

Clearly endowed by God, the power of Mother Teresa's heart transcends the power of the world.

STATEMENT ON ALS RESEARCH,
TREATMENT AND ASSISTANCE
ACT

HON. WALTER H. CAPPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1997

Mr. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, together with my colleague BEN GILMAN, I am today introducing the Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis [ALS] Research, Treatment and Assistance Act of 1997. This bill is designated to assist individuals with ALS, encourage advances in treatment, and accelerate research support at NIH.

The terrible nature of ALS was recently brought home to me through a very close friend of mine, Tom Rogers, who is suffering from this disease. Tom has been an able and compelling legislator, and a leader in the environmental movement in Santa Barbara County. His struggle with this disease has been heroic and an inspiration to all who know him. During my campaign for Congress, Tom gave me his running shoes which he said he no longer had any use for due to the debilitating aspects of ALS. I wore those shoes through the months leading up to my election. To this day, that gesture of friendship and support has continued to be a source of inspiration for me.

While most of us know of the famed baseball star for which this disease is named, many of us are unaware of the tragic consequences of Lou Gehrig's Disease. First diagnosed over 130 years ago, ALS is a progressive, fatal neuromuscular disease afflicting 25,000 to 30,000 individuals in the United States today. Approximately 5,000 new cases are reported every year.

Victims of the disease are struck by a creeping paralysis that eventually leaves them unable to eat or even breathe. There is no cure for ALS and researchers are just now beginning to understand what kills the nerve cells in the brain and spinal cord that lead to the disease's destructive effects. ALS usually strikes people in their 50's or later and life expectancy is a mere 3 to 5 years.

My bipartisan bill would waive the 24-month waiting period for Medicare eligibility on the basis of disability for ALS patients. This is only fair since life expectancy following diagnosis is often shorter than the waiting period and most ALS patients will have paid into the Social Security system well before the onset of ALS.

Disabled people under age 65 are eligible for Social Security Disability Insurance and Medicare benefits. However, there is a 5-month waiting period from the onset of the disability until SSDI benefits are granted and then a further 24-month waiting period for Medicare eligibility. Unfortunately, since ALS patients' life expectancy is only 36 to 60 months, the 29-month waiting period leave them little time to participate in Medicare. This is unfair as most ALS patients have had productive working lives prior to onset of the disease and an estimated 17,000 of them are not age-eligible for Medicare. The cost of assisted living care and various effects of the disease can leave many patients' families financially drained. Victims of end stage renal disease, who experi-

ence a similar life expectancy as ALS patients, are granted this waiver.

The Capps-Gilman bill would provide Medicare coverage for outpatient drugs and therapies for ALS. This provision would ensure patient access to such treatments and help spur the development of new treatments for ALS. Currently, Medicare part B provides drug coverage for five other afflictions: oral cancer, clotting factors, immuno suppressives, osteoporosis, and hemophilia.

Finally, this legislation would double Federal funding of research into the cause, treatment, and cure of ALS. NIH-sponsored ALS research totaled only \$12 million in fiscal year 1996. Clearly, more must be done. Recent advances in ALS research have produced promising leads, many related to shared disease processes that appear to operate in many neurodegenerative diseases. Increased research funding for NIH can speed up work on these promising leads.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the support of my colleagues for this critically important legislation.

A TRIBUTE TO U.S. WEATHER BUREAU'S NORTH ATLANTIC PATROL

HON. SUE W. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1997

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, my fellow colleagues: I would like to call your attention to a great service rendered to this country by the men who served as civilian weather observers with the U.S. Weather Bureau's North Atlantic Patrol during the Second World War. These men significantly impacted the success of D-day, and many other battles of World War II, and yet, they have never been given the public appreciation they so richly deserve.

One of my constituents, Mr. Ray McCool, told me of these men, serving in the North Atlantic Weather Patrol aboard Coast Guard vessels, who obtained and transmitted essential weather data to Washington, DC. As a result, they made possible the preparation of weather maps used throughout the war. In fact, their long-range forecasts provided vital information needed to plan the D-day invasion. Their knowledge and talents made an enormous difference in the success of the overall mission and ultimately in an Allied victory.

