

The same thing has happened in regard to Medicaid. And it's really sad what we have done to the American people, and especially to the poor and the lower-income and the working people of this country in these two programs. And if we don't—if we aren't very careful, and if we don't put many free market and free enterprise-type measures and reforms into these bills, then these costs are going to explode, and the poor and the lower-income people and the middle income people are going to be hurt even more by programs that are, as I say, the "tyranny of good intentions."

□ 1930

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

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

AMERICA'S DEALERSHIPS NEED A MIRACLE

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

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, in less than 48 hours the doors of hundreds of GMC dealers across the Nation and Chevy dealers will be closed. General Motors, now a State-owned enterprise with 60 percent of the stock belonging to the American people and with the directors appointed by the Auto Task Force, capriciously, willfully, unjustly sent out letters to so many of their GM dealers terminating their dealerships at end of this week, dealers who had been asked, in many cases, a few years before to invest millions of dollars of their own in order to promote the GM brand and dealers whose families go back three and four generations, some 85 to 90 years of continuous ownership of service to the community, and their doors will be shut by GM as a result of a letter. And the letter has completely changed the rules as to why they should stay open.

Dealerships that are profitable, dealerships that add to the community, dealerships that pump billions of dollars into State and local sales tax coffers, closed by a letter, without explanation. How outrageous. So outrageous that the majority leader of the House of Representatives, STENY HOYER, whom I joined in a press conference just a few hours ago, made these statements:

"Two Sundays ago, I was on a telephone call with the folks at the White House who are helping to make our policy with respect to this, and I asked them this: 'What money does it save the manufacturer, General Motors or Chrysler, if you shut down the dealership?' The answer: Zero, zero, zero."

This is the official answer from the Auto Task Force to the majority lead-

er of the United States House of Representatives.

We sent letters to General Motors, we sent letters to the Auto Task Force, and all we get is silence. The destruction of a family business after 90 years does not deserve silence in America. It deserves the outrage of America saying, How dare you close down these dealerships when it cost you no money to keep them open?

We asked General Motors and Chrysler, tell us the reasons why you're doing it. And do you know what they say? It's to lessen competition. That means Americans have less choice. That means prices get higher. And isn't it ironic that the American taxpayer, who has paid \$60 billion to keep open these companies, now will see his local dealership closed because the guys at GM want to lessen competition. What's good for General Motors isn't good for America today.

A bill introduced by several Marylanders, including CHRIS VAN HOLLEN and FRANK KRATOVIL, H.R. 2743, solves the problem. We need that bill to pass by some miracle before Friday.

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 Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas 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 California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. McCLINTOCK 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 Utah (Mr. BISHOP) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BISHOP of Utah 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 Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PAULSEN 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 Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GOHMERT 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 Georgia (Mr. BROUN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

PRO-LIFE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. SCHMIDT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to shine the light on a subject where I do not believe this administration's actions are living up to its rhetoric. Whether it was said on the campaign trail or in speeches during his time in office, the President has certainly tried to sound reasonable on the issue of life, but the administration's actions belie its words.

During a campaign appearance at the Saddleback Civil Forum with Pastor Rick Warren on August 17, 2008, then-candidate Barack Obama made clear that his goal was to "reduce the number of abortions." In fact, he said that he had inserted this into the Democratic Party platform: "How do we reduce the number of abortions?"

Now, given the administration's expressed support for Roe v. Wade, I never expected, nor do not expect it, to suddenly reverse its course. However, one way to reduce the number of abortions in a way that works and one that is a common-ground issue for the American people is not to allow taxpayer-funded abortions. Violating the consciousness of millions of pro-life Americans to fund a procedure which they object to based on a deeply held religious belief, a moral belief, by allowing taxpayers to fund abortions actually increases the number of abortions performed, according to the Guttmacher Institute through research on Planned Parenthood.

Honoring the deeply held religious and moral beliefs of millions of taxpayers by restricting taxpayer-funded abortions actually decreases abortions by about 30 percent. So that is one way to reduce the number of abortions, something that the President has said he would like to do. But since taking office, this administration has actually worked to increase taxpayer funding for abortions at both home and abroad. The first was the Mexico City Policy.

The Mexico City Policy was first promulgated in 1984 and renewed by the Bush administration in 2001. This is a very simple policy that says, as a condition for receipt of U.S. family planning aid, foreign, nongovernmental organizations and international organizations must certify that they neither perform nor actively promote abortion as a method of family planning. Simply

put. This policy says that U.S. taxpayers will not pay to promote abortions overseas, yet one of this administration's first acts back in January was to rescind this Mexico City Policy.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to defer here because I have a gentlelady from the other side of the aisle, Congresswoman DAHLKEMPER, who would like to speak out about this issue, and I would like to give part of my time, as much time as the gentlelady needs, on this issue.

Thank you very much for joining me tonight.

Mrs. DAHLKEMPER. I thank the gentlelady from Ohio for yielding. And I want to extend a thank you for inviting me to have this opportunity tonight to speak on the floor about the issue of life, an issue that is very important to me.

I believe in the sanctity of life from birth to natural death. In fact, I often like to refer to myself as a person who is "whole life" in my beliefs.

