

## 2008 CONGRESSIONAL CANDIDATE QUESTIONNAIRE

### ABORTION

The National Right to Life Committee (NRLC) believes that unborn children should be protected by law, and that abortion should be permitted only when necessary to prevent the death of the mother. Under what circumstances, if any, do you believe that abortion should be legal?

(a)\_\_\_\_\_ Only to prevent the death of the mother (the NRLC position).

(b)\_\_\_\_\_ To prevent the mother's death, in cases of incest committed against a minor, and in reported cases of forcible rape.

(c) Other (please explain): \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

*For your information: In every question below, a "yes" response indicates agreement with the position of NRLC.*

### ROE V. WADE

In its 1973 rulings in *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton*, the U.S. Supreme Court created a "right to abortion" for any reason until "viability" (into the sixth month), and for any "health" reasons – including "emotional" health – even during the final three months of pregnancy. These rulings invalidated the abortion laws that were in effect in all 50 states at the time. In the 1992 ruling of *Casey v. Planned Parenthood*, the Supreme Court reaffirmed the "core holdings" of *Roe v. Wade*, and said that any law placing an "undue burden" on access to abortion would be struck down.

**(1) Do you support the reversal of the *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton* decisions, so that elected legislative bodies may once again protect unborn children by limiting or prohibiting abortion?**

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

### "FREEDOM OF CHOICE ACT" (FOCA)

Pro-abortion members of Congress have proposed federal legislation called the "Freedom of Choice Act" (FOCA) (H.R. 1964, S. 1173), which would invalidate virtually all state and federal laws limiting abortion, including the federal Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act and state laws requiring waiting periods or parental notification.

**(2) Would you vote against the "Freedom of Choice Act" or other proposed federal laws that would limit the authority of legislatures to restrict abortion?**

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

### THE PAIN OF UNBORN BABIES

There is now overwhelming scientific evidence that abortion methods used by the fifth month (and perhaps earlier) such as the "dilation and evacuation" (dismemberment) method, and the partial-birth abortion method, cause excruciating pain to the unborn child.

**(3) Would you support legislation, such as the Unborn Child Pain Awareness Act (H.R. 3442, S. 356), to require that any mother considering an abortion first must be provided with clear and accurate information about the capacity of an unborn child to feel pain, and about possible alternatives to lessen or avoid that pain?**

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

### ULTRASOUND INFORMED CONSENT

Many women who undergo abortions later regret that they were not given full information about their unborn child beforehand.

**(4) Would you support federal legislation, such as the Ultrasound Informed Consent Act (S. 2075), to require that before an abortion is performed, the abortionist must perform an ultrasound and display the ultrasound images for the mother, so that she may view the images?**

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

### PROTECTION OF HUMAN EMBRYOS

The right to life of human beings must be respected at every stage of their biological development. Human individuals who are at the embryonic stage of development should not be used for harmful or lethal medical experimentation. This applies equally to human beings whether their lives were begun by in vitro fertilization, by somatic cell nuclear transfer (human cloning), or by some other laboratory technique. NRLC opposes harvesting "stem cells" from living human embryos, since this kills the embryos. Note: NRLC is NOT opposed to other research on "stem cells" that are obtained without killing embryos – for example, stem cells harvested from umbilical cord blood and from adult tissue.

**(5) Will you vote for measures to protect living human embryos from being used for medical experiments that would harm or kill them, including so-called “embryonic stem cell research” that would require the killing of human embryos, regardless of the method used to create these human embryos?**

**YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_**

On August 9, 2001, President Bush adopted a policy of prohibiting federal funding of research using any stem cells obtained by killing human embryos after that date. During 2007-2008, some members of Congress pushed for legislation (S. 5) to overturn this policy and to mandate federal funding of research that would require the killing of human embryos. President Bush vetoed this legislation.

**(6) Would you oppose any legislation that would authorize federal funding of research for which the killing of human embryos would be a predicate step or necessary part?**

**YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_**

### **HUMAN CLONING**

Human cloning is a process (technically known as “somatic cell nuclear transfer”) in which genetic material from one person is artificially transferred into a human or animal egg cell, thereby beginning the life of a new human individual who has only one parent and who is genetically nearly identical to that parent. NRLC believes that human life at every stage of biological development is deserving of respect and protection regardless of the circumstances under which that human life was created. It has been proposed to create human life through cloning for the purpose of destructive experiments on those humans, resulting in their deaths, a process sometimes referred to as “therapeutic cloning.” In Congress, the Brownback-Landrieu and Weldon-Stupak bills (S. 1036, H.R. 2564) would prohibit the use of somatic cell nuclear transfer (cloning) to create any humans, including human embryos.

