

resolutions to keep the government going.

Be wise as you put forward those resolutions, I would ask my colleagues on the Republican side. It is a great challenge. It is a challenge that we must and we will meet. We need a balanced, long-term vision, bringing the economy along, allowing it to grow and to build in the future, whether that be the green tech economy of the future, the medical systems, the health care systems. We have great opportunity, but those opportunities will not be met if we are not wise and if we have the wrong kinds of deficit reduction plans, which, again, we saw today on this floor not more than an hour ago.

I thank my colleagues for their participation.

CELEBRATING WOMEN'S HISTORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. SCHMIDT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, thank you for giving me this opportunity to talk about a subject I really love, and that is history, especially women's history.

I think all too often as we grew up as children, our history books failed to mention the courageous activities of women throughout the Nation and throughout the world. Somehow we learned about men, but all too often not about women. But when we did learn about women, we didn't learn what they really were all about.

Growing up as a little girl, I grew up in an era where women were not really allowed to do all the things we could do today. We weren't allowed to run marathons or drive race cars or be in the pits at the Indianapolis 500 as a press person. We weren't allowed in Rotaries. It was just not something women were allowed to do. Why, shoot, women weren't even allowed to vote until 1920. In fact, the first woman that served in this House served there 2 full years before women had the right to vote.

And when you think about all the things that happened in this last century, we have to look to a century before to see, wow, who were the folks that really made this happen, because it just didn't happen overnight.

In the hallway out in the Rotunda there is what I think is the best statue, and it is the statue of the pioneers for women's suffrage. It is an extraordinary piece of artwork, one that depicts the likenesses of Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Lucretia Mott, and Susan B. Anthony, arguably the women who pushed the button for women today to have true equal rights with men.

□ 1640

These were the most pro-women feminists in the history of America. And as you will see in a few moments, the rest of the story, as Paul Harvey

would say, for Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony was just not written when I was a little girl.

I would like to begin this hour by referring to a few quotes from a couple of these four mothers that truly show where they stood in history with what I believe is the most pro-feminine issue, and that's the issue of abortion. You see, Mr. Speaker, every one of us has the right to life, born and unborn. And it is the women who have the responsibility to make sure that that baby is born. Unfortunately, our courts over 38 years ago decided to change that and said that women had the right to end that life. But, Mr. Speaker, we don't have that right. It is our responsibility to bear those children. And these four mothers knew that.

In a letter to Julia Ward Howe in 1873, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, the woman who shocked society, Mr. Speaker, by daring to leave her house proudly showing her pregnancy—because that was just not done—wrote: "When we consider that women are treated as property, it is degrading to women to treat our children as property to be disposed of as we see fit."

When I was a child in school learning about the issues of women's suffrage and women's rights, I knew Elizabeth Cady Stanton was pro-woman, pro-freedom pioneer, but I didn't know she was pro-life. I didn't know she was pro-life until a few years ago. She was hardly alone in her pro-life views. As you can see, Susan B. Anthony also expressed her thoughts about pro-life in the publication "The Revolution":

"Guilty? Yes. No matter what the motive, love of ease, or a desire to save from suffering the unborn innocent, the woman is awfully guilty who commits the deed. It will burden her conscience in life; it will burden her soul in death."

Mr. Speaker, those words were written over 150 years ago, and yet they could easily be written today. Because today, Mr. Speaker, we hear from women who have had the painful tragedy of abortion on their soul, and they talk about how their heart weeps because of the life that they gave up and how they want not just to forgive themselves but to protect women from that awful decision that they made to protect other women from the suffering that they have. And yet Susan B. Anthony knew that years ago. So, you see, in history, pro-life was an issue.

You have to think about it, Mr. Speaker, and you have to think it makes sense because the whole issue of abortion, it just didn't come about in the 21st century. It came about centuries ago. Unfortunately, indiscretions have happened throughout history. And when indiscretions happen, babies are created, and then the issue becomes what do you do to hide the dirty little secret. Are you like Hester Prynne in Nathaniel Hawthorne's, "The Scarlet Letter," where you put her in prison and then put her out into the wilderness, trying to hide Pearl,

her beautiful daughter; in the end, only knowing that Pearl became the most beautiful little girl?

