Mrs. MORELLA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of John Sturdivant, a good friend of mine and a good friend of hundreds of thousands of Federal employees, including those he knew personally and those whom he never met. John died after a courageous struggle with cancer on Tuesday night. His death and the loss of his leadership are devastating blows to his family, his friends, and all Federal employees. I will miss him very much.

As president of the American Federation of Government Employees since 1988, John was an outstanding champion of Federal employees during a time of rapid downsizing and unprecedented attacks against Federal employees.

He was a wonderful ally to have in our fight for Federal employees. We worked together to successfully reform the Hatch Act and give Federal employees the political voice they deserve.

In 1995, we stood together protesting the deleterious and wasteful Government shutdowns. He presented not only compelling arguments against the Government shutdowns, but he also voiced the human costs of the Government shutdown in a very powerful way.

He successfully advocated the use of official time and led the charge against excessive Government privatization. John was there, with me and several of my colleagues, as we successfully fought against proposals to reduce Federal retirement benefits. He did not let partisan politics obstruct his pursuit of fairness for Federal employees. We supported one another, I valued his help, his guidance, and his bipartisan approach to Federal employee issues.

He was a man who was selfless in his dedication to AFGE. Enduring his illness, in and out of the hospital, he continued to speak out powerfully on issues involving our civil service.

I offer condolences to his companion, Peggy Potter, his daughter, Michelle Sturdivant, his mother, Ethiel Jessie, and his brother, stepbrother, and sister. May they be strengthened by his inspiration, his warm personality, and his achievements.

Madam Speaker, I honor the memory and the great accomplishments of John Sturdivant, a man who touched the lives of hundreds of thousands of people, and a man who will be greatly missed by all who knew him and by those for whom he fought, who never had the good fortune to meet him.

□ 1245

AN EXTRAORDINARY MONTH FOR WOMEN IN THE HOUSE AND IN THE COUNTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, this has been an extraordinary month for women in the House and in the country, and I want to say a few words about women in both places; first, about women in the House, and then about two issues that concern women throughout the country.

On October 21 the women of the House, those who belong to the Women's Caucus, and that is virtually all of us, had our first ever gala. That gala was given to raise funds for Women's Policy, Inc., and it was a most successful event, with the President and the First Lady and the Secretary of State all coming to pay tribute to 20 years of achievement by women in Congress.

We set an extraordinary bipartisan example. The gentlewoman from Connecticut, Mrs. NANCY JOHNSON, is the Republican cochair this year. Last year the gentlewoman from New York, Mrs. NITA LOWEY was the Democratic cochair, and the gentlewoman from Maryland, Mrs. MORELLA, was the Republican cochair. They kept the caucus alive and bipartisan, and we were pleased to follow in their wake this year.

The caucus simply gets things done. It gets things done any way it can. Sometimes it is by getting policies changed; sometimes it is by getting laws changed. And what does the caucus have to show for 20 years from the work we have done? More women getting mammograms, and therefore a decrease in breast cancer and cervical cancer; the Pregnancy Discrimination Act; the Violence Against Women Act. It is a roster to be proud of.

But as it turns out, October was the awareness month for two concerns that women across the country have given the caucus as their own priorities, Breast Cancer Awareness Month, and Domestic Violence Month.

The Women's Caucus this very year waged a battle for mammograms for women over 40. This was in the tradition of the Women's Caucus, when it looked as though we were about to get a reversal in policy on that very issue. The science did not support a reversal, and we were able to get it changed based on the science.

We pride ourselves in not getting changes like that not on political grounds, and using the data that is provided us by Women's Policy, Inc., we were able to help turn that decision around. Now women at 40 should get a mammogram every year or every other year.

This is an important issue. It is important to have the focus of women in Congress on it, because since the early seventies the incidence of breast cancer has increased by 1 percent a year, and we do not know why. All we know is that we have to do something about it.

Actually, if mammograms are high quality they can spot breast cancer in women over 50 at a rate of 85 to 90 percent of the incidence of cancer. So we have made a lot of progress.