This issue of abortion is very personal for me. When I was 21 and I was in college, I found myself unmarried and pregnant, and it was obviously a very difficult time of my life. There was a lot of soul searching that went on, a lot of praying. I had the support of friends and family, but I struggled; I struggled with the thought of telling my parents, and I struggled with the social stigma and the fact that I may have to drop out of school, and also the fact that I would have to be a single parent. But I knew that there was a life inside of me, a living person. And little did I know at that very early stage the joy and the beauty that that child would bring into my life. Today I have an absolutely gorgeous 30-year-old son who is married, and he made me a grandmother just a little over 2 months ago with a beautiful daughter named Charlotte. She is obviously the joy of his life right now, and certainly the joy of her grandfather and my life, too. But that's why I feel so strongly about this important issue of choosing life, an issue where there is a general consensus among American people—in fact, a recent poll shows that a majority of Americans believe in at least some restrictions on abortions, and they certainly do not support their taxpayer dollars going to fund abortion. In fact, a May 15 Gallup poll shows that this practice is opposed by 75 percent of the American people.

Now, I came to Congress just a short 5½ months ago, but I came to this Chamber to represent the American people and my constituents. Therefore, I do not believe that we should be using taxpayer dollars, hard-earned taxpayer dollars for something that faces such widespread opposition.

That being said, it is equally important that we provide the support that is required to bring that child into this world; only then are we going to be able to prevent the root cause of abortion in America and, actually, throughout this world. So I would like us to use our taxpayer dollars not to fund

abortions, but to use this money for the moms and for the babies for health care and other services that they need.

I was really proud during my first few weeks here in Washington, in this Chamber, to vote for SCHIP. This legislation provides critical health services for our Nation's babies, and just as importantly, it provides crucial assistance for pregnant moms as well, the first time that we've done that in this country. What a blessing it is that we are finally taking care of our brand new precious babies and providing support for moms too.

I strongly supported this bill because of another personal story that I have. When my second child was being born, when I was pregnant with number two, Gretchen, we changed jobs in the middle of the pregnancy. My husband was carrying the health insurance through his job, and we had a new health care provider. All of a sudden, I had a pre-existing condition, and that pre-existing condition was my pregnancy. And that child was born without myself having any health care coverage. Luckily, I had a very noneventful natural birth, but you still have to go to a doctor and make sure that your child's needs and your needs are taken care of. I would just like to say that a child is not a preexisting condition; a child is precious, and a life that we need to be taking care of.

So as we go forward here in Congress and we take up health care reform, we must address this issue of pre-existing conditions that too often keep mothers, fathers, and children from the care that they need. But the first step is stopping the practice of spending taxpayer dollars to fund abortion.

Once again, I want to thank you so much for the opportunity to speak on the floor tonight about an issue that is very personal for me and for millions of families across this country. And I ask all of my colleagues from both sides to join me in making the whole life of the child a priority, beginning at conception. This begins with steering taxpayers' hard-earned dollars away from providing abortions and towards health care and the other critical services for our children, as well as our moms and dads.

I want to thank the gentlelady, and I yield back.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Thank you very much. And I would just like to say to the gentlelady, we have so much in common, even though we represent different sides of the aisle, and one is the fact that we have the joy of being grandparents. I think one of the things that we learn often in life is that, while your children bring you tremendous joy, the joy cannot even be realized until you have that grandchild.

Mrs. DAHLKEMPER. Will the gentlelady yield?

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Absolutely.

Mrs. DAHLKEMPER. I just have to tell of another joy. My second grandchild was born just 2 weeks ago today, and I was there for that birth.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Congratulations. Well, the gentlelady has me beat by one, but I only have one child, so—

Mrs. DAHLKEMPER. I yield back and thank the gentlelady.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Well, God bless you and your family. Thank you so much.

While we are on this subject of taxpayer abortions, I would like to recognize another gentlelady from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX). I will extend as much time as you need on this very sensitive and important subject.

Ms. FOXX. Well, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio for being the leader of this Special Order tonight. And I want to thank the gentlelady from Pennsylvania for her pro-life statement and for sharing her experience with us. We are all blessed by her statement, we are all blessed by her being here. She and I and the gentlelady from Ohio are regular attendees at our weekly prayer breakfast, and I can say that it is a blessing to have that opportunity. And it just would make us all so much happier if more people in her caucus felt the way that she does on this issue.

You know, over the past several months, the Obama administration has begun to erode the pro-life protections in place to keep taxpayer dollars from paying for abortions. We know and have known for a long time that the majority of the American people do not want to see taxpayer money used for abortions, but we even know now that the majority of the American people are opposed to abortions.

I think the Obama administration is going in absolutely the wrong direction on this issue, as it is on many other issues. But they began with the repeal of the Mexico City Policy, which restricted taxpayer money from funding groups providing abortions overseas. This is something that had been in effect for many, many years.

□ 1945

Now, what they want to do is bring taxpayer-funded abortions back to Washington, D.C., by changing the so-called Dornan amendment, which restricts publicly funded abortions in the District of Columbia.

The District of Columbia has one of the most troubling track records in the Nation when it comes to its abortion policies. Not only is the District of Columbia part of a notorious group that allows minors to receive abortions, only the District of Columbia and three States have such laws, but it also has one of the highest abortion rates in the country. It is no secret that the District of Columbia's lax abortion policies draw women to D.C. abortion clinics from other States. Repealing the Dornan amendment would mean allowing D.C. to use tax dollars to foot the bill for abortions for minors and potentially for minors from other States.

