While Congress is fighting to defund Planned Parenthood and protect life at conception, the staff and volunteers at the Piedmont Women's Center are on the front lines every day literally saving lives.

I would like to congratulate the Piedmont Women's Center and their CEO, Lenna Neill, on reaching their 20th anniversary. I thank them for their commitment to protecting the most innocent among us and wish them God's blessing as they continue to spread their ministry across the Palmetto State.

May God bless you, the unborn, and may God continue to bless America.

STOPPING THE ASSAULT ON PUBLIC BROADCASTING

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, the Republican assault on public broadcasting continues. We are told that tomorrow we will be considering H.R. 1076, which really goes further than anything that we have considered to date. It would prohibit the purchase of any content for public broadcasting resources using Federal money.

Now, I think we are going to see in the course of the debate some unfortunate, and I hope unintended, consequences.

It is ironic that my Republican friends who came to Congress this time with a pledge of regular order, that everybody would have 72 hours to review legislation online, that we are going to have the committee process working in a robust fashion, have again decided to violate their own rules by rushing this to the floor without extensive committee work and without being available for Americans to review this legislation for 72 hours.

I don't understand why, but I can guess that if they really want to try to pass this, they would be far better off rushing it, not having it carefully examined.

First and foremost, the whole point of public broadcasting is the development and broadcast of content that doesn't have commercial value, that doesn't inspire the networks, the channels, radio and television, to be able to sell advertising for this particular type of program.

You will search in vain reviewing the thousands of commercial radio and television stations, cable channels and networks, to find the type of educational programming that we rely on PBS for, for example, to supply to our children. There is no content for our children on the vast commercial sea of broadcasting that doesn't come from people who are trying to sell something to our kids, not educate them.

□ 1020

You're at a time when news is shrinking in the commercial arena. Newspapers are getting thinner. Broadcast networks are withdrawing correspondence from overseas at precisely the time that the American public needs to know what is happening in the Middle East, in Japan. At precisely the time commercial coverage is shrinking, public broadcasting has actually expanded coverage and, in fact, at times devotes a lot of time and attention to boring news—boring news which often we find is some of the most important for us to understand.

This proposal would prohibit not just purchase of NPR, which is the target. Ironically, National Public Radio has a miniscule level of support from the Federal Government. Most of this money flows to provide content and programing to smaller stations in rural and small-town America, where they don't have the financial base to be able to provide robust public broadcasting.

We're always going to have public broadcast stations in New York and San Francisco, Los Angeles. Even Portland, Oregon, a medium-size city, will have that resource. It will be diminished if we don't have the program support, but it will be there. In rural Burns, Oregon, where it costs 11 times as much to send a signal, that's where it's going to be hit.

Now, denying the ability to purchase content doesn't mean just NPR. It's ''Car Talk.'' It's ''Prairie Home Companion.'' And most significantly, in my mind, it is some of the special programs that have been developed for the Pacific Northwest. Again, no commercial station would do it because no advertiser will pay for it. But it serves a market for important news that people need to have about their communities. It's not just in the Pacific Northwest. It's in the Rocky Mountain States, in the Upper Midwest. In fact, some of these stations are the sole source of programming. And so by prohibiting the use of this resource, it's going to cut them off at the knees.

Well, that's unfortunate because public broadcasting is the most trusted name in American media. It's why Republicans and Democrats alike don't want it cut. In fact, some would even increase it. I hope my colleagues will listen to what the American public wants and reject this legislation.

GENERAL PETRAEUS AND ''THE CHARLIE SHEEN COUNTERINSURGENCY STRATEGY''

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, the American people are rapidly losing confidence in the Nation's Afghanistan policy. Public opposition has reached an all-time high. According to the new ABC News/Washington Post poll, nearly two-thirds of Americans, or 64 percent, say this war isn't worth fighting. I wonder if any of the programs that my Republican colleagues want to cut have sunk to that level of nonsupport. And yet this charade goes on.

The July drawdown, the date we should be leaving Afghanistan, is rapidly approaching; and there are precious few signs of preparations for a massive military redeployment. In fact, top officials have been ''walking back'' the July 2011 commitment from almost the moment the President made it.

General Petraeus has returned to Capitol Hill this week to pat us on the head and tell us the same things he's told us before. During testimony he gave last year, he offered up this—I call it a doozy—describing the July deadline as ''the point at which a process begins to transition security tasks to Afghan forces at a rate to be determined by conditions at the time.'' With all due respect to the general, Madam Speaker, that's an awful lot of weasel words.

His testimony in the Senate yesterday didn't inspire much confidence either. He continues to offer the same bland and tone-deaf talking points—a lot of vague reassurances about progress we've supposedly made, while being sure to say that challenges remain so he can continue justifying a substantial troop presence. He's over here on the House side today. I hope my colleagues on the Armed Services Committee will hold his feet to the fire, demanding the clarity and candor that the American people deserve.

With everyone hanging on General Petraeus' every word, even though he is the symbol of a discredited and unpopular policy, I thought some of us should speak for the overwhelming majority opinion—for that 64 percent. So yesterday, the Congressional Progressive Caucus Peace and Security Task Force held a briefing with a fascinating group of panelists. We heard from Robert Pape, the suicide terrorism scholar, who posed an interesting analogy—if suicide bombings are the lung cancer of terrorism, then foreign occupation is the smoking habit, the lethal but preventable addiction that's feeding the illness.

Matthew Hoh, the former marine captain and State Department official, noted that we're laying off police officers here at home while building up a corrupt and ineffective police force in Afghanistan. And Rolling Stone contributing editor Michael Hastings, who recently broke the story about the Army using psyops propaganda on U.S. Senators, was also there; and he made this observation. He said General Petraeus is giving us ''the Charlie Sheen counterinsurgency strategy, which is to give exclusive interviews to every major network and keep saying you're winning and hope the public actually agrees with you.''

Madam Speaker, it was a compelling briefing. I hope all of us in the 112th Congress will listen to people like Professor Pape, Mr. Hoh, and Mr. Hastings. But, most of all, I hope we'll listen to the American people, who are angry,