What was Nathaniel Hawthorne saying about the pregnancy? What was he saying about the birth of that child? Was he saying that child had the right to life or was Nathaniel Hawthorne thinking other things? We don't know. We can only wonder why he put her in prison and why he chastised her to the wilderness, but the point was they wanted to hide the secret. And because she chose to have the child, that secret was going to be born.

So for people like Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton in the 1860s to say, wait a minute; women should have the right to get married, to get divorced, to raise their children, and, oh, by the way, have their children, own property, be able to vote; we shouldn't be surprised that protecting the child and the birth of that child was part of their platform.

Today, in 2011, I am very proud to stand here and carry on with their message, because today, ever more so, the assault of life is all around us. And I believe that assault to life is there because we don't recognize the meaning of life at its conception. And when you compromise it at its conception, I think you question the validity of life all the way through to its end.

Each year—and I'm so proud to represent the Second Congressional District of Ohio—I am really proud of the hundreds of thousands of people that come out to the lawn on the Capitol on probably the coldest day in January to petition Congress to end abortion. It's called the Right to Life March. In the 5 years that I have been in Congress, standing with them, we've yet to have a decent day. Sometimes it's just cold. Sometimes it's cold and snowy. Sometimes it's cold and rainy. But it's always cold.

And I stand out on a platform, and I'm there for maybe an hour, but they're standing there for hours. Kids from schools are coming up in buses, traveling all night, getting off the bus, only to stand on cold ground, only to get back on that bus and go right back home and go right back to school. Parents are coming with small kids, buses, cars, airplanes, caravans asking Congress to end something that is so wrong.

And as I look out on the lawn and I see these brave people, I say to myself, Wow, that's what America is all about. And among the crowd I see so many women. I believe more women than men, because women, we have the privilege to experience childbirth, and we understand firsthand what that life is like inside a womb. And I think when we do have that experience and we understand the meaning of life, it makes us want to get out and protect it so that it can have its natural right to come into the world and be the person God wants it to be. And I do this because I'm so proud of the folks that are out there, but I also do it for some folks back home.

Back when I was in high school, the whole issue of abortion began to emerge before *Roe v. Wade* because States were considering whether they should legalize abortion or not. There was a couple in Cincinnati by the name of Dr. Jack and Barbara Wilke—he a physician, she a nurse—who were at the forefront of this movement. They gathered people like my parents and other people around their coffee table to discuss how we could protect Ohio from legalizing abortion. Of course, *Roe v. Wade* hit in 1973, and the campaign escalated to a national debate.

But along the way—and they weren't the only ones, Mr. Speaker. There were people all across coffee tables all across America debating how we're going to protect life. But it was Barbara among the group. And they were talking on the telephone. It was before email and BlackBerrys and even fax machines, talking on the phone long distance with one another.

But it was Barbara at her kitchen table that said one day, Jack, I just don't understand this whole debate. My gosh, we're protected. Our Nation protects us. It's as if everybody has the right to life. And he says, Barbara, that's the name of the movement. And the name of the movement was branded: the National Right to Life movement.

Now, Barbara and Jack Wilke have served for many years in many capacities in this movement. Jack served as president of the National Right to Life Committee for well over a decade. They founded the International Right to Life Federation and wrote the "Handbook on Abortion," a book often described as the unofficial bible of the pro-life movement during the seventies and eighties.

□ 1650

They also have other groups that they work with around the world, fighting all kinds of life issues, not just for the unborn but for human trafficking and women's rights. I mention this because this couple, this simple couple from College Hill, Ohio, is just one of many across our Nation who recognizes the importance of this issue and is dedicating their lives to eradicating abortion.

