

into Bosnia. We are not talking politics here, as much as the President would like to make this a partisan issue. We are talking about Congress' plenary control of the power of the purse and its moral obligation to address this fundamental policy issue. I fully expect this House to exercise its constitutional authority in the very near future.

Madam Speaker, many of us in the Congress have a number of very serious questions we would like the Clinton administration to answer, and to date those answers have been few and far between. For instance, what kind of risk to our troops are we talking about? What is this operation going to cost in terms of American lives? Almost certainly there will be casualties in that treacherous and mountainous region of the world.

I explicitly asked the Vice President for the administration's casualty estimates weeks ago, but I have not yet received an answer, not one word, from the administration on this matter. What is it going to cost in terms of taxpayer dollars? And where is the money going to come from? What are the rules of engagement? What happens the first time a stray bullet hits an American peacekeeper? What is the exit strategy?

Madam Speaker, Secretaries Christopher and Perry insist that troops will be home in a year. Few believe that, but, if so, then what? An outbreak of lasting peace in the Balkans? If you believe that, I have got a bridge I would like to sell to you.

These are critical questions, and the answers, are not forthcoming from the White House.

Now I would submit that there is a reason that those answers have not been forthcoming. The reasons is that there is no clear mission. President Clinton mistakenly, and apparently without consulting anybody in Congress, promised to send American ground troops to Bosnia in the event of a peace agreement. If he had bothered to ask, somebody would have told him that the last three peace agreements in Bosnia have been dismal failures and that the presence of American troops in that troubled region would likely do little to improve the attitudes of the warring parties.

Does President Clinton have the support of the American people in this instance? Absolutely not. I have received numerous calls and letters in my particular district in Cincinnati from people who have urged me to prevent United States troops from going in on the ground in Bosnia. I am still waiting for one call or one letter from anybody who thinks it is a good idea to send young Americans into Bosnia on the ground.

One of the major newspapers in my district, the Cincinnati Enquirer, published an editorial last week which I think sums up the views of most of my constituents and the constituents of many other Members in this body, and I would like to insert that in the

RECORD at this point. This is a copy of the article:

[The Cincinnati Enquirer, Oct. 24, 1995]
NO WAY—SENDING U.S. TROOPS TO BOSNIA
WOULD BE A DISASTROUS BLUNDER

It may throw a wet blanket on the United Nations' 50th birthday party, but someone besides Russian President Boris Yeltsin should ask some tough questions about the U.N. debacle in Bosnia.

Start by asking President Clinton: How can a contortionist who twisted himself into ethical pretzels to avoid Vietnam, send 20,000 U.S. troops marching into quicksand in Bosnia?

The echoes of Vietnam are unmistakable: Another war in which unsupported troops fight for unexplained goals in an ungrateful land. For all his recent rhetoric about rescuing NATO and performing a "peacekeeping" role, Clinton still has not offered a reason why one American life — much less 20,000 — should be risked for a shameful paper "peace" that ratifies the rape and plunder of Bosnia.

The fragile truce now in effect (between attacks) exists only because the Bosnian Serbs dread Croatian attacks more than air strikes or U.N. scolding. Bloodthirsty Bosnian Serbs who bombarded unarmed cities are fleeing from the Croatian army.

So now they suddenly want to talk peace. If a real peace agreement can be worked out in talk that begin Oct. 31 at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in Ohio, there will be plenty of soldiers on all side to enforce it.

Sending U.S. troops into a flammable pit of ethnic hatred, where death has been a fact of life since 1992, will invite hostage taking and terrorism against our soldiers, to inflame American outrage against Clinton's policy. Somalia and the near-loss of a U.S. flier in Bosnia should be fresh, painful reminder that it is sheer folly to gamble American blood in a game where our nation has no cards to play.

If that's not enough Clinton can recall his own protests against Vietnam.

Instead, he threatens to invoke his presidential war powers to send troops, even if Congress balks.

