



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 158

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 31, 2012

No. 115

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 31, 2012.

I hereby appoint the Honorable STEVE WOMACK to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 17, 2012, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m.

FAILED POLICY IN AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, again, I try to get to the floor once a week to talk about our failed policy in Afghanistan.

Last Thursday, an article in Politico reminded us of the difficulty of trying to change a culture like Afghanistan. It is nearly impossible. For centuries, outside influences have been trying, but we are never going to be able to change the belief systems and culture of the Middle East.

The Politico article stated that parts of Afghanistan were stuck in the 14th century. We are supporting a corrupt country and a culture where it is commonplace for grown men to have sexual relations with young boys. The American taxpayer should be outraged to know that their tax dollars are going to support this kind of practice.

Yesterday, The Washington Post published an article, titled, "U.S. Construction Projects in Afghanistan Challenged by Inspector General's Report." While discussing the fact that projects implemented in Afghanistan by Americans will not be possible for the Afghans to sustain once the United States leaves, the question for policymakers in Washington is whether the massive influx of American spending in Afghanistan is actually making the problem worse.

One such project to provide electricity requires purchasing diesel fuel to run the generators enough to power about 2,500 Afghan homes or small businesses and is projected to cost the United States' taxpayers about \$220 million through 2013.

Mr. Speaker, it is just billions and billions and billions going to Afghanistan and very little accountability, and yet we are cutting programs for the American people. To me, it makes no sense at all.

Mr. Speaker, again I brought a poster down. This is a new one that I purchased myself. There is a little girl holding her mother's arm. The mother is being escorted by an Army officer, and the little girl is looking at the caisson that is carrying her father. Her father is under an American flag. The father was killed in Afghanistan for America.

I would say to this family: You should be very proud of your father.

I would say to Congress: Why can't you understand that you've got a failed policy in Afghanistan, and these young men and women are dying?

These young men and women are losing their legs and arms, and yet we keep sending \$10 billion a month to a corrupt leader where they have the practice of adult men making love with boys over there in Afghanistan. I just don't understand the Congress, to be honest with you.

Mr. Speaker, as you and many know, I have Camp Lejeune Marine Base in my district. In the last 10 days, three marines have been killed in Afghanistan. I salute their families and thank them for the gift of that loved one.

How many more young men and women have to die in Afghanistan? How many more taxpayer dollars have to go to prop up a corrupt leader? Afghanistan will not survive under Karzai. The Taliban will eventually take over.

Mr. Speaker, before closing, as I always do, first I would like to ask the American people to contact their Member of Congress and say bring our troops home now, at least no later than 2014, and stop spending our taxpayers' money when you can't even account for what it is being spent for in Afghanistan, and start spending it right here in America to rebuild our roads, schools, and infrastructure.

So on behalf of this little girl and her mom, and all of the families who've given loved ones dying for freedom in Afghanistan, I will close this way:

God, please bless our men and women in uniform. God, please bless the families of our men and women in uniform. God, in your loving arms, hold the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq. God, please bless the House and Senate that we will do what is right in God's eyes for the people of today and the people of tomorrow. And I ask God to please bless the President of the United States, to give him wisdom, courage, and strength to do what's right for God's people here. And three times I will say, God, please, God, please, God, please continue to bless America.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H5333

REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH FOR WOMEN OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, sometimes schoolyard bullies pick on the wrong kid. Anti-choice forces thought they had found a cheap way to make a large point against the right of women in our country to reproductive health and choice by picking on the District of Columbia. Pick a fight with the District of Columbia—after all, the District of Columbia doesn't have a vote even if the bill is about only the District of Columbia. But in the process, they picked a fight with the women of the United States because this is still a pro-choice Nation.

Now, they didn't want to get women worked up in an election year, but they wanted a Federal imprimatur, a Federal label, so they thought that they could get the House to pass the bill that's coming to the floor today on suspension that women in the District of Columbia are not entitled to an abortion after 20 weeks. Mind you, everywhere else in the United States that right still would exist.

And while they're at it, they say, let's penalize women by allowing an injunction against an abortion by these women by, any health care provider who has had anything to do with the woman any time in her life—I guess the elementary school nurse could come in to seek an injunction. And, of course, penalize doctors—2 years in jail and a fine are possible. No health exception for the woman no matter her health nor fetal abnormality, rape or incest exceptions.

One of my constituents, Professor Christy Zink, had an abortion at 21 weeks, the earliest time her physicians would discover that she was carrying a fetus with half a brain. Had it been born alive, it would have had constant seizures. She would have had to carry that fetus to term.

Sometimes, bullies pick the wrong fight. Anti-choice forces have threatened the leadership here, particularly Republicans, saying they are going to score the vote. All that did was to bring out the really big boys and girls—Planned Parenthood and NARAL Pro-Choice America—who are going to score the bill as well.