It is a real travesty when most of our children cannot get any kind of treatment from a physician. They can't get a shot. They can't get a preventative shot. They can't get any treatment.

They couldn't be sewn up in a hospital if they are hurt or at school without permission from their parents. However, the District of Columbia allows these minors to get an abortion, to kill a human life. And, again, polls have shown that a majority of Americans do not support taxpayer-funded abortion.

We must preserve the Dornan amendment and keep hardworking Americans' tax dollars from paying for abortions, a practice that violates the conscience of millions of pro-life Americans.

We also know that taxpayer-funded abortions increase the number of abortions done because the research has been done on that.

But I, again, applaud my colleague from Ohio for leading this Special Order tonight. And I want to say that I share Congresswoman DAHLKEMPER's philosophy, that I support life from conception to natural death, and I think that a society that devalues the unborn will soon devalue those who are born, and I do not want to see our country going down that slippery slope because it would not be good for us.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. I want to thank the gentlewoman for her kind words on this very important issue.

Before I turn this over to another gentleperson regarding this issue, I would like to explain to the Speaker one of the situations that we're talking about is the potential funding of abortions for the District of Columbia. And one of the things that I think we might forget is that article I of the U.S. Constitution says that Congress holds complete legislative authority over the District of Columbia, exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever. That is why the entire budget for the District of Columbia, including revenue generated by local sources, must be appropriated by Congress through an annual appropriations bill.

For many years, the annual D.C. appropriations bill contained a provision to prevent the use of any congressionally appropriated funds for the abortions except to save the life of a mother or in the case of rape or incest. This was the so-called Dornan amendment, named after Congressman Dornan, for the fiscal year 1989 appropriations bill that he talked about in 1988. This bill has been in place pretty much consistently over that time. The White House budget document released on May 7, appendix page 1209, asks Congress to repeal the ban on congressionally appropriated funds and replace it with a bookkeeping requirement that would apply only to funds specifically contributed for Federal program purposes.

Now, what I want to point out is this: that while the Dornan amendment was officially put in place in 1989 and was there until 1993, for a few years under the Clinton administration it was relaxed, and what happened during that time was that the funding for abortions in the District of Columbia continued and those funds for abortions actually increased the number of abortions in

the District of Columbia. And the way they did it was, according to then Mayor Sharon Pratt Kelly, they authorized the use of a million dollars from the Medical Charities Fund, which was originally set up to help indigent AIDS patients to pay for those abortions. So back during the Clinton administration when the Dornan amendment was relaxed, specifically prohibiting any money both directly and indirectly into the District of Columbia that was Federal money for the purpose of abortions, when that was relaxed, not only did the number of abortions go up, but they used an alternate funding to actually pay for those abortions. And that's really the focus of what we're talking about tonight.

And before I go back through my history of this new administration since taking office in January, I do want to turn it over to my good colleague from Minnesota, Congresswoman BACHMANN.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I want to thank the gentlewoman from Ohio, Congresswoman JEAN SCHMIDT. She is the head of the Women's Pro-Life Caucus, and she has done such a remarkable job for us. There aren't that many women who are pro-life women here in the United States Congress, and JEAN has done a wonderful job taking that effort forward.

Thank you, JEAN, for hosting the hour this evening, and I appreciate the honor of being with you and Ms. FOXX and with my colleagues this evening to be able to address this important issue.

I come here tonight as a female Member of Congress, as a strong pro-life Member of Congress, and also as a mother. I have been gifted to be able to bear five children, and I'm grateful for that honor, grateful to have known what it's like to be able to hold a little baby and be able to know what it's like to carry a little baby to full term. It is a thrill. It is a blessing.

And I know for many women across America, they've made decisions in their lives regarding abortion that have affected them, that have affected them for good and for not so good. And for women who are abortion-minded, who have made that decision to abort their baby, they know what I'm talking about. They have made a decision that has radically altered their life. And whether that's a memory that they've tried to put under the carpet or whether it's a memory they are still dealing with, they know in the center and in the core of their being that something huge happened when they made that decision.

And I don't stand here this evening, Mr. Speaker, condemning any women that have made that decision. To the contrary, what I am saying is that there is a way out for women who have made that decision. They can find peace. They can find forgiveness.

But we also want to tell the truth about abortion. We want to tell the truth, that it leaves a gaping hole in the soul of a woman when she makes that decision.

Many women are pressured to make that decision, pressured by a boyfriend who tells them they'll leave the woman if they don't make the decision, pressured by parents who are embarrassed or who don't want their daughter to have to deal with a baby or maybe who themselves don't want to deal with a grandchild that they're just not quite prepared to deal with. And I think part of the message that we want to give tonight is that there are alternatives. There are positive alternatives for women and for men who find themselves in that situation.

