

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-