

vastness of space and do a job that no one could be sure was even possible. We need to be bold and innovative, and I understand that we cannot make progress unless we take risks.

Nonetheless, I have serious reservations about NASA's emphasis on human space spectaculars. If our goal is really to explore space and advance our knowledge of its mysteries, robotic rather than human exploration can penetrate longer, farther and deeper into space for a fraction of the cost.

I do not reject the long-term goal of human space exploration, but believe that NASA's focus should be on scientific research projects like Mission to Planet Earth, which will improve the quality of life for people on this planet. Among other things, this approach would mean scaling back if not eliminating the Space Station, the purpose of which has never been as clear as its huge costs.

IN HONOR OF PROFESSOR HENRY KING

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 22, 1998

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a man, Henry King, who at the age of twenty-seven, when most persons are just beginning to think about their careers, took part in one of the most prominent events in the post-World War II era: the Nuremberg Trials. Professor Henry King undertook a great task in joining the United States prosecution team at Nuremberg and his many accomplishments in the field of law during and after the trial truly are a testimony to his successful career.

Professor King was educated at several fine institutions of higher learning in his younger years and later matriculated at Yale Law School. After graduating and obtaining a prestigious position with a New York law firm, King was offered the chance to join the U.S. prosecution team in the trials of Nazi criminals at Nuremberg in 1946. Exempted from military service because of a heart murmur, King felt he could serve his country and attempt to correct the wrongs of the war by serving as an attorney on this team.

King was heavily involved with the prosecution of Erhard Milch who participated in slave labor and human experimentation. While investigating Milch, King met and interviewed Albert Speer, one of Hitler's highest ranking lieutenants, and gained insight on the secret activities of the Third Reich. After success in the prosecution of the Nazi war criminals, King had a successful career in corporate and government posts. He became chief corporate international counsel for TRW in 1983 and joined the faculty at Case Western Reserve University's School of Law. He recently authored a book about Speer and his experiences at the war tribunal.

My fellow colleagues, join me in saluting the accomplishments of Professor Henry King through his many years in the practice of law and most notably, his contribution to his country at the Nuremberg war crimes trial.

TRIBUTE TO JACK FIELDS

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 22, 1998

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to congratulate, Mr. Jack Fields upon his retirement next month from his position as St. Clair Shores City Clerk. His friends and colleagues will honor him with a retirement party at Blossom Heath on April 8, 1998.

Jack Field's compassion and dedication have earned him a special place in the hearts of the residents of St. Clair Shores. In his office, a cork board is warmly decorated with pictures of families and children who reside in St. Clair Shores. The people who know and work with Jack realize he is more than just the City Clerk, he is a friend. As St. Clair Shores mayor Curt Dumas has said, "He has touched a lot of people in many ways. Jack Fields always has that kind of smile on his face that helped so many people."

When Jack quit his job at an automotive factory in 1971 to run the Civic Arena, he had no idea the job would lead him to the position of City Clerk. During the twelve years that Jack ran the Civic Arena, he earned a reputation for fairness and as a peacemaker. His popularity within the community prompted city officials to ask Jack to apply for the position as clerk. Jack turned them down. However, after some persuasion, Jack became the City Clerk in 1983. Jack has said, "I have loved this job more than I can express." I am sure many people in the community feel the same way about him.

St. Clair Shores has been lucky to have a leader like Jack Fields. Few people give to their community with the same time and energy that Jack has given to his. On behalf of the citizens of St. Clair Shores, I would like to thank Jack for all of his hard work and dedication.

VETERANS' ACCESS TO EMERGENCY HEALTH CARE ACT OF 1998 H.R. 3702

HON. LANE EVANS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 22, 1998

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, for years veterans who rely on the VA for their health care have run into a brick wall when they sought reimbursement from VA for emergency health care received from a non-VA provider. Even when veterans took the time to contact VA when a medical emergency arose and were directed by VA to seek emergency care from the closest health care provider, they have been routinely denied reimbursement by VA for the cost of the emergency health care they needed and received from a non-VA provider.

The Veterans' Access to Emergency Health Care Act of 1998 will provide veterans access to emergency services when and where the need arises. It will solve a long-standing problem—reimbursement from VA—that has bedeviled veterans who needed and received emergency health care when they were needed from a non-VA provider.

The Veterans' Access to Emergency Health Care Act of 1998 will also make it possible for

the Department of Veterans Affairs to comply with the Consumer Bill of Rights, which President Clinton has directed every Federal agency that administers or manages health plans to adopt. VA has reported that it will largely be able to comply with the Consumer Bill of Rights through administrative action, but legislation will be required to provide veterans the access to emergency services. Currently, only veterans who are on VA property when an emergency occurs receive reimbursement from VA for contract emergency care furnished by a non-VA provider. VA has limited emergency care capabilities and must refer much of its emergent care to other providers.

