against breast cancer and committing to finding a cure so that they and other women can live healthy lives.

These women and their families have created a community of hope for those who struggle every day—with courage and dignity—with this terrible disease.

They are mothers, daughters, sisters, friends, and advocates whose strength and tenacity have driven us toward significant progress in treating breast cancer.

Improvements in treatments coupled with advances in early detection and screening methods have increased the survival rates for women to 98 percent when breast cancer is detected in its earliest stages.

But this remarkable achievement can not stop us from ensuring this terrible disease is cured once and for all.

Government can't cure cancer, but it can put the resources in the hands of scientists who will. That's why I have made funding biomedical research at the National Institutes of Health a top priority in Congress.

It is hard to believe, but when I was first appointed to the Appropriations Committee in 1991, the federal government was spending just $133 million on breast cancer each year.

In the last decade, however, that investment has increased dramatically—to more than $1.3 billion between spending at the National Institutes of Health, National Cancer Institute, and Department of Defense.

Furthermore, last year, legislation I authored with Representative SUE MYRICK to study the link between the environment and breast cancer was enacted into law.

In addition to fighting for more research into the causes and best treatments for breast cancer, I have also spearheaded the effort to substantially increase and accelerate research into early detection technologies.

Mammography screenings are a woman's best chance for detecting breast cancer early, and when coupled with new treatment options, can significantly improve a woman's chances of survival.

However, experts and scientists agree that we still have not found the 21st century early detection method we need.

I am pleased that the National Cancer Institute is spending close to $55 million per year to research better screening methods for breast cancer spurred by my legislation, the Better Screening for Women Act.

The federal commitment to cancer research has enabled us to make enormous strides in our understanding of this complex disease.

The investment we make in research and education today will improve care for each and every cancer patient, and move us closer to the day when we eradicate cancer.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be speaking before you today about the importance of "National Breast Cancer Awareness Month." This campaign goes back a quarter of a century, starting as a weeklong campaign in 1985, by AstraZeneca, a pharmaceutical company; its aim from the start has been to promote mammography as the most effective weapon in the fight against breast cancer. This month and throughout the year, we should all be committed to ongoing education about options for breast health and helping women become more informed so that they can make educated choices about breast health.

Breast cancer is a disease that impacts all Americans, affecting women and men of all backgrounds, races, and incomes. Women in the United States have the highest incidence rates of breast cancer in the world; 141 among white women and 122 among African American women.

Among women in my home state of Texas, breast cancer is the most common cancer, and the second-most common cause of cancer death (after lung cancer). Women in the U.S. have a 1 in 8 (12.5%) lifetime chance of developing invasive breast cancer and a 1 in 35 (3%) chance of breast cancer causing their death. There were 216,000 cases of invasive breast cancer and 40,000 deaths in 2004. In 2007, breast cancer was expected to cause 40,910 deaths in the U.S. (7% of cancer deaths; almost 2% of all deaths).

It is unacceptable enough that so many women today meet such an end. But, worse still, several studies have found that black women in the U.S. are more likely to die from breast cancer even though white women are more likely to be diagnosed with the disease. Even after diagnosis, black women are less likely to get treatment compared to white women. The journal Cancer Causes and Control, for instance, found in their sample that there has been no improvement in mortality from breast cancer for black women in 23 years.

Worldwide, breast cancer is by far the most common cancer amongst women, with an incidence rate more than twice that of colorectal cancer and cervical cancer and about three times that of lung cancer. However breast cancer mortality worldwide is just 25% greater than that of lung cancer in women. In 2004, breast cancer caused 519,000 deaths worldwide (7% of cancer deaths; almost 1% of all deaths). The number of cases worldwide has significantly increased since the 1970s, a phenomenon partly blamed on modern lifestyles in the Western world.

However, research has proven that by making treatment available, we can fight this horrendous disease. In my home city of Houston, the Ben Taub General Hospital and Baylor College of Medicine strive to ensure that the most advanced medical care is available to all the city's residents regardless of wealth or ability to pay. Ben Taub General Hospital is vital in providing care to the over 1.1 million Houston residents without health insurance, and millions more with little or low insurance coverage. For over 100 years, Baylor College of Medicine has firmly committed to caring for patients, regardless of their ability to pay.

