

MARCO RUBIO ON ABORTION

Highlights:

- Marco Rubio supported federal bans on abortion.
 - Rubio backed constitutional efforts to ban abortion federally.
 - Rubio claimed that the president had power from the Constitution to ban abortion.
 - Rubio expressed support for the Life at Conception Act, which would have banned abortion nationwide and imperiled access to contraception and IVF.
 - Consistent with the Life at Conception Act, Rubio claimed that fertilized eggs were human beings.
 - Rubio supported several federal abortion bans.
- Marco Rubio opposed Roe v. Wade.
 - Rubio signed a brief that called on the Supreme Court to consider overturning Roe v. Wade.
 - Rubio voiced his opposition to Roe v. Wade.
 - Rubio effectively voted twice against the Women’s Health Protection Act, which would have codified abortion protections under Roe v. Wade.
- Marco Rubio supported state laws that restricted abortion.
 - Rubio supported a Texas law that imposed numerous restrictions on access to abortion.
 - Rubio said he was “incredibly disappointed” that the Supreme Court overturned the Texas law.
 - The Texas law imposed numerous restrictions on access to abortion by making abortion providers and facilities follow strict requirements.
 - Rubio supported a Florida law that required women to have a medically unnecessary ultrasound prior to an abortion.
- Marco Rubio supported efforts to restrict medication abortion.
 - Rubio said he supported more government oversight of medication abortion.
 - Rubio co-sponsored a bill that would have made it harder to access medication abortion.
- Marco Rubio backed efforts to restrict contraception access.
 - Rubio dismissed the need for contraception coverage, saying women could simply pay for it themselves or work elsewhere.
 - Rubio voted against legislation that would have overturned the Supreme Court’s Hobby Lobby decision.
 - Rubio repeatedly backed efforts to weaken the ACA’s contraception coverage requirements.
 - Rubio voted against a bill requiring that hospitals provide birth control for rape survivors.
- Marco Rubio supported efforts to antagonize Planned Parenthood.
 - Rubio supported defunding Planned Parenthood and voted at least 11 times to do so.
- Marco Rubio supported legislation that would have made it harder for young people to receive abortions.
- Marco Rubio supported efforts to restrict federal funding for abortion care.
 - Rubio said he would block any legislation that undermined the Hyde Amendment.
 - Rubio co-sponsored legislation to ban federal funds for abortion.
 - Rubio voted at least seven times to oppose federal funding for abortion.
 - Rubio effectively voted against insurance subsidies for private insurance plans that provide abortion coverage.
- Marco Rubio backed efforts to antagonize private-sector organizations that supported access to abortion care.

- Marco Rubio supported so-called “born alive” legislation.
- Marco Rubio supported legislation to interfere in family decisions about abortion.
- Marco Rubio backed efforts to restrict abortions abroad.

Rubio Supported Federal Bans On Abortion

RUBIO BACKED CONSTITUTIONAL EFFORTS TO BAN ABORTION FEDERALLY

Rubio Supported A Constitutional Amendment Banning Abortion. According to the National Pro-Life Alliance 2010 Congressional Candidate Survey, “Will you support an amendment to the U.S. Constitution banning abortion except to prevent the death of the mother? [Rubio]: Yes.” [National Pro-Life Alliance 2010 Congressional Candidate Survey, 7/6/10]

Rubio Claimed That The President Had Power From The Constitution To Ban Abortion

Rubio Argued That The Constitution Allowed The President To Outlaw Abortion. According to the Huffington Post, “Former Arkansas Gov. Mike Huckabee and Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.) found one thing they could agree on during Thursday’s Republican presidential debate: They both believe the Constitution already gives the president the power to outlaw abortion. Their view is a minority one in the legal community that is out of sync with the overwhelming consensus on constitutional interpretation.” [Huffington Post, [8/7/15](#)]

RUBIO EXPRESSED SUPPORT FOR THE LIFE AT CONCEPTION ACT, WHICH WOULD HAVE BANNED ABORTION NATIONWIDE AND IMPERILED ACCESS TO CONTRACEPTION AND IVF

2010: Rubio Indicated He Would “Support And Cosponsor” The Life At Conception Act. According to the National Pro-Life Alliance 2010 Congressional Candidate Survey, “Would you support and cosponsor a Life at Conception Act defining that life begins at the moment on conception thereby resolving for all time, as stated by the Supreme Court in Roe v. Wade, “the difficult question of when life begins?” [Rubio:] Yes.” [National Pro-Life Alliance 2010 Congressional Candidate Survey, 7/6/10]

The Life At Conception Act Would Ban Abortion Nationwide

UC Davis School Of Law Professor Mary Ziegler On The Life At Conception Act: “It Would Be A Nationwide Abortion Ban.” According to the Los Angeles Times, “The Life at Conception Act is fewer than 300 words, but its language leaves little room for ambiguity on abortion. The bill, introduced in the U.S. House earlier in the congressional session, seeks ‘equal protection for the right to life of each born and preborn human person,’ specifying that it covers ‘all stages of life, including the moment of fertilization, cloning, or other moment at which an individual member of the human species comes into being.’ Put simply: ‘It would be a nationwide abortion ban,’ said Mary Ziegler, a professor at UC Davis School of Law who studies reproductive rights.” [Los Angeles Times, [8/29/22](#)]

The Legislation Could Also Threaten Access To The Morning-After Pill And IUDs

Ziegler Claimed The Legislation Could Ban Some Forms Of Contraception, Including The Morning-After Pill. According to the Los Angeles Times, “The Life at Conception Act is fewer than 300 words, but its language leaves little room for ambiguity on abortion. The bill, introduced in the U.S. House earlier in the congressional session, seeks ‘equal protection for the right to life of each born and preborn human person,’ specifying that it covers ‘all stages of life, including the moment of fertilization, cloning, or other moment at which an individual member of the human species comes into being.’ Put simply: ‘It would be a nationwide abortion ban,’ said Mary Ziegler, a professor at UC Davis School of Law who studies reproductive rights. [...] Ziegler, the UC Davis law professor, said the legislation’s ban on abortion could also extend to some contraceptives, such as morning-after pills, she said.” [Los Angeles Times, [8/29/22](#)]

Legal Scholars Said The Legislation Could Threaten Access To IUDs. According to New York, “The Life at Conception Act is a classic ‘personhood’ bill treating every fetus, embryo, and fertilized ovum as just like me and you when it

comes to fundamental rights. While the bill does say it does not ‘authorize the prosecution of any woman for the death of her unborn child,’ there’s no exception to the ‘right to life’ for pregnancies involving rape, incest, or even threats to the life of the mother. Most legal scholars believe ‘personhood’ statutes could ban morning-after pills or the use of IUDs.” [New York, [8/31/22](#)]

The Life At Conception Act Would Not Protect IVF

The Life At Conception Act Would Imperil Access To IVF. According to the Washington Post, “The congressional proposal, known as the Life at Conception Act, defines a ‘human being’ to ‘include each member of the species homo sapiens at all stages of life, including the moment of fertilization or cloning, or other moment at which an individual member of the human species comes into being.’ The bill would also provide equal protection under the 14th Amendment ‘for the right to life of each born and preborn human person.’ The measure has no provisions for processes like IVF, meaning access to the procedure would not be protected. It would ban nearly all abortions nationwide.” [Washington Post, [2/25/24](#)]

Consistent With The Life At Conception Act, Rubio Claimed Fertilized Eggs Were Human Beings

In Line With The Life At Conception Act, Rubio Said Fertilized Eggs Were Human Beings. According to Slate, “When Rubio appeared on CNN after Thursday night’s Republican debate, he kept insisting that this vague entity called ‘science’ has declared that human life begins at conception. [...] CNN host Chris Cuomo vainly tried to point out that ‘science’ says no such thing, and Rubio got a little excited. ‘Let me interrupt you. Science has—absolutely it has. Science has decided... Science has concluded that—absolutely it has. What else can it be?’ he asked. Then Rubio reared up for what he clearly intended as his wowza line: ‘It cannot turn into an animal. It can’t turn into a donkey. The only thing that that can become is a human being.’ Cuomo pointed out that Rubio was ‘oversimplifying it a little bit’: ‘It having a DNA map—so does a plant.’ The question of when you think a fertilized egg/embryo/fetus becomes a person is, Cuomo said, a matter of ‘faith. That’s not science.’ But Rubio, grinning with pleasure at the sick burn he’s about to administer, replied, ‘Well, if they can’t say it will be human life, what does it become, then? Could it become a cat?’” [Slate, [8/11/15](#)]

RUBIO SUPPORTED SEVERAL FEDERAL ABORTION BANS

2021: Rubio Backed A Federal Abortion Ban

2021: Rubio Announced He Was Co-Sponsoring A Federal Abortion Ban. According to a press release from Rubio, “Rubio announced he was co-sponsoring 10 anti abortion bills. Those bills include: [...] Pain Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. Senator Lindsey Graham’s (R-SC) bill would amend the federal criminal code to make it a crime for any person to perform or attempt to perform an abortion if the probable post-fertilization age of the fetus is 20 weeks or more.” [Rubio Press Release, [1/29/21](#)]

2021: Rubio Voted For An Amendment That Would Have Created Penalties For Providers Who Conducted Elective Abortions At Or After 20 Weeks

2021: Rubio Voted For An Amendment That Would Create Penalties For Providers That Conducted Elective Abortions At Or After 20 Weeks Of Gestation. In August 2021, Rubio voted for an amendment which would, according to Congressional Quarterly, “create a deficit-neutral reserve fund to allow for legislation related to improving health programs, including to establish penalties for providers of elective abortions at or after 20 weeks of gestation.” The vote was on the adoption of an amendment. The Senate rejected the amendment by a vote of 48-51. [Senate Vote 348, [8/11/21](#); Congressional Quarterly, [8/11/21](#); Congressional Actions, [S.Amdt. 3758](#); Congressional Actions, [S.Con.Res.14](#)]

2018: Rubio Effectively Voted For A Federal Abortion Ban

2018: Rubio Effectively Voted For A Bill Banning Abortion Nationwide After 20-Weeks. In January 2018, Rubio voted for legislation banning abortion after the fetus is 20 weeks old. According to Congressional Quarterly, “the bill that would prohibit abortions in cases where the probable age of the fetus is 20 weeks or later and would impose criminal penalties on doctors who violate the ban, with certain exceptions. The bill would require a second doctor trained in neonatal resuscitation to be present for abortions where the fetus has the ‘potential’ to survive outside the womb.” The vote was on a motion to

invoke cloture on a motion to proceed, which required 60 affirmative votes. The Senate rejected the motion by a vote of 51 to 46. [Senate Vote 25, [1/29/18](#); Congressional Quarterly, [1/29/18](#); Congressional Actions, [S. 2311](#)]

