he or she would have the choice of receiving paid time off in lieu of cash wages for overtime hours worked. However, under current Federal law, if the individual is employed in the private sector then he or she cannot choose paid time off, even if that form of compensation is preferred.

The Working Families Flexibility Act would allow employers to make compensatory time available as an option for employees. Employees would have the choice, through an agreement with the employer, to take overtime pay in the form of paid time off. As with overtime pay, the compensatory time would accrue at a rate of time-and-a-half.

Opponents of the Working Families Flexibility Act have raised concerns about employees being coerced by employers into choosing compensatory time over cash wages. Thus, the legislation includes numerous protections to ensure that employees cannot be pressured into one choice or the other.

Employees could accrue up to 240 hours of compensatory time within a 12-month period. The legislation would require the employer to annually cash-out any unused, compensatory time accrued by the employee.

Employees could choose when to take accrued compensatory time, so long as its use does not unduly disrupt the operations of the business (the same standard used in the public sector and under the Family and Medical Leave Act.) Employers would be prohibited from requiring employees to take accrued time solely at the convenience of the employer.

At any time, an employee could withdraw from a compensatory time agreement with their employer or request a cash-out of any or all accrued, unused compensatory time. The employer would have 30 days in which to comply with the request. The legislation would also require an employer to provide the employee with at least 30 days notice prior to cashing out any accrued time in excess of 80 hours or prior to discontinuing a policy of offering compensatory time.

This legislation does not eliminate or change the traditional 40-hour work week. It simply provides employees with another option in the workplace—time off instead of overtime pay. This concept may be revolutionary to some, but to America's workers, who are increasingly frustrated about coping with the demands of work and family responsibilities, it is a long overdue change.

I urge my colleagues to respond to the needs of America's workers by supporting the Working Families Flexibility Act.

KEEP THE NAME AS DEVILS TOWER

HON. BARBARA CUBIN

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1997

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to ensure that the name of Devils Tower National Monument remain unchanged. I introduced this bill during the 104th Congress and since that time I have received numerous positive comments and support from constituents from around the Devils Tower area. In fact, my office has received a petition with an estimated 2,000 names from not only those in and around the monument but from all over the country of those concerned with changing the name of this beloved landmark.

For more than 100 years the name ''Devils Tower'' has applied to the geologic formation in my State and has since appeared as such on maps in Wyoming and nationwide. The name was given to the monument by a scientific team, directed by Gen. George Custer and escorted by Col. Richard Dodge in 1875, and is universally recognized as an important landmark that distinguishes the northeastern part of Wyoming. The monument has brought a vital tourist industry to that portion of the State due to its unique character and structure.

According to a July 17, 1996, release by the U.S. Board on Geographic Names, the National Park Service has advised the board that several native American groups do intend to submit a proposal, if one has not already been submitted, to change the name of the monument. On September 4–6, 1996, the superintendent of Devils Tower, Deborah Liggett, gave a presentation at the Western States Geographic Names Conference in Salt Lake City, UT, giving the native American perspective.

During a July 1, 1996, meeting with Ms. Liggett she gave me her assurance that she had no intention of proposing a name change for the monument, and made it clear to me that no one else was in the process of initiating a name change. The legislation that I am introducing today on behalf of the State of Wyoming will ensure that the name of the geological formation, historically known as Devils Tower, remain unchanged.

It is my belief and the belief of hundreds of people from around the region that a name change will only bring economic hardship to the tourist industry in the area. I cannot and will not stand idly by and allow that to happen. I commend this bill to my colleagues and urge them to join me in cosponsoring it.

A BEACON-OF-HOPE FOR ALL AMERICANS: ASQUITH REID

HON. MAJOR R. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1997

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, with the 1996 election behind us, this Nation has completed another cycle for the ongoing democratic process which makes America great. The electoral process and the public officials selected through this process are invaluable assets in our quest to promote the general welfare and to guarantee the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. It is important, however, Mr. Speaker, that we also give due recognition to the equally valuable contribution of nonelected leaders throughout our Nation. The fabric of our society is generally enhanced and enriched by the hard work done year after year by ordinary volunteer citizens. Especially in our inner city communities which suffer from long public policy neglect, local grassroots leaders provide invaluable service. These are men and women who engage in activities which generate hope. I salute all such heroes and heroines as Beacons-of-Hope.

Asquith Reid is one of these Beacons-of-Hope residing in the central Brooklyn community of New York City and New York State. While Asquith Reid has served as an electrical engineer employed with the telephone industry, most of his time is spent as a political engineer. He has guided campaigns for district 18 school board candidates; for Assemblyman Nick Perry; Councilwoman Una Clark; and Congressman MAJOR R. OWENS.

