

proteins in humans. The most significant aspect of Betaseron for MS patients is that it reduces the formation of new lesions in the brain, an occurrence widely thought to be connected with the progression of the disease.

On a day-to-day basis the results of Betaseron treatments are also proving dramatic. For example, Mr. Kevin Cloy of Middleport, NY, is a constituent and friend of mine. Mr. Cloy is 32 years old, and was diagnosed with MS in 1990. He was forced to quit his job due to the disabling effects of MS. In December 1993, Mr. Cloy became one of the first people to receive Betaseron treatments.

The change in his physical condition has been remarkable. The frequency of his exacerbations has significantly decreased, and his physical condition has stabilized enough that he no longer feels the need to be wheelchair-bound. Although he still remains at home during the day, he can return to doing simple tasks like walking to the mailbox. He is hopeful that the Betaseron treatments will allow him to return to the work force someday soon.

NEED FOR MEDICARE COVERAGE

Unfortunately, because Betaseron is a high-technology, genetically engineered treatment, it is also prohibitively expensive. Betaseron is injected under the skin at home every other day, and the injections cost approximately \$1,000 per month.

The expense of Betaseron is a grave problem for all people with MS, but especially for those like Kevin Cloy who are forced to leave the work force due to their MS-induced disability. Not only must they deal with the financial constraints of a lost income, but they also lose the coverage of any employer-provided health insurance as well. They generally become eligible for Medicare, but as we all know, Medicare does not cover prescription drugs and self-administrable treatments.

Mr. Cloy's situation again illustrates the problem. In March of last year, after Mr. Cloy left his job, he became eligible for Medicare and lost his private insurance coverage, thereby also losing coverage for prescription drugs.

When he became eligible to receive Betaseron treatments, he was therefore faced with a difficult choice—either expend all of his family's resources to pay for Betaseron, and eventually become destitute enough to be eligible for Medicaid—which does cover prescriptions—or go without Betaseron, a treatment which has changed his life.

Mr. Cloy has done everything feasible to avoid making that choice. He has drained his family's savings as much as possible in order to pay for Betaseron. Last spring, the residents of Middleport even organized a fundraiser for Kevin at a local restaurant. The fundraiser was successful, but the money raised only covers about 9-months worth of treatments.

Mr. Speaker, since the first introduction of my bill last year which would have provided Medicare coverage for Betaseron, I have heard from people across the Nation who have MS, from New York to California, from Arkansas to Illinois. Their stories have been chronicled in major newspapers like the Philadelphia Inquirer and the Orlando Sentinel. These people have experienced the very beneficial effects of Betaseron, and they are desperate for a solution to this problem of access.

NEW SCIENTIFIC DEVELOPMENTS

Last year, I introduced legislation to provide Medicare coverage for Betaseron, in order to

help these people and their families. This year, I am expanding the bill to cover all beta-interferons, a consequence of recent exciting scientific developments.

Another constituent and friend, Dr. Lawrence Jacobs, who is an esteemed researcher at the Multiple Sclerosis Center at Millard Fillmore Hospital in Buffalo, recently announced with his partner, Dr. Salazar of the National Institutes of Health, the development of a new beta-interferon which is promising to be more effective than Betaseron. This new substance would be used as an alternative to Betaseron.

The new beta-interferon, which will soon be before the FDA for formal approval, has been affirmatively proven to reduce the progression of the disease. The new substance better mirrors natural substances produced in our bodies, and therefore also produces less side-effects for the patients. It is also being developed to be injected once a week, instead of every other day.

Mr. Speaker, the preventive health aspects of beta-interferons are obvious. We can stop or significantly reduce the progression of the disease. We can substantially reduce the number of attacks these people experience. Since as estimated 41 percent of hospitals stays of MS patients are covered by Medicare, we can also clearly reduce those costs to Medicare.

Moreover, we can reduce all of the other health care costs which are a consequence of a severe disability—physician visits, clinic visits, home health care, medical equipment, physical therapy—the list goes on and on. We may even be able to move many of these people back in to the work force, allowing them to leave Medicare altogether, a clear savings to taxpayers.

I believe that providing access to these beta-interferons is an excellent example of the successes of preventive health care. In slowing the progression of MS, and allowing these individuals to lead more productive lives, these treatments provide benefits which, in the long term, may far exceed the cost of the injections.

It is time we act to make these critical treatments available to all of those people with MS whose disabilities are so severe that they have lost their jobs and their private health insurance. I urge the Congress to adopt this important legislation.

