

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman 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 Maine [Mr. ALLEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. ALLEN 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 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 Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. SANDERS 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 California [Mr. RIGGS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. RIGGS 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 gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. NORTON 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 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 New York [Mr. McNULTY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. McNULTY 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 Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

## H.R. 135 AND BREAST CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, as October is Breast Cancer Awareness Month, I rise to reflect on those loved ones we have lost to breast cancer and to offer my support to those who are struggling with the disease. I also rise to strongly urge an important legislative response to this killer disease.

Whether we are aware of it or not, all of us know at least one person who has been affected by breast cancer. The prevalence of this disease is underscored by some truly alarming statistics. Breast cancer is the most common form of cancer in women in the United States. And as was mentioned a minute ago, one in eight women will be diagnosed with the disease in her lifetime. In my home State of Connecticut alone, 2,000 women will be diagnosed with breast cancer in 1997 and approximately 480 women, unfortunately, will succumb to this illness.

Finding a way to eradicate breast cancer must be a national priority. It is imperative that the public and private sectors continue to devote sufficient resources for research activities aimed at finding a cure. I would like to commend my colleagues for their efforts to pass the fiscal year 1998 Labor, Health and Human Services Education Appropriations bill, which provides a \$764.5 million increase over last year's level for the National Institutes of Health and \$124 million more for the National Cancer Institute.

Until we find a cure, however, we must ensure that those living with breast cancer have access to quality health care services. New drugs and therapies are being developed to ease the suffering of breast cancer victims and help them lead normal lives. However, as my colleague, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] eloquently stated on the floor of this House the other night, some managed care organizations are providing inadequate coverage for hospital stays after women undergo mastectomies.

I find it unconscionable that managed care staffers whose knowledge of medicine is often limited and whose decisions are influenced by financial considerations are forcing women out of hospitals in their time of need. The results of a study conducted on this matter by the Connecticut Office of Health Care Access are stunning. The report revealed that the average length of a hospital stay for breast cancer patients in Connecticut and across the Nation is decreasing, and it is falling faster for mastectomies than for other inpatient discharges. We must act to halt this unacceptable trend. Breast cancer patients face life-and-death decisions, and they should be afforded the peace of mind that comes with adequate coverage of services.

The gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] and I, together with 194 of our colleagues, have introduced legislation to address this problem. I am proud to be a cosponsor of the Breast Cancer Patient Protection Act, critical legislation which provides important safeguards for those afflicted with breast cancer. This measure will guarantee coverage of a maximum hospital stay of 48 hours for a woman having a mastectomy and 24 hours for a woman undergoing a lymph node removal. This is the least we can do for patients who have just endured a traumatic and painful surgical procedure. And consistent with other efforts to regulate managed care plans, and ensure quality health care, this legislation helps to empower women to make their own health care choices, and gives doctors the ability to make appropriate medical decisions.

Unfortunately, the Congress has not taken action on this legislation. The Sapien Health Network has created a web page and is asking people to sign their "Breast Cancer Care" petition urging Congress to schedule hearings on the Breast Cancer Protection Act. Thousands of Americans have contacted that website to express their support for this critical legislation.

□ 2045

This web site also contains a number of testimonials from breast cancer survivors, patients, and family members of victims.

I would like to close by reading the moving statements of two Connecticut residents whose lives have been touched by breast cancer. One reads: "I am a breast cancer survivor who was fortunate enough to have my reconstruction covered by my insurance company, thanks to some careful wording by my plastic surgeon. I had my mastectomy and reconstruction at the same time just 4 years ago, and my surgeon said that I would be in the hospital 4 to 5 days. I can't imagine going home any sooner, especially with the drains still in me. Unfortunately I developed an infection and stayed 21 days. What if that infection hadn't shown up before I was sent home?"

Another Connecticut resident writes: "In May of 1997, I was diagnosed with breast cancer. Fortunately it was detected through a mammogram at a very early stage. I've had a lumpectomy, lymph node dissection, and radiation. The laws need to be supportive and realistic. These are our mothers and sisters and wives and daughters that we're talking about."

Mr. Speaker, now is the time for us to intensify our efforts to eliminate breast cancer. I urge my colleagues to support the Breast Cancer Patient Protection Act.

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

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

#### ACLU AT IT AGAIN

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday in one of our Nation's leading daily newspapers, the Christian Science Monitor, was this paragraph:

"The ACLU is at it again. The organization that opposes school uniforms, obstructs teen curfews, fights metal detectors at airports, and challenges restrictions on child pornography is now turning its legal firepower against single-sex public schools."

As the headline in the Monitor said, "Single-sex schools are a form of diversity." The Christian Science Monitor is not a conservative publication. Also, even many liberals like columnist William Raspberry and others have praised single-sex schools.

People should be free to go to any type of school they want to go to or their parents want them to go to. But everyone should realize how elitist and left wing the ACLU has become, how out of step with the American people it is. It basically has become an organization that is supported by rich socialists.

