

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

(Mr. PAUL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

WESTERN RESOLVE

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, I rise to applaud the passage today of H.R. 2194, the Iran Refined Petroleum Sanctions Act of 2009.

Iran's regime has consistently lied to the world over its nuclear ambitions. Yesterday's revelation that Iran has been working on nuclear bomb detonators should convince even the most naive officials within our government of Iran's ultimate intention.

I do not believe that petroleum sanctions alone will dissuade the Iranian regime from its obvious intention to acquire nuclear weapons, or from its stated goal of wiping Israel off the map, or from its unremitting hostility toward our own country; but I do believe that it will send a vital message of growing Western resolve at a critical moment in world history.

Iran should interpret the House action today as an overwhelming expression of American commitment that spans the wide spectrum of political views within our Nation.

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

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

AMERICA'S NATIONAL SECURITY

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

Mr. WELCH. Madam Speaker, I want to address the question of Afghanistan.

The President was confronted with a very serious and difficult decision. The decision that he made, as America knows, is to increase troop strength by 30,000 troops and to also seek the support for an additional 10,000 troops from allies. The question which really confronts America as well as the President is this:

What is the best strategy to protect our homeland from another attack that would be perpetrated by and inspired by al Qaeda?

The question is also whether having a military force of occupation of now 100,000 troops, or soon to be 100,000 troops, from the United States of America in Afghanistan and doing nation-building is a sustainable strategy that will be the one that can protect

America from a future attack. I believe that it is not, and there are a couple of reasons.

First of all, as we know, al Qaeda goes where our military is not. There are presently, according to General Jones, 100 al Qaeda in Afghanistan and about 500 in Pakistan. Al Qaeda moves to areas of opportunity. It is not just there. It's in Yemen. It's in Somalia. It's in other parts of the world.

Also, as we know, the Internet is a tool, and some of the folks who have been plotting and planning to do destructive conduct and to hurt our American people live in the United States and in other parts of the world. It is not a threat that is confined to Afghanistan. It is a decentralized threat.

So where you have a threat which, by definition, is decentralized and not from a nation state, does it make sense to deploy the vast majority of our troops, 100,000, and the vast majority of our resources, \$1 trillion minimum over the next 10 years, to a single country and to then take on the goal of nation-building, of institution building, in Afghanistan? I believe it does not. It is not an effective strategy that is sustainable militarily. It is not an effective strategy that is sustainable financially.

Secondly, the effect of a decision to nation-build in Afghanistan is that, by definition, our military and our government need a functional partner no matter what the shortcomings of that partner may be—hence, the embrace of the Karzai administration, which is, despite the fact that it is losing credibility among its own people, and despite the fact that the election was not only deeply flawed but it is documented that the Karzai Government stole 1 million votes in order to stay in power.

The more work that we do which requires us to line up, to cooperate, to conciliate, and to protect a Karzai Government that does not have the support of its people—and every day that we do that—it undercuts the support and the definition of the mission of the American soldier in Afghanistan.

As is well-known, a major problem is Pakistan. What we have seen is that we now have to have a significant alliance with the Pakistani military as the only institution that can provide some measure of security in Pakistan. Because they control the nuclear weapons, this is obviously of great importance to the American people, but the Pakistani military is notable for two things:

Number one, it has been an adversary of democratic development in Pakistan, something which is essential to build economic well-being in a country that is absolutely destitute, impoverished and getting poorer.

Number two, the Pakistani military, as reported in The New York Times as recently as today, made it clear that, however urgent it is for the United States to take out the Hakani network, which is in the tribal areas and

is crossing into Afghanistan on a regular basis to attack our troops, the Pakistani military regards the Hakani network as its ally in geopolitics in the Afghanistan region. So it will not do what needs to be done to protect the American military and American security, and that is to attack the Hakani network—the Afghanistan Taliban. In fact, it has made it explicit that it sees the Hakani network as its ally to keep India at bay.

So what we have is a strategy that depends on nation-building, which has very doubtful prospects of success in an alliance with two 'friends' who aren't there to help us.

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

(Mr. GINGREY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

BREAST CANCER AWARENESS

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

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, more than 190,000 women will be diagnosed with breast cancer in the United States this year, and more than 40,000 will die. In the last 20 years, there have been declines in the breast cancer mortality rate, and those declines are attributed to increases in early detection and improvements in breast cancer treatment.

Today, when breast cancer is found before it spreads, the 5-year relative survival rate is 98 percent, but that rate will decline to 84 percent for regional disease and to 23 percent when cancer has metastasized, or has spread, to other parts of the body.

In November, the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force released new guidelines for screening mammography. These changes have again reignited the controversy over mammography screening—a debate that has remained for a number years.

However, it is important for us to remember that the Susan G. Komen for the Cure organization agreed that mammograms save lives in women 40 to 49 as well as in women over 50. Additionally, while the USPSTF has chosen to make revisions in its guidelines for screening, patient advocates and professional organizations, not just the Susan G. Komen for the Cure but also the American Cancer Society, the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecology, and the American Society of Clinical Oncology, have reviewed the same evidence and have continued to recommend annual screenings beginning at age 40 for women of average risk and earlier for women with known risks of breast cancer.

Our real focus should be on the fact that one-third of the women, some 23

million, who qualify for screening under today's guidelines are not being screened. They are not being screened due to a lack of education, of awareness, or access. That issue needs focus and attention. If we can make progress with screening in susceptible populations, we can make more progress in the fight against breast cancer.