While we focused on the threat to women at 40, the fact is that I want to remind everybody that it is women who are over 50 who are at greatest risk for breast cancer. If women aged 50 to 69 have regular mammograms, they can reduce their chances of death from breast cancer by one-third, and gradually, by bringing attention to this dreaded disease, we have been able to do something about it.

I do want to put into the record risk factors that are more specific than what we usually hear. These are the risk factors: Having had a previous breast cancer; a specific, identified genetic mutation that may make one susceptible to breast cancer; a mother, a sister, or a daughter, or two or more close relatives with a history of breast cancer, and that could be even cousins; a diagnosis of other types of disease that are pinpointed to predispose one to breast cancer; that is to say, breast disease that predisposes one to breast cancer; dense breast tissue, which makes it difficult to read a mammogram; and having a first child at age 30 or older.

Madam Speaker, this was also Violence Against Women Month. By observing and talking about this terrible epidemic in our country, we are finally bringing it out of its special closet. Some 3 out of every 100 women in this country have been severely assaulted by a partner, that is, not simply a slap, but severely assaulted. They had to go to the emergency room or get medical treatment.

Madam Speaker, I hope what the Women's Caucus has done helps us all to understand the value of the caucus to bring our attention to problems such as these.

THE TRUTH ABOUT VANDALISM AND ILLEGAL PROTEST IN DISTRICT OFFICE OF HON. FRANK RIGGS OF CALIFORNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RIGGS. Madam Speaker, it is rather unusual circumstances that bring me to the floor to address my colleagues during special orders, but I really feel compelled to make this statement because of some very, I think, one-sided, misleading reports that have appeared in the media recently regarding a protest that occurred at my district office in Eureka, CA, on October 16.

On that day, over 60 protesters stormed my office. They trespassed my office. They threatened, they actually accosted and assaulted my two employees working in the office at the time, both female employees, wonderful, dedicated employees by the names of Julie Rogers and Ronnie Pelligrini, who felt genuinely threatened and frightened for their safety when this incident began.

These protesters, however, four of whom were subsequently arrested, have now gone to the media, along with

their criminal defense attorneys, claiming that they were the victims of improper police conduct or inappropriate use of force by law enforcement. So I want to explain exactly what transpired in my office.

First of all, as I mentioned, the group was led by an individual wearing a ski mask and carrying a walkie-talkie. So imagine for a moment if your workplace, your business, your office, was invaded by somebody wearing a ski mask, and a group of protestors.

As they came in the office, as I mentioned, they jostled my employees, who obviously had no idea what was transpiring at the time, and who were attempting to call for help. They then trashed and vandalized my office, throwing bark and sawdust 6 inches deep on all of the equipment and throughout the office on the floor, and they unloaded and wheeled into my office a gigantic tree stump as part of this protest. When they off-loaded the tree stump in the parking lot, they did it with such a thud that my employees initially thought that some sort of a bomb had gone off outside.

Bear in mind, this was all part of an orchestrated protest, part of a series or ongoing series of protests that have become, unfortunately, a fact of life on California's north coast, but involve the harassment of private law-abiding citizens, intimidation, trespassing, vandalism of personal and commercial property, and resisting arrest.

After all this took place, and this was to protest my role in helping to secure congressional authorization and funding for the protection of living wage jobs in the forest product industry, and 7,500 acres of old growth forestland in my district, in the context of the annual spending bill for the Department of the Interior, they were protesting my role in that because they wanted to preserve, they want to preserve, 60,000 acres of forestland, all of it privately owned in our district, and they would like to add that to the vast tracts of forestland that already is in the public domain, under public ownership.

But as this protest continued, four individuals, one of them a minor, all female, chained themselves to this gigantic tree stump in my office. When the local law enforcement agencies arrived, they refused repeated commands, lawful orders from sworn peace officers, to separate themselves.

It turns out they had stuck their arms in metal sleeves, chained themselves to this tree stump, and law enforcement officers explained to these four protestors that not only were they under arrest, not only were they resisting arrest, but that law enforcement was afraid to cut through these metal sleeves for fear that the sparks might set off a fire in the office, which, as I mentioned, had been littered at that point with sawdust and wood chips everywhere.

