

makes a \$25 donation does not get to do?

□ 1300

I think that is one of the problems. The other one is this issue of the 800-pound gorilla. When I am a candidate and I announce for a race, I call my brother-in-law and he sends me \$25, and I call the guy down the street and he sends me \$100.

The outside money in these huge amounts, \$800,000, absolutely overwhelms the local fundraising. It distorts the local politics. It makes the race one in which outside huge money powers control the race, and I think that is wrong.

We have a second example. Our dear friend, Walter Capps, passed away just a few days ago, and there is obviously going to be a special election. There is already discussion out there in California about who is going to be in the race, and Walter's funeral has not even occurred yet.

Yesterday's Roll Call newspaper has a quote discussing that race from an employee of the National Republican Congressional Committee, and this is what he said. "We will do whatever it takes to win this seat. That means spending whatever it takes, ground troops, party money. This is the kind of seat where we will go to war to win."

Well, aside from perhaps commenting on the crassness of making such a statement even before poor Walter has had his funeral, listen to those terms, "Party money." Not "local money," "party money." The \$800,000 gorilla presents his head. It is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress needs campaign finance reform.

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

[Mr. SMITH of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. VISCLOSKY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

BREAST CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

woman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, as you are aware, October is National Breast Cancer Awareness Month. Why is the issue so important? It is important because breast cancer is the most common major cancer for women. Every 3 minutes, a woman in the United States is diagnosed with breast cancer.

This devastating disease is the second leading cause of death among cancer victims overall. Today there are more than 2.6 million women living with breast cancer, women who struggle daily against the ravages of this killing disease. Of those 2.6 million American women, 71,000 of them are in North Carolina. Many of these aforementioned women are undiagnosed, do not know they have the disease.

Fortunately, through research developments, we have effective methods of detection that are improving steadily. However, no technique, no matter how effective, can diagnose women who do not have adequate access to health care.

Each year on average 182,000 women are diagnosed with breast cancer. Of that total, 16,000 are Afro-American and over 4,900 of them are from North Carolina.

While the prognosis is good for many women with breast cancer, it often proves fatal for those women whose cancer is not discovered until it is very late in their lives.

Mr. Speaker, the losses we have as a Nation suffered are staggering as a result of this. Each year on average nearly 44,000 women succumb to breast cancer; 44,000 mothers, sisters, daughters, spouses, partners and friends. Mr. Speaker, 5,200 of those women are, again, Afro-American women; 1,200 of them are from my home State of North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot stress enough how critical it is to study this insidious disease further, for 80 percent of women diagnosed with breast cancer do not fall into any known high-risk category, so they do not know they have it.

This is an issue for all of us, not just those with a family history of breast cancer. The incidence of breast cancer has been rising steadily since 1940, but none of the experts have been able to ascertain why. We do not know how to cure this disease or even how to prevent it. Significant strides have been made in detection and treatment of breast cancer, but we still have a long ways to go.

The economic impact on the United States is incredible. Breast cancer costs the United States over \$6 billion annually in medical care and the loss of productivity.

Mr. Speaker, two of my colleagues in Congress, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. ESHOO], have begun an Internet petition drive calling for improved insurance coverage for breast cancer. Those who

wish to add their name to the list should use the following address: <http://breastcare.shn.com>.

Mr. Speaker, we must be committed to finding a cure for this cancer as well as many other devastating diseases. We all can help because cancer, indeed, claims many of our loved ones.

TRIBUTE TO FORMER CONGRESSMAN JOEL PRITCHARD

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

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks, the House has lost a man who should be an example to all of us, and I just wanted to spend a few minutes today talking about him.

Joel Pritchard, who served in this House from 1972 to 1984, died earlier this month in Seattle. There was a memorial service here last night over in the Cannon Office Building that many of us attended. There was a funeral service in Seattle several weeks ago. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, I will never be able to match the observations that were made at those two proceedings about what a wonderful person Joel was, but I would like to make just a few observations of my own.

