



Secretariat of Pro-Life Activities

3211 FOURTH STREET NE • WASHINGTON DC 20017-1194

202-541-3070 • FAX 202-541-3054 • EMAIL PROLIFE@USCCB.ORG • WEB WWW.USCCB.ORG/PROLIFE

The Extreme Campaign Against the Hyde Amendment

Beginning in 1976, the Hyde Amendment and similar measures have prevented the federal government from forcing pro-life Americans to support abortion with their tax dollars. Now the 48-year-long bipartisan consensus on this issue is under attack.

Pro-abortion groups are campaigning to rescind Hyde, and to make this policy reversal permanent through the so-called “EACH” Act (Equal Access to Abortion Coverage in Health Insurance Act). This extreme measure would require every federal health program to cover, and every federal health facility to provide, elective abortions. It would even nullify state and local policies against abortion coverage, rescinding the compromise policy agreed to by President Obama and congressional Democrats in the Affordable Care Act of 2010 (42 U.S.C. § 18023).

This campaign uses claims developed by public relations strategists to overcome widespread public objections to publicly funded abortion. Here are some of those claims with responses.

Do Hyde and other abortion funding restrictions contradict the “right” to abortion the U.S. Supreme Court claimed to find in the since-overturned *Roe v. Wade* decision?

No, and the court itself repeatedly said they did not. Even if there were a “right” to be free from undue government interference in the decision whether to have an abortion before *Dobbs*, that would not create an entitlement to active government subsidies for abortion. Upholding the Hyde amendment in 1980, the court cited its own 1977 statement that when government funds childbirth but not abortion, it “has imposed no restriction on access to abortions that was not already there.” *Harris v. McRae*, 448 U.S. 297, 314 (1980), citing *Maher v. Roe*, 432 U.S. 464, 474 (1977). By insisting that the alleged “right of privacy” demands *public* financing, abortion advocates depart even from *Roe* – and they violate the right of others to freely choose *not* to promote and support abortion.

Does Hyde discriminate against women?

No, in federally funded health care it “discriminates” (distinguishes) between live birth and abortion. In 1980 the Supreme Court said government has a perfectly legitimate reason to do so: “Abortion is inherently different from other medical procedures, because no other procedure involves the purposeful termination of a potential life.” *Harris*, 448 U.S. at 325. Later the court dropped the confusing phrase “potential life,” citing government’s legitimate interest in promoting “respect for *life*, including life of the unborn.” *Gonzales v. Carhart*, 550 U.S. 124, 158 (2007) (emphasis added).

Does Hyde discriminate against the poor?

Not at all. The amendment covers all health programs funded through appropriations bills for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education – not only programs covering the poor. And Congress has enacted the same policy in programs for the military, federal employees, and others who are not poor. Moreover, low-income Americans have often been *more* likely than others to oppose abortion and public funding of abortion.¹ This is also true of Americans who lack other

advantages such as a college degree.² As Grace Olivarez, the only Latina on the 1972 Rockefeller Commission on Population Growth, said when she dissented from this presidential commission’s pro-abortion conclusions: “The poor cry out for justice and equality and we respond with legalized abortion.”³ *That* is discrimination against the poor.

Does Hyde discriminate against women of color, because they are disproportionately poor?

No, for the same reason that it does not discriminate against the poor. 50% of nonwhite Americans, for example, say abortion is morally acceptable, compared to 53% of white Americans.⁴ Yet people of color are especially targeted by the abortion industry, and the challenges they face are exploited by abortion advocates to promote public funding. *Without* federal funding of abortion, the abortion rate among non-Hispanic black women (abortions per 1000 women of reproductive age) is almost *four times* that of non-Hispanic white women; so is their abortion ratio (abortions per 1000 live births).⁵ It is the effort to increase this tragic disparity further, by promoting abortion in a population disproportionately made up of black Americans, that could be seen as racist. Hundreds of Planned Parenthood’s own supporters and current and former employees have said that “Planned Parenthood was founded by a racist, white woman” and remains guilty of systemic racism.⁶

Do restraints on abortion funding “force” poor women to carry their children to term?