That is why we all work to raise awareness and educate our fellow citizens about this horrible disease; that is why we must fight to make sure breast cancer is defeated through early detection and funding for a cure; and that is why, to make sure that women across our nation have the treatment they need to fight this battle, we must pass real health care reform in America.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank everyone here for being part of this fight, and I pledge to remain by your side until breast cancer is defeated, and no American woman ever again has to fear it.

BREAST CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I just want to rise in support tonight and commend my colleagues from Florida and North Carolina for their support in this effort and bringing attention to this very important issue.

As I listened to the personal stories tonight, I couldn't help but think about how this has touched so many different people in so many different ways. As the father of four daughters myself, I certainly have the perspective of wanting to focus early prevention and attention on this issue.

I have staff members who have family members who have been afflicted by this terrible disease. I think it is very important to recognize that as we look at October being Breast Cancer Awareness Month, and the efforts that are going on here this evening, the more that we can do as a Congress bipartisanly and across the aisle, especially to drive attention and focus on a disease that is afflicting so many people and is something that is very preventable, as was mentioned. This is the disease that is the most commonly diagnosed cancer among women in the United States after skin cancer, and the second most common cause of cancer death, after lung cancer, among U.S. women.

Twenty-five years ago was the first observance of National Breast Cancer Awareness. We have come a long way since then, but we have a long, long way to go. We must continue to do more to raise awareness of this very serious issue.

That is the reason that I am a cosponsor of the gentlelady's legislation from Florida. It does focus the education on the prevention measures which are so critical. I mention that, having four young daughters myself. That is a bill that has 370 cosponsors. There aren't that many pieces of legislation that garner that type of support. It really is a testimony of not only the issue, but the leadership of the gentlelady from Florida. It is an honor to be part of this effort tonight and to drive focus and attention on this.

This bill really does focus important attention to early detection, which is the key to preventing and curbing this horrible disease. Studies have shown that early detection of breast cancer can and does save lives.

Mammograms performed every 1 or 2 years for women aged 40 years or older can reduce mortality by approximately 20 to 25 percent over 10 years. So it works.

I was proud last night to highlight an example of two young entrepreneurs, enterprising constituents in my district, that began their own efforts to drive attention on this deadly disease. They started their own lawn care business, but on the side they decided to dedicate a portion of their profits toward breast cancer research.

So these two young 15-year-olds have begun one of the most inspiring and philanthropic organizations throughout Minnesota, and now they are trying to drive more attention to this

around the country and throughout Minnesota to raise money to focus attention on breast cancer research. It goes all the way down to the younger and youth that are trying to bring attention to this issue.

I hope this month serves as a reminder of early detection and screening and working towards a cure for breast cancer.

I thank the gentlelady for giving me some time this evening and for her leadership.

AMERICA'S LONG-TERM STRATEGIC POSITIONING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to discuss America's dependence on NATO, our relations with Russia, today's threat of radical Islam, and tomorrow's looming threat of an ever-more-powerful Communist China. In other words, tonight we will examine America's long-term strategic positioning in the world.

It is always valuable to look at history as well as the present before considering the future. So let's start with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. It made sense, NATO made sense when it created it. It made sense to strengthen the NATO alliance during the 1950s while the Soviet Union was forming its Warsaw Pact and while the fall of China to Communist tyranny and the Korean war halted the vision of a peaceful world that we had been dreaming of in the aftermath of World War II. But in the 1950s, that was a threat.

But the 1950s are ancient history. The cold war is over. This is the 21st century. NATO no longer serves its purposes and is, in many ways, counterproductive. Ronald Reagan's visionary leadership, coupled with the unrelenting commitment and courage of the American people, brought an end to the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact. The people of Eastern Europe were freed from a hostile occupation and puppet Marxist governments. In the 1990s, the Russians dramatically moved away from domestic tyranny and away from a belligerent foreign policy.

Freed from its Soviet shackles, Russia expected to be embraced. At least if they weren't embraced, they certainly expected to be accepted as the Russians moved their troops out of occupied nations and opened up its political and economic system. It was perhaps the greatest peaceful resolution of a hostile confrontation between major global powers in history. NATO played an important role in bringing us to that point in the late 1980s and early 1990s.

The armed might of NATO deterred aggression and Soviet adventurism that could have resulted in a world conflict. NATO, with American leadership, won for Western civilization a new chance at building a future of progress, freedom, and tranquility on a global scale.

