Mr. Speaker, I also rise tonight to salute the many women who have survived this terrible disease—and there are many survivors. We know the grim statistics: in the last 20 years, the incidence of breast cancer has increased by 20 percent. Twenty years ago, 1 in 20 women developed breast cancer. Today, it is 1 in 8. Most Americans have known someone—a mother, sister, friend or coworker affected by this terrible tragedy.

Breast cancer is an extremely complex disease and we are unfortunately far from a cure. We have many more questions about breast cancer than answers. Solving the mystery of breast cancer is like working on an incredibly complicated and frustrating puzzle. Each piece of this puzzle solved is a small victory. The Federal Government's research is helping us to solve this puzzle and to slowly answer these unanswered questions.

One of these unanswered questions is the role the environment plays in breast cancer. Another is the importance of genetics in determining who develops the disease and who does not. Still another question is whether diet can reduce a women's risk of breast cancer.

There is mounting evidence that exposure to pesticides may contribute to breast cancer. For example, a study done several years ago at Mt. Sinai Medical Center in New York found that women with the highest levels of a pesticide compound in their blood were four times more likely to have breast cancer than other women. Another study in Israel found a 10-percent drop in breast cancer during the same time that there was a drop in the levels of pesticides in human and cow milk. The Long Island breast cancer study will help to answer many other important questions regarding the link between environmental and occupational factors in breast cancer. But again, many unanswered questions remain.

Science has also recently begun to document a genetic link to breast cancer. The breast cancer gene is thought to account for 5 percent of all breast cancer cases but 25 percent of the breast cancer in women under age 30.

Last month, researchers found a particular mutation of this breast cancer gene in 1 percent of a study of Jewish women of Eastern European background. Jewish women with a family history of breast cancer who were found to have this gene had a very high risk of developing breast cancer. However, we don't know what kind of risk women face who have this gene but do not have a family history of breast cancer. So it makes no sense to test women for this gene until we know more. Again, many unanswered questions remain.

Lastly, scientists are beginning to develop a link between nutrition and breast cancer. But again, our knowledge is scanty. We know that the risk of breast cancer increases with the degree of obesity. One small study showed that moderate alcohol use might even increase a woman's risk of cancer because of the influence of alcohol on hormones. Research continues to tell us that a low-fat, high-fiber diet may decrease our risk of many cancers including breast cancer. Exercise may also reduce the risk of the disease. But again, many unanswered questions remain.

Breast cancer poses one of the major scientific challenges of today. I urge my colleagues to look at the many unanswered questions as a challenge to continue to maintain the Federal Government's commitment to breast cancer research and the enforcement of environmental regulations. We must not abandon our commitment to the women of America.

But funding research is not enough. We must support efforts to regulate exposures to chemicals strongly suspected of being linked to breast cancer. Tomorrow we will vote on a motion by Representative STOKES to allow the EPA to enforce the Delaney clause. The Delaney clause protects processed foods from contamination by known carcinogens but Congress has voted to restrict EPA from enforcing the Delaney clause. Congress has also tied EPA's hands by cutting its budget by one-third. This is an outrage. Members have a chance tomorrow to support the Stokes motion to demonstrate that they are truly serious about addressing the breast cancer epidemic.

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

[Mr. KING 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 Minnesota [Mr. MINGE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. MINGE 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. LAZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. LAZIO 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 New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. SLAUGHTER 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 Georgia [Mr. BARR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BARR 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. FARR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. FARR 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 Georgia [Ms. MCKINNEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. MCKINNEY 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 Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. GUTKNECHT 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. SCARBOROUGH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. SCARBOROUGH 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 North Carolina [Mrs. MYRICK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. MYRICK addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

AMERICAN POLICY IN BALKANS A FAILURE

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed 3 years of failure as far as the policy of the United States concerning the ongoing tragedy in the Balkans. During this 3 years, we have heard the screams of agony and horror. And what has American policy been? An arms embargo against the criminals who are committing the aggression and the victims alike.

This formula of treating the victims and the criminal alike had left the aggressor with all of the tanks, all of the heavy artillery, and an overwhelming superiority in arms. It led to 100,000 deaths or more. The aggressor was, naturally, not deterred by an arms embargo that prevented the victims from arming themselves and defending themselves against aggression.

□ 1930

We have seen mass rapes, ethnic cleansing and genocide. It has been a tragedy. It has been a fiasco on the part of the Western democracies. It has been a lack of moral leadership from the United States in that we have put the victims and the aggressors in the same category. Yet the victims even though they have been raped and murdered and seen their families destroyed and their homes burned and destroyed have never come to the United States and asked us for ground troops, to put our young people in their place. They have not asked for our ground troops to be deployed, and they still are not asking for our ground troops to be deployed.

The plan that we are hearing about today that President Clinton is suggesting of sending 25,000 young Americans to the Balkans has not come as a result of a request from the victims. It is instead a product of the fuzzy thinking and moral relativity of those people who have formulated America's disastrous policy for the past 3 years. They have failed for 3 years, and now they ask us to trust their judgment in sending 25,000 young Americans into a Balkan meat grinder that has been getting nothing but worse due to their leadership.