Of course not. Even with public assistance for *some* costs of parenthood, the lifetime expense of raising a child is far more than the cost of an abortion, such that keeping abortion unsubsidized would not reasonably compel someone for financial reasons to choose the still more financially challenging path of parenthood. Economic pressure makes many women consider abortion – and by funding abortion itself, government adds to that pressure, *doubling* the abortion rate among low-income women.⁷ Laws like Hyde, especially if combined with generous support for the needs of pregnant women and their children, help relieve that pressure, so that many women who would have been driven to abortion allow their children to live. A recent study concluded that the Hyde amendment has saved the lives of 2.5 million children since it was enacted.⁸ Hyde has an *influence* in *encouraging* childbirth over abortion – and the Supreme Court said long before *Dobbs* that that is a legitimate goal for government. *Harris*, 448 U.S. at 325.

Does Hyde endanger women, such as by driving them to “unsafe” or illegal abortions?

This is an old and discredited claim. When Hyde took effect, pro-abortion doctors predicted it would lead to “excess mortality” among poor women – but follow-up studies instead found a *reduction* in abortion complications.⁹ The chief effect of abortion funding restrictions is to save unborn children’s lives. They may also help reduce unintended pregnancies.¹⁰

Do Hyde and similar laws “impose” some Americans’ views on others who disagree?

The opposite is true: Forcing taxpayers to fund abortions they find abhorrent imposes the abortion industry’s views on all of us. In fact opinion surveys show majority opposition to public funding of abortion.¹¹ Many abortion advocates now admit that abortion is the taking of a human life – yet they would force those who oppose abortion to promote what even *they* admit is killing.¹² By contrast, laws like Hyde leave everyone, *including* those who want to pay for other people’s abortions, free to act on their own convictions.

Rescinding Hyde would even impose a pro-abortion-funding policy on states that have decided against it. Hyde allows states to choose whether or not to fund elective abortions with state taxes, and the people and

elected representatives of 32 states have voluntarily chosen *not* to do so.¹³ Without the amendment, abortion becomes just another basic service that *all* states must fund to be part of Medicaid.

Do such laws reflect one religious doctrine about life, contrary to the Constitution’s ban on an establishment of religion?

The Supreme Court has long said no. Moral concern about abortion reaches far beyond any one religion, and these laws have the legitimate *secular* purpose of encouraging childbirth over abortion. The fact that some religions oppose abortion doesn’t change this. “That the Judeo-Christian religions oppose stealing does not mean that a State or the Federal Government may not, consistent with the Establishment Clause, enact laws prohibiting larceny.” *Harris*, 448 U.S. at 319.

Abortion advocates claim that, however we may feel about abortion, we should not impose our views on others. But they do not hold themselves to this standard. How we feel about abortion – or rather, what we recognize it to be – is the whole issue. If abortion is a wrongful attack on life, as millions of American women and men believe, it is wrong to use government funds to promote it – and many times more wrong to force objecting taxpayers to be involved in this injustice. Hyde and similar laws do not fully protect the unborn; but they reduce the awful number of abortions, and protect all of us from being forced against our will to treat abortion as a positive good for women and society. As an in-depth survey of 217 Americans, including many with strongly “pro-choice” views, concluded: “None of the Americans we interviewed talked about abortion as a desirable good.... Americans do not uphold abortion as a happy event, or something they want more of.”¹⁴

Shouldn’t pro-life Americans be forced to pay taxes for abortion, just as people who object to a war still have to pay taxes for it?

When most Americans object to a war, the government often ultimately finds that it needs to stop pursuing it, as in Vietnam. That is the case here: Most Americans – including millions of Americans who identify as “pro-choice” – object to use of their tax dollars for the war on innocent human life that is abortion.¹⁵ The war analogy is not meant sincerely by pro-abortion groups in any case, since Americans certainly have a right of conscientious objection against actually taking part in wartime killing – and these groups fiercely oppose recognizing such a conscience right for hospitals, doctors, and nurses who object to abortion.

Updated July 2024

¹ In a 2024 national poll, 44% of Americans with an income below \$50,000 described themselves as pro-life (compared to 40% of the overall sample), and 56% opposed public funding of abortion (compared to 53% overall). Marist Poll, *Americans’ Opinions on Abortion* (January 2024), at [marist-poll-results2024.pdf](https://www.maristpoll.com/poll-results/2024/01/01/abortion) (kofo.org). Crosstabs are at [marist-poll-full-results-crosstabs2024.pdf](https://www.maristpoll.com/poll-results/2024/01/01/abortion-crosstabs) (kofo.org).

