

That is why for most women, including women who want to have children, contraception is not an option; it is a basic health care necessity. Contraceptive use saves scarce public health dollars. For every \$1 spent on providing family planning services, an estimated \$3.80 is saved in Medicaid expenditures for pregnancy-related and newborn care.

Many poor and low-income women cannot afford to purchase contraceptive services and supplies on their own. About 1 in 5 women of reproductive age were uninsured in 2003, and that proportion has increased by 10 percent since 2001. Half of all women who are sexually active, but do not want to get pregnant, need publicly funded services to help them access public health programs like Medicaid and Title X, the national family planning program. These programs provide high-quality family planning services and other preventive health care, such as pap smears, to underinsured or uninsured individuals who may otherwise lack access to health care and alternative options for birth control. Each year, publicly funded family planning services help women to prevent an estimated 1 million unplanned pregnancies and 630,000 abortions. Yet these programs are struggling to meet the growing demand for subsidized family planning services without corresponding increases in funding. The Prevention First Act authorizes funding for Title X clinics and strengthens States' coverage of Medicaid family planning services.

Improved access to emergency contraception, EC, can further reduce the staggering rates of unintended pregnancy and abortion in this country. EC prevents pregnancy after unprotected sex or a contraceptive failure. The Alan Guttmacher Institute estimates that increased use of EC accounted for up to 43 percent of the total decline in abortion rates between 1994 and 2000. In addition, EC is often the only contraceptive option for the 300,000 women who are reported to be raped each year. Unfortunately, even with the recent FDA decision to allow EC to be sold over-the-counter to women 18 years of age and over, many women do not know about EC and many still face insurmountable barriers in accessing this important product. The Prevention First Act mandates that the Secretary of Health and Human Services implement an education campaign about EC and requires that hospitals receiving Federal funds provide victims of sexual assault with information and access to EC.

Contraceptives have a proven track record of enhancing the health of women and children, preventing unintended pregnancy, and reducing the need for abortion. However far too many insurance policies exclude this vital coverage. While most employment-related insurance policies in the United States cover prescription drugs in general, the many do not include equitable coverage for prescription contraceptive drugs and devices. Although 21 States now have laws in place requiring insurers to provide contraceptive coverage if they cover other prescription drugs, 29 States still do not have any laws. Out of pocket expenses for contraception can be costly. Women of reproductive age currently spend 68 percent more in out-of-pocket health care costs than men, much of which is due to reproductive health-related supplies and services. The Prevention First Act requires that private health plans cover FDA-approved prescription contraceptives and related medical services.

Teens face additional barriers regarding access to services and information. Sixty percent of teens have sex before graduating high school. Teens who receive comprehensive sexuality education that includes discussion of contraception as well as abstinence are more likely than those who receive abstinence-only messages to delay sex, to have fewer partners, and to use contraceptives when they do become sexually active. Efforts by conservatives to restrict access to family planning services and promote abstinence-only education programs, which are prohibited from discussing the benefits of contraception, actually jeopardize adolescent health and run counter to the views of many mainstream medical groups.

Nearly 50 percent of new cases of STDs occur among people ages 15 to 24, even though this age bracket makes up just a quarter of the sexually active population. Clearly, teens have the most to lose when faced with an unintended pregnancy or an STD infection.

Moreover, 1 in 3 girls becomes pregnant before the age of 20, and 80 percent of these pregnancies are unintended. Teen mothers are less likely to complete high school. Furthermore, children of teenage mothers have lower birth weights, are more likely to perform poorly in school, and are at greater risk of abuse and neglect. Improving access to contraceptive services and information does not cause non sexually active teens to start having sex. Instead, teens need information to help them both postpone sexual activity and to protect themselves, if they become sexually active. A November 2006 study of declining pregnancy rates among teens concluded that the reduction in teen pregnancy between 1995 and 2002 is primarily the result of increased use of contraceptives.

The Prevention First Act provides funding to public and private entities to establish or expand their teenage pregnancy prevention programs. This bill also provides for comprehensive, medically accurate sex education programs that teach young people about abstinence, health, and contraceptives. Moreover, my bill requires federally funded programs that provide information on the use of contraceptives to ensure that the information is medically accurate and includes health benefits and failure rates.

Reducing unintended pregnancy and infection with STDs are important public health goals. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention included family planning in their published list of the "Ten Great Public Health Achievements in the 20th Century." My bill, the Prevention First Act, will improve access to family planning services for all women in need and will go a long way in fulfilling the promise of this important public health achievement.

Madam Speaker, I urge every Member to join me in this comprehensive, nationwide effort to reduce unintended pregnancies.

#### TRIBUTE TO LEE VAN VOORHIS

**HON. JAMES P. MCGOVERN**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 14, 2009

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Lee Van Voorhis, a

World War II veteran living at the New Horizons facility in Marlborough, MA. Mr. Van Voorhis recently wrote an essay calling for the establishment of a Department of Peace. I was honored to visit with Mr. Van Voorhis on January 12. Below is a story about Mr. Van Voorhis from the Marlborough Enterprise, which includes a copy of his remarkable essay.

