1 NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC. 2 RPTS WOJACK 3 HIF043140 4 5 6 PROTECTING WOMEN'S ACCESS TO 7 REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH CARE WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2020 8 9 House of Representatives 10 Subcommittee on Health 11 Committee on Energy and Commerce 12 Washington, D.C. 13 14 15 16 The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10:00 a.m., in 17 Room 2123 Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Anna G. Eshoo 18 [chairwoman of the subcommittee] presiding. 19 Members present: Representatives Eshoo, Engel, Butterfield, 20 Matsui, Castor, Sarbanes, Lujan, Schrader, Kennedy, Cardenas, 21 Ruiz, Dingell, Kuster, Kelly, Barragan, Blunt Rochester, Pallone (ex officio), Burgess, Shimkus, Guthrie, Griffith, Bilirakis, 22 23 Long, Bucshon, Brooks, Hudson, Carter, Gianforte, and Walden (ex 24 officio).

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

Staff present: Jacquelyn Bolen, Counsel; Jeff Carroll, Staff Director; Elizabeth Ertel, Office Manager; Austin Flack, Staff Assistant; Waverly Gordon, Deputy Chief Counsel; Tiffany Guarascio, Deputy Staff Director; Zach Kahan, Outreach and Member Service Coordinator; Aisling McDonough, Policy Coordinator; Meghan Mullon, Policy Analyst; Joe Orlando, Staff Assistant; Tim Robinson, Chief Counsel; Benjamin Tabor, Staff Assistant; Rebecca Tomilchik, Staff Assistant; Madison Wendell, Intern; C.J. Young, Press Secretary; Mike Bloomquist, Minority Staff Director; Jordan Davis, Minority Senior Advisor; Caleb Graff, Minority Professional Staff Member, Health; Tyler Greenberg, Minority Staff Assistant; Peter Kielty, Minority General Counsel; Ryan Long, Minority Deputy Staff Director; Kate O'Connor, Minority Chief Counsel, C&T; Zach Roday, Minority Communications Director; Kristin Seum, Minority Counsel, Health; and Kristen Shatynski, Minority Professional Staff Member, Health.

Ms. <Eshoo. = Good morning, everyone. The Subcommittee on Health will now come to order.

Let me just say that we will hear several deeply personal stories from our witnesses today and we are grateful on behalf of all of my colleagues to have you with us. We appreciate your being here today and the testimony that each one of you are going to give.

Our subcommittee has always prided itself on a tradition of respect and collegiality and so I ask not only all the members but also everyone that is here in the hearing room today to continue in that tradition.

The chair now recognizes herself for five minutes for an opening statement.

Nearly 50 years ago, the Supreme Court of the United States affirmed the right of every woman to make decisions about her own life, her body, and her future.

Now that right is under threat by state laws restricting and banning reproductive health care and abortion care. Since 2011, states have passed more than 450 medically unnecessary restrictions on reproductive care.

For example, Alaska, Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas force doctors to lie to their patients by having them inaccurately link abortion and breast cancer in their patient counseling.

Louisiana, Texas, and Wisconsin require providers to perform

medically unnecessary ultrasounds and show and describe the images to women who have already decided to have an abortion.

Eighteen states have specific requirements for procedure rooms and corridors, as well as requiring facilities to be near and have relationships with local hospitals.

These requirements do not improve patient care but purposely set expensive standards that make it difficult for clinics to stay open.

Today, 90 percent of our counties in our country are without a single abortion provider and six states have only one clinic. So why is this a problem that the subcommittee should address? First, these restrictions deny women access to safe health

care. Restricting abortion does not stop abortion. It makes it less safe.

A nonpartisan study by the National Academies of Sciences found that the biggest threat to the quality and safety of abortion care are state regulations that create barriers to trained providers.

When abortion is accessible and legal, it is extremely safe.

The rate of serious complications in first-trimester abortions is less than .05 percent, making abortions 40 times safer than a colonoscopy.

When abortion care is restricted, women face devastating consequences. The landmark Turnaway Study, a five-year

longitudinal study by researchers at UCSF, followed 1,000 women who sought, but did not always obtain, abortion care.

The researchers found that the women who were denied health care consistently faced worse outcomes than those who received it.

The women forced to carry a pregnancy were more likely to experience eclampsia and more likely to stay with abusive partners.

They were four times more likely to be living below the poverty level. Two women who were denied abortion care died of pregnancy-related causes.

Every day women across our country face the deeply personal decision of whether to continue pregnancy. They should be able to make their own decisions, together with their partner, their husband, their minister, their rabbi, their priest, free from political interference.

The Women's Health Protection Act ensures that every

American woman has equal access to comprehensive reproductive

health care, no matter where they live in our country.

This legislation follows in the tradition of the Voting
Rights Act of 1965 where Congress safeguarded a
constitutionally-protected right. That is because states don't
get to pick and choose what part of the Constitution to follow.

When we support access to quality affordable health care,

we reduce the rate of unintended pregnancy. Today, the teen birthrate is at a record low. Total unplanned pregnancies recently hit the lowest level in 30 years.

Any member who wants to reduce abortions can support public health programs proven to reduce unintended pregnancies, including increased access to no-cost contraception as provided by the Affordable Care Act, comprehensive sex education that includes medically-accurate information, programs to support women facing domestic violence and sexual abuse, expanding Medicaid coverage rather than cutting it by \$920 billion, as the president proposed this week in his released budget.

The chair now recognizes Dr. Burgess, the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Health, for his five minutes for an opening statement.

Mr. <Burgess.= And I thank the chair.

I do feel that today's hearing is an indication of where the Democratic Party is headed. The policy concerns surrounding abortion and the right to life are not new.

But a bill such as H.R. 2975, with over 200 members of the Democratic Party in support, is in fact unprecedented. This bill before us today transcends pro-life and pro-choice issues.

The question of abortion, sometimes reduced to yet another political issue, is personal for some of us. It is personal for me. My belief in the right to life has influenced my professional

career for much longer than my time in Congress.

Before being elected to represent the 26th District of Texas,

I spent over 25 years practicing as an OB-GYN in north Texas.

My medical career was rooted in my pro-life practice and the

belief that all life had meaningful potential.

In the span of my career in obstetrics I delivered more than 3,000 babies. Not only did I have the joy of seeing these babies when they were delivered, but throughout my career I witnessed great advances in technology.

It is interesting at the time that Roe v. Wade was adjudicated by the Supreme Court, sonography was itself in its infancy. It is technology that was really only available to me in the latter half of my residency at Parkland Hospital and they have seen great strides.

And yes, for those of us who have watched a baby with purposeful movements in utero there is no question to me about the sanctity of life.

While my work has changed, I now spend late nights delivering policy rather than babies. My dedication to pro-life medicine remains steadfast.

Ironically, the bill is called the Women's Health Protection Act of 2019, even though if this bill became law it would put women's health and safety at risk.

The heavy-handed language that this bill uses is what places

that risk by codifying that there may be no restrictions, no prohibitions, on any particular abortion procedure prior to viability, may place at risk a number of women to potential harms associated with certain abortion procedures, and complications, such as infection, bleeding, uterine perforation with no ability to regulate for safety purposes.

Not only does the bill raise questions about the Democrats' concern for women's health and safety, it also raises questions about the regard for the United States Constitution.

The Supreme Court established the viability tests in Roe v. Wade in 1971. The standard says that once a baby reaches the point of viability a state may regulate or prohibit abortions.

In Justice Blackman's opinion in Roe v. Wade he stated the viability is usually placed at about seven months, or 28 weeks gestation, but it may occur earlier, even at 24 weeks.

In 1973, a baby being born 24 weeks was--had very dim chances for survival. But I will tell you, throughout my career the youngest gestational age baby that I personally delivered was 23 weeks and that child went on not just to survive but to thrive without any neurological sequelae.