2015: Rubio Supported A National Ban On Abortions After 20 Weeks Of Pregnancy

2015: Rubio Supported A National Ban On Abortions After 20 Weeks Of Pregnancy. According to Politico, “Republicans are more united than they have been in years on a national strategy to roll back abortion rights, using state legislatures and the new GOP Congress to push for banning the procedure after 20 weeks of pregnancy — a platform that also has the backing of the party’s presidential candidates. [...] And eight major potential Republican presidential hopefuls are on board with the national ban, cementing the party’s abortion plank long before primary season. Besides Bush and Paul, that list includes Sens. Marco Rubio of Florida and Ted Cruz of Texas, Govs. Mike Pence of Indiana and Bobby Jindal of Louisiana, former Pennsylvania Sen. Rick Santorum and former Gov. Mike Huckabee of Arkansas. Huckabee and Bush are the two candidates who have taken the most concrete steps toward running.” [Politico, [1/12/15](#)]

2015: Rubio Effectively Voted For A Bill That Would Prohibit Abortions After 20 Weeks

2015: Rubio Effectively Voted For A Bill That Would Prohibit Abortions Nationwide After 20 Weeks Gestation. In September 2015, Rubio effectively voted for a bill that would prohibit abortions after 20 weeks of gestation and would impose criminal penalties on doctors that violated the ban. According to Congressional Quarterly, the bill would, “prohibit abortions in cases where the probable age of the fetus is 20 weeks or later, except in cases of rape, incest against a minor or when the life of the pregnant woman is in danger. Specifically, it would provide an exemption for pregnancies that are the result of rape against adult women if the woman obtained counseling or medical treatment for the rape at least 48 hours before the abortion. Pregnancies resulting from rape or incest against a minor would also be exempt from the ban if the rape or incest had been reported before the abortion to law enforcement or another government agency authorized to act on reports of child abuse. The measure would impose criminal penalties on doctors who violate the ban. The measure also would require health care practitioners to give the same level of care to an infant born alive during a failed abortion as they would give to an infant born at the same gestational age through natural birth.” The vote was on cloture and the Senate rejected the bill 54 to 42; 60 Senators voting yes would have been required to invoke cloture. The House had earlier passed the bill. [Senate Vote 268, [9/22/15](#); Congressional Quarterly, [9/22/15](#); Congressional Actions, [H.R. 36](#)]

2014: Rubio Co-Sponsored A Federal 20-Week Abortion Ban

2014: Rubio Co-Sponsored A Federal 20-Week Abortion Ban. According to a press release from Rubio, “As an original co-sponsor of the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act (S.1670), I was disappointed that Majority Leader Harry Reid and Senate Democrats blocked today’s attempt to bring this compassionate and reasonable legislation to the floor for a vote. S.1670 would protect unborn babies beginning at 20 weeks – more than halfway through pregnancy – when science reveals that they can feel excruciating pain. [...] I am proud to be joining Senator Lindsey Graham and 39 of my colleagues in the Senate in strongly supporting the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. I hope the Majority Leader will reconsider and allow this legislation to be considered on the floor.” [Rubio Press Release, [5/13/14](#)]

Rubio Opposed Roe v. Wade

RUBIO SIGNED A BRIEF THAT CALLED ON THE SUPREME COURT TO CONSIDER OVERTURNING ROE V. WADE

Rubio Signed On To Amicus Brief That Called For Supreme Court Reconsider Overturning Roe v. Wade In Dobbs v. Jackson. According to the Washington Examiner, “Possible Republican presidential contenders have asked the Supreme Court to overturn Roe v. Wade, the ruling that legalized abortion nationwide, arguing in court documents the 1973 decision was unconstitutional. GOP lawmakers possibly positioning themselves for a 2024 presidential run, such as Sens. Tom Cotton and Marco Rubio and Govs. Ron DeSantis of Florida and Greg Abbott of Texas, petitioned the Supreme Court this week to throw out Roe in Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization, which is on the court’s agenda for the 2021-2022 term. ‘If the Court construes Roe ... as prohibiting the assertion of vital state interests in regulating abortion — such as protecting women from dangerous late-term abortions ... these precedents should be reconsidered and, where necessary, wholly or

partially overruled,' Rubio and Cotton wrote with 42 other senators and 184 House members in a brief filed to the Supreme Court on Thursday." [Washington Examiner, [8/1/21](#)]

RUBIO VOICED HIS OPPOSITION TO ROE V. WADE

Rubio Called Roe v. Wade An "Egregiously Flawed Supreme Court Decision." According to Bloomberg, "At the National Right to Life Convention on Friday, Florida Senator Marco Rubio touted his opposition to abortion rights, long a prerequisite for being a viable Republican presidential candidate. Speaking to the crowd in New Orleans, he hit all the necessary notes — legal abortion is 'the taking of innocent life on a massive scale'; Roe v. Wade was an 'egregiously flawed Supreme Court decision'; the case for abortion rights is 'indefensible.'" [Bloomberg, [7/10/15](#)]

Rubio Called The Anniversary Of Roe v. Wade The "Tragic Anniversary Of One Of America's Most Blatant Instances Of Judicial Activism." According to a press release from Rubio, "U.S. Senator Marco Rubio (R-FL) issued the following statement regarding the 40th anniversary of the Roe v. Wade Supreme Court decision: "Today marks the tragic anniversary of one of America's most blatant instances of judicial activism that paved the way for the destruction of innocent unborn life." [Rubio Press Release, [1/22/13](#)]

Rubio Said Roe v. Wade Was A "Catastrophe" With "Horrifying" Results. According to the Palm Beach Post, "Republicans Charlie Crist and Marco Rubio didn't mention each other by name Saturday at a Christian Family Coalition forum. But the U.S. Senate rivals were clearly battling. Rubio said politicians are pro choice unless they support overturning Roe vs. Wade, a ruling Rubio called a 'catastrophe' with 'horrifying' results. It was a swipe at the governor, who says he is anti abortion but would 'rather change hearts' than change the abortion law. 'Senators can't change hearts. Only God can change hearts,' said Rubio, a former state House speaker. 'Senators can help change the law,' he continued. 'Senators can make sure that judges confirmed to the United States Supreme Court understand that Roe v. Wade is bad law constitutionally and morally and it should be overturned.'" [Palm Beach Post, 2/28/10]

RUBIO EFFECTIVELY VOTED TWICE AGAINST THE WOMEN'S HEALTH PROTECTION ACT, WHICH WOULD HAVE CODIFIED ABORTION PROTECTIONS UNDER ROE V. WADE

2022: Rubio Effectively Voted Against The Women's Health Protection Act Of 2021. In May 2022, according to Congressional Quarterly, Rubio voted against the "motion to invoke cloture on the Schumer motion to proceed to the bill that would statutorily establish that health care providers have a right to provide and patients have a right to receive abortion services." The vote was on a motion to invoke cloture. The Senate rejected the motion by a vote of 49-51. [Senate Vote 170, [5/11/22](#); Congressional Quarterly, [5/11/22](#); Congressional Actions, [H.R. 3755](#)]

2022: Rubio Effectively Voted Against The Women's Health Protection Act Of 2021, Which Would Protect The Right To Abortion Access And Prohibit Restrictions On Abortion. In February 2022, according to Congressional Quarterly, Rubio voted against the "motion to invoke cloture (thus limiting debate) on the Schumer, D-N.Y., motion to proceed to the bill." The vote was on a motion to invoke cloture. The Senate rejected the motion by a vote of 46-48. [Senate Vote 65, [2/28/22](#); Congressional Quarterly, [2/28/22](#); Congressional Actions, [H.R. 3755](#)]

The Women's Health Protection Act Would Have Codified The Protections Under Roe v. Wade

The Women's Health Protection Act Would Have Codified Protections For Abortion Rights Under Roe v. Wade.

According to the Washington Post, "The House on Friday passed legislation that would protect access to reproductive health care, including the ability to travel across state lines for an abortion, as part of Democrats' efforts to minimize the consequences of the Supreme Court overturning Roe v. Wade last month. One bill, the Women's Health Protection Act, would enshrine the protections of Roe v. Wade into law. The House already passed the bill last year, but it did not advance in a Senate vote in May. The House passed the bill, 219-210, prompting applause from Democrats in the chamber." [Washington Post, [7/15/22](#)]

Rubio Supported State Laws That Restricted Abortion

RUBIO SUPPORTED A TEXAS LAW THAT IMPOSED NUMEROUS RESTRICTIONS ON ACCESS TO ABORTION

Rubio Joined An Amicus Brief In The Case of Whole Woman’s Health v. Cole Urging The Supreme Court To Uphold The Constitutionality Of The Texas Abortion Law H.B. 2. According to a press release from Rubio, “U.S. Senator Marco Rubio (R-FL) today issued the following statement regarding his participation in an amicus brief, filed in the case of Whole Woman’s Health v. Cole which urges the Supreme Court to respect the judgment of the Texas legislature and uphold the constitutionality of Texas’s abortion law.” [Rubio Press Release, [2/3/16](#)]

Rubio Said He Was “Incredibly Disappointed” That The Supreme Court Overturned Texas’ H.B. 2

Rubio Said He Was “Incredibly Disappointed” The Supreme Court Overturned Texas’ H.B. 2. According to a press release from Rubio, “U.S. Senator Marco Rubio (R-FL) today commented on the U.S. Supreme Court’s decision in the case of Whole Woman’s Health v. Hellerstedt, striking down a Texas law that requires abortion clinics whose doctors can admit patients to hospitals subject to the same regulations that apply to ambulatory surgery centers. The Texas law, H.B. 2, is designed to safeguard women who choose to have abortions by ensuring that all Texas clinics are sanitary, regulated and in proximity to a hospital in the event complications arise. [...] ‘I’m incredibly disappointed that the Supreme Court has struck down what I believe is an appropriate response to make sure that women and unborn children aren’t ever again subjected to the atrocities that took place in Kermit Gosnell’s facilities.’” [Rubio Press Release, [6/27/16](#)]

The Texas Law Imposed Numerous Restrictions On Access To Abortion By Making Abortion Providers And Facilities Follow Strict Requirements

The Texas Law Required Doctors Who Perform Abortions To Have Admitting Privileges At A Hospital No Farther Than 30 Miles Away. According to the Center for Reproductive Rights, “In 2013, Texas legislators passed HB2, a sweeping measure that imposes numerous restrictions on access to abortion, most notably the following requirements: doctors who provide abortion services must obtain admitting privileges at local hospitals no farther than 30 miles away from the clinic, and every health care facility offering abortion care must meet building specifications to essentially become mini-hospitals (also known as ambulatory surgical centers, or ASCs).” [Center for Reproductive Rights, accessed [3/22/24](#)]

The Texas Law Required Every Health Care Facility Offering Abortion Services To Meet Building Specifications To Essentially Become Mini-Hospitals. According to the Center for Reproductive Rights, “In 2013, Texas legislators passed HB2, a sweeping measure that imposes numerous restrictions on access to abortion, most notably the following requirements: doctors who provide abortion services must obtain admitting privileges at local hospitals no farther than 30 miles away from the clinic, and every health care facility offering abortion care must meet building specifications to essentially become mini-hospitals (also known as ambulatory surgical centers, or ASCs).” [Center for Reproductive Rights, accessed [3/22/24](#)]