Their service was not without danger and sacrifice. Under the Geneva Convention Articles of War, the rules for treating military prisoners did not apply to civilians. Therefore capture by the enemy most likely meant being treated as a spy and shot. To prevent this, they were outfitted in Coast Guard uniforms, carried as chief petty officers and enlisted into the service as "U.S. Coast Guard Temporary Reserves."

If capture by the enemy wasn't worry enough, they had the high seas and enemy ships to face. A typical mission took these men out to sea for 4 to 6 weeks at a time where they dealt with hurricanes and attacks from depth charges, U-boats, and German submarines.

To date, the United States have never fully recognized the invaluable job these civilian weather observers performed.

Today, let the record show we salute these unsung heroes and acknowledge their service

to our Nation. Further, in order to show our proper recognition, I am recommending that each local veteran's office present a U.S. flag to the family of a deceased member of this elite ensemble of men. In the face of danger and against the odds, these men stood tall and answered our country's call to freedom, and for that the United States of America is forever grateful.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. NICK J. RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1997

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for rollcall Nos. 224, 223, 222, and 221 on June 20, 1997. Had I been present and voting, I would have noted in favor of these four amendments to the Defense authorization bill, H.R. 1119.

OPEN LETTER OF SENATOR NANCY KASSEBAUM BAKER AND VICE PRESIDENT WALTER MONDALE TO THE PRESIDENT AND MEMBERS OF CONGRESS CONCERNING BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN REFORM

HON. MARTIN T. MEEHAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1997

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, last week two of America's most respected and distinguished senior statespeople, Senator Nancy Kassebaum Baker and Vice President Walter Mondale, visited with several bipartisan reform leaders on Capitol Hill, including myself and several of my fellow cosponsors of the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 1997. The purpose of their visit was to discuss an open letter they wrote to the President and to Members of Congress on the topic of campaign reform. For my colleague Representative CHRISTOPHER SHAYS of Connecticut and myself, I enter Senator Kassebaum Baker and Vice President Mondale's letter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT AND THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES FROM NANCY KASSEBAUM BAKER AND WALTER F. MONDALE,
Washington, DC, June 18, 1997.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT AND MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: In March, the President asked that we help in the cause of campaign finance reform. Since then we have observed closely the national discussion of this issue, which we believe is central to the well-being of American democracy. We would now like to report about our initial recommendations, with a plea, in the best interests of our political process, that the Executive and Legislative Branches commit themselves to a course of urgent debate leading to early and meaningful action.

One of us is a Republican. The other is a Democrat. We are inspired by the bipartisan efforts of Senators John McCain and Russell Feingold, and Representatives Christopher Shays and Martin Meehan, to achieve campaign finance reform. The bipartisan effort of new members of the House, led by Representatives Asa Hutchinson and Thomas

Allen, is also a foundation for hope. We are mindful that no change will occur unless there is a consensus in both parties that reform is fair to each. We also believe the imperative task of renewing our democracy requires that we all look beyond party. Guided by basic lessons from our Constitution and national experience, we must identify specific measures and commit ourselves to action where agreement is within our grasp, even as we identify other questions for further consideration.

The Constitution, in this as in all public affairs, is our first teacher. It directs that the Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech. The Supreme Court has provided substantial guidance how that command applies to campaign finance laws. Whether any of us might wish that the Court had decided particulars of prior cases differently, our national legislative task is to give full honor to its free speech decisions.

The Constitution also enshrines political democracy. One of its central purposes is to ensure that every individual has the right to participate fully in the electoral process. As Madison said of the Congress in *The Federalist Papers* (No. 52), "the door of this part of the federal government is open to merit of every description, ... without regard to poverty or wealth." Our campaign finance system must respect, and do everything it can to bolster, the constitutionally rooted primacy of individual citizens in our political democracy.

In applying constitutional values to campaign finance, we do not have to start from scratch. We have had a century of debate and legislation about several essential matters, including what we now describe as "soft money." From early in the twentieth century, federal law has prohibited contributions from corporate treasuries to federal election campaigns. Starting in the 1940s, this bar has been applied equally to contributions to federal election campaigns from union treasuries. The basic principle of these constraints, upheld by the Supreme Court, is that organizations which are granted special privileges and protections, provided by federal or state law for economic advantage, should not be permitted to leverage that advantage to cast doubt on the integrity of our national government.

