

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

reform agenda, engage appropriately with the West and eschew regional conflict.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, we as Americans have a responsibility to live up to our own ideals. How can we preach democracy, yet shun the free and fair choices of Egyptians? Of course, we cannot be naive. We have to recognize that democracy is about more than just elections, but also about protecting minority rights and building institutions that outlast the individuals who occupy them.

But we also have to recognize that supporting only democracies around the world that produce our own preferred results is the height of hypocrisy. On a more practical level, compromising our own values would only strengthen the hands of anti-Western fundamentalists. Refusing to engage with the Muslim Brotherhood would simply achieve a self-fulfilling prophecy by giving rise to extremists over reformists and moderates.

No country following decades of authoritarian rule can make a full transition to a thriving, stable, peaceful and prosperous democracy quickly and painlessly. Even with the most optimistic of outlooks, the Egyptian people will struggle for years to come to throw off the shackles of the past and create the kind of future for which we all strive. We have been working at this for 236 years, Mr. Speaker, and we still haven't gotten it exactly right.

We have a responsibility, as longtime Egyptian allies and as champions of democracy around the globe, to stand with them in this process, encouraging continued reform and providing our support for the development of real democracy in the Arab world's most populous nation.

HONORING AMERICA'S VETERANS AND CARING FOR CAMP LEJEUNE FAMILIES ACT

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

Mr. MILLER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Honoring America's Veterans and Caring for Camp Lejeune Families Act, which the House will consider later today, especially title I, the Janey Ensminger Act.

Title I and a similar House bill honor a 9-year-old girl who died from childhood leukemia, most likely because she was exposed to contaminated drinking water at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, when her mother was pregnant with her.

And by honoring Janey Ensminger, we honor those Americans who have shown remarkable determination to make their government do the right thing. They have struggled for more than a decade to learn exactly what chemicals were in the drinking water at Camp Lejeune, water that perhaps a million marines and their families

were exposed to over a 30-year period, to learn the health effects of exposure to the contaminated drinking water, and to seek justice for those harmed.

They took on their own government, including the Marine Corps they had served and to which they are still loyal, but which has been shamefully reluctant to accept responsibility for the water contamination.

Janey's father, Jerry Ensminger, is a retired marine who lived with his family on base at Camp Lejeune for a time. Jerry watched his daughter become ill from leukemia, struggle with the disease, and eventually lose the struggle. Years after he watched his daughter die, Jerry learned of the water contamination at Camp Lejeune and has not rested since.

I first met Jerry 4 years ago when he testified powerfully on the Science and Technology Committee's Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight, which I then chaired. Jerry worked shoulder to shoulder with others, including Tom Townsend, Mike Partain, Jim Fontella, the Byron family and William Hill against long odds.

□ 1220

The Janey Ensminger Act is the result of their remarkable efforts. They were always faithful to the cause of justice for those harmed by the contaminated drinking water.

The Janey Ensminger Act will require the VA to provide medical coverage for certain illnesses to veterans who served at Camp Lejeune between 1957 and 1987, and to their families. The VA will be the "payer of last resort." Justice requires no less for the people harmed by the water contamination at Camp Lejeune.

The harm will never be fully made right. The bill will not help Janey or her father. But the Janey Ensminger Act acknowledges responsibility and provides needed treatment for many others.

The marines who have championed this legislation served our democracy when they wore our Nation's uniform, and they served our democracy by their determination to obtain justice for the people harmed by the toxic drinking water at Camp Lejeune.

THE POLITICS OF FAIRNESS—I.E., THE POLITICS OF FAVORITISM

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot about fairness from the President lately. Perhaps his Chicago advisers think that if he distracts, divides, and creates envy all in the name of so-called "fairness," Americans will ignore their thin wallets and stacked up bills. But the people are smarter than back-room government policycrats.

If the President is reelected in January, he will have inherited a weak economy from his predecessor—him-

self. Then who will he blame? The President was elected to solve problems, not place blame and make excuses for failure.

Like most Americans, I want the administration to succeed, but the evidence is not on the administration's side. With unemployment higher than 8 percent for 41 months—even higher for recent college graduates at above 50 percent—and our deficit above \$15 trillion, there isn't much of a record to stand on.

So we are involved in a new Madison Avenue campaign diversion called "Re-make America" to make America "fair." Of course, fairness is in the eyes of the beholder, and it means different things to different folks; but it certainly sounds good at first glance.

Mr. Speaker, let's look at this idea. The politics of "fairness" are used when politicians want you to ignore their record and then claim that some people just haven't been treated fairly. This is a mere diversion from failed policy, failed ideas. When you look at the record, you'll see that this administration's definition of "fairness" really means "favoritism."

There is no fairness in crony capitalism. That is favoritism. There is no fairness in a perpetual bailout culture where the omnipotent government deems some too big to fail and others too small to succeed. That is favoritism. There is no fairness in forcing Americans to fork over money to pay for failed pet endeavors like Solyndra. That is favoritism. There is no fairness in an unaccountable government that constantly takes money from the working people and squanders it in a failed stimulus—or two. That is favoritism. And there is no fairness in enforcing some laws while proudly ignoring other laws. That is favoritism.

What this "fairness" debate—or the politics of favoritism—achieves is a systematic desire by government to create animosity—animosity towards those who have or are just trying to achieve some success. It also creates animosity toward government from those who built it on their own without being a member of the government's favored class.

This debate degrades the American Dream because it removes the equality of opportunity and creates a class of favorites—the class of government "friends."

There is no equality or fairness in forced equal outcomes. Since some people are more successful than others, to paraphrase Lincoln, the government, which cannot make everyone rich, is trying to accomplish what it can do—make everyone poor and dependent on the government for success. This is fairness? I think not.

Instead of encouraging individuals to succeed on their own, this administration tells citizens that they need the government. In fact, according to The Wall Street Journal, almost 50 percent of the population lives in a household where at least one member receives a government benefit.