RUBIO SUPPORTED A FLORIDA LAW THAT REQUIRED WOMEN TO HAVE A MEDICALLY UNNECESSARY ULTRASOUND PRIOR TO AN ABORTION

Rubio Urged Crist Not To Veto HB 1143, A Bill Requiring Women To Have An Ultrasound Prior To An Abortion. According to the Florida Times-Union, “While most of the heated debate around an abortion measure passed in the waning hours of the 2010 legislative session has focused on a provision requiring a woman to have an ultrasound before undergoing an abortion, the legislation also includes a potential political land mine for Gov. Charlie Crist. If Crist vetoes the bill, as he has indicated he is likely to do, he will also be nixing language that supporters say will bar taxpayer funding of abortions. [...] In fact, Rubio highlighted the issue in a statement last month on the abortion bill, House Bill 1143.” [Florida Times-Union, 6/2/10]

Guttmacher: Mandatory Ultrasound Provisions Are “A Veiled Attempt To [...] Dissuade An Individual From Obtaining An Abortion”

Guttmacher: Mandatory Ultrasounds Are “A Veiled Attempt To [...] Dissuade An Individual From Obtaining An Abortion.” According to Guttmacher, “Since the mid-1990s, several states have moved to make ultrasound part of abortion service provision. Some laws and policies require that a person seeking an abortion receive information on accessing

ultrasound services, while others require that a patient undergo an ultrasound before an abortion. Since routine ultrasound is not considered medically necessary as a component of first-trimester abortion, the requirements appear to be a veiled attempt to personify the fetus and dissuade an individual from obtaining an abortion. Moreover, an ultrasound can add significantly to the cost of the procedure.” [Guttmacher, [9/1/23](#)]

Rubio Supported Efforts To Restrict Medication Abortion

RUBIO SUPPORTED MORE GOVERNMENT OVERSIGHT OF MEDICATION ABORTION

Rubio Joined A Letter To The Head Of The FDA That Requested Restoration Of Stringent Oversight Of Chemical Abortion. According to Rubio press release, “U.S. Senator Marco Rubio (R-FL) joined Senator Cindy Hyde-Smith (R-MS) and U.S. Congressman Bob Latta (R-OH), along with 124 bicameral colleagues, in sending a letter to the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) requesting the FDA immediately restore more stringent oversight of chemical abortion bills, including the in-person dispensing requirement the FDA suspended in December.” [Rubio press release, [2/22/22](#)]

RUBIO CO-SPONSORED A BILL THAT WOULD HAVE MADE IT HARDER TO ACCESS MEDICATION ABORTION

Rubio Announced Co-Sponsorship Of Bill S.95. According to a press release from Rubio “Rubio announced he was co-sponsoring 10 anti abortion bills. Those bills include: [...] Cindy Hyde-Smith’s (R-MS) bill would prevent labeling changes from previously-approved abortion drugs, most notably attempts to remove the Risk Evaluation and Mitigation Strategies (REMS) certification. REMS is a safety requirement that mandates certified providers only dispense drugs from healthcare settings and they inform the patient about the associated risks of taking abortion medication. The bill also prevents providers from prescribing these drugs remotely, by mail, or via telehealth services. It also prevents the FDA from authorizing new abortion medicines.” [Rubio press release, [1/29/21](#)]

- **Bill S.95 Would Make It Harder To Access Medication Abortion By Preventing Prescription Of These Drugs Remotely And Preventing The FDA From Authorizing New Abortion Medicines.** According to a press release from Rubio, “SAVE Moms and Babies Act. Senator Cindy Hyde-Smith’s (R-MS) bill would prevent labeling changes from previously-approved abortion drugs, most notably attempts to remove the Risk Evaluation and Mitigation Strategies (REMS) certification. REMS is a safety requirement that mandates certified providers only dispense drugs from healthcare settings and they inform the patient about the associated risks of taking abortion medication. The bill also prevents providers from prescribing these drugs remotely, by mail, or via telehealth services. It also prevents the FDA from authorizing new abortion medicines.” [Rubio Press Release, [1/29/21](#)]

Rubio Backed Efforts To Restrict Contraception Access

RUBIO DISMISSED THE NEED FOR CONTRACEPTION COVERAGE, SAYING WOMEN COULD SIMPLY PAY FOR IT THEMSELVES OR WORK ELSEWHERE

Rubio On His Contraception Mandate Bill: “If An Employee Asks For Birth Control, That Worker Could Pay For It Themselves Or Choose To Work Elsewhere.” According to an op-ed by Rubio in the Tampa Bay Times, “The editorial against my bill to protect religious freedom against an unconstitutional Obama administration overreach was blatantly misleading. The Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 2012 would insert a conscience clause to effectively repeal the new Obamacare mandate forcing most church-affiliated organizations to offer employees private insurance coverage without out-of-pocket charges for birth control, something they object to on moral grounds. Without this exception, their religious liberties and conscience rights are being violated. To be clear, this bill does not forbid women from pursuing these products. If an employee asks for birth control, that worker could pay for it themselves or choose to work elsewhere. What it does forbid is government from forcing religious entities to provide them. Contrary to your editorial, I am not imposing my beliefs on anyone. The culprit here is the Obama administration, which has decided to impose its ideological beliefs on faith-based institutions that have a First Amendment right not to offer birth control to workers.” [Tampa Bay Times, Op-ed – Marco Rubio, [2/3/12](#)]

RUBIO VOTED AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD HAVE OVERTURNED THE SUPREME COURT'S HOBBY LOBBY DECISION

2014: Rubio Effectively Voted Against Barring For-Profit Employers From Excluding Contraception, Or Any Other Federally Required Coverage, From The Health Coverage They Provide Their Employees. In July 2014, Rubio effectively voted against a bill that, according to Congressional Quarterly, “would prohibit employers from refusing to cover contraception or any other type of health coverage guaranteed under federal law for their employees and dependents. It includes language that would ensure that exemptions for places of worship and religiously-affiliated nonprofit organizations remain in place.” The vote was on a motion to end debate on a motion to proceed to consider the bill, which required 60 votes to succeed. The Senate rejected the motion by a vote of 56 to 43. [Senate Vote 228, [7/16/14](#); Congressional Quarterly, [7/16/14](#)]

- **The Hobby Lobby Ruling Stated That The Affordable Care Act Violated A Federal Law Protecting Religious Freedom By Requiring Family-Owned Corporations To Pay For Insurance Coverage For Contraception.** According to the New York Times, “The Supreme Court ruled on Monday that requiring family-owned corporations to pay for insurance coverage for contraception under the Affordable Care Act violated a federal law protecting religious freedom. It was, a dissent said, ‘a decision of startling breadth.’ The 5-to-4 ruling, which applied to two companies owned by Christian families, opened the door to many challenges from corporations over laws that they claim violate their religious liberty.” [New York Times, [6/30/14](#)]

RUBIO REPEATEDLY BACKED EFFORTS TO WEAKEN THE ACA'S CONTRACEPTION COVERAGE REQUIREMENTS

2017: Rubio Effectively Voted Against Requiring 60 Votes To Consider Legislation That Would Reduce Birth Control Coverage From The Affordable Care Act

2017: Rubio Effectively Voted Against Requiring 60 Votes To Consider Legislation That Would Reduce Reproductive Health Care Coverage And Birth Control Coverage From The Affordable Care Act. In January 2017, Rubio voted against waiving a point of order against an amendment that said, according to the text of the amendment, “(a) Point of Order.--It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that makes women sick again by eliminating or reducing access to women’s health care, including decreases in access to, or coverage of, reproductive health care services including contraceptive counseling, birth control, and maternity care, and primary and preventive health care as afforded to them under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148). (b) Legislation That Makes Women Sick Again.--For the purposes of subsection (a), the term ‘makes women sick again’ with respect to legislation refers to any provision of a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report, that would— [...] (C) permitting discrimination against providers who provide reproductive health care benefits or services to women; or [...] (3) eliminate, or reduce the scope or scale of, the benefits women would have received pursuant to the requirements under title I of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148) and the amendments made to that title. (c) Waiver and Appeal.--Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).” The underlying legislation was an FY 2017 budget resolution designed to being the process of repealing the Affordable Care Act, which could be passed by a majority vote. The vote was on a motion to waive the budget act in relation to the amendment. The vote required a three-fifths vote for approval. The Senate rejected the motion by a vote of 49 to 49. [Senate Vote 23, [1/11/17](#); Congressional Record, [1/11/17](#); Vox, [1/3/07](#); Congressional Actions, [S. Amdt. 82](#); Congressional Actions, [S. Con. Res. 3](#)]

2013: Rubio Voted To Oppose Protecting The Affordable Care Act's Contraception Coverage Provisions For Women

2013: Rubio Voted To Support Allowing Employers To Claim Exemptions To The Affordable Care Act's Provisions On Health Care And Contraception Coverage On The Basis Of Religious And Moral Objections. In March 2013, Rubio voted for an amendment that, according to the National Law Review, “would allow employers to opt out of contraception coverage on moral grounds.” According to the Congressional Record, the purpose of the amendment was to

“establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to protect women's access to health care, including primary and preventive care, in a manner consistent with protecting rights of conscience.” The vote was on an amendment to the Senate version of the fiscal year 2014 budget resolution. The Senate rejected the amendment by a vote of 44 to 55. [Senate Vote 55, [3/22/13](#); Congressional Record, [3/22/13](#); National Law Review, [3/25/13](#)]

2013: Rubio Voted To Oppose Protecting The ACA’s Health Care And Contraception Coverage Provisions For Women. In March 2013, Rubio voted against an amendment that, according to The Hill’s Floor Action Blog, would “protect women’s healthcare coverage and employer-provided contraceptive coverage authorized under the Affordable Care Act.” According to the Congressional Record, the purpose of the amendment was to “establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to protect women’s access to health care, including primary and preventative health care, family planning and birth control, and employer-provided contraceptive coverage, such as was provided under the Affordable Care Act.” The vote was on an amendment to the Senate version of the fiscal year 2014 budget resolution. The Senate adopted the amendment by a vote of 56 to 43. The underlying budget resolution later passed the Senate, but Congress had taken no further action on it as of September 2013. [Senate Vote 54, [3/22/13](#); The Hill’s Floor Action Blog, [3/22/13](#); Congressional Record, [3/21/13](#); Congressional Actions, [S. Amdt 438](#); Congressional Actions, [S.Con.Res. 8](#)]

2012: Rubio Supported The Blunt Amendment, Which Would Restricted Access To Contraception Under The ACA

2012: Rubio Effectively Voted For The Blunt Amendment

2012: Rubio Effectively Voted For The Blunt Amendment, Which Would Have Allowed Employers And Insurance Companies To Avoid Affordable Care Act Requirements They Found Morally Objectionable. In March 2012, Rubio effectively voted for the Blunt Amendment that, according to CNN, “would establish that an entity refusing coverage on religious or moral grounds is not in violation of the law.” The vote was on a motion to table the amendment, with 48 senators voting against the motion – keeping the amendment alive – and 51 senators voting for the motion. [Senate Vote 24, [3/1/12](#); CNN, 3/1/12]

