

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to issue a warning to America's seniors and working families: Top Republicans are still trying to privatize Social Security. The GOP Budget Chairman PAUL RYAN, author of the budget that ends Medicare and increased health costs for seniors, admitted he views Social Security as a Ponzi scheme. And Congressman PETE SESSIONS, who serves in House leadership for the GOP, introduced legislation labeled "Savings Account For Every American Act" that would have people opt out of Social Security by sending their contributions to a private account.

According to Stephen Goss, Social Security's chief actuary, this change will "severely compromise" the ability to pay for current seniors and those near retirement. "So Social Security, the ability to pay benefits to people who are currently receiving, or are now approaching the time of receiving benefits, would be severely compromised. Our year of trust fund exhaustion would certainly come to be much sooner than 2036." In other words, the plan of the Republicans to privatize Social Security would put that program that has never missed a check to Americans in danger. We need to oppose those efforts.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 358, PROTECT LIFE ACT

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 430 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 430

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 358) to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to modify special rules relating to coverage of abortion services under such Act. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted and that the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

POINT OF ORDER

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, I raise a point of order that the rule, H. Res. 430, violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act. The resolution contains a waiver of all points of order against consideration of the bill, which includes a waiver of section 425 of the Congressional Budget Act, which causes a violation of section 426(a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Wisconsin makes a point of order that the resolution vio-

lates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The gentlewoman has met the threshold under the rule, and the gentlewoman from Wisconsin and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes of debate on the question of consideration. Following debate, the Chair will put the question of consideration as the statutory means of disposing of the point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wisconsin.

Ms. MOORE. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I raise this point of order that H.R. 358 contains several potential unfunded mandates that would burden the States, burden private insurance companies, and burden women. I am also raising this point of order because it is a powerful vehicle to register my concern that this bill is a misguided ideological distraction from what should be our top priority—getting people back to work and protecting working families who have been hit hard by economic circumstances.

It is so clear to me that in spite of what our colleagues may say across the aisle, this bill is not about public funding for abortion. It's really crystal clear, Madam Speaker, that the Affordable Care Act already explicitly prohibits Federal funding for abortion. It reaffirms the Hyde amendment. It even includes the Nelson amendment to ensure that there's no commingling of funds. H.R. 358 would bring back the infamous world of Stupak-Pitts. But this time it adds even more restrictive language to the proposal.

This bill would essentially ban insurance coverage of abortion in health care exchanges, not just for women who are being publicly funded or subsidized in the exchanges, but even for women paying with their own private dollars, Madam Speaker. In addition, H.R. 358 would create a system that plays Russian roulette with pregnant women's lives when they enter a hospital. This would mean that any hospital could refuse to perform an emergency abortion—even if a woman would die without it—without violating the Federal law designed to prevent people from being denied emergency medical care.

It goes even further by paving the way to allow State refusal laws that are not limited to the provision of abortion services, but to anything that would be considered controversial—treatment for STIs, birth control services, screening services, and counseling.

With that, I would yield time to my good colleague from California, Representative SPEIER.

Ms. SPEIER. I thank the gentlelady from Wisconsin.

Madam Speaker, I think this bill goes to the farthest extreme in trying to take women down not just a peg but take them in shackles to some cave somewhere. Twenty-five years ago, this body passed EMTALA, a bill that basi-

cally said anyone that shows up at an emergency room would access health care, no questions asked. Now, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to amend that law and basically say, Oh, except for a woman who is in need of an abortion, or except for a woman who's bleeding to death who happens to be pregnant, or except for a woman who is miscarrying.

Basically, what this bill would do is say that any hospital could decline to provide services to one class of people in this country. And that one class of people is pregnant women.

Let me tell you something. My story is pretty well known now. I was pregnant. I was miscarrying. I was bleeding. If I had to go from one hospital to the next trying to find one emergency room that would take me in, who knows if I would even be here today.

What my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are attempting to do is misogynist. It is absolutely misogynist.

The time has come for us to stop taking up this issue over and over again this year and do something that the American people really care about. They want jobs. They want to be able to hold on to their homes. They want some mortgage relief. And what do we do? We stand here on the floor and create yet another opportunity for women to be cast in shackles.

Ms. MOORE. Thank you for that compelling story.

How much time do I have, Madam Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Wisconsin has 5½ minutes remaining.

Ms. MOORE. I would like to yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Illinois, Representative JAN SCHAKOWSKY.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I thank my friend, the gentlewoman, for yielding to me. I rise in support of her point of order.

The American people are begging us to work together to create jobs to bolster the economy. Instead, we're here once again to consider legislation that endangers and attacks the right of women and is far out of the mainstream of American priorities.

H.R. 358 is extreme legislation. It is another attempt to unravel the health care law while at the same time expanding anti-choice laws that will harm women's health. It would take away a woman's right to make her own decisions about her reproductive health—even with her own money. It would allow public hospitals, as you heard, to deny emergency abortion care to women in life-threatening situations. It would expand the existing conscience objection to allow providers to avoid providing contraception. We're talking now about birth control.

This legislation revives a debate that has already been settled. There is no Federal funding for an abortion in the health care reform law. Legal experts have said it, independent fact-check organizations have said it. Yet Republicans continue to insist that the possibility of funding remains.

□ 1210

Federal funds are already prohibited from being used for abortions under the Hyde amendment—at the expense, I should add, of poor women, Federal employees, women of the District of Columbia, and women in the military. But this bill goes way beyond that law. The attention Republicans are focusing on the private lives of women—what American families do with their own money—makes it clear that their real goal is to ban all abortions and end access to birth control and contraceptives.

Republicans don't want government to protect the water we drink—oh, no—or the air we breathe or the food we eat, but they do want to intrude in a woman's right to choose.

We are now at 280 days into this Congress without passing a jobs plan, yet the Republican majority has consistently managed to pass extreme and divisive legislation targeted at women's health. The administration strongly opposes H.R. 358, and this bill has no chance of becoming law. Now is the time to work on the issues that are most important to Americans—creating jobs and improving the economy—rather than restricting reproductive choice and access to family planning.

American women will suffer if this bill becomes law, but we're just wasting time here because it will not. And it just shows how mean spirited and extreme this legislation is. It's a way to roll back women's health and rights. It's too extreme for women, too extreme for America, and we should reject it right now.

Ms. MOORE. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I claim time in opposition to the point of order and in favor of consideration of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 10 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. The question before the House is: Should the House now consider H. Res. 430? While the resolution waives all points of order against consideration of the bill, the committee is not aware of any points of order. The waiver is prophylactic in nature.

The Congressional Budget Office has stated that H.R. 358 contains no intergovernmental or private sector mandates, as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, and would impose no cost on State, local, or tribal governments. Again, Madam Speaker, this waiver is prophylactic, and the motion of the gentlewoman is dilatory.

I would like to now yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina for yielding me this time.

I have listened very carefully to the arguments that have been advanced by the speakers on the other side—my

friend and neighbor, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER), and the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY). None of them address the question before the House. The question before the House is whether or not to consider this bill. It's not about jobs—although they're important. It's not about the merits of the bill—which we will debate later should the House vote to consider this bill. It's about whether there are unfunded mandates in the bill.

The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) read the CBO statement of February 28, 2011: "H.R. 358 contains no intergovernmental or private sector mandates, as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act and would impose no costs on State, local, or tribal governments." That's what the CBO said, and that has not been rebutted either by the proposer of the point of order, my colleague from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE), or those who have spoken on behalf of this.

Now, if we're to follow the rules and say, okay, if there's an unfunded mandate, we ought to waive it—which the resolution does—then we've all got to vote "yes" on consideration, because there are no unfunded mandates and nobody has claimed that there are any unfunded mandates. That's why the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is correct in saying that the point of order is dilatory.

If you want to debate the bill, let's debate the bill. If you want to object to consideration of the bill, then all you want to do, those who decide to vote "no" on this motion to consider ought to have a debate on whether there should be public funding of abortion.

Now, when the taxpayers are asked to fund abortions, that's a whole different issue than whether there should be a right to abortion. This question is whether there should be taxpayer funding of abortion. There are no unfunded mandates. And the honest vote is "yes" on the motion to consider.

Ms. MOORE. I would reserve my right to close.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina would have the right to close.

Ms. MOORE. Does the gentlewoman have more speakers?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentlewoman from North Carolina have other speakers?

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry. I believe that we have the right to close; is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has the right to close.

Ms. FOXX. Then I will reserve my time.

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, can you tell me how much time I have?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Wisconsin has 2½ minutes remaining.

Ms. MOORE. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I would yield 1 minute to my colleague from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I find it actually somewhat humorous to think that the argument on the other side of the aisle is that this is dilatory when, in fact, the entire bill is dilatory when you look at what is really facing this country right now.

This bill makes it very clear that any hospital that does not want to provide emergency room services to a woman who is miscarrying and needs an abortion would no longer have to do it. Let's make that very clear.

Let me read one little example from the American Journal of Public Health:

A woman with a condition that prevented her blood from clotting was in the process of miscarrying at a Catholic-owned hospital. According to her doctor, she was dying before his eyes. In fact, her eyes were filling with blood. But even though her life was in danger and the fetus had no chance of survival, the hospital wouldn't let the doctor treat her by terminating the pregnancy until the fetal heartbeat ceased.