In the 1970s, in response to the constitutional crisis that began twenty-five years ago this week, the Congress established limits on individual contributions to candidates and political parties, and barred large individual contributions to them that threatened to undermine governmental integrity in reality or appearance. Though it subsequently invalidated several other reform provisions of that time, the Supreme Court sustained this central element of our campaign finance law.

At the end of the 1970s, the Federal Election Commission began to erode these important protections. The Commission authorized national party committees to spend the proceeds of a new category of contributions which we now know as "soft money." This allowed previously prohibited corporate and union treasury contributions, and also unlimited contributions from individuals, to the national political parties. The theory has been that if contributions are not used directly in a federal election, federal campaign finance laws do not limit them. At first, the amounts of soft money involved were relatively small. But as happens with cracks in dikes, the power behind the breach has overwhelmed all defenses. The resulting flood of

money to the national parties and their campaign organizations now threatens the credibility of our entire electoral process.

We believe that Congress, as a matter of high priority must stop, unambiguously, all "soft money" contributions to the national parties and their campaign organizations. The Congress should also prohibit the solicitation of soft money by those parties and organizations, any federal office holder, or any candidate for federal office for the seeming benefit of others, but in truth to circumvent the prohibition of soft money to the national parties. These interrelated acts would do much to reinvent the basic concept of the Federal Election Campaign Act: that, while we must remain mindful of the political parties' needs for resources to perform their vital role in the political process, it is individuals, subject to contribution limits established by Congress, who are the heart of the system of private contributions for federal elections. The prompt end to soft money solicitations by presidential candidates, among others, would also assure that the public gets full value for its investment in publicly financed presidential elections.

A recurring observation about the 1996 and other recent federal elections is that candidates have lost control of the conduct of their campaigns. Indeed, many candidates are at risk of becoming bystanders to campaigns waged by others in the name of "issue advocacy." As a result, the accountability of the candidates for the conduct of campaigns is seriously compromised. Part of the problem is the need to sharpen definitions, that may have worked twenty years ago, to distinguish campaigning for candidates from a more general public debate of issues. Another part is the need to update the disclosure requirements of the Federal Election Campaign Act. Progress on both counts is necessary to assure that our political process achieves the substantial benefits that should result from an end of the "soft money" system.

First, it is essential that Congress establish, on the basis of the experience of recent elections, an appropriate test consistent with the First Amendment for distinguishing advocacy about candidates from the general advocacy of issues. The purpose of this test should be to identify for consistent treatment under the Federal Election Campaign Act significant expenditures for general communications to the public, at times close to elections, that are designed to achieve specific electoral results. The Supreme Court has said that Congress may regulate federal campaign activity to avoid corrupting influences or appearances. In doing so, the Congress should look at reality, not the self-applied labels of partisans. Our objective should be to assure that comparable expenditures are treated comparably.

The gains from ending "soft money" will be incomplete if money currently spent by parties is only redirected into so-called issue advertisements, including those by surrogate organizations established to circumvent campaign finance laws. A tightened, realistic definition of statutory terms will not foreclose communications to the public on behalf of the interests of business enterprises and unions even up to Election Day, under regulations evenly applied to their political action committees. It will mean that communications to the general public in periods close to elections that are designed to achieve electoral wins or losses are financed through the voluntary contributions of individuals, such as to their parties, political action committees, or candidates.

Second, disclosure is an essential tool because it allows citizens to hold candidates accountable for the means by which campaigns are financed. On election day voters can only express themselves about candidates on the ballot. Even candidates, however, may not know the true identity of entities that dominate the airwaves during the closing weeks of a campaign with electoral message patently targeted to favor or disfavor them or their opponents. Broader disclosure of the sources of financing of campaign advertisements would contribute to the robustness of political debate. It would ensure that candidates know to whom they might respond, and that the electorate knows who can be held accountable for the accuracy or demeanor of advertisements.

Additionally, we should take advantage of an electronic age in which information can be transmitted rapidly from, and updated frequently by, party and campaign officials, and made readily available to the public with equal rapidity.