- **The Blunt Amendment Proposed To Give All Employers, Religious And Non-Religious, The Ability To Opt-Out Of Health Care Requirements With Which They Disagreed On Moral Or Religious Grounds.** According to CNN, “The Senate is set to vote Thursday on a controversial amendment pushed by Senate Republicans that would allow employers to opt out of health care coverage they disagree with on moral grounds. The so-called ‘conscience’ amendment, sponsored by Sen. Roy Blunt of Missouri, is the Senate Republicans’ response to the simmering controversy over a recent Obama administration decision to mandate the kind of health care coverage provided by religious employers. ‘This bill would just simply say that those health care providers don’t have to follow that mandate if it violates their faith principles,’ stated an early February press release from Blunt. ‘This is about the First Amendment. It’s about religious beliefs. It’s not about any one issue.’ [CNN, 3/1/12]

Rubio Was An Original Co-Sponsor Of The Blunt Amendment

Rubio Was Original Co-Sponsor Of Blunt Amendment. According to the Tampa Bay Times, Rubio was an original co-sponsor of the ‘Blunt amendment’ to the Affordable Care Act that would have allowed employers to deny coverage, particularly for contraception, on moral or religious grounds. The amendment failed. In a statement, Rubio said, “The Senate’s failure to pass Senator Blunt’s amendment is a setback for religious freedoms in America. We must stop the unconstitutional mandate under Obamacare that requires church-affiliated organizations to offer their workers private-insurance coverage without out-of-pocket charges for birth control, something they are morally opposed to. Telling religious based organizations that they must, by mandate of the federal government, pay for things that that religion teaches is wrong. You may not agree with what the religion believes, but that’s not the point. The point is the First Amendment still applies. Religious freedom still exists.” [Tampa Bay Times, 3/1/12]

Rubio Expressed Disappointment At The Failure Of The Blunt Amendment

2012: Rubio Expressed Disappointment With The Failure Of Senator Blunt’s Amendment. According to a press release from Rubio, “U.S. Senator Marco Rubio (R-FL) issued the following statement after today’s vote on the Blunt Amendment: ‘The Senate’s failure to pass Senator Blunt’s amendment is a setback for religious freedoms in America. We must stop the

unconstitutional mandate under Obamacare that requires church-affiliated organizations to offer their workers private-insurance coverage without out-of-pocket charges for birth control, something they are morally opposed to. Telling religious based organizations that they must, by mandate of the federal government, pay for things that that religion teaches is wrong. You may not agree with what the religion believes, but that's not the point. The point is the First Amendment still applies. Religious freedom still exists." [Rubio Press Release, [3/1/12](#)]

2012: Rubio Introduced A Bill To Allow An Exception To Mandated Contraceptive Coverage Under The ACA For Religious Reasons

2012: Rubio Introduced Legislation To Repeal The ACA's Requirement That Employers Offer Coverage For Contraception in Employee Health Plans. According to the Pensacola News Journal, "Rubio introduced the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 2012 (RFRA), which would repeal the requirement in the Affordable Care Act requiring employers offer coverage for contraceptives, if the employer had a religious objection. In a statement, Rubio said, "The Obama Administration's obsession with forcing mandates on the American people has now reached a new low by violating the conscience rights and religious liberties of our people." [Pensacola News Journal, 2/1/12]

RUBIO VOTED AGAINST A BILL REQUIRING THAT HOSPITALS PROVIDE BIRTH CONTROL FOR RAPE SURVIVORS

2002: Rubio Voted Against An Amendment That Required Hospitals Make Birth Control Available To Rape Victims. In March 2002, Rubio voted against an amendment that "deems it essential that rape survivors be informed of pregnancy prophylaxis and have access to pregnancy prophylaxis as a treatment option." The amendment was rejected by the House 48 to 64. No subsequent action was taken. [Florida Legislative Archive, [3/18/02](#)]

- **The Legislation Required Hospitals To Provide Rape Survivors With Birth Control Pills That Can Prevent Pregnancy.** According to the Associated Press, "A bill to require hospitals to provide rape survivors with birth control pills that can prevent pregnancy failed in the House. The idea had drawn bipartisan support in committee, but a bill requiring the pregnancy prevention drugs hadn't made it to the floor. Rep. Anne Gannon tried to put the proposal onto another health care bill (CS HB 507) as an amendment, but the House rejected it on a 48-64 vote. 'Go back and tell the women in your district that you voted against treatment for a rape survivor,' said Gannon, D Delray Beach. According to supporters, the drugs, if taken within 72 hours of intercourse, prevent ovulation or fertilization and inhibit implantation of eggs in the uterus. They don't end pregnancies." [Associated Press, 3/18/02]

The Amendment Included An Exception For Religious Beliefs. According to the Florida Legislative Archive, "Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, a health care facility licensed under this chapter may refuse to provide care to a rape survivor because the provisions of this section are inconsistent with the religious beliefs of the facility or the health care practitioner." [Florida Legislative Archive, [3/18/02](#)]

Rubio Supported Efforts To Antagonize Planned Parenthood

RUBIO SUPPORTED DEFUNDING PLANNED PARENTHOOD

Rubio Said He Was Proud That One Of His First Actions As Senator Was To Vote To Defund Planned Parenthood

Rubio Said He Was "Proud" That One Of His First Actions As Senator Was To Vote On Defunding Planned Parenthood. According to Caputo's Twitter, "...--Rubio cont... 'I'm proud that one of my first actions in the Senate was voting to defund this organization.' 2/2" [Twitter, @MarcACaputo, [7/15/15](#)]

RUBIO VOTED AT LEAST 11 TIMES TO DEFUND PLANNED PARENTHOOD

2018: Rubio Voted To Defund Planned Parenthood

2018: Rubio Voted To Defund Planned Parenthood. In August 2018, Rubio voted for an amendment that would have, according to Congressional Quarterly, “prohibit[ed] federal funds from going to Planned Parenthood.” The underlying legislation was an FY 2019 Labor, HHS, Education and Defense appropriations bill. The Senate rejected the amendment by a vote of 45 to 48. [Senate Vote 191, [8/23/18](#); Congressional Quarterly, [8/23/18](#); Congressional Actions, [S. Amdt. 3967](#); Congressional Actions, [S. Amdt. 3695](#); Congressional Actions, [H.R. 6157](#)]

2017: Rubio Voted For The So-Called “Skinny Repeal” Version Of Trumpcare, Which Defunded Planned Parenthood For One Year

2017: Rubio Voted For The So-Called “Skinny Repeal” Version Of Trumpcare, Which Defunded Planned Parenthood For One Year. In July 2017, Rubio voted for the Health Care Freedom Act, also known as “skinny repeal.” According to Vox, “The Health Care Freedom Act is the Senate Republicans’ last-ditch attempt to repeal Obamacare. Released around 10 o’clock Thursday night, it is expected to come to a vote early Friday morning. [...] This HCFA would repeal the Affordable Care Act’s mandate that all Americans carry coverage. It would nix the requirement that large employers provide coverage to all workers, too. The bill includes a three-year repeal of the medical device tax and a one-year defunding of Planned Parenthood.” The vote was on the amendment. The Senate rejected the amendment by a vote of 49 to 51. [Senate Vote 179, [7/28/17](#); Vox, [7/27/17](#); Congressional Actions, [S. Amdt. 667](#); Congressional Actions, [S. Amdt. 267](#); Congressional Actions, [H.R. 1628](#)]

2017: Rubio Voted For The Obamacare Repeal Reconciliation Act, Which Would Have Defunded Planned Parenthood

2017: Rubio Voted For The Obamacare Repeal Reconciliation Act, Which Would Have Defunded Planned Parenthood. In July 2017, Rubio voted for the Obamacare Repeal Reconciliation Act of 2017. According to Congressional Quarterly, the legislation would have “sunset Medicaid expansion and certain taxes created under the 2010 health care overhaul, repeal[ed] the individual and employer mandates, would [have] exclude[d] health plans that cover abortion from certain tax credits and would [have] ban[ned] federal funding for abortion providers that receive at least \$1 million in federal funding annually.” The underlying legislation was the reconciliation vehicle for Trumpcare. The Senate rejected the amendment by a vote of 45 to 55. [Senate Vote 169, [7/26/17](#); Congressional Quarterly, [7/25/17](#); Congressional Actions, [S. Amdt. 271](#); Congressional Actions, [S. Amdt. 267](#); Congressional Actions, [H.R. 1628](#)]

2017: Rubio Voted To Disapprove A Rule That Would Have Effectively Withheld Title X Funds To States That Restrict Title X Funds To Planned Parenthood

2017: Rubio Voted To Disapprove A Rule That Would Have Effectively Withheld Title X Funds To States That Restrict Title X Funds To Planned Parenthood. In March 2017, Rubio voted for disapproving the HHS rule related to Title X funding compliance via the Congressional Review Act. According to Congressional Quarterly, “This resolution disapproves the rule issued by the Health and Human Services Department (HHS) on Dec. 19, 2016, that modifies eligibility requirements for Title X grants for family planning services to specify that states and other entities awarding funds cannot prohibit a health care provider from participating for reasons other than its ability to provide Title X services (which effectively threatens to withhold Title X money from states that restrict participation by Planned Parenthood). The measure provides that the rule (formally titled Compliance With Title X Requirements by Project Recipients in Selecting Subrecipients) would have no force or effect.” The vote was on passage. The Senate passed the resolution by a vote of 50 to 50 with Vice President Pence breaking the tie in favor of the bill. The legislation later became law. [Senate Vote 101, [3/30/17](#); Congressional Quarterly, [2/10/17](#); Congressional Actions, [H.J. Res. 43](#)]

2017: Rubio Effectively Voted To Disapprove A Rule That Would Have Effectively Withheld Title X Funds To States That Restrict Title X Funds To Planned Parenthood. In March 2017, Rubio effectively voted for disapproving the HHS rule related to Title X funding compliance via the Congressional Review Act. According to Congressional Quarterly, “This resolution disapproves the rule issued by the Health and Human Services Department (HHS) on Dec. 19, 2016, that modifies eligibility requirements for Title X grants for family planning services to specify that states and other entities awarding funds cannot prohibit a health care provider from participating for reasons other than its ability to provide Title X services (which effectively threatens to withhold Title X money from states that restrict participation by Planned Parenthood). The measure provides that the rule (formally titled Compliance With Title X Requirements by Project Recipients in Selecting Subrecipients) would have no force or effect.” The vote was on a motion to proceed. The Senate adopted the motion by a vote of 50 to 50

with Vice President Pence breaking the tie in favor of the motion. The Senate later passed the resolution. The legislation later became law. [Senate Vote 100, [3/30/17](#); Congressional Quarterly, [2/10/17](#); Congressional Actions, [H. J. Res. 43](#)]

