

world. Without our support, women in developing nations will face more unwanted pregnancies, more poverty, and more despair.

It is extremely hypocritical that those in Congress who would deny women in the developing world the choice of an abortion, would also seek to eliminate our support for family planning programs that reduce the need for abortion. Without access to safe and affordable family planning services, there will be more abortions, not fewer, and more women's lives will be put in danger.

I wish that today we could be voting on legislation allowing our foreign aid dollars to pay for a full range of reproductive health services, not just the limited services that barely get a right-wing seal of approval. But what is most important now is that the House of Representatives oppose the Smith anti-family amendment and support the Campbell/Gilman/Gejdenson/Porter/Maloney amendment to restore funding to the UNFPA.

Let's keep the doors of more family planning clinics open for the women who are desperately in need of this information and these services. We will reduce the number of abortions and improve the lives of women and their children. I urge my colleagues to support the UNFPA.

#### IN HONOR OF RICHARD S. BRYCE

#### HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1999

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Ventura County, California, Undersheriff Richard S. Bryce, who will retire next month after a long, honorable and distinguished career.

Undersheriff Bryce accomplished much in his more than three decades with the Ventura County Sheriff's Department, but will perhaps be remembered most for three particular achievements:

He spearheaded California legislation that permitted the merging of the Marshal's Offices into the Sheriff's Departments; he is recognized as an expert on jail operations and management, providing court testimony and conducting seminars throughout the Western United States on custody issues; and he provided leadership in management of the department's budget and in the fight to win passage of California's Proposition 172, which ensured the continued funding for the department and other local public safety agencies.

Richard Bryce began his law enforcement career in 1965 as a reserve deputy. After his appointment as a deputy sheriff on April 22, 1966, he embarked on a number of diverse assignments as he rose through the department's ranks. He was a patrol deputy, a staff officer at the Ventura County Police and Sheriff's Academy, a burglary detective and narcotic detective. As an administrative sergeant, he served at the Jail Honor Farm and in the Civil Bureau. He was a facility lieutenant at the Oxnard Branch Jail, a Civil Bureau lieutenant for Court Services, and a narcotic lieutenant for Special Services.

In 1982, Richard Bryce was promoted to commander of the special Services Bureau, which oversees the department's investigation units. In 1986, then-Sheriff John Gillespie ap-

pointed him assistant sheriff, and in 1993 he was appointed undersheriff by then-Sheriff Larry Carpenter.

Richard Bryce's peers have consistently described him as "loyal, ethical, professional, articulate, and conscientious."

Ventura County's undersheriff holds a master's degree in public administration, a bachelor's degree in political science and an associate's degree in administration of justice. He and Loretta have been married for more than 30 years. They have two children, Jeffrey and Kimberly.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues will join me in recognizing Richard S. Bryce for his decades of dedicated service and in wishing him and his family Godspeed in his retirement. His dedication to public safety and his community will be missed.

#### STAMP OUT PROSTATE CANCER ACT

#### HON. RANDY "DUKE" CUNNINGHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1999

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to introduce the Stamp Out Prostate Cancer Act of 1999. I am joined in this effort by my colleague from Ohio, the Honorable SHERROD BROWN, and twenty-two other colleagues. I have also attached letters from organizations in support of this legislation, including the Men's Health Network, National Prostate Cancer Coalition, and CapCure.

According to the National Prostate Cancer Coalition (NPCC), each day 507 men will learn they have prostate cancer. Prostate cancer, the most common cancer in men, is a devastating disease affecting more than 200,000 American men each year. One out of every ten men will develop this terrible disease in his lifetime, and more than 40,000 American men will die each year. This disease does not occur only in older men. Nearly one quarter of all diagnoses occur in men between 40 and 65 years old. The single best thing we can do to help more men combat this disease is to increase funding for research, education, and awareness. Currently, both the National Institutes of Health and the Department of Defense fund prostate cancer research. Yet, the NPCC has identified nearly \$250 million in worthwhile research projects not initiated last year due to lack of funding.

The Stamp Out Prostate Cancer Act will help expand research money available, much like the very successful breast cancer stamp which has raised millions for breast cancer research. This successful model will allow millions of Americans to voluntarily donate to the basic research that will help us find a cure to this terrible disease. I hope that all my colleagues will join me and cosponsor this important bill.

MEN'S HEALTH NETWORK,  
Washington, DC, July 13, 1999.

Hon. RANDY "DUKE" CUNNINGHAM,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CUNNINGHAM, I am writing on behalf of the Men's Health Network (MHN) in support of legislation that will introduce the Stamp Out Prostate Cancer Stamp Act of 1999. We thank you and Congressman Sherrod Brown for proposing this important legislation.