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, I can tell you this bill does waive the health and lives of women if the point of order is not found to be in order.

To sum it up, H.R. 358 is incredibly divisive. It takes away comprehensive health coverage from women in not only eliminating the protections they currently have right now, but going even further than current law and completely undermining women's health.

At a time when the majority should be using its tremendous power to create jobs and turn the economy around, the majority is using its power to turn on women.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I find it unbelievable that our colleagues across the aisle could make the comments that they are making today. H.R. 358 takes away no protections from women in this country. It takes away no rights of women. It is not extreme.

Seventy-seven percent of the people in this country are opposed to taxpayer funding for abortions. What H.R. 358 does is to say we are going to make it absolutely certain that we are not going to use taxpayer funding to pay for abortions, even under what has become known as ObamaCare. This bill does not go beyond the pale, as our colleagues have said. It is not outside the mainstream. It is our colleagues across the aisle who are outside the mainstream. They represent 23 percent of the people in this country who do want to see taxpayer funding for abortions. They are outside the mainstream.

And talk about dilatory, this whole point of order is dilatory. It is an effort on their part to simply bring up issues that are irrelevant. And in many cases, the points made are not true. They are

the ones who are wasting time. They say we should be dealing with the jobs bill.

Well, Madam Speaker, let me point out to our colleagues across the aisle that not one of them who spoke today, not one of them who gave 1-minute on the jobs bill have cared to be cosponsors of the jobs bill. The jobs bill, which President Obama has been asking the Congress to pass, was defeated in the Senate.

□ 1220

It was introduced in the House by one Member, and he put on the bill, "by request." That means it was a courtesy to the President. No other Member across the aisle has chosen to cosponsor that bill. If they are so eager to get that bill passed, you would think that they would become cosponsors of the bill.

We are doing a lot on our side of the aisle to create jobs. We are doing our best to reduce spending and to reduce rules and regulations, and that will create jobs in this country.

Additional spending by the Federal Government doesn't create jobs. We know that from the stimulus bill that was passed in 2009.

And for my colleagues across the aisle who say that this is a misogynist bill, nobody has ever fought more for the rights of women than I have. But 50 percent of the unborn babies that are being aborted are females. So the misogyny comes from those who promote the killing of unborn babies. That's where the misogyny comes in, Madam Speaker. It doesn't come in from our trying to protect taxpayers' money from being spent on killing unborn children.

Madam Speaker, in order to allow the House to continue its scheduled business for the day, I urge Members to vote "yes" on the question of consideration of the resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

The question is, Will the House now consider the resolution?

The question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, House Resolution 430 provides for a closed rule providing for consideration of H.R. 358, the Protect Life Act.

I would now like to yield 2 minutes to my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my good friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, the Protect Life Act offered by Chairman JOE PITTS and DAN LIPINSKI ensures that all the elements of the Hyde amendment apply to all the programs that are authorized and appropriated in ObamaCare.

By now I trust that all Members fully understand that because programs in ObamaCare are both authorized and appropriated in the law on a parallel track but not subject to appropriations under HHS, the actual Hyde amendment therefore has no legal effect whatsoever. Hyde only affects Labor-HHS programs including Medicaid, not the massive expansion of government-funded health care. Thus, ObamaCare, when phased in fully in 2014, will open up the floodgates of public funding for abortion in a myriad of programs, including and especially in the "exchanges", resulting in more dead babies and wounded mothers than would otherwise have been the case.

Because abortion methods dismember, decapitate, crush, poison, or starve to death or induce premature labor, pro-life Members of Congress and, according to every reputable poll, majorities of Americans want no complicity whatsoever in the destruction of human life. ObamaCare forces us to be complicit.

Despite breathtaking advances in recent years, and respecting and treating unborn children as patients in need of diagnosis and care and treatment for any number of diseases just like any other patient, far too many people dismiss the baby in the womb as *persona non grata*.

I respectfully submit: How can violence against children by abortion be construed as benign or compassionate or caring?

The dangerous myth of "safe abortion" must be exposed—and absolutely not subsidized by taxpayers. So-called safe abortion is the ultimate oxymoron, an Orwellian manipulation of language designed to convey bogus respectability to a lethal act. Abortion is, by any reasonable definition, child mortality. Its sole purpose is to kill a baby.

I would also suggest that presumptuous talk that brands any child as "unwanted" or an "unwanted child" reduces that child to a mere object bereft of inherent dignity or value.

We should not be paying for abortion. I support the Protect Life Act.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, the Protect Life Act amends the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to prohibit Federal funds from being used to pay for abortion services or any health plan that

includes such service. It also imposes new restrictions on health insurance coverage for termination care and expands conscience protection laws, while limiting access to reproductive health services.

At a time when our Nation is facing great economic uncertainty and millions of Americans are in need of jobs, please, somebody tell me why we are here considering a bill that is a direct attack on a woman's constitutionally protected right to choose and that does not create one single job.

Let's be serious here. Republicans have yet to pass a jobs bill. Instead of getting down to the business of creating jobs, they're bringing to the House floor a deeply flawed and deeply divisive bill that will not pass the Senate and would be vetoed if it reached the President's desk. They know that. I know that. Everybody knows that.

The Protect Life Act is both unnecessary and clearly politically motivated. Republicans are resorting to their old bag of tricks and pulling the abortion card in order to distract from their clear lack of leadership. In April they rammed through H.R. 3, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, instead of focusing on efforts to pass a clean continuing resolution that would prevent a government shutdown.

As the deadline approaches for the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction in Congress to approve a deficit reduction plan in excess of \$1.5 trillion, Republicans have deemed it necessary to rehash the health care reform debate and roll back women's rights.

And I want to clear up one thing. You keep saying "ObamaCare." I've said repeatedly that there are those of us, and I am among them, that advocated for health care, including a public option and universal health care long before we even knew Barack Obama's name. So perhaps it should be called "Hastings-ObamaCare."

This time, however, they take it to a new harmful extreme. The Protect Life Act is not about the regulation of Federal funds with regard to abortion services. The Hyde amendment already does that. This act is about restricting access to care and intimidating women and their families in the use of their own money.

Since 1976, the Hyde amendment has prohibited the use of taxpayer money for funding abortions, unless the abortion is performed in the case of rape, incest, or a threat to the life of the mother. The Affordable Care Act is no exception.

Regardless of the facts, however, House Republicans continue their assault on a woman's right to choose. Contrary to popular belief, the Protect Life Act is not the Stupak-Pitts amendment of the 2009-2010 health care reform debate. It goes far beyond Stupak-Pitts to impose unprecedented limitations on abortion coverage and restricts access to abortion services for all women.

The Protect Life Act would have an adverse effect on women's access to reproductive services, especially for low-income minority women who are very likely to be underinsured or uninsured and use partial subsidies to purchase insurance.

□ 1230

It not only ends abortion coverage for women in the exchange who use their own private funds to pay for their insurance, but also essentially shuts down the private insurance market for abortion coverage. This act imposes crippling administrative burdens on insurance companies that choose to cover abortion care and bans abortion coverage from all multi-State plans, interfering with private insurance companies' decisions about what benefits to offer.

Simply put, the Protect Life Act is a misnomer. It poses a direct threat to the health and lives of women by restricting access to termination services, including factually accurate information such as the availability and coverage of abortion care by insurance plans. Even more troubling is the fact that this act creates an exception to the obligation of hospitals to comply with the Emergency Medical Treatment and Labor Act, which requires appropriate treatment and referral for emergency patients. If enacted, hospitals could refuse to provide abortion services to pregnant women whose lives are in critical danger. This is beyond irresponsible. It is, indeed, reprehensible.

Finally, the Protect Life Act vastly broadens already expansive federal conscience laws without regard for patient protection or anti-discrimination protection for providers of abortion services. It safeguards from federal preemption State conscience laws beyond abortion, which could allow providers to drop their coverage of other reproductive health services like contraception and possibly even reproductive care such as mental health services and HIV counseling.

All I hear from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, especially those within segments of their party, is that they want the government to butt out. Why, then, are we considering legislation on the House floor that effectively overturns the privacy rights enumerated by the United States Supreme Court as well as increases burdensome government regulations on insurance companies? Congress should not be making personal health care decisions for women, and Congressmen really shouldn't be even involved in making personal health care decisions for women. That should be between a woman, her family, and her doctor.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished chairwoman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I thank my good friend for yielding me the time.

I stand in strong support of the Protect Life Act.

I thank my good friend, my colleague, Congressman PITTS, for introducing this important legislation because this bill will help ensure that no funds authorized or appropriated by the President's health care law will be used to pay for abortion except in the cases of rape, incest, or to save the life of the mother.

This is not something new. This is not something radical. This simply applies the bipartisan principles of the Hyde amendment, which has helped guide this Chamber's legislative deliberations for over three decades. It extends the same standards applied to Medicaid, the Federal Employee Health Benefits Program, and other federal programs.

The American people, Madam Speaker, have made it quite clear that they do not want their taxpayer dollars used to fund abortions. And the Stupak-Pitts amendment, as we know, was gutted in the Senate. The President's Executive order stating that the Hyde amendment would apply is not enough. Why? It is flawed because Executive orders can disappear as quickly as they are issued. But the Protect Life Act will create a solid framework that will safeguard taxpayer dollars.