2015: Rubio Voted For A Bill That Defunded Planned Parenthood

2015: Rubio Voted For A Bill That Defunded Planned Parenthood. In December 2015, Rubio voted for a bill that according to Congressional Quarterly, would have “scrap[ed] in 2018 the law’s Medicaid expansion, as well as subsidies to help individuals buy coverage through the insurance exchanges.” Additionally, according to Congressional Quarterly the bill would have “repeal[ed] portions of the 2010 health care law and block[ed] federal funding for Planned Parenthood for one year. As amended, the bill would zero-out the law’s penalties for noncompliance with the law’s requirements for most individuals to obtain health coverage and employers to offer health insurance.” The vote was on passage of a reconciliation bill. The Senate approved the bill by a vote of 52 to 47. The bill was later passed by the full Congress, which the president then vetoed. The House was not able to override the veto. [Senate Vote 329, [12/3/15](#); Congressional Quarterly, [12/3/15](#); Real Clear Politics, [12/4/15](#); Congressional Actions, [H.R. 3762](#)]

2015: Rubio Voted To Defund Planned Parenthood

2015: Rubio Effectively Voted To Shut Down The Federal Government By Passing A 10-Week Continuing Resolution That Defunded Planned Parenthood. In September 2015, Rubio effectively voted for a 10-week continuing resolution that defunded Planned Parenthood. According to Congressional Quarterly, the vote was on a “Motion to invoke cloture (thus limiting debate) on the Cochran, R-Miss., substitute amendment no. 2669 that would provide continuing appropriations for government operations through Dec. 11, 2015, at an annual rate of about \$1.017 trillion. It also would prohibit for one year federal funding for Planned Parenthood or its affiliates unless they certify that they will not perform, or fund other entities that perform, abortions during that period. The substitute amendment would redirect \$235 million to community health centers.” The vote was on a motion to concur. The Senate rejected the motion by a vote of 47 to 52. The president signed the legislation into law. [Senate Vote 270, [9/30/15](#); Congressional Quarterly, [9/24/15](#); Congressional Actions, [H.R. 719](#)]

2015: Rubio Effectively Voted For Defunding Planned Parenthood

2015: Rubio Effectively Voted For Defunding Planned Parenthood. In December 2015, Rubio effectively voted for defunding Planned Parenthood. According to Congressional Quarterly, the amendment would have “remove[d] the section of the measure that would block for one year federal funding that is considered direct spending to Planned Parenthood.” The underlying legislation was a substitute amendment repealing key provisions of the Affordable Care Act while also defunding Planned Parenthood. The vote was on a motion to waive all applicable budgetary discipline required a 3/5’s majority. The Senate rejected the amendment by a vote of 48 to 52. [Senate Vote 314, [12/3/15](#); Congressional Quarterly, [12/3/15](#); Congressional Quarterly, [12/3/15](#); Congressional Actions, [S. Amdt. 2885](#); Congressional Actions, [S. Amdt. 2874](#); Congressional Actions, [H.R. 3762](#)]

2015: Rubio Voted For Defunding Planned Parenthood

2015: Rubio Voted For Defunding Planned Parenthood. In August 2015, Rubio voted for barring all federal funding to Planned Parenthood. According to CNN, “The fight over funding for Planned Parenthood shifts to a must-pass government funding measure this fall after a procedural vote in the Senate on legislation that would have barred all federal funds for the group failed on Monday.” The vote was on cloture the Motion to Proceed; the motion was rejected by a vote of 53 to 46; 60 Senators voting yes would have been required to proceed. [Senate Vote 262, [8/3/15](#); CNN, [8/4/15](#)]

2011: Rubio Voted Twice To Defund Planned Parenthood

2011: Rubio Voted For A Bill To Defund Planned Parenthood. In April 2011, Rubio voted for prohibiting any funds appropriated in the recently-passed bill funding the government through the end of fiscal year 2011 from being made available to Planned Parenthood or any of its affiliates. The vote was on a continuing resolution that, according to the Congressional Research Service, “[d]irect[ed] the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 1473 (Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011) to prohibit any funds under such Act from being made available to Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc. or any affiliate of Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc.” That change would have been made prior to sending H.R. 1473 – which had already passed both the House

and Senate – to the president. The Senate rejected the concurrent resolution by vote of 42 to 58. [Senate Vote 60, [4/14/11](#); CRS Summary, H Con Res 36, [4/14/11](#)]

2011: Rubio Voted For Eliminating FY2011 Federal Funding For Planned Parenthood. In March 2011, Rubio voted for prohibiting any funds in the remainder of FY2011 from being used to fund Planned Parenthood. The provision was part of a continuing resolution to fund the federal government until the end of FY 2011 that, according to Congressional Quarterly, “would prohibit any funds in the bill from being made available to Planned Parenthood Federation of America Inc. or its affiliates.” The bill was rejected by the Senate by a vote of 44 to 56. The bill number was later used as the vehicle for another piece of legislation. [Senate Vote 36, [3/9/11](#); Congressional Actions, [H.R. 1](#); Congressional Quarterly, [3/1/11](#)]

RUBIO OPPOSED ALLOWING TITLE X FUNDS TO ENTITIES THAT PROVIDED ABORTION REFERRALS

Rubio Signed On To A Resolution To Overturn The Biden Administration’s 2021 Final Rule On The Title X Family Planning Program. According to a press release from Rubio, “U.S. Senator Marco Rubio (R-FL) and 32 Republican Senators introduced a joint resolution under the Congressional Review Act (CRA) to overturn the Biden Administration’s 2021 Final Rule on the Title X Family Planning Program, which reversed the Trump Administration’s 2019 ban on federal funding to entities that provide abortion referrals to pregnant mothers. The 2019 rule did not reduce Title X funding, but simply redirected it to providers that do not perform or promote abortions as part of their ‘family planning’ practices. [...] ‘The Biden Administration’s rule is an assault on the most sacred and fundamental human right, the right to life,’ Rubio said. ‘I will continue to protect the sanctity of life and do everything I can to make sure taxpayer dollars are not used for or promote abortions.’” [Rubio Press Release, [3/17/22](#)]

- **Rubio Called Democrats “Disgraceful” For Rejecting His Resolution To Ban Federal Funding For Entities That Provide Abortion Referrals.** According to a Rubio press release, “U.S. Senator Marco Rubio (R-FL) released a statement after the Senate rejected his joint resolution under the Congressional Review Act (CRA) to overturn the Biden Administration’s 2021 Final Rule on the Title X Family Planning Program. The Final Rule reversed the Trump Administration’s 2019 ban on federal funding to entities, such as Planned Parenthood, that provide abortion referrals to pregnant mothers. 35 Republican senators have joined this resolution since its introduction on March 17, 2022. Rubio spoke on the Senate floor ahead of the vote. ‘President Biden’s rule is an assault on the most sacred and fundamental human right, the right to life,’ Rubio said. ‘It is disgraceful that Democrats voted to use tens of millions of taxpayer dollars to promote abortion instead of reinstating commonsense safeguards that protect life and ensure families have the resources they need to thrive. I will never stop advocating for the unborn.’ [Rubio press release, [4/27/22](#)]

Rubio Announced Co-Sponsorship Of A Bill To Restrict Title X Funds From Flowing To Abortion Providers.

According to a Rubio Press Release, “Rubio announced he was co-sponsoring 10 anti abortion bills. Those bills include: [...] Senator Marsha Blackburn’s (R-TN) bill would prohibit the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) from providing federal family planning grants to any entities that perform abortions.” [Rubio Press Release, [1/29/21](#)]

Restricting Title X Funds To Providers That Provided Abortion Referrals Would Have Blocked Planned Parenthood Health Centers From Receiving Funds

The Policy Would Have Blocked Funds To Planned Parenthood, Which Served 41% Of Those Who Relied On Title X Funds. According to Physicians for Reproductive Health, “Second is the blocking of Planned Parenthood health centers from receiving funding through Title X through an onerous ‘physical separation’ requirement. This is specifically designed to block patients from accessing care at Planned Parenthood, a vital provider of health care across this country serving 41% of those who rely on Title X health centers.” [Physicians for Reproductive Health, accessed [3/25/24](#)]

RUBIO SUPPORTED ALLOWING STATES TO EXCLUDE ABORTION PROVIDERS, LIKE PLANNED PARENTHOOD, FROM MEDICAID

Rubio Announced Co-Sponsorship Of Women’s Public Health and Safety Act. According to a press release from Rubio, “Rubio co-sponsored legislation [...] Women’s Public Health and Safety Act. Senator James Lankford’s (R-OK) bill would allow states to exclude providers of elective abortions from a state’s Medicaid program.” [Rubio Press Release, [1/29/21](#)]

The Women’s Public Health And Safety Act Would Have Allowed States To Exclude Abortion Providers, Including Planned Parenthood, From Receiving Medicaid Funds

The Women’s Public Health And Safety Act Would Have Allowed States To Exclude Abortion Providers, Including Planned Parenthood, From Medicaid Funding. According to a press release from Lankford, “Senator James Lankford (R-OK) today reintroduced the bicameral Women’s Public Health and Safety Act, which gives states the authority to exclude abortion providers, like Planned Parenthood, from receiving Medicaid funds.” [Lankford Press Release, [1/28/21](#)]

RUBIO INTRODUCED A BILL TO PREVENT PLANNED PARENTHOOD FROM RECEIVING PPP LOANS

Rubio Introduced A Bill To Prevent Any Tax Dollars, Including PPP Loans, Going To Planned Parenthood. According to a Rubio press release, “U.S. Senators Marco Rubio (R-FL), Joni Ernst (R-IA), and several other Republican senators introduced the Protecting Funding for Women’s Healthcare Act, which would prevent any taxpayer dollars from going to the nation’s single largest provider of abortions, as the Biden Administration looks to reverse a rule that prevents Title X funds from going to abortion providers. This week, Rubio joined colleagues in urging the U.S. Secretary of Health and Human Services (HHS) Xavier Becerra and the White House to preserve the rule and prevent taxpayer dollars from going to abortion providers. The Protecting Funding for Women’s Healthcare Act would apply to funds from the Paycheck Protection Program (PPP).” [Rubio press release, [4/15/21](#)]

Rubio Supported Legislation That Would Have Made It Harder For Young People To Receive Abortions

RUBIO SUPPORTED LEGISLATION THAT WOULD ALLOW PARENTS TO PREVENT MINORS FROM GETTING ABORTIONS

Rubio Indicated His Support For Federal Legislation Allowing Parents To Stop Minors From Getting Abortions. According to the National Pro-Life Alliance 2010 Congressional Candidate Survey, “Will you support federal legislation giving parents the right to stop any abortion from being performed on their minor daughter, except to prevent the death of the mother? [Rubio]: Yes.” [National Pro-Life Alliance 2010 Congressional Candidate Survey, 7/6/10]