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

(Mr. POLIS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE GREAT SEAL OF THE UNITED STATES

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

Mr. GRAYSON. Madam Speaker, I invite you and everyone within the sound of my voice tonight—all Americans—to reach into your pockets. Take out a dollar bill. Turn it around. On the back, you will see the Great Seal of the United States.

Our Founding Fathers had very few ways to communicate with us. They lived before the time of television. They lived before the time of radio. They lived before the time of photography, so they communicate to us through the Constitution. They communicate to us through the Declaration of Independence, through the Federalist Papers, through letters that they wrote, and only one image—and that image is this image—the image on our dollar bill, the image of the Great Seal of the United States.

I invite you to take a close look at it. I have one right here. The one in my pocket is in black and white—or green and white, if you will. The one here is in color. Take a look at it, and you will see the American eagle. You will see that the American eagle is holding arrows on the right, in its claw, and an olive branch on the left. This had deep symbolism to our Founding Fathers. This seal was adopted before the Constitution, itself, was ratified.

The gentleman who had to explain and to support the adoption of this symbol as our country's Great Seal said that he had the eagle holding arrows and an olive branch to symbolize war and peace. Specifically, what he said was, with regard to that olive branch, he wanted to illustrate the power of peace. He said, "the power of peace," which is not a phrase we hear very often. We hear a great deal of the power of war, but we don't hear much about the power of peace.

You will note that the eagle is not looking toward the arrows. That eagle is looking toward the olive branch. The reason the American eagle was placed by our Founding Fathers with an eye on that olive branch was that they al-

ways wanted America to be looking for peace.

I'm sad to say that we have forgotten that, this message from our Founding Fathers from over 200 years ago. We've forgotten that, but it's still here in our pockets today and on our dollar bill to remind us that the Founding Fathers wanted us to be looking not for war but for peace.

What is that power that peace has? The power that peace has is the power to educate your children, the power to maintain your own health and the health of other citizens, and the power to build roads, hospitals, and bridges. The power of war is the power to destroy all of that.

□ 1830

That is why our Founding Fathers warned us against foreign entanglements and why our Founding Fathers reminded us in the Great Seal to be looking all the time to peace and not to war. The things that we do now for the past 8 years are things that are unprecedented anywhere else in the world. The English stopped occupying other countries in the fifties, half a century ago. The French stopped doing it in the sixties. The Portuguese stopped doing it in the seventies. The Soviet Union stopped doing it in the nineties, too late to save the Soviet Union. And to a large degree the destruction of the Soviet Union came from a disrespect for the power of peace and a worship of the power of war. Let's hope that we recognize that mistake and let's hope that we don't repeat it in Iraq and in Afghanistan, wherever the next war might be.

In Washington, D.C., you hear much discussion of leadership. Everyone wants to claim that mantle. I'm a leader, he's a leader, she's a leader. Everybody claims to be a leader. Well, there is a kind of leadership that we need right now very badly, and that is the leadership that looks just a little bit ahead into the future, recognizes what's inevitable and tries to make it come sooner. I have no doubt in my mind that one day the war in Afghanistan will be over. I have no doubt in my mind that one day the war in Iraq will be over. The question is, when?

We are the strongest country on earth, the strongest country that the earth has ever seen. We end a war when we decide to end a war, and I submit to you that that time has come. There is no force on earth that will make us end the war. We have to do it now. We have to fight for the power of peace.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

AMERICA IN AFGHANISTAN: QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER

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

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, today Members received another classified briefing on our policy in Afghanistan, a briefing that raised a number of questions that need answers before our country commits further troops and resources to that conflict. These are not loaded questions or simply rhetorical, they are real questions—and just some of the real questions—that people in central New Jersey are asking.

Would this proposed troop increase bring us closer to capturing or killing those responsible for the 9/11 attacks? If the al Qaeda remnant Americans are seeking to capture or kill is on the Pakistani side of the border, or in Yemen or East Africa, how will sending more troops to, say, southern Helmand Province in Afghanistan help us to get those terrorists who attacked us on September 11 or might attack us in the future? Should we send troops to where al Qaeda isn't? Should we expand our aerial strikes? Would an escalation in air attacks do more harm than good? Is our intelligence apparatus structured and capable of giving our military and political leaders the intelligence they need to wage this war? Given our lack of foreign language capabilities, can we really know what's going on in the towns and farms and villages? Does the deterioration in the military and political situation in recent years in Afghanistan result from actions Americans have taken or failed to take? If so, how do we avoid those problems in a surged military action? What constitutes victory or success in this conflict? What is it that we hope to leave behind once we exit Afghanistan? What can we reasonably hope to leave behind?

Is the Afghan Government a viable partner? Is it viewed as legitimate by the Afghan people? Does the government and do the people have the same dedication to human rights, education and public welfare that we do? If so, how will our military troops bring improvements in those areas? Do the Afghan people have the same revulsion to official corruption that Americans do? Can the Afghan security forces be expanded as quickly as claimed? Is President Karzai correct that he needs extensive military U.S. security assistance for 15 or 20 more years? Will such assistance require the use of many private security contractors? If so, what will such a reliance on contractors cost the American taxpayer? If contractors are employed extensively in Afghanistan, do the State and Defense Departments have sufficient oversight mechanisms to ensure those contractors operate more legally and ethically than they have in, for example, Iraq? What lessons from Afghanistan's history can