There are loving alternative pregnancy centers in nearly every community in the United States who will offer free pregnancy testing, who will offer free sonograms or ultrasounds so that you can hear your baby's heartbeat and see your baby on a screen and make that decision. And I think what we're trying to let a lot of American women know across this country this evening is that choosing life is probably one of the most gratifying decisions any woman, any man can make. We want to let them know they're not alone.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Reclaiming my time, I've been to a number of these wonderful pregnancy care centers in my own district, and it's not just offering them the opportunity of a free sonogram, but it's also offering them the opportunity to really help them, not just with their pregnancy but with the delivery and the carrying of that child. And these centers have programs to help educate the moms and the dads on good parenting skills, something that all of us can benefit from. They also work to give them a points program so, as they go through each one of their phases of education, they can earn points so that they can have a free bed, a free bassinet, free clothing, free food. It is a wonderful experience for these young women and these young men, and it really makes them better parents not just for that baby but for future babies, and it builds a stronger relationship in many cases between that mother and that father.

So it's not just pregnancy centers that want these women to have their child but pregnancy centers that reach out and help that woman and the dad with that child, not just through its birth but through the process of its natural life. And at least the ones in my district open their arms to that, and toward the end of all of the pregnancy centers, I really salute them because they're doing a great job.

I yield.

Mrs. BACHMANN. You're absolutely right, Congresswoman SCHMIDT. They are all across America and they are doing a fabulous job. They do it on very little money. They aren't receiving money from the Federal Government the same way that Planned Parenthood does. Planned Parenthood receives well over \$300 million a year in grants from the Federal taxpayer. We don't see that for these pro-life centers. And these are centers who people give donations to.

And for women who find themselves in a situation where they're torn, trying to figure out what they should do about this unplanned pregnancy, Mrs. SCHMIDT is exactly right, because they offer not only just the sonogram and just a pregnancy test, but they offer clothes if you need maternity clothes. They offer baby clothes. They offer a little bassinet. They might offer a stroller, a little baby carrier, free diapers. They are there to help women at their most vulnerable time.

And you will find in a Planned Parenthood that a woman walks in and they say that they're full service, but there is actually only one option usually when you go into Planned Parenthood, and that's to end the life of that little baby. And what the pro-life centers try to do is offer women life-giving choices and to let them know they can keep their dignity. Whether they choose to keep their baby or not, they can keep their dignity, but they can give the greatest gift they can ever give, and that's that they give the gift of life to the next generation. It's one of the most beautiful decisions than can ever be made.

You've had the pleasure of being a mother. I've had the pleasure of being a mother, and it is truly one of the greatest treasures anyone can ever have, to be entrusted with giving life to the next generation.

So I think as we start this discussion on abortion, on what it means, and there are a lot of opinions on either side, but one thing we have seen that has occurred recently, the American people, for the first time, the public opinions show that over 51 percent of Americans claim they are pro-life. This is one of the highest ratings we've ever seen. Part of that, I think, is because of science, because science shows us the human development of the unborn child. And the more that we learn about the unborn child, the fascination, the intricacy, the beauty of the unborn child, the more we embrace giving life to this beautiful treasure and to this beautiful gift.

And that brings us to our subject this evening, dealing with D.C., and there are a few things I wanted to mention in my remarks. The taxpayer funding of abortion also increases the number of abortions. So when we put tax money into the equation, we'll get more abortions. And it makes sense. It's practical. And that's according to the Alan Guttmacher Institute, which is the research arm of Planned Parenthood.

The Guttmacher Institute also routinely reports showing that when public funding is not available, 30 percent fewer women who receive Medicaid have abortions. Now, this is interesting because it means 30 percent more babies whose mothers receive government-subsidized health care survive because of abortion-funding restrictions. And this is, I think, particularly important for women and men in the African American communities, in the Latino communities. In communities

of color, we see a very high percentage of abortions. And I know one of our colleagues, Congressman TRENT FRANKS, speaks about this often. He has a tremendous heart, as we do as well, for unborn children in the minority community because such a grossly high percentage of babies in the African American/Latino community are aborted, and we don't want to see that.

□ 2000

These babies add to the richness of the American fabric just as Caucasian babies do. All babies are valuable, but what we're seeing is an even higher percentage of babies who are losing their lives in the minority community. In particular, we see this with minorities as they access Medicaid funding. If they have Medicaid funding, government funding, we'll see more abortions, and we'll see that particularly in the minority communities.

This is a common-ground issue, I think, that we can share with those who embrace a pro-abortion view and with those who embrace a pro-life view because the polls have shown very clearly that the majority of Americans do not support taxpayer-funded abortion. They don't support it. We are here to represent the will and the interests of the American people. That's not where the American people are right now. They don't want to see us spending their money when we don't have much, when this government is in the red—in red ink up to our eyeballs. We don't have money to pay for the intentional murder of unborn children.

The Obama budget changes this Dornan amendment, as my colleague Mrs. SCHMIDT has said, to the Financial Services' appropriations bill, so the publicly funded abortions will, once again, be available in the District of Columbia. Right here where we stand this evening, this is the District of Columbia. So now, once again, President Obama is expanding abortion. Instead of making it rare, instead of making it safer, this is making more abortions, particularly for pre-born babies of color.

The District of Columbia has a record of abusing taxpayer funds for abortion. It's bad news, but it's true news. In the 80s when the District had the most permissive abortion funding policy in this country, abortions were funded for anyone, not just for Medicaid recipients.