² In the Marist Poll, those without a college degree were more likely to describe themselves as pro-life (46%) and to oppose public funding of abortion (61%). See note 1 *supra*. In a June 2023 Gallup poll, 45% of those without a college degree said abortion is “morally acceptable” (compared to 52% overall). See J. Jones, “Fewer in U.S. Say Same-Sex Relations Morally Acceptable,” *Gallup News*, June 16, 2023, at <https://news.gallup.com/poll/507230/fewer-say-sex-relations-morally-acceptable.aspx>. Full results and crosstabs are at [file:///C:/Users/User/Downloads/230619MoralIssues%20\(1\).pdf](file:///C:/Users/User/Downloads/230619MoralIssues%20(1).pdf).

³ Separate Statement of Grace Olivarez, *Population and the American Future: The Report of The Commission on Population Growth and the American Future* (1972), http://www.population-security.org/rockefeller/018_separate_statements.htm.

⁴ See Gallup poll, note 2 *supra*.

⁵ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, *Abortion Surveillance – United States, 2021* (Nov. 24, 2023), Table 6.

⁶ Open Letter, “Save PPGNY,” June 18, 2020; <https://saveppgny.wordpress.com/>. Also see B. Lowry and J. Thomas, “Ex-KC area Planned Parenthood CEO exits after complaints of abusive behavior, racism,” *The Kansas City Star*, June 23, 2020; <https://www.kansascity.com/news/politics-government/article243732912.html>.

⁷ R. Jones et al., “Patterns in the Socioeconomic Characteristics of Women Obtaining Abortions in 2000-2001,” 34(5) *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health* (Sept./Oct. 2002), 226-235 at 231; www.guttmacher.org/pubs/journals/3422602.pdf.

⁸ M. New, “Hyde @ 40: Analyzing the Impact of the Hyde Amendment with July 2020 and June 2023 Addenda,” *On Point* 95, Charlotte Lozier Institute, June 27, 2023, at <https://lozierinstitute.org/hyde-40-analyzing-the-impact-of-the-hyde-amendment-with-july-2020-and-june-2023-addenda/>. This analysis takes into account the fact that some states use their own funds for elective abortions, nullifying Hyde’s protective effect.

⁹ “For poor women, it appears that restriction of public funding for legal abortions has not markedly increased the number of illegal abortions, but has reduced the number of legal abortions, especially those at later gestational ages, which would have cost more and been at greater risk of complications.” R.M. Selik, W. Cates, and C.W. Tyler, “Effects of restricted public funding for legal abortions: a second look,” 71(1) *Am. J. Public Health* (Jan. 1981): 77–81 at 77; <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1619707/>. Abortion supporters publicly cited one Texas woman in particular as “a martyr to the Hyde Amendment” until it was found that the policy was not responsible for her death. R. Grauel and F. Murray, “Facts Don’t Back Link of Abortion Death in Texas to Fund Cutoff,” *Ob.Gyn. News*, December 1, 1977, at 1, 26.

¹⁰ P.B. Levine, A.B. Trainor, and D.J. Zimmerman, “The effect of Medicaid abortion funding restrictions on abortions, pregnancies and births,” 15(5) *J. Health Econ.* (Oct. 1996): 555-78; <https://ideas.repec.org/a/eee/jhecon/v15y1996i5p555-578.html>.

¹¹ W. Saletan, “Abortion Funding Isn’t As Popular As Democrats Think,” *Slate*, June 12, 2019; <https://slate.com/news-and-politics/2019/06/joe-biden-hyde-amendment-democratic-support.html>. Also see note 1 supra.

¹² M.E. Williams, “So what if abortion ends life?,” *Salon*, Jan. 23, 2013; http://www.salon.com/2013/01/23/so_what_if_abortion_ends_life/. See also J. Schaeffer, “Abortion Provider: We Should Admit ‘It’s Violence, It’s a Person, It’s Killing’,” *Newsmax*, Nov. 2, 2015, <http://www.newsmax.com/Newsfront/abortion-providers-violence-killing/2015/11/02/id/700238/>.

¹³ Guttmacher Institute, “State Funding of Abortion Under Medicaid,” August 31, 2023, at <https://www.guttmacher.org/node/26272/printable/print>.

¹⁴ T. Bruce, *How Americans Understand Abortion*, McGrath Institute for Church Life, University of Notre Dame (July 2020) at 54; download available at <https://churchlife-info.nd.edu/en-us/how-americans-understand-abortion-a-comprehensive-interview-study-of-abortion-attitudes-in-the-u.s.>

¹⁵ In the 2024 Marist poll, even 29% of respondents who described themselves as “pro-choice” opposed public funding of abortion. See note 1 supra.