**(7) Would you support a legal prohibition on all human cloning (i.e. the creation of human embryos by cloning)?**

**YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_**

As an alternative to a genuine ban on all human cloning, some members of Congress have proposed legislation (such as H.R. 2560 or S. 812) that would permit the use of cloning to create human embryos to be used in medical research (so-called “therapeutic cloning”), but that would attempt to prevent the implantation of such an embryo into a uterus. These bills are sometimes misleadingly referred to as “bans on reproductive cloning,” but they really do not ban human cloning at all – rather, they ban the survival of human clones. Such a bill would impose a legal mandate that every clone must be killed or allowed to die. NRLC strongly opposes such “clone and kill” legislation.

**(8) Would you oppose “clone-and-kill” legislation (i.e. legislation that would permit the creation of human embryos by cloning but prohibit allowing such human clones to live past a defined point of development)?**

**YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_**

In 2005, Congressman Dave Weldon, M.D. (R-Fl.) proposed legislation to require any government or non-government entity that receives funds from the federal National Institutes of Health (NIH) to refrain from engaging in any form of human cloning research, including the creation of human embryos by so-called “therapeutic cloning” or research using such cloned human embryos.

**(9) Would you support legislation to require that any recipient of federal NIH funds must not engage in the creation or use of cloned human embryos?**

**YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_**

### **ABORTION FUNDING**

Congress votes from time to time on the “Hyde Amendment,” a law that prohibits federal Medicaid money from being used to pay for abortions or for health care plans that include abortion, except to save the life of the mother, or in cases of rape or incest.

**(10) Would you vote for the current Hyde Amendment policy without weakening amendments?**

**YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_**

**(11) Besides Medicaid, would you vote against weakening the existing bans on the use of any congressionally appropriated funds for abortion in bills covering the military, federal employees, the District of Columbia, etc., with the same exceptions as the Hyde Amendment?**

**YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_**

**(12) Federal law prohibits performance of abortions at U.S. military facilities, even if privately funded (except to save the life of the mother, or in cases of rape or incest). Would you vote against any attempt to weaken or repeal this policy?**

**YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_**

Title X (“Title 10”) of the Public Health Service Act provides more than \$300 million annually for grants to state and private entities for “family planning” programs. Although federal law does not permit such funds to be used directly for abortions, large amounts of Title X funds go to organizations (such as Planned Parenthood) that operate abortion clinics.

**(13) Would you support legislation to make organizations that operate abortion clinics (not bona fide hospitals) ineligible for Title X funding?**

**YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_**

## **ABORTION IN HEALTH INSURANCE**

Many bills for "health care reform" have included provisions under which the federal government would require coverage of abortion in certain types of health insurance plans. Often, such bills do not explicitly mention abortion, but they contain mandates that invariably will be construed by courts, and/or by administrative agencies, to include abortion. For example, any legal mandate for coverage of "medically necessary services" or "reproductive health services" will be construed to include elective abortion, unless explicit language is added to prevent this interpretation.

**(14) Would you vote to add strong abortion-exclusion language to any legislation that would define a specific package of health care benefits?**

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

**(15) Would you oppose any bill that would mandate a specific package of health benefits, if the bill does not explicitly exclude abortion from the benefits package?**

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

## **FOREIGN AID FOR ABORTION**

The U.S. spends about a half-billion dollars annually on family planning/population-control programs in other nations. In January 2001, President George W. Bush used his executive authority to reinstate the pro-life "Mexico City Policy," which had previously been in effect from 1984-92. Under this policy, in order to be eligible for U.S. population-control funds, a private overseas organization must agree not to perform abortions (except to save the life of the mother, or in cases of rape or incest) or to "actively promote abortion as a method of family planning."