RED INK GREATER THREAT THAN RED ARMY

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1995

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, one of the gravest errors that the Republican majority is in the process of making is to increase military spending over what we have already voted while it proposes serious cuts in important domestic programs. And for those who do not share my sense that these programs should be preserved, the increase in defense spending can be seen as a threat to further deficit reduction, or even to tax reductions for those who prefer that course. In any case, spending money that we do not need on the military at a time when we are short of resources is an error. For this reason, I will from

time to time be sharing with my colleagues knowledgeable commentary from national security experts who are pointing out that it is a grave error to increase military spending, and that in fact, given the collapse of the Soviet Union, the severe weaknesses of the Russian military, the untapped ability of our Western European and East Asian allies to do far more in the area of military spending, we in fact can afford to make further reductions in the military without in any way endangering national security or the well-being of the men and women who have so gallantly volunteered to defend us.

Recently, one of the most distinguished experts in the national security field, former Director of Central Intelligence William Colby, wrote an article in the Hill on February 22 pointing out how unwise it is to increase—and even maintain—the current level of military spending. Mr. Colby's tenure as Director of Central Intelligence began in the Nixon administration and extended into the administration of Gerald Ford, so he can hardly be dismissed as the voice of Democratic liberalism. His hard-headed, persuasive argument for military spending reductions is an important contribution to our budget debate and I ask that it be printed here.

WHICH IS GREATER SECURITY THREAT: RED ARMY OR RED INK?

(By William E. Colby)

The Cold War is over, but you wouldn't know it from America's defense budget or from Republican calls for more defense spending. The once fearsome Red Army no longer threatens Europe at the Fulda Gap in North Germany. Instead, it hardly is able to enter a medium sized Chechnya city against lightly-armed partisans, even with the advantage of air power and heavy artillery.

But the U.S. defense budget still siphons off some \$250 billion from the national economy as political leaders talk about a balanced budget (but don't act to produce), promise middle income tax cuts instead of building savings, and vie to cut domestic and foreign programs. U.S. defense expenditures still amount of well over twice the \$121 billion spent by the eight other nations that conceivably could pose a threat to U.S. national interests, and over three times what Russia spends on its reduced, rusting and hapless military.

One would think that an intelligence assessment of dangers for the U.S. in the years ahead, and a strategic review of how we should respond, would focus on some of the obvious threats looming ahead in the economic field, which has now replaced military competition as the main arena of conflict in the post-Cold War world.

The most obvious danger is the national debt and its servicing costs, which threaten the economy and will crush almost all discretionary spending unless economically depressing and politically unpalatable new taxes are imposed. Similarly, the inexorable march of the Cold-War-era baby boomers toward senior-citizen status clearly threatens the Social Security system and will mean a generational conflict with a younger generation saddled with the bills. The sloshing of trillions of panicky dollars through global electronic markets, as just occurred with Mexico, is spreading to other emerging economies is today's real threat to the nation's economy—and security.

And it is not that the defense budget is beyond challenge, for need or for specifics. Former Secretary of Defense Les Aspin's "bottom up review" assumed two regional wars on the scale of the Gulf War, conducted

simultaneously, without allies, with no build-up period and with rotation capability for a long engagement—an obvious gold-plated invitation to the “bottom” of the military to plan forces at about the current levels. A bit of top-down guidance might have insisted on a more realistic scenario.

The review did not question some of the sacred cows of current planning: another attack submarine (against which fleet?); a better attack fighter (when our present ones are the best in the world); the Cold War B-2 bomber when modernized B-52's were the main muscle used in the Persian Gulf; a surfeit of aircraft carriers to “show the flag” when Aegis cruisers demonstrated their capability to hit an office complex in Baghdad from the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf; continued land and sea-based nuclear missiles aimed at the open ocean in numbers far above the 100 or so that respected defense experts agree is sufficient for deterrence.

If to these are added 20 more B-2's designed to penetrate Soviet airspace after a nuclear exchange, six huge C-17 airlifters when C-5's can carry what needs to go by air and heavy tanks should go by sea or be prepositioned to be available in real quantity, and new Trident submarine-launched strategic missiles, one can see that the mindset of the planners is clearly to continue to prepare for and deter the now-outdated massive threat from the Soviet Union. At least 24 budget-conscious Republican congressmen deeped sided the SDI, recognizing that the more proximate threat of a nuclear weapon arriving in the U.S. would be in the hold of a non-descript freighter.

The real post-Cold War world calls for the deployment of new kinds of “secret weapons” such as the diplomatic efforts of former President Jimmy Carter, who has already averted violence in Haiti and North Korea and at least has tried in Bosnia. It calls for programs to reduce the population growth bomb which is already exploding in Asia and Africa. And it calls for carefully planned and conducted anti-terrorist operations with formerly hostile nations and services.

It also calls for more “competition” between the expenditures to fight a Cold War better and the need to keep our nation's economy strong and targeted on the real threats—and opportunities—of the future.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE
DWIGHT EVANS

HON. THOMAS M. FOGLIETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1995

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, on this last day of Black History Month, I wanted to congratulate the Honorable Dwight Evans for his great accomplishments as a public servant in the city of Philadelphia and in the State of Pennsylvania. Dwight Evans is making history every day for his constituents.