Elizabeth Reveal was the D.C. budget director at the time. She confirmed that the District's government has a policy of funding abortion on demand and does not attempt to determine the circumstances of the pregnancy. D.C. allows minors—that's children—to receive abortion services without the consent of their parents.

So imagine that. Here in D.C., children can receive abortions without their parents' consent, which means that the American taxpayer will be funding abortions, paying for them for children, and minors could easily be

brought in from other States. Remember, D.C. is only about 10 miles square, so minors could be transported across State lines and brought to D.C. from other States to have abortions paid for by the American taxpayer right here in Washington, D.C. to avoid the parental notification laws in their home States. That's according to the Alan Guttmacher Institute. According to Planned Parenthood, they don't have accurate numbers on abortions in D.C. due to women from other States coming to D.C. for abortions.

There are problems here with this, deep problems with this measure. That's why we had the Dornan amendment. It made sense. It was only reasonable. So, unfortunately, under the Obama administration, we are taking the Band-Aid off this problem and are exposing it to even more infection. The infection is more money, and we know that more money will lead to more abortions and particularly to more abortions for babies of color.

This is really a sad story. We don't want to just talk about sad stories, because life is such a wonderful story. We would love to just be here this evening and talk about the positive story of life—and it's a beautiful story—but this is a really ugly story because it's about expanding more abortion; it's about more misery for women who are forced into abortions often against their will, who are given incomplete and inadequate information and who may be headed for a lifetime of addiction, depression or of a sense of loss and grief that they may have to deal with for 10, 15, 20 years. We don't want this to happen. We want women to be dignified. We don't want women to be brutalized. That's why we're here this evening, because we really believe in women, and we believe in women's choices and in empowering women. This doesn't empower women to put them in a situation where they're forced to do something quite often by pressure from boyfriends who are careless or from parents who don't want to be bothered.

So I just want to, again, thank Representative JEAN SCHMIDT. She has a heart of love. She has a heart of love on this issue. With her courage and with her dignity, she has brought together this group of men and women here on the House floor this evening who believe very strongly that American women will be hurt by this bill. Certainly, American children will be hurt by this bill.

I thank you for your courage in bringing this forward this evening.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Thank you so much, my good friend from Minnesota.

I just want to add that, while the whole issue is a very emotional issue, one of the things that really disturbs me in the whole abortion debate is when minors have abortions without parental consent, because when a minor has an abortion, that means that child has gotten into a family situation, and they're under age. In many

States, that's considered statutory rape. In some cases, including in my own district, at Planned Parenthood, which technically is in District One but is in my own community, there are two lawsuits right now with regard to underage children who had abortions, and their parents were not adequately notified about it. So the whole issue of parental notification on anything—on a child's taking an aspirin—is critical.

Back in the 80s, we know that the District of Columbia was very open about abortions. It let folks from other States have abortions. It let minors without parental consent have abortions. I don't think we want to expand on that policy today.

I really want to turn this over right now to my good friend, the head of our Values Action Team, the good Congressman, Mr. PITTS.

Congressman PITTS, would you please give us your words of advice and encouragement on this issue.

Mr. PITTS. Thank you, Jean. I really want to commend the lady from Ohio for her leadership and for the Pro-Life Women's Caucus for having this Special Order.

You know, there are really no more eloquent voices for women and children than pro-life women. You're not only eloquent; you're elegant. I want to thank you for your wonderful statements on the issue of life and of women and of the unborn child.

Abortion is an exploitation of women and children. I remember hearing a few years ago the President of Feminists for Life, Frederica Mathewes-Green, when she spoke to the Congressional Life Forum. She said abortion breaks a woman's heart. She said there are always two victims with an abortion. One is the baby. The other is the mother. One is dead. One is wounded. We should keep that in mind as we talk about this issue.

I am very sad to see this administration act so quickly in going towards promoting abortion policies. Three days after the President was inaugurated, on Friday evening at about 5:30, he issued an order overturning the Mexico City Policy. Mexico City was started by President Reagan, and it has been in our policy for many years. He overturned Mexico City. By eliminating the Mexico City Policy, what that does is permits all of the family planning funds that go to international organizations to go to organizations that promote and provide abortions. He has given them that money. Not only did he overturn Mexico City, but in the omnibus bill, he raised the amount of money this year to \$545 million to go to these international organizations that promote and provide abortions. It's a tragedy. He is becoming known by many in the pro-life community as the "abortion President." It's very unfortunate. It's very sad.

The next thing he did shortly after that was to issue an executive order overturning the Federal ban that President Bush had put on the stem

cell policies, expanding the use of taxpayer funds for the use of destroying embryos so that they could harvest the stem cells and use them for experimentation. Not only did he do that, but he issued an order to discourage adult stem cell research. Now, we all know, having followed this for many years, that for the last 25 years, they've done research on mice and, for the last 12 or 13 years, on humans. The only thing that has worked as far as treating humans are adult stem cells. There are something like 73 successful treatments and several protocols using adult stem cells, but there is nothing using embryonic stem cells, which kills the tiniest of human beings, the human embryo.

Then he proposed a rule shortly after that to remove the critical regulations that were put in place to protect the right of conscience of health care workers so that now health care workers—doctors, nurses, those in health care—can be compelled against their consciences to provide abortion services, which are referrals and providing abortion services. This is another promotion, if you will, of abortion.