So after they gave repeated orders to these protestors to separate, to unchain themselves, and to submit to the custody of law enforcement because they were under arrest, after they repeatedly refused these lawful orders, the peace officers involved, who have a very difficult, dangerous, and dirty job to do, then warned that they might use chemical agents to compel them to surrender to arrest. I am a former law enforcement officer myself. That is opposed to some other manner of peaceful restraint. They thought that was the proper arrest technique to use in this situation.

Even then, after being warned repeatedly, they refused to comply with the orders, so the law enforcement officers at that point applied a little pepper spray in the face area of these protestors, who still refused to comply with the orders of the law enforcement officers, who then finally, as a last resort, used a chemical agent called pepper spray to force them to submit to arrest.

Now these protesters are out there with their criminal defense attorneys saying, and I quote one of the attorneys, ''The abuse of this extremely dangerous and incredibly painful chemical weapon to force obedience of peaceful protesters is not related to any legitimate law enforcement objective.''

I want to conclude by saying that these were not peaceful protesters, these were reckless, wanton lawbreakers. My message to the media is get it right, and tell the rest of the story.

NEED FOR CAMPAIGN FUND-RAISING REFORM HIGHLIGHTED BY SPENDING FOR UPCOMING SPECIAL ELECTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. SNYDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SNYDER. Madam Speaker, over the last several months we have heard a number of discussions about the problem of large donations in our campaign system. I have been up on the floor, as have many people, discussing that issue.

At one time I had a large blown-up check that we had which had been signed by my friend, Ima Big Donor, made out for $1 billion, with a big sign, ''To any old political party,'' a completely and perfectly legal donation under our current campaign laws. I continue to be optimistic that something will occur in this session of Congress that will deal with campaign finance reform.

But when I go back home and make speeches and people ask me, do you think that you all are going to do anything in Washington about campaign finance and these terrible problems we are having, I say, look, it may take one more election cycle. Maybe we will have to go through the 1998 election cycle, and just see these thousands and thousands and millions of these soft dollars, these unregulated, unlimited, huge donations saturate our system to where the outrage of the American people will finally force this Congress, specifically the Republican leadership, to let us take up campaign finance reform.

But I am thinking that maybe we are not going to have to wait that long, because we have some examples right now going on in special elections where we can see and predict what is going to happen in 1998.

Right now in New York this Tuesday there is going to be an election to fill the seat of retired Representative Susan Molinari. We have two candidates, a Democrat, Eric Vitaliano, and a Republican, Vito Fossella. As the press reports a couple of days ago, the Democrat had spent about $35,000 in television ads and the Republican had spent about $85,000. I am sure those numbers are substantially higher now. But what we have is a duel between two local candidates who care very much about their country and are trying to win the election.

But in the middle of this duel comes the 800-pound gorilla. The 800-pound gorilla is the Republican National Committee. Not only is it an 800-pound gorilla, it is an $800,000, $800,000 gorilla that has brought in outside money through the committee saturating the airways to tilt the election toward the Republican.

Our laws do not have loopholes, they have an absolute, major sieve, and have become almost meaningless to deal with these massive amounts of money.

Madam Speaker, for Mr. Vitaliano, the Democratic candidate, he is currently required by Federal law that he can only accept a $1,000 donation from any individual, and he can only accept $5,000, maximum, from any political action committee.

The Republican National Committee has absolutely no limit on the amount of money it can accept into the party as soft money, and in fact, there have been reports of donations over $1 million, and I suspect we will see more of those to that size.

So what is the problem? The problem for the voters of New York, they are going to have to decide if that seat is for sale to the highest bidder. Folks say, well, Democrats do it, too. But I do not think that makes it in any better.

All it means is if you are a local person sitting in New York, you are going to say, is the amount of Republican money coming in from the outside going to win the day or the bid, or will it be offset by the amount of the Democratic money coming from outside New York? Is that going to tip the scale? The seat becomes for sale to the highest bidder.

The problem for our system is two, as I see it. No. 1, what do those huge donations buy? Is it access? That is what we often hear. Is it access, the ability of someone who makes a $300,000 donation to get into the seat of power and discuss the issues that a person who