So, when I stand out on that lawn on those cold January days each and every year, I look at people, and I think there are other Jack and Barbara Willkes—maybe not as famous—who are doing the same thing, hundreds and hundreds and thousands.

Then I think of Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton and of the contemporary bearers of that message like that of the Willkes, and I say, wow, there is a plan out there, and the last note on abortion hasn't been written. Alice Paul is another pretty important feminist in history. She was actually the original author of the Equal Rights Amendment.

Mr. Speaker, if you think that abortion is a hot issue, I can remember

back in the 1970s when the Equal Rights Amendment was being debated across this land and the hot issue that that was. Oh, my gosh.

Should we give women the same rights as men?

There were women who said, No, no, no. They need to be back in the home.

Then there were folks who said, No, no, no. Women need to have equal pay as men.

What are we going to do about private facilities?

Ah, it was just an awful debate because it really deflected from the real issue that all of us are God's creatures and that all of us are created equal.

So I remember Alice Paul as being at the forefront of this, and I remember the debate both in high school and college—but, man, I didn't know until a few years ago that Alice Paul was pro-life. Now, here is a woman who was painted as this equal rights, left-wing feminist. When we look at pro-life issues, we think they're conservative, right-wing issues. Yet it was Alice Paul, the original author of the Equal Rights Amendment, who stated: "Abortion is the ultimate exploitation of women." Let me repeat that. "Abortion is the ultimate exploitation of women." This is from this far-left, hard-nosed person. Add to her views the ones previously referenced, and it is difficult to see any ambiguity or confusion about where these feminists and advocates of the women's rights movement stood on the issue of abortion. Simply put, they detested abortion and went as far publicly and privately as they could in condemning it.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, it seems as though their rhetoric has been largely lost over the years, hidden in the annals of history, and I just don't know why, because, if we don't understand the full depth of history, we'll never understand March 15, 2011, and the views that we debate in this very Chamber today.

It's sad because, as a little girl, I didn't know about these pioneers. I didn't know about their pro-life positions. I didn't know that they were sisters with me. I thought they were different. I thought that the folks who stood before me to give us equal rights were pro-choice. That couldn't be farther from the truth.

I think many people wrongly believe that feminism and pro-life principles are mutually exclusive and cannot be reconciled with each other; but when you look at history, you can see that they're not exclusive but inclusive because it is we, as I said earlier, who have the responsibility to have the children, to continue to procreate for the future. That is why we were put here on Earth—to have children. It is our responsibility to make sure that these children are cared for both inside the womb and out; and for a court to say it is our right to end it I think is exclusive of what we are made of. It is against what we are made of.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'll speak more, but I've had the privilege of being

joined by my good friend, the Congresswoman from North Carolina. I would like to yield as much time to the good Congresswoman as she would like.

Mrs. ELLMERS. Thank you so much, my esteemed colleague from Ohio. Your comments are so pertinent to today's fight.

We are women. We are conservative women. As for those who have come before us, as you pointed out so eloquently, we don't know what they believed, but we are starting to unveil all of that.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of women, to honor the rich contributions women have made in the history of this world. I want to take a moment to discuss the strong pro-life movement that my colleagues and I are continuing to fight today. I rise in support of and fight on behalf of women. In this month dedicated to women, I ask them to choose life for themselves and for their children.

The original feminists were, indeed, against abortion. These women believed that there was power in motherhood and in choosing life. Alice Paul, the author of the original Equal Rights Amendment, said it best: Abortion is the exploitation of women.

It is this exploitation by groups like Planned Parenthood that frighten me for the women of our country. It has been proven that a woman who has had an abortion is six to seven times more likely to commit suicide in the following year than a woman who chooses to deliver her child. We all know of the syndrome postpartum depression. Women who abort are 65 percent more likely than women who deliver to be at risk for long-term clinical depression. Sixty-five percent of U.S. women who had abortions experienced multiple symptoms of posttraumatic stress disorder, which they attributed to their abortions. In another study, 60 percent said they felt "part of me died." Compared to women who deliver, women who abort are more than twice as likely to be subsequently hospitalized for psychiatric illnesses within 6 months and to subsequently require significantly more treatments for the psychiatric illnesses through outpatient care.