Then, in the omnibus bill, they removed the provisions that would have prevented funds from going to the UNFPA—the groups in China that promote abortion and that force abortion and sterilization. They now are eligible to get those funds for that practice.

I remember a few weeks ago that Harry Wu, the great human rights activist from China, who spent 19 years in their laogai, in the gulag there, presented testimony before the Human Rights Caucus. He said, in China, having a baby is not a human right. He said, if you have a second pregnancy, they will forcibly abort that woman. They will forcibly sterilize her. They will find her and tear down her house and sometimes imprison her. We are putting taxpayer funds into organizations that promote and provide that kind of service in China? It is really a terrible thing that American taxpayers, who have consciences against their funds being used for these things, are now seeing this administration open the floodgates for these kinds of provisions in our country and around the world.

Now, in this budget, in the Obama budget, he has included a loophole that will allow taxpayer funds for abortions in the District of Columbia.

The best way to reduce abortion is to limit taxpayer funding for abortion. There has been a lot of talk about abortion reduction, and the one thing that everyone seems to agree on is that public funding for abortion increases the number of unborn babies lost to abortion. Even the Alan Guttmacher Institute, the arm of Planned Parenthood, routinely issues reports showing that, when public funding is not available, 30 percent fewer women in the covered population have abortions. That means 30 percent of babies whose mothers receive government-subsidized

health care survive because of an abortion funding restriction. So undermining commonsense policies like the restriction on taxpayer funding for abortion flies in the face of the President's claims that he is working to reduce abortion in America. It is very unfortunate.

I just want to commend the pro-life women for this Special Order tonight. They have an understanding like no one else on this issue, and it is so heartening to hear their eloquent testimony and their voices on behalf of women and children here in our country and around the world. So thank you. Thanks to the gentle lady for inviting me down. I really commend you for your Special Order tonight.

□ 2015

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Thank you so much for sharing some moments with us and for all that you do with the Values Action Team to keep us alerted to issues that are pertinent to all in the United States.

When I started this a few moments ago, I was talking a little bit about the new administration and the new President and matching his words with his actions. And I would like to go back a second because I have a transcript from the Saddleback forum, which was back in August of 2008, and I got this off of CNN. And I just want to read you a couple of paragraphs so that, Madam Speaker, you understand that I am not taking what then-candidate Obama and now President Obama has said. I really want to give you the full text.

And so Pastor Warren, after asking then-candidate Obama about his views on religion, Pastor Warren said, Let's go through some tough questions, tough ones. Then-candidate Obama said, I thought that was pretty tough. And Pastor Warren said, Well, that was a freebie. That was a freebie. That's a gimme, okay? Now let's deal with abortion. Forty million abortions since Roe v. Wade. As a pastor, I've had to deal with this all the time, all of the pain and all of the conflicts. And I know this is a very complex issue, 40 million abortions. At what point does a baby get human rights in your view?

Then-candidate Obama said, Well you know, I think that whether you're looking at it from a theological perspective or a scientific perspective, answering that question with specificity, you know, is above my pay grade.

Pastor Warren: But have you—

Then-candidate Obama: But let me speak more generally about the issue of abortion because this is something obviously this country wrestles with. One thing that I am absolutely convinced of is that there are moral and ethical elements to this issue. And so I think anybody who tries to deny the moral difficulties and the gravity of the abortion issue I think is not paying attention. So that would be point number one.

But point number two, I am pro-choice. I believe in Roe v. Wade, and I

come to that conclusion not because I am pro-abortion but because ultimately, I don't think women make these decisions casually. I think they, they wrestle with these things in profound ways in consultation with their pastors or their spouses or their doctors or their family members. And so this for me, the goal right now should be, and this is where I think we can find common ground—and by the way, I have now inserted this into the Democratic Party platform—is, how do we reduce the number of abortions?

The fact is that although we have had a President who was opposed to abortion over the last 8 years, abortions have not gone down, and that is something that we have to address.

Pastor Warren: Have you ever voted to limit or reduce abortions?

Then-candidate Obama: I'm in favor, for example, on limits on late-term abortions if there is an exception for the mother's health. From the perspective of those who are pro-life, I think they would consider that inadequate, and I respect their views. One thing that I've always said is that on this particular issue, if you believe that life begins at conception, then—and you are consistent in that belief, then I can't argue with you on that because that is the core of the faith for you.

Madam Speaker, I would like to repeat that because I'm going to be coming back to that in a few minutes.

Then-candidate Obama said, If you believe that life begins at conception, then—and you are consistent in that belief—then I can't argue with you on that because that is a core issue of faith for you. What I can say, what I can and do say, there are ways we can work together to reduce the number of unwanted pregnancies so that we actually are reducing the sense that women are seeking abortions. And as an example of that, one of the things that I've talked about is how do we provide the resources that allow women to make the choice to keep a child. You know, have we given them health care that they need? Have we given them the supportive services that they need? Have we given them the options of adoption that are necessary? That can make a genuine difference.

When I began this, I talked about the fact that the President, when he was running for office, spoke of a concept of abortion where we would actually reduce the number of abortions, and yet as soon as he took office, he seemed to reverse that policy.