Clinton's crew is already squishy, backing down on promises that U.S. troops would be out in one year. Former Defense Secretary Dick Cheney told CBS, "To talk about a timetable that we will be out within a year, when do not know what the objective is, and haven't really develop a plan for executing that, raises serious questions about the quality of the decision making process within the administration."

After leaving Bosnia policy on U.N. cruise control until it ran into a ditch, Clinton now wants to floorboard U.S. intervention. If he does, it will take more than a wrecker to pull us out.

Madam Speaker, I want to stress again this is not a partisan issue. This is an issue where first and foremost we are talking about American lives, young men and young women who may be sent to die in a foreign land. We all remember the tragedy in Lebanon. Who can forget the image of those flag-draped caskets coming home from a peacekeeping mission in a land where there was no peace? And we remember the more recent tragedies when this Government sent more of its young people on a loosely defined mission to Somalia. The image of that young American soldier's body being dragged through the streets is forever etched in our memories.

Madam Speaker, let us not commit our young soldiers to another so-called

peacekeeping mission which is doomed to failure. Let us put a stop to this ill-advised Bosnian plan before it is too late.

BREAST CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I am honored tonight to participate in this special order, and I thank the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY] for her efforts in organizing this commemoration of Breast Cancer Awareness month. Most importantly, we are here to pay tribute to the women and men who fight to survive this deadly and tragic disease.

Breast cancer claims the lives of more than 44,000 women and 300 men each year. Excluding cancers of the skin, breast cancer is the most common cancer among women, accounting for one out of every three cancer diagnoses.

In 1996, over 184,000 new cases of invasive breast cancer are expected to be diagnosed.

While the statistics are daunting, there is hope.

We have learned over the years that early diagnosis and early treatment of breast cancer dramatically increases survival rates for its victims.

I know something about the importance of early detection—it saved my life.

Nine years ago, I was diagnosed with ovarian cancer. But I was lucky. My cancer was discovered early and I have been cancer free for 9 years. I am forever grateful to the wonderful doctors and nurses who saved my life and to the many researchers whose relentless and often unrecognized efforts have produced so many advancements in cancer detection and treatment.

We know that early detection is the most effective way to keep cancer from killing. Unfortunately, these services are not as readily and widely available as they need to be.

Therefore, we must continue to fight for increased funding for breast cancer research and screening. As a member of the National Security Committee, I worked hard to ensure that the House appropriated \$100 million for breast cancer programs in the Department of Defense appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996.

Furthermore, we must fight for increased funding for the breast cancer research at the National Institutes of Health and the National Cancer Institute. The House appropriated a 5.7 percent increase in funding for the National Cancer Institute, which funds the Breast and Cervical Cancer Mortality Prevention programs which I sponsored.

On the last evening of Breast Cancer Awareness month, we must not allow the specter of breast cancer to lurk in the darkness. We must recommit ourselves in the upcoming year to arm our Nation's women with the information, resources and support to combat and survive this horrifying disease. Together, I know we can do it.

REASONS FOR SENDING TROOPS INTO BOSNIA NEED TO BE EXAMINED

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

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. Speaker, I certainly applaud the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] in her comments, and her fight against cancer and her fight against cancer in this institution as well.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues to ask the President to go to the American people and tell us why we must send troops to Bosnia. It is a simple request, but it is one that must be made, and it is one that we must have the President address to the American people. I would submit, from the calls and comments that I received from the folks that I represent in Kansas, that he has not made his case to the American people. He has not make his case to the Congress. I sit on the Committee on International Relations, and we have heard from several of the Secretaries in this administration, and they fail to put forward a clear plan, a clear reason, a convincing case, a compelling case, for why we should send our young men and women into Bosnia.

Now it seems to me that we have discovered the way to handle these sorts of issues some time ago, and particularly this was exercised during the Persian Gulf war when that President, President Bush, initially said, well, Congress, I need a vote of the Congress, but then there was so much pressure he decided, no, I will get a vote of the Congress, and he took his case to the American people, and he explained why we needed to be in that region of the world, and explained it clearly and concisely, and said here is the reason, here is how we are going to go in, here is what we are going to accomplish, here is how we are going to get out, and it convinced American people and convinced this body. A vote was taken, and a supportive vote was taken, and we conducted that engagement very successfully with a great deal of support of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, we have to do that in this situation in the world, in Bosnia. The vital interests of the American people have to be explained by the Presidency, and it has not been done to date.