We must protect the sanctity of an innocent human life, we must stand behind the rights of the unborn, and we must prevent taxpayer dollars from being used to fund abortions. That's why I'm proud to support the Protect Life Act and the rule for it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, would you be so kind as to tell me how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 23 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from North Carolina has 26½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, with your permission, at this time, I am going to yield to a number of Members for unanimous consent, the first of whom is the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY).

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in opposition to this bill because it is an assault on a woman's health and her right to make her own life decisions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield for a unanimous consent request to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELAZQUEZ).

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in opposition to this bill because this extreme legislation is dangerous to women's health and does nothing to address the main issue affecting American families: the lack of jobs.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina will state it.

Ms. FOXX. Is it appropriate for our colleagues across the aisle to make comments about the bill when they're asking unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise Members to confine their unanimous consent requests to a simple declarative statement of the Member's attitude toward the measure, either "aye" or "no." Further embellishments will result in deductions of time from the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. That declarative statement that you speak to, am I correct, Madam Speaker, that it could include a sentence?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A simple declarative statement is acceptable. "Because tada-tada-tada" would be an embellishment.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. At this time, I yield for a non-embellishment, unanimous consent request to the distinguished lady from California (Ms. HAHN).

Ms. HAHN. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in opposition to this bill because Americans need us to focus on jobs right now, not this extreme bill that endangers the lives of women.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will begin deducting time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield for a unanimous consent request to the distinguished lady from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in opposition to this bill that is extreme, dangerous legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished lady from California, a former member of the Rules Committee, Ms. MATSUI, for unanimous consent.

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in opposition to this bill because it's extreme legislation that is dangerous to women's health and does nothing to address the jobs crisis facing America today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will be charged.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, at this time, I am very pleased to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in opposition to this bill because it is an attack on women, and it does nothing to deal with the job crisis of this country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will be charged.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield to the distinguished lady from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in strident, strident opposition to this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, as a cosponsor and the proud parent of two young boys—adopted young boys—whose family exists only because two women in two difficult situations in two different States chose life and gave us a family, I am proud to rise in strong support of the rule to allow the House to consider the Protect Life Act, led by my friend and colleague, Congressman JOE PITTS.

Over a year ago, President Obama's health care plan was signed into law—despite a strenuous outcry by the American people—without significant and substantial prohibitions on federal funding for abortion. This funding of abortion through insurance plans, community health centers, and other programs created by the new health care law could have been avoided. But such language was intentionally left out. There have been restrictions on abortions and subsidies for over 30 years, beginning with the Hyde amendment in 1976, and I'm proud that today we are acting in that spirit.

Regardless of whether you are pro-choice or, like me, strongly pro-life, Americans have always agreed we will not use federal tax dollars to subsidize or incentivize abortion. And you don't have to take my word for it.

□ 1240

In poll after poll, more than 60 percent of Americans oppose using Federal funding for abortions. More recently, two-thirds of Americans said we shouldn't subsidize health insurance that includes abortions.

The President's health care plan fails to provide real conscience protection

for health care providers who decline to participate in abortions by mandating that they not be discriminated against because of their religious faiths.

The bottom line is that this bill we take up today strikes an important balance. It makes sure your Federal tax dollars are not used to subsidize abortions in the President's plan, and we make sure that people and institutions are able to care for their patients and are not forced to violate their moral principles.

I strongly urge my colleagues to respect America's conscientious objections to abortion by voting for the rule and by voting for the Protect Life Act.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY).

Mr. QUIGLEY. Madam Speaker, earlier this year, we learned what opponents of choice really think of women when they attempted to redefine rape in H.R. 3, when they claimed to be fiscal watchdogs and then voted to repeal funding for family planning services and Planned Parenthood, which saves the public \$4 for every \$1 invested.

Now they are pushing H.R. 358, the falsely named Protect Life Act, which, rather than protecting life, would actually allow hospitals to refuse lifesaving treatment to women on religious or moral grounds. This bill would also effectively ban comprehensive insurance coverage, which includes abortion care—even if a woman pays with her own private dollars.

H.R. 358, like every extremist, antichoice measure before it reveals what choice opponents really think of women. Here is what I think of women: I think they should be able to make their own life choices about their own bodies.

I think we should vote down this bill and every other destructive measure being pushed by those who think so little of our mothers, sisters, wives, and daughters.

Ms. FOXX. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO).

Mr. POMPEO. I thank the gentle lady for yielding.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 358, the Protect Life Act, and I want to thank Congressman PITTS for his hard work on this legislation.

Kansas has long been on the front lines of defending life, and I join most other Kansans in acknowledging that life begins at conception. Nearly all Kansans understand that Federal taxpayer dollars should never be used for abortions.

I know the history here. For a very long time, there was bipartisan support for the Hyde amendment and for legislation that said that taxpayer money should not go for abortions; but today, the left has moved so far that they object to this simple, commonsense measure which will protect taxpayers from their money going to a procedure which they find abhorrent.

Simply put, we must end what ObamaCare did, and we must stop subsidizing abortions with Federal taxpayer dollars. I urge my colleagues to support both this rule and H.R. 358 and to protect the life of the unborn.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. I thank my friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the so-called Protect Life Act. Our first priorities here now must be to help to foster job creation and support middle class families.

We are 280 days into this Congress without even having a jobs plan from the majority. Instead, the Republicans have chosen to continue their radical assault on women's health and health care in the guise of preventing the use of Federal funds to pay for abortion procedures.

This bill is as unnecessary as it is offensive and inhumane. The bill would penalize private insurers that offer comprehensive plans; would allow hospitals to refuse lifesaving care to women; and would prevent access to birth control, including providing emergency contraception to sexual assault survivors.

Instead of debating how to put Americans back to work, the majority party is spending our time on socially divisive bills that are going nowhere.

Ms. FOXX. I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT. I thank the gentle lady for yielding.

I rise in support of H.R. 358, the Protect Life Act.

Doesn't that name really say it all, the "Protect Life Act"?

Historically, the Federal funding of abortion has been restricted. Time and time and time again, an overwhelming majority of Americans has indicated that they oppose the Federal funding of abortion. Go all the way back to 1976. Congress has repeatedly passed the Hyde amendment.

What does it do?

It ensures that no Federal Government dollars are used to pay for elective abortion or insurance plans that provide elective abortion under Medicaid. Unfortunately, the insurance plan that was forced through Congress this last session would now allow Federal funds to subsidize, to basically support and pay for, abortions on demand in America for the very first time since 1976. So the Hyde amendment, as it stands today, only extends to HHS.

The Obama health care plan, what does it do?

It exploits that loophole. As the law now stands, the government can literally force that federally funded and private health care providers cover abortion under the guise of family planning or pregnant women services or countless other euphemisms.

My friends on the other side of the aisle will say, Well, that's incorrect because President Obama signed an Executive order to bar abortion funding.

No. Members on both sides of the aisle know that pointing to an Executive order is disingenuous at best. We all know, as we come to this floor, that this Executive order, the same one that the Planned Parenthood Federation of America calls a "symbolic gesture," can be completely undone by a future administration.

The only way to ensure that taxpayer dollars are not spent on abortion is—how?—through legislative action.

President Obama's insurance plan passed Congress. It did so over the objection of the majority of the American public. So it is time now that we come to the floor to respect that majority of Americans and to ensure that they do not fund abortions simply by paying their taxes every April 15. Therefore, I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill, as I said at the very beginning, the Protect Life Act—the bill that says it all.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS).

Ms. TSONGAS. Madam Speaker, recently, I got an email from a constituent from my hometown of Lowell, Massachusetts, that read, "I think Republicans are focusing on the wrong thing. We need jobs."

Our constituents are pleading with us to focus on jobs; yet here we are again, debating an ideologically driven bill that does nothing for the economy as it endangers women's health. For women to receive the best possible health care, they need—we need—access to all legal and appropriate medical procedures. Decisions about these procedures should be made by a woman in consultation with her doctor and her family.

I believe a woman's right to choose is fundamental to a woman's freedom, but this bill puts the government in the middle of that decision. This bill discriminates against women, and it goes so far as to prevent those who want to buy health plans that cover abortion services with their own money from making that choice. This bill also permits hospitals and hospital workers to choose to deny women care that could save their lives, putting ideology above women's health.

Let's focus on the right thing and vote down this bill.

Ms. FOXX. I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of both the rule and the bill.

In 1973, the Supreme Court decided that a right to an abortion was a constitutional right, but they did not decide that there was a constitutional right to have the taxpayers pay for it.

The Hyde amendment has been passed every year since 1976 with my

support and with the support of an overwhelming bipartisan majority. However, when the President's health care bill was rammed through this House in March of last year, the Hyde amendment didn't apply. So, if you try to get a Medicaid abortion, the Hyde amendment applies, and the taxpayers don't finance it; but if you try to get an abortion under the Obama plan or under the exchanges that have been set up under the Obama plan, then there will be taxpayer money that will be used to pay for it. This bill closes that loophole. It is in response to the overwhelming sentiment of the American public, including the sentiment of many of those who do support legalized abortion.