Last week at the State of the Union, President Trump recognized a young woman--a young girl--and her mother in the crowd. This youngster, Ellie Schneider, was born severely premature at 21 weeks. Ellie is now perhaps the youngest baby

to survive early gestational delivery in the United States and she is now a happy and healthy two-year-old.

So, for me, it is incredible to see the medical advances saving the lives of mothers and babies.

As the viability of a baby occurs earlier with the help of medical innovation, the Roe v. Wade standard inherently extends the rights of states to regulate earlier in a pregnancy term.

A bill like this seems to override--seeks to override and dismiss the viability standard set by the Supreme Court in the wake of medical advances that are saving babies' lives.

The bill would also codify into law that access to an abortion is essential to women's health and in fact is contrary to one of the founding principles of our country, which is a right to life.

The federal government should work to overcome the factors that lead to abortions and should support well-crafted legislative proposals that directly address these factors. But that is not this bill.

I am a physician. Most members of Congress are not. If this bill does cross the line it is perhaps the most uncomfortable and threatening legislation that I have seen that threatens not just hospitals, doctors, but the very women patients we serve.

I yield back my time.

208 Ms. <Eshoo.= The gentleman yields back.

It is a pleasure to recognize the chairman of the full committee, Mr. Pallone, for his five minutes for opening statement.

The <Chairman.= Thank you, Madam Chair.

Today's hearing is on legislation to protect women's access to abortion care. This legislation is necessary today because states have passed an onslaught of ideological bans and restrictions intended to interfere with women's personal medical decision-making and to severely limit women's access to abortion care.

Since 2011 alone, anti-abortion state lawmakers have passed nearly 450 restrictive laws with the sole purpose of making it more difficult for women to access this care.

They have passed mandatory waiting periods, requirements for multiple in-person visits, and requirements that doctors provide their patients with medically inaccurate information about the potential risks of the procedure.

They have also passed ridiculous and unnecessary building requirements for abortion providers that are intended solely to shut down clinics that provide abortion services.

And the result of these increasingly restrictive laws is that women all across the country are having a harder time accessing abortion care, which they have a constitutional right to obtain.

Comprehensive health care means having access to affordable abortion care, which is a safe medical procedure with far fewer risks than many routine medical procedures.

Repeated studies have confirmed the safety of abortion, including comprehensive findings by the National Academies of Science, Engineering, and Medicine.

It is a legal and safe procedure, but ideological state legislators continue to put up roadblocks for women and providers.

Today, nearly 90 percent of American counties are without a single abortion provider and six states only have one abortion clinic in the entire state.

The unfortunate reality in America is that your constitutionally guaranteed health care rights are now dependent upon where you live, and that is simply wrong.

Sadly, we know that anti-abortion restrictions fall hardest on those who already face significant barriers to health care, and that is low-income women, women of color, LGBTQ people, young people, and people living in rural communities.

At a time when we should all be working together to reduce health care disparities, we are watching states across the country actively pass legislation that increases those disparities.

And their actions are putting access to care further out of reach. One particularly alarming study from the Center for Reproductive Rights and Ibis Reproductive Health found that

states with more anti-abortion laws have poorer health outcomes generally for both women and children than states that have fewer restrictions.

This should be alarming to all of us, especially as we are faced with an increasingly dire national maternal health crisis that we also know disproportionately impacts women of color.

It is for all of these reasons that we are holding this important and timely hearing on the Women's Health Protection Act. This legislation simply ensures that patients can access, and health care providers can provide, abortion services. It prevents medically unnecessary and burdensome restrictions that single out abortion services and deny women access to care.

It is long past time that we affirm women's health care rights by ensuring that they can actually utilize those rights. The Women's Health Protection Act would do just that by ensuring the constitutional right to have an abortion is a reality for all people, no matter where they live.

And, finally, I want to thank our witnesses for being here today. I know that this can be a very personal and, at times, difficult conversation to have in a public setting and I want to express my sincere thanks and appreciation for all of you for being here today and sharing your experiences and expertise with the committee.

And I would like to yield a minute and a half to

- 281 Representative Schakowsky.
- Ms. <Schakowsky.= I thank the gentleman for yielding to
- 283 me.
- Abortion is health care and health care is a human right.
- This hearing is historic but it is about time that the Congress
- has finally weighed in and said that we do support the right of
- women regardless of color, of income, of state, of zip code, to
- have the health care that they need.
- This is about the women who deserve comprehensive
- reproductive health care, all of them. And for the first time
- in over 20 years our committee is considering a proactive bill
- that would guarantee the constitutional right to abortion care
- free from the interference of any politician who has no place
- in making this very personal decision.
- 295 Protecting access to abortion care isn't the beginning of
- women having abortions. But it is the end of women dying from
- abortions.
- We will not go back no matter what is happening in states
- around the country. Women will go forward together to protect
- 300 our rights.
- 301 And I yield back.
- 302 The <Chairman.= And I yield back.
- 303 Ms. <Eshoo.= The gentleman yields back.
- It is a pleasure to recognize Mr. Walden, the ranking member

of the full committee, for his five minutes of an opening statement.

Mr. <Walden. = Well, thank you, Madam Chair.

During the State of the Union Address, President Trump welcomed and spoke about Ellie Schneider. Remember, she was the little girl who was delivered at just 21 weeks gestation.

The president called for policies to protect the unborn after fetal viability. Following the State of the Union, the Senate Judiciary Committee held a hearing on medical care for children born alive.

Instead of considering these policies, we are, regrettably, convened here today to discuss yet another deceptively titled partisan bill that has no chance of becoming law or being considered by the Senate.

We all know the issue of abortion is a very sensitive one. It is a painful topic for the women and men who, for whatever reason, find themselves facing the dilemma of whether or not to terminate a pregnancy and, in turn, a human life.

Abortion is one of the most polarizing subjects in American political discourse but even many people that consider themselves pro-choice believe some restrictions are appropriate.

Seven in 10 Americans support substantial restrictions on abortion after three months of pregnancy. Even nearly half of those who identify as pro-choice support restrictions on late

term abortions.

Indeed, fewer than four in 10 Democrats support abortion at any time and for any reason, which is why I am so concerned we are considering a bill so sweeping and out of sync with the views of the majority of Americans, a bill that seeks to strip away even the most minimal protections for women and their unborn children at any stage of prenatal development.

Even the original Roe v. Wade ruling never envisioned the extreme position reflected in this bill. By overturning nearly all federal and state limitations on abortion, the deceptively-named Women's Health Protection Act would require the provisions of abortion on demand at any stage of pregnancy regardless of any compelling interest in the welfare of the patient, the protection of human life, or the conscience of the health practitioner.

I will oppose this bill for Oregonians like Elizabeth Gillette, who told me about her heartbreaking experience of getting an abortion in 2011.

In her letter, which I would like to submit for the record,

Madam Chair, Elizabeth states that, quote, "On-demand abortions

are not putting the safety of the woman as the highest priority.

Because chemical abortion is a procedure that encompasses risk both physical and emotional it should not be thought of as

- a routine procedure. We need to protect the health of women.
- It is my deepest hope no woman would have to suffer, as I did,''
- 355 closed quote.
- With that, I would like to yield the remainder of my time
- 357 to the gentlelady from Washington, Mrs. Rodgers.
- 358 Mrs. <Rodgers.= I thank the ranking member and the chair
- for allowing me to participate today.
- At times like this each one of us reflect on our own journey.
- 361 As human beings we go through so many ups and downs. I was 35
- and single when I was elected to Congress, and before I met my
- husband I wasn't sure about kids or if I was even a baby person.
- I had traveled. I had met amazing people. I had had
- 365 extraordinary opportunities that I am grateful to God for every
- 366 single day.
- 367 But I can testify today that the best thing in my life has
- been becoming a mom. There is nothing more amazing than bringing
- a new life into the world.
- 370 Again, there was a time when I was fearful. I was uncertain.
- 371 Even when I was pregnant it was scary. It was overwhelming.
- And in that moment, I could see the fear of the unknown making
- a person question everything.
- Now I am so grateful that it happened. Today, I am a working
- mom of three. My oldest has Down Syndrome and is one of the best
- things that has happened in my life.

377	I also want to share Linda's story from Washington State.
378	She had an abortion when she was in college and she said, quote,
379	"The best thing I can remember about the abortion clinic was that
380	no one seemed to care. They didn't care that I was there to end
381	a life. They didn't seem to care about me as a person and they
382	didn't follow up to make sure that I was okay.''
383	Today, Linda has two adult children but she still wonders.
384	I quote: she said, "What about the one that I aborted? What
385	would she or he be like today?''
386	I urge us all to remember Linda's story as some move to this
387	extreme where nearly unlimited abortions at nearly every stage
388	of pregnancy would be the law of the land.
389	Our country needs hope. America needs hope and healing.
390	Abortion doesn't bring hope or healing. There is a despair that
391	has come over our country.
392	Do you know what despair is? Despair is a complete lack
393	of hope. It is hopelessness. I urge my colleagues to reconsider
394	this legislation.
395	I yield back.
396	Ms. <eshoo. =="" and="" asks="" back="" for<="" gentleman="" td="" the="" yields=""></eshoo.>
397	unanimous consent to have something placed in the record.
398	So ordered.
399	[The information follows:]
400	

402	Ms. <eshoo. =="" chair="" move="" now="" our<="" th="" the="" theto="" to="" will=""></eshoo.>
403	witnesses for their statements and, again, we appreciate each
404	one of you being here.
405	Dr. Yashica Robinson is the medical director of the Alabama
406	Women's Center for Reproductive Alternatives. Welcome to you.
407	Ms. Georgette Forney, co-founder of the Silent No More
408	awareness campaign. Welcome to you and thank you.
409	Teresa Stanton Collett is a professor of law and director
410	of the Pro-Life Center at the University of St. Thomas School
411	of Law in Minneapolis. Welcome to you.
412	Nancy Northup, the president and CEO of the Center for
413	Reproductive Rights. Thank you for being here.
414	And Holly Alvarado, who is a retired staff sergeant of the
415	United States Air Force.
416	So, again, thank you and welcome to each one of you.
417	I think you are probably familiar with the lighting system.
418	Green, obviously, is go. Yellow, you slow down, and red you
419	stop. Okay.
420	So, Dr. Robinson, you are recognized for five minutes for
421	your testimony.

?STATEMENTS OF DR. YASHICA ROBINSON, MEDICAL DIRECTOR, ALABAMA WOMEN'S CENTER FOR REPRODUCTIVE ALTERNATIVES; GEORGETTE FORNEY, PRESIDENT OF ANGLICANS FOR LIFE, CO-FOUNDER OF THE SILENT NO MORE AWARENESS CAMPAIGN; TERESA STANTON COLLETT, J.D., PROFESSOR OF LAW; NANCY NORTHUP, PRESIDENT AND CEO, CENTER FOR REPRODUCTIVE RIGHTS; HOLLY ALVARADO, ADVOCATE=

Dr. < Robinson. = Thank you, and good morning.

Good morning, Chairwoman Eshoo, Ranking Member Burgess, and members of the subcommittee.

My name is Dr. Yashica Robinson. I am a board-certified obstetrician and gynecologist. I serve on the board of Physicians for Reproductive Health and I am the medical director of Alabama Women's Center for Reproductive Alternatives in Huntsville, Alabama.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak with you in support of the Women's Health Protection Act.

At my obstetrics practice, I provide prenatal care, deliver babies, and treat mothers after they give birth. I also provide abortion care because I believe that patients deserve the full spectrum of reproductive health care options.

I came to this work because of my passion as a young mother.

I know that young people--I am sorry, I came to this work because of my passion for young people, one that is deeply connected to

my personal experience.

In high school, I learned that I was pregnant. As a result of fear and lack of resources, by the time I confided in my family I had no choice. I was going to be a mother.

Becoming a mother came with many harsh realities. I love my children with all my heart but I know that everyone should be able to make the decision to parent for themselves.

I am proud to provide patients with compassionate quality care when they enter our doors and I support this bill because access to care should never depend on your zip code.

In states like California or Maryland a patient can access abortion care without the state forcing medically inaccurate information on them or making them endure a mandatory delay.

This is what care should look like. Unfortunately, that is not the case for many patients in Alabama. Last year, the Alabama legislature passed a near total ban on abortion. It would threaten doctors like myself with prison for providing ethical medically-appropriate care for simply doing our jobs.

Represented by the ACLU, I, and other providers, filed suit to prevent this ban from taking effect. Thankfully, it was blocked and abortion remains legal in Alabama.

However, decades of medically unnecessary restrictions have taken their toll in Alabama. It is not unusually for patients to travel up to eight hours to reach us because so many other

providers have been forced to close. Then they are required to wait an additional 48 hours before I can provide the care they need.

I know people who have slept in their cars overnight as a result of this state-mandated delay. The state also requires my patients to receive outdated materials as part of so-called counseling.

These materials are filled with misinformation that I later have to correct. We are required to do ultrasound examinations even when they are unnecessary and provide no medical value. The effect of these needless costs and delays on my patients are so painful for me to see.

Over the years, my practice has been forced to comply with onerous medically-unnecessary building requirements. For example, we were forced to install 24-hour lighting even though we can't see patients after 5:00 p.m. because of a local regulation.

This has nothing to do with safety at all. The local anti-abortion group even drafted legislation making it illegal to operate an abortion clinic within 2,000 feet of a school, specifically designed to shut our clinic down. A court struck that down, recognizing it as just another thinly-veiled attempt to push abortion out of reach for patients.

In 2018, the National Academies of Science, Engineering,

and Medicine published a comprehensive study affirming that abortion is extremely safe and the biggest threat to patient safety is the litany of medically unnecessary regulations that raise costs and delay care.

They confirmed that access to safe abortion depends on where you live and how much money you have.

Alabama is a state with an unconscionably high maternal and infant mortality rate. According to the Alabama Department of Public Health, nearly two-thirds of Alabama counties lack hospitals where obstetrical care is provided.

In Alabama, black women are nearly five times more likely to die of pregnancy-related causes than white women and many preexisting conditions can be made worse during pregnancy, and other serious health-related conditions can be caused by pregnancy.

Without access to abortion, maternal mortality rates will rise even more.

The bottom line is this. Abortion is health care. The Women's Health Protection Act would bring needed federal protections for my patients and safeguard their rights.

Protection abortion will also protect access to pregnancy care because they are interconnected. Health care should be patient centered and medical decisions should remain between the patient and her physician without any political interference.

518	Thank you.
519	[The prepared statement of Dr. Robinson follows:]
520	
521	*********INSERT 1******

522	Ms. <eshoo.= dr.="" robinson.<="" th="" thank="" you,=""></eshoo.=>
523	Ms. Forney, you're recognized for your five minutes of
524	testimony for the committee, and thank you again for being here.

525 ?STATEMENT OF GEORGETTE FORNEY= 526 527 Ms. <Forney.= Push the magic button. Do I wait till I get 528 the green light? 529 [Laughter.] Ms. <Forney.= There we go. 530 531 Thank you for inviting me to testify today. My name is 532 Georgette Forney and I am here as a woman who had an abortion 533 and has spent the last 22 years helping others who regret their 534 abortion. 535 Sorry, I get so emotional. 536 As the co-founder of the Silent No More awareness campaign, 537 I speak on behalf of the 19,582 people who are registered to be silent no more. 538 539 We want you to know that abortion didn't solve our problems. 540 It just created different ones. When I was 16 and I found out 541 I was pregnant I was scared. A baby felt like a threat to my 542 future. 543 I didn't know what abortion was but my friend told me it 544 would fix my problem. As I drove to the clinic that day my heart 545 said, this feels wrong. But the fear in me said, it's legal so 546 it must be okay. 547 For 19 years after my abortion, I pretended it was no big 548 deal. But the reality was I wouldn't allow myself to face the

549	truth of what I had done. I had aborted a human being.
550	Once I made that connection, everything changed for me.
551	You know, as long as we stay in that place of denial it is okay.
552	We are okay. The problem is that sometimes something will
553	trigger usthe birth of a child, the death of a loved one, a
554	parent, or even a sonogram image.
555	At the March for Life last month, 31 women shared their
556	testimony for the first time outside of the Supreme Court. They
557	each told why they had their abortion.
558	They talked about what the procedure was like, what happened
559	immediately afterwards, what were the long-term consequences,
560	and then, finally, how they found help in healing.
561	Here are some quick excerpts.
562	Chelsea: My boyfriend, friends, and family all agreed that
563	an abortion was the best choice for my circumstances.
564	Lynn: I was one month from graduating from college and had
565	just signed my first teaching contract.
566	Cindy: I was told that the tugging would be like strong
567	menstrual cramps. What I felt was intense pain as though not
568	only my baby but my soul was being suctioned out.
569	Kelly: When I went in, I was treated with no compassion,
570	just like a cow going off to slaughter.
571	Laura: When I left Planned Parenthood that day, I promised

myself I would never think about it or talk about this day ever

573 again.

Virginia: Immediately afterwards, I forced myself to shut out the reality of what had happened. I had taken care of my problem.

Cecilia: My life spiralled into a life of self-hatred, drugs, alcohol, and relationships. I ended up having three more abortions. Each time I felt like my life was being sucked out of me. I was dead inside. Empty.

Lynn, North Carolina: I became an angry militant advocate for abortion. But over a year later, the guilt and horror of what I had done and the resulting depression, drug abuse, and self-loathing started consuming my life.

The women of Silent No More publicly share—speak publicly about their abortions. But many more are silent and seek help quietly. The campaign partners with more than 40 different abortion after—care programs helping women both nationally and internationally.

One program alone, Rachel's Vineyard, has helped over 326,000 individuals. These organizations have grown as women reach out to us for help because they are dealing with nightmares, depression, suicidal feelings and attempts, eating disorders, addiction, sexual dysfunction, and, most common, a low sense of self-esteem.

If abortion is no big deal, why are all these people going

through healing programs? Also, there is clear evidence that tighter regulations of abortion clinics are needed.

Consider the filthy Gosnell clinic in Philadelphia where Karnamaya Monger died, or the St. Louis Planned Parenthood that failed relicensing inspection last year when the DHSS discovered four women had suffered from major abortion complications. Or consider Preterm in Cleveland where a haemorrhaging abortion patient had to call 911 herself after being kicked out of the clinic because they were closing.

And then there are women who can't speak. Keisha Atkins died at 23 in Albuquerque during a late-term abortion. Tonya Reaves died in Chicago after bleeding for hours after three botched abortion attempts. She was 24 and the mother of a baby.

Jennifer Morbelli was 29 when she died. Cree Erwin was 24 when she died of an incomplete abortion in Michigan. Tell the families of these women that abortion must be protected.

You say that abortion restrictions impact women of color.

But the inconvenient truth is that women of color are being killed in the recent years more than the white women, like Cree, Tonya, and Keisha.

Or how about Lakisha Wilson, Jamie Lee Morales, or Maria Santiago? Do their black lives and Hispanic lives matter?

We need legislation that requires every state to report every abortion, every incident of physical harm by abortion, and every

621	woman that dies by legal abortion is acknowledged. Let us get
622	the facts. Trust women with the facts, not rhetoric.
623	Thank you.
624	[The prepared statement of Ms. Forney follows:]
625	
626	*********INSERT 2******

627	Ms. <eshoo. =="" a="" almost="" are="" forney,="" minute="" ms.="" over="" th="" time.<="" you=""></eshoo.>
628	Thank you for your testimony.
629	I now would like to recognize Ms. Stanton Collett for your
630	five minutes for testimony.

631	?STATEMENT OF TERESA STANTON COLLETT=
632	
633	Ms. <collett.= chair.<="" madam="" td="" thank="" you,=""></collett.=>
634	Ms. <eshoo.= microphone="" on.<="" td="" turn="" your=""></eshoo.=>
635	Ms. <collett.= chair.<="" madam="" td="" thank="" you,=""></collett.=>
636	Ms. <eshoo.= good.<="" great.="" is="" td="" that=""></eshoo.=>
637	Ms. <collett.= burgess,="" member="" members="" of="" ranking="" td="" the<=""></collett.=>
638	subcommittee. My name is Teresa Collett. I am a law professor
639	in Minneapolis, as the chairwoman mentioned.
640	I also, however, have a fairly robust litigation practice
641	Mr. <shimkus.= chair,="" her="" madam="" may="" mic<="" need="" pull="" she="" td="" to=""></shimkus.=>
642	a little bit closer to her.
643	Ms. <collett.= td="" thank="" you.<=""></collett.=>
644	I also have a fairly robust litigation practice and have
645	represented numerous public officials and amicus briefs before
646	the U.S. Supreme Court, federal courts of appeals, and state
647	supreme courts.
648	I have also had the privilege of serving as special attorney
649	general or special counsel to the states of Oklahoma, New
650	Hampshire, and also in Kansas.
651	That is the basis of my testimony today, which represents
652	my personal views, not the views of my employer, the University
653	of St. Thomas.
654	It is important to note what is absent from this bill, at

the outset.

Number one, while the bill recognizes that abortion is constitutionally protected, it fails to recognize the unique nature of abortion.

Abortion, unlike the other procedures that are listed as comparable procedures in the legislation, in the words of the Eighth Circuit, ends the separate unique human life.

There is no other medical procedure that is undertaken in this country where that is permitted. It is also important to note that many of the premises of this bill are simply false.

The first congressional finding in the bill suggests that abortion access is a necessary precondition to a woman's full participation in the economic and social life of this country.

To that extent, it is a version of what the Supreme Court plurality said in Planned Parenthood v. Casey. But when that case was decided, abortion rights were already beginning their steep decline.

The simple fact is that from 1991 to 2016, the last year in which we have statistics from the CDC regarding the rate of abortion, abortions have declined more than 50 percent, going from an annual rate of 24 per 1,000 women to 11.6.

During that time period, women's participation in the workforce has remained, largely, steady including participation by women who have children under the age of 18. During that time

also, women's educational achievement has skyrocketed.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, women's college degrees have quadrupled from 1970 to 2018. In addition to that, women's business—women—owned businesses have increased 42 percent, according to the American Express Study in 2019 of women's businesses. They contribute \$1.9 trillion to the national economy.

The simple fact is there is no correlation between access to abortion and women's participation in the economic and social life of this country.

To the extent that there is a correlation, it appears to be a negative correlation. But I won't insult the members of this committee by suggesting that's a truth. We all know that correlation and causation are very different things.

But women are succeeding in this society while abortion rates are falling rapidly. There is no correlation.

My second point is that the restructuring of the abortion market is in response to that steep decline. While it is said many times already today that abortion access is a necessary component of health care, the committee ignores in this legislation the fact that 54 percent of all counties in this country have no hospitals providing obstetric services.

Dr. Robinson testified to that fact today and said in Alabama it's an even greater number of hospitals that provide no obstetric

703 services. That is an outrage.

711

712

713

718

719

- If you were really concerned about women's health, that would be your primary concern. In addition to that, we also see that there is a restructuring by the major market force in that industry.
- The industry, of course, is led by Planned Parenthood, who has adopted as a strategy the building of mega clinics. When markets are declining, you need economies of scale.
 - That makes sense to me. In the state of Texas, they have built a mega clinic that in 2014 expanded their ability to serve women by 1,000.
- But when Wal-Mart comes to town you expect smaller businesses to close. The fact that these clinics are closing that compete with Planned Parenthood is much more a product of market forces than it is by any regulation.
 - And, in fact, researchers at Guttmacher have said that they cannot explain with certainty what is causing the decline or what the impact of these regulations are on that decline.
- It is also important, finally, to note that this legislation is based on studies that are predominantly done by the abortion industry.
- It would be comparable to trying to pass tobacco regulation
 based on the Tobacco Research Institute, an institute that was
 funded by the industry and that suppressed studies that were

727	contrary to its economic interests and its economic desires.
728	That is true in this area as well.
729	Again, if this committee were interested in women's health,
730	truly, they would be passing legislation that would require all
731	states to report to the CDC the rate of abortions, the injuries
732	from abortions, the age and gestational age of the child.
733	They would also require and fund studies done by independent
734	researchers.
735	Thank you, Madam Chair.
736	[The prepared statement of Ms. Collett follows:]
737	
738	************INSERT 3*******

739	Ms.	<eshoo.=< th=""><th>Thank</th><th>VO11.</th></eshoo.=<>	Thank	VO11.

740 I now would like to recognize Ms. Northup for your five 741 minutes of testimony, and welcome and thank you again.

?STATEMENT OF NANCY NORTHUP=

744 Ms. <Northup. = Thank you, Chairwoman Eshoo--

Ms. <Eshoo. = You want to put on your microphone, please?

746 Ms. <Northup. = Thank you, Chairwoman Eshoo, Ranking Member

Burgess, and members of the subcommittee for inviting me to speak

748 at this important hearing this morning.

Right now, one of the most basic protections of our Constitution—the right to make for ourselves the important decisions of our lives—is under attack.

As you have heard this morning, since 2011 states have enacted over 450 laws as part of a coordinated nationwide strategy to make it harder and sometimes impossible for women to access abortion care.

Last year in 2019 we saw extreme abortion bans enacted in state after state. These attacks come against the backdrop of the president's vow to appoint justices to the Supreme Court who will overturn Roe v. Wade and judges hostile to reproductive rights are being confirmed on our federal, trial, and appellate courts.

Recently, people across the nation have been calling on Congress to stand up for women and codify Roe. The Women's Health Protection Act is the answer to that call.

The moment is now to draw the line on the decades of assaults

on women's rights. My name is Nancy Northup and I am president and CEO of the Center for Reproductive Rights. We are a nonpartisan nonprofit legal organization working to ensure that reproductive rights are protected as fundamental human rights around the world.

Since our founding in 1992, we have litigated hundreds of cases in state and federal courts, including in the Supreme Court, where we will be back in three weeks.

I have led the Center for 17 years and I have been an abortion rights advocate for far longer than that. Never have I been as concerned as I am today about the promise of Roe being hollowed out for too many women in this country.

Forty-seven years ago, the Supreme Court recognized in Roe that the right of personal liberty guaranteed in the Fourteenth Amendment includes the decision by a woman to end her pregnancy.

As the court would later explain, it is the promise of the Constitution that there is a realm of personal liberty that the government may not enter. This protective realm is the hallmark of a free society.

It is for each one of us and not the government to decide for ourselves the intimate and profound choices of our lives that we are hearing about this morning.

These choices include whether and who we choose to marry,

whether and when to have children, and how we raise our children with our values and our beliefs.

The commitment of Roe to women is that we too are guaranteed the dignity and respect to make the critical decisions about our bodies, our health, and our lives.

That guarantee is being obliterated by the avalanche of restrictions that have been designed to make the right to abortion unavailable, in fact.

We are not blocked by court orders. This new wave of restrictions are closing clinics, exacerbating inequalities, and harming women and their families.

The 2019 state legislative session marked a new level of extremism including nine blatantly unconstitutional bans such as the blanket Alabama ban.

New restrictions are still moving through the legislatures as we sit here today. Ninety percent of American counties have no abortion providers and six states have but one clinic.

The impact of these restrictive laws are deeply unequal, falling most heavily on people who already experience significant systemic barriers to quality health care including those who are women of color, low income, rural, immigrants, LGBTQ, young, and living with disabilities.

That is why Congress needs to pass the Women's Health

Protection Act. The bill creates a statutory right for health

care providers to provide care and a corresponding right for their patients to receive care free of medically-unnecessary limitations and bans that single out abortion and impede access to services.

It is a meaningful concrete step to ensuring that Roe is real for all women. The Women's Health Protection Act is targeted at a specific problem on medically unjustified laws and bans.

Access is also denied to women in this country for other reasons including discriminatory restrictions on insurance coverage like the Hyde Amendment.

Other important abortion access bills, most notably the EACH Woman Act, are needed to address this inequality. After so many years of chipping away at Roe, multiple efforts are needed to restore access to abortion care.

One in four women in the United States will make the decision at some point in her life that ending a pregnancy is the right decision for her.

These are women from all walks of life. They live in every state. They live in every one of your congressional districts. They are our loved ones, our neighbors, and our colleagues.

A woman's decision is based on her individual circumstances, her health and her life.

Ms. <Eshoo. = Ms. Northup, your time has expired. One more sentence to wind up.

838	Ms. <northup. =="" act.="" congress="" for="" i="" is="" it="" th="" these<="" time="" to="" urge=""></northup.>
839	members to send the act to the floor.
840	Thank you.
841	[The prepared statement of Ms. Northup follows:]
842	
843	************INSERT 4*******

844	Ms. <eshoo. =="" much.<="" th="" thank="" very="" you=""></eshoo.>
845	It is a pleasure to recognize Ms. Alvarado. You have five
846	minutes for your testimony. I thank you again for being with
847	us.

	\sim \Box	TT	7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7
⁹ STATEMENT	() H	$H() _{1} _{1}Y$	$A \cup V A \times A \cup U =$

Ms. <Alvarado.= Thank you, Chairwoman Eshoo and Ranking
Member Burgess and members of the subcommittee, for inviting me
to testify today.

My name is Holly Alvarado and I am here to share my story.

In 2009, I faced multiple barriers in accessing abortion care due to burdensome and medically unnecessary state abortion restriction.

I am here today to show you how important it is that you pass the Women's Health Protection Act.

I served in the United States Air Force from 2006 to 2011 as a law enforcement officer. I was motivated to serve my country as the granddaughter of Mexican immigrants.

I had seen my family build their American dream and felt grateful to this nation. I served honorably, earned the rank of staff sergeant, and became an instructor.

I am proud of my service to this country. In 2009, I was given orders for deployment. While preparing for deployment in the middle of a Wal-Mart shopping for supplies, vomiting in the middle of an aisle, I realized I could be pregnant.

It felt like I was a fast car going 100 miles per hour and then someone hit the brakes. I took the time to think about how I was not financially or emotionally in the stage of my life where

I was ready to continue a pregnancy and raise a child.

To end my pregnancy, I would need to immediately coordinate an appointment, an abortion, approval to take leave from work, and find time between all of these things to still continue preparing for deployment in two weeks.

I called Planned Parenthood in North Dakota and learned that the closest facility that could perform abortions was in Fargo, North Dakota, two hours from me.

North Dakota only has one abortion clinic, which means longer wait times for an appointment. They did not have any appointments in the next two weeks before deployment and wasn't able to help me.

I was encouraged to call St. Paul, Minnesota, four hours away. I called and scheduled my first and second appointment. My first appointment was needed to verify my pregnancy with an ultrasound and urinalysis. They gave me information and an ultrasound picture.

I needed to book a second appointment for the procedure itself. This was not due to any medical reason and it was certainly not my preference.

Minnesota state laws mandate a 24-hour waiting period between the first appointment the day of the procedure, and because of the wait times for an appointment at the clinic, I would have to wait three days between the appointments. I would

spend a total of four days in Minnesota without resources.

Due to Minnesota state law, I would also be required to endure scripted counselling including information that portrayed abortion as unsafe and a threat to my future fertility.

Only after this could I confirm my appointment for the next day.

I ended the phone call secure in my decision to not continue the pregnancy. I did not need or benefit from the mandated waiting period, the resulting 600-mile round trip, the biased counselling, or the protestors in front of the Planned Parenthood.

It was not a cold or bleak decision on my behalf. Rather, a compassionate one for myself and life and potential I wanted in my own future.

On top of all of this, I also faced an enormous financial burden. Because of the federal ban on abortion coverage, I was unable to use TRICARE as my health care insurance.

The procedure for an abortion is approximately \$500. In addition to purchasing gear for deployment, needs for gas and food for the four-hour 600-mile round trip, I had \$16 to my name the day I drove back to North Dakota.

A week and a half later, I would fly to Afghanistan with almost no money to my name. The environment in Planned Parenthood of Minnesota was compassionate. The clinic provided an escort to walk me through a line of shouting protestors trying to redirect

920 me to a fake clinic nearby.

When I finally made it to the exam table, my doctor asked me, "Is this what you want?'' We took a pause together. I shared that I never wanted to be pregnant. I never wanted to travel to Minnesota.

I never wanted to jump through all of these hoops to obtain an abortion. But I knew that this was a pregnancy I did not want to continue and, ultimately, knew this was the right decision for my life.

When the procedure was complete, I felt relief. I was 22 and knew what now 33-year-old me wanted out of life and her future. I was confident that the trajectory of my life was changed for the better because I was able to make the best decision for myself and my life.

I was a trusted law enforcement officer charged with defending my team and resources, taught federal use of force and lethal force. I am a decorated campaign veteran who was taught Geneva Conventions, NATO rules of engagement, and trusted to be competent in my abilities enough to teach them to future airmen.

Yet, when making a decision over my own life I was not trusted to know what was best for myself. Several state laws made that very clear to me.

The decision to continue or end a pregnancy is a health care decision that cannot be made by one individual for another

944 individual. 945 I cannot reconcile that our government trusted me to hold weapons in protection for our country and serve as a respected 946 947 member of our armed services but could not trust me to make the 948 right decision over my own body. I have no regrets about my decision to end my pregnancy. 949 I was honorably discharged from the military and decorated after 950 951 my tour in Afghanistan. 952 I received my education in public health, traveled the world, 953 met my partner, and now professionally support families making 954 health care decisions. 955 I am proud of the life I now live. 956 Ms. <Eshoo. = Ms. Alvarado, your time has expired. You need 957 to--958 Ms. <Alvarado.= Thank you, ma'am. 959 Ms. <Eshoo. = --finish with a sentence to wrap up. 960 Ms. <Alvarado.= I urge you to pass the Women's Health 961 Protection Act so that no one else has to face the barriers that 962 I did. 963 Thank you. 964 [The prepared statement of Ms. Alvarado follows:] 965 ************************** 966

967 Ms. <Eshoo.= Thank you very much.

We have concluded the statements of all of our witnesses.

We thank you again. We are now going to move to member questions

and I recognize myself for five minutes of questions.

But I first want to start out with a couple of comments to some of the comments that have been made by my colleagues--that there are no safety codifications in this legislation.

That simply is not so. As long as the state has evidence to show that the restrictions increase women's safety, then the regulations would stand.

So there is a direct correlation between the safety of the patient and regulations, and that is very important for each one of us. We all expect those standards to apply to us when we are-especially in a medical setting.

In terms of viability, the bill acknowledges that viability varies on a case by case basis and that the judgment of a viability should be made by a physician—by a physician, not a politician—and I just can't emphasize that enough, and it upholds the Roe standard of viability.

I also think it is very important to highlight, to underscore, the following. Very little is being said about contraception and I don't know anyone on this panel, and I am not going to ask, but there are very few here that have 11, 12, and 15 children. So something is working somewhere and—

991 [Laughter.] 992 Ms. <Eshoo. = It is. And the Guttmacher Institute found that, quote, "The evidence clearly indicates that the more and 993 994 better contraceptive use has been the main factor driving the 995 long-term decline in teen pregnancy, '' and there is a correlation there between the historic low that has been reached after the 996 997 passage of the Affordable Care Act because, of course, there is 998 coverage for contraception. 999 So now let me get to my questions with the three minutes 1000 and 30 seconds that I have. I want to go to Nancy Northup. 1001 you for you work over so many years. 1002 Roe v. Wade established the right to an abortion nearly 50 1003 years ago, as you testified. That's almost a half a century ago. 1004 Imagine that, a half a century ago. 1005 But can you speak to the disparities, given what the 450 1006 laws that have been passed, between a woman living in, say, Fort 1007 Worth or Fort Wayne, Indiana, what they get to exercise in terms 1008 of a right and a woman living in my community in Palo Alto, 1009 California? 1010 Because I think that these disparities are deep and they're 1011 wide, and they need to be emphasized. So can you comment on that first, please? 1012 1013 Your microphone. 1014 Ms. <Northup. = So the constitutional standard is strong

and, as you say, almost 50 years that each of us has the constitutional right to make this decision pre-viability. But the reality is because of restrictions that there are vast differences and those differences include the ones that Ms. Alvarado testified to about having to make multiple trips, having to have scripted un-medically-based information that the doctor must give to the patient, the depriving of health insurance coverage, which Ms. Alvarado also talked about.

And so we have a situation in the United States today where in a place like California, where there is access to services in people's own communities, and other states—the state of Louisiana, which is going to be before the Supreme Court in three weeks and we are representing the clinic in Shreveport there, there is only three clinics left in the state of Louisiana—one in New Orleans, one in Baton Rouge, and one in Shreveport.

And if the law were to go into effect, if we are not able to win this case in the Supreme Court, Louisiana will be down to one clinic, one doctor for the entire state for 1 million women.

Ms. <Eshoo. = I mean, the record is really very full relative to these deep and wide discrepancies. So it's based on zip code. It defies what the Supreme Court decided, and if you live in any of these states and you're a woman, politicians are going to make the decision.

You have nothing to do with your future. I recognize fully

that there are those that would and have the right to in our country to choose not to undergo an abortion. That is what the word choice means. But this is forcing people to do one thing. So it wipes out choice.

Dr. Robinson, can you describe for us--of course, abortion care in Alabama is legal. Walk me through or walk us through exactly what happens. To say that it is legal, however. What comes after that comma of however?

Dr. <Robinson. = Despite the fact that abortion care is legal in Alabama, we only have three clinics to service the whole state. And with that being said, our facility actually services patients from five states because of restrictions that have closed clinics in the other areas or restricted to gestational age.

So even though there are other areas that have clinics, we have patients that have to travel very far to get to us. What that means is that women, especially those that come from a low-income family who are already struggling to make ends meet it may be difficult for them to access care despite the fact that there is a facility there in Alabama.

Ms. <Eshoo. = Was the penalty of 99 years for doctors passed in Alabama and then struck down by a lower court?

Dr. <Robinson.= That is correct.

Ms. <Eshoo. = Ninety-nine years for a doctor. I mean, it is--that is enough to take anyone's breath away.

1086

1063	I am out of time, and I now would like to recognize theDr.
1064	Burgess, the ranking member of the subcommittee.
1065	Mr. <burgess.= again,="" and,="" chair.<="" i="" td="" thank="" the=""></burgess.=>
1066	Just before I start with my questions, I do feel obligated
1067	to point out that there is a serious illness going on half a world
1068	away and I do hope this subcommittee, which has the primary
1069	jurisdiction over health, will take that up seriously some point
1070	in the near futurewe have waited some time for thatwith a
1071	formal hearing, not just a briefing.
1072	Now, I do want to thank our witnesses for being here today.
1073	Ms. <eshoo. =="" burgess.<="" could="" i="" if="" just="" mr.="" say="" something,="" td=""></eshoo.>
1074	The subcommittee is certainly not ignoring the coronavirus.
1075	We have had classified briefings that have been very important.
1076	
1077	We have had open briefings where we have all participated.
1078	And I feel as up to date on the information as possible and we
1079	will have a hearing with other stakeholders from outside of the
1080	administration to advise us.
1081	But in no way, Dr. Burgessand I think that you know
1082	thisare we ignoring this. We have scheduled the end of this
1083	month the hearing with the secretary of HHS. He was the one that
1084	wanted to come in and do the briefing. He said, I am the one
1085	that should be doing it and not anyone else.
1006	

He gave us the date. I said, terrific. I will welcome you.

- We will all welcome you. So to suggest that we are ignoring the coronavirus is simply not so.
- 1089 Mr. <Burgess.= But as you know, a hearing is different from 1090 a briefing and there is no transcript from a briefing and--
- 1091 Ms. <Eshoo.= We had a hearing with the secretary. I just explained to you. He wanted to come.
- 1093 Mr. <Burgess.= Yes.
- 1094 Ms. <Eshoo.= He said, I am the top person. I am the one 1095 that wants to do it. So I said yes.
- 1096 Mr. <Burgess.= I don't want to spend any more--I don't want
 1097 to spend any more time in this debate.
- 1098 Ms. <Eshoo.= Well, I want to respond because it is--you 1099 are suggesting that we are ignoring it. We are not.
- 1100 Mr. <Burgess.= I am simply suggesting it is an important 1101 issue that we need to take up.
- I do want to thank our witnesses for being here today. Ms.

 Alvarado, thank you for your service to the country.
- I know it's a difficult subject and I guess, Ms. Forney and
 Ms. Collett, I would like to ask you. Both of you referenced
 data collection and data reporting.
- How do each of you think that that would make a difference if we were to engage in that aggressive data collection and data reporting that you both described? Where would that go?
- 1110 Ms. <Forney.= I would say that the key to this is that we

would have real information. Facts, as opposed to estimations.

The fact that there are certain states that don't even submit their data for the CDC makes it impossible for us to really follow the numbers and track injuries and deaths.

Whenever a woman dies by abortion the underlying cause is featured instead of the abortion on the death certificate.

These things are creating data confusion, if you will. So

I believe that if we are really interested in caring about women,
we start with getting good information so we are not using data
from organizations that have predetermined agendas.

Ms. <Collett.= Congressman Burgess, the fact is that to the extent there is good data, it is, largely, from European countries where they have universal health care and that creates a database for the investigators that want to look at the psychological harms that can arise from abortion, whether they were based on a preexisting psychological weakness. They also have better data on the correlation between suicide and post-abortion experience.

So we don't have a comprehensive health care system and I am glad we don't, frankly. But we could have comprehensive reporting, which we simply do not have in this country.

Even Stanley Henshaw, the former demographer for Planned Parenthood and who worked at Guttmacher, has complained that the data that they have is incomplete. Eighty percent of the

abortions in this country are reported to the CDC. But that leaves 20 percent with no reports on them, including the state of California.

Mr. <Burgess.= Well, it is just interesting. Yesterday in a different subcommittee we had a hearing on self-driving cars.

I realize that sounds unrelated.

But the almost universal in all the witnesses that were there was the acknowledgment that we needed good data on safety and accidents and to be able to legislate around that space was it was virtually required to have the information. That's why when both of you brought that up this morning it struck me that that is something that where I think we would all benefit.

Ms. Collett, let me just ask you, because so much is made on the statement of no restriction prior to viability and the age of viability, is that something that was set in court decree or has that ever been set it statute, the determination of viability?

Ms. <Collett.= In fact, the U.S. Supreme Court has addressed statutes that attempted to statutorily define the stage of viability, and as Dr. Robinson and Ms. Northup testified, the court has held that it is an individual physician's decision which, based on--you, as a doctor, know that there are certain conditions, prenatal conditions, that would affect the viability of the pregnancy in general. So that statement regarding the

- standard is correct. But the Supreme Court has always upheld the right of states to regulate.
- Early on it was the second trimester for women's health and
 then in the last trimester, of course, to protect the unborn life.

 And now, under Casey, that's not even the standard. The standard
 is does the law create a substantial obstacle to a woman's access
 to abortion.
- Mr. <Burgess.= But it just strikes me through the continuum of my professional career that level of viability has--Parkland Hospital, we were told we had to get a gestation of 33 weeks if there is going to be any hope. Twenty-three weeks was my individual level, and then we saw at the State of the Union 21 weeks.
 - So it does seem to be changing. Are we able--are we technically capable of keeping up with the fact that the actual length of gestation is changing for viability?
 - Ms. <Collett.= We are seeing many legislatures examine that very question and sometimes it's not simply the duration of viability but as well as the weight--the estimate of weight--which is why ultrasound is so important.
- 1179 Mr. <Burgess.= Thank you, and I yield back.
- 1180 Ms. <Eshoo.= The gentleman yields back.

1172

1173

1174

1175

1176

1177

1178

1181 A pleasure to recognize the chairman of the full committee,

1182 Mr. Pallone, for his five minutes of questions.

The <Chairman.= Thank you, Madam Chair, and I want to thank the witnesses for being here because this hearing is an important step towards, or forward I should say, in protecting access to abortion and stopping unnecessary state laws that intrude on a woman's ability to exercise her constitutionally-protected right to abortion.

But I want to focus on the actual bill today and what that means for abortion access. So let me start with Ms. Northup.

Will you discuss why you believe the Women's Health

Protection Act is necessary and what effect the bill would have

if it became law? Briefly.

Ms. <Northup.= So yes, necessary. Yes, necessary, as we have been talking about this morning, the avalanche of laws.

And what the Women's Health Protection Act does is make sure that doctors have a right to provide services free from unnecessary regulations and unscientific regulations and women have a right to get that care.

And what it does is both specify the type of medically unnecessary laws that are burdensome. So admitting privileges--like, we are twice up in the Supreme Court fighting about that, even though the Supreme Court has decided.

Waiting periods that aren't medically necessary. The kind of hallmark or hallway restrictions and so forth that aren't necessary. And that it also provides a broader test for new kinds

of things that will come up, to make sure that they are medically based.

And the reason why it's necessary, even though we win hundreds of cases including the last one in the Supreme Court, even after we won that Supreme Court case over a hundred new restrictions were passed in the state disregarding the Supreme Court's clear guidance that you have to actually advance women's health.

The Supreme Court found that Texas's admitting privileges did not advance women's health. But the laws keep coming.

We need a statute that makes it clear that we are going to have fact-based medically-based scientifically-based regulations, not these underhanded tactics to shut clinics and block women from care.

The <Chairman. = Thank you.

Dr. Robinson, how would the bill change your practice if health care providers had a statutory right to provide abortion services and that your patients would also have a right to receive such services? Briefly.

Dr. <Robinson.= Well, we know that abortion care needs to be safe and it needs to be readily accessible for all patients, and these restrictions are making it where it places barriers that makes it more difficult for these patients to access the care that they need.

1231	So the Women's Health Protection Act will ensure that
1232	patients can receive the care they need without constant
1233	regulations coming down that are constantly chipping away at that
1234	care.
1235	The <chairman.= all="" right.="" td="" thank="" you.<=""></chairman.=>
1236	Back to Ms. Northup, and maybe just yes or no, would the
1237	bill in any way require or mandate that providers provide abortion
1238	if they did not want to?
1239	Ms. <northup.= no.<="" td=""></northup.=>
1240	The <chairman.= and="" bill="" can="" describe="" how="" td="" the="" would<="" you=""></chairman.=>
1241	impact the limitations and restrictions that have been placed
1242	on abortion care at the state level?
1243	For example, would the requirement that a provider offer
1244	medically inaccurate information in advance of an abortion be
1245	allowed to stand? Why don't you just address that since you kind
1246	of addressed the others before?
1247	Ms. <northup. =="" cannot="" health<="" no,="" td="" the="" women's="" you=""></northup.>
1248	Protection Act would stop these laws that require doctors to
1249	provide medically inaccurate information to women.
1250	So, for example, right now there are many state laws that
1251	are requiring doctors to tell women that medication abortion is
1252	reversible. I mean, that is scientifically untrue.
1253	The American Medical Association is suing the state of North

Dakota on behalf of the doctors in that state to say you cannot

1254

force doctors to tell patients things that aren't true.

The <Chairman.= All right. Now, it is my understanding that the bill specifically ensures that state laws can be maintained if they demonstrate that the requirement significantly advances the safety of abortion services or the health of patients. Is that correct?

Ms. <Northup. = Absolutely.

The <Chairman.= Well, given this, is there anything in the bill that would make the provision of abortion care less safe?

Because I know we have heard that from some of the--

Ms. <Northup. = Absolutely not, and it has been clear by the American Medical Association, including the brief they just filed in the Supreme Court. Abortion is a safe procedure.

The <Chairman. = Okay. I just want to thank you. The bill, in my opinion, is critical to ensuring that health care providers can provide the care they are trained to provide free of unnecessary restrictions.

I always worry about, you know, efforts on the federal level, let alone the state level, where we try to tell doctors what they should do or not do, even though they are the experts.

And, you know, so I think it is important that patients get the care they need and that they are constitutionally entitled to, and I am proud to support the bill and I believe it is an important legislative solution to protect access to abortion,

- 1279 which increasingly is not available.
- 1280 And as Dr. Robinson pointed out, it can't be that in New
- Jersey you can get an abortion but in Alabama it's almost
- impossible. So I appreciate all of your statements. Thank you.
- 1283 Thank you, Madam Chair.
- 1284 Ms. <Eshoo.= The gentleman yields.
- 1285 And it is a pleasure to recognize the gentleman from
- 1286 Illinois, Mr. Shimkus, for his five minutes of questioning.
- 1287 Mr. <Shimkus.= Thank you, Madam Chairman.
- 1288 Before I start, I just want to congratulate you and my
- 1289 colleagues. This is such a tough issue and if we continue to
- deal with this with dignity and respect I think it'll bring some
- 1291 luster back onto the legislative branch that we can have this
- 1292 tough discussion.
- 1293 Let me--we got a lot of diversity in this hearing room.
- 1294 Why are we, as individual humans, diverse? What is it that makes
- 1295 us different? Anyone know, on the panel? Anyone?
- Okay. We all have separate DNA. It is our DNA strand that
- defines who we are and all our differences. Red hair, blond,
- 1298 black hair. And when is a separate DNA formed, Dr. Robinson,
- of an individual? I mean, you are a doctor so you should know
- this. When is a separate distinct DNA of an individual formed?
- 1301 Dr. <Robinson.= I don't know that that question has ever
- 1302 been posed to me or that I have thought about it so-

1303 Mr. <Shimkus. = Okay. Well, let me just say--anyone want 1304 to answer that question? 1305 Ms. Collett? 1306 Ms. <Collett.= Congressman, Dr. Jerome Lejeune provided 1307 comprehensive testimony on this point at a trial court level in Tennessee. That testimony is available and I would be happy to 1308 1309 forward it to your office. It is at the moment that the sperm 1310 and the egg unite. 1311 Mr. <Shimkus.= It is at the moment of conception. 1312 the DNA--1313 Ms. <Collett.= Conception, in the medical literature, has 1314 changed. So it is at the moment of fertilization. Some medical 1315 journals use conception to mean implantation. 1316 Mr. <Shimkus. = Okay. Thank you for that. 1317 The point being is that half of the DNA comes from the woman, 1318 half from the male, and that makes you distinct separate entity, 1319 and I think that is important. 1320 When does a child's heart begin to beat on its own inside 1321 the womb? Anyone know? 1322 Ms. Forney? 1323 Ms. <Forney.= I believe it is 28 days. 1324 Mr. <Shimkus. = Six to seven weeks is what most--1325 Ms. <Forney. = No. I mean I think it is 28 days, which would be more like four weeks. 1326

1327 Mr. <Shimkus.= Dr. Robinson?</pre> 1328 Dr. <Robinson. = I don't know the exact answer to that but I know that based off of--1329 1330 Mr. <Shimkus.= Can you give me a ballpark? Can you give me a ballpark? Is six--1331 Dr. <Robinson.= Well, I can tell you what I see in my 1332 1333 practice. Usually around six weeks I can see cardiac activity 1334 on an ultrasound. Mr. <Shimkus. = No, is six--all right. All right. 1335 1336 Reclaiming my time. Reclaiming my time. 1337 When does the brain activity of an unborn child start 1338 occurring? Anyone want to -- I think the scientific literature 1339 says six to seven weeks, maybe even before that. Then the age of viability. Twenty-three states identify 1340 1341 either between 20 weeks or 24 weeks as the age of viability, from 1342 Mississippi to Pennsylvania. 1343 The president did have, as was mentioned, a child in the 1344 gallery who was 21 weeks and six days old who is now a healthy 1345 two-year-old child. Under this bill, would it be legal to abort an unborn baby at 21 weeks? 1346 1347 Ms. Forney? Just answer--just answer it. Ms. <Forney.= I believe it is because--1348 1349 Mr. <Shimkus. = Okay.

Ms. <Forney.= --the whole idea is to remove all

1350

1351 restrictions. I have not read it--1352 Mr. <Shimkus. = Okay. Let me go to--let me go to Ms. 1353 Collett. 1354 Ms. <Collett. = Congressman, the bill allows post-viability 1355 and pre-viability based on--post-viability based on health. 1356 Pre-viability must be unrestricted. And so yes. 1357 Mr. <Shimkus.= Okay. So here is the other concerns and 1358 troubles I have with -- we had a debate on a chemical substance--per- and polyfluorinated compounds. We tried to 1359 1360 address the issue of vulnerable populations and we tried to make 1361 sure that it comported with federal law, which was the Unborn Victims of Violence Act. 1362 1363 We know that it is against the law and you are considered a capital criminal crime if you attack a pregnant woman and that 1364 1365 unborn baby dies. Is that correct? 1366 Ms. <Collett.= Congressman, in fact New York revised its 1367 law so it is no longer an independent crime. It is simply 1368 considered a--1369 Mr. <Shimkus.= But public law, which we passed here 108 to 12, the Unborn Victims of Violence Act identifies the unborn 1370 1371 child in any part of pregnancy even prior to the age that they could live, in essence, outside the womb. Is that correct? 1372 1373 Ms. <Collett.= That is correct. 1374 Mr. <Shimkus. = Madam Chairman, thank you. My time has

- 1375 expired.
- 1376 Ms. <Eshoo.= The gentleman yields back.
- 1377 It is a pleasure to recognize the gentleman from New York,
- 1378 Mr. Engel, for his five minutes of questions.
- 1379 Mr. <Engel.= Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair, and thank