There are also numerous health risks that can occur after an abortion is performed. Reproductive complications and problems with subsequent deliveries can occur, one of these being pelvic inflammatory disease, which is a major direct cause of infertility. After an abortion, there is a 7- to 15-fold increase in placenta previa in subsequent pregnancies, which is a life-threatening condition for the mother and baby that increases the risk of birth defects, a still birth and excessive bleeding, leading to the possible loss of life of the woman.

Honestly, I could go on and on about the aftereffects of an abortion, but I think that the picture has been made quite clear.

□ 1700

The picture has been made, as Susan B. Anthony said, who believed it was not sufficient merely to denounce abortion. Anthony considered it the work of women to prevent this violation. This is the task that Susan B. Anthony gives us to continue today. Like Anthony, we, too, must challenge the status quo for the sake of women and their children. Women deserve better than abortion.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Thank you to the gentlelady from North Carolina for so eloquently pointing out some of the dangers of abortion, both physical and emotional, and I don't think the chapter, Mr. Speaker, has been written on the dangers of abortion, but I do wonder about the lives that we've missed and the fabric, and how it has been compromised, the fabric of America, the fabric of the world, because an innocent life didn't get to be woven into it.

You know, when we're born, our parents don't know what we're going to become. They just hope that we're happy. They hope that we're healthy. I mean, if you look at our President, do you think when he was born his mom thought he was going to be the President of the United States? I seriously doubt it. He didn't come from a dynasty of Presidents. He was just an ordinary person born from an ordinary mom, but he, you know, had the opportunity and the privilege to live in America and become the President.

Our very own Speaker from Cincinnati, Ohio, I dare say, his parents never thought he would be Speaker of the House. They were ordinary people. They owned a bar. They had 12 kids. Chances are 12 kids will do 12 different things, but I don't think any of them thought they were going to be Speaker of the House. But that mother gave all those kids love, and because they lived in America, the piece of fabric that he has become resides over this wonderful body.

And I point that out because none of us knows what our children or grandchildren will become, but it's incumbent upon us to give them that chance to be the best person they can be, the best version of themselves, and that starts at conception. It doesn't start when we choose for it to start. It starts when God chooses for it to start, or if you don't want to use the term "God," nature chooses for it to start, and when you compromise that, you compromise life all the way through.

You know, as I said before, many people see feminism and pro-life issues as exclusive. Well, they're inclusive, and I would like to offer evidence of the pro-life feminists in the past, the ones that we owe so much to, because they are in large part responsible for women being able to go to college, to serve in the military, to vote, and may I dare say, stand on the floor this very evening. It is because of them that we are here today arguing for this precious position.

In a few minutes, I am going to be joined by another good lady from North Carolina, and I believe that this young lady is going to eloquently talk about her views on women in history and the pro-life movement, and I now yield to the gentlelady from North Carolina.

Ms. FOXX. Well, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio, my colleague, for organizing this time to speak about the importance of protecting unborn children in this country.

March is national Women's History Month, and each year other Members and I of the Pro-Life Women's Caucus make a point of coming to the House floor to celebrate the achievements of women and talk about the detrimental impact of abortions on women.

Last year, it was brought to my attention that the University of North Carolina's system, which I attended, three of the universities in the system required its students to purchase health care through the university if they did not have acceptable coverage through their parents or on their own. These plans automatically enrolled students in abortion coverage, regardless of gender or their feelings regarding abortion.

Pro-life groups in North Carolina, as well as the Students for Life of America, wrote to the UNC system, as well as North Carolina Governor Bev Purdue, requesting that they not force students to purchase abortion coverage as part of their student health plan. The UNC system responded by allowing students to opt-out of abortion coverage. However, a student still pays the same amount for health care coverage regardless of whether or not abortions are included on his or her plan.