Secondly, this bill also reaffirms Federal and State conscience protection laws. The Supreme Court, when it decided *Roe v. Wade*, did not force people to choose between their faiths and their jobs if they had religious objections to abortion. This protection is not afforded in the Obama health care bill. This legislation closes that loophole.

□ 1250

We've heard a lot about jobs from people on the other side of the aisle that don't want to talk about the fact that this legislation shuts the door to the two loopholes that I have just described.

Maybe there will be more unemployment if someone who has a license to practice medicine or is in the healthcare profession is told that they have to violate the tenets of their religion in order to keep their job.

Now, we have a choice. We have a choice of freedom and liberty by closing the loopholes and passing the bill or not.

I urge support of the bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentlelady from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) for the purpose of offering a unanimous consent.

Mrs. MALONEY. I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD my opposition to this attack on women's access to reproductive health services and our fundamental right to lifesaving medical care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 358.

There is no question and there can be no debating the fact that this bill endangers women's health and puts their lives at risk and intrudes on their constitutionally protected liberties.

This bill extends the reach of government more cynically and in a more profoundly disturbing way than any piece of legislation in modern times.

This bill carries with it the clear implication that under some circumstances—a woman just doesn't have a right to live.

The Republican majority has consistently said its priority is jobs and job creation, but

here we are debating a bill that even their Members admit is the wrong bill at the wrong time.

Instead of creating jobs, they remain focused on creating obstacles for women to access safe, legal, and badly needed health care.

H.R. 358 is an attack on women's access to reproductive health services and our fundamental right to life saving medical care.

It is stunning in its scope, appalling in its indifference and outrageous in its arrogance.

This bill is deliberately divisive and cynical in its intent.

Madam Speaker, Americans want Congress to create jobs, strengthen middle class families, and find bipartisan consensus.

It's time to end this attack on women and get to work on our top priority: Creating Jobs.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, this bill threatens the health and basic rights of American women.

The majority is once again trying to embed their extreme and divisive ideological preferences into law. They are trying to impose their backward view of a woman's role on everyone else, forcing women back into traditional roles with limited opportunities.

They need to trust and respect American women. The bill goes beyond prior legislation. It bans working women access to a legal medical procedure. It denies all but the wealthiest women their choice in health services. It puts the government between a woman and her doctor. It allows hospitals to deny lifesaving care to women. We should be standing up today for the middle class by working to create jobs, not trying to prevent women access to lifesaving health services.

This bill is an affront to women's health. I urge all of my colleagues to oppose it.

Ms. FOXX. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I am a little appalled at some of the comments that I have heard across the aisle, especially those that say talking about jobs is more important than talking about saving lives.

I don't believe there are many Americans who would agree with our colleagues who say that we in this country pride ourselves on saving lives at every opportunity, both humans, animals, any form of life, and I believe this is a worthy debate for us to be having today.

But, Madam Speaker, the Republican-led House has also been working hard to rein in out-of-control government spending and represent the majority of the American people who elected us, and we know that by reining in spending we could do something to help create jobs. So we are not a one-note party. We understand we can do both of those things.

The bill before us today is a continuing effort to steward the taxpayer money wisely, represent the majority

of Americans who believe taxpayer money should not be used to pay for elective abortions, and, thereby, protect innocent life.

Last year, as others have said, the liberal Democrats rammed through their overall health care legislation and refused to include standard pro-life protections that have had broad bipartisan support in the past.

The rule before us today provides for consideration of H.R. 358, the Protect Life Act, which prohibits taxpayer funding for elective abortions under ObamaCare and also prohibits the Federal Government from forcing private insurance companies to offer plans that cover elective abortions. It does not take away any rights of women.

In addition, the underlying bill ensures that taxpayer subsidies for purchasing health insurance plans on the ObamaCare exchanges are not used to pay for plans that cover elective abortions, and does not allow the Federal Government to administer health plans that cover elective abortions. This is consistent with the history in our country of not using taxpayer funding for elective abortions.

Finally, the bill provides for conscience protections for pro-life health providers and entities to ensure they are not discriminated against for their pro-life beliefs and practices.

This bill has gone through regular committee consideration and passed the House Energy and Commerce Committee on February 15 with bipartisan support. The need for this legislation is critical, as the Institute of Medicine recommended in July that what has come to be called ObamaCare should cover emergency contraception with no copay or deductible. Many pro-life conservatives are concerned that their recommendation is a slippery slope to, again, what has been known as ObamaCare mandating and covering elective abortions, because the law does not contain specific longstanding pro-life protections.

A Zogby poll last year found that 77 percent of Americans believe Federal taxpayer funds should never pay for abortion or should pay only to save the life of the mother, and it is unacceptable that the liberal Democrats ignored the will of the people last year in ramming through their government takeover of health care.

As you can see, Madam Speaker, the vast majority of Americans don't want their tax dollars paying for or promoting abortion.

This isn't part of a radical agenda, as some of our friends on the left like to say. This is part of a longstanding and growing social consensus. Americans do not want their tax dollars supporting the abortion industry or promoting this terrible practice.

In May this House passed H.R. 3, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act. This legislation would codify many longstanding pro-life provisions and ensure that taxpayer money is not being used to perform abortions. H.R. 3 is

now awaiting consideration in the Senate.

As a proud cosponsor of H.R. 3 and H.R. 358, I will not cease to fight to protect the lives of the unborn at every turn. Since 1973, approximately 52 million children's lives have been tragically aborted in the United States. Until we have a permanent prohibition on taxpayer funding of abortion and protection for health care providers who cherish life, I will continue to offer and support efforts to protect taxpayers' families and children from the scourge of abortion.

The unborn are the most innocent and vulnerable members of our society, and their right to life must be protected.

Yesterday in the Rules Committee our friends across the aisle who spoke against this rule and bill said we're bringing up "hot-button social issues as diversions from the important topic of jobs."

I have two responses to them on that comment. The issue of life is not a hot-button social issue; it's at the very core of our values as a country. We go to extraordinary lengths to save not only human beings, but even animals, because we value life so much. However, there are many who do not hold the unborn in the same esteem, and that is tragic for more than 1 billion unborn babies every year.

Therefore, Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule in favor of the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, would you tell us again how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 18 minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from North Carolina has 13½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Thank you very much.

I am pleased at this time to yield 1 minute to the distinguished minority leader, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

□ 1300

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for giving me this opportunity.

As a mother of five children, when I brought my baby, my youngest baby, number five home from the hospital, that week my oldest baby was turning 6 years old. The birth of a baby is such a jubilant occasion, and women's health is essential to the health of families and raising our children in a way that has respect for all of them.

It's very interesting that we're taking this bill up now when the American people are calling out for jobs. Their number one priority is the creation of jobs, and once again we come to the floor of the House with a major distraction that "ain't going nowhere" in order to cater to an extreme agenda of the Republican majority.

The American people want us to take up jobs. They want us to take up the

American Jobs Act, which three-quarters of the American people say they want us to consider. It would create nearly 2 million jobs. Or we could vote on the China currency legislation which would save 1 million jobs and has the support of the majority of the Members, including 61 cosponsors from the Republican side of the aisle. But again, instead, we are pursuing the Republicans' ideological agenda, forcing us to relitigate a very divisive issue.

Every woman in America should be very concerned about this assault on women's health. Let us begin the debate with a very clear understanding of the facts. The Federal funding of abortion is already, and has been for a long time, prohibited under the Hyde amendment, except in cases of rape, incest, or to save the life of the mother.

Furthermore, the Affordable Care Act prohibits the use of U.S. taxpayer dollars to fund abortions. That is why the Catholic Health Association said: "We are confident that health care reform does not allow Federal funding of abortion and that it keeps in place important conscience protections for caregivers and institutions alike." I repeat, the Catholic Health Association said: "We are confident that health care reform does not allow Federal funding of abortion and that it keeps in place important conscience protections for caregivers and institutions alike."

This bill is a radical departure from existing law. It represents an unprecedented and radical assault on a woman's access to the full range of health care services. For the first time, this bill places restrictions on how a woman with private insurance can spend her own private dollars in purchasing health insurance. As a result of this bill, millions of women using health insurance exchanges are likely to no longer have access to insurance policies that cover all reproductive services.

Furthermore, supporters of this bill falsely claim that this bill is simply a restatement of the Stupak amendment considered by the House in 2009. It is not. This bill is very different from the Stupak amendment. It appears that health care providers could withhold care for women with life-threatening conditions. In other words, a woman could be dying on the floor of the hospital and, when you vote for this bill, you will be saying that caregivers would not allow medical professionals to treat that woman and keep her from dying.

The Obama administration has come out strongly against this legislation, rightly saying it intrudes on women's reproductive freedom and access to health care and unnecessarily restricts the private insurance choices that women and their families have today.

So just a few points again:

Public funding of abortion is prohibited under the Hyde amendment except in cases of rape, incest, and life of the mother;

The Catholic Health Association says: We are confident the Affordable

Care Act “does not allow Federal funding of abortion and that it keeps in place important conscience protections for caregivers and institutions alike”; and

Third, it is not the Stupak amendment.