No limitations and no disclosure requirements are worth much in the absence of timely and effective enforcement. Indeed, the absence of credible enforcement causes damage beyond the campaign finance laws by engendering real doubts about the application of the rule of law to powerful members of our society. The American public believes resolutely that a fundamental premise of our constitutional democracy is that high elected officials, like ordinary citizens, are subject to the rule of law, and to the timely application of it. The Congress and the President need to work together to assure the public that campaign finance laws are not pretenses.

The President and the Senate should take immediate action to assure that vacancies on the Federal Election Commission are filled by knowledgeable, independent-minded individuals who are not subject to the suggestion that they are appointed to represent political organizations. We say this because we need a clean break from the past, not to be critical of any former, present, or potential member of the Commission. It is within the President's power to accomplish this new start for the Commission, beginning today. We urge the President, in consultation with the leadership of the Congress, to name an advisory panel of citizens whose task would be to recommend highly qualified candidates for the President's consideration for appointment to the Commission, subject of course to the Senate's advice and consent.

Congress can take further steps to protect the independence of the Commission. If commissioners were limited to one term, they would have no occasion to measure the impact of their decisions on the possibility of reappointment. The independence of the Commission can also be furthered by placing its funding on a more secure, longer term basis.

The potential for deadlock inheres in the requirement that the Commission have an even number of commissioners. Because the Congress also has made the Commission the official gatekeeper to the United States courts, judicial action to resolve complaints under the Federal Election Campaign Act is impeded unless permitted by a majority of commissioners. Thus, a deadlocked Commission is an obstacle to the adjudication of meritorious claims. It is important to rely on the expertise of the Commission, but when the Commission is unable to resolve complaints, our respect for the rule of law

requires that complainants have the right to a fresh start through a direct action in the United States courts against alleged violators. The law should be amended to provide for this in the event that the Commission is unable to act because of deadlock or a lack of resources.

We have not attempted to set out an exhaustive list of reforms which may be attainable and would make a significant contribution. Other important proposals by members of Congress or students of campaign finance reform merit consideration, such as encouraging small contributions through tax credits, or providing greater resources to candidates through enhanced access to communications media or through flexibility by the parties in supporting candidates with expenditure of hard money contributions. Rather, our purpose is to illustrate that it is possible to identify and act on particular, achievable improvements, which should not be postponed or neglected. We very much encourage and support a larger debate about other changes at the federal and state levels in the manner in which political campaigns are financed. Additional changes will be essential to renewing American democracy. The enactment of immediate reforms may give us a measure of time to address other reforms, but should never become an excuse for avoiding them.

We urge that the work of the Congress over the next few months be spurred by one overriding thought: no one would create, or should feel comfortable in defending, the campaign finance system that now exists. Public cynicism about our great national political institutions is the inevitable product of the gaps that exist between our principles and the law, and between the law and compliance with it. The trend lines, also, are all wrong. If we were unhappy about campaign financing in the election of 1996, as the public is and as members of both parties ought to be, then we should anticipate with great trepidation the election of 2000, absent prompt reforms.

The challenge for this Congress is to put in place changes for the presidential and congressional election cycle that will start the day after next year's elections, a little more than sixteen months from now, to enable an election in the year 2000 in which we will have pride and the public will have confidence. Your leadership in that endeavor will serve the interests of American democracy, and command the enduring appreciation of all of us who know how needed that leadership is.

Sincerely,

NANCY KASSEBAUM BAKER.
WALTER F. MONDALE.

AN OPTION WORTH WATCHING

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1997

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas, the Ways and Means Chairman, Mr. ARCHER, has developed a tax relief plan to help restore our Nation's Capital, the District of Columbia. I enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post which, recognizing that a tax incentive plan is the sole solution to the troubles of the District, still concludes that it is an option "worth watching."

[From the Washington Post, June 11, 1997]

MR. ARCHER'S PLAN FOR THE DISTRICT

House Ways and Means Committee Chairman Bill Archer's tax incentive plan for the

District has encouraged a chorus of carping from city officials who predict that the measure won't stem the middle-class exodus to the suburbs. Perhaps to their surprise, Rep. Archer agrees. "The single biggest thing that the District of Columbia needs to do," he told a press conference at the bill's unveiling, "is to create an environment that is healthy for people to live and to work and to educate their children. * * * There are no changes in the tax code that are going to be enough to accomplish that."