Mr. Reid's most recent victory was the triumphant election of John Sampson for New York State Senator. Undoubtedly, Mr. Reid's political engineering has yet to reach its peak.

Throughout the years, Asquith Reid has worked diligently in top positions to the benefit of his community. He currently serves as chairman of the New Era Democratic Club; vice chair of District 17 Neighborhood Advisory Board; board member for the Husain Institute of Technology; and president of the Donna Reid Memorial Education Fund.

Mr. Reid was born in Hanover, Jamaica. He graduated from Kingston Technical High School and served in the U.S. Air Force from 1963 to 1967. He later graduated from Kingston Technical College with a degree in electrical engineering. Asquith and his wife, Dean, are the proud parents of two children, Michelle and Sharon.

Asquith Reid is a Beacon-of-Hope for central Brooklyn and for all Americans.

INTRODUCTION OF THE BREAST CANCER PATIENT PROTECTION ACT OF 1997

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1997

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the bipartisan Breast Cancer Patient Protection Act of 1997. I want to thank my colleagues Representatives DINGELL, ROUKEMA, ACKERMAN, THOMAS, BARRETT, BENTSEN, CORRINE BROWN, SHERROD BROWN, CLAYTON, CLEMENT, CONYERS, DEFAZIO, ESHOO, EVANS, FALEOMAVAEGA, FARR, FOGLIETTA, JON FOX, FRANK, FROST, GEJDENSON, GONZALEZ, GORDON, GREEN, HINCHEY, PATRICK KENNEDY, KENNELLY, KILDEE, LAFALCE, LOWEY, MCDERMOTT, CAROLYN MALONEY, CARRIE MEEK, PATSY MINK, JAMES MORAN, MORELLA, MURTHA, NADLER, NORTON, OBERSTAR, OLVER, OWENS, PALLONE, PAYNE, PELOSI, QUINN, RAHALL, RIVERS, SANDERS, SLAUGHTER, TOWNS, and VELAZQUEZ for joining me as original cosponsors.

As an active participant in the fight for health care reform, I continue to believe that we must reform the health care system to provide quality care for all Americans. Particularly important is ensuring that women receive equitable treatment in our nation's health care system.

This year, approximately 184,300 grandmothers, mothers, and daughters will be diagnosed with invasive breast cancer. Another 44,300 women will die from this disease. With one in every eight women developing breast cancer, virtually every family in America is vulnerable to this disease. That's why today I am filing a bill that sets a minimum length hospital stay for patients undergoing breast cancer treatment. This bill would require a minimum

hospital stay of 48 hours for mastectomies and 24 hours for lymph node removals.

Standard surgical treatment for breast cancer includes mastectomy, lymph node dissection, and lumpectomy. Over the least ten years, the length of hospitalization for patients undergoing mastectomies has dwindled significantly from 4–6 to 2–3 days. In the past, patients undergoing lymph node dissections generally were hospitalized for 2–3 days. Hospitalization is essential for pain control and for the management of fluid drainage from the operative site. The less tangible, but still important benefit of hospitalization is to provide a supportive surrounding for the patient to address the psychological and emotional reactions to having breast cancer, such as depression, anxiety, and hostility.

Now, under incessant pressure from managed care organizations to reduce costs, surgeons have had to perform lymph node dissections and even mastectomies as outpatient surgery. Some health maintenance organizations [HMO's] send their patients home a few hours after their surgery groggy from anesthesia, in pain, and with drainage tubes still in place. Others even deny women hospitalizations on the day of their lymph node dissection or mastectomy, making the surgeon choose between giving the patient the individual care she needs or being penalized by the HMO for not following its guidelines. Doctors, concerned for their patients' well-being, even find themselves locked in battle with HMO's. One doctor in my district had to spend over 7 hours—not in surgery treating women for breast cancer—but rather making phone calls pleading with HMO staff members to get a mastectomy patient admitted to the hospital for 24 hours.

The guidelines that many managed care companies are using today are written by a single actuarial consulting firm. And, while a few physicians are employed by this company, none are actively performing breast cancer surgery. These guidelines are designed to fit the ideal breast cancer surgery patient that is placed in the most optimal situation. However, both the American College of Surgeons and the American Medical Association believe that most patients can not satisfy these guidelines and will require a longer length of stay. Today, HMO's base their coverage on the recommendations of health care actuaries, not on those of surgeons who care for patients day in and day out. And the guidelines they use to do it are based on the bottom line, not on medically established standards of care.