**(16) Would you vote against any attempt to weaken or overturn the pro-life "Mexico City Policy"?**

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

The United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) participates in China's population-control program, which relies heavily on coerced abortion. The UNFPA also promotes expanded access to abortion in developing nations, and has promoted the abortion pill, RU-486. The Bush Administration has cut off U.S. funding to the UNFPA because of its role in China.

**(17) Will you vote against U.S. funding of the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA)?**

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

## **PARENTAL NOTIFICATION/CONSENT FOR MINORS' ABORTIONS**

Laws are already in effect in about half the states that require notification or consent of at least one parent (or authorization by a judge) before an abortion can be performed on a minor. However, these laws are often circumvented by minors who cross state lines in order to evade parental notification requirements (often with the aid of older boyfriends, abortion clinic staff, or other adults lacking parental authority). The Child Interstate Abortion Notification Act (CIANA) (H.R. 1063) would require any abortionist, encountering a minor client from another state, to notify one parent before performing an abortion, unless presented with authorization from a court, or in cases of life endangerment, or in cases of sexual or physical abuse or neglect by a parent, in which case the appropriate state agency must be notified instead of a parent. The bill would also make it an offense to transport a minor across state lines to evade a parental involvement requirement.

**(18) Would you vote for the Child Interstate Abortion Notification Act, and oppose weakening amendments?**

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

## **ABORTION NON-DISCRIMINATION ACT**

Across the nation, pro-abortion officials and advocacy groups have sought to use the compulsory powers of government to compel health-care providers to participate in abortion. The Abortion Non-Discrimination Act (S. 350) would prohibit state and local governments from discriminating against any health care professional, hospital, HMO, insurance plan, or other "health care entity" because of that provider's decision not to perform, cover, or pay for induced abortions.

**(19) Would you vote for the Abortion Non-Discrimination Act and oppose weakening amendments?**

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

## **"EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT" (ERA)**

The proposed "Equal Rights Amendment" (also called the "Women's Equality Amendment") (H.J.Res. 40, S.J. Res. 10) would amend the federal Constitution to invalidate any law or government policy that discriminates "on account of sex." In some of the states that have already added similar provisions to their state constitutions, courts have used them to invalidate limits on abortion. For example, the New Mexico Supreme Court in 1998 unanimously ruled that the New Mexico ERA required tax funding of abortion. NRLC opposes the federal ERA unless this "abortion neutral" amendment is added to ensure that the ERA will not change abortion policy in either direction: "Nothing in this article [the ERA] shall be construed to grant, secure, or deny any right relating to abortion or the funding thereof."

(20) Would you vote for the “abortion-neutralization” amendment to the proposed ERA?

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

(21) Would you vote against the ERA, as long as it does not contain the “abortion-neutralization” amendment?

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

## EUTHANASIA ISSUES

From its inception, the pro-life movement has been as dedicated to protecting people with disabilities and older people from euthanasia as it has been to protecting unborn children from abortion.

### INVOLUNTARY EUTHANASIA

Some hospitals have implemented formal policies authorizing denial of lifesaving medical treatment against the will of a patient or the patient’s family if an ethics committee thinks the patient’s so-called “quality of life” is unacceptable, even though the patient and family disagree. The federal Patient Self-Determination Act currently requires health care facilities receiving Medicare or Medicaid to ask patients on admission whether they have an advance directive indicating their desire to receive or refuse lifesaving treatment under certain circumstances.

**(22) Would you vote to prevent involuntary denial of lifesaving medical treatment by amending the Patient Self-Determination Act to provide that, if failure to comply with a patient’s or surrogate’s choice for life-saving treatment would in reasonable medical judgment be likely to result in or hasten the patient’s death, a health care provider unwilling to respect the choice for lifesaving treatment must allow the patient to be transferred to a willing provider and must provide the treatment pending transfer?**

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

### HEALTH CARE RATIONING

How Americans may obtain health care and health insurance is one of the most significant issues likely to face the next Congress, as proposals for some form of universal health care are being widely debated. The manner in which any restructuring of the American health care or health insurance system is constructed is a matter of **central importance to the pro-life movement** because when the government rations health care in a way that makes it illegal or impossible for Americans to choose lifesaving medical treatment, food, and fluids, it imposes a type of involuntary euthanasia.

Some, in the name of controlling health care costs, seek to prohibit or limit the right of Americans to spend their own money to obtain lifesaving health care. The greatest impact of such policies is likely to fall on middle-income Americans.