They fight against school prayer and in favor of child pornography. What a group. Then they try to portray themselves as a pro bono public interest group and then demand \$6.7 million, \$450 an hour, for legal work in their suit against the Citadel. The ACLU charged \$105,000 just to prepare the bill in that case, so now all the students at the Citadel will have to pay higher fees for their college education, thanks to the ACLU.

While I am speaking about the type of education our children receive and the choices or options they have, let me also mention last week's White House Conference on Day Care. Columnists Linda Chavez and Mona Charen both wrote about this conference and the harmful effects of placing small children into institutional day care.

Linda Chavez wrote, "From everything we know about child development, it's a good thing more children, especially infants, are not being cared for in institutional settings. Babies and very young children need the kind of personal attention and care giving that is impossible to find in a day care center no matter how well-intentioned or well-meaning the staff."

She quoted Dr. Stanley Greenspan, a professor of pediatrics and psychiatry at George Washington University, who wrote recently in the Washington Post, "In the rush to improve and increase child care, we are ignoring a more fundamental reality: Much of the child care available for infants and toddlers in this country simply isn't good for them."

Among his reasons were a lack of continuity with one care giver and lack of prolonged interactions between child and adult. In other words, babies and small children need, desperately need and desperately want, much more individualized attention than is possible even in the best, most expensive day care center.

Mona Charen went on to write: "American families are creative. Though we hear endless calls for more and better child care, 66.7 percent of mothers with children under age 6 are full-time mothers or are employed part-time. They are not crying out for more institutional child care. What they do need are tax breaks, flex-time, work-at-home options, telecommuting and job sharing."

She goes on to say this: "The notion of a child care crisis is a myth. We now have expert testimony like that of Dr. Greenspan and other experts cited by the Clintons themselves to bolster the common-sense intuition that parents are the best guardians of young children. The goal of public policy ought to be to ensure that as many parents as possible are free to make that choice."

The thing that would help children the most, Mr. Speaker, would be to drastically decrease the cost of government. Today the average person is paying almost half of his or her income in taxes of all types, Federal, State and local.

Thus, as several commentators have noted, today one spouse has to work to support the government while the other spouse works to support the family. Many families who would like to spend more time with their children simply do not have the option because of our big government, the Nanny State we have created. Our children would be far better off today, Mr. Speaker, if we drastically downsized our government and drastically decreased its cost and left more money for parents to spend on their own children and less on government bureaucrats. Our children will be far better off with less government and more time with and attention from their parents.

#### WHAT A DIFFERENCE 4 YEARS MAKES

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

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, this last weekend as I do most weekends, I went back to my home State of South Dakota and had the opportunity to participate in the annual governor's pheasant hunt, which was a huge success in spite of the weather. It is always a great reminder and a great opportunity for me to get away to clear my head, get out in the beautiful country, in the fall in South Dakota, which is a wonderful time of the year, and participate in an activity which has become a trademark and something that is very much a part of our culture in

my State of South Dakota. Oftentimes as I travel in my State when I am back home I will hear from some of my conservative friends who express frustration at the fact that sometimes Washington has not come, or that we have not done enough in terms of changing the culture of this city, that we are not making progress fast enough. What I often try to remind them of is what a difference 4 years has made.

As I look at the progress that has been made here in the last 4 years, I think it is important to keep in perspective from where we have come so we know where we are going. Four short years ago, we had a President who was trying to invent a national health care system, where the government, this huge bureaucracy, would take over the health care system in this country. We saw the largest tax increase in the history not only of this country but, as someone has said, I believe a Senator, the biggest tax increase in the history of the world. And now in 4 short years and after the 1994 election, when those policies were repudiated and the Republicans took majority of the Congress, we began to take action to reverse the culture of this city, and it changed the value system that we have here.

I would like to think that the values that we have brought here as a matter of value, that bigger is not necessarily better and that smaller is better in the area of the Federal Government and that my kids are infinitely better off if we have a Federal Government that is more efficient, more responsive and a better value for the taxpayers. As a basic statement of values, that it is not the government's money, it is in fact the people of this country's money, and they ought to be able to best determine how those dollars are spent. Furthermore, that we do not need Hollywood, as the Vice President suggested last week, to force us to consider what our values ought to be. But as a matter of fact, that we want to give a more active role to parents, to families, to churches, to communities, to allow parents to spend more time with their families so they will not have to work 3 jobs by giving them a lower tax structure so they can have the important role in shaping the values of the future of our country and the future of our kids.

These are the things that I think we are making and the areas where we are making historic progress, as we consider the accomplishments of the past 4 years, welfare reform, the first balanced budget in some 30 years, the first tax relief, lower taxes on American families and businesses and people who are farmers and ranchers in my State for the first time in 16 years. Medicare reform. So many issues we have tackled in this Congress and progress we have made.

The short of it is I believe for the first time in a generation, we have taken bold steps to shift power out of Washington, D.C. and back home to the