Rubio Said That Parental Notification In The Case Of A Minor Seeking An Abortion Was A “Fundamental Role Of Parents Raising Their Children.” According to the Miami Herald, “On Wednesday, it was treated like a political speed bump after King said he feared the Parental Rights Amendment could lead to the revival of a parental consent law that the Supreme Court struck down in 1989. ‘It was way too broad,’ said King. ‘There were some arguments my people were making that by trying to define what a parents rights were, you could also eliminate the rights of the parent that might be implied because they weren’t listed.’ The whittled-down amendment proposal still provoked a partisan furor Wednesday, as House Democrats tried in vain to change the legislation so that the parental notification requirement would be waived when a minor had gotten pregnant due to rape or incest. ‘It is utterly irresponsible to actually make matters worse for a victim of rape or incest,’ said Rep. Nan Rich, D-Weston. But House Republicans called Democrats insensitive to the rights of parents. ‘Whether it is judicial activism or Democrat opportunism,’ said House Majority Leader Marco Rubio of Miami. ‘We cannot be deterred from the fundamental role of parents raising their children.’ [Miami Herald, 3/4/04]

RUBIO BACKED LEGISLATION TO MAKE IT A CRIME TO PERFORM AN ABORTION ON A MINOR FROM OUT OF STATE WITHOUT PARENTAL CONSENT

2021: Rubio Reintroduced Legislation To Make It A Crime To Perform An Abortion On A Minor From Out Of State Without Parental Consent At Start Of 117th Congress. According to a Rubio press release, “U.S. Senator Marco Rubio (R-FL) reintroduced the Child Interstate Abortion Notification Act (CIANA) and joined introduction of ten additional pieces of legislation to protect the sanctity of life. ‘There is no human right more fundamental and more sacred than the right to life,’ Rubio said. ‘Every single human being is entitled to the protection of our laws from the very moment of conception. I pray, and stand with those who march today in Washington and across our nation, that the dignity of human life will one day be respected. I remain committed to fighting to protect and uphold the right to life in Congress.’ Rubio sponsored legislation: Child Interstate Abortion Notification Act (CIANA) CIANA would make it a federal crime for physicians to perform an

abortion on a minor from another state without parental consent. The bill sets criminal punishments for providers that violate the law, and it provides an exception for when the minor's life is at risk. Rubio first introduced the legislation in January 2019.” [Rubio press release, [1/29/21](#)]

2015: Rubio Sponsored Legislation That Made It A Federal Crime To Transport A Minor Across State Lines To Obtain An Abortion. On February 5, 2015, Rubio sponsored S.404, which according to the Congressional Research Service, “Amends the federal criminal code to prohibit transporting a minor child across a state line to obtain an abortion (deems such transporting to be a de facto abridgment of the right of a parent under any law in the minor’s state of residence that requires parental involvement in the minor’s abortion decision). Makes an exception for an abortion necessary to save the life of the minor. Makes it an affirmative defense to a prosecution or civil action under this Act that a defendant: (1) reasonably believed that before the minor obtained the abortion, the required parental consent or notification or judicial authorization took place; or (2) was presented with documentation showing that a court waived parental notification requirements or authorized the minor's abortion.” The bill was introduced in the Senate on 2/5/15 and referred to the Committee on Judiciary. No subsequent action was taken. [Congressional Research Service, [S.404](#); Congressional Actions, [2/5/15](#)]

- **The Legislation Imposed A Fine And Prison Sentence Of One Year To Doctors Who Performed An Abortion.** According to the Congressional Research Service, “Imposes a fine and/or prison term of up to one year on a physician who performs or induces an abortion on an out-of-state minor in violation of parental notification requirements. Requires such physician to give 24-hour actual or constructive notice to a parent of the minor seeking an abortion, subject to certain exceptions.” [Congressional Research Service, [S.404](#); Congressional Actions, [2/5/15](#)]

2011: Rubio Introduced A Bill That Would Have Made It Illegal To Take A Minor Across State Lines To Obtain An Abortion. According to the Florida Times-Union, “This week, freshman U.S. Sen. Marco Rubio took his first foray into the choppy waters of Washington abortion politics. The Florida Republican introduced a familiar bill Tuesday that would outlaw taking a minor out of her home state to get an abortion in order to avoid parental consent or notification laws.” [Florida Times-Union, 6/23/11]

Rubio’s Bill Required Abortion Providers To Notify Parents Of Out-Of-State Minors

Rubio’s Legislation Required Abortion Providers To Notify Parents Of Out-Of-State Minors Before Performing An Abortion. According to a Rubio press release, “And second, it would require abortion providers to notify a parent of an out-of-state minor before performing an abortion. With disparate state laws regarding parental involvement all across the country, this bill would ensure those state laws are enforced regardless of where an abortion may be performed.” [Rubio press release, [6/21/11](#)]

Rubio’s Bill Allowed For The Punishment Of Physicians Who Performed Abortions

Rubio’s Legislation Allowed For Fines For And The Imprisonment Of Physicians Who Performed Abortions. According to a Rubio press release, “CIANA allows for punishment, in the form of fines or imprisonment, of physicians who knowingly perform an abortion on a minor who has traveled across state lines and any individual who transported the minor across state lines. This legislation does not apply in the cases of a medical emergency, abuse or neglect.” [Rubio press release, [6/21/11](#)]

RUBIO REPEATEDLY VOTED FOR LEGISLATION TO MAKE IT HARDER FOR A YOUNG PERSON TO OBTAIN AN ABORTION

2013: Rubio Effectively Voted For A Measure Calling For The Passage Of The Child Interstate Abortion Notification Act. In March 2013, Rubio effectively voted for a “sense of the Senate” amendment regarding the Child Interstate Abortion Notification Act (CIANA) and calling for that bill’s passage. According to The Hill, “The Senate on Friday evening rejected a Republican amendment to the 2014 budget that calls for new criminal penalties for abortions performed on minors outside their home state. Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.) proposed an amendment to the budget that encourages passage of his Child Interstate Abortion Notification Act.” The vote was on a motion to waive a point of order raised against the amendment. According to The Hill, “Boxer raised a point of order against Rubio’s amendment, saying it was non-germane. Rubio asked for a waiver from Senate budget rules.” The Senate rejected the motion to waive the point of order by a vote of 48 to 51, killing the amendment. [Senate Vote 64, [3/22/13](#); The Hill, [3/22/13](#)]

- **The Legislation Would Have Prohibited Transporting A Minor Across State Lines To Seek An Abortion And Would Require 24 Hours' Parental Notice Before An Abortion Could Be Performed On A Minor.** According to the Hill, “That bill makes it a crime to transport minors across state lines to obtain an abortion, and requires doctors to give 24 hours notice to parents before performing an abortion. It calls for fines of up to a year in prison for doctors who perform abortions on minors from outside the doctors’ home state without parental notification.” [Hill, [3/22/13](#)]

2005: Rubio Voted For A Bill Requiring Minors Obtain Parental Notice Before Getting An Abortion In Florida. In May 2005, Rubio voted for a bill that called for creating parental notice for abortion; prohibiting performing or inducement of termination of pregnancy upon minor without specified notice; prescribing procedure for judicial waiver of notice; providing for issuance of court order authorizing consent to termination of pregnancy without notification; and providing for confidential & closed hearings. The bill passed both houses of the Florida legislature, in the House by a vote of 96 to 14. The bill went on to be signed by the governor. [Florida Legislative Archive, [H 1659](#), [5/6/05](#)]

2004: Rubio Voted For An Amendment To The Florida Constitution That Required Minors To Notify Parents And Legal Guardians Before Getting An Abortion. In April 2004, Rubio voted for a bill that “constitutional amendment to authorize Legislature to require by general law for notification to parent or guardian of minor before termination of minor’s pregnancy; provides that Legislature shall not limit or deny privacy rights guaranteed to minors under United States Constitution as interpreted by United States Supreme Court, etc.” The bill failed to pass both houses of the Florida legislature, passing in the House by a vote of 91 to 24. No subsequent action was taken. [Florida Legislative Archive, [HJR 1](#), [4/30/04](#)]

Rubio Supported Efforts To Restrict Federal Funding For Abortion Care

RUBIO SAID HE WOULD BLOCK ANY LEGISLATION THAT UNDERMINED THE HYDE AMENDMENT

Rubio Signed Onto Letter Stating He Would Vote To Block Any Legislation That Would “Eliminate Or Weaken The Hyde Amendment.” According to a press release from Rubio, “U.S. Senator Marco Rubio (R-FL) and Steve Daines (R-MT), founder and chair of the Senate Pro-Life Caucus, along with 46 Senate colleagues sent a letter to Democratic Leader Chuck Schumer (D-NY) pledging that they will vote to block any bill that would undermine the Hyde Amendment or any other pro-life protections. ‘We are united in our resolve to guard against any changes to Federal law that would unsettle nearly half a century of bipartisan consensus against taxpayer funding for abortion on demand, or otherwise threaten the lives of unborn children. Accordingly, we are committed to vote against the advancement of any legislation that would eliminate or weaken the Hyde Amendment or any other current-law pro-life protections, or otherwise undermine existing Federal pro-life policy,’ the senators wrote.” [Rubio Press Release, [2/5/21](#)]

RUBIO CO-SPONSORED LEGISLATION TO BAN FEDERAL FUNDS FOR ABORTION

2021: Rubio Co-Sponsored Legislation To Prohibit Federal Funds From Being Used For Abortion Care. According to a press release from Rubio, “Rubio co-sponsored legislation: No Taxpayer Funding for Abortions Act Senator Roger Wicker’s (R-MS) bill would prohibit any federal funds from being used for abortions or to support health insurance coverage that includes abortions.” [Rubio Press Release, [1/29/21](#)]

RUBIO VOTED AT LEAST SEVEN TIMES TO OPPOSE FEDERAL FUNDING FOR ABORTION

2019: Rubio Effectively Voted For Legislation Prohibiting Federal Funds From Funding Abortions Or Health Benefits Covering Abortions

2019: Rubio Effectively Voted For Legislation Prohibiting Federal Funds From Funding Abortions Or Health Benefits Covering Abortions. In January 2019, Rubio effectively voted for a bill that, according to Congressional Quarterly, “prohibit[ed] federal funds from being used to fund abortions or to fund health benefits covering abortions.” The vote was on a motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to the bill. The Senate rejected the motion, thereby defeating the bill, by a vote of 48 to 47. [Senate Vote 7, [1/17/19](#); Congressional Quarterly, [1/17/19](#); Congressional Actions, [S. 109](#)]

2015: Rubio Voted For The “Hyde Amendment,” Which Prevents Federal Funds From Being Used To Pay For Most Abortion Services

2015: Rubio Voted In Support Of The “Hyde Amendment,” Which Prevents Federal Funds From Being Used To Pay For Most Abortion Services. In April 2015, Rubio voted against an amendment that would have, according to NARAL, “strike a reiteration of the Hyde amendment, a current-law public coverage ban on abortion care.” The underlying legislation that permanently patched the SGR reimbursement rate for Medicare physicians and reauthorized the Children’s Health Insurance Program. The vote was on the amendment. The Senate rejected the amendment by a vote of 43 to 57. [Senate Vote 140, [4/14/15](#); NARAL, [12/30/15](#); Congressional Quarterly, [4/14/15](#); Congressional Actions, [S. Amdt. 1117](#); Congressional Actions, [H.R. 2](#)]

2015: Rubio Voted At Least Five Times To Restrict Funding From An Anti-Human Trafficking Bill To Be Used To Pay For Abortion Care

