

[From the Associated Press, Oct. 5, 2011]

POLL: 1 IN 3 VETS SEES IRAQ, AFGHAN WARS AS WASTES

WASHINGTON.—A new opinion survey says one in three U.S. veterans of the post-9/11 military believes the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan are not worth fighting. Most of the vets polled by the Pew Research Center also think that after 10 years of combat America should be focusing less on foreign affairs and more on its own problems.

#### SYSTEMATIC TORTURE IN AFGHAN PRISONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. "One interrogator kept banging my head against the wall. "After 2 days, he tied my hands behind my back and started beating me with an electric wire. The interrogation and beating lasted for 3 to 4 hours into the night.

"For the next 2 days, I was tied up from both wrists to the bars of an iron door. From morning until lunchtime they put a hood on my head and hung me by my wrists."

Mr. Speaker, these are the direct quotes from detainees apprehended in Afghanistan and subjected to torture at the hands of Afghan intelligence officials and police forces. It's all documented in a report issued by the United Nations this week. What they found was systematic abuse that followed a pattern—not random or isolated incidents—a pattern at several different facilities, involving at least 300 prisoners.

There's more. Kicks to the head; beatings with electric cables, rubber hoses, and wooden sticks; electric shocks to the thumbs; threats of sexual abuse, some of them against children. And there are some even more graphic, gruesome details that I know we've read about that I'll spare my colleagues for now.

No Americans have been directly implicated in this. But as long as we're continuing a military occupation of Afghanistan and as long as we've taken on the task of training Afghan security forces, I don't see how we avoid the responsibility for these shameful acts of abuse and ritual humiliation. At the very, very least, Mr. Speaker, we're guilty of shoddy oversight and failure to instruct Afghan officials in humane interrogation techniques.

Of course, this kind of brutality is a gross violation of international human rights standards. But it's also well-documented that torture doesn't work. Torture, at the very most for a normal human being, will force that human being to confess to anything under such duress, and it's a complete failure as an intelligence-gathering strategy.

The war in Afghanistan has been going on for 10 years now. It's costing American taxpayers \$10 billion a month. How can we justify spending all this money, money that we need to invest in job creation right here at home,

on a policy and a mission that is leading to such barbaric acts. How can we continue to sacrifice blood and treasure on this war, a war that is being waged in such gross violation of our very American values?

I have never been more convinced it's time to bring our troops home.

□ 0940

#### IRANIAN CONNECTION WITH ZETAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the last 2 days, we have been learning some disturbing information about the Nation of Iran and its dictator, Ahmadinejad. It seems as though, with the consultation with Iran and the drug cartels in Mexico, it was the idea that the Iranian Government, through one of its operatives, would commit a crime against the United States. We're learning more and more about this, but it's my opinion that the Iranian Government was in the middle of this attempted assault on American soil.

The idea that the Embassy down the street that belongs to the Saudi Arabians would be attacked, that the Saudi Arabian Ambassador would be murdered somewhere in a restaurant in Washington, DC, with a possible attack on the Israeli Ambassador, with a possible attack on the Israeli Ambassador and the Saudi Arabian Ambassador in Argentina, was being plotted by the Iranian Government against us is something that we should be aware of and conscious of and be very concerned about.

Thanks to good law enforcement, this terror plot was thwarted. But what if it had occurred? What if the will of this terrorist would-be to go to Mexico and meet with what he thought was a Zeta cartel member to smuggle explosives into the United States from Mexico that would be used in an attack in Washington, DC, what if that had actually occurred? Certainly, if the Iranian Government was involved in it, we would consider that an act of aggression against the United States.

And it's interesting to me that the Iranian Government was so bold that they thought they could do something like this and get away with it. Did they believe that the United States would not do anything about it? Did they perceive us to be so weak that we would not have shown them consequences for this action against this Nation? We don't know. But the truth is we should show the Iranian Government that there are consequences for an attempted attack such as this by the Iranian Government.

