

these reports and support policies that will lead to the development of these valuable resources.

#### VOTE "NO" ON H.R. 3

(Ms. BASS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BASS of California. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3, which the House will vote on later today.

After voting last month to end Medicare, as we know it, for seniors, today the majority is attacking women's reproductive freedom. For the last 3 months, we have watched as the majority party has consistently attacked the right of women to receive comprehensive health care, and today is no different.

H.R. 3 has outrageous provisions that would end comprehensive private health insurance coverage and reduce women's access to abortion care in many ways. H.R. 3 manipulates the Tax Code to restrict access to comprehensive care. The bill raises taxes on individuals and small businesses with insurance plans that cover abortion, forcing them to drop their health insurance plan.

H.R. 3 is an unprecedented attempt to deny access to full reproductive care. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this radical antichoice bill.

#### TAX PENALTIES ON WOMEN'S HEALTH

(Ms. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. RICHARDSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 3. This deceptively titled legislation is nothing more than an assault on women's access to health care.

If enacted, this legislation would severely curtail women's access to reproductive health care services. What would it do? It would impose tax penalties on women. It would narrow the already restrictive areas that the Hyde amendment has dealt with. And further, what I find most alarming, it would attack the coverage for Federal employees, including women who serve in the military. Where is all of our applause now?

The Hyde amendment clearly states that no taxpayer dollars are to be used for abortion care and has narrowly provided exceptions that state for rape, incest, and health complications that arise from pregnancy which would put a mother's life in danger. Are we against that?

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill resoundingly, "no" on H.R. 3.

#### ABORTION COVERAGE

(Mr. PETERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PETERS. The people in Michigan are clear: Our number one priority is jobs. And yet the Republican majority here in Washington is once again ignoring the economy and pushing a bill that raises taxes and attacks women's health care choices. Current law already prohibits Federal funds from covering abortion services, and it has for 30 years. Now Republicans want to stop private insurers from offering coverage, and they want to ban women from purchasing a comprehensive health care plan with their own money.

H.R. 3 is not about taxpayer funding, and it's certainly not about reducing the deficit. It is an extreme plan that will raise taxes on any person or business that buys insurance that includes abortion coverage. That's right, if a small business wants to treat women equally and guarantee them access to legal health care services—paid for with their own money—that business will pay higher taxes.

Do not be fooled by the talk about taxpayer funding. This bill is harmful to women's health. It undermines the right to choose, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill later today.

#### WHEN WILL THE REPUBLICANS WORK ON RESTORING JOBS?

(Mr. HIMES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HIMES. Madam Speaker, I rise this morning with a question, which is: What are we doing? What are we doing here? Like all 434 of my colleagues, I just spent 2 weeks at home listening to my constituents, and I heard one message: Do everything you can. Don't let a second go by. Work to restore jobs in this country. Improve the economy.

And I get down here on Monday, and what did we do this week? We voted in this Chamber to eliminate funding for school-based health centers, funding for kids who don't have any other way to see a doctor. Today, thanks to the Republican majority, we will vote to try to scale back the right of women to have access to reproductive health care. And later on this week, we are going to take up measures that will keep the gravy train flowing to the oil companies, the \$4 billion in our taxpayer money that goes to companies like ExxonMobil, which last week reported \$10 billion in profits. I'm glad ExxonMobil is making money, but you know what? They don't need ours.

So what are we doing? When is the Republican majority going to get serious about the one thing that my constituents care about—jobs?

#### NEW HEALTH INSURANCE TAX

(Ms. SCHAKOWSKY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3.

You know, Republicans say that they are for smaller government, but that ends when it comes to women. In order to curtail women's reproductive rights, it isn't enough to prevent the public dollars from helping poor women end a dangerous or unplanned pregnancy. That's already the law: no public money for abortions. But now they are going to raise taxes on small businesses, telling them that if they offer a health plan for men or women that has the gall to cover abortions—and, by the way, that's about 90 percent of plans that cover all legal procedures—then they can no longer get a tax break for offering such a plan.

Raising taxes on businesses that offer comprehensive health plans, that's the bill that's up today. Now, even private money of individuals, both men and women, and businesses will now face a new tax. So, so much for small government and lower taxes that the Republicans talk about.

□ 1220

#### THE NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION ACT

(Ms. ESHOO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 3, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.

First of all, to imply that taxpayers fund abortions today is a lie. No, not one penny can be spent on abortions because of the Hyde Amendment which passed on September 30, 1976.

What this bill does is to play reproductive roulette with the Tax Code. Under H.R. 3, if someone buys private insurance that includes coverage for abortions, they will be taxed. If someone buys private insurance, using your own money, obviously, that doesn't include coverage for abortions, then they can deduct the cost of the health plan from their taxes. This would turn our tax collection agency into a health care policing agency.

I support a woman's right to opt for or against abortion. The decision is private. It's a matter of faith. It's a matter of conscience, and our Constitution recognizes this.