2015: Rubio Effectively Voted For An Anti-Human Trafficking Bill That Included A Ban On Using Victim Restitution Funds To Pay For An Abortion

2015: Rubio Effectively Voted For An Anti-Human Trafficking Bill That Included A Ban On Using Victim Restitution Funds To Pay For An Abortion, Except In Cases Of Rape, Incest Or To Save The Mother’s Life. In March 2015, Rubio effectively voted for a bill that, according to Congressional Quarterly, “would use fines and penalties against sex-trafficking perpetrators for more restitution and assistance funds for victims.” According to a separate Congressional Quarterly article, “At issue is a provision that would prohibit the money in a crime victim compensation fund — established by the bill and funded by fines from offenders — from being used towards abortion services. Bill sponsor and Senate Majority Whip John Cornyn of Texas said the measure would provide about \$30 million to help victims of human trafficking crimes recover. [...] The provision bars federal dollars from being used to fund abortions except in cases of rape, incest or when the mother’s life is in danger.” The vote was on a motion to end debate on the bill, which required 60 votes to succeed. The Senate rejected the motion by a vote of 56 to 42. Afterwards, the Senate set the bill aside, and moved on to other business. A month later, the Senate passed a compromise version of the legislation. [Senate Vote 76, [3/19/15](#); Congressional Quarterly, [3/19/15](#); Congressional Quarterly, [3/10/15](#); Congressional Quarterly, [4/21/15](#); Congressional Actions, [S. 178](#)]

2015: Rubio Effectively Voted For An Anti-Human Trafficking Bill That Included A Ban On Using Victim Restitution Funds To Pay For An Abortion

2015: Rubio Effectively Voted For An Anti-Human Trafficking Bill That Included A Ban On Using Victim Restitution Funds To Pay For An Abortion, Except In Cases Of Rape, Incest Or To Save The Mother’s Life. In March 2015, Rubio effectively voted for a bill that, according to Congressional Quarterly, “would use fines and penalties against sex-trafficking perpetrators for more restitution and assistance funds for victims.” According to a separate Congressional Quarterly article, “At issue is a provision that would prohibit the money in a crime victim compensation fund — established by the bill and funded by fines from offenders — from being used towards abortion services. Bill sponsor and Senate Majority Whip John Cornyn of Texas said the measure would provide about \$30 million to help victims of human trafficking crimes recover. [...] The provision bars federal dollars from being used to fund abortions except in cases of rape, incest or when the mother’s life is in danger.” The vote was on a motion to end debate on the Senate Judiciary Committee’s substitute version of the legislation, which required 60 votes to succeed. The Senate rejected the motion by a vote of 56 to 42. After another attempt to end debate on the bill with the controversial language failed, the Senate set the bill aside, and moved on to other business. A month later, the Senate passed a compromise version of the legislation. [Senate Vote 75, [3/19/15](#); Congressional Quarterly, [3/19/15](#); Congressional Quarterly, [3/10/15](#); Congressional Quarterly, [4/21/15](#); Congressional Actions, [S. 178](#)]

2015: Rubio Effectively Voted For An Anti-Human Trafficking Bill That Included A Ban On Using Victim Restitution Funds To Pay For An Abortion

2015: Rubio Effectively Voted For An Anti-Human Trafficking Bill That Included A Ban On Using Victim Restitution Funds To Pay For An Abortion, Except In Cases Of Rape, Incest Or To Save The Mother’s Life. In March 2015, Rubio effectively voted for a bill that, according to Congressional Quarterly, “would use fines and penalties against sex-trafficking perpetrators for more restitution and assistance funds for victims.” According to a separate

Congressional Quarterly article, “At issue is a provision that would prohibit the money in a crime victim compensation fund — established by the bill and funded by fines from offenders — from being used towards abortion services. Bill sponsor and Senate Majority Whip John Cornyn of Texas said the measure would provide about \$30 million to help victims of human trafficking crimes recover. [...] The provision bars federal dollars from being used to fund abortions except in cases of rape, incest or when the mother’s life is in danger.” The vote was on a motion to end debate on the Senate Judiciary Committee’s substitute version of the legislation, which required 60 votes to succeed. The Senate rejected the motion by a vote of 57 to 41. After two other attempts to end debate on the bill with the controversial language failed, the Senate set the bill aside, and moved on to other business. A month later, the Senate passed a compromise version of the legislation. [Senate Vote 74, [3/18/15](#); Congressional Quarterly, [3/18/15](#); Congressional Quarterly, [3/10/15](#); Congressional Quarterly, [4/21/15](#); Congressional Actions, [S.178](#)]

2015: Rubio Effectively Voted For An Anti-Human Trafficking Bill That Included A Ban On Using Victim Restitution Funds To Pay For An Abortion

2015: Rubio Effectively Voted For An Anti-Human Trafficking Bill That Included A Ban On Using Victim Restitution Funds To Pay For An Abortion, Except In Cases Of Rape, Incest Or To Save The Mother’s Life. In March 2015, Rubio effectively voted for a bill that, according to Congressional Quarterly, “would use fines and penalties against sex-trafficking perpetrators for more restitution and assistance funds for victims.” According to a separate Congressional Quarterly article, “At issue is a provision that would prohibit the money in a crime victim compensation fund — established by the bill and funded by fines from offenders — from being used towards abortion services. Bill sponsor and Senate Majority Whip John Cornyn of Texas said the measure would provide about \$30 million to help victims of human trafficking crimes recover. [...] The provision bars federal dollars from being used to fund abortions except in cases of rape, incest or when the mother’s life is in danger.” The vote was on a motion to end debate on the bill, which required 60 votes to succeed. The Senate rejected the motion by a vote of 55 to 43. After several further attempts to end debate on the bill with the controversial language failed, the Senate set the bill aside, and moved on to other business. A month later, the Senate passed a compromise version of the legislation. [Senate Vote 73, [3/17/15](#); Congressional Quarterly, [3/17/15](#); Congressional Quarterly, [3/10/15](#); Congressional Quarterly, [4/21/15](#); Congressional Actions, [S.178](#)]

2015: Rubio Effectively Voted For An Anti-Human Trafficking Bill That Included A Ban On Using Victim Restitution Funds To Pay For An Abortion

2015: Rubio Effectively Voted For An Anti-Human Trafficking Bill That Included A Ban On Using Victim Restitution Funds To Pay For An Abortion, Except In Cases Of Rape, Incest Or To Save The Mother’s Life. In March 2015, Rubio effectively voted for a bill that, according to Congressional Quarterly, “would use fines and penalties against sex-trafficking perpetrators for more restitution and assistance funds for victims.” According to a separate Congressional Quarterly article, “At issue is a provision that would prohibit the money in a crime victim compensation fund — established by the bill and funded by fines from offenders — from being used towards abortion services. Bill sponsor and Senate Majority Whip John Cornyn of Texas said the measure would provide about \$30 million to help victims of human trafficking crimes recover. [...] The provision bars federal dollars from being used to fund abortions except in cases of rape, incest or when the mother’s life is in danger.” The vote was on a motion to end debate on the Senate Judiciary Committee’s substitute version of the legislation, which required 60 votes to succeed. The Senate rejected the motion by a vote of 55 to 43. After several further attempts to end debate on the bill with the controversial language failed, the Senate set the bill aside, and moved on to other business. A month later, the Senate passed a compromise version of the legislation. [Senate Vote 72, [3/17/15](#); Congressional Quarterly, [3/17/15](#); Congressional Quarterly, [3/10/15](#); Congressional Quarterly, [4/21/15](#); Congressional Actions, [S.178](#)]

RUBIO EFFECTIVELY VOTED AGAINST INSURANCE SUBSIDIES FOR PRIVATE INSURANCE PLANS THAT PROVIDE ABORTION COVERAGE

Rubio Effectively Voted To Restrict Access To Private Insurance Plans That Provide Abortion Coverage. In July 2017, Rubio effectively voted for legislation that would have, according to Planned Parenthood, “restructured the tax credits in the underlying legislation in order to restrict coverage of abortion. This Strange Amendment was not about segregating federal funds from abortion – it was really about restricting access to safe and legal abortion. This proposal needlessly restricted women’s access to private plans that offer abortion coverage. Health plans participating in the Marketplace may already choose whether or not to offer coverage of abortion – unless state law prohibits or requires abortion coverage.” The underlying

legislation was the legislative vehicle for Trumpcare. The vote was on a motion to waive all applicable budgetary discipline for the amendment, which required a three-fifths majority. The Senate rejected the motion, thereby defeating the amendment, by a vote of 50 to 50. [Senate Vote 174, [7/27/17](#); Planned Parenthood Action Congressional Scorecard, [Accessed 5/1/18](#); Congressional Actions, [S. Amdt. 389](#); Congressional Actions, [S. Amdt. 267](#); Congressional Actions, [H.R. 1628](#)]

Rubio Backed Efforts To Antagonize Private-Sector Organizations That Supported Access To Abortion Care

RUBIO SUPPORTED EFFORTS TO HARM COMPANIES THAT PAID TRAVEL EXPENSES FOR ABORTION CARE

Rubio Supported An Effort For Congress To Cut Ties With Citibank Over Their Policy For Paying Employee's Travel Expenses For Abortions

Rubio Signed A Letter That Called To End Business Relations Between The Senate And Citibank, Citing Citi's Policy For Paying Travel Expenses For Employees Having An Abortion. According to the Washington Examiner, "Montana Republican Sen. Steve Daines led multiple GOP senators in demanding an end to contracts with Citibank Friday, citing its intentions to facilitate 'abortion tourism.' In a letter to the Senate sergeant-at-arms, Daines (the founder and chairman of the Senate Pro-Life Caucus) and others wrote: 'Citi's decision to finance abortion tourism for its employees, in brazen circumvention of State law, shows a reckless disregard for the lives of preborn children and disdain for the will of the people of the States in which Citi acts as an employer,' expressing the group's 'deep concern' about the bank. Sens. Roger Marshall, Kevin Cramer, Ted Cruz, Marco Rubio, Roger Wicker, Mike Braun, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Rick Scott, and James Lankford signed the letter alongside the Montana senator." [Washington Examiner, [4/29/22](#)]

RUBIO INTRODUCED A BILL TO DENY TAX BREAKS FOR COMPANIES THAT PAID FOR EMPLOYEES' TRAVEL TO GET AN ABORTION

Rubio Introduced The "No Tax Breaks For Radical Corporate Activism Act," Which Was Designed To Prohibit Tax Breaks For Businesses Relating To Expenses For Interstate Abortion Care. According to Fox News, "Republican Sen. Marco Rubio introduced a bill Tuesday that would prohibit employers from receiving tax breaks for expenses related to employees' 'interstate abortion' or employees' children's 'gender transition procedure' costs. Rubio, R-Fla., introduced the 'No Tax Breaks for Radical Corporate Activism Act' on Tuesday, which would 'deny the trade or business expense deduction for the reimbursement of employee costs of child gender transition procedure or travel to obtain an abortion.'" 'Our tax code should be pro-family and promote a culture of life,' Rubio told Fox News. 'Instead, too often our corporations find loopholes to subsidize the murder of unborn babies or horrific 'medical' treatments on kids.' Rubio added: 'My bill would make sure this does not happen.' 'No deduction shall be allowed under this chapter to an employer for any amount paid or incurred to reimburse an employee for, or to otherwise pay, expenses in connection with— travel for the purpose of obtaining an abortion, or any gender transition procedure for a minor child of the employee," the legislation, obtained by Fox News, states. The bill notes several 'exceptions,' including services 'performed because the individual suffers from a physical disorder, physical injury, or physical illness which would, as certified by a physician, place the individual in imminent danger of death or impairment of major bodily function unless surgery is performed.'" [Fox News, [5/3/22](#)]