No, no, hell, no. Twenty-five thousand Americans put in the Balkans. Part of their plan is to put 20,000 Russians into the Balkans at the same time. Putting 20,000 Russians and 25,000 Americans into a conflict situation like that? That is total insanity.

We have another alternative. We are not talking about isolationism versus international activism here. What we need to do is have a policy that is rational and responsible and not putting our people at maximum risk.

We have the alternative. Let us lift the arms embargo on these victims, on the Croatians and on the Bosnians who have been victimized by the aggressor, clearly the aggressor who is grabbing territory in the Balkans. We have invested in smart weapons. We have invested in bombers and aircraft. We have done this to permit us to exercise our influence while minimizing the risk.

The idea of sending so many young Americans to the Balkans carries little chance of success and an incredibly high chance of failure. Failure in this case means a major loss of American lives. The screams and agony that we will hear will not just be coming from the Balkans but will be coming from American homes when their loved ones are lost, when they find out that their loved one has been torn apart by a land mine or by some sort of artillery barrage. Thanksgiving dinner with empty seats. Wives without husbands. Children without fathers.

We should not be putting Americans at risk for such a fiasco, an adventure that has such little chance of success.

I yield to my colleague the gentleman from San Diego.

Mr. HUNTER. I think the gentleman for yielding. Mr. Speaker, I was attracted to his very articulate statement. He reminds me that when we have the Secretary of Defense before us, the Secretary of State and other leading members of the Clinton administration, the one question they could not answer was, what happens when that one car bomb occurs and you lose 12 or 15 or 20 people? Do you stay there? Do you show resolve? Do you move out immediately?

They offered no answer beyond what has happened already in Somalia and other places. That is, that we are driven out. If we are driven out because of terrorism, then we have lost all of the important things that they talked about. Like holding NATO together, maintaining our credibility with our European allies, et cetera. They never answered that question.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. It is sad and an appropriate question to ask, because I was in the White House in the 1980's when Ronald Reagan made the worst decision of his Presidency, which was to introduce U.S. Marines into the Lebanon conflict. I remember during that time when Ronald Reagan issued the order and the Marines landed, I ran all over the White House, asking, pleading with people, why are we there? What are we doing? How can we possibly succeed?

I went to every office of the decision-markers in the National Security Council, my friends who are in various positions in the government and they said, ''DANA, here is the formula. If we do this, this, and this, it will eventually lead to peace in the Middle East.''

I said, ''This, this and this. For all of these things to happen, the chances of that happening are very small.'' The chances of this turning into a fiasco, a horrible situation where we lose maybe 100 American lives, the chances are very high.

I thought they would take care of it. I thought that some of the people who understood the implications of what was going on would handle the situation. But instead we got mixed up in the Lebanon situation, in the crisis. We were mixed up in local politics. Our Marines were actually, people do not understand this, the political situation was so complicated the Marines were ordered not to have bullets in their rifles.

The situation in Bosnia is far more complex than what was in Lebanon. We lost 240 young Marines in Lebanon. Let me say, I will never forget the day when it was announced that this bomb exploded, this care bomb exploded and it was not just 20 Americans, and it was these young Marines and the first name on the list was my brother's best friend from high school, who I grew up with, and I vowed that day that I would never sit back and watch a senseless operation go forward without trying my best to save the lives of those young Americans.

Today we have that opportunity. If we try our hardest and we spread the word, this is a democracy, the President is not going to send troops overseas into a risky situation without the support of the U.S. Congress and the American people. We can deter this, we can bring some sense to this, and we can save some American lives.

I ask the American people, I hope everyone contacts their Congressman and the White House saying no troops to Bosnia, no American troops to Bosnia, unless the Congress approves of this operation.

ENDING WELFARE FOR LOBBYISTS

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

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, in the coming weeks, this Congress has a chance to end welfare for lobbyists once and for all, ending the insidious practice of allowing Federal grant recipients to use taxpayer dollars while advancing their own narrow special interests.

Much has been written and debated on this issue; but, contrary to many Washington political pundits and the special interests who are desperately trying to save their taxpayer-funded subsidies, the issue is really quite simple. The American people do not want their money going to special interests to lobby Congress.

Consistent with the Republican philosophy that people, not the Government, know best how to spend their own money, the Istook-McIntosh-Erlich language ends this abuse of taxpayer dollars being used directly or indirectly to lobby by Federal grant recipients. This ban on lobbyist subsidies will ensure the Nation's taxpayers that their money is not being used by Washington lobbyists to promote a special interest agenda they may or may not agree with.

To those who oppose this legislation, I have just one question: If you are not abusing Federal taxpayer dollars now, then what is all the fuss about?

The people who oppose this important reform legislation cannot have it both ways. On the one hand, they argue that they do not lobby with taxpayer dollars, while, on the other hand, they contend that ending their subsidy will directly impact their lobbying efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I think we owe the American people who are taxpayers in this Nation a pledge that we will not let their money be used for any special interest group to lobby in this Capitol or any State capitol around this country. Let us promise to let the people of this country decide who, if anyone, should speak for them.

It may be Halloween, but do not let the ghouls and goblins of taxpayer subsidies past scare you out of doing the right thing for our country.

I urge my colleagues in this House and in the other body to end welfare subsidies for lobbyists.