There are a couple of things that I think are important for us to realize. One, we should hold the Iranian Government accountable for this attempted attack on American soil, to show them that you must leave us alone no matter what your political

philosophy is. But just as equally disturbing is the fact that this operative—that I believe was dispatched by the Iranian Government—had the wherewithal to go to Mexico, our neighbors, and try to work with the drug cartels down there, and working in unison to come into the United States to commit a crime. Now, granted, the person that he was working with was not a Zeta cartel member. It was one of our own law enforcement officers. But the person thought he was working with the drug cartels. And the reason he was working with the drug cartels is because they, too, are at war with the United States, and they have easy access into the United States.

On a daily basis, the Zeta drug cartel—which I think is the worst of the worst in Mexico—comes into the United States and brings drugs and people, traffics humans, anything for money. And on a daily basis, they go back to Mexico and they take that money and they take weapons because they have access to our porous borders. If you want to get into the United States, hook up with one of the drug cartels and they'll get you in the U.S. And that's obvious what this Iranian operative was trying to do was to hook up with them. The drug cartels, for little money, will do anything, including commit murder in the United States.

So that should tell us that the border is still porous, Mr. Speaker. We hear that it's not, it's safe. It is porous, Mr. Speaker. There are portions that are safe, but the portions that are not safe are where the drug cartels go back and forth.

So, two lessons we should be learning are that the Iranian Government has it in for the United States—at least some people do in their government; two, that the border is porous, and we need to protect the national security of the United States' southern border.

So what are we going to do about it? We've heard that, well, we're going to impose some more sanctions to try to isolate Iran. Historically, sanctions have never worked any time countries have tried to use them. It is true that we could actually have some sanctions that would do some good, such as keeping Iran from having refined gasoline going back into the country, and maybe keeping crude oil from going out of Iran, but that doesn't solve the problem long term.

The long-term solution in Iran is a regime change. And let me make it clear, that regime change should be by the people of Iran who live in Iran and people who support the freedom fighters in Iran.

It's time that the regime of Iran be removed by the good folks who live in Iran. And the United States' policy publicly should be that we support those dissidents to get rid of the rogue regime of Ahmadinejad.

And that's just the way it is.

IN OPPOSITION TO THE PROTECT  
LIFE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to state my strident opposition to H.R. 358, proposed by our colleague, Representative PITTS, which we will be considering later on today.

H.R. 358 includes several truly unprecedented restrictions on abortion coverages—coverages which, by the way, our Supreme Court has determined are rights of women. And it would limit access to abortion services for all women, regardless of their health status, economic circumstances, age, or any other considerations.

This bill would also impose sweeping refusal provisions that not only undermine women's health care and women's rights, but actually endanger women's lives. It's not hyperbole to say that the provisions of the Pitts bill represent an extreme and callous attack on women's health.

First, H.R. 358 would effectively end abortion coverage for women in State insurance exchanges, both for those who receive subsidies to buy coverage and for those who use their own private money to buy coverage. This would mean that millions of women—contrary to what we have promised them through the Affordable Care Act, that they would be able to keep coverage they currently have—would actually lose the coverage that they currently have. The Pitts bill represents an unparalleled restriction on the use of private funds and an insurmountable impediment for women who simply want to be able to choose a health plan that will cover all of their potential health needs.

Second, H.R. 358 would codify and expand the vast refusal clause currently in law, the Weldon amendment, granting people with only a tangential connection to abortion services—such as receptionists who make appointments or claims adjusters at insurance companies—the right to refuse services to women who seek abortions. Not only that, but the Pitts bill would make it possible for States to pass a whole new slate of refusal laws that could allow insurers to opt out of covering not just abortion care, but birth control, screening, counseling for sexually transmitted diseases, mammograms, and much more.