This situation was brought to my attention because the UNC system, along with at least 37 other university systems across the country, requires their students to purchase health care coverage that includes abortion. These universities are including the cost of this health care plan in the total cost of attendance, which means there may be Federal money covering these health insurance plans and thereby covering abortion.

My concerns about unborn children not only in North Carolina but across the United States prompted me to send a letter to the Secretary of Education, Arne Duncan, requesting that he look into the UNC situation and determine if, in fact, taxpayer money was being used to purchase these health insurance plans. Secretary Duncan responded last month and said the Department of Education was not able to determine if students were able to use Federal, also known as taxpayer, student aid money to purchase these health insurance plans, which can include abortion coverage.

This is unacceptable. There should be no question whatsoever that taxpayer money should not be used to purchase abortion coverage, regardless of whether it is through a student health plan

at a university or at an abortion clinic. I will continue to work with the Department and the UNC system to ensure that taxpayer money is not being used to pay for abortions.

As a Christian, I am adamantly opposed to the practice of abortion, and I'm especially opposed to American taxpayers being forced to pay for it. This is why last month I voted with 239 of my colleagues to stop subsidizing Planned Parenthood's radical abortion agenda with taxpayer money. In 2009 alone, Planned Parenthood reported that the organization performed over 332,000 abortions nationwide, and in the next 2 years will require each and every one of its 87 affiliates to have at least one abortion clinic.

The vast majority of my constituents do not want their hard-earned money paying for abortions, and as their elected Representative, I will continue fighting to protect unborn children and taxpayers from the scourge of abortion.

Congresswoman SCHMIDT, I have here a chart that I'd like to make sure people watching can see. This is from a Quinnipiac poll in December 2009. It is a little hard to read Quinnipiac down here, but it was a poll that asked women: Do you support or oppose allowing abortions to be paid for by public funds under a health care reform bill? Only 25 percent of the women polled said they support it, 70 percent opposed, and 5 percent didn't know or didn't care. That is an astounding number to have.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Especially for women because we're always cast as the ones that really want abortion, and it's the men that don't want it, but you're telling me that 70 percent of the women in that December 2009 study adamantly opposed Federal funding of abortion under the health care bill?

□ 1710

Ms. FOXX. That's correct. I'm sorry I couldn't be on the floor for your entire presentation. I was in the Rules Committee and could not leave to come down. But as I came in, I heard you talking about the fact that pro-life women can be feminists, and I think that's very important for us to point out. I do quote from Alice Paul, who worked very hard for equality for women, who said, "Abortion is the ultimate exploitation of women." And I think that as we work hard to see that women are treated equally in our society under the law that we make sure that they are not exploited by abortion.

And there is another quote from Elizabeth Cady Stanton. I don't know if you have used it. But she said, "When we consider that women are treated as property, it is degrading to women that we should treat our children as property to be disposed of as we see fit." That was in a letter to Julia Ward Howe in October 1873 and was recorded in Howe's diary.

I think, again, that it's so important that women be here during Women's

History Month to speak in favor of rights for women and that we point out that we are opposed to abortion, which is the ultimate exploitation of women.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Thank you so much. I am really glad that you took the time to point out that survey, because I believe that the Nation has shifted its opinion on abortions since 1973. And maybe it's because with technology and the fact that sonograms can now show us the color of a baby's eyes and what it's going to look like inside the mom's womb as early as like 3 months, that we're really believing and knowing that it really is a baby. It's not this little fetus, this little mushy thing. It's really a baby. And when you see that sonogram and you see that baby inside the womb, you've got to say to yourself, How can I call this anything else but life? And I think that's probably one of the reasons why, throughout the years, public opinion has truly shifted on abortion.

