 70,000 buildings will reach 50 years of age and require evaluation.

In fact, our military is the largest manager of infrastructure in the world with over \$500 billion in bridges, hospitals, roads and docks. One of the most challenging examples is to be

found in the area of housing. There are over 300,000 units of military housing; and sadly, as President Bush is discovering today, two-thirds of them are substandard. There is an opportunity to harness new techniques in partnership with the private sector to make sure that we retain valued personnel by treating their families right with homes we can all be proud of.

I hope this Congress will step forward to help the military in other ways to promote livable communities. One of the most important ways would be to increase the necessary funding in order to accelerate the timetable for cleaning up unexploded ordnance, the bombs and shells that did not go off as intended and litter the landscape in over a thousand locations across the United States. There is a legacy of bases, bombing sites, and storage depots from Martha's Vineyard to Camp Bonneville in metropolitan Oregon.

Even around the American University campus right here in Washington, DC there is unexploded ordnance and nerve gas and that has been here since World War I. We cannot wait 500 years to clean these sites up, which is the time that will be required if we follow the current pattern.

The President should include a separate line item in the budget he submits to us, and Congress should focus on it and provide adequate funding. Another simple but powerful step would be for the Department of Defense and, say, the Post Office to obey the same rules as the rest of America. The presumption should be that absent a specific finding of urgent military necessity, our Department of Defense meets the same building codes, environmental standards, and transportation requirements.

Last, but by no means least is the opportunity to keep the mission if not the team intact at the Department of Defense for the military to provide true environmental leadership. There

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.

H259

was an outstanding team that was assembled in the last administration: Sherri Wasserman Goodman, Randall Yim, Sandy Apgar, to name just a few. These people have doubtless moved on, but there is a lot to be learned from them, and we need to make sure that the mission and the techniques are retained and enhanced.

Getting and retaining the highest quality fighting force in the world requires that we treat them and their families right. It is important to make the military a full partner in livable communities using the ingenuity, the brain power, and the sense of mission and devotion to duty that are the hallmark of our armed forces.

PHILIP MORRIS'S CHARITABLE GIVING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to applaud the excellent efforts of the ABC television network and particularly journalists Dan Harris and John Stossel for demonstrating the tremendous deceit associated with the latest round of Philip Morris advertising.

Philip Morris is a company that is in the business of addiction and death. It markets a product that it knows causes death, disease, and untold human misery. It markets a product that most of its victims would never consume, or certainly not continue consuming, were it not for the highly addictive quality of nicotine, which is an essential ingredient to its future sales.

Hence, in one sense, these advertisements are quite accurate—"the people of Philip Morris" are "working to make a difference." Indeed, to the 3,000 new children who each day try tobacco, it can be a life and death difference. One thousand of those children will eventually die or suffer from serious disease as a result of their tobacco use. Of course the "difference" that we hear about on television is not those children but the children who receive Philip Morris scholarships and shelters. We hear not how they addict people but how they feed them, not how they flood the market with nicotine but how they help flood victims. Indeed, ABC pointed out that Philip Morris has generously contributed \$115 million to such charitable activities.

But, wait, there was more that Philip Morris did not want the public to know. Although they spent \$115 million for charitable contributions, they spent \$150 million to publicize their charity. As John Stossel said, "Give me a break!" If Philip Morris really had such a big heart, why doesn't it just donate all the money to charity instead of wasting \$150 million on ads?

The reason, of course, is quite clear. Philip Morris has taken to heart more

than most the old adage that charity begins at home. And for Philip Morris, spending \$115 million on charity is charity for itself.

As ABC has reported, internal Philip Morris documents show that charitable giving has been a key part of its strategy for years. Favorite philanthropies of Philip Morris include those who could "neutralize" women and minority groups, which might otherwise speak out against their being targeted for nicotine addiction. Those documents also indicate that Members of Congress and legislators around the country have not been forgotten—some of Philip Morris' favorite charities are the favorite charities of those policymakers that have the power to do something about the addiction and death business that is so critical to this company's future.

Indeed, I think that Matt Myers at the Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids said it best: "These ads are not about charity. These ads are trying to convince Congress and juries that Philip Morris is reformed and responsible, so that the next time they have to walk into a courtroom or the halls of Congress, they can avoid real change."

Of course when they walk into the halls of Congress, they do not walk into strangers. Philip Morris spent from 1997 to 1999, just a 2-year period, about \$120 million on lobbying here in Washington. And it was generous with its contributions to the national political parties and to Members of Congress, contributing over \$11 million in PAC and soft money contributions during 1999.

At the same time Philip Morris was conducting this advertising campaign about its charitable giving, it was also advertising that it no longer markets to children in ways that will attract 3,000 children to tobacco products every day. Of course, in other countries where it markets its deadly products, Philip Morris refuses to abide by any of those restrictions on the marketing to children. Philip Morris continues to play a key role in a worldwide pandemic that will be the largest killer, more than AIDS, more than the combined death toll of a long series of diseases that plague our planet. Philip Morris will be a part of the pandemic that will kill more people in this world than any of these other diseases put together over the next couple of decades.

But I think that for this Congress, it is important for us to realize the financial difference between the good deeds Philip Morris advertises and the amount it spends to promote those good deeds. Congress must react by giving the Food and Drug Administration the jurisdiction it needs over tobacco products, the Justice Department the support it needs to continue its lawsuit against the tobacco industry, and address the problem of Big Tobacco's involvement in smuggling around the world. As Members of Congress, we must respond responsibly and responsibly to the growing problem

of worldwide tobacco addiction and death, though Philip Morris has done neither.

PRESIDENT BUSH'S TAX PLAN AND ITS EFFECTS ON GUAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, considering that the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives has begun hearings on President Bush's tax plan, I thought it important to speak about the impact such a plan will have on my home island, the territory of Guam.

At the outset, let me just say that I fully support tax relief for the people of Guam, as well as for hardworking taxpayers across the country, especially for middle- and low-income families. However, I think it would be irresponsible for me if I did not raise the concerns that the President's tax plan would have on Guam.

Unlike the rest of the Nation, Guam and the Virgin Islands are the only U.S. jurisdictions which have tax systems which mirror the U.S. Internal Revenue Code. This means that Guam's tax law mirrors the Internal Revenue Code as required under Guam's Organic Act of 1950. Whatever tax policies are implemented at the Federal level will take effect at the local level without input from the people of Guam or the government of Guam.

Unlike the States, however, the tax cuts for Guam will come from the government of Guam, not the Federal Government, since these revenues collected in accordance with the IRS code are deposited with the government of Guam. Therefore, the immediate issue here is the disruption of the revenue stream for the government of Guam, a concern which will have a direct impact on needed services by the government of Guam and the local economy.

The government of Guam anticipates a 30 to 50 million reduction in revenues from the President's plan. Considering that the government of Guam is projecting \$243 million in income tax revenue for this year, such a decrease in revenue will greatly impact Guam. If the government of Guam had a surplus, I probably would not be speaking about this issue, but we do not. Guam's economy is still rebounding from the effects of the Asian financial crisis, particularly since much of our economy relies heavily on tourists from Japan and other Asian countries.

□ 1245

Guam's unemployment rate is a staggering 15 percent, more than three times the national average. It is for this reason that I am asking my House colleagues, particularly those who sit on the Committee on Ways and Means, to consider proposals that would ameliorate the anticipated loss in revenue,