

**May 4**

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.

**May 5**

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

Our first priorities in the House of Representatives must be helping to foster job creation and supporting middle class families. More than four months into the 112th Congress, we have not considered one bill that would achieve these goals.

This deceptively named bill claims that it would enact a government-wide prohibition on federal subsidies for abortion and health insurance plans that cover it. In truth it is an unprecedented and extreme attempt to limit health insurance coverage for American women, raise taxes on small businesses, infringe on the legally protected rights of American Servicewomen, and make this legal, constitutionally protected medical procedure inaccessible to women.

This bill would eliminate tax credits for families and small businesses to purchase comprehensive health insurance plans. This would result in substandard health care for millions of Americans.

Unprecedented, H.R. 3 would change the tax code to promote an anti-choice agenda. This bill would allow women to use tax preferred saving accounts for abortion care only in cases of rape, incest, or when their life is in danger. Under this extreme bill, women would have to prove to the IRS that they have been victim of sexual assault to use their own money for their medical care.

This bill triumphs on states' rights by preventing the District of Columbia from using its own funds to pay for abortion services for low-income women. Further, it would permanently deny low-income women, federal employees, and military women access to abortion care, even when their health is at risk.

It is important to remember why comprehensive health care is needed. I recently heard a heartbreaking story from one of my constituents who was desperate to have a baby with her husband. Unfortunately after getting pregnant, they discovered that the fetus had a deadly condition and was not going to survive. They were left with only one choice--to terminate the pregnancy. This couple never thought they would be in that position. This bill would deny private health insurance companies from providing this kind of medical care to women.

The question of whether or not to have an abortion is one of the most difficult decisions any

woman can face. Reproductive health care is a personal matter that should be left to individuals, their doctors, and their families without interference from the government. Rather than making abortion more dangerous for young women, I believe that Congress should do more to create the conditions that enable women to make true choices by providing comprehensive sexuality education and ensuring that women have access to a range of effective contraceptives.

I oppose H.R. 3 and urge my colleagues to vote no on this dangerous piece of legislation.