But the most shocking expansion of our refusal laws is the provision in H.R. 358 that would exempt hospitals from treating or referring women, in case of emergency abortion care, even if women will die without it. Hospitals would no longer be forbidden from abandoning patients on the doorstep of emergency rooms and providing treatment to at least stabilize the medical condition of such patients. This provision heartlessly puts the preferences of hospitals above the lives of women.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 358 even establishes restrictions on peo-

ple's ability to get information about their coverage options. The Pitts bill would prevent the Federal Government, States, or any other entity implementing the Affordable Care Act from requiring access to abortion services. This means, for example, that people may not get impartial or even accurate information from the patient navigators who are designated to help them choose coverage.

The advocates of Planned Parenthood in Wisconsin sent me a story that truly encapsulates the emotion, the real-life consequences of what we're talking about today. This is Judy's story, not a woman who wanted an abortion so that her bikini line would not be ruined, but a woman whose mother had died when she was 4 years old. She and her husband agonized about their decision, but her health was in jeopardy, and they knew that preserving her health and her life was the best choice for her family.

□ 0950

And she painfully, painfully, agonizingly decided to terminate her pregnancy to save her life and to preserve the quality of the life of the one child that she has so that she could rear him.

To protect the right to safe, legal abortion care takes a serious commitment to Wisconsin's health, and it takes courage, Mr. Speaker. Politicians who want to end private health insurance coverage of abortion have neither of these qualities.

FOCUS ON JOB CREATION IN  
AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of Nevada's unemployed workers who got a glimpse this week of exactly what is wrong with Washington. Too many politicians in Washington have their priorities upside down.

My State is struggling with record unemployment rates. We should be focused every day here in Washington like a laser on job creation. And yet, this week, Washington voted repeatedly to send more jobs overseas.

Just yesterday, the House voted to kill legislation that would have stopped China from cheating Nevada workers out of thousands of jobs. These unfair currency manipulation tactics by China have already cost the Silver State nearly 15,000 jobs; and ironically, at the same time that Washington Republicans rejected efforts to stand up to China, three job-killing trade agreements sailed through the House and the Senate. These trade agreements could cost our Nation another 200,000 jobs.

Mr. Speaker, we need jobs here in America, not in foreign countries. Unemployed workers in Nevada and across our Nation are counting on us to get our priorities straight. Washington

must stop protecting China and start fighting to create jobs for American workers right here on American soil.

## BIG GOVERNMENT CONSERVATISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in the current issue of the American Spectator Magazine, Robert Merry, the former CEO of the Congressional Quarterly, has a great article that I wish everyone would read. It is an article about the Presidency of Andrew Jackson, but it applies lessons of history to modern-day issues and problems better than almost anything I have ever read.

Mr. Merry says the Republican Party should not follow the big government conservatism of David Brooks, William Kristol, or Presidents like Theodore Roosevelt or George W. Bush, who he says "expanded the size and scope of the Federal Government and pursued the global goal of remaking other cultures in far-flung regions."

Mr. Merry asks, "Who among past Presidents should Republicans turn to for lessons and guidance?"

"The answer," he says, "is Andrew Jackson, who would have slapped down the notion of American greatness conservatism," i.e., big government conservatism, "with utter contempt because he believed," that is, Jackson believed, "the country's greatness emanated from its people, not from its government."

"Jackson was the great conservative populist of American history, and his story bears study at a time when the country seems receptive to a well-crafted brand of conservative populism."

"Indeed," Mr. Merry continues, "conservative populism is the essence of the Tea Party—opposed to big, intrusive government; angry about the corporate bailouts of the late Bush and early Obama administrations; fearful of the consequences of fiscal incontinence; suspicious of governmental favoritism; wary of excessive global ambition."

"These concerns and fears were Jackson's concerns and fears 180 years ago when he became President, and his greatest legacy is his constant warning that governmental encroachments would lead to precisely the kinds of problems that are today besieging the country. That legacy deserves attention."

Mr. Merry also admires Thomas Jefferson. He wrote:

"Jackson was of course a Democrat, but the Democratic Party of that era was almost the polar opposite of today's version."

"The 19th-century party emerged from the politics of Thomas Jefferson, who despised the governing Federalists of the early Republic for their elitist tendencies and push for concentrated Federal power."

"Jefferson brought forth new political catchphrases: small government,