As many of my colleagues demonstrated tonight, just days after taking office, the first thing that this President did was reverse the Mexico City Policy. And that policy, again, simply says that U.S. taxpayer dollars will not promote abortions overseas and that any NGO and any governmental agency or non-governmental agency overseas cannot use that money to promote abortions that they receive from the United States.

But if this was not enough, today Congress considered a bill that would

establish in the State Department the Office of Global Women's Issues. And one of those purposes of that Global Office on Women's Issues is to promote abortions overseas.

So as the President stated when he was running for office, he wanted to reduce the number of abortions, he put it in the platform of the Democratic Party. He said that if you're consistent in your beliefs that life begins at conception, that this should be recognized.

One of the things that this Congress, in concert with the administration, is doing is rapidly promoting abortions through the use of Federal funds for those abortions.

But it's not just the funding of overseas abortions that is occurring. It's not the only assault on creating a culture of life that we have witnessed both from this administration and this Congress. And it's not the only instance where the administration's rhetoric does not match its actions.

What candidate Obama said about stem cell research at the Saddleback forum, he said, Now, if in fact adult stem cell lines are working just as well, then, of course, we should try to avoid any kind of moral arguments that may be in place.

I've got to repeat that.

Candidate Obama at the time said, Now, if in fact adult stem cell lines are working just as well, then, of course, we should try to avoid any kind of moral arguments that may be in place.

Well, today, adult stem cells have actually been found to be useful in treating a large number of diseases or ailments; embryonic stem cells have not yet been found to effectively treat anything. Yet in March, our President signed an executive order overturning the Bush administration's stem cell research policy.

And the assault on life does not stop there. Nor does the double-talk.

You know, the President recently spoke at Notre Dame, and it was met with some controversy. And in that May speech—I want to read to you the context, the full context of what he said on the issue of abortion.

And he said, Nowhere do these questions come up more powerfully than on the issue of abortion. As I considered the controversy surrounding my visit here, I am reminded of an encounter during my Senate campaign, one that I describe in the book I wrote called "The Audacity of Hope." A few days after I won the Democratic nomination, I received an e-mail from a doctor that told me while he voted for me in the primary, he had a serious concern that might prevent him from voting for me in the general election. He described himself as a Christian who was strongly pro-life, but that's not what was preventing him for voting for me.

What bothered the doctor was an entry that my campaign staff had posted on my Web site, an entry that said I would fight right-wing ideologies who want to take away a woman's right to choose. The doctor said that he had as-

sumed that I was a reasonable person, but that if I truly believe that every pro-life individual was simply an ideologue who wanted to inflict suffering on women, then I was not very reasonable.

He wrote, I do not ask at this point that you oppose abortion, only that you speak about this issue in fair-minded words.

Fair-minded words.

After I read the doctor's letter, I wrote back to him and thanked him. I didn't change my position. But I did tell my staff to change the words on my Web site. And I said a prayer that night that I might extend the same presumption of good faith to others that the doctor had extended to me. Because when we do that, when we open our hearts and our minds to those who may not think like we do or believe what we do, that's when we discover at least the possibility of common ground; that's when we begin to say, Maybe we won't agree on abortion, but we can still agree that this is a heart-wrenching decision for any woman to make, both with moral and spiritual dimensions.

So let's work together to reduce the number of women seeking abortions by reducing unintended pregnancies and making adoption more available and providing care and support for women who do carry their child to term. Let's honor the conscience of those who disagree with abortion and draft a sensible conscience clause and make sure that all of our health care policies are grounded in clear ethics and sound science as well as respect for the equality of women.

I could go on with this speech. But what I want to say is that while speaking at Notre Dame, the President said, Let's honor the conscience of those who disagree with abortion and draft a sensible conscience clause to make sure that our health care policies are grounded in clear ethics and sound evidence.

I didn't take it out of context.

But he actually said this, Madam Speaker, after his administration had rescinded the conscience clause regulations promulgated by the Bush administration. These regulations made it clear that a health care provider who would not have to choose between his or her deeply held moral and religious beliefs and a career. In fact, this is what the President, then-candidate, alluded to at the Saddleback conference that, you know, your conscience should be recognized and your moral ground should be recognized especially if you're consistent with your belief that life begins at conception and ends at natural death. And yet the conscience clause was almost immediately rescinded upon this President's arrival to take office.

Does the gentlelady wish to say something?

Ms. FOXX. I wonder if the gentlewoman would yield.

I appreciate very much what you and our other colleagues have pointed out

tonight in terms of the inconsistencies in the President's position. I also want to thank you for having pointed out the joy of having children. And I want to bring up one more example of what I think is an inconsistency on the part of the President.

He has nominated Dawn Johnsen to head up the Office of Legal Council, and she is among the most controversial of his nominees. She formerly worked for NARAL and the ACLU's Reproduction Freedom Product.

She has compared pregnancy to involuntary servitude, describing pregnant women as "losers in the contraceptive lottery," and she even criticized then-Senator Clinton for claiming a need to keep abortions, traumatic experiences, rare.

She, as I said, has said that she believes that being pregnant or banning abortion undermines the 13th Amendment, which bans slavery. And she says "that there is no 'father' and no 'child'—just a fetus." Any move by the courts to force a woman to have a child amounted to "involuntary servitude." She goes on and on and on to talk about how horrible it is to bear a child.