Dwight represents the 203d Legislative District in the Pennsylvania House of Representatives. Throughout his life, Dwight has contributed greatly to the city of Philadelphia. He has made these contributions in many different capacities, but has never failed to make significant improvements in his community.

Prior to his membership in the Pennsylvania State Legislature, Dwight was responsible for revitalizing the abandoned Ogontz Plaza in Philadelphia, turning it into an economically viable shopping district. He was also responsible for bringing a police ministration to the Ogontz Avenue area, making it a safer place

for members of the community. We are working together to develop the Southeastern Pennsylvania Regional Employment and Training Center.

More, recently as the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee in Pennsylvania, Dwight has been able to provide day care services for children, adequate funding for youth programs, and the improvement of educational services to children.

In 1994, Dwight Evans ran as the first African-American candidate for the Governor of Pennsylvania. He surprised the pollsters and the experts, but not those of us who know him by coming in second. He was also endorsed by most of the major daily newspapers in the Commonwealth.

As we mark the end of Black History Month, I would like to recognize and congratulate Dwight Evans for his excellent accomplishments. It is important that we look back at history, but it is also important that we applaud the men and women who are making progress today and tomorrow.

H.R. 450

HON. CARDISS COLLINS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 28, 1995

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last week we were given a real clear picture of what the new Republican majority that now controls the Congress really cares about.

During the consideration of H.R. 450, Members had two opportunities to vote on amendments that would have excluded from the moratorium regulations the Fish and Wildlife service needs to issue in order to establish hunting seasons for ducks and waterfowl.

I offered the first amendment which, in addition to the hunting season regulations, also exempted several other important matters, such as:

Rules the FEC has issued to prohibit personal use of campaign funds; rules to make it harder for aliens to stay in the United States on the basis of meritless petitions for political asylum; rules giving preference to the elderly in section 8 housing; rule pertaining to elimination of drug use in Federal housing; rules designating empowerment zones and enterprise communities; rules compensating Persian Gulf veterans with disabilities from undiagnosed illnesses; and rules for the development of a data base for child molesters, as required by the crime bill.

The Republican majority argued against amending their bill to make it clear that these important regulations could be excluded from the moratorium. They claimed there was nothing to worry about.

Yet, later in the day, they chose to support an amendment which only exempted the hunting season regulations, and none of the other regulations—not for veterans, not for the protection of children against child molesters, and not for the elderly.

I have nothing against duck hunting, but I think it is a sad day when this Congress cares more about guaranteeing there is a duck hunting season, than whether our children are safe, and the elderly and disabled veterans are properly cared for.

RISK ASSESSMENT AND COST-BENEFIT ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. BLANCHE LAMBERT LINCOLN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1022) to provide regulatory reform and to focus national economic resources on the greatest risks to human health, safety, and the environment through scientifically objective and unbiased risk assessments and through the consideration of cost and benefits in major rules, and for other purposes.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. Chairman, I rise as a strong proponent of risk assessment and effective government and cost-benefit analysis.

Having grown up on a farm in eastern Arkansas and having seen in person both the tremendous waste, that government regulations can assist us in preserving our environment and our surroundings but also in being overburdensome as well as top heavy in regulatory needs. Risk assessment is a vital tool in forming cost-effective and well-reasoned Federal regulations. It should be used to create a better and responsive Federal Government, not stymie things down with court actions or excessive delay.

But I do have some concerns that the bill we are looking at today, this will happen under the current bill. Before we consider H.R. 1022 further, we may have to take a time-out to do a cost-benefit analysis on this bill. CBO has made some conservative estimates that the bill will cost the Federal Government an additional 250 million a year to conduct risk assessment. This breaks down to approximately 5,000 new Federal employees, including many new lawyers hired to defend agency actions.

As we look at this bill today, I hope that we will work in bipartisan fashion to make it better so that it will be of great assistance to all of us across the Nation in making government more effective.

Mr. Chairman, the costs of doing an effective and needed risk assessment doesn't bother me very much if in the long run those expenses are more than covered in the costs saved down the road. However, I am skeptical that the \$25 million threshold is a figure where we can get the biggest bang for our buck. The threshold set out under this bill to conduct risk assessments is \$25 million. However, Executive orders in the past issued by President Ford, Reagan and Clinton set the threshold at \$100 million. OMB in 1993 concluded that 97 percent of the total rulemaking costs on the economy came from rules with a dollar threshold over \$100 million. Like the companies who rightly complain that we shouldn't spend millions of dollars to get Superfund sites, water and air one additional percentage cleaner, I question whether we should be spending so much money in conducting additional risk assessments to reach an additional 3 percent of the regulations that have a financial impact on the economy. Additionally, H.R. 1022 requires a risk assessment for permits under Federal program. Does this mean that every State that issues a Clean Water Act section 402 permit must conduct a risk assessment before finalizing any permit? Let's make sure that we are adopting the most cost effective law as we