They've been too clever by two-thirds. It'll take two-thirds to pass this bill. I'm hoping they won't get that kind of supermajority.

This is not the typical anti-home-rule bill that holds everyone else harmless except for D.C. residents and the D.C. government. This bill is a key element in a State-by-State campaign that seeks first to undermine and then to eliminate reproductive choice and health care for women across the United States.

They've miscalculated. They have re-invigorated the pro-choice movement,

just as they did when they infiltrated Susan G. Komen for the Cure and forced Komen, which later reversed itself to stop giving to Planned Parenthood, just as they did when they failed to defund Planned Parenthood, just as they did when they caused a furor by women with the attack on contraceptives in health insurance policies.

□ 1210

Now women see this fight against reproductive choice for what it is, because it has ended with the constitutional right to abortion. Anti-choice Republicans have abandoned their own principles. If they feel so deeply, how could they introduce a bill that would affect only women and only fetuses in the District of Columbia?

The Supreme Court decided 39 years ago that a woman is entitled to an abortion. That's a constitutional right. It's not a constitutional right everywhere except the Nation's Capital. The differences in our country on choice are great, but they are differences we all must respect. And the Supreme Court has settled those differences with *Roe v. Wade*, which says pre-viability, that is a decision between a woman and her doctor. After viability, of course, there are some things that can be done, but the health and life of the mother always have to be protected.

This bill stretches beyond penalties doctors in our country would receive, and penalties on women, and it is the kind of bill that sends a message to women: this is not a House that is protecting your reproductive health. If this bill passes, it will cause the kind of uproar that we have not seen in almost 40 years.

FREE TRADE WITH EGYPT

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, nearly three decades ago, one of my great heroes, Ronald Reagan, famously said:

In all of the arsenals of the world, no weapon is so powerful as the will and moral courage of free men and women.

For the last year and a half, no development on the world stage has drawn greater interest or sparked more passionate debate than the upheaval in the Arab world. What started in Tunisia in December of 2010 has spread throughout North Africa and the Middle East, leaving virtually no Arab nation untouched.

Tunisia ousted a dictator and elected a constituent assembly, which is drafting a new constitution. Libya fought a civil war, rid itself of its dictator, and held elections. In both cases, particularly in Libya, blood was shed, but it has so far not been in vain, as real hope for democracy and an improved quality of life prevails.

Other countries, such as Morocco and Jordan, have seen more modest changes, but in the same direction—to-

ward greater openness. Elsewhere in the Arab world, this unprecedented chain of events has thus far taken a far more tragic path. The Syrian people are suffering immeasurably for their efforts to unseat a regime that has proven itself eager to take innocent lives in brutal fashion.

In countries like Bahrain, the violence has been more limited, but no less tragic. Even in those nations where regimes stifle public discourse, we know that the autocrats are watching. They are mindful of Reagan's lesson that the will of the people cannot be suppressed indefinitely.

Of all the nations where this movement has unfolded, none holds greater sway over the future of the region than Egypt. Since the stunning fall of Mubarak in February of last year, Egypt has held parliamentary and presidential elections. Both sets of elections swept the Muslim Brotherhood to office, setting up a power struggle between the Brotherhood's leadership, the secularists, and the military council. Knowing of the harsh and deeply troubling rhetoric the Brotherhood has used over the years, many Americans rightly ask the question, can we work with the newly elected leadership in Egypt?

Should we continue to provide support to this government and the Egyptian people? What exactly does the Brotherhood stand for, and how will they lead? Mr. Speaker, these are important questions. To answer them, we have to go beyond the reactionary and reductionist assumptions that are often made. I've spent a great deal of time in Egypt, meeting with staunch secularists to Salafists and everyone in between, including leaders and members of the Muslim Brotherhood. What I have found is a vast movement that is far from monolithic. It is made up of moderates and hard-liners, reformers and the old guard, and great internal differences exist.

One thing, however, that has unified them is their public statements of support for the Camp David peace accords for human rights, including women's rights, as well as religious freedom, all of which are prerequisites to meet their quest to get their economy back on track through tourism and international investment. I've joined with a Democratic colleague in introducing a resolution calling for a free trade agreement with Egypt to help achieve just that.

Ultimately, we will judge them not by their words, as Secretary Clinton has just said in a piece, but by their actions. But the mere fact that these public statements have been made says a great deal about the stark difference between the nature of an underground movement, which the Muslim Brotherhood was, and an elected government. Now that the Brotherhood has at least taken some of the responsibility of righting the economy and providing opportunity for 85 million Egyptians, it will face enormous pressure to pursue a