First of all, I think that for those of us in the House it would be good for us to recognize that Joel was everything that we so often are not. Joel was always cheerful. He was always positive. He never said an unkind word about anybody. Nobody could remember one in all of his long years here in the House of Representatives.

Joel was the sort of person who believed that one could accomplish anything they wanted to accomplish if they did not care who got the credit. And I think those are all things that we can stand to remember today.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into the RECORD two things: First, a column that appeared in the Seattle papers just a week or two after Joel died by Adele Ferguson that makes the comment at the end of the article that, "Joel Pritchard is an argument for human cloning."

I think that is something that those of us who knew him would agree with.

Include the following for the RECORD.

A MAN OF HIS WORD, JOEL PRITCHARD GAVE POLITICIANS A GOOD NAME

(By Adele Ferguson)

Few, in my nearly 40 years of covering the doings of politicians, had what I called HIGI, for honesty, intelligence, guts and integrity, and Joel Pritchard was one of them.

If anybody remembers that classic television series about a congressman called "Slattery's People," the former Seattle congressman and lieutenant governor who died of lymphoma at age 72, was Slattery. He was walking integrity.

He was also fun. He used to come charging up out of his seat in the state House like a seltzer fizz, and the foam just got all over everybody. Everybody liked him and everybody listened to him because he only talked when he had something to say. When Pritchard

said something came "slithering" over from the Senate, everybody else had to say it too, over and over again.

It was Pritchard who told me that when he shared a house with then-fellow Reps. Dan Evans, Slade Gorton and Chuck Moriarty, Evans was the only one who made his bed before they left each morning. He shared with me his disgust as fellow legislators who, during the morning prayer, shuffled and read papers on their desks instead of concentrating on the message.

Once, when rumors were hot about something the Republicans were up to, I asked him about it, and he looked sad. "Adele," he said, "I know exactly what you want to know, but I am part of it and I am sworn to secrecy." When he was not sworn to secrecy, however, he was candid and trusting that I would not misuse his confidences. I knew a lot I couldn't write.

Pritchard had been in the Legislature for 12 years when he decided it was time to move on, and he'd always said he wasn't going to grow old in the office just listening to the lobbyists tell him what a good guy he was.

One of his neighbors at his summer place on Bainbridge Island was U.S. Rep. Tom Pelly, who had served in Congress for 18 years. Two long, Pritchard said. It was time for new blood, new ideas. He never said a bad word about Pelly, who survived the primary challenge, but who got the message and retired the next time around, leaving the field to Pritchard.

God and the voters willing, Pritchard said, he would limit his time in Congress to 12 years, which he did, despite a burgeoning tide of encouragement, including mine, to accept a draft to stay on.

In 1988, Lt. Gov. John Cherberg retired and Pritchard decided to run for the open seat. He would never have challenged Cherberg, who not only was a good friend but his football coach at Cleveland High School.

Pritchard told me that during World War II, when he was an Army private slogging through the jungles of Bougainville, a fellow soldier gasped, "How are we ever going to get use to this awful heat and being thirsty all the time?"

"You should have played for my high school football coach," Pritchard gasped back. "You would have gotten use to it." Cherberg never let his players go to the drinking fountain during practice. "He thought it was bad for you," Pritchard said.

He promised, on his election to succeed Cherberg, that he would only serve two terms and not run for governor. He kept that promise too.

Three bouts of cancer never diminished his spirit, although he was saddened by two failed marriages. He was a devoted brother and father. A voracious reader, he wanted everybody to enjoy reading as much as he did and spent much of his spare time as a tutor.

Joel Pritchard was one of the finest public officials and human beings I ever met. Joel Pritchard made being a politician respectable. Joel Pritchard is an argument for human cloning.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter in the RECORD the last public writing that Joel had. It appeared less than 2 months ago in one of the Seattle papers. It is a subject that I think all of us could benefit from in this House. It is entitled "The 10 Habits of Highly Effective Legislators." If I could take just a minute or two to point out a couple of things that Joel was talking about in here.