A decade ago, back in 2001, there was a poll taken wherein 40 percent of the respondents identified themselves as being pro-life while 49 percent identified themselves as being pro-choice. Well, in 2005, another poll was taken. There was little movement toward the pro-life position: 42 percent said they're pro-life while 52 percent said they're pro-choice. But for some reason, in 2006, the number grew 45 to 47; and in 2008, the numbers were 46 to 48. Now maybe that's because of the prevalence of all these sonograms. And today when your daughter or your son goes in with his wife for the sonogram, the grandparents and great grandparents go, too. It didn't happen a decade ago. But, oh, my gosh, it's a family thing because we can't wait to see what the baby is. And we are told to cover our eyes at that one moment if you don't want to know what the sex of the baby is. Believe me, I couldn't tell anyway. But I have gone twice and had to close my eyes twice. And I think because the family is involved in this whole sonogram with the birth of the baby, that all of our eyes are beginning to light up and say, Wow, that really is a life. In just 3 months' time, it's a real baby.

In May 2009, 51 percent of those polled identified themselves as being pro-life where only 42 percent responded that they were pro-choice. Now, the latest poll I could find on the subject was conducted in January of this year, just a couple of months ago; and it was consistent with the 2009 poll. Half the respondents said they were pro-life. The numbers become even more definitive when it comes to public funding or taxpayer moneys going towards the funding of abortions, even indirectly.

This is a very real and timely debate as we struggle today to tackle our enormous deficit and debt which, Mr. Speaker, if we don't get under control will reshape this country in a way that I don't believe will allow our children to have at least as equal an oppor-

tunity as us, if not to have a better opportunity than us. But that's a debate for another day on the debt and deficit.

When I first got here in September of 2005, the very first person I wanted to meet was Henry Hyde of Illinois because he was my hero. You see, after *Roe v. Wade*, people at my kitchen table and in my family were talking about money, Federal money being used for abortion. My mom and dad were mad; and, shoot, even I was mad. And Henry Hyde was mad, too.

In 1976, he offered the Hyde amendment, and it simply said that Federal taxpayer dollars were barred from funding abortion, period, case closed. And that amendment has been consistent with the policy of this House ever since. So I wanted to meet that hero, that gentle man. And when you walk into my office, you see a picture of him and me on the last day that he served in this House. Of all the people that I have ever met, he is truly my hero.

Anyway, every year we debate this. Even in the health care bill, it was a hotly contested issue. And after the bill was voted on, the President had an executive order that at this point still stops the Federal funding of abortion in health care, we believe. But that's a very fragile piece of paper, and I really believe this body needs to recodify in the health care bill that no money will ever be spent for abortion and no insurance policies will have any Federal dollars attached to it that would allow for abortions to occur. But that's something I believe we have to work on this year, Mr. Speaker.

And even today in this body as we voted on the CR, the issue of abortion was there. Do we put it in the CR and stop the Federal funding of abortion or not? You know, we have a lot of pro-life leaders in the House. They have looked at the budget very, very shrewdly; and they have determined that if we don't put these protections in place, Federal funding will slip into the budget in the future. And that's why they are so adamant about putting out bills and provisions in CRs that would stop the Federal funding of abortion.

One of the latest initiatives to receive a full vote in the House was an amendment introduced by my good friend from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) that would prohibit Federal funding for Planned Parenthood, which happens to be the largest abortion provider in the country. Now, I know what you are going to say, Well, they have a separate wall, and they're really only using the money for women's health issues. They're not using it for abortion. But we know money is fungible, and we know in a building, you can't really dissect how much energy costs are going to one side of the building and how much are going to the other. We know that while, yeah, the actual procedure isn't using Federal money, we know that the building is. So it's fungible, and it's slipping through.

But a few weeks ago when we had the CR, his amendment received, I think, 239 votes out of this body that said, No, Planned Parenthood shouldn't receive the money. And you know, Mr. Speaker, maybe it's a bigger debate than just the abortion issue because what we saw last fall was a sting operation that showed where in some cases, abortion clinics, Planned Parenthood clinics across the country were actually talking about or ignoring the fact that people were coming in about human trafficking and saying there was a human trafficking issue, and if the underage girl got pregnant, how could they get an abortion. And the gal at the desk didn't think there seemed to be a problem with that conversation.

