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 foward 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 Kassebuam-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 a American.

Since the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was implemented, we have made enormous strides in our quest for an eqalitarian 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 ramification 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.