He said that among the 10 habits of highly effective legislators was the fact that, No. 1, they keep their egos under

control. Another thing that he mentioned was that highly effective legislators refuse to take themselves too seriously. He also said that highly effective legislators demonstrate their integrity by admitting their imperfections, and he has several other things here that I think we could learn from here. I will include this article as well for the RECORD.

[From the Seattle Times, Sept. 7, 1997]

THE 10 HABITS OF HIGHLY EFFECTIVE LEGISLATORS

What does it take to become an effective lawmaker? State and national political veteran Joel Pritchard has seen a lot of promising candidates wither on the political vine. One thing he has learned: A winning campaign style does not translate into legislative competence. In this era of term limits, he offers 10 characteristics of successful politicians—attributes voters should consider when evaluating candidates.

(By Joel Pritchard)

Campaign season is a good time for voters to think about what it takes to be an effective office-holder as compared to what it takes to be an effective political candidate.

The requirements not only are different, they often are contradictory, and they are not always obvious. In 32 years of political service, I witnessed numerous state legislators and members of Congress who possessed the intellectual capacity and energy to be effective public officials, but somehow did not develop the habits that would make them so. Still, some were very accomplished at winning elections back home. Others simply self-destructed in politics as well as statesmanship.

Two come immediately to mind. One was a young Washington state legislator who was smart and articulate; the kind to whom the media attach the word "promising." But he refused to acquire understanding and competence in legislative practices. Instead, he developed as his primary interest finding opportunities to make public criticisms of minor problems at state agencies. This approach interested few constituents.

The other was a Western state congressman who wasn't effective in the House because of a quiet reputation for being untrustworthy. His constituents probably didn't distrust his word, because they didn't see him in action, close up. But his colleagues learned that they could not count on him, and, believe it or not, that is still an important standard in legislative chambers. In addition, this individual made it his custom to encourage voters in neighboring congressional districts to criticize their own representatives. That may not be immoral, but it certainly is foolish if you want your colleagues to cooperate with you later on matters that you care about.

Neither of these individuals is still in office.

Two other members of Congress that I encountered—one from the Southwest and the other from the Midwest—never came close to fulfilling their potential. Seeking publicity and constant campaigning for the next election were always more important to them than legislative work.

They chased television cameras and ingratiated themselves with reporters and commentators. They were masters of taxpayer-financed newsletters and the art of perpetual fund raising. Their re-election efforts were successes, all right, and they were returned to office again and again.

Most of the voters in their districts probably thought that the blizzard of press releases signified that their congressman was one of the most powerful leaders in the country.

The reality, however, was that electoral success was their only success. For one, after eight years in office, not a single amendment or other piece of legislation offered by him in committee or on the floor of Congress was ever adopted, even though he was a member of the majority party. The other was a confrontational, bombastic speaker whose instinct for controversy gave him high media notice and therefore high name recognition. But, again, in the halls of Congress, even the members with well-fed egos (which is most, of course) looked down on him as a showboater, and he was as ineffectual as the first fellow in actually getting things done.

These were people who were in office not for what they could do, but for what they could appear to do. Watch out for politicians with big propellers and small rudders.

Of course, there are a few members of legislative bodies whose early years are marked by ineffectiveness who change for the better over time.

I served with two members of Congress who were completely undistinguished in their first years on the Hill, but eventually matured. One, from the East, was noted for what a colleague termed "self-righteous grandstanding." Colleagues don't mind if you do that back home, but they hate it when you try it on them! Worse, this fellow often hinted to fellow members that they all lacked his intelligence and concern. Instead of admiring him more, of course, his colleagues for years went out of their way to ignore him. Fortunately, he was smart enough to see in time what he was doing wrong.

The other late-bloomer, from the upper Midwest, performed as a narrow-minded ideologue, someone who didn't want to be bothered with the lessons of experience, because he already knew what was wrong with the country and had simplistic slogans to meet every situation. After about a decade of such posturing, he began to realize that though he was still in office, he hadn't accomplished anything. Listening to others, accepting a little less than perfection (by his lights) and accepting responsibility for the legislative process, he, like the other case above, grew into a respected leader in his party.