□ 1720

Now, I'm not saying that Planned Parenthood International condones it, and I'm sure that they don't, but I'm saying that there were clinics at which this conversation occurred. I know in my own hometown in Cincinnati, Ohio, where in 2 cases there were young girls that went to the Planned Parenthood clinic on Auburn Avenue, and both told the abortion provider they were underage and they were pregnant, one by her father, one by a coach. The father's now in jail. And the situation with the parents was, they didn't know the coach took her to the abortion clinic. He signed the document that said, oh, I'm the legal guardian, and it wasn't until later when she went to the doctor on another issue that the doctor said—When did your daughter have an abortion?—that this whole thing exploded. And right now it's in court. They're going after the coach, and they're trying to go after Planned Parenthood because the girl said, I'm 15.

So maybe Planned Parenthood shouldn't have our money if they're not careful stewards about people that are coming through their doors, because a 15-year old that's pregnant, well, I think that's called statutory rape, no matter who the father was. And if a girl comes in at 15 we should be asking questions—How did you get pregnant? Who was the father? What happened?—because that's breaking the law.

So above the fact that we have a looming deficit and a looming debt, above the fact that I believe that money is fungible with Planned Parenthood, above the fact that in some cases they have people that go into clinics and they have a lady or a guy at the desk that doesn't understand what human trafficking is all about, maybe they shouldn't have the money, because when it's right in their eye, they simply choose to ignore the issue.

Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of pro-life people in America, and there are a lot of pro-life people in this House. And I think it is time that we discussed this issue more openly, because people of this Nation understand that all life is precious, including the life of the unborn. They also understand that our

money comes from taxpayers, and taxpayers expect us to do the right things with their money, and that means protecting life at all costs.

One of the things that I want to say before I wrap up—and we talked about polling—is that there have been multiple polls conducted on the subject within the last year of Federal funds and abortion. Two that I want to highlight were conducted by CNN and Quinnipiac. Now, CNN is hardly a right-wing organization. But the CNN poll showed that 60 percent of Americans oppose public moneys going to fund abortion. That's well over a majority. The Quinnipiac poll shows 72 percent oppose it. Wow, that's a lot of Americans.

I believe that we need to do the right thing and end the public funding of abortion whether it's in the health care bill, any bill that comes here, or any moneys that go overseas.

Like the feminists, the pro-life women of the past, pro-life women today simply believe that we are all afforded the right to life. It is not a gift from our government; it is a gift from our Lord. He is the one that has allowed us to stand here in America and across the world. He is the one that has said to us, He wants us to be in His image and His likeness. It is our Lord that wants us to be the best person we can be. And if we are to be the best person we can be, we have to ensure that each other has that same chance whether it's a little seed in a womb that is 20 minutes old or it's an elderly person in a nursing home. All of us are equal in the Lord's eyes. All of us have the right to life.

So I am proud to stand here today, like my sisters before me—like Elizabeth Cady Stanton, like Susan B. Anthony and, yes, like Alice Paul—and say, enough's enough. Women's rights are women's rights, and if a woman has rights, those rights are the child's rights because everybody has the right to life.

CONTINUING RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege and honor to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives and also to have listened in on the presentation over the previous hour, the Republican Women for Life, led by Congresswoman SCHMIDT, who has relentlessly stood up for the innocent unborn. I certainly support that cause and lend my voice to it, although I don't know that there's much to be added after the presentation that I've just heard. I'm just thankful that it's in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and that your ear has been tuned to it, Mr. Speaker, and that the ear of the American people is tuned to that message as well.

I have a couple of subjects that I wanted to discuss here within the up-

coming 30 minutes that's been allotted. The first one is to speak to the vote that we've just had here on the floor on the continuing resolution for extending the funding for this government for an additional 3 weeks. It is known as a clean CR.