This legislation is bad public policy. It's the wrong priority for Congress. It's an assault on women's health, and women should know that. It prevents them from using their own dollars to buy their own private insurance should they be part of an exchange.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” and implore the Republican majority to turn their attention to what this country needs, and that is jobs, jobs, jobs, and more jobs.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I want to remind my colleagues across the aisle that they are entitled to form their own opinions, but they are not entitled to form their own facts which are in opposition to what is true.

Our colleagues across the aisle know that the Hyde amendment applies only to discretionary spending, has to be introduced every year into the appropriations bill, and has never applied to mandatory spending.

The Affordable Care Act is mandatory spending, and if the protection for life were in the Affordable Care Act, then why did President Obama issue his Executive order saying that he was clarifying the issue?

Ms. DEGETTE. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. FOXX. I will not yield.

I think it is very important that we get the facts out here again. Several of my colleagues have pointed those out.

The gentlewoman has time on her side and she will be able to make her points.

I now would like to yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Mississippi (Mr. NUNNELEE).

Mr. NUNNELEE. I thank the gentlelady from North Carolina for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 358, the Protect Life Act, which would prohibit Federal funding for abortions and would end abortion coverage under President Obama's health care law.

As a member of the Mississippi State Senate, I introduced similar legislation that would have prevented hard-earned tax dollars of Mississippians for paying for abortions under ObamaCare. That legislation specifically allowed Mississippi to opt out of using the State tax money to pay for abortions in the State health care exchange. And I'm proud to say that in May of 2010, our Governor, Haley Barbour, signed that legislation into law and Mississippi became the third State in the Nation to approve the abortion subsidy opt-out.

For 16 years, it was my privilege to stand up for life on the floor of the Mississippi Senate. And I'm proud to say that as a result of that effort, Mississippi is now one of the safest States in the Nation for unborn children and one of the strongest pro-life States in

the Nation. Today, I'm proud to take that voice to the floor of the House of Representatives in our Nation's Capitol.

ObamaCare should not have served as a vehicle for abandoning or weakening Federal policies on abortion funding. Health care is about saving and nurturing, not about taking human life. Even though President Obama signed an Executive order to address abortion funding concerns in the health care bill, an Executive order is not law. The Protect Life Act would strengthen long-standing Federal policies on abortions; and, more importantly, would codify the principles of the President's Executive order.

As I stand here today, I have the privilege of serving the First District of Mississippi in the United States House of Representatives, and I will continue to fight to protect the lives of the innocent and to serve as a voice for those who cannot speak for themselves. Americans recognize the value of life.

As a cosponsor of this legislation, I urge my colleagues in the House of Representatives to support this bill as we work to defend the morals of our taxpayers and give the needed protections to the unborn.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place my statement in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, at this time I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

□ 1310

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Since my colleague on the other side of the aisle did not yield to my colleague from Colorado, I want to yield to her.

Ms. DEGETTE. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I just wanted to point out that while the gentlelady on the other side is correct that the Hyde amendment is in the annual appropriations bills, if she would look at section 1303(b) of the Affordable Health Care Act, the provisions that say no Federal funding shall be used to pay for abortion are extended to that Act and to the exchanges. So in fact, the Democratic leader is correct. Under the Affordable Health Care Act there are no Federal funds used under that Act to pay for abortions, period, end of story.

I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. I thank my colleague for clarifying that.

Madam Speaker, we have had this discussion many times on the floor. That's why my colleagues and I want to get back to the issues at hand today, which is jobs and enhancing and sup-

porting the middle class in this country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentlelady an additional 15 seconds.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. But I want remind us all that what we were talking about here is denying millions of women from purchasing comprehensive coverage with their own private funds. This would upend the promise of health care reform for many, many women across this country. We need to put a stop to these attacks on women's health. I urge my colleagues to join me as well in strong opposition.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. How much time is remaining again, Madam Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 15¼ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from North Carolina has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. At this time I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, when you ask Americans what Congress' focus should be, guess what they don't say? They don't say, Forget about jobs. What this country really needs is a divisive assault on women's privacy and primary care.

This bill tells women, Madam Speaker, that if they use their own money, using their own money they can't purchase insurance that includes abortion coverage. Isn't it the majority party that is constantly saying that they trust people with their own money? I guess that applies if you're a CEO but not if you're a woman making a wrenching decision about your reproductive health.

This bill has no chance of becoming law. It is a dog-and-pony show designed to please the far-right fringe. I say: Do it on your own time, Republicans, and not on the American people's time.

I ask us to vote “no” now and get to the job at hand, which is to put America back to work.

Ms. FOXX. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman, my good friend from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH).

Mr. DEUTCH. Madam Speaker, it's not news that the majority refuses to address our jobs crisis. But passing time by attacking women's health is appalling.

Despite Americans' overwhelming support for the American Jobs Act, today we have before us H.R. 358, a cruel attack on women's health. We could help jobless workers feed their families today. Instead, this bill grants hospitals the right to deny abortions even in life-and-death cases. We could cut taxes for small businesses today. Instead, this bill forbids Americans

from using their own dollars to buy private health insurance that includes abortion coverage. We could put teachers back to work today. Instead, this bill denies abortion even for the thousands of women each year who develop breast cancer while pregnant and need an abortion to start chemotherapy to save their lives and retain the hope of childbirth.

Americans don't want a war on women. They want a war on joblessness. They want us to work so that they can work. They want us, Madam Speaker, to take up the American Jobs Act. Oppose this rule so that we can get to work on their behalf.

Ms. FOXX. I yield myself 1 minute.

Madam Speaker, our colleague across the aisle I think was not here earlier when we talked about the fact that the jobs bill, which he says has overwhelming support by the American people, was introduced by request and has not a single cosponsor. I'm curious as to why he is not a cosponsor if he thinks we should be bringing up that bill.

I would also like to point out again that this bill, this rule, is not a war on women. And if this is such a cruel act, I want to point out that this is a bipartisan bill, and that the support for not giving taxpayer funding for abortions has always been nonpartisan or bipartisan in this House.

This is not purely a Republican issue. I thank God every day for our colleagues on the other side of the aisle who are pro-life.

Mr. DEUTCH. Will the gentlelady yield?

Ms. FOXX. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield to the distinguished woman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. EDWARDS. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in opposition to this bill that doesn't create jobs but strips women of appropriate reproductive health care services.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Ms. EDWARDS. Madam Speaker, with 21 legislative days remaining on the calendar, I urge my colleagues in the Majority to finally bring to the floor a jobs bill that puts Americans back to work rather than work to restrict a woman's right to receive affordable and comprehensive care. Bills like the falsely named Protect Life Act only serve as cover for the Republicans' unwillingness to bring forth a real jobs plan and restore the economy.

This Republican package is wrapped in a label that says, "I care", but contains nothing more than an empty promise. Let me be clear—this bill jeopardizes the health and wellness of women throughout this country and is a clear assault on women's choice. I have heard from women throughout Maryland and across the 4th Congressional District who value access to and information on abortion services. I have heard from women who have

had planned and wanted pregnancies, but suffered unexpected and costly complications. I have heard from women like Mary who, after undergoing years of fertility treatment, had finally been pregnant with her son David, but found out that due to atrophy of his lungs and kidneys there was virtually no chance of his survival beyond a few hours. I have heard from women who are faced with difficult, personal, and emotional choices about their health and that of their children.

These are the women who need access to health care when they face unexpected health complications. H.R. 358 would allow hospitals to deny care to patients whose lives are in peril, while also denying many Americans, not just women, access to safe, affordable, and comprehensive care when they need it most.

It is simply unfair, unwise, and irresponsible for this Chamber to decide what health care options women and families are able to explore. I urge my colleagues to oppose both this unfair rule that does not allow any amendments and the underlying, mean-spirited legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished lady from California (Ms. CHU).

Ms. CHU. H.R. 358 would stop abortion coverage for millions of women. It allows doctors and hospitals to refuse treatment even if women will die without their help. This bill is so extreme that it prohibits a pregnant woman with cancer from getting an abortion so radiation can save her life. For those women, every day and every week of treatment could be the difference between life and death.

If this bill passes, we will see thousands more women abandoned by their doctors—women like Stephanie, who was pregnant at 19 weeks. She came to the hospital with a 108-degree fever. The whites of her eyes were filled with blood. She was dying before her doctor's eyes. But the hospital considered the life of the fetus more important than the life of the mother and refused treatment until the fetus died. Because they delayed, Stephanie almost lost her life.

This bill should really be called the "Don't Protect the Life of the Mother Act."

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS).

Mr. HARRIS. Much has been said on the floor about perhaps taking time out from a jobs agenda to pass the bill. The fact of the matter is this bill corrects a problem with the bill that shouldn't have been discussed by the last Congress; they should have spent time dealing with the jobs issue instead of leaving it to this Congress. So we do need to make a correction.

Madam Speaker, this one very important correction is the conscience protection in this bill. And I know as someone who's worked in a hospital where abortions are done—but they never forced me to do it because we have conscience protections in the State of Maryland. We need those conscience protections for everyone in the

country, so that if you don't believe in abortion, you don't have to participate in it. That's a basic freedom, a basic religious freedom, we should protect for every single American health care provider.

Madam Speaker, I would like to introduce into the RECORD four letters from obstetricians who work in facilities who point out that the conscience clause is not going to harm anyone's health in this bill. There's no evidence that it will.

