



Unravelling the New World Order

*An Exposé of How Government, Religious, and Financial Insiders
Are Deciding Your Future*

January 2011

What's Ahead in the ObamaCare Repeal Fight? *Government funding for abortion will be a major issue*

By Marilyn M. Brannan, Associate Editor IRN/USA NEWS

On January 19 this year, House Republicans were successful in passing H.R.2—the act that would repeal ObamaCare—by a vote of 245-189. Now we are seeing an all-out propaganda blitz by the Left, attempting to convince Americans that a majority of us now are *opposed* to repeal.

No surprise. President Obama and his supporters will use every means—fair or foul—to keep his “trillion-dollar baby” from going down to defeat. Amid the barrage of distortions and misinformation that will be unleashed in the controlled media, the Republicans will need to implement an aggressive program for getting their own healthcare reform message out to the public.

At this writing, pro-life legislators are now introducing the “No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act” as H.R. 3. The objective of that bill is to prevent federal funding for abortion procedures by codifying the Hyde Amendment, which has long barred federal agencies from paying for abortions.¹

“Most Pro-life” in Living Memory

The new Congress, sworn in on January 5, has been described by many pro-life advocates as the most pro-life congress in living memory. Republicans can count the abortion debate as one reason that they now enjoy majority status in the House. Of the 22 pro-life Democrats who signed off on the controversial ObamaCare deal last year, only five have returned to Congress. Many, like Stupak, opted to retire, and others were defeated by pro-life opponents.

H.R. 3 is supported by the chairman of an Energy Committee health panel, Rep. Joseph Pitts (R-PA), and the co-chairs of the Congressional Pro-Life Caucus, Reps. Chris Smith (R-NJ) and Dan Lipinski (D-IL). It also comes in tandem with the Protect Life Act, another measure meant to prevent taxpayer funding of abortion.

The issue of whether abortions will be paid by government nearly derailed passage of President Obama’s national healthcare law last year. Now, as Republicans have taken up the effort to repeal ObamaCare, the issue has returned to the forefront.

Pro-life advocates warned, before ObamaCare was rammed through Congress, that nothing would stop taxpayer dollars from being used to finance abortions through insurance subsidies once ObamaCare became law. To keep his “trillion-dollar baby” on track for passage, Obama and his congressional allies made a deal with pro-life Democrats, among them then-Rep. Bart Stupak (D-MI), who got a lot of media coverage over his opposition to government-paid abortions. To mollify Stupak and a handful of other pro-life moderates, the president signed an Executive Order restating his promise to use no federal monies for abortion. Although it gave Democrats the votes they needed, that piece of paper was really nothing more than a symbolic gesture. Skeptics weren’t impressed.

“One way or another, taxpayer money will help and assist abortions that will occur as a result of ObamaCare,” said Rep. John Fleming, a Louisiana Republican who is also a physician. Fleming says he’s concerned about *\$11 billion slated to fund community health centers* because “there’s nothing that blocks using some, if not all, of that money for abortions.”

Pro-life advocates will want to watch closely in the weeks to come, as a bi-partisan coalition in the House—led by Pitts, Smith, and Lipinski—introduce a measure that would codify an all-out ban on federal funding for abortion costs or coverage. This is the first opportunity to make good on the promises that so many new members of Congress made, with 80 of 87 new members being strongly pro-life.

Pro-choice leaders, of course, strongly oppose any measure that would codify an all-out ban on federal funding for abortion costs or coverage. But pro-life advocates want them to explain *why pro-choice groups won't agree to codify language to ban federal funding for abortion under ObamaCare—especially since prochoice advocates argue that is already the case.*

The reason NARAL and Planned Parenthood are screaming so loudly about statutory language in the health care bill—or any other bill—that would prohibit government-funded abortion is that it would be a set-back for abortion-on-demand, an issue for which support has slipped. According to Pew Research:

“Polls conducted in 2009 have found fewer Americans expressing support for abortion than in previous years. In Pew Research Center polls in 2007 and 2008, supporters for legal abortion clearly outnumbered opponents; now Americans are evenly divided on the question, and there have been modest increases in the numbers who favor reducing abortions or making them harder to obtain. Less support for abortion is evident among most demographic and political groups.

“The latest Pew Research survey also reveals that the abortion debate has receded in importance, especially among liberals. At the same time, opposition to abortion has grown firmer among conservatives, who have become less supportive of finding a middle ground on the issue and more certain of the correctness of their own views on abortion” (“Support for Abortion Slips,” Pew Research Center, October 1, 2009).