This House came together to work its will on H.R. 1. We debated that continuing resolution, which would be designed to fund this government for the balance of the fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's really important that you and the American people are reminded that we're in this condition of this debate over this continuing resolution because the Pelosi Congress didn't do business as directed and as framed under the Constitution of the United States.

The Pelosi Congress continued to digress when it first opened up here in January of 2007, after the majority and the gavel was passed right behind me where you are, Mr. Speaker. This Congress functioned for the first few weeks pretty much the same as it had under the previous Speaker.

But in that transition that took place, the rules began to get changed, and there were fewer and fewer opportunities for Members to weigh in. The committees began to function less and less. More and more bills were written out of the Speaker's office, and as this unfolded, the rules changed. They took away—one of the things was an open rule under the appropriations process so that Members couldn't offer their amendments and force a debate and a vote on an issue of their concern.

The appropriations bills have always been the tool that allowed Members to work their will on the package that came from committee. Well, that went away. That was taken away, I just presume it was, by order of the Speaker, Speaker PELOSI.

So the House was no longer able to work its will. Bills came down under a closed rule. Appropriations bills came down under, well, modified closed rule, and then they didn't come down at all. Then they turned into omnibus spending bills or they turned into continuing resolutions, and this government limped along, without having the opportunity to gather together from across this country the collective wisdom of the 435 Members of Congress, as informed by our constituents.

□ 1730

So the Congress became dysfunctional. One of the things that is a result of that is the legacy today of having to be in this business now of seeking to put Congress back on its tracks again in the fashion that the Constitution frames and the tradition of functional Congresses direct us. That has been the mission of Speaker BOEHNER, and he has been very clear about this to make this Congress work again. Because of that commitment, it brought about the debate on H.R. 1, which debated all the funding of the Federal Government for the balance of this fis-

cal year and allowed it under an open rule.

There were hundreds of amendments that were offered by Members that had 4 years of pent-up frustration, Democrats and Republicans alike, that had a voice that wanted to be heard, votes that we wanted to see cast, and a message that helped shape, let's say, the political consensus of this body before a bill goes over to the United States Senate.

We worked through that bill for over 90 hours of debate. Of the hundreds of amendments that were offered, there were a good number that were passed, and some of them shut off funding to certain pieces of policy. But it was the will of the House wrapped up in the result of the passage of H.R. 1 that went over to the Senate. That was the first offer, and it was the best offer of the House so far, and it reflects the will of the House of Representatives and the House of Representatives designed, by definition, to reflect the will of the American people.

So I want to make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that we are in this debate and in this discussion over continuing resolutions: the continuing resolution that was passed in the lame duck session that carried this Congress until March 4 of this year and the 2-week "clean CR" that funded this government for 2 weeks that is set to expire on the night of March 18. They've extended now a 3-week "clean CR" that extends the funding an additional 3 weeks under similar terms, not identical terms, to the previous continuing resolution.

That is the scenario that we are in, Mr. Speaker, and we are in this scenario because Congress wasn't doing its job from 2007 on up until we gaveled in here in January of 2011.

There is a 4-year period of time where, in 2007, it wasn't too bad when it started. It digressed progressively until it became as close to completely dysfunctional as the Congress has been, at least in my understanding of the history. And I would say, Mr. Speaker, that I have lived a fair amount, and I have studied the rest of it, although I wouldn't present myself as being a congressional scholar and historian on all of the detail, but that is generally what has taken place.

Now we have Speaker BOEHNER putting this Congress back on the tracks. And, yes, there were some growing pains going through those 90-plus hours of debate on the continuing resolution under an open rule. And, yes, some of us compromised. Many of us actually compromised to take our amendments down and negotiated a unanimous consent agreement that was negotiated in good faith. I appreciate all the effort that went into that. It was a very, very good exercise.

Democrats and Republicans alike, I heard no one argue that the process of open rules and open debate was a bad process or that it wasn't fair or that it somehow should not have been done, that we should have engaged in a