The Consumer Bill of Rights, developed by a Presidential Advisory Commission on Consumer Protection and Quality in the Health Care Industry, establishes eight basic rights for consumers. In addition to access to emergency services, these rights include: Accurate information about health plans; a choice of providers and plans; participation in treatment decisions; nondiscrimination; the protection of their confidential medical information; and a fair and efficient process for complaining about and/or appealing a medical decision; and responsibility for one's own health.

VA has reported it will be able to largely comply with the Consumer Bill of Rights through administrative action, but legislation will be required to provide veterans the access to emergency services.

The Veterans' Access to Emergency Health Care Act of 1998 will provide veterans access to emergency services when and where the need arises. Providing veterans who rely on VA for health care access to emergency services when the need arises is long overdue. This legislation should be quickly passed by Congress and signed into law by the President.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 22, 1998

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, April 22, 1998 into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

I often hear that nobody really cares that the way we finance political campaigns is rotten. Polls indicate that by a wide margin Americans believe the system is corrupting and needs a major overhaul, yet I rarely find people outraged that the system isn't being reformed. The American people are deeply cynical that the system will ever be changed. They recognize that special interests and elected officials from both parties are complicit in the system and have a vested interest in perpetuating it. After all, they have made the system work successfully for them.

I've come to the view that those of us who think the current system must be overhauled immediately need to spell out more specifically why Americans should be outraged by the failure of Congress to reform the campaign finance system.

NEED FOR REFORM

Defenders of the current system argue that as a nation we spend far less on our federal elections than is spent to advertise various consumer products, that contributions from

individuals still exceed PAC contributions in congressional races, that campaign contributions are protected by the First Amendment right of free speech, and that it is difficult to demonstrate a clear connection between campaign contributions and voting patterns. Yet I believe that the current system has serious problems and is in urgent need of reform.

Buying access

Money talks. The current system of campaign finance is anti-democratic. Those who have money clearly have a stronger voice in our representative democracy. The reverse is also true, that those without money have less of a voice. There is no doubt that under the current system they have gained more while the have-nots remain unrepresented or underrepresented.

Those who contribute can be paid back with access, time to discuss issues, and sometimes even a role in drafting legislation, which means other people are being shut out of the process. When the elected official walks into his office late in the afternoon and has ten phone calls to return but only time to make one, who gets the attention? Almost certainly the person who has contributed substantially to his campaign.

It is hard to challenge the cynical view that large contributors have bought their way into the White House and obtained access to powerful Members of both parties. My view is that the current financing system, if not constrained, will end up doing serious harm to representative democracy.

Special favors

Contributors usually want something in return for their political contributions—a subsidy, a contract, a tax break, a hand-out from the federal government. That costs taxpayers money and makes it difficult to control federal spending or properly allocate limited resources. The average American can also be affected more directly. For example, you pay more today for sugar because contributions from the sugar lobby are a significant factor in keeping sugar price supports on the books.

The system can be corrupting. Candidates are put in very difficult situations. It is almost impossible today to run a political campaign without accepting money that has some strings attached, even if the strings are subtle and not explicit.

Enormous cost of campaigns

The cost of campaigns for high office—driven largely by the cost of television—has risen to a point that it is destructive to the democratic process. Today, competitive House races can easily cost \$1 million, and the winners in Senate races on average spend well over \$4 million. The prospect of raising such amounts discourages many good people from running for office, and both parties now make a major effort to recruit wealthy candidates. Candidates have already started to run expensive political ads, indicating that the system is increasingly spinning out of control.

Time spent fundraising

Under the current system, the candidates have to spend a huge amount of time chasing money. A Senator running for re-election needs to raise a minimum of \$15,000 every week of his six-year term to try to hold on to his seat. Members are so involved in the system that they often don't realize the nature and the shape of the treadmill they are on. The more time Members spend raising money, the less time they are able to spend on public policy issues and meeting with constituents to discuss the issues. Members will often state that their vote is not for sale, but it is quite clear that their time is.

Pressures to skirt limits

The competition to raise money is so fierce that it can push people to the edge of the law if not over it. It's no accident that some of the biggest fundraisers in 1996 got into deep trouble after the campaign for raising large amounts of money from sources that were either forbidden or doubtful under the law.