Prostate cancer is the most commonly occurring cancer in America, affecting about 200,000 men in 1999. Nearly 40,000 men will lose their lives to the disease this year. A man has a one in six chance of getting prostate cancer in his lifetime. If he has a close relative with prostate cancer, his risk doubles. With two close relatives, his risk increases five-fold. With three close relatives, his risk is nearly 97%. Today, African-American men have the highest prostate cancer incidence rate in the world and their mortality rate from the disease is more than twice that of the rate for Caucasian Americans.

With the right investment in public education and research, prostate cancer is preventable, controllable and curable. It is vitally important to educate not only men but also their families as to the risk factors associated with this disease and the need for annual screenings. The creation of a prostate cancer research stamp not only will raise the public's awareness of the risk and prevalence of this deadly disease but also it is an innovative way by which Americans can freely aid scientific research.

Thank you for creating this opportunity for concerned Americans to support the fight against prostate cancer. If there is anything we can do in the future to assist in the passage of your bill, please do not hesitate to let us know.

Sincerely,

TRACIE SNITKER,  
Government Relations.  
CAP CURE

Washington, DC, July 15, 1999.

Representative RANDY "DUKE" CUNNINGHAM,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CUNNINGHAM: Even though I am on the road, I wanted to assure that my office transmits this letter to you.

I admire your courage and conviction to stamp out prostate cancer, and I support your efforts, and those of your many colleagues, in the presentation of your proposed legislation. The "Stamp Out Prostate Cancer Act" creates a simple tool to enhance research funding that will end the roll that prostate cancer takes in this country.

You and your colleagues know that prostate cancer is the most commonly diagnosed nonskin cancer in America today, with almost 200,000 new case expected in 1999.

You and your colleagues know that almost 40,000 men will lose their lives to the disease this year, creating tragedies for far too many wives, children, fathers, mothers, brothers and sisters.

You and your colleagues know that, despite its burden on individuals and society, prostate cancer research receives only five cents of every federal cancer research dollar.

You and your colleagues know that the National Prostate Cancer Coalition, of which CapCure was a founding member, has estimated that \$500 million of unfunded prostate cancer research should be supported this year if resources existed.

Duke, you are helping to expand the opportunities for acceleration of new research—and treatment opportunities—for the men who need them most. You have been stalwart and determined support for all those affected by this devastating disease. As the world's largest private funder of prostate cancer research, CapCure considers it a pleasure to support you.

Cordially,

RICHARD N. ATKINS, M.D.,  
President.

July 15, 1999.

Representative RANDY "DUKE" CUNNINGHAM,  
*House of Representatives*,  
*Washington, DC*,

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CUNNINGHAM: On behalf of the thousands of men battling prostate cancer and their families, I want to express our sincere appreciation to you and your colleagues for introducing the "Stamp Out Prostate Cancer Act of 1999".

Our primary goals at the National Prostate Cancer Coalition (NPCC) are to make prostate cancer a national health priority while finding a cure for his deadly disease. In order to accomplish these goals, we must increase awareness of the disease and increase funding for prostate cancer research. Your bill takes great strides forward in both areas.

In 1999, one cancer case in every six will be prostate cancer. About one in four prostate cancer cases strikes a man during his prime working years, under the age of 65. Regrettably, prostate cancer took the lives of about 100 men yesterday. Congressman Cunningham, we know that you are aware of the terrible toll which prostate cancer takes on Americans. We salute you for your playing a role in finding a cure of this disease.

We look forward to working with you to increase the opportunities for new and accelerated research and treatment for prostate cancer. The NPCC stands ready to assist you as your legislation moves through Congress.

Sincerely,

BILL SCHWARTZ,  
*Vice-Chairman and CEO*,  
*National Prostate Cancer Coalition*.

#### CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

**HON. TOM DeLAY**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 1999

Mr. DeLAY. Mr. Speaker, our Founding Fathers recognized that restricting the free exchange of ideas in the political arena is the tool of tyranny. The First Amendment ensures that a free exchange of ideas, not the forceful will of the government, will always dominate the political landscape.

Currently, there are those who would obliterate the First Amendment in the name of "campaign finance reform." Reforming our campaign finance system by limiting the ability of individuals and groups to express their views on issues and candidates is like trying to make a car run better by removing the engine.

Time and time again, the Courts have held that the First Amendment protects the right of individuals and groups to speak freely about issues and candidates, free from the heavy hand of government regulation and restrictions.

The American people do not need government speech police dictating what, where, when and how they can speak about issues that are important to them. The "big brother" reforms that are being proposed will trample on the fundamental rights of individuals in order to protect the interests of incumbent politicians.