The Bill Came After Several Corporations Said They Would Cover Travel Expenses For Abortions. According to Fox News, "The introduction of the bill comes after a number of large corporations, including Amazon, Apple, Citigroup and others, have announced they will cover travel expenses each year for non-life threatening medical treatments, including abortions. Amazon's new benefit, first reported by Reuters on Monday, retroactively applies if an operation is not available within 100 miles of an employee's home and if virtual care is not possible." [Fox News, [5/3/22](#)]

Rubio Said That Companies That Covered Travel Costs For An Abortion Was "Crazy"

Rubio Said Corporations Offering To Subsidize "Abortion Tourism" For Their Workers Is "Full Crazy." According to an Op-ed by Marco Rubio in Newsweek, "Apparently, flying the right flag at the office and saying the right things at cocktail parties are no longer sufficient for maintaining woke status. In the contest between common sense and crazy, corporate elites

have gone full crazy. The case in point: major businesses like Citigroup, Salesforce, Yelp and now Amazon are offering to subsidize ‘abortion tourism’ for their employees. With leaked indications that the Supreme Court will overturn Roe v. Wade, you can bet their ranks will swell. Meanwhile, Disney is planning to help its employees secure gender transition ‘care’ for their children.” [Newsweek, Op-ed – Marco Rubio, [5/4/22](#)]

Rubio Supported So-Called “Born Alive” Legislation, Which Was Aimed At Criminalizing Abortion Providers

RUBIO CO-SPONSORED SO-CALLED “BORN ALIVE” LEGISLATION WHICH COULD CRIMINALIZE DOCTORS

Rubio Announced Co-Sponsorship Of So-Called Born-Alive Legislation. According to a Rubio press release, “Rubio announced he was co-sponsoring 10 anti abortion bills. Those bills include: [...] Senator Ben Sasse’s (R-NE) bill would extend legal protection to an infant born alive after a failed attempt at an induced abortion. This legislation ensures all newborns are given the same level of necessary care they deserve.” [Rubio press release, [1/29/21](#)]

- **Reproductive Rights Proponents Say The Legislation Was Unnecessary And Could Criminalize Doctors.** According to Vox, “But reproductive rights and physician groups say the bill could criminalize doctors and is unnecessary — not only because a live birth after an abortion attempt is an extremely unlikely scenario but also because laws already exist to protect an infant in this instance anyway. ‘The bill maligns and vilifies providers and patients to push a false narrative about abortion later in pregnancy,’ Dr. Kristyn Brandi, a board member of Physicians for Reproductive Health, told Vox in an email last year.” [Vox, [2/11/20](#)]

RUBIO EFFECTIVELY VOTED AT LEAST TWICE FOR THE SO-CALLED “BORN-ALIVE” ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT WHICH THREATENED WOMEN’S ACCESS TO REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH CARE

2021: Rubio Effectively Voted For An Amendment That Would Create Penalties For Health Care Providers Who Do Not Provide The Same Medical Treatment To An Infant Who Survived An Abortion As Babies Born At The Same Gestational Age. In February 2021, Rubio voted for , according to Congressional Quarterly, the “motion to waive all applicable sections of the Congressional Budget Act with respect to the Durbin, D-Ill., point of order that the Sasse amendment no. 192 amendment is not germane and thus violates section 305(b)(2) of the Budget Act. The amendment would create a deficit-neutral reserve fund to allow for legislation related to improving health care, including legislation to establish criminal and civil penalties for health care providers who do not provide the same degree of medical care for an infant who survives an abortion procedure as would be provided to another infant born at the same gestational age.” The vote was on a motion to waive. The Senate rejected the motion, failing to acquire 3/5 of the vote, by a vote of 52-48. [Senate Vote 23, [2/4/21](#); Congressional Quarterly, [2/4/21](#); Congressional Actions, [S.Amdt 192](#); Congressional Actions, [S.Con.Res. 5](#)]

2019: Rubio Effectively Voted For The So-Called Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. In February 2019, Rubio effectively voted for a bill that would have, according to Congressional Quarterly, “require health care practitioners to provide medical care to any infant that survives an abortion procedure, to the extent legally required for any infant born at the same gestational age.” The vote was on a motion to invoke cloture, which required 60 affirmative votes. The Senate rejected the motion by a vote of 53 to 44. [Senate Vote 27, [2/25/19](#); Congressional Quarterly, [2/25/19](#); Congressional Actions, [S. 311](#)]

- **National Abortion Federation: “This Anti-Choice Bill Uses Inflammatory Language In Yet Another Attempt To Justify Politically-Motivated, Medically-Unnecessary Interference In The Practice Of Medicine, Interference That Threatens Women’s Access To Reproductive Health Care.”** According to the National Abortion Federation, “This anti-choice bill uses inflammatory language in yet another attempt to justify politically-motivated, medically-unnecessary interference in the practice of medicine, interference that threatens women’s access to reproductive health care. It is an attempt to distract from the Trump-Pence assault on safe, legal abortion care and is intended to intimidate abortion providers so that they stop providing essential health care. These bills are written by anti-choice politicians to score points with their extremist base; they disregard the health of women and their families. Today’s attempt

to pass yet another inflammatory and medically unnecessary bill demonstrates, once again, that the only thing anti-choice politicians in Congress can agree upon is finding new ways to demonize women who need to access safe, legal abortion care.” [National Abortion Federation, [2/25/19](#)]

Rubio Supported Legislations To Interfere In Family Decisions About Abortion

RUBIO ANNOUNCED CO-SPONSORSHIP OF A BILL THAT ALLOWED FAMILY MEMBERS TO SUE PROVIDERS WHO PERFORMED ABORTIONS ON FETUSES WITH DOWN SYNDROME

Rubio Announced Co-Sponsorship Of Bill S.18, Which Would Have Allowed Family Members To Sue Providers Who Performed Abortions On Fetuses With Down Syndrome. According to a Rubio press release, “Rubio co-sponsored legislation [...] Senator James Inhofe’s (R-OK) bill would prohibit providers from knowingly performing abortions on an unborn baby because he or she has or may have Down syndrome. The bill also bans anyone from forcing a mother to get an abortion because the baby has or may have Down syndrome. Certain family members of the baby would be able to bring forward civil action against violators of the law. The bill shields a mother from being prosecuted or held liable for any one of these violations.” [Rubio press release, [1/29/21](#)]

The Legislation Was Criticized For Interfering In Family Decisions

Opponents Of So-Called “Reason Ban” Bills Said They Result In Elected Officials Interfering In Deeply Personal Decisions. According to PBS, “Opponents of the bills, including some parents with children who have Down syndrome, argue that elected officials should not be meddling with a woman’s deeply personal decision on whether to carry a pregnancy to term after a Down syndrome diagnosis.” [PBS, [5/19/21](#)]

Rubio Backed Efforts To Restrict Abortions Abroad

RUBIO SUPPORTED THE GLOBAL GAG RULE

Rubio Backed Legislation To Codify The Global Gag Rule

Rubio Announced Co-Sponsorship Of Protecting Life in Foreign Assistance Act, Which Would Have Codified And Expanded The Global Gag Rule. According to a press release from Rubio, “Senator Lee also reintroduced this legislation that codifies an expanded Mexico City policy to ensure that no foreign aid funding goes to organizations that perform abortions, provide abortion counseling, or refer to abortion services.” [Rubio Press release, [1/29/21](#)]

2021: Rubio Disparaged A Recension Of The Global Gag Rule

2021: Rubio Called Biden’s Recension Of The Global Gag Rule “Unconscionable.” According to a Rubio press release, “U.S. Senator Marco Rubio (R-FL) issued the following statement after President Joe Biden rescinded the Mexico City Policy. ‘It is unconscionable that one of the first actions taken by the Biden Administration is to send U.S. taxpayer dollars overseas to organizations that perform and promote the killing of the unborn,’ Rubio said. ‘By rescinding the Mexico City Policy, the Biden Administration is sending a signal to the world that protecting life at its most vulnerable stage is no longer a part of America’s core values. I will always stand on the side of life, and will continue my work in the Senate to protect the unborn.’” [Rubio press release, [1/28/21](#)]

2017: Rubio Praised A Reinstatement Of The Global Gag Rule

2017: Rubio Applauded Reinstatement Of The Global Gag Rule. According to a Rubio press release, “U.S. Senator Marco Rubio (R-FL) issued the following statement today after President Trump reinstated the Mexico City Policy: ‘I applaud President Trump for reinstating the Mexico City Policy. U.S. taxpayer dollars should not be used to perform or promote abortions overseas. This is a positive first step from the Trump Administration on pro-life issues and I look forward to working together to protect life at its most vulnerable stage.’” [Rubio press release, [1/23/17](#)]

Rubio Voted To Restrict International Family-Planning Funding

2019: Rubio Voted For The FY 2020 Minibus Appropriations Bill, Which Continued The Mexico City Restrictions On International Family-Planning Funding. In December 2019, Rubio voted for the FY 2020 minibus spending bill, which represented 8 of the 12 appropriations bills. According to Congressional Quarterly, “Within the total for global health programs, the agreement provides the FY 2019 level of \$575 million for family planning and reproductive health programs. The measure does not take any actions with regard to the Mexico City restrictions on international family-planning funding that were reinstated by President Trump in January 2017, and it is silent on the May 2017 expansion of the policy, effectively leaving in place current restrictions.” The vote was a motion to concur. The Senate agreed to the motion by a vote of 71-23, thereby sending the bill to the president, who signed it into law. [Senate Vote 415, [12/19/19](#); Congressional Quarterly, [12/19/19](#); Congressional Actions, [H.R.1865](#)]

2011: Rubio Voted To Reinstate The Global Gag Rule. In March 2011, Rubio voted for a bill that according to Congressional Quarterly, “would reinstate the so-called Mexico City restrictions on family-planning funds. The provision prohibits U.S. funding to any private, non-governmental or multilateral organization that uses its own funds to directly, or indirectly, perform abortions in a foreign country. The restrictions would not apply to funds used to perform abortions in instances of rape or incest, or when the life of the woman is in danger.” The provision was part of a continuing resolution to fund the federal government until the end of FY 2011. The bill was rejected by the Senate by a vote of 44 to 56. The bill number was later used as the vehicle for another piece of legislation. [Senate Vote 36, [3/9/11](#); Congressional Actions, [H.R. 1](#); Congressional Quarterly, [3/1/11](#)]