Numerous loopholes

Even the current systems' rather mild restrictions on money in politics have numerous loopholes. "Soft money" can be donated in unlimited amounts to the political parties, rather than to individual candidates, but it can easily be diverted to individual campaigns. Through "independent expenditures" outside groups can come into a state and spend millions of dollars on television ads attacking a candidate as long as there is no coordination with the candidate's opponent. Spending on "issue advocacy" is growing even faster, as outside groups can spend millions of dollars in unreported funds for thinly veiled ads attacking a candidate as long as the ads don't specifically say to vote against him. All of these forces candidates to spend even more time fundraising to prepare for possible attacks from forces that are completely unaccountable to the voters.

Undermines public trust

The rising flood of money that flows into campaigns undermines public trust in government. By a four-to-one margin Americans believe that elected officials are influenced more by pressures from campaign contributors than by what's in the best interests of the country. Cynicism is always the worst enemy of democracy, and it has certainly been bolstered by our campaign finance system.

CONCLUSION

Reforming the current campaign finance system will be enormously difficult unless there is a much greater public outcry. Leaders of both parties simply do not see a need to change a system that has elected them. Members read the polls showing that the public has largely given up on the chances of reform. They know how infrequently campaign finance reform is brought up in their public meetings and in letters from constituents. And they know that people will rarely vote against them because of their failure to pass reform. If the system is to be changed, the American people will need to become more active in bringing that about.

A VOICE IN OUR DEMOCRACY

HON. MICHAEL D. CRAPO

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 22, 1998

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to your attention an award-winning essay written by a constituent of mine on a subject I know is near to your heart—the importance of freedom and democracy.

I'm pleased to announce that Amanda Burtenshaw of Montevideo, Idaho, has been honored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States with a VFW 1998 Voice of Democracy Scholarship Award. Amanda's broadcast script is an important reminder of the need to be active in our efforts to ensure that we continue to enjoy our freedom and rights. With all of today's headlines bemoaning the lack of appreciation America's youth has for civics, it is encouraging to know that those as young as Amanda understand the importance of democracy and freedom.

I would insert that award-winning script into the RECORD at this time.

1997-98 VFW VOICE OF DEMOCRACY SCHOLARSHIP COMPETITION—"MY VOICE IN OUR DEMOCRACY"

(By Amanda Burtenshaw)

A small girl stands wide-eyed on the street curb, watching as the numerous wonders of the annual parade promenade through the streets. Her fascination is obvious as she stands among thousands of people enjoying the celebration. As three prancing white horses enter the scene, she recognizes the American flag, to which she pledges allegiance each morning in her first grade classroom. Dismayed at the inability to make her voice be heard above the crowd, she does the most appropriate thing she can think of. She raises to her full height of four feet, steps out as far into the street as she dares, and places a tiny hand over her heart as she watches, in reverent sincerity, Old Glory pass by. Few notice the innocent gesture, those that do chuckle and remark, "How cute!" The crowd grows silent, however, as a war-hardened veteran pulls his horse to the side and halts in front of the little girl. He leans down, speaking directly to her, but loud enough the crowd can hear. "Thank you," he solemnly states, "for showing proper respect to our flag. You are the first patriot I've seen today." With that, he salutes the girl gallantly and wheels to rejoin the procession, but not before the tears in his eyes are witnesses by the crowd. No one looks at anyone, and all sit and ponder upon what they have just witnessed.

Citizens of America, does it require an office of importance or a battle on the front lines to be an important member of our blessed country? Certainly not, for even through the simple placing of the hand on a heart, many can be affected. The key is to want to be involved, to want to make a difference. And still, wanting to make a difference is not enough, we must do all we can to put that want into effect. A common belief in our society says "faith without works is nothing", is this not so in the case of desire without action? Yet, I cannot make you take action . . . but I can lead by example. I am studying our form of government, and developing opinions and values of my own. I am getting involved wherever I can in organizations that will better my political knowledge. I am developing talents for effective public speaking and persuasive writing in order to make my "voice" understandable and easily heard. I am dedicating my life to my country, and though I may not die for the freedom of my country, I can live for the betterment of our democracy. I am a youth in America. I am the future of our country. My actions today will determine the conditions of tomorrow.

Everyday, I enjoy so many blessings that come with living in this country. I can put gas in my car and drive to a public school, where I can learn skills that will aide me in the job field later on. I have the freedom to choose my career, to marry whom I please, to have as many children as I want, and then to raise them in a society where they are encouraged to become the best they can possibly be. I can sit down to a meal at Thanksgiving, my family surrounding me, and feel safe in the security of my home, my town, and my country. The simple ability to say my prayers at night, to the God I have chosen as mine, in the manner I feel proper for me is the greatest blessing of all. Everything I have, I owe to America, and to the system so widely developed by the Fathers of this country, who were not afraid to make their voices heard. Is it asking too much to take the time out of my life to become involved in