(23) Would you vote against any bill that would prohibit or limit the right to spend one’s own money for health care or health insurance?

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

### PRICE CONTROLS

When the government limits by law what can be charged for health care, it limits what people are allowed to pay for health care. While everyone would prefer to pay less – or nothing – for health care (as for anything else), government price controls in fact prevent access to lifesaving medical treatment that costs more to supply than the price set by the government. The same is true when price controls are imposed on what people are permitted to pay for health insurance.

**(24) Would you vote against any bill that would impose price controls on health care?**

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

**(25) Would you vote against any bill that would impose price controls on health insurance premiums?**

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

### MEDICARE RATIONING

It is well known that because of the impending retirement of the baby boom generation, Medicare faces a fiscal crisis. Broadly speaking, there are three fundamental options. One, substantial tax increases, is widely considered improbable. Another, in which less and less money (adjusted for health care inflation) is available for each beneficiary, would compel rationing.

The third option is to allow older Americans *who wish to do so* to add their own funds on top of the diminishing government contribution in order to obtain health insurance that is less likely to ration medical treatment and prescription drugs. By voluntarily putting more money into the health care system through this means, middle income Americans will make possible greater private sector cost shifting, allowing more undercompensated and uncompensated health care to be provided to those with low incomes.

In 1997 and 2003, the National Right to Life Committee persuaded Congress to allow such an alternative in the form of “private fee-for-service” plans. So long as these plans meet requirements for financial stability, and cover what original Medicare covers, the government places no price controls on what private fee-for-service plans can pay for health care or prescription drugs, or on what premiums they can charge in addition to the amount provided by the government under Medicare. These are left for the market to determine. However, some are pushing to abolish the private fee-for-service option in Medicare.

**(26) Would you vote against any bill that would eliminate or curtail the private fee-for-service option in Medicare?**

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

**(27) Would you vote against any bill that imposes price controls or otherwise limits the right of older Americans who choose to do so to add their own funds on top of the government contribution in order to obtain Medicare health insurance that is less likely to ration medical treatment and prescription drugs?**

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

**DRUG PRICE-FIXING IN MEDICARE**

Under the Medicare prescription drug benefit implemented in 2006, individual prescription drug or health plans negotiate drug prices with suppliers. The market, rather than the government, determines what older people pay and what drugs they can get. By contrast, in the Veteran’s Administration (VA) health program, the government “negotiates,” but in reality fixes, prices for covered drugs, and drugs whose suppliers cannot meet the government’s price demands are not included. Consequently, 81% of drugs newly approved by the FDA since 2000 are excluded from the VA health plan, and 27% of veterans eligible to do so have instead chosen the Medicare drug benefit under which more new drugs are accessible in many of the plans. However, it has been proposed that the government should fix or “negotiate” prescription drug prices in Medicare, as it does in the VA. As this is a form of government limitation on the right of older people to choose to spend their own funds (by purchasing more expensive prescription drug plans) in order to get unrationed access to lifesaving prescriptions, National Right to Life opposes this proposal.

**(28) Would you vote against legislation that would impose government price-fixing or “negotiation” on prescription drugs under Medicare?**

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

**POLITICAL SPEECH**

The Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act (BCRA) directed the Federal Election Commission to promulgate new rules that specifically do not require that there be “formal agreement or collaboration” with a member of Congress or other candidate in order for an expenditure by a citizen group or political action committee to be a “coordinated expenditure” and thus a campaign “contribution.” Under the loose new definition of “coordination,” citizen groups and PACs that communicate with Congress on legislative matters and also conduct independent expenditures are at risk of being unintentionally “coordinated,” thereby making their independent expenditures illegal campaign “contributions.”

**(29) Would you vote to reestablish that “coordination” means only a formal agreement or collaboration on a specific project between a candidate and a citizen group or PAC?**

YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

<i>Signature of Candidate</i>		<i>Please Print or Type Name</i>		<i>Date Signed</i>
<i>State</i>	<i>Congressional District #</i>	<i>Political Party</i>	<i>Phone Number</i>	<i>Fax Number</i>
<i>Name of Campaign Committee</i>		<i>Contact Person</i>	<i>Email Address</i>	
<i>Campaign Address</i>			<i>Campaign Website</i>	