Earlier today a colleague of ours, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON], supplied a certain standard for sending young men and women into combat that I thought was a very good one that we should apply into this case

when the President presents his case as to why we should send our troops in

□ 1915

He asked the question simply this way: Would I be willing to go? Would I be willing to send my daughter or my son into harm's way for this cause?

It seems to me that is the same standard we should apply in this particular case once we get from the administration what the plan is. Why we are going in? What are the strategic and vital interests? And that has been taken to the countryside, because maybe then we will be convinced that we should be going into Bosnia, we should be protecting that region of the world.

But as of today, we have not seen any compelling case or any real case at all from the administration as to why we should go. Why should we vote or appropriate the funds or allow the use of funds to send our troops into harm's way in that part of the world, when we do not even know what our plan is to go in, to occupy, and how to get out, and what will we declare as victory once we are there.

I have a lot of questions of the administration myself. What is the deployment strategy we are going to have? Let us take that out to the American people. What are the military goals we are going to pursue in this particular area? What is the exit strategy?

Mr. Speaker, I simply ask the President of the United States to do what we have learned over years and years of the history of this country when we engage in military conflicts, when our young men and women can be sent into conflict and some can come home not alive, and that is simply this: Take the case to the American people first. Explain to the American people first what are our strategic and vital interests of why we need to be here. Why do we need to do this? Take it there first. And then, Mr. President, come to this body. Come to the Congress and ask for a vote of Congress, so each of us in our conscience can look and ask ourselves, would I be willing to go? Would I be willing to send my son or daughter into harm's way for this cause? And then let us have a vote. That is how a democracy should operate. That is how we should operate in this particular case.

I call on the administration to act that way. It is in their best interests and the best interests of the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

INCREASED MONEY FOR BREAST CANCER RESEARCH NEEDED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I believe this evening is a very important evening, and I thank the gentlewoman from New York for her leadership on this issue and for organizing this special order to save lives.

I rise tonight to speak about an issue of vital importance to all of the women of this Nation, and this issue happens to be breast cancer. As a woman and a mother, I feel there are few issues as important as the breast cancer epidemic facing our Nation.

As you may know, breast cancer is the most commonly diagnosed cancer in American women today. I recall just a few weeks ago joining in with the Susan G. Coleman Foundation in Houston, TX, where some 8,000 women, many of them survivors, gathered to fight against the epidemic of breast cancer, and to encourage more research in that area.

But the most pointed and the most striking part of it was to see mothers and daughters being able to fraternize and fellowship because of what had occurred in terms of breast cancer detection, to see the survivors, and to see that they were willing to continue the fight.

Currently there are 1.8 million women in this country who have been diagnosed with breast cancer, and 1 million more who have yet to be diagnosed. This year, 182,000 women and 1,000 men will discover they have breast cancer, and 46,000 will die from the disease. Breast cancer costs this country more than \$6 billion each year in medical expenses and lost productivity.

But these statistics cannot possibly capture the heartbreak of this disease which impacts not only the women who are diagnosed, but their husbands, children, and families, and that is what we are talking about today, keeping families together by eliminating this dreaded disease.

We have made some progress in the past few years by bringing the issue to the Nation's attention. Events such as Breast Cancer Awareness Month are crucial to sustaining this attention. There, however, is more to be done. We in Congress must work with the Department of Health and Human Services to implement the national action plan on breast cancer. The plan provides a framework and a plan for activities in three major areas: The delivery of health care, the conduct of research, and the enactment of policy.

It has six major priorities that I think are key to the direction this Congress should take: Identifying strategies to disseminate information about breast cancer and breast health to scientists, consumers, and practitioners using the state-of-the-art technologies available on the information