

before allowing it to proceed. As a result, we have specifically not included the provision you refer to.

That is correct. The GSA should not use funds appropriated to it to facilitate the proposed FCC move. Since the Commerce Appropriations Subcommittee denied requested funding for the relocation, the proposed move should not go forward until Congress has more closely examined the proposal. This matter involves the expenditure of tens of millions of taxpayer funds and it should be carefully reviewed before going forward. Until these issues have been resolved, I do not believe the proposed relocation should go forward. Accordingly, we did not include language allowing GSA to fund the proposed move and they should not use any of the resources provided to them for that purpose.

#### BREAST CANCER PATIENT PROTECTION ACT OF 1996

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Saturday, September 28, 1996*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to join my colleague, Representative ROSA DELAURO of Connecticut, in introducing the Breast Cancer Patient Protection Act of 1996. This legislation seeks to ensure that women and doctors—not insurance company bureaucrats—will decide how long a woman who has a mastectomy should remain in the hospital.

Breast cancer is physically and emotionally devastating. As Abigail Trafford stated in the Washington Post, "Breast cancer holds a unique place in the constellation of diseases. First, because it involves the breast, it challenges not just a woman's life, but her identity. [The breast] is the functioning symbol of motherhood and nurturing the young."

For any woman, facing breast cancer is one of her most frightening experiences. Learning that she must have a mastectomy, a surgical procedure that will change her body and her life, can be traumatic. An insurance company insults a woman facing one of life's great crises when it decrees that she must leave the hospital whether she is healed or not.

I realize that this legislation has little chance of enactment before this Congress concludes. Representative DELAURO and I, along with many other Members, have placed this on the table because we wanted every member of this body to think about it for the next 3 months. At the beginning of the 105th Congress, we will introduce similar legislation. It is our intention over this time to research the best, most effective ways to accomplish the bill's goals. That includes making sure we do not preempt responsible State legislation and that we define health plans to be consistent with the Kassebaum-Kennedy health insurance reform bill and with the MOMS bill providing 48-hour maternity stays that I introduced earlier this year, which was enacted as part of the VA-HUD appropriation bill.

Whether a patient is a young woman giving birth to a baby, or a woman having surgery to treat breast cancer, insurers have no right to interfere in decisions about treatments that are medically necessary and appropriate. This legislation seeks to make care, rather than cost, the driving principle of our health care system.

#### AUTHORIZING STATES TO DENY PUBLIC EDUCATION BENEFITS TO CERTAIN ALIENS NOT LAWFULLY PRESENT IN THE UNITED STATES

SPEECH OF

HON. PATRICK J. KENNEDY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, September 25, 1996*

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose H.R. 4134 on behalf of a generation of children who will be left to twist in the wind because they have been denied an elementary education.

I agree that measures should be taken to discourage and prevent undocumented individuals from entering our country. I will not support, however, any mean spirited, punitive attempts to secure our borders that will devastate numbers of children because of the sins of their parents.

Are we, as a body, going to reduce ourselves to mistreating little children because we are angry that their parents have not complied with our laws? The obvious recourse would be to punish their parents or proactively prevent them from immigrating here unlawfully. What good will it do to ban their children from attending public school? In the long run, it is the children of American citizens that will also be punished, because they will be forced to deal with the tragedy of a population of uneducated immigrants.

It sickens me to think of the discrimination that will inevitably result as parents will be forced to prove that their children are indeed legal. Unfortunately, those children who look foreign will be forced to prove that they are, in fact, Americans. Be assured that the children whose ancestors are Irish, or British or Dutch or French won't be asked to prove their legality—they can easily pass as American.

Since the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was implemented, we have made enormous strides in our quest for an egalitarian society. This bill will only take us back to a dark period in our Nation—one in which those who looked different from the majority were treated as second-class citizens.

What good will it do us to leave a generation of children—most of whom were born here and are American citizens—uneducated, unskilled, and downright hopeless? In an era when we are intent on reducing crime, cutting Government spending, and helping American families strive for a better living standard, relegating thousands of children to a lifetime of virtual poverty as a consequence of their lack of education is morally reprehensible, politically irresponsible, and fiscally imprudent.

Need I remind my colleagues of the numbers of organizations, including every major law enforcement organization in the United States are opposed to this measure. They recognize that putting thousands of kids on the streets will not decrease illegal immigration but only promote crime, gangs and drugs, and place enormous strains on the cities and counties that will be forced to deal with these problems.