#### WORLD WAR II VET URGES "SECRETARY OF PEACE"

(By Mary Wenzel)

MARLBOROUGH.—World War II was underway and a poster, hanging in the Montclair, N.J., Post Office, calling for 50,000 pilots, was meant to catch the attention of young men. And it did.

"As a teenager, flying a plane seemed like an exciting kind of thing to do," said Lee Van Voorhis, a senior at the local high school, who during his junior year had been an air raid warden for his neighborhood.

Like many of the young men of his generation, Van Voorhis signed up for the flight training program and became a pilot for the B-25 medium bomber.

"It was the work horse of the Army Air Corps," said Van Voorhis who served from June 1943 to November 1945.

"My grandfather was in the Civil War, my father in World War I and I was in World War II," reminisced Van Voorhis who also saw a son serve in Vietnam.

"I remember very distinctly my father being very emotional about my going off to war," said Van Voorhis, "because he thought that when they fought World War I, it was the war to end all wars, and he was so upset because he saw his son going off to a second World War."

However, for this pilot, a Second Lieutenant, United States Army Air Corps, his service would be short lived.

"The war was winding down," he said, "and there were surplus pilots."

For Van Voorhis and many of his fellow servicemen, it was off to college on the GI Bill when he entered Dartmouth College in Hanover, New Hampshire.

"When I was in college, my philosophy professor was dynamic, always asking us questions," explained Van Voorhis.

In spite of a half century since he sat in that classroom, Van Voorhis remembers this professor pacing up and down and asking the students, half of whom were GIs, a question that they couldn't answer, "What's the cause of war?"

"You're GIs and you fought the greatest war the world has ever known and you don't know the cause," the professor said with great passion.

"It's a lack of communications," the professor stated answering his own question. "What should you do when two countries are having problems getting along with each other? Send 100 ambassadors, send 10,000 ambassadors."

Van Voorhis still remembers the final exam for this philosophy class and the blue book to be filled with the answer to only one question, "What would you do when two countries are not getting along well and explain in detail."

"I had an hour to answer the question," said Van Voorhis. "I poured sweat because I tried so hard to think of all the things that you could do following his (the professor) idea of communications."

That was in 1948 and now in 2008, 60 years later, Van Voorhis has found a way to express himself in a way that he didn't know he had so many years ago.

Nena Van Voorhis, Lee's wife of 61 years, signed up for a Creative Writing Class that had begun at New Horizons, off Hemenway Street, where the couple reside.

"I love this class. It keeps me writing and thinking," said Nena Van Voorhis, who urged her husband to join her.

Reluctantly Lee Van Voorhis went to the class, taught by Gloria Goostray, and in a short time found the class to be an exciting thing.

"This class is fantastic. You realize you have a mind that's full of ideas," he explained. Van Voorhis had finally found a way of putting into words his thoughts about that question posed to him six decades ago.

"I have always loved the Robert Frost poem, 'The Road Not Taken,'" said Van Voorhis.

"We all pray for peace," explained Van Voorhis, "but the road to peace, like I described here, you have to work at it. I mean a very specific effort as much as you have to work on your defenses."

Nena and Lee Van Voorhis are the parents of four, three sons and one daughter, and the grandparents of 12.

Following is an essay Van Voorhis wrote for the class that is included in a book called "Writings from the Heart," a collection of short stories published by the 2007-2008 Creative Writing Class.

#### THE ROAD NOT TAKEN

(By Robert Frost)

"I shall be telling this with a sigh  
Somewhere ages and ages hence  
Two roads diverged in a wood, and I—  
I took the one less traveled by,  
And that has made all the difference."

So it has been through human history the most traveled road has been the road to war. Every nation carefully records all its wars and usually marks them with various memorials, statues, and honors for all the veterans.

The road less traveled leads to peace. This is desired by everyone worldwide. We all want to raise our children in peace. Going on the road to war is easy. My country is right and your country is doing something wrong or starting open conflict in some disputed area then the threatening words start escalating. Each side putting out aggressive words like "you need to be punished" or "face sanctions" or calling them "an axis of evil." Our people hate you and you hate us. Now each country believes the other country is evil and we must settle our differences with war.

"The road less traveled by" is the road to peace. This improves your communication with other countries, then we better understand the real root of each other's concerns and will be more compassionate and try to find common ground for peaceful solutions. Going on the road to war means we immediately start thinking of our military defenses and start cutting communications with the country we disagree with.

Ping-pong games opened China for President Nixon. The N.Y. Philharmonic's visit to N. Korea gave us the opportunity to try to negotiate with N. Korea. As Robert Frost said about the road taken, "I, I took the one less traveled by and that has made all the difference."