Rep. Archer's appraisal was both candid and realistic. The District's tax code isn't the chief reason more than 50,000 residents have fled the city in the 1990s alone. A host of problems—including poor schools, crime, broken city services and abysmal local leadership—are responsible. The District's survival will depend less on tax cuts than on a wide variety of policies and actions that directly address those ills. Fixing the school system, imposing financial accountability and management reforms in the government, improving public safety and adopting the president's plan to take over some burdensome state-level responsibilities and costs will go a long way toward creating a stable and livable city.

Tax cuts, whether they benefit the majority of residents or are focused on the city's poorest neighborhoods, aren't going to provide the city with a sustainable revenue base. Yet to dismiss the GOP tax-break proposals out of hand may be shortsighted and self-defeating too.

Businesses are leaving town, and the city is having trouble attracting new firms. Much the same applies to middle-income residents. Rep. Archer believes tax relief could become a magnet for residents and businesses in certain economically depressed areas of the city such as Anacostia, Mount Pleasant and Chinatown. Whether tax breaks would keep and attract new residents or spur investment and job creation in the District's struggling areas is an open and untested question in this city. At \$325 million in tax relief spread out over five years and targeted on about 80,000 of the city's 554,000 residents, it's an expensive gesture, if not gamble.

Control board chairman Andrew Brimmer believes the plan's economic impact would be "slight." House Speaker Newt Gingrich, on the other hand, reportedly views the D.C. tax package as a "demonstration project that Republican free-market solutions are the best way to solve the problems of our nation's inner cities." It's an experiment worth watching.

THANKS TO PHIL JACKSON AND
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
BROADCASTERS

HON. EARL POMEROY

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1997

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank those who helped the victims of the flood that hit the upper Great Plains this spring. I would especially like to point out the public service announcement filmed by Chicago Bulls coach and former North Dakotan Phil Jackson and distributed by the National Association of Broadcasters.

In the midst of the Chicago Bulls run for a fifth NBA title in 7 years. Coach Jackson took the time to film a public service announcement asking Americans to help the flood victims of his former State. Teaming up with the National

Association Broadcasters, we got the work out about this PSA, and about how broadcasters could join the flood relief effort.

While the PSA was playing in cities across the United States asking individuals to give what they could to help the flood victims, broadcasters were also becoming involved in the campaign. In Fargo, ND, a TV station's telethon raised \$1.2 million. In Minneapolis, 21 radio morning shows raised \$500,000. In Omaha, a DJ got listeners to fill a 53-foot truck with donations. While in Grand Forks, KCNN Radio continued its round the clock effort to answer any and all questions for flood victims and provide the community with the latest in local and national news affecting its listeners.

To Phil Jackson of the Chicago Bulls and to the broadcasting community I extend my thanks.

A TRIBUTE TO EUNICE KINDRED

HON. JIM DAVIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 23, 1997

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and congratulate Eunice Kindred, a rising senior at Tampa Preparatory School, on her first-place finish in the Congressional Art Competition for high school students of the 11th Congressional District. Her painting will be hung in the Capitol here in Washington, DC. For many students, this honor might be his or her first recognition of talent, but for Eunice, this is one addition to a long list of accomplishments within as well as outside the realm of art.

Eunice has excelled at art throughout her life, showing a unique talent for expression through canvas since age 5. She has received countless awards for her artistic abilities, at the local and national levels. Her artwork has been displayed in various exhibitions in the Tampa area; the list continues. Recently, Eunice has entered the world of business, starting her own design company. Undoubtedly she will enhance and fulfill her entrepreneurial skills to the level of her artistic skills.

Aside from these talents Eunice has the distinction of being one of the top young bowlers in the United States today. Eunice bowled a 299 game in 1992, consistently places highly in tournaments, and was recognized in 1994 as being in the top 5 percent of all young bowlers in the United States and Canada, an honor for which she received a letter of recognition from the President of the United States.

Eunice's extraordinary abilities also extend into musicianship. She is an accomplished violinist, having held the first violin chair of the Tampa Bay Youth Orchestra.

What is impressive about this young lady is the fact that despite her extensive extracurricular activities, Eunice maintains an excellent academic record; her induction into numerous honor societies is reflective of this record.