

in building nutritious meal plans for the nation's school children and increase the price of school meals. In many cases, the proposal would eliminate foods that are both nutritious and popular with children. The school lunch program is intended to feed hungry kids, not pick "good foods" and "bad foods". The new guidelines would limit starchy vegetables—corn, peas and lima beans, in addition to potatoes—to two servings a week. That's about one cup. As a parent, I would like to see more of these vegetables consumed, not less. School nutritionists should be applauded for the work they do in constructing meals that kids love and give them the energy they need to succeed in the classroom.

This rule will cost taxpayers \$6.8 billion over the next ten years. In this current fiscal crisis, our school children and taxpayers cannot afford to adapt to inconsistent, costly and unproven regulations. USDA should revisit its proposal and write a rule that does not put limitations on school nutritionists' choices in how to best feed hungry children or put further economic pressures on food companies that supply schools and the American taxpayer.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF GLEN  
KERSLAKE

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, October 18, 2011*

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, today I honor Mr. Glen Kerslake of Tucson, Arizona, for a lifetime of service to country and community. Mr. Kerslake, who I had the pleasure of meeting in Tucson, is known to me for his close work with our colleague, Congresswoman GABRIELLE GIFFORDS, to support southern Arizona's military members, veterans, and military and veterans' families.

Glen joined the Tucson community in 1994 and quickly developed a record of deep and devoted service to southern Arizona—serving on the boards of the Tucson Arizona Boys Chorus and National Apartment Association, as a member of the Southern Arizona Leadership Council, and as President of the Arizona Conservation Land Stewards, among other community contributions.

Glen made one of his greatest civic impacts serving Tucson's military community and the proud men and women who make it up. He has served as a member, president, and board-member of the Davis-Monthan 50, a committed group of Tucson civic and business leaders dedicated to strengthening the relationship between Davis-Monthan Air Force Base and the civilian population of the region. As a DM-50 member and then president of the organization, Glen helped thousands of airmen through the child car safety seat program, which supplies car seats to young military families, and the development of the important Bachelor of Applied Science in Meteorology program at the University of Arizona. He also made critical contributions to Tucson's Military Community Relations Committee, a local organization dedicated to resolution of key issues between Davis-Monthan Air Force Base and the community.

Recently, Glen was most passionate about his role as the Honorary Commander of the 612th Air and Space Operations Center. Glen

took great pride in the critical nature of the 612th AOC's mission and its heritage springing from the famous Doolittle Raiders of World War II. The Raiders took great risk performing a tactical mission, executed in a joint manner, at a crucial juncture for our nation, ultimately demonstrating the strategic reach of American airpower. The 612th AOC was dedicated the Gen. James H. Doolittle Center in honor of the leader of the Doolittle raid, who was also the first commanding general of 12th Air Force.

I was this heritage and the 612th AOC's unit motto, "Leading the Fight—Ever Vigilant, Omnis Vigilantia," along with an abiding commitment to Davis-Monthan's airmen and women, that inspired Glen's efforts to ensure the unit would remain at Davis-Monthan when its continued existence in Arizona was threatened. Glen sprung into action and worked closely with Congresswoman GIFFORDS' office to lead a diverse group of community and governmental stakeholders to stop the effort to move the 612th AOC's operations.

The Congress and this country owe Glen, his family, and countless community leaders in Glen's mold a debt of gratitude for their selfless and inspired service. Please join Congresswoman GIFFORDS and me today in honoring Mr. Glen Kerslake of Tucson, Arizona.

PROTECT LIFE ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. LAURA RICHARDSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, October 13, 2011*

Ms. RICHARDSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition of H.R. 358, the misnamed "Protect Life Act". At a time when the American people's top priority is job creation, Republicans continue to waste valuable time advancing legislation that has no chance of being signed into law. The real aim of the Protect Life Act is to restrict, if not eliminate all together, reproductive health options for American women. H.R. 358 is a callous piece of legislation that disrespects the judgment of American women.

The Protect Life Act imposes an unprecedented limitation on abortion coverage and takes extreme measures to prevent women from accessing safe and legal abortion services. This legislation even prevents women from using their own money to purchase private insurance coverage for abortion, worse; the bill would relieve hospitals of their obligation to treat women who need an emergency abortion to save their life.

The Affordable Care Act already contains strict safeguards at multiple levels to prevent federal funds from being used to pay for abortion services beyond those in cases of rape, incest or where the life of woman would be in grave and eminent danger. But the Protect Life Act goes further, much further. It is reckless and endangers women's lives.

The Protect Life Act makes it virtually impossible for insurance companies in state health-insurance exchanges to offer abortion coverage, including those paying for coverage entirely with private dollars. The bill also prohibits all individuals who receive federal subsidies from purchasing a plan that includes abortion coverage, as well as barring insurance plans from covering abortion if they in-

clude even one individual who receives a subsidy.

Today, nearly 87 percent of private employer-sponsored insurance offer plans which include abortion coverage. This bill would deter insurance companies from offering plans with such options and would likely force millions of women to drop the coverage they currently have.

Currently, all hospitals in America that receive Medicare or Medicaid funding are bound by the 1986 law known as the Emergency Medical Treatment and Active Labor Act (EMTALA), to provide emergency care to all patients, regardless of the circumstance. Under EMTALA, if a woman required an emergency abortion to save her life and she was a patient at an anti-abortion hospital or being treated by a health care provider against abortion on religious or moral grounds, the hospital would be required to either perform the abortion or transfer the patient.

The Affordable Care Act leaves laws that protect medical providers who have religious or moral objections to abortion services intact. But the Protect Life Act goes even further by removing the obligation for medical providers who are not willing to terminate a pregnancy to facilitate a transfer to a hospital that is willing to save the woman's life.

Madam Speaker, in short, this irresponsible and dangerous legislation would allow a hospital to let a pregnant woman die rather than perform a life-saving procedure. Saving a woman's life should be every hospital's first priority, especially hospitals that receive federal funding.

The Protect Life Act amends the historic Affordable Care Act, which was passed by the Democratic 111th Congress, so that it does not ensure access to abortion services. This broad language could prevent states and state-based health insurance exchanges from ensuring that women get information about the health care coverage options available to them. It should be an ethical healthcare provision that patients be presented with accurate and complete information about their medical options in order to make the best decisions regarding their health care. This bill denies women that fundamental right.

In addition, another provision of the Protect Life Act could allow insurers to refuse to offer important services that are part of the minimum standards for health coverage such as services and supplies related to contraception, infertility and sexually transmitted diseases.

Our friends across the aisle are fond of saying they are against government intrusion into the market place, excessive regulation, and limits on personal freedom. But here they are again trying to deny women the right to choose what is best for themselves and their families. Eliminating access to legal abortions denies women the right to make their own health decisions in accordance with their religious and moral beliefs and as a result, infringes on their equal rights. When it comes to attacking women's freedom and privacy, this legislation knows no bounds. It is an extreme attack against women's reproductive rights and undermines women's access to quality healthcare.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons I am proud to stand in strong opposition of H.R. 358, the