Make no mistake, this is an attack on women's health and it's a giant step back for the equality we've worked so hard to achieve. This is wrong, this is dangerous, and the House should oppose it.

#### OPPOSING H.R. 3

(Mr. HOLT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, I also rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3.

Our first priorities here in the House of Representatives must be helping foster job creation and supporting middle-

class families. Yet, more than 4 months into this Congress, we have not considered one bill, not one bill that would achieve these goals.

Instead, we have before us today H.R. 3, one of the centerpieces of the Republican agenda, and it would limit the health care choices of women.

Now, even if all it did is what the name implies, to prohibit Federal subsidies for abortion, it would be redundant, unnecessary and misguided. But it's much worse than that. In truth, it's an unprecedented and extreme attempt to limit health insurance coverage for American women, to raise taxes on small businesses, to infringe on the legally protected right of American servicewomen, to make this legal, constitutionally protected medical procedure inaccessible to women.

I oppose H.R. 3, and urge my colleagues to vote "no." And I urge the majority to get to work helping Americans to get to work.

#### VOTE "NO" ON H.R. 3

(Mr. FARR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FARR. Madam Speaker, it appears that there are some in this body who believe that if you state a falsehood often enough people will believe that it's the truth. That's what the bill before us is all about. It's an attempt to legislate something that isn't.

The proponents of H.R. 3 want you to believe that abortion is rampant in America, and we spend zillions of Federal dollars a year, and this bill will stop the use of those Federal funds. This is a crock of baloney.

Everyone in this House knows that Federal funds are not spent on abortions. It's been the law of this land for the last 35 years. H.R. 3 will have no effect, zero, nada, on the use of Federal funds for abortion services in America because it's the law under which we are already operating.

But what H.R. 3 will do is drastically codify an untruth. It will reach into the pockets of women and prevent them from using their own money, their own private money, on purchasing health care insurance which covers abortion services.

This is a mass intrusion into the private lives of people and to businesses. It should be defeated.

#### ASSAULT ON WOMEN'S HEALTH

(Mrs. LOWEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. LOWEY. Later today, the House will continue its extreme assault on women's health. H.R. 3 would prevent small businesses and families from receiving tax credits for private insurance coverage that includes safe and legal health procedures; allow hospitals to deny lifesaving care to women; if audited, potentially require

victims to prove to the IRS agents they were raped.

Most troubling, in the report accompanying the bill, radical Republicans want to limit the exception for rape victims who can access full legal health services to only forcible rape victims.

This bill to limit women's health services is a shameful distraction from the public's top priority, creating jobs.

#### BIG OIL WELFARE REPEAL ACT

(Mr. YARMUTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Speaker, with gas prices in my district in Louisville, Kentucky hitting \$4, as they are all over the country, ExxonMobil just reported earnings of \$10.7 billion for the quarter, almost 70 percent higher than last year. BP, Conoco, Shell, and Chevron already reported huge increases in profits. And we are still giving them taxpayer-financed subsidies.

Last week, the chairman of the Budget Committee said he thinks we ought to do away with these subsidies. And yet, he and the rest of the Republican majority are pushing a budget that not only sustains those giveaways to oil companies, but also would lower taxes for billionaires, all at the expense of our seniors, our students and our struggling families who are paying that \$4 a gallon all over the country.

We ought to do away with these subsidies, and the Democrats have introduced the Big Oil Welfare Repeal Act to do just that. If we are serious about deficit reduction and equity in this country and fairness, we will pass the Big Oil Welfare Repeal Act, and we will help to begin to return this country to having an economy that works for everybody, and not just for ExxonMobil.

#### THE NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION ACT

(Mr. HINCHEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HINCHEY. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3, which has nothing to do with taxpayer funding of abortion. Right or wrong, Federal funding for abortion hasn't been allowed for more than 3 decades.

Instead, H.R. 3 has everything to do with infringing on the constitutionally protected right to an abortion that has been the law of the land for 38 years.

For years we've been listening to Republicans call for smaller government, less regulation, fewer taxes. But this bill represents the opposite of these values. It's more regulation on business, more regulation on health care decisions that should be left up to women and their doctors. It's more taxes on small business, more taxes on women. And it's more control by anti-choice extremists in Washington.

Finally, this bill isn't about job creation either. Instead, it's about bring-

ing up divisive legislation that has no hope of becoming law in order to divide and distract the American people.

It's been 4 months, and still the new majority here hasn't brought a serious bill about job creation to this floor for a vote. It's time to get back to the work of putting Americans back to work. Let's do that.

#### NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION ACT

Mr. NUGENT. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 237 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 237

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3) to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions and to provide for conscience protections, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. NUGENT. For the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NUGENT. House Resolution 237 provides for a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 3. The rule provides for ample debate on this bill and gives Members of both the minority and the majority the opportunity to participate in the debate.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying