

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in solidarity with my colleagues from the Safe Climate Caucus to call on Republicans to end their silence and join the conversation on climate disruption.

A recent United Nations report provides a stark warning, saying that if we don't address climate disruption, the number of people living in extreme poverty could increase by up to 3 billion by 2050.

The report is clear: failing to act now creates a much larger and more costly problem later. Fortunately, we have the ability and the means to address climate disruption.

I'm proud to say that clean-energy companies and universities in my own district are leading the way in research, clean-job creation, and sustainable long-term solutions.

But this type of innovation and job creation cannot go on if Republicans continue to ignore the threat of climate change and recklessly cut funding to important programs that protect the air we breathe and the water we drink.

I urge my Republican colleagues to think about their moral responsibility to join this dialogue and to protect our planet for their children and for the long-term stability of this country.

THE BUDGET

(Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the President on finally sending up a budget, though it was 65 days late with no real explanation for why it was late.

Of course, the House passed its budget on time. The Senate, to their credit, for the first time in 4 years passed a budget on time. And the amazing thing, Mr. Speaker, is that in the face of an almost \$1 trillion deficit and a \$17 trillion debt, the President sent up a budget that increases spending, increases taxes, increases the deficit, cuts Social Security and Medicare, and still never balances. That's quite a feat.

Mr. Speaker, America knows our debt and our deficit are strangling our economy. Let's roll up our sleeves, work with the Senate, and solve the fiscal mess this Nation is in.

GUN SAFETY

(Mr. LANGEVIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I am encouraged by the clear bipartisan support in the Senate for a full and fair debate on meaningful ways to reduce gun violence in our country.

Having experienced a gun accident myself that left me paralyzed more than 30 years ago, I know firsthand

that the answer to keeping people, especially our children, safe is not having more guns around our kids and our communities as the gun lobby has proposed.

I am hopeful that the Senate has heard the public outcry for real change with 90 percent of Americans favoring the basic step of universal background checks.

Forty percent of the gun sales in America occur at gun shows that require no background check at all. Let's close the gun show loophole and ensure that whenever a gun is bought or sold in this country, that there's a background check so we keep the guns out of the hands of criminals or those who have mental illness that is so severe that they would be a danger to themselves or their community.

As the Senate moves forward, I continue to urge Speaker BOEHNER to stop delaying full debate on the House floor on responsible gun safety legislation. The House Gun Violence Prevention Task Force has put forward a comprehensive set of proposals, and I welcome ideas from both parties.

What is inexcusable in the wake of so many gun tragedies is inaction. We cannot sit back and wait any longer.

THE BUDGET

(Mr. WOODALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I come to the House floor today fresh from a Budget Committee hearing. We had the OMB Director presenting the President's budget today.

I know so many folks have said, I thought the budget was required by law to be here the first week of February. That's true. Better late than never continues to be true, as well. But as we listened to the details of the budget, Mr. Speaker, what we heard was that the President is proposing to increase spending, increase taxes, and increase the debt.

Mr. Speaker, there are thousands of pages to this budget. I hope we'll find some things that we can agree on. But I know that the American people agree with Republicans in this House when we say taxes are already too high, spending is already too high, and the debt is already too high.

The President's budget never, ever pays one penny of our Federal debt. It's wrong. We can do better. This House must come together and lead that charge.

REGARDING NATIONAL MEDIA COVERAGE OF PHILADELPHIA MURDER TRIAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PITTENGER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that

all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the decades-long national news media cover-up of the brutality and the violence of abortion methods ever end?

Will Americans ever be told of the horrifying details as to how and how often abortionists dismember, decapitate, and chemically poison innocent babies?

Will Americans ever be informed by a conscientious, unbiased national news media that in the past 40 years over 55 million child victims have been brutally killed by abortion, a staggering loss of children's lives that equates to the entire population of England, and that many women have been hurt physically, emotionally, and psychologically? And according to the Center for Disease Control—and this is a very conservative estimate from CDC—over 400 women have actually died from legal abortions.

Will Americans ever be told that of the 55 million children, Planned Parenthood alone claims responsibility for destroying 6 million babies and that just 2 weeks ago a Planned Parenthood leader in Florida testified at a legislative hearing at a State initiative to protect born-alive infants that even when a child survives an abortion, the decision to assist or kill the born-alive infant should be "up to the woman, her family and her physician"? In other words, if a child intended to be aborted survives the assault, the choice to kill remains—so-called "after-birth abortion."

□ 1430

Isn't that extreme child abuse?

Murdering newborns in the abortion clinic, it seems to me, is indistinguishable from any other child predator wielding a knife or a gun. Why isn't the child also seen as a patient in need of medical care, warmth, nutrition, and—dare I say—love?

Now another national media cover-up—in this case, even when a Jeffrey Dahmer-like murder trial of an abortionist named Kermit Gosnell, who ran the benign-sounding Women's Medical Society unfolds in a Philadelphia courtroom, replete with shocking testimony of beheadings, unfathomable abuse, death, and body parts in jars. To this day, the national news media remains uninterested, woefully indifferent—AWOL.

Why the censorship? Why does Gosnell's house of horrors—his trial—fail to this day to attract any serious and meaningful national news reporting?

Dr. Kermit Gosnell is on trial for eight counts of murder. One count is for the death of a woman, a victim who

died during an abortion in his clinic. Seven counts are for babies who survived their abortions and were born alive but then killed by severing their spinal cords with a pair of scissors.

In the words of the grand jury report: “Gosnell had a simple solution for unwanted babies—he killed them.” He didn’t call it that. He called it “ensuring fetal demise”—a nice euphemism. The way he ensured fetal demise was by sticking scissors in the back of the baby’s neck and cutting the spinal cord. He called that “snipping.” Over the years, according to the grand jury report, there were hundreds of snippings.

Indeed, the national news media has not only taken a pass and looked the other way, but their stunning indifference has done a grave disservice to Gosnell’s victims: the woman killed, other women injured, and children slaughtered by Gosnell. Because of the national news media’s indefensible silence and because of their failure to report, other women and children at other abortion mills might also be at risk.

The grand jury report, again in January of 2011, pointedly pointed out and noted that an absence of press coverage and gross negligence by the health department in Pennsylvania enabled Gosnell to show a “contemptuous disregard for the health, safety, and dignity of his patients that continued for 40 years.”

Right from the beginning of *Roe v. Wade*, he was overlooked by a media that was disinterested. Some media commentators, however, are beginning to take note of the national news media blackout and the bias that undergirds and is inherent in that blackout.

The title of an editorial yesterday in the *Investors Business Daily* was “Newtown in the Clinic: The Media Ignore the Gosnell Trial.” It begins in part:

Media bias: A basketball coach who shoves and curses at his players merits constant coverage by a media also transfixed by Newtown; but a Philadelphia doctor on trial for murdering a woman and seven babies? It’s ignored.

Those who get their news from the three major networks have probably not heard of Dr. Kermit Gosnell, now on trial in Philadelphia, charged with seven counts of first-degree murder and one count of third-degree murder for killing seven babies who survived abortions and a woman who died after a botched painkiller injection.

The editorial points out that, according to the Media Research Center, in 1 week, Rice—who is the coach from Rutgers—received 41 minutes, 26 seconds on ABC, CBS, and NBC in 36 separate news stories. Gosnell received zero coverage.

The editorial points out:

If Dr. Gosnell had walked into a nursery and shot seven infants with an AR-15, it would be national news and the subject of Presidential hand-wringing.

In today’s edition of *USA Today*, columnist Kirsten Powers writes:

Infant beheadings, severed baby feet in jars, a child screaming after it was delivered during an abortion procedure. Haven’t heard about those sickening accusations?

It’s not your fault. Since the murder trial of Pennsylvania abortion doctor Kermit Gosnell began March 18, there has been precious little coverage of the case that should be on every news show and front page.

She goes on to write in her column:

A LexisNexis search shows none of the news shows on the three major national television networks has mentioned the Gosnell trial in the last 3 months. The exception is when *Wall Street Journal* columnist Peggy Noonan hijacked a segment on “Meet the Press.”

Again, I ask my colleagues, and I ask the news media: Why the blackout?

Will America ever be told the brutality of abortion and the violence that is commonplace inside the abortion industry; or will the media, the national media especially, continue to censor and censor and, in this case, censor a trial—a trial of the century—that exposes all of the all too inconvenient truth: that not only are unborn children destroyed in these killing centers by being decapitated and dismembered but that even babies who survive the abortions can’t escape the deadly hand of these child predators?

I would like to yield to my good friend and colleague, VICKY HARTZLER.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you so much. I appreciate this opportunity to share today, as we look at the national media coverup of this very, very horrific act.

As we gather today to bring awareness to the trial of Kermit Gosnell and to the horrific actions he has been charged with, we remember the many who were murdered at the Women’s Medical Society clinic and denied the chance to be our siblings, playmates, our friends, our peers. We mourn their losses, and we mourn the deep pain and confusion that abortion has inflicted upon women, men, and their families.

This trial provides revealing insights into the abortion industry, and it specifically highlights the reality that abortion involves taking a human life. These killings expose the very gruesome nature of what happens in abortion clinics all across this country where over 1.2 million unborn children die in abortions every year.

As a legislator, I will continue to speak in defense of the most basic human right—life. I will continue to support legislation that would stop the Federal funding for abortion providers, and I will continue to champion the inherent human dignity of every life born and unborn.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my good friend and colleague Mrs. HARTZLER for her very eloquent statement, for her championing the rights of the unborn and their mothers, and for joining us in this Special Order today.

I’d like to now yield to a medical doctor who has been the leader on conscience rights in the House of Representatives, in the Congress, Dr. FLEMING.

Mr. FLEMING. I certainly want to thank my good friend from New Jersey for all the great work that you’ve done on this and the work you continue to do.

I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that just hearing about this trial—and quite frankly, I haven’t heard about it on TV. If I weren’t informed about it in leading up to this Special Order, I wouldn’t know about the Gosnell trial—one in which, I think, it is really sickening just to hear the facts.

It’s interesting. This country has reached a point in which we have focused so much on the humane treatment of animals—that is, to treat animals like humans. Then that leaves the question: Why do we not treat people like people? Why don’t we treat humans humanely? I think that is an important question. What do people say who themselves have survived abortion?

I was at a meeting several months ago, and I met two fantastic mothers, mothers of children today. As to one of them, her mom, while she was still pregnant with her, attempted to have an abortion, but for whatever reason, she never could get around to it. She couldn’t get it lined up or whatever, and eventually, she just ended up not having the abortion. Of course, this beautiful lady was eventually born, and now she has grown up to be an adult, and is very productive and very beautiful and herself has children. Of course, if you asked her, Well, what do you think about your mother’s attempt to have an abortion of you while you were still in the womb? she would say—speaking, I think, for millions of unborn today and unborn in the past—Let me live. Give me an opportunity—I, the innocent unborn—to live. Give me a chance to live in society.

□ 1440

I met another beautiful lady at this meeting. Her mother, while still pregnant with her, late term, actually attempted to have a saline abortion. It was a botched abortion. It didn’t work. By that I mean she was born alive and remained alive. And, fortunately for her, the health care workers decided to go ahead and revive and resuscitate her. And, of course, we know that saline abortions, if you have a child that survives, it scalds the skin. It creates injury to that baby. But she was treated, and she grew up to be a beautiful woman who married and who had children. If you asked her today, she would tell you she speaks for the millions of the unborn, both in the past and those who are killed in the womb today: Yes, let me live. Give me a chance to live.

Well, what about the question of infanticide? That’s really what we’re talking about in the Gosnell case. These babies, for whatever reason, he certainly wasn’t a good enough doctor to accomplish the abortion while the babies were still in the womb, and then has to go on and do something I think most Americans would consider murder, and that is infanticide. In most

places, perhaps all places in America today, infanticide is murder.

But the question is: Do you realize there are two bioethicists in Australia who have recently proposed a concept called “post-delivery abortion?” Of course, we know that to be infanticide. Once the baby is born, if you kill the baby, that’s infanticide. But they want to do a little wordsmithing and call it something else—post-delivery abortion. What they mean is this: if the baby is born and there’s something about the baby that you’re dissatisfied with, maybe it has an abnormality of some sort, maybe it’s going to cost some money for a heart deformity or a facial deformity, maybe it’s born with a genetic defect, that you should have, as a mother, the option of killing that baby even outside of the womb. There has even been a hint that perhaps taking a baby’s life, even up to the age of conscious life, which can be, I don’t know, a year or even more, would be still incongruent with the concept of post-delivery abortion.

So you see, Mr. Speaker, this is a slippery slope. Once you get past the fact that life begins at conception, and of course with today’s technology, infants born as early as age 22 weeks, certainly 24 weeks, often survive at a time when they couldn’t in the past. This has become an extremely slippery slope to the point where there are many out there who would actually turn their backs on life even after the point of delivery.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what about the lives of the women themselves? I’m a physician, and I’ve seen women after they’ve had an abortion. I can even think of a couple of cases in my practice when of course I would never send a lady for an abortion, but I was forced to treat a lady after an abortion because she was treated by an itinerant physician who comes into town, does a bunch of abortions, leaves town, and says if you have any complications, go see your family doctor. Well, of course, that is sickening for me. That means I am involuntarily participating, at least tacitly, in treating a lady who has had complications from an abortion.

This really goes to show you to the point with Dr. Gosnell just how unfeeling and inhumane the whole consideration is.

But what drives people to do this? Well, we know if you look at studies, it’s about money. It’s all about money, Mr. Speaker. They make millions of dollars. I think in the case of Dr. Gosnell, he became a multimillionaire because of all of the many abortions he provided over the years.

But, again, back to the women. What happens to the women who have abortions? Well, these are some things that we know. Once a woman has an abortion, her chance of having a future miscarriage goes up. And so now we’re talking about miscarriages, stillborn, and the issue of infertility. Rate of suicides, they’re higher in women who

have had abortions. What about the rate of other complications, rates of depression and other things? We know they’re all higher. The outcomes in the future lives of young women, and even not-so-young women who undergo abortions, Mr. Speaker, are really not very positive. So why would we encourage this? And certainly we know that a woman who gets an abortion a first time is far more likely to get a second and a third abortion, and oftentimes it really becomes a form of birth control.

So, in summary, Mr. Speaker, I stand up with my colleagues today to speak out against the fact that not only are we seeing abortion continue, the taking of innocent life through this Nation, but even the mere consideration of ending the life of an infant after birth, either because of a botched abortion or even deliberately just because there is some dissatisfaction with the outcome. I think is really horrible and something we should be ashamed of. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, if we can give consideration and humane treatment to animals, should we not do this for our own as well?

So, again, I rise in support of my colleagues on this very important issue. I do think that if we can’t do it on a Federal level, we need to move forward in our States, such as my own State of Louisiana, where we have developed certain requirements, elevated requirements of accountability for doctors who provide abortions so that they can’t just fly in and fly out and leave a mess. They have to have certain credentials and maintain hospital privileges perhaps; create limitations after so many weeks can an abortion actually be done. Let’s do away with late-term abortions, again, an abominable act. We know through studies that the unborn feel pain at least as early as 20 weeks gestation, and maybe earlier.

Certain States, such as Arkansas, recently passed laws against late-term abortions. And, again, in my home State of Louisiana, we have a cooling-off period where you have to think about this. Think one more time, just think for 24 hours, maybe even pray about it: Is this something I really want to go forward with, end the life of my progeny? And certainly the requirement of an ultrasound, at least a requirement of the option of seeing your baby before you terminate its poor life.

Once again, I thank my colleagues. It is certainly a privilege and an honor to speak on what is, I think, one of the most important issues that we have in America.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank you, Dr. FLEMING, so much for your leadership and for that very concise statement. And now I would like to yield to my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for arranging today’s Special Order. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey also for his leadership on this very important issue, not just

today, not just yesterday, but over years, year after year after year, coming to this floor, speaking around our State, speaking around the Nation as well, speaking for those who do not have a voice, speaking for the weak, the unborn. We thank you for your leadership in this area. We recognize that you have done a profound thing for this Nation, and we thank you for that.

I, too, come from New Jersey; and tonight I would like to speak briefly, and I will reference a woman who lived in New Jersey, who lived in Bergen County, who actually lived in Tenafly, up in my neck of the woods. And maybe some of you have heard her name before, and you would if you’ve walked about this Capitol, because she is commemorated in a sculpture located in the rotunda of this building, and I’m talking about Elizabeth Cady Stanton. She was a suffragette. She was a women’s rights activist. She was someone who fought long and hard to ensure the equality of women before the law in this country. And also she fought for the important issue of the sanctity of life. Way back over 100 years ago in 1873, she wrote a letter to Julia Ward Howe, a prominent abolitionist and also a suffragette, and in it she wrote the following:

When we consider that women are treated as property, it is degrading to women that we should treat our own children as property to be disposed of as we see fit.

□ 1450

So she classified abortion as a form of infanticide.

Today, Mrs. Stanton, I believe, would be horrified. I believe she would be disgusted, as my colleagues are as well, with what millions of Americans are watching going on in Philadelphia right now.

Kermit Gosnell is on trial in a city that gave birth to America, in a city that gave birth to the Declaration of Independence, a city that gave birth to the idea, the promise of life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness. He’s there on trial for the callous murder of eight Americans, one woman, she who died from a botched abortion, and seven innocent, defenseless children who were born alive and healthy but then were killed by the abortionist.

These are only the murders that Gosnell is being charged with. His clinic, it is recorded, has carried out literally hundreds, thousands of abortions over the years using the doctor’s own gruesome techniques on children, who were often over the Pennsylvania legal limit of 24 weeks.

Now, as was pointed out, news reports on the trial are nonexistent. Reports of testimony in the grand jury are basically nonexistent in the media. But if you dig down and you get a copy of the grand jury’s report, you see what we’re talking about and how gruesome it is.

According to the grand jury’s report, “Gosnell had a simple solution”—this

is from the grand jury's report. "Gosnell had a simple solution for unwanted babies; he killed them." He didn't call it that. He called it, ensuring fetal demise. He called it, then, "snipping." Over the years there were literally hundreds of snippings. This we find from the grand jury's report.

Snipping? This is not a medical procedure. This is murder, and we should call it for what it is.

Where, then, is the protection of life? Where, then, is the protection of liberty? Where is the protection of the pursuit of happiness?

Where is the outrage at what is going on there? Where is the outrage that nothing of this is being reported in any of the major newspapers across this country, on any of the major radio stations, on any of the major TV or cable channels across this country?

You have to dig, as I did, to find it in the back pages. The media and the pro-abortion movement are more concerned about things like Rush Limbaugh's comments on contraception, or ensuring that girls under 18, kids, have easy access to the morning after pill than they are with this trial, the gruesome acts in the trial, they allege, of Dr. Gosnell, or for the 1.2 million unborn Americans who die in America every year.

So, Mr. Speaker I join the rest of my colleagues tonight in expressing my disgust with this case and the failure also, the disgust also with the media to cover these actions.

Every child is precious. Every child is a gift. We must continue, then, this fight to protect this most fundamental right for the unborn, and each of us, the right to life. And we must also make sure that when it is destroyed, that it is exposed.

Again, with that, I conclude, and I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his actions tonight.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I want to thank Mr. GARRETT for his eloquence, but also for his faithfulness in defending the powerless and the people who need voices, unborn children and their mothers, all those who are similarly situated, the vulnerable and the weak. He is always there, and I want to thank you so much, SCOTT.

I'd like to now yield to the chairman of the Health Subcommittee for the Energy and Commerce Committee for the House of Representatives, JOE PITTS, and note that Congressman PITTS, Chairman PITTS, is the author of the Abortion Control Act of 1980, the legislation that established, within the framework of *Roe v. Wade*, a very aggressive attempt to protect, to the maximum extent possible, pursuant to that onerous decision by the Supreme Court, and it was upheld by the Supreme Court, to do investigations of clinics and to just hold to a higher standard so that, to the greatest extent possible, life would be protected.

Congressman PITTS has been leading the charge on life for his entire career, both in the State legislature and in the

U.S. House of Representatives, so it is a distinct honor to yield to my good friend.

Mr. PITTS. Thank you, Congressman SMITH, for your leadership on this issue here in Congress, very, very wonderful, inspiring leadership to all of us who've been engaged in this, on this issue for years in State legislatures like Pennsylvania and across the other parts of the country.

But U.S. Route 30 runs through the heart of my district, in Lancaster County and Chester County, in Pennsylvania. You follow that road all the way into Philadelphia, you'll pass a nondescript, triangle-shaped brick building at 38th Street. And for years, Dr. Kermit Gosnell operated a factory of death in this location, just across the street from a church.

This week, Gosnell is on trial for multiple homicides that demonstrate just how thin the line between abortion and murder is in this country.

Dr. Kermit Gosnell spent years taking advantage of vulnerable women, offering illegal and dangerous abortions in exchange for cash. He also operated a pill mill, selling prescription drugs to anyone in the neighborhood with enough cash.

He sold death to the poor, and he lived handsomely for years. State authorities never darkened the door of what he called a "clinic" until a mother died of an overdose during one of Gosnell's procedures.

He used clinical terminology to pave over the fact that in many cases he was killing a child who had already been born. While he is charged with seven counts of murdering an infant and a single count of murdering a mother, we don't really know how many children died after they were born.

Just as he was careless with the lives of children, he was careless with the lives of mothers, and he treated them in terrible conditions, often sending them out of the clinic injured and still under the influence of anesthesia.

We should always remember that abortion is the most violent form of death known to humankind. And there are always two victims in every abortion. One is the child, the unborn child. The other is the mother. One is dead, one is wounded.

An abortion is violence against the unborn. It's also violence against women.

But the facts of this case raise the disturbing question of just how close legal abortion practices come to outright murder. Gosnell knew that there was little real medical difference between killing the child in-utero and killing them outside of the mother.

Like standard, legal abortion practice, he would use chemicals to first poison the unborn child. And if he had waited until death to remove their bodies, he would be within the law. Because he took the children out of the mothers while they were still alive, he is guilty of murder.

Gosnell only took a leap that certain intellectuals and so-called medical

ethicists have been talking about for decades. Just last year, two researchers published a paper in the prestigious *Journal of Medical Ethics* entitled "After Birth Abortion." Their assertion was that a fetus doesn't become a child until they are wanted.

Let us never say that these are unwanted children, not while there are tens of thousands of married couples waiting to adopt, couples who wait months or years to bring home a baby boy or a girl. Many Americans even travel far abroad in order to adopt. In many cases, they go all the way to China or Ethiopia.

Gosnell's victims, and the millions of other lives lost to abortion are, by no means, unwanted.

The case of Dr. Gosnell is gruesome. The place that he ran was a gruesome factory and disturbing, but only because it strips away the clinical nature of most abortions.

□ 1500

His carelessness exposed what the fetus actually was—a human that he cruelly murdered. And yet the press will ignore, will remain silent on what is happening in this very important trial in Philadelphia. We ignore the tiniest human life at great peril because, as Gosnell demonstrates, flippancy for life creeps from the infant to the adult. We must protect all life, no matter how small or at what stage.

And so I commend Congressman SMITH and my other colleagues who have come to speak today about this important policy issue. It's about people, it's about children, it's about women.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I want to thank Chairman PITTS for his very eloquent statement. Even the grand jury report noted that if Mr. PITTS' law had been followed faithfully, the whole Gosnell destruction of not only women's lives but the death and murder of one woman and the killing of these children might not have occurred.

I'd like to yield to Dr. ANDY HARRIS, a Johns Hopkins physician and also a Member of the U.S. House from Maryland.

Dr. HARRIS.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you very much. I would like to thank the gentleman from New Jersey for bringing this subject to the attention of the American people because this is a subject that's not going away.

What we're talking about today, of course, is a trial going on in Pennsylvania, little heard about in the press, but one that's very significant. Because when it's coupled with what the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Louisiana spoke about, the overarching medical ethics question, it's something that we have to come to deal with. Because, Mr. Speaker, it is true that apparently in Dr. Gosnell's mind there was little difference between a late-term abortion and killing a baby after birth. And make no mistake about it, these children were killed. Because the trial

right now is for seven cases of murder on those newborns. Interestingly, it was only discovered because of the death of the mother. And to show how flippantly many States have dealt with the issue of regulating clinics like that, we would never have known unless this mother died.

In my home State of Maryland, two deaths have recently occurred; and only as a result of those deaths has the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene decided that, yes, maybe we actually should regulate clinics where this kind of surgery is done. And, in fact, they have closed four of those clinics until they can bring them up to standards that we would consider modern medical practice.

But let's pay attention—because my specialty is anesthesiology—to what was going on in that clinic in Pennsylvania. Dr. Gosnell hired a surgical technician. This is someone he hired to clean instruments. He had that person administer anesthesia to those poor women going to that clinic thinking they were going to get good medical care. This is someone whose training was in how to clean a metal instrument and now administering life-threatening drugs. And, Mr. Speaker, we know they're life threatening because the misuse of those drugs resulted in that woman's death. In fact, three drugs administered—Demerol, a powerful narcotic; Valium, a powerful sedative; and promethazine, another sedative—administered by someone whose training was to clean medical instruments. And that is what's considered acceptable practice in many States in the country because many States choose not to regulate clinics where these abortion procedures are done.

But let's make no mistake about it. It wasn't just the killing of the mother that's at issue here. It's the grotesque procedure that was done in that clinic by the doctor and the people he trained to end the lives of those babies who were born alive. We might think this is a terrible thing. In fact, that grand jury thought it was a terrible thing. They, in fact, indicted on seven counts of murder. They called it "murder."

But the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Louisiana bring up an article published just last year in the *Journal of Medical Ethics* by professors from Italy and Australia. These are fairly civilized countries. The title of the article is fascinating. If the gentleman doesn't mind, I'm going to go through some of this because America has to understand what this moral discussion going on worldwide is. I will tell you I'm shocked because 10 years ago—I'm shocked now that this article is published, and 10 years ago, it wouldn't even be thinkable. The title is, "After-Birth Abortion: Why Should the Baby Live?" And it's about committing what this author calls after-birth abortion, which is currently called euthanasia or murder, or infanticide in our current

speech. But these authors propose a new term: after-birth abortion. We're going to make this sound better because we know abortion is legal so we're just going to call this after-birth abortion. What it is is justification for killing a child after birth when no abortion was intended.

Mr. Speaker, this is just the next step to what Dr. Gosnell did. Dr. Gosnell killed a child after an abortion was intended. We think that's bad. A grand jury thought it was bad. There's seven indictments for murder in Pennsylvania. These medical ethicists propose that even if it wasn't an intentional abortion, that mother went and had her baby and decided that her daughter just wasn't going to fit in with the family, literally, and that it was okay to kill that baby. And if you don't believe me, ladies and gentlemen, just go and Google it. Read the article yourself. It's chilling.

Some people say, Well, maybe the child is born disabled or born with some terrible illness or something that's very painful and maybe we're just doing a good thing for the child. But the authors say these include cases where the newborn is not disabled. And I'm going to read from these word-for-word because I want to get this right and, Mr. Speaker, I want America to understand what's at stake here.

They make the argument that the fact that a fetus or a newborn has the potential to become a person who will have an acceptable life is no reason for prohibiting an abortion, or in this case, killing that child after birth. They argue that—and I'm going to quote:

When circumstances occur after birth such that they would have justified abortion, what we call after-birth abortion should be permissible.

Mr. Speaker, let me remind you that in the United States, sex-selection abortion is legal in many States, in China. And if we don't think this is a slippery slope, remember what's happened in China over the past decade. They've decided under their one-child policy that if you have a live birth of a second child, it's legal to kill that child for the sole purpose of it being a second child. And, Mr. Speaker, as we know, occasionally the girls were killed, if they were the first child, knowing that you can only have one child and the family wanted a boy. So in China it's gone past sex-selection abortion to sex-selection infanticide. But that's exactly what this article speaks about.

This article, again, was written by professors from Italy and Australia, published in a prestigious journal that ethically justifies killing a child after birth because, well, Mr. Speaker, for any reason. Because they argue that child has no right to grow up. And if you don't believe me, they go on to say that this is not an actual person. It's a potential person. It's not an actual person.

So they say if a potential person like a fetus or a newborn does not become

an actual person because you don't allow it to grow up like you or I, then there is neither an actual nor a future person who can be harmed—I'm not sure I understand that—which means there is no harm at all. So killing the fetus or the child, there's no harm at all.

But they go on to say this, which is amazing and this is why people have to understand how foreign a thought this is to many of us, "So if you ask one of us if we would have been harmed had our parents decided to kill us when we were fetuses or newborns, our answer is no."

□ 1510

What, Mr. Speaker? They're suggesting that if someone came up to me and said, would I have been harmed if my parents had decided to kill me when I was a newborn, my answer should be no? How many people do they really think you can go up to and ask, if your parents had killed you as a newborn, would you have been harmed? Do they really think people are ready to say, no, no harm, no foul; I wasn't a person, that's all right, that's totally ethical.

They create an ethical framework completely consistent with abortion policy throughout most of the United States, and that is, that a late-term, third-trimester fetus has no rights as a person, and only merely extend that logic to the period after birth. That's all they're doing.

So although this may sound grotesque and shocking that they suggest that there is no moral problem with killing a newborn, it's merely an ethical, logical extension of the way we have been treating fetuses since 1973.

It gets worse. Because the gentleman from Pennsylvania suggested, well, there are plenty of people who would adopt this child. They go on to say that it's actually better in many cases to kill the child than to put it up for adoption. This is stunning. The reason they say that is that we need to consider the interests of the mother, who might suffer psychological distress for giving her child up for adoption. They suggest there would be no psychological distress for that woman to have carried that child for 9 months, given birth to a normal baby, decided they don't want it, and agree to have someone kill it? It's stunning. It's striking.

Let me tell you, and I'll close on this, because we're shocked by this. But let me tell you something, we can't argue with nature. We can't argue with what nature tells us. It answers the question: Why in the world is the younger generation more pro-life than my generation? It comes up in poll after poll after poll. How in the world can that be? We have an enlightened younger generation? Isn't it enlightened to think about this ethical framework? How can this be?

Mr. Speaker, let me suggest how this can be. This is the first generation where two things hold true: They fully

understand what makes a human a human because they learned genetics and chromosomes, and they know that every single person is unique from every other person ever, based on science.

There's one other thing they know, Mr. Speaker. This is the first generation where they know that they could have been aborted legally. The first generation where they actually answer those ethicist questions: Would harm have been done to me if I would have been killed as a fetus? Their answer, resoundingly—because that's why the polling shows this—is they know the answer is yes. We are harming a human in the decision to take its life. That is true whether it is at 3 months, 6 months, 8 months. Because they know that was them as an embryo and a fetus at 3 months, and that was them at 6 months, and that was them at 9 months. And if they were in Philadelphia, in Dr. Gosnell's clinics, that would have been them 1 minute after birth or 5 minutes after birth. They know that under that construct of ethics by those professors in Italy and Australia, published in *Journal of Medical Ethics*, they're proposing that could have been them at 1 day, 1 week. Because those professors actually go on to say we can't really set what the deadline is for how long it's ethical. Mr. Speaker, that younger generation is smarter than my generation on this issue.

I want to thank again the gentleman from New Jersey for bringing this issue up. This is something that is so troubling, we have to come to grips with this. We have to understand the slope we are on when we neglect to treat every human being as one worthy of protection.