And I think it is a very sad, sad situation that the President has nominated a woman who has these kinds of beliefs to head up an extremely important position in the administration, the Office of Legal Council. And I wanted to point that out as another inconsistency in the positions that he's taken.

And I yield back.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. I thank you so much for that because consistently since January, the words and the actions have not met the conscience clause, which he clearly took out, and yet said both as a candidate and in subsequent speeches as President that our conscience needs to be recognized and our moral beliefs need to be recognized, especially on this issue. He has really taken that away.

□ 2030

What we now are facing today is the change in the D.C. policy in which we are going to be faced with allowing for the public funding of abortions. Congressman Dornan's amendment prior to FY1989 allowed the District of Columbia to use congressional funds, appropriated funds, something that we have to do because of article I of the Constitution, give the District of Columbia money to operate with. The disconnect between using those funds inadvertently for abortions was shut down by Congressman Dornan's amendment. This was an amendment that has been faithfully in place, except for a few years in the Clinton administration. Now with the President's new budget, he wants to cleverly allow for the District of Columbia to use federally funded money for abortions.

I would now like to turn some time over to my very dear colleague, an individual who has been at the forefront of life issues, not just recognizing the value of a child both inside and outside

the womb, but the value of children all across the world, including his fight for a father to bring his child home from Brazil.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my friend for yielding. As a matter of fact, that's why I was late in getting here. I was working on that very issue.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. You are a great American. Take as much time as you would like.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. JEAN, just very briefly to say to my colleagues tonight, Barack Obama has said he is seeking common ground, and he wants to reduce the number of abortions. Sadly, virtually everything he has done, months to date, as President of the United States has expanded abortions internationally as well as domestically by executive order as well as by his embedding into his administration a virtual who's who of abortion leaders, people from the organizations who are now running agencies of the government of the United States. These are the people who ran the organizations for abortion rights. Now they're there.

The District of Columbia for years has not provided—and our hope is that it will continue not to provide—any funding for abortion, except for rape and incest and life of the mother. That language, as you have pointed out, was crafted by Congressman Bob Dornan; and it was a little game that was played for years. I have been here 29 years, and I will never forget the game that was played. The language would say, no Federal funds can be used to pay for abortion; but they would allow it because we congressionally authorize local funds, so the bottom line was, the net consequence was, abortion on demand unfettered was paid for by public funds, by taxpayers.

Barack Obama keeps saying he wants to reduce abortions. The common ground on reducing abortions is proscribing, prohibiting funding for abortions. The Alan Guttmacher Institute, the research arm of Planned Parenthood, and Planned Parenthood itself continually say that about a third of the abortions don't occur when public financing is not available. So as a result of the Hyde amendment, as a result of an amendment that I offered back in 1983 that proscribed funding under the auspices of the Federal Employees Health Benefits plan, the Dornan amendment on D.C. approps, and all the other amendments have actually permitted, facilitated those children who otherwise would have been aborted because public financing of abortion wasn't there. That's true common ground. Taxpayers don't want to subsidize chemical poisoning and dismemberment of unborn children.

People can talk all they want. The cheap sophistry of choice is that it does not bring into the visibility that it deserves the very active abortion, which is the maiming, ultimately the killing, of an unborn child. This is the year 2009. We know more about the magnificent life of an unborn child

than ever before. Microsurgeries are being done. These unborn children are the littlest patients. They can get blood transfusions. Unfortunately in some hospital rooms and especially in clinics, they are being dismembered; they are being chemically poisoned; and they are being starved to death in the act of abortion, which then is suggested to be a benign act. It is anything but. It is not compassion. It shows no sense of justice; and the public should not be forced, compelled to finance abortion in the District of Columbia or anywhere else.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. I would just like to close, Madam Speaker, by saying this is a very sensitive and important issue. The public has spoken out on the fact that they really do not want Federal funds to be used for abortion. The President, as a candidate, when he took office, and in subsequent speeches, has said he wants to work to reduce the number of abortions. To do that is not to allow for Federal funds. So I would only hope that this administration would match their words with their action.

CREATION OF NEW JOBS THROUGH CLEAN ENERGY TECHNOLOGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. KILROY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, we are truly on the verge of a historic moment. We're moving closer and closer to finally achieving legislation that will put us on the right path towards true energy independence and true environmental protection. Legislation that, at the same time, will grow our economy through clean energy jobs and promote an investment in cutting-edge American technology all while addressing the costly damages to our public health, economy and environment that is coming and will come from a changing climate.

The Republican Party just doesn't seem to get it. They don't seem to understand that the American people know that the cost of inaction is far higher than the cost of action. The same scare tactics and lack of faith in science and in American innovation which lost them the last election won't fool the American people. Madam Speaker, the minority party has chosen to put this debate in oversimplified and disingenuous terms, and that's truly sad. They've decided to call our clean energy future a tax because they don't think the American people can figure out the truth, that endangering our economy, our public health and our environment is what is truly taxing our Nation.

Madam Speaker, what the Republicans are espousing is a tax of inaction. The Republican inaction tax will cost our country many, many middle-class careers. The Republican inaction