We must think of every possible way to improve our communication with the countries we have problems with. How about such things as starting a worldwide Art Olympics in which there would be various themes either taking or on the road to peace with various categories for children and adults?

To stimulate these ideas helping peace, how about a Secretary of Peace in our President's cabinet, charged with nothing but encouraging ideas and actions for peace. (The Secretary of State's job is charged with protecting American interests, and official dealings with foreign countries only.)

As Robert Frost said about having taken the road less traveled "and that has made all the difference."

So let's go for the road less traveled—Peace will make all the difference.

### IN RECOGNITION OF UNITED PARCEL SERVICE LEADING THE NATION IN UNITED WAY DONATIONS

#### HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 14, 2009

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate United Parcel Service (UPS) and its employees for its generosity.

For the past nine years, UPS has consecutively led the nation in donations to United Way. This year's annual campaign raised over \$53 million for United Way and with a matching contribution by the UPS Foundation, the total is expected to exceed \$60 million—more than any other participating company. In total, over the past twenty-five years UPS has contributed over \$924 million to United Way. Their charity extended beyond their financial contributions. Employees gave generously of their time with over 900,000 hours of community service through the Global Volunteer Month and UPS's Neighbor-to-Neighbor program. The emphasis on philanthropy and improving local communities through its partnership with United Way can be seen at all levels of the organization.

Madam Speaker, I ask my esteemed colleagues to join me in expressing our heartiest congratulations to UPS on this remarkable achievement and for their commitment to helping others.

### INTRODUCING WE THE PEOPLE

#### HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 14, 2009

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, I rise to introduce the We the People Act. The We the People Act forbids federal courts, including the Supreme Court, from adjudicating cases concerning State laws and policies relating to religious liberties or "privacy," including cases involving sexual practices, sexual orientation or reproduction. The We the People Act also protects the traditional definition of marriage from judicial activism by ensuring the Supreme Court cannot abuse the equal protection clause to redefine marriage. In order to hold Federal judges accountable for abusing their powers, the act also provides that a judge who violates the act's limitations on judicial power shall either be impeached by Congress or removed by the President, according to rules established by the Congress.

The United States Constitution gives Congress the authority to establish and limit the jurisdiction of the lower Federal courts and limit the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. The Founders intended Congress to use this authority to correct abuses of power by the Federal judiciary.

Some may claim that an activist judiciary that strikes down State laws at will expands individual liberty. Proponents of this claim overlook the fact that the best guarantor of

true liberty is decentralized political institutions, while the greatest threat to liberty is concentrated power. This is why the Constitution carefully limits the power of the Federal Government over the States.

In recent years, we have seen numerous abuses of power by Federal courts. Federal judges regularly strike down State and local laws on subjects such as religious liberty, sexual orientation, family relations, education, and abortion. This government by Federal judiciary causes a virtual nullification of the Tenth Amendment's limitations on Federal power. Furthermore, when Federal judges impose their preferred policies on State and local governments, instead of respecting the policies adopted by those elected by, and thus accountable to, the people, republican government is threatened. Article IV, section 4 of the United States Constitution guarantees each State a republican form of government. Thus, Congress must act when the executive or judicial branch threatens the republican governments of the individual States. Therefore, Congress has a responsibility to stop Federal judges from running roughshod over State and local laws. The Founders would certainly have supported congressional action to reign in Federal judges who tell citizens where they can and can't place manger scenes at Christmas.

Madam Speaker, even some supporters of liberalized abortion laws have admitted that the Supreme Court's *Roe v. Wade* decision, which overturned the abortion laws of all 50 States, is flawed. The Supreme Court's establishment clause jurisdiction has also drawn criticism from across the political spectrum. Perhaps more importantly, attempts to resolve, by judicial fiat, important issues like abortion and the expression of religious belief in the public square increase social strife and conflict. The only way to resolve controversial social issues like abortion and school prayer is to restore respect for the right of State and local governments to adopt policies that reflect the beliefs of the citizens of those jurisdictions. I would remind my colleagues and the Federal judiciary that, under our constitutional system, there is no reason why the people of New York and the people of Texas should have the same policies regarding issues such as marriage and school prayer.

Unless Congress acts, a State's authority to define and regulate marriage may be the next victim of activist judges. After all, such a decision would simply take the Supreme Court's decision in the *Lawrence* case, which overturned all State sodomy laws, to its logical conclusion. Congress must launch a preemptive strike against any further Federal usurpation of the States' authority to regulate marriage by removing issues concerning the definition of marriage from the jurisdiction of Federal courts.

Although marriage is licensed and otherwise regulated by the States, government did not create the institution of marriage. Government regulation of marriage is based on State recognition of the practices and customs formulated by private individuals interacting in civil institutions, such as churches and synagogues. Having Federal officials, whether judges, bureaucrats, or congressmen, impose a new definition of marriage on the people is an act of social engineering profoundly hostile to liberty.