I thank the organizer of this Special Order.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Dr. HARRIS, thank you for that very insightful—and I would say brilliant—defense of not just the unborn, but the newly born, and your very logical argument as to how this is already being extended in what is euphemistically called after-birth abortion to those, like Dr. Gosnell's victims, who have been born and then are killed.

I would point to my colleagues, before going to Mr. STUTZMAN, that one of the clinic individuals who was actually killing these children—this came out in testimony at the trial—said that when he heard the child crying, it was like an alien.

Children cry when they're being killed—and in this case, a very painful—as you pointed out, pain-capable children are at least 20 weeks gestational age. Many of these kids were 23, 24, 25, even higher. As we've learned from the grand jury, as well as from these proceedings, some of these children were as old as 30 weeks gestational age—very, very large children, very mature children, but no different than the child who just a few weeks and even months before, same child,

just a little more mature and, as you said, worthy of protection always.

I'd like to yield to Mr. STUTZMAN.

Mr. STUTZMAN. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding, and I appreciate his efforts to bring this particular matter to the attention of the American people.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS), who just spoke so eloquently and factually and knowledgeably about this particular issue as a doctor.

My heart is torn, as I stand here on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives as we're discussing a matter that's happened right here in our own country. I tell the gentleman from New Jersey that I was just meeting with a doctor in my office within the last couple of hours who worked in one of the neonatal clinics in northeastern Indiana. The work and the technology, the ability and the effort that doctors in a neonatal facility go through to save the life of a baby that is wanted is amazing and is heart-touching. And to then come to this particular matter and to hear the details of this tragic location in Philadelphia that was performing abortions like this is just heart-wrenching.

Mr. Speaker, I would just share with this body that certain places are permanent reminders that evil men will do evil things, whether it's in Auschwitz's ovens, Cambodia's killing fields, and now a run-down brick building on the corner of 38th and Lancaster in west Philadelphia.

In that building—crawling with animals, reeking with urine, and filled with blood-stained furniture—Kermit Gosnell was running a slaughterhouse. On a regular basis, he used a pair of scissors to sever the spinal cords of helpless babies who were born alive during illegal, late-term abortions.

The loss of these lives should scar the conscience of civilized people everywhere. This is not a discussion about abstract concepts like choice. We are talking about brutal deaths of newborn children.

Mr. Speaker, Kermit Gosnell is a predator who must be publicly exposed and openly denounced. That's why I come to the floor, to bring attention to this case, that the American people are informed of it, aware of it, and realizing the acts that are happening within our own country.

I have no doubt that in this life or the next he will be held accountable for his crimes. However, right here and right now we ought to take a serious look at our culture's careless disregard of this story in particular, and innocent life in general.

How is it that in our age of constant news not a single major news outlet has devoted serious attention to the atrocities that weren't committed halfway around the world but in west Philadelphia, Pennsylvania?

□ 1520

Has our national conscience been irreversibly seared by the deaths of more

than 1.2 million unborn children every year in this country. I believe this is something that the media should be talking about. They talk about so many other issues that affect our country, and rightly so. But I believe this is one of those that should be discussed and reported on by the media.

I've only seen a brief report on this within the last week. Mr. Speaker, I am confident that one day the era of abortion on demand will close and we will restore a lasting respect for life. However, until that day comes, each of us must take up the cause of those who cannot speak for themselves.

I thank Congressman SMITH for his unwavering commitment and his leadership and his efforts to protect life, and especially to bring this particular matter to the attention of the American people, so that we as a country will stand up and do the right thing for those who cannot speak for themselves.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for that very extraordinary and eloquent speech, bringing to the American people an inconvenient truth that needs to be exposed, and for, again, reminding us all that the major news media—NBC, CBS, ABC—have all had a blackout, there's been a coverup. If this was any other trial of a horrific bloodletting, a house of horrors, it would be front page, it would be the lead story, maybe second or third on some nights on the major networks.

The Philadelphia Inquirer, to its credit, a newspaper that is not pro-life editorially, and I know that because I've talked to them over the many years, they, nevertheless, have deployed reporters who have done a very, very good job in covering this trial. But that's pretty much where it ends. And, again, the major networks ought to be there.

I would point out that the reason why this clinic in this house of horrors was allowed to do much of what it has done is because of the chilling effect that the proabortion side has had on inspections of clinics where children are routinely slaughtered.

The grand jury itself said: "The politics in question were not antiabortion, but proabortion. With the change of administrations from Governor Casey," a Democrat pro-lifer, "to Governor Tom Ridge," a proabortion Republican, "officials concluded that inspections would be putting a barrier up to women seeking abortions. Better to leave the clinics to do as they please," went on the grand jury report, "even though, as Gosnell proved, that meant both women and babies would pay." That is found on page 9.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to my good friend and colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS) for as much time as he may consume.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Thank you.

"Troubling" is the word for what we see happening in Philadelphia. I think if you look at what this trial is about, about 20 years ago we had a decision

from our Supreme Court that basically said:

At the heart of liberty is the right to define one's own concept of existence, of meaning, of the universe, and of the mystery of the human life.

I suggest that at the heart of Dr. Gosnell's trial is this understanding on the part of Dr. Gosnell that he had the liberty to define his own concept of existence and of meaning and of the universe. But that's to be juxtaposed with what our Founders described as self-evident truths, that we are endowed by our Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among them are the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

That concept was enshrined in our Constitution, where our Fifth Amendment provides that no person is to be deprived of life without due process of law; and, again, our 14th Amendment adds that no State shall deprive a person of life without due process of law.