Madam Speaker, in conclusion, the conscience protection clause is needed. It's a correction for the work of the last Congress. We should pass this bill.

VIRGINIA COMMONWEALTH
UNIVERSITY HEALTH SYSTEM,
Richmond, VA, October 12, 2011.

Hon. JOE PITTS,

Hon. DAN LIPINSKI,

Hon. ERIC CANTOR.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES PITTS, LIPINSKI, AND CANTOR: I understand that the House of Representatives may soon consider H.R. 358, the Protect Life Act. As a physician I am especially interested in this bill's section reaffirming federal protection for health care providers' conscience rights on abortion. I have heard there may be an effort in the House to insert an exception into this law, so governmental bodies can discriminate against providers who decline to provide abortions in "emergency" cases.

As a physician who has worked in emergency rooms for over 30 years, I am well versed in the federal Emergency Medical Treatment and Active Labor Act (EMTALA) and similar policies. I continue to practice emergency medicine, and to teach it at Virginia Commonwealth University. Based on then decades of experience, I see absolutely no merit in the claim that conscience laws on abortion pose any risk of allowing pregnant women to die in emergency rooms. Current federal laws as well as a Virginia state law respect conscientious objection to abortion in all circumstances and I have never seen or heard of a case in which these laws created any conflict with women's safety or with legal obligations to stabilize patients' conditions in emergencies.

Your provision on conscience protection is warranted and I do not think it should be weakened in any way.

Sincerely,

EDWARD J. READ JR., MD, FACEP.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE,

Chapel Hill, NC, October 12, 2011.

Representatives JOE PITTS and DAN LIPINSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES PITTS AND LIPINSKI: I am a board certified specialist in Obstetrics and Gynecology with a sub-specialty certification in Maternal-Fetal Medicine. I have over twenty-seven years of experience in practice, teaching and research at a major academic health center. During my career I have cared for numerous women and babies with complications that increase the risk of maternal death. In some of these situations, both a mother and her baby have lost their lives. I care deeply about the effects that public policy and legislation can have on both those of us who provide perinatal care and on our patients.

My personal conscience directs me to provide the best of care to pregnant women and their unborn children and I am able to do so without performing abortions, as are several

of my colleagues and a proportion of the residents we train each year. I have not seen a situation where an emergent or even urgent abortion was needed to prevent a maternal death. I am aware of, and have read, sections 2(a)(6) and 2(a)(7) of H.R. 358 and I am writing to provide my opinion that I support the formalization of these protections. No woman at UNC hospitals has ever been denied care due to her conscience or beliefs; nor does any physician ever feel obliged to direct or change the standard of care for any woman due to race, ethnicity, religion, or conscience. I see no need for any exceptions or amendments to the law as written.

I am available for question or comment or for further discussion on this matter. You may reach me at thorp@med.unc.edu or by calling my office (919) 843-7851.

Sincerely,

JOHN THORP, MD.

ROBERT C. BYRD HEALTH SCIENCES
CENTER OF WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY,

Charleston, WV, October 12, 2011.

Representatives JOE PITTS and DAN LIPINSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES PITTS AND LIPINSKI: I am writing in support of Sections 2(a)(6) and 2(a)(7) of H.R. 358 that provide federal legal protection of conscience regarding abortion for those who care for pregnant women. My experience includes 20 plus years of clinical care, research, and instruction as a Board certified Obstetrician & Gynecologist and Maternal-Fetal medicine. I daily provide care for women and babies who have medically complicated, life-threatening, and uncommon pregnancy complications. Further, as the originator of "perinatal hospice", I have cared for (and still do) dozens of women with babies who have terminal prenatal diagnoses who will die shortly after birth.

No one in my entire 20 plus years of clinical experience has ever been denied appropriate care because of the exercise of rights of conscience in the provision of abortion. Women and babies may die in spite of our best efforts, but this is not related to abortion availability or provision.

In my understanding of this new federal statute, conscience will now be formally and legally protected. There is no need for additional exceptions or amendments to this law as it is written.

I am more than happy to discuss this issue with either of you or with one of your colleagues. I may be contacted by email at byron.calhoun@camc.org or directly on my cell phone at [REDACTED].

Sincerely,

BYRON G. CALHOUN, M.D., FACOG.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA,

Minneapolis, MN, October 13, 2011.

Representatives JOE PITTS and DAN LIPINSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES PITTS AND LIPINSKI: I am a board certified specialist in Obstetrics/Gynecology and Maternal/Fetal Medicine with 31 years of experience in practice, teaching and research. During that time I have cared for hundreds of women and babies with life-threatening, complicated, and rare pregnancy conditions. In some of those situations mothers and babies have lost their lives despite undergoing the best available treatment including induced delivery at the margins of viability. I care deeply about the effects that public policy and legislation can have on the care of mothers and babies.

During my years of practice I have worked under informal and formal conscience rights protections that permit me to provide the

best pregnancy care without being forced to perform abortions. I have read Sections 2 (a) (6) and 2 (a) (7) or H.R. 358 and I agree with the federal formalization of these protections. In my years of practice I have never seen a woman denied appropriate care because of the exercise of rights of conscience in this regard. There is no need for additional exceptions or amendments to this law as it is written.

I am happy to discuss this with either of you or with one of your colleagues. I can be reached by email at calvis@umn.edu or on my cell phone at [REDACTED].

Sincerely,

STEVE CALVIN, MD.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, this bill seeks to undo women's constitutional rights under the guise of being about government funding for abortion. The law, unfortunately, already forbids Federal funds from paying for abortions except in the case of rape, incest, or where the woman's life is in danger. This bill goes well beyond that. It would make it virtually impossible for any of the health plans offered through the health exchanges set up as part of the Affordable Care Act to cover abortions.

As the authors plainly intend, it would make it virtually impossible for most women to buy insurance coverage for abortions with their own money. The bill would also allow a doctor or hospital to refuse to provide an abortion to a woman whose life is in imminent peril. They could let that woman die right there in the emergency room, and the government would be powerless to do anything.

□ 1320

Madam Speaker, I remember a time not that long ago when women had no options for legal abortions and had to resort to illegal back alley abortionists. Women were butchered, many died, others became sterile, all because the medical care they desperately sought and the compassion they desperately needed was denied to them. No woman should be treated with this contempt.

The real purpose of this bill—which denies women the right to purchase insurance coverage for legal abortions, even with their own money—is to make it impossible for women to exercise their constitutional right to choose for themselves.

This bill is an abomination. I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I would like to point out to my colleague across the aisle that if we have a constitutional right for taxpayer funding of abortions, then we should have a right to taxpayer funding of guns. The Second Amendment allows us to keep and bear arms.

I now would like to yield 3 minutes to our distinguished colleague from Louisiana, Dr. CASSIDY.

Mr. CASSIDY. Madam Speaker, if anyone is concerned about our jobs

program, go to gop.gov.jobs. That's all the bills we've introduced so far that we have passed—most of the time you have not participated, but indeed it directly addresses the need for more jobs.

Secondly, I think we may have some common ground, it just may be that we have not read the same bill. For example, folks keep saying that this will not allow women to purchase coverage even with their own money. May I direct folks to page 6, line 8: Premiums for such coverage or plan—it goes on to say—may be used as long as it's not government money. It can be the individual's own money.

Third, there is this kind of myth that this will prevent women from having abortions. Medicaid currently does not pay for abortions; there are many Medicaid women who get abortions. The Federal Employees Health Benefits Program does not cover abortion. I suspect—although I don't know—that there are many women covered by the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program who indeed get abortions. Empirically, we know what's being asserted is not true.

Then there is the question of whether or not they're going to be denied life-saving health care. If you go to page 4, line 20: This does not apply in the case where a pregnant woman suffers from physical disorder, physical injury, or physical illness that would, as certified by a physician, place the female in danger of death unless an abortion is performed.

So I think we have common ground.

The leader on the other side's next point said that this is a dramatic departure from current law, but that's kind of a curious term or phrase, because we know that current law is the President's health care plan. It is current law that has turned upside down the equilibrium that had been reached between freedom of faith for the provider to practice versus the dicta of State as to what to provide. So she is right; it dramatically overturns current law—that's the point—because the Affordable Care Act dramatically overturned that delicate balance.

Lastly, I want to point out something else. I'm a physician. I work in a hospital for the uninsured, and I teach medical students. I was there last Monday teaching medical students. You know, over 50 percent of the residents, probably 60 percent of the residents doing OB/GYN are women, and many of them are concerned about issues like this.

As we speak about women, let's not also forget the woman's right to practice her faith. And if she chooses to practice her faith in a way which preserves life, she should not be coerced by the dictates of an overreaching State.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished lady from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule and this bill. Instead of focusing on jobs, Republicans are continuing to wage their war on women with this dangerous legislation today.

This bill forces comprehensive coverage for women to be dropped from the State exchanges, cutting off millions of women from affordable, comprehensive health care. And you know that Federal funds have not been allowed for abortion since 1976—to my dismay—and nothing has changed.

This bill makes it virtually impossible for any health care plan to offer abortion coverage and allows hospitals to refuse—mind you, refuse—to provide lifesaving care to a woman who needs an abortion to protect her own life. This is unprecedented and should be rejected.