In truth, such late-bloomers are unusual. Most people—including politicians—find it hard to change. The personal behavior and political techniques that a candidate brings to office normally are the ones he or she will practice once there. In an age of term-limit considerations, when many fear the loss of legislative bodies seasoned by experience and institutional memory, discovering these attributes in candidates is more important than ever, though no easier.

My observation is that effective legislators possess characteristics that, regardless of their years in office, are primarily responsible for their success. Of course, office-holders need to be ambitious, intelligent and committed to hard work. But they also have to have cultivated good political habits.

Here are ten of them:

(1) They keep their egos under control.

Put it this way: They don't let the praise of their own campaign brochures go to their head. They don't abuse staff members and those who assist them, nor treat career public servants or their fellow legislators with condescension. In fact, the code of the gentleman (or "gentlelady" in Congress) is what it always has been: Treat everyone in a friendly, collegial way.

(2) They are able to manage and lead their staff or those who are chosen to assist them, and they seek advice from competent and trustworthy sources.

The ultimate effectiveness of legislators can be partially judged by whom they employ, by their willingness to seek information from many sources (whether or not on

his own side) and by whom they rely on for regular counsel. Legislators who limit themselves to a narrow circle of advisers from any part of the spectrum usually limit the breadth of their knowledge and vision.

(3) They do their legislative homework and develop expertise on at least one issue.

A legislator earns respect from his fellow lawmakers by providing them with a superior understanding of certain types of legislation, even if the subjects are not of greatest importance to other members. Because legislators deal with so many issues, each has the opportunity to become an expert. It's an opportunity the showboaters pass up, but which pays off at crucial times and becomes the source of mutual trust and reliance in legislative bodies.

(4) They are not obsessed with obtaining credit from the media and the public for presumed legislative accomplishments. Obviously, elected officials need to receive some credit in order to be seen as effective back home. But for that very reason, the legislator who shares credit builds trust and respect among his colleagues. This kind of credit in politics is like financial credit in a bank; it's there when you really need it.

Most legislators especially develop a distaste for fellow members who continually seek praise when it is not deserved. It may not count against them in the media, but it does count against them in legislative negotiations.

(5) They realize that changes often come in a series of small steps.

I'm talking about the art of compromise, of course. Political and social principles are extremely important, but of little benefit if they can't persuade people on their own. Obtaining desired legislation by increments is usually more realistic under the American system than it is, perhaps, in systems without so many checks and balances and where laws can be fundamentally changed all at once. Legislators who insist on having everything their own way may look noble on television, but they carry little weight with their colleagues and generally get little of consequence done.

(6) They know how to work in a bipartisan fashion on most issues and respect the sincerity of those who oppose their point of view.

The effective legislator, like an effective person in any field, is able to discuss issues without personal rancor, and to realize that he or she may not possess the final truth in all matters of public policy.

Respect is the basis of civility. It lubricates the legislative process and removes unnecessary friction.

There's wisdom as well as kindness in this attitude of humility. An honest legislator will admit that much legislation, once it is implemented, may turn out to lack the perfection its authors claimed for it and will have to be modified or even repealed. Don't denounce your critic too harshly. History may prove him right!

(7) On issues where dramatic differences of opinion exist, they are intellectually capable of understanding their opponents' positions and arguments.

This is hard to do, or at least to do well. The common tendency is to parody the arguments of an opponent or put words in his mouth. But even if the public cannot always see it, other legislators know when a colleague is representing an opponents' case fairly. When it happens, even though minds may not change, attitudes are changed. An honest debater wins points of respect. It adds to the credit in his bank!

(8) They refuse to take themselves too seriously.

Politics is a serious business, but keeping a sense of humor is essential to keeping a re-

alistic sense of proportion, and that actually helps the serious business proceed. For many elected officials, periodic re-election and growing seniority make them imagine that they not only are gaining in experience but in virtue. Arrogance and acute self-centeredness hurt effectiveness. An ability to laugh at yourself has the "serious" result that it disarms your opponents!

(9) They understand that you become more effective by listening, questioning and learning, rather than just talking.