I ask my colleagues, will you feed, clothe, house, and offer work to this generation of uneducated adults?

Certainly my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have not fully ingested the ramifica-

tion of this potentially devastating legislation. I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 4134.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 640, WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1996

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, September 26, 1996*

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 640, the Water Resources Development Act. This bill authorizes the construction of various water resources development projects by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The projects involve flood control, navigation, erosion control, and environmental regulation.

The bill also contains a provision that increases the required contribution by non-Federal sources for the costs of Federal flood control projects from 25 to 35 percent for all future flood control projects. This provision does not apply to projects that are authorized in this bill.

Additionally, for the first time, local sources must contribute 35 percent of the costs of all environmental protection and restoration projects. The bill also provides Federal funding—between 40 and 80 percent of the total cost—for constructing dredged material disposal areas. Previously, these areas had to be constructed solely with local funds.

As we will continue to debate and approve funding for water resources development projects in the next Congress, I hope that we will support adequate funding for the Sims Bayou project in Houston, TX. While I favor active local involvement and some local contribution in funding these projects, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers must not abandon its oversight responsibility to make sure that projects such as Sims Bayou are completed to specifications in a timely manner. I also hope that Congress will continue to closely monitor the work of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers on these important issues.

#### AMERICA'S ENERGY FUTURE

HON. DAN SCHAEFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Saturday, September 28, 1996*

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely unhappy to see that today's budget deal again sells oil from the strategic petroleum reserve to meet short-term budgetary goals. This is the third sale in 2 years and there appears to be no end in sight.

This year we got a wake-up call about the state of U.S. energy security. Troops stationed in Saudi Arabia to protect United States interest in the region came under attack from forces hostile to the United States. Saddam Hussien is again on the move. Tensions in other parts of the Middle East continue to mount. At the same time, U.S. dependence on foreign oil, including oil from the Middle East, grew to unprecedented levels. And oil markets are reflecting this instability through their volatility.

Yet, despite all these signs, the administration and the House and Senate budget negotiators continue to give U.S. energy security the lowest priority. Last week, a witness testifying before the Senate Armed Services Committee stated that " \* \* \* our national energy policy seems to be based, largely, on the policy of prayer." While I don't believe that it is true yet, this country certainly seems headed in that direction.

In the 1970's energy crisis became a term every American understood. In the years after the Arab oil embargo this Nation took several steps to increase our energy security. We created and filled a strategic petroleum reserve, we encouraged environmentally benign development of domestic energy resources, we encouraged fuel diversification and greater use of alternative fuels, we encouraged research and development of renewable energy resources, and we encouraged conservation and energy efficiency in all areas.

However, in recent years we seem to have forgotten the lessons we learned from the gas lines and energy shortages of the 1970's. Our current policies discourage development of domestic energy resources. We have placed large tracts of oil and gas bearing lands off-limits to exploration and development. We have to fight vigorously every year to keep renewable energy research budgets from being slashed.

And now we are selling oil from our strategic petroleum reserve just as fast as we can. Clearly, there are those who have forgotten that the SPR is America's first line of defense from those who would hold us hostage through our high level of dependence on imported oil. These oil sales are occurring not because of any energy shortage, but because the administration and the appropriators see an opportunity to use this oil reserve as a cash reserve.

However, when the reserve is used in this manner everyone loses. The American people paid over \$200 billion to build and fill the strategic petroleum reserve. It costs approximately \$35 to buy and store a barrel of oil in the reserve. When oil was sold from the reserve last year to help balance the budget, the Department of Energy received approximately \$18 a barrel. It doesn't take an economics professor to tell you that you can't balance the budget by buying high and selling low.

In addition, when oil is sold from the reserve in a nonemergency situation it gives those who want to intervene in free markets, including our President, the ability to do so. This past April, even though there was no oil shortage, the President announced he would use authority he had to draw down the reserve in order to lower rising gasoline prices. Again, think to the 1970's if you have doubts about whether the Government should intervene in the free marketplace. I fully expect the President to use the authority we are granting him today to intervene in the marketplace again this winter.

Finally, when we sell the strategic petroleum reserve during anything less than an energy emergency the American people aren't just losing money, they are losing something more important: their energy security. At the rate we are selling oil from the reserve, in 2015 when the U.S. depends on foreign suppliers for as much as 68 percent of its daily oil consumption we will have less than 100 million barrels of oil left in the reserve. That scares me and I hope it scares everyone else.

