

As the Speaker knows, we have had very little opportunity for deliberation and debate of this issue in the current Congress, over the objections of a fair number of people who really believe strongly that the American people deserve and in fact are requesting that Congress deal with this matter.

One of the bills that has been presented of the many bills that are before this Congress that could be debated and deliberated and voted upon this session, if the Republican leadership so desired, is the clean money, clean elections bill which I was proud to sponsor, H.R. 2199.

I would like to take a little bit of this time to explain some of the concepts in this bill so people will understand just what one of the proposals is that could be dealt with in this particular session.

The clean money, clean elections bill would have a privately funded candidate, if so desired, and a publicly funded candidate. That would be the option.

If you are a clean money candidate, or the publicly funded candidate, then the campaign would start six months before your primary date. That is when the effort would begin.

Anything before then would only be an opportunity to collect seed money, so-to-speak, just \$35,000 or less in contributions of \$100 or less to fund the operation of an office and a campaign staff to help you get your grassroots organization to get together. There would be no money involved in that small seed amount for TV or radio or other advertising.

From that period of six months prior to the primary date onward up until the thirtieth day before the election, one month before the election, candidates would seek to qualify these public funded candidates by collecting a set number of \$5 contributions from individual residents of the state.

Once that amount was received and you were qualified for the primary, if in fact you won the primary, you would be qualified for the final. The total amount you could receive as a clean money candidate for the primary and the general election would be 80 percent of the national average of campaign expenditures by all winning House candidates for the previous three election cycles. That amount would be limited and set. In addition, if you opted to be a publicly funded candidate, you would receive TV and radio time free, and that would be compensation to the broadcast companies for the spectrum that they already receive from the American public.

This should be a strong incentive for people to forego the private money chase, to become a member of this system of clean money financing.

Soft money would be prohibited. And, yes, if you elect to have private funding, you can certainly go about and raise as much as you want, but there are strong disincentives for you not to do that.

Issues campaigns run for a private money candidate against a clean money candidate would count toward the private money candidate's sum. If they surpassed the limits allowed in the campaign, the clean money candidate would get offsetting moneys, so that this would always be an evenly balanced campaign.

The five objectives that are basically addressed in this particular bill, Mr. Speaker, are as follows: It would eliminate any perceived and real conflicts of interest caused by the direct financing of campaigns by private interests; it would limit campaign spending by requiring that candidates who choose to participate in the clean money system spend no more money than the fixed amount of funding that they receive; it allows qualified individuals to run for office, regardless of their economic status or their access to large contributors; it frees candidates and elected officials from the burden of the continuous money chase; last, it would shorten the effective length of campaigns by defining the point at which candidates receive clean money financing to pay for campaign expenditures.

Mr. Speaker, this bill creates a voluntary system. Candidates may choose to rely upon private financing, though the system provides strong incentives not to do that. For candidates, it also gets rid of the system of disfavored soft money.

It creates a level playing field. There would be no unilateral disarming of any party. In effect, Mr. Speaker, I find that is generally the complaint of one side of this House or another, that many of the campaign finance bills would disarm unilaterally one faction against the other. That is not the case with this bill. It sets an even, level playing field, so the candidate with the message, with the ability to organize, get their message out, put together a strong grassroots campaign, would be the candidate that would get the voters' attention.

It is, I think, Mr. Speaker, a fact that best organized candidates would prevail, and voters would in fact prevail. They would own back their own electoral process and they would once again have faith and the system would have credibility.

Mr. Speaker, I put that out there as one of the options that are available for people as they wonder why it is that this House under the Republican leadership has not dealt with the issue of campaign finance reform.

I say there are a number of other credible bills up for consideration that deserve a chance to be debated, deserve the deliberation of this great body, and deserve to come to a vote in a meaningful way.

I would urge the Republican leadership to put this matter on the floor of the House before we go home for recess this fall, and I hope that other Members who have presented their bills will take the opportunity to address to the public the substance of their bills so

that we can in some fashion have a debate that I think is much deserved and long overdue.

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

[Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

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

PERSIAN GULF WAR SYNDROME STILL A MYSTERY AFTER 6 YEARS

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I want to address one of the most important issues facing American veterans and one of the great medical dilemmas facing our entire country, and that is that over 70,000 veterans of the Persian Gulf war, including hundreds in my own State of Vermont, continue to suffer from gulf war illness, and 6 years, 6 years after the completion of that war, there is still no understanding of the cause of that illness and no effective treatment for it.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS], who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Resources, has held 10 hearings on gulf war illness since March, 1996. As a member of that committee, I cannot begin to express the frustration that many of us feel regarding the ineptitude of the Department of Defense and the Veterans Administration in responding adequately and effectively to the needs of those veterans who continue to hurt.

Pure and simple, the bottom line is that 6 years after the end of the Persian Gulf war, the Department of Defense and the Veterans Administration still have not developed an understanding of the cause of gulf war illness or an effective treatment protocol. In fact, their record has been so inadequate that several weeks ago the Presidential Advisory Committee on Persian Gulf War Veterans Illnesses indicated that it will be recommending to the President that an independent agency outside of the Pentagon take responsibility for investigating the health effects of low level chemical and biological weapons exposure.

According to Arthur L. Kaplan, a bioethics professor at the University of