Before the vote on repeal of ObamaCare, Americans United for Life Action president Charmaine Yoest stated, “With the Obama Administration arguing in court that they have the right to force this upon Americans because they may tax us, AULA calls on Congress to say no to this abortion tax and the law that violates the principles of the pro-life Hyde Amendment. The vast majority of Americans agree that no tax for abortions is acceptable.”

Ms. Yoest says Obama’s healthcare law should be repealed because, contrary to the long-standing Hyde Amendment, it allows taxpayer funding to go to insurance plans that cover abortions, and also permits direct funding of abortion in some areas.

“[ObamaCare] contains vague ‘mandates’ for private insurance plans into which abortion coverage can be pushed,” Yoest added. “Given the pro-abortion sentiments of Obama’s administration, it is unlikely that they will attempt to keep abortion out of health care . . . But they are out of step with the vast majority of Americans—prolife and pro-choice—who agree that we should not pay for abortions with tax dollars.”

Obama’s EO to Appease Pro-Life Democrats

In the contentious run-up to passage of ObamaCare, President Obama issued a highly controversial Executive Order that supposedly would take the abortion funding issue off the table. However, virtually every pro-life group has said it would not mitigate abortion funding. They argue that Obama’s EO:

- lacks the legal authority of congressionally enacted law;
- could be reversed in the future;
- fails to address much of the abortion funding in the bill;
- is not comprehensive enough to make sure no money goes to insurance companies that subsidize abortion; and
- cannot be relied on in the face of courts that combine flexible statutory interpretation with liberal views of “abortion rights.”

Pro-lifers contend—and abortion advocates agree—that the order in itself does not, and cannot, change the statute’s approach to abortion funding.

In one particularly troubling clause, the order directs HHS not to disperse \$11 Billion in “community health center” funds for abortion, even though the statute directs those funds to include comprehensive Ob/Gyn care while containing no restriction that the money not fund abortion. Some have noted that \$11 billion in funding is so massive that it could fund virtually every abortion in America for years to come.

Back in July, the National Right to Life Committee (NRLC) exposed other serious weaknesses in Obama’s Executive order. They discovered that Obama’s Department of Health and Human Services had approved applications for federal subsidies of high-risk pools from at least three states (New Mexico, Maryland, and Pennsylvania) that included elective abortion as a covered benefit. Obama’s EO pertaining to abortion coverage did not technically cover Pre-existing Condition Insurance Plans (PCIPs), a \$5 billion HHS stopgap program to help those with pre-existing medical conditions (possibly pregnancy) who are unable to afford health insurance, until the health care reform law takes full effect in 2014.

This raised further questions about what else the executive order did not cover that requires constant vigilance on the part of pro-life advocates.

GOP Strategy

House Energy and Commerce Committee chairman Fred Upton (R-Mich.) said the GOP would pursue a dual strategy of tackling the whole health care law or chopping away at critical sections of the Affordable Care Act (ObamaCare), such as its provisions that allow for abortion funding. Upton said that after that vote, the GOP would attack major pillars of the health law in order to cripple the legislation.

One method of attack, he explained, would be to implement a Pitts-Stupak style ban that would provide a government-wide ban on public funding for abortion in the health care scheme. That bill would likely come out of the Health subcommittee chaired by pro-life Rep. Mike Pence (R-IN).

Another area of attack (this one on Constitutional grounds) would be the individual mandate, a law that forces U.S. citizens to purchase health insurance from insurance providers or pay a fine. The mandate is considered essential to the regulatory scheme of ObamaCare.

McConnell's Pledge

According to *The Hill Blog* (1/19/2011), Mitch McConnell, the Senate Minority Leader, said he would "assure" a Senate vote on legislation to undo Democrats' healthcare reform law.

"The Democratic leadership in the Senate doesn't want to vote on this bill, but I assure you, we will," McConnell said. Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) has wide discretion in setting the Senate's calendar, and he has indicated little interest in bringing up repeal for a vote. Obviously, that vote could be politically difficult for many of the 23 Democrats up for reelection in 2012, many from centrist or swing states where ObamaCare has not been well received.

ⁱ The Hyde Amendment is not a permanent law; rather it is a rider that, in various forms, has been routinely attached to annual appropriations bills since 1976. The Hyde Amendment applies only to funds allocated by the annual appropriations bill for the Department of Health and Human Services, and it primarily affects Medicaid.