We cannot and must not allow the Republicans to turn the clock back on women, on choice, and on our access to health care. I remember the days of back alley abortions—women died, women were injured for life. Let's not go back there.

I urge my colleagues to reject this unnecessary and harmful legislation. Health care decisions should be made by women and their health care providers, not Republicans and the House of Representatives who want to impose their own ideological agenda on women. We should be creating jobs, not interfering with women's reproductive rights.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. At this time, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this so-called Protect Life Act. This bill is another egregious, over-the-top assault on America's women, their health and their autonomy over their bodies. Instead of doing what we've been sent here to do, focus on jobs, once again we are talking about this extreme Republican right-wing agenda against women.

What we're essentially talking about is going back to the dark ages here. We started this Congress by talking about ending Federal support for birth control, a debate that women in my district thought ended a generation ago. And now we're going so far as to say that women can't even have access to information about the full extent of choices with respect to their health care.

This is a war on women. This is a distraction from job creation. We should reject this bill; we should end this assault on women's health care; and we should get back to the work that we were sent here to do, to fix this economy for everyone in this country, women and men, together.

Ms. FOXX. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1

minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank the gentleman. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition. I'm not surprised by this bill. In March, they tried to close down the Federal Government over a woman's right to go to Planned Parenthood for health care, and today they are trying to close down a woman's right to life-saving treatment in our hospitals.

They call this "protecting life." It is the opposite of protecting life, Madam Speaker. This allows hospitals to deny lifesaving treatment to women. It limits essential health care services to women. It denies preventive health care to women. It even hurts the victims of rape and sexual assault who have been hurt enough.

Madam Speaker, the American people want a Republican majority that will help create a climate for small businesses to create jobs, not create a climate of war against women's health care. They want a war on unemployment; they do not want a war on women. They want more jobs and less extremism. This bill is about extremism, and it ought to be defeated.

Ms. FOXX. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN. I thank my friend. Madam Speaker, how much floor time do we have to spend on redundant legislation that will surely die in the Senate and has already been threatened with a veto?

We've had this debate. We know what the final result will be. Federal funding of abortion is already illegal except in cases of incest, rape, and life-threatening situations. We accept that. But while millions of Americans are losing their jobs and seeing their life savings evaporate, the Republican majority insists on wasting our time on publicly demagoguing a deeply personal issue.

This bill also contains a refusal clause that would allow emergency room health professionals to deny lifesaving care to a pregnant woman because of their personal beliefs. Evidence shows that barriers to abortion services increase the risk of maternal injury and death, and that the best way to reduce the number of abortions is with accurate sexual education and the widespread availability of contraception. Yet the same people who oppose abortions also oppose appropriate sex education and family planning services.

The Supreme Court has ruled abortion is legal. Federal funds don't pay for abortion. Those policies are in place. Let's move on with help for the millions of unemployed individuals who need a good job and leave the women of America alone to control their own body and their own lives.

Ms. FOXX. I yield 1½ minutes to my distinguished colleague from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY).

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Madam Speaker, health care is a necessary element to a good and orderly and compassionate society. We all support health, but abortion is not health care.

□ 1330

The vast majority of Americans do not support using their dollars in support of the abortion industry, and Americans should not be forced by the strong arm of the government to subsidize the abortion industry.

Here's the problem. The health care law passed in 2010 contains some serious flaws in this regard. Namely, now the Federal Government will subsidize insurance policies that cover abortion on demand.

The health care law also forces enrollees in health care plans that cover abortion to pay for abortions obtained by others. The health care law also gives license to Federal agencies to mandate abortion coverage.

We have just seen that the Secretary of Health and Human Services, Kathleen Sebelius, under the guise of preventative care, has now promulgated rules that will force everyone to pay for abortifacient drugs and not to mention sterilization. And this also tramples on the conscience rights of health care entities that do not perform or promote abortion.

Madam Speaker, I believe this: The Protect Life Act is in the interest of the right type of health care for America.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. It's unfortunate that we have to come to the floor of the House to discuss the personal decisions that a woman has to make. And I can assure you that the question of choice, the question of abortion, the question of what a woman does to her body is not one that a woman takes lightly. On many occasions, there is the necessity for a doctor and his female patient to make decisions to save the life or health of the mother.

Just as the federal courts have ruled unconstitutional and rejected the Texas law that requires a doctor to talk first to a woman seeking an abortion and to allow or force them both to listen to sounds that might discourage this needed action, this is going to be held unconstitutional. This is not a law that can pass. You can not tell a woman her insurance company can not provide her all the benefits of that coverage. It goes way beyond the pale.

I would ask my colleagues to vote against this rule and protect the right of a woman to choose and the dignity of all people in this Nation to make their own decisions over their lives, through consultation with her family, faith leader and doctor. I am saddened that we're here today discussing such an issue. Please vote no on this rule and for a woman's right to choose.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. We all know that the ObamaCare bill allows for both the implicit and explicit taxpayer funding of abortion, and we all know that the Executive order signed by the President is not worth the paper that it was written on. It repeats the accounting gimmick that allows for Federal subsidies to go to insurance plans that cover abortion. And that's why we need to pass the Protect Life Act, which would apply the principles of the Hyde amendment to every component of ObamaCare. The Protect Life Act eliminates that accounting gimmick and ensures that Americans are not forced to pay an abortion surcharge, if you will, in order to get a health care plan. It ensures State laws are not preempted by Federal law.

This is the right move, the right bill. Americans deserve to have this assurance.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT).

(Mr. McDERMOTT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, this is nothing more or less than an attack on poor women.

I stood beside the bed of a couple of women in the Buffalo General Hospital in 1963 and watched them die because of back alley abortions.

I was in the State legislature in 1970 when we, in the State of Washington, granted, by referendum, a vote of all the people, the right of women to have an abortion. Now the question is how to get it paid for.

Well, when I came to Seattle, if you wanted an abortion, what you did was you went down and bought a ticket to Japan; you flew to Japan, had an abortion, had a day of shopping in Tokyo while you made sure that you were okay medically; and then you came home. Rich women never had any problem, but the women that I stood next to as they died and left 12 kids without mothers were poor. And that's what this is really all about. It is an attack by the right wing who consider that they wrap themselves in theological raiment and then attack poor women. Christ wouldn't have done that.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I would ask the gentlelady if she is prepared to close.

Ms. FOXX. I am.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 5½ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from North Carolina has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I won't take all of that time, Madam Speaker,

but I do wish to assert into this debate, it's been said often on the other side, and my distinguished friend from the Rules Committee made the point, that people came here and said that jobs were more important than life. I didn't hear anybody say that, and I don't believe anybody believes that.

But what I do believe that most of us understand is that this is not going to become the law and, therefore, what we are doing, in the final analysis, is a waste of time, and we could have been trying to do as we have not done in this session of Congress, address the subject of jobs.

Madam Speaker, what we have before us is an extremely flawed bill; and, contrary to their self-professed commitment to an open process, this particular provision being considered is under a closed rule.

Furthermore, I would also like to call into question how it's possible for us to consider this bill on the House floor when its sponsor, Mr. PITTS of Pennsylvania, failed to provide a statement citing Congress's constitutional authority to enact it. Mr. PITTS's statement of constitutional authority for the Protect Life Act cites no provision of the Constitution or any amendment to the Constitution.

Therefore, I would like to request of him or Members on the other side to share with us the basis for this bill which violates the fundamental right to privacy upheld by the Supreme Court. It restricts women's access to health care and imposes further regulations on health insurance coverage. It's clear that the Protect Life Act lacks both constitutional and moral integrity.

Let me insert additionally some feelings that have been expressed in public, and I take the prerogative of using them here on the floor.

H.R. 358 comes on top of votes by the Republican-led House to eliminate all Federal funding for title X, the National Family Planning Program, to eliminate funding for all other reproductive health programs offering breast and cervical cancer exams or well-woman and primary health care and family planning to prevent unintended pregnancies and to reduce the need for abortion.

They've led measures that eliminate requirements in health care reform covering maternal health care, mammograms, breastfeeding support, and other essential health services.

In addition, they've made it impossible for women to speak to their doctors about abortion using Internet-based telemedicine.

□ 1340

Now, these are just a few examples. The Republicans are full of fuzzy facts. I start my day almost every day, Madam Speaker, by reading the cartoon, after other parts of the newspaper, "Get Fuzzy." And the cat in that particular cartoon constantly comes up with fuzzy facts. If you put

all the fuzzy facts together and all the things that the Republican majority has done, they include Tea Party-led efforts to gut Environmental Protection Agency rules that keep the air we breathe, the water we drink, and the environment in which we live safe. They have done efforts to virtually eliminate child nutrition. And I can't believe that 20 years I'm here, and I hear Republicans talk about cutting out the Head Start program, the one documented program that has benefited American society over and above what was thought.

They have done things to eliminate programs to help the unemployed to survive, to slash Medicaid and Medicare, to effectively abrogate any social contract and tear to shreds any social safety net.

I have to ask, exactly whose lives are we protecting here?

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, our position on taxpayer funding for elective abortion is bipartisan, bicameral, and supported by the majority of the American people. We all know that.

