

research, as well as the members of his subcommittee.

Earlier this year, Congresswoman NITA LOWEY and I circulated a congressional letter urging the Appropriations National Security Subcommittee to provide \$175 million for the peer-reviewed breast cancer research program at the Department of Defense, a letter co-signed by 225 of our colleagues. The peer-reviewed breast cancer research program has gained a well-deserved reputation for its innovation and efficient use of resources, with over ninety percent of program funds going directly to research grants. We must continue to increase our investment in this important program.

We must also work to better translate new research findings to clinical applications, both through a greater focus on clinical research and through technology transfer. As Chair of the Technology Subcommittee, I have been working to facilitate technology transfer between government agencies and the private sector. Efforts such as the "missiles to mammograms" project between the Public Health Service, the Department of Defense, the intelligence community, and NASA, are critically important in applying new technologies to the fight against breast cancer.

Access to mammography screening is another critical issue. The Congressional Caucus on Women's Issues had a major victory during the last Congress when the Balanced Budget Act included annual coverage for mammography screening under Medicare.

As of last year, the breast and cervical cancer screening program had provided more than 1.2 million breast and cervical cancer screenings, education, and follow-up services for low-income women across the country. While this program has been very successful, we must ensure that efforts are expanded to better reach disadvantaged and minority populations.

As an increasing number of mastectomies and lymph node dissections are performed as outpatient surgery, Congress should ensure that women receive the hospital care and insurance coverage they need. We must hold hearings and pass legislation to require health plans to provide coverage for a minimum hospital stay for mastectomies and lymph node dissection for the treatment of breast cancer. Congresswoman ROSA DELAURO and Congresswoman SUE KELLY have each introduced legislation that would provide 48 hours of inpatient care following a mastectomy and 24 hours of inpatient care following a lymph node dissection for the treatment of breast cancer. I am a cosponsor and strong supporter of this critical legislation. Women and their doctors—not their insurance companies—should determine whether a shorter stay is sufficient.

These initiatives are just a few of the many important efforts underway to address the critical issue of breast cancer. For as long as I serve in Congress, I will continue to work with my colleagues on programs that will provide fuel for the hopes of patients and scientists alike and move us forward in the battle against breast cancer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WATERS. addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

REPORT ON H.R. 3037, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. YOUNG of Florida, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-370) on the bill (H.R. 3037) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of the special order I am about to give.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

DEBT FORGIVENESS FOR THIRD-WORLD COUNTRIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, today was a very historic day in this body, and Congress has finished its business at a reasonable time. I wish that many more of my colleagues were in town to hear our special order, because it addresses an issue that came up in our foreign operations bill the other day; and that is the issue of debt forgiveness in the developing world.

In the course of a debate on the legislative bill, an appropriations bill like the foreign operations bill, all we had was an hour on the rule and an hour on the bill, which is the regular order. But because so many Members want to express their support or their opposition to the legislation, the most any of us gets to speak is a few minutes if we are lucky if we are ranking member, or one or two if we are not.

The bill covers a wide range of issues. The foreign operations bill is the bill which funds our diplomatic efforts abroad. The pillars of our foreign policy are promoted in that bill: stopping the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, promoting democratic values, growing our economy through exports, looking out for our national se-

curity, and the assistance that we provide for other countries is in the national interest of the United States.

So this is not about charity. It is about acting in our own self interest. It also, though, taps the well of generosity and concern that the American people have to alleviate poverty in the world and to make the world a safer place, promoting our democratic values, which are universal, so that the world is a safer place in which we can raise our children and our grandchildren.

That brings us to the point of, making the world a safer place means making the world a better place for all of the children of the world. I know my colleagues have heard me say the three most important issues facing this Congress are our children, our children, our children. By that, I mean, not only our children in America, but the fate of children throughout the world. They are affected by the economic well-being of the countries in which they live.

Many of the countries in the Third World, particularly in Africa, some in Latin America, mostly all in the southern hemisphere, have been burdened by debt that has been incurred by previous regimes. For instance, in South Africa, there is a heavy debt load that has been carried over from the apartheid government. Now this new government of the last few years has that burden to carry. How can they succeed with this drag on their economies? That is repeated over and over.

I think we have a responsibility in this area because, during the Cold War, the Soviets and the United States excerpted their influence on the continent of Africa. When the Cold War was over, we up and left, leaving the continent awash in weapons and, in many cases, burdened down by debt.

There is a movement afoot. This is not just a U.S. effort to alleviate this debt, this is an international issue. There is a movement afoot in the religious community. Bishop Desmond Tutu, the Nobel Prize winner from South Africa, was well-known to everyone in the world, I believe, a champion of reconciliation in South Africa, is part of something called the Jubilee, Jubilee 2000.

That is an effort to have debt forgiveness in the developing world so that these new emerging democracies can proceed to meet the needs of their people in terms of education and health and the well-being of their people, unburdened by debts, especially those incurred by previous regimes in their countries and not the democratically elected governments that prevail now.

In our foreign operations bill, there had been a request made by President Clinton for several hundred million dollars over a 3-year period to forgive debt in that region. During the debate, it was contended that, oh, forgiving debt in the Third World was just sending checks to these, what did they call them, turbans and tyrants, or something, so that they could then put this