America needs to pay more attention to securing its energy future. And we need to begin by stopping the fire sale being conducted at our Nation energy security reserve. If we don't stop these trends, the term "energy crisis" will again be part of the vocabulary of every American.

#### SUPPORT H.R. 4264

HON. EARL POMEROY

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Saturday, September 28, 1996*

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4264, a bill which marks an important step forward in our national effort to combat diabetes. The provisions of H.R. 4264 are identical to the provisions of two separate diabetes bills I have cosponsored this session, H.R. 1073 and H.R. 1074. These bills will for the first time provide Medicare reimbursement for outpatient self-management training for individuals with diabetes. They will also for the first time provide Medicare coverage for the blood-testing strips that diabetics use to monitor their blood sugar levels. The Congressional Caucus on Diabetes—of which I am a member, led by Representative ELIZABETH FURSE (D-OR), has worked hard throughout this session to get these bills passed, and I am glad that H.R. 4264 provides us with the vehicle to achieve this goal.

Diabetes is a particular problem for older Americans. Over 16 percent of Americans over the age of 65 have the disease, and over one quarter of the entire Medicare budget is spent caring for diabetic seniors. With coverage of self-management training and blood-testing strips under Medicare, Congress has recognized that efforts to combat diabetes must not focus solely on treatment of serious illness but also on education and self-management which can prevent serious illness. This preventive emphasis is not only cost-effective, but will result in greatly reduced human suffering.

Medical research has shown us that many of the most serious complications stemming from diabetes can be controlled through proper management by those who have the condition. According to Practical Diabetology, 90 percent of diabetes-related blindness is preventable, and 50 percent of diabetes-related amputations and hospitalizations are preventable. With coverage of self-management training and blood-testing strips, many more diabetic seniors will be able to head off these serious, and sometimes life-threatening, complications which can result from unbalanced blood sugar levels.

Mr. Speaker, I hope consideration and passage of H.R. 4264 indicates a renewed sense of urgency in Congress about combating diabetes. An area to which we must direct this sense of urgency in the coming months is the epidemic of diabetes among native Americans. Whether by granting the Indian Health Service [IHS] third-party reimbursement authority or by preserving IHS diabetes-control efforts as the agency downsizes and restructures, we must elevate our commitment to reducing the tragic incidence of diabetes among our native American population. Mr. Speaker, I urge by colleagues to support H.R. 4264 as the first im-

portant step in a renewed national effort to combat diabetes.

#### TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSMEN ANDY JACOBS AND JOHN MYERS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Saturday, September 28, 1996*

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the careers of two outstanding Members of Congress who are retiring this year: ANDY JACOBS and JOHN MYERS.

I have known ANDY and JOHN for many years, and have always had the highest regard for them. They are a true credit to this institution. Congress will miss them. The State of Indiana will miss them. And I will miss them.

It has been a great pleasure working with them over the years. They are individuals of remarkable integrity, dedication, and professionalism. They have, of course, had a tremendous impact on our great State and its people, as well as the citizens of this country.

ANDY and JOHN, will also be missed for the personal qualities they brought to their work. In national politics and in Congress we have seen a clear decline in basic civility. There have been far too many personal attacks and shouting matches, too much partisanship, and meanness.

ANDY and JOHN, in contrast, have long been models of civility and decency. They certainly have their views on issues, and have never been afraid to voice them. But they always have respected those with whom they have disagreed, and worked tirelessly to build consensus on some of our most difficult challenges. We can all learn from their example.

Their work has certainly been a mark of distinction. ANDY and JOHN have every right to look back on their service with a full measure of satisfaction. I have enjoyed greatly my association with them. They have been wonderful colleagues, and good friends.

I wish both ANDY and JOHN—and their families—all the best in their retirement.

#### TRIBUTE TO SUSAN LECRON

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Saturday, September 28, 1996*

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the retirement of a dedicated community leader in our district, Susan LeCron. She is retiring after 20 years of service to the Toledo Botanical Gardens. Under her leadership as executive director, the Toledo Botanical Gardens has truly flourished. Her able hand has guided the gardens from 20 acres and a groundskeeper to a 60-acre nationally designated botanical garden, a staff of more than 30, and a budget which is 20 times greater than at the beginning of her tenure.

Although she is proudest of the gardens' children's programs, Susan's leadership has