I'd like to point out to my colleagues across the aisle when they keep saying we need to be talking about jobs, when the Democrats took control of the Congress in 2007, the unemployment rate was 4.6 percent. Between then and the time that Republicans regained control of the House this January, the unemployment rate rose to over 9 percent—6.9 million more Americans became unemployed during that period of time. I'd also like to point out to my colleague that the constitutional authority for H.R. 358 is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He knows it's required when the bill is introduced.

Madam Speaker, the American people are probably a little confused by listening to this debate because they hear two very conflicting stories. I would like to urge them to go to thomas.gov. H.R. 358 is only nine pages long. It's very simple to read. It's not like what they call the Affordable Care Act, which we had to get passed before we would know what was in it.

There is nothing more important, Madam Speaker, than protecting voiceless, unborn children and their families from the travesty of abortion. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to put aside all this rhetoric that has been spoken of in this debate today and vote for life by voting in favor of this rule and the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 248, nays 173, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 786]

YEAS—248

Adams	Goodlatte	Olson
Aderholt	Gosar	Palazzo
Akin	Gowdy	Paulsen
Alexander	Granger	Pearce
Altmire	Graves (GA)	Pence
Amash	Graves (MO)	Peterson
Amodi	Griffin (AR)	Petri
Austria	Griffith (VA)	Pitts
Bachus	Grimm	Platts
Barletta	Guinta	Poe (TX)
Bartlett	Guthrie	Pompeo
Barton (TX)	Hall	Posey
Bass (NH)	Hanna	Price (GA)
Benishkek	Harper	Quayle
Berg	Harris	Rahall
Biggert	Hartzler	Reed
Bilbray	Hastings (WA)	Rehberg
Bilirakis	Hayworth	Reichert
Bishop (UT)	Heck	Renacci
Black	Hensarling	Ribble
Blackburn	Herger	Rigell
Bonner	Huelskamp	Rivera
Bono Mack	Huizenga (MI)	Roby
Boren	Hultgren	Roe (TN)
Boustany	Hunter	Rogers (AL)
Brady (TX)	Hurt	Rogers (KY)
Brooks	Issa	Rogers (MI)
Buchanan	Jenkins	Rohrabacher
Bucshon	Johnson (IL)	Rokita
Buerkle	Johnson (OH)	Rooney
Burgess	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Burton (IN)	Jones	Roskam
Calvert	Jordan	Ross (AR)
Camp	Kelly	Ross (FL)
Campbell	King (IA)	Royce
Canseco	King (NY)	Runyan
Cantor	Kingston	Ryan (WI)
Capito	Kinzinger (IL)	Scalise
Carter	Kline	Schilling
Cassidy	Labrador	Schmidt
Chabot	Lamborn	Schock
Chaffetz	Lance	Schweikert
Coble	Landry	Scott (SC)
Coffman (CO)	Lankford	Scott, Austin
Cole	Latham	Sensenbrenner
Conaway	LaTourette	Sessions
Costello	Latta	Lewis (CA)
Cravaack	Lipinski	Shimkus
Crawford	LoBiondo	Shuler
Crenshaw	Long	Shuster
Culberson	Lucas	Simpson
Davis (KY)	Lucas	Smith (NE)
Denham	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NJ)
Dent	Lummis	Smith (TX)
DesJarlais	Lungren, Daniel	Southerland
Diaz-Balart	E.	Stearns
Dold	Mack	Stivers
Donnelly (IN)	Manzullo	Stutzman
Dreier	Marchant	Sullivan
Duffy	Marino	Terry
Duncan (SC)	Matheson	Thompson (PA)
Duncan (TN)	McCarthy (CA)	Thornberry
Ellmers	McCaul	Tiberi
Emerson	McClintock	Tipton
Farenthold	McCotter	Turner (NY)
Fincher	McHenry	Turner (OH)
Fitzpatrick	McIntyre	Upton
Flake	McKeon	Walberg
Fleischmann	McKinley	Walden
Fleming	McMorris	Walsh (IL)
Flores	Rodgers	Webster
Forbes	Meehan	West
Fortenberry	Mica	Westmoreland
Fox	Miller (FL)	Whitfield
Franks (AZ)	Miller (MI)	Wilson (SC)
Frelinghuysen	Miller, Gary	Wittman
Gallely	Mulvaney	Wolf
Gardner	Murphy (PA)	Womack
Garrett	Myrick	Woodall
Gerlach	Neugebauer	Yoder
Gibbs	Noem	Young (AK)
Gibson	Nugent	Young (FL)
Gingrey (GA)	Nunes	Young (IN)
Gohmert	Nunnelee	

NAYS—173

Ackerman	Becerra	Boswell
Andrews	Berkley	Brady (PA)
Baca	Berman	Brale (IA)
Baldwin	Bishop (GA)	Brown (FL)
Barrow	Bishop (NY)	Butterfield
Bass (CA)	Blumenauer	Capps

Capuano	Himes	Payne
Carnahan	Hinchoy	Pelosi
Carney	Hinojosa	Perlmutter
Carson (IN)	Hirono	Peters
Clarke (FL)	Hochul	Pingree (ME)
Chandler	Holden	Price (NC)
Chu	Holt	Quigley
Cicilline	Honda	Rangel
Clarke (MI)	Inslee	Reyes
Clarke (NY)	Israel	Richardson
Clay	Jackson (IL)	Richmond
Cleaver	Jackson Lee	Rothman (NJ)
Clyburn	(TX)	Roybal-Allard
Cohen	Johnson (GA)	Ruppersberger
Connolly (VA)	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Conyers	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)
Cooper	Keating	Sánchez, Linda
Costa	Kildee	T.
Courtney	Kind	Sanchez, Loretta
Critz	Kissell	Sarbanes
Crowley	Kucinich	Schakowsky
Cuellar	Larsen (WA)	Schiff
Cummings	Larson (CT)	Schrader
Davis (CA)	Lee (CA)	Schwartz
Davis (IL)	Levin	Scott (VA)
DeFazio	Loeb sack	Scott, David
DeGette	Lofgren, Zoe	Serrano
DeLauro	Lowey	Sewell
Deutch	Luján	Sherman
Dicks	Lynch	Sires
Dingell	Maloney	Smith (WA)
Doggett	Markey	Speier
Doyle	Matsui	Stark
Edwards	McCarthy (NY)	Sutton
Ellison	McCollum	Thompson (CA)
Engel	McDermott	Thompson (MS)
Eshoo	McGovern	Tierney
Farr	McNerney	Tonko
Fattah	Meeks	Towns
Filner	Michaud	Tsongas
Frank (MA)	Miller (NC)	Van Hollen
Fudge	Miller, George	Velázquez
Garamendi	Moore	Visclosky
Gonzalez	Moran	Walz (MN)
Green, Al	Murphy (CT)	Wasserman
Green, Gene	Nadler	Schultz
Grijalva	Napolitano	Neal
Grijalva	Gutierrez	Olver
Hahn	Hahn	Owens
Lance	Hanabusa	Pallone
Lance	Hastings (FL)	Pascrell
Hanabusa	Heinrich	Pastor (AZ)
Hastings (FL)	Higgins	

NOT VOTING—12

Bachmann	Herrera Beutler	Paul
Broun (GA)	Hoyer	Polis
Cardoza	Langevin	Slaughter
Giffords	Lewis (GA)	Wilson (FL)

□ 1407

Ms. ESHOO and Mr. DICKS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. FRANKS of Arizona, FLEMING, STIVERS, Mrs. BIGGERT, and Mr. CAMP changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 786 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “Yes.”

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2832. An act to extend the Generalized System of Preferences, and for other purposes.

EPA REGULATORY RELIEF ACT OF 2011

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORTENBERRY). Pursuant to House Resolution 419 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2250.

□ 1407

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2250) to provide additional time for the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to issue achievable standards for industrial, commercial, and institutional boilers, process heaters, and incinerators, and for other purposes, with Mrs. EMERSON (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, October 12, 2011, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 22 printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) had been postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. COHEN

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 174, noes 250, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 787]

AYES—174

Ackerman	Clay	Fattah
Andrews	Cleaver	Filner
Baca	Clyburn	Frank (MA)
Bachus	Cohen	Fudge
Baldwin	Connolly (VA)	Garamendi
Bass (CA)	Conyers	Gonzalez
Becerra	Cooper	Green, Al
Berkley	Costello	Green, Gene
Berman	Courtney	Grijalva
Bishop (GA)	Crowley	Gutierrez
Bishop (NY)	Cuellar	Hahn
Blumenauer	Cummings	Hanabusa
Boswell	Davis (CA)	Hastings (FL)
Brady (PA)	Davis (IL)	Heinrich
Brale (IA)	DeFazio	Higgins
Brown (FL)	DeLauro	Himes
Butterfield	Deutch	Hinchoy
Capps	Dicks	Hinojosa
Capuano	Dingell	Hirono
Carnahan	Doggett	Hochul
Carney	Donnelly (IN)	Holt
Carson (IN)	Doyle	Honda
Castor (FL)	Edwards	Inslee
Chandler	Ellison	Israel
Chu	Engel	Jackson (IL)
Cicilline	Eshoo	Jackson Lee
Clarke (MI)	Farenthold	(TX)
Clarke (NY)	Farr	Johnson (GA)