As we watch this trial unfold in Philadelphia and continue to hear the daily testimony of what's happening, I think it's appropriate that we reflect on those words of the Founders and how far we've come from those days.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my friend for coming from his markup to be with us here today.

There was a report in the Philadelphia Inquirer—again, just tell the truth, just tell the story about what's happening in the trial—and they report that this week an ex-employee of Gosnell talked about how she perceived the brutal snipping of the spines of newborns still alive after abortion.

"Did you know it was murder?" Assistant District Attorney Joanne Pescatore asked ex-clinic worker Lynda Williams, referring to the clinic's practice of snipping the spines of babies born alive during abortion procedures.

"No, I didn't," said Williams, 44.

She goes on to say that one of her duties was to retrieve fetuses from women who would sometimes spontaneously abort in the waiting room after getting large doses of drugs. "One day," she testified, "a woman expelled a second trimester fetus and it was moving." Williams said she took a pair of scissors and snipped the spine as Gosnell showed her. "I did it once," she said, "and I didn't do it again because it gave me the creeps."

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude. Dr. ANDY HARRIS a few moments ago talked about the bioethicists who had made statements that after-birth abortion is justified because the newborn, or children who have been out of the womb for even weeks, have the same moral stature—and that is none—as an unborn child. Those two bioethicists say: "The devaluation of newborn babies is inextricably linked to the devaluation of the unborn." They said: "We propose that this practice of after-birth abortion be called that, rather

than infanticide, in order to emphasize that the moral status of the individual killed—that is to say the baby—is comparable to that of the fetus."

Whether she will exist is exactly what our choice is all about. So the choice to kill extended to the point of snipping the spines of children who were born and struggling and gasping for breath and for some kind of outreach of hands that would save that child, but it wasn't there. That is now being prosecuted, as it ought to be, as murder.

Our hope is that the blackout of this trial of Kermit Gosnell will end. It is ongoing. It's occurring today. It's occurring every day. I don't know how long it will take. But to NBC, CBS, and ABC and to the major news media, The Washington Post, The New York Times, and others, just tell the story. Keep your editorials on the editorial page—you are absolutely entitled to that—but don't let that creep onto and bleed onto the other pages. Just tell the story. And the indifference, again, and the lack of coverage suggests a coverup.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### CONGRESSIONAL PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the Congressional Progressive Caucus. We are here today to talk about a specific item in the President's budget, and that item is the chained CPI in Social Security.

The chained CPI is an idea that originated with the Republicans and was included in the President's budget as a way to try to convince them to come to the table and have a budget for the Nation. But the chained CPI is more than that. We have a problem with the way the chained CPI works.

Chained CPI. No one in the real world talks about chained CPI. It's like sequester. I don't know a single person who tells their child, I'm going to sequester your toys.

Chained CPI is another Washington idea. What that idea is, in layman's terms, is essentially a cut in how people will receive the cost of living increase for Social Security. A real important way to talk about this is currently the consumer price index is how we determine any increases to people who receive Social Security.

□ 1530

When you do the chained CPI, it takes the rate that we provide for that cost of living increase and changes the cost of living increase in a different way that makes it a smaller increase for people who receive that.

The problem is specifically for seniors and disabled and children who are

receiving Social Security. Seniors, especially, pay about 20 percent to 30 percent of their incomes on health care, and health care costs have risen more than the consumer price index or the cost of living increases that people have had. So by doing the chained CPI, essentially it is a cut in Social Security to people who need it the most.

There is a famous Midwesterner, a former Senator from the State of Minnesota, Hubert Humphrey who once said:

The moral test of government is how that government treats those who are in the dawn of life, the children; those who are in the twilight of life, the elderly; and those who are in the shadows of life, the sick, the needy and the handicapped.

Our moral test today is Social Security. It's our moral promise to seniors for their economic security. That promise comes in the form of Social Security.

It's also our promise to veterans, to people with disabilities and to our children and orphans in this country. If we break that American promise by moving to a chained CPI, it'll have real consequences to real people.

Granted, this was a Republican proposal that the President included. This is a Republican idea that the President included in his budget in order to try to get them to the table. Nonetheless, it is a bad idea no matter where it comes from.

Let me give you a little example about the amount of cuts that would be provided on average to some seniors through this. Benefits for someone who's 75 years old would see \$658 less a year. If you're 85 years old, you would see \$1,147 less a year. If you're a 95-year-old, you would see \$1,622 less a year. And for our 3.2 million disabled veterans in this country who sacrificed for our country, it means they would see reduced disability in Social Security benefits as well.

These cuts grow deeper and deeper, as I explained, the older you get, but they also are especially hard on women in this country. Women have longer life expectancies. They rely more on their income from Social Security, and they already are more economically vulnerable than men.

Let me give you an example of what this means in real terms.

My mother is 84 years old. My father died in 1991, and she has been alone all those years living on Social Security. I called her and I asked her specifically what she gets from Social Security every month. She gets \$1,101 a month. That comes out to \$13,212 annually.

I asked her to break out her expenses for me. I went through every possible expense that we could, just to get an idea of what it's like to be 84 and to be on a modest income. I grew up in a lower middle class family. She's already gone through most of her savings, living to 84. Her mother lived to 101. Should her genes hold out, her savings will definitely not hold out that amount of time.