I commend the following piece by Mr. James Bopp, published by the Heritage Foundation, to my colleagues' attention. Mr. Bopp clearly explains the need for true reform that is constitutional and strengthens, rather than destroys, the ability of the American people to have a voice in their government.

[From the Heritage Foundation, July 19, 1999]

CAMPAIGN FINANCE "REFORM": THE GOOD, THE BAD, AND THE UNCONSTITUTIONAL

(By James Bopp, Jr.)

Campaign finance reform soon will be debated in the U.S. Senate. The problems with the current campaign financing system that are identified by the most vocal reformers, however, are not real problems for Americans who want more of a say in who is elected and what policies public officials pursue. And although incumbent officeholders in Washington, D.C., may feel threatened by negative advertising and want to manipulate the campaign rules to their advantage, this does not justify imposing further restrictions on the freedom of speech and association. The U.S. Supreme Court already has addressed the remedies proposed by the "reformers" and found them unconstitutional under the First Amendment.

The Supreme Court and numerous federal courts following it have struck down almost all laws that attempt to restrict campaign spending or campaign advertising by individuals or organizations (including corporations, unions, political action committees [PACs], and political parties). Pursuant to the First Amendment, the Supreme Court limits the regulation of political expression to a very narrow class of speech: explicit or express words advocating the election or defeat of clearly identified candidates—such as "vote for" or "elect." But not every type of express or explicit appeal for votes is subject to regulation. For example, the Supreme Court has held that:

A political candidate has an absolute First Amendment right to spend an unlimited amount of his own money expressly advocating his own election (unless he voluntarily waives that right in order to receive public financing).

Individuals and organizations also have an absolute First Amendment right to spend an unlimited amount of their own money expressly advocating the election or defeat of particular candidates so long as there is no coordination between the individual or organization and the candidates. And governments may not presume that there is coordination under certain scenarios—unless there really is some.

In addition, all other election-related speech that discusses candidates and issues (including their voting records or positions) but does not explicitly call for the election or defeat of particular candidates is protected as "issue advocacy." Although it undoubtedly influences elections, issue advocacy is absolutely protected from regulation by the First Amendment. Consequently, "reforms" that attempt to redefine "express advocacy" to include types of issue advocacy, or to create new categories of speech subject to regulation, or that effectively would ban issue advocacy by corporations and labor unions are doomed to a court-ordered funeral. So is legislation that effectively would require any group engaging in issue advocacy to register and report as a PAC or that would impose burdensome disclosure requirements on issue advocacy.

Political parties enjoy the same unfettered right to receive contributions for and to engage in issue advocacy. And there are even fewer reasons to fear their exercise of this important right because political parties have an interest in a broader array of issues than narrow interest groups do, and their donors know they exist to advance those issues. The Supreme Court also has found that proposed bans on political parties receiving and spending soft money cannot be justified on the ground that it might prevent corruption. Instead, the Supreme Court has determined such a goal is insufficient to restrict the discussion of candidates and their positions on issues.

To adopt true reform, Congress first needs to recognize that today's perceived abuses are simply the predictable result of past "reforms" in which the suppression of free speech was the principal focus. Today's complex laws cause wasteful distortions in the electoral process and lessen transparency and public accountability. There are, however, constitutional measures that would correct these flaws. Specifically, raising or eliminating contribution limits, which have been eroded by inflation, would allow elected officials to concentrate more on their public duties than on raising funds, make the flow of campaign money more transparent, and improve public accountability. And removing barriers that prevent political parties from exercising a moderating influence on political campaigns would serve to reduce the weight of narrow interests.

These reforms would encourage more direct citizen participation in campaigns, thereby reducing the incentive for indirect involvement through independent expenditures and issue advocacy. Such true reforms not only are constitutional, but they also reinforce the sovereignty of the people over government officials and decrease the threat of corruption by making it more likely that any influence will be exposed. Bearing this in mind,

Congress should not rush to pass measures that would cause uncertainty in the short run and inevitably be struck down as unconstitutional. Because Members of Congress take an oath to support and defend the Constitution, they should pay special attention in the legislative process to any constitutional defects in pending legislation.

Congress should not try to challenge the Supreme Court's rulings on the First Amendment, especially when the people's freedom to speak is at stake and Members self-interest in retaining office conflicts with those rulings.

Instead, to enhance political participation and improve transparency and accountability in the process, Congress should:

1. Raise the individual contribution limit to at least \$2,500, indexing it for inflation; raise the aggregate individual contribution limit; and raise the individual and PAC contribution limits to political parties from \$20,000 and \$15,000, respectively, to at least \$50,000.

2. Remove the limits on coordinated expenditures by political parties with their own candidates.