

given to me by my constituents to tell the world about the brutality that Mario Perez Aguilera, that political prisoner, and the many others, that they are facing day in and day out, and the added inhumanity of not being able to be seen by their family members.

The island that the world ignores. And what is most tragic is that it is 90 miles from our shores and for over 50 years, it has been in the grasp of a demented despot who orders such actions as the ones I have discussed this evening.

So I will continue to denounce the brutality, the inhumanity, and I will also continue to remind the world that despite that brutality, Cuba will soon be free.

To be continued.

NO FEDERAL FUNDING FOR ABORTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, there was a wonderful gathering in Washington today of thousands of people from all over the country. Many of those people held up signs that said Abortion is Not Health Care. The American public is more intelligent than those in charge in this House.

Pro-life Members here in the House are continuing to stand up and speak out for the unborn, and we will, until we defeat this bill or stop Federal funds from being used for abortions through this bill. Pro-life Members have offered amendments to the majority's original health care plan, H.R. 3200, to permanently exclude Federal funding of abortion. All of these amendments were rejected by the majority. Minority whip CANTOR's amendment to stop health care from funding abortion was rejected in the Ways and Means Committee on July 16, 2009. Representative SOUDER's amendment to stop abortion funding was rejected by the majority in the Education and Labor Committee on July 17, 2009.

Democrat Representative BART STUPAK and Republican Representative JOE PITTS offered another amendment to stop abortion funding in Energy and Commerce, and the majority rejected it on July 30, 2009. The reasons given by the majority for rejecting these amendments was that they were not needed as there was no abortion funding in the bill.

Now the contrast to that is the Republican substitute which will be offered has a permanent, government-wide Hyde amendment, meaning unequivocally, no Federal funds can be used for abortion anywhere in any bill that passes. Yet despite claims from the majority that abortion funding was not in the bill, the Energy and Commerce Committee voted on July 31, 2009, to include the Capps amendment to explicitly include abortion funding in the health care bill.

Recently, Speaker PELOSI unveiled H.R. 3962, her 2,000 page \$1.3 trillion government takeover of health care. This bill also includes the Capps amendment, which will increase the number of elective abortions and gut the well-established government policy that prevents Federal funds from being used to pay for elective abortion known as the Hyde amendment.

Before the Hyde amendment was passed in 1976, Medicaid funded almost 300,000 abortions. In contrast, the Republican substitute again has a permanent government-wide Hyde amendment, meaning unequivocally, no Federal funds for abortion anywhere.

Section 222 of H.R. 3962 permits Federal funds to be used for abortion in the government insurance plan.

Section 4(a) refers to elective abortion procedures that are otherwise prohibited from receiving Federal funds in other government programs due to current Hyde amendment policies, but cannot be prohibited in the government-run public insurance plan.

Supporters of the bill assert that only private funds will be used to fund abortion in the government-run public insurance plan. This is not true. The bill places individual premium payments for the government-run public insurance plan into a Federal treasury account that may be used to pay for abortions. The bill also federally subsidizes private insurance plans that cover abortion in the government-run exchange.

Let there be no doubt that Pelosi's plan explicitly authorizes the government-run public insurance plan to pay for elective abortions and subsidizes private plans on the government-run exchange that cover elective abortion. Despite assurance from the majority that something would be done to correct this, the manager's amendment for H.R. 3962 does not contain any language regarding abortion funding.

The proposal outlined by Representative BRAD ELLSWORTH of Indiana yesterday falls short of addressing these issues. In his plan, the government-run public insurance plan would still cover abortion, but would have to contract with private contractors to carry out the administrative functions related to paying for elective abortion. Rather than reducing the number of abortions, the majority seems content with overseeing legislation to create the largest expansion of abortion since Roe v. Wade. This is unacceptable.

Pro-life Members on both sides of the aisle want the opportunity to vote on the Stupak-Pitts amendment to apply the Hyde amendment and exclude the abortion funding in Pelosi's plan. The American people understand this. We should not be using our Federal funding to kill innocent life.

HEALTH CARE RALLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, an extraordinary thing happened here today, right out here down the hill. There were tens of thousands of people that came out on very short notice. They came out, and these were not the super wealthy. These weren't the Wall Street folks that if you will check, give four to one to Democrats over Republicans. These people didn't care about party at all. They were concerned about the America that they knew, an America where people were given a chance to succeed and a chance to fail. Because as people far more wise than I am have noted over the years, any government that can take away your chance to fail has taken away your chance to succeed.

So people came out on very short notice. These were working people. You could see these were not people of leisure. These were people who had jobs, but they felt like this was something so critical they had to come, make their voices heard. You see them around offices all over the Capitol Hill area.

□ 1900

It was immensely moving. And the way the people all said the pledge to the flag at the start and honored the prayer as it was said to start the proceedings. And I don't know that I have ever heard a group sing the National Anthem with such fervor as a group. It was immensely touching because the people were up here to let their voices be heard and to let people know that the government does not need to take over 18 percent of this country's economy. Haven't we messed up the car companies enough? Haven't we messed up the banks and the lenders and the housing market enough that we're not satisfied yet until we take over 18 percent of the world's economy and muck it up as well? Do we really have to meddle and take over that kind of thing?