□ 2130

In the last 20 years, there's been a change on a massive scale, most of it for good, in the former Soviet Union. Certainly, elements of this transition have been counterproductive and short of expectations and disappointing to the people of Russia, as well as peace-loving people in the West who had such high expectations. But by and large, enormous positive changes have taken place in Russia over these last 20 years.

It is in vogue now, in some circles, to suggest the current leadership in Russia is similar to the Communist thuggery of those who not so long ago ruled that country with an iron fist and threatened world peace. Let this Cold Warrior shock you by suggesting that the Russian government's flaws, and they have many flaws, do not reflect a fundamental, malicious nature, as was the case under communism. And while there are examples of heavy-handedness, there is ample evidence of freedom of speech, religion and enterprise.

Within this context, the vilification of Russia by old Cold Warriors, my friends, most of them, has been unconscionable and unrelenting. The fall of communism, the restructuring of its society, and Russian forces, of course, withdrawing from Eastern Europe, this was breathtaking. These were breathtaking events. Clearly, the Russian people and the Russian government wanted to be part of the Western community if they were willing to take such dramatic steps. The door was open, and the Russians were not only willing but anxious to leave Cold War hostilities behind. They were naive and so were we about the transition. This historic opportunity has almost totally been squandered.

During the transition, rotten elements in the West allied themselves with nefarious Russian elites, and together they took advantage of their country's weakened and vulnerable condition. Russia was looted, and much of the loot ended up in Western banks. Vast natural resources ended up in the hands of a few power brokers. Billions of dollars of Russian wealth, basically mineral wealth, was transferred to private hands for a pittance.

The Russian people, rejected and isolated when they expected to be partners in building a new world, sunk into despair. Adding to their sense of helplessness, Russia was frozen out of the world market and relegated to the fringe market, like Iran. Let us note that today we are suffering because of that effort to isolate Russia from the global economy. I remember shortly after the Communists fell in Russia, I went to my own aerospace industry leaders and said, We've got to let the Russians compete with us. This is the one area, high technology, where they can compete. And of course, the reaction with our major aerospace companies was, no way.

And for 7 years after the fall of communism, Russia, which had invested enormous resources in rocket technology, was not permitted to sell their launch services to the West. That was the one area they could have really raised some hard currency, and we denied that to them.

While, at the same time, what did our friends in Europe do? Of course, Europe, by its very nature, the European Union is a cartel, excluding other countries like Russia. But instead of utilizing Russian missile and rocket technology to launch satellites, our European allies rushed forwards to spend hundreds, maybe $150 billion, in developing their own launch capabilities. Again, instead of letting Russia be part of the world market, they were frozen out.

And how does this relate to Iran? Their scientists were earning $50 a month, people with Ph.D.'s, the top level of their society, the cream of the scientific crop, starving, seeing their families suffering. They were looking around, so they were relegated to the fringe, and they went to Iran, and Iran agreed to hire them to build a nuclear reactor. I remember this very well. During the Clinton administration, I went to top people in the Clinton administration and explained, This will eventually be a horrible catastrophe, a threat, a huge threat to the United States and the West if we permit this nuclear power plant in Iran to be finished.

I said, but we shouldn't be threatening the Russians, which is what we did. Our government policy was, don't do it, or you're going to suffer, instead of saying, look, we know your people are unemployed. We'll get you a contract, financed by the World Bank. It wouldn't have cost us anything to build two power plants, maybe one in Turkey, maybe one in Malaysia, maybe one in another country that needed electric power. Instead, we just threatened them, and of course they had no other alternative. We didn't give them that alternative. And so now, we face this problem.

By the way, shortly after George W. Bush was elected, I went to see Condoleezza Rice. Made the same argument, We've got to act now—if we act now we can give the Russians an alternative in which they do not have to build this nuclear reactor for the Iranians. But let's give them the alternative.

Again, it was only threats and talk about punitive actions but no willingness to offer the Russians a positive alternative. So, of course they had to get their people employed. We're going to find out a lot about that in the months and years ahead as our own experts find themselves unemployed. And we care about them, just like the Russian people cared about their people. But we did not at that time reach out to help the Russians, and we are paying a price for that now.

It's important to look back at the end of the Cold War, and to recognize