That is simply unacceptable. Accepted practice has shown that victims of breast cancer need to remain in the hospital at least 48 hours after a mastectomy and 24 hours after a lymph node dissection. This legislation would ensure that women with breast cancer receive the medical attention they need and deserve. My bill ensures that health plans which provide medical and surgical benefits for the treatment of breast cancer provide a minimum length of hospital stay of 48 hours for patients undergoing mastectomies and 24 hours for those undergoing lymph node removals. Under this bill, physicians and patients, not insurance companies, can determine if a shorter period of hospital stay is appropriate.

Beginning on the first day of the 105th Congress, with this bipartisan bill, we can ensure that women with breast cancer receive the best treatment and coverage available. And, we can ensure that crucial health care decisions are left in the hands of doctors, and not accountants.

This legislation enjoys strong support from the National Breast Cancer Coalition, the National Association of Breast Care Organizations, the Y-Me National Breast Cancer Organization, the Families USA Foundation, the Women's Legal Defense Fund, and the American Society of Plastic and Reconstructive Surgeons, as well as from women across the country from Wisconsin to California to New Hampshire. I strongly urge all of my colleagues to endorse this widely-supported bipartisan effort to help ensure that American women who have breast cancer receive the comprehensive and equitable health care coverage they deserve.

PROTECT OUR FLAG

HON. JO ANN EMERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1997

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a constitutional amendment for the protection of our Nation's flag. The flag is a revered symbol of America's great tradition of liberty and democratic government, and it ought to be protected from acts of desecration that diminish us all.

As you know, there have been several attempts to outlaw by statute the desecration of the flag. Both Congress and State legislatures have passed such measures in recent years, only to be overruled later by decisions of the Supreme Court. It is clear that nothing short of an amendment to the Constitution will ensure that Old Glory has the complete and unqualified protection of the law.

The most common objection to this kind of amendment is that it unduly infringes on the freedom of speech. However, this objection disregards the fact that our freedoms are not practiced beyond the bounds of common sense and reason. As is often the case, there are reasonable exceptions to the freedom of speech, such as libel, obscenity, trademarks, and the like. Desecration of the flag is this kind of act, something that goes well beyond the legitimate exercising of a right. It is a wholly disgraceful and unacceptable form of behavior, an affront to the proud heritage and tradition of America.

Make no mistake, this constitutional amendment should be at the very top of the agenda of this Congress. We owe it to every citizen of this country, and particularly to those brave men and women who have stood in harm's way so that the flag and what it stands for might endure. I urge this body to take a strong stand for what is right and ensure the protection of our flag.

INTRODUCTION OF CLEAN SWEEP ACT OF 1997

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1997

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the ''Clean Sweep Act of 1997'' which is intended to bring fiscal sanity back to our nation's campaign financing system. In 1994, congressional candidates spent close to $725 million to be elected to the U.S. Congress. This is nearly $610 million more than candidates spent in 1976 and 60 percent more than the 1990 congressional election. Corporation and union Political Action Committee (PAC) contributions made up 27 percent of this total in 1994.

While the final tally for campaign spending in the most recent election cycle is not yet known, Common Cause, a campaign finance reform advocacy group, has estimated that the cost of the 1996 presidential and congressional elections may reach nearly $2 billion. PAC contributions from corporations have been estimated at over $150 million, while union PACs have been reported between $150 to $500 million. We cannot allow special interest to buy influence in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the ''Clean Sweep Act'' requires that at least half of a candidate's contributors come from within the district; prohibits the acceptance of Political Action Committee (PAC) money; limits a candidate's personal contributions to his or her own campaign to $50,000 per election cycle; prohibits the use of soft money; provides free broadcasting for candidates who comply with a voluntary spending limit of $600,000; assesses monetary penalties for candidates who exceed spending limits; prohibits all individual foreign contributions; prohibits cash contributions in federal elections; prohibits unsolicited franking within 90 days of a primary or general election; and requires Congress to evaluate the effects of campaign finance reform within 3 months of the first full election cycle after enactment of this bill.

The greatest deliberating body in the world belongs to the American people, not corporate or union bosses in Washington, D.C. It is our civic duty as elected officials, who are responsible to the American people, to send a clear message to special interest groups that we will not be bought. We must restore integrity and honesty to a system that has contributed to increased cynicism of government and historic low voter turnout.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand before you today to say that in my 22 years of service in the United States House of Representatives, I have not taken a single penny of PAC money. The people of the 19th District of Pennsylvania have awarded me the opportunity to represent them for over two decades because I put their interests ahead of special interest. My standing here today is proof that big money is not a prerequisite to holding a seat in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, reform of our campaign finance system is sorely needed. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this legislation which will reduce the cost of campaign financing and restore faith in the federal election process.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN CHARLES B. RANGEL, RONALD BROWN BUILDING, DESIGNATION BILL

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 7, 1997

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce legislation designating the Federal