The role of the government should be as a referee, not as a player. We shouldn't be out there taking over businesses. You want to speed up the demise of a country, then let the government start becoming the player. Now, the Soviet Union was brutal enough and totalitarian enough. They were able to make a socialist form of government last for 70 years, as a record. Extraordinary. But they were brutal and totalitarian enough, they could force it that far. We won't last that long, not when we've moved the government in charge of everything.

Under the bill—I haven't gotten through the full bill, but I have seen some things that are staggering. I do remember hearing a number of our Nation's leaders saying that there was no way Federal dollars would be paying for abortion, so let me just read straight from page 110, subsection B, titled, Abortion for Which Public Funding is Allowed. And I'm reading the quote from page 110: The services described in this subparagraph are

abortions for which the expenditure of Federal funds appropriated for the Department of Health and Human Services is permitted.

Then it goes on and says, Based on the laws in effect of the date that is 6 months before the beginning of the plan year involved—yeah, right—no money there will be used for abortions, and then there it is in black and white.

We were told that if you liked your plan, you're going to get to keep it. And yet you could go over here—actually, that's an easy section to find. You're not going to be keeping it because it says here—and this is on page 91. This says, Protecting the Choice to Keep Current Coverage. The number one limitation on keeping your insurance, the individual health insurance issuer offering such coverage does not enroll any individual in such coverage. The second limitation is the issuer does not change any of its terms or conditions. Good grief. You're going to add beneficiaries to every policy, you're going to change terms and conditions. It turns out that wasn't true either.

It is time to be true and faithful in this job to the American people and the job for which they sent us here. It is time to honor the Constitution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MCHENRY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SESTAK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SESTAK addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROSLEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. ROSLEHTINEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. CHU) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. CHU addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEAL of Georgia addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. REHBERG) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. REHBERG addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ABORTION AND THE DEMOCRAT HEALTH CARE BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, even though reputable polls consistently show that public funding of abortion is opposed by a supermajority of Americans, some 67 percent, the multibillion-dollar abortion industry, its lobbyists and friends in Congress are today demanding that the two massive new government programs created by the Democratic leadership's so-called "health care reform" bill force Americans to facilitate and fund the killing of unborn children by abortion.

Anyone who tells you otherwise—and I appreciate the gentleman from Texas pointing out the text. It clearly states it. Anyone who tells you otherwise that public funding for abortion on demand is not in the pending legislation is either seriously misinformed or simply not telling the truth.

Americans do want to know up front what's in this bill. No games. No brinksmanship. Americans want and the public deserves total transparency and truth in legislating.

Madam Speaker, despite the fact that in 2009 we know more and understand more about the magnificent world of unborn children than ever before—the fact that these babies move inside the womb and stretch and do somersaults and kick, they wake and sleep, believe it or not—and it is true, they have a waking and sleeping cycle. The fact that beneficial prenatal health care interventions, including microsurgery, can be performed in utero, inside the womb, the fact that these children can feel excruciating physical pain before birth, including the pain deliberately inflicted by abortionists—I would note, parenthetically, that I authored the Unborn Child Pain Awareness Act, which got 250 votes in a bipartisan vote a couple of years ago. And we know for a fact that at least at 20 weeks gestation, unborn children feel excruciating pain up to four times what everyone else after birth feels because the pain receptors are very close to the skin. And we do believe that these children

feel pain even earlier than the 20th week. Despite all of this, President Obama and the Democratic leadership are on a fast track to compel, force, mandate, and coerce public funding for abortions.

Madam Speaker, pro-life Americans want no role or complicity in this assault on the weakest and the most vulnerable. Frankly, Madam Speaker, it is time to face an inconvenient truth—abortion is violence against children, and it exploits and harms women.

There has been study after study that shows that women who procure abortions experience immediate relief followed by very serious psychological and deleterious consequences to them. And the younger they are, it appears, based on the empirical data, the more egregious the pain and suffering and the agony endured by these young women.

New Zealand did a study in 2006, a very comprehensive study, and found that 78.6 percent of the 15- to 18-year-old girls who had abortions displayed symptoms of major depression compared to 31 percent of their peers. Twenty-seven percent of the 21- to 25-year-old women who had abortions had suicidal idealization compared to 8 percent of those who did not have abortions. Abortion hurts women.

I would remind my colleagues that organizations like the Silent No More Campaign, run so admirably and courageously by people like Dr. Alveda King, the niece of Dr. Martin Luther King, a woman who had two abortions and had profound, profound psychological problems from that but now knows reconciliation and hope again, Silent No More is made up exclusively of women who have had abortions. Dr. King has said that her uncle's dream, how does it survive if we murder the children? And then she went on to say the other victim is and always will be the woman.

Time magazine, and others, has finally reported on another little known fact—abortion adversely affects subsequent children born to women who abort. Recent studies have indicated that the risks of preterm birth goes up 36 percent after one abortion, and a staggering 93 percent after two or more abortions. Similarly, the risk of subsequent children being born with low birth weight increases by 36 percent after one abortion and 72 percent after two or more.

The health consequences to subsequent children born to women who abort is deeply troubling and largely unrecognized and underreported upon. Thus, abortion not only kills babies and wounds women, it directly injures subsequent children. And as we all know, prematurity is one of the leading causes of disabilities in children.

As you know better than I, Madam Speaker, Congress will vote as early as Saturday on the health care restructuring bill, H.R. 3962, and it includes highly deceptive policy language that will massively increase the number of