Almost all politicians, in or out of office, like to talk, naturally.

However, that does not mean that they have a lot of patience for other politicians who abuse the privilege. They do notice the person who studies carefully, gives evidence of sincere intellectual curiosity and works hard.

(10) They demonstrate their integrity by admitting their imperfections.

Nobody's perfect and little is more annoying than some politician who pretends otherwise—especially with his colleagues, who definitely know better. In fact, if you were perfect, you'd be smart to hide it.

Admitting your were wrong on an issue, not knowing the answer to every question and even changing one's mind in the face of facts are signs of personal security and strength, not of weakness. Such occasional admissions (which obviously should not be calculated) demonstrate to colleagues genuine character and encourage trust. Any observer can tell you that most legislators do not have all of these characteristics, and I would be the first to confess that in my 24 years as a legislator, not all of them were part of my own makeup.

Effective legislators don't need to have them all, but they do need to have a majority etched in their personality, and usually long before their election.

Other factors will help develop character, including experience, analytical powers that improve personal judgment, and the courage to stand up and be counted when the political risks are high.

Oddly, however, many of our most effective legislators have great difficulty being elected to higher office. Why is this so? Regrettably, just as a good "show horse" does not necessarily result in a good "work horse," the opposite is also true. The very humility that makes for trust within a legislative body, enabling quiet influence for good, is the vulnerability a rival can exploit at campaign time. The courage of one's conviction that the history books are likely to praise is perceived as mere stubbornness in the eyes of an offended interest group.

That is why it is increasingly important for voters, and the media that inform them, to consider the quiet, behind-the-scenes merits of effective legislators and other elected officials. The character issue is really about the age-old search for someone who would be "good" in office. The implication is that character and effectiveness usually go hand in hand. So don't just take the word of a campaign ad, television sound bite, or even a news column, as to who is likely to do the best job in office.

Check with a legislator's colleagues and the people who work with him or her. If we want effective people in office, we need to learn how to do a better job of figuring out which ones they are.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a couple of personal observations about Joel Pritchard.

When I ran for Congress, I had never run for any office before. I was not really all that involved in politics and I did not know Joel very well at the time, but I can remember when a re-

porter first asked me who I would like to be like in Congress and who was my hero, what sort of model would I like to follow, Joel Pritchard was the first person I thought of. He had that reputation throughout our State, even among people who did not know him.

After I was elected, Joel took a personal interest in me and we saw a lot of him in our office in Washington, DC. He would come back and talk to me and talk to the staff. Every once in a while he would give me gentle advice on the right way to deal with things, and frankly he gave me an example of a really excellent way to conduct myself in the job that I have. I have the seat that he had for 12 years.

I would like to say, Madam Speaker, in closing, that he set out a very admirable path for those of us who are in this business. It is a path that frankly will be harder for me to follow, and I think harder for all of us in this House to follow, now that Joel is no longer with us. We will miss him very much, perhaps more than we know. I just hope we can all be worthy of his example.

HONORING THE LIFE OF JOHN N. STURDIVANT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I came to speak about the loss of a leader in the Washington Metropolitan Area and in our community, but as well in our Nation. I came to the floor and I heard the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WHITE] speak about Joel Pritchard. I had not heard that he died.

Madam Speaker, I had the opportunity to serve with Joel Pritchard. He was a Representative, as has been said, of great integrity and great substance, a very decent human being who believed that partisanship came long after principle. He was a delight to serve with, and I am sorry to hear that he has passed away.

But as I will say about John Sturdivant, Joel Pritchard was someone who made this House a better place because of his service.

Madam Speaker, I rise to speak about a very good friend of mine, John Sturdivant, president of the American Federation of Government Employees. John Sturdivant died just a few days ago of cancer. I had the opportunity to talk to him about 3 or 4 days prior to his death. Even at that time, he was talking about his beloved members of the American Federation of Government Employees, was talking about how he could fight for and work for ensuring that they had an opportunity to earn sufficient funds to create for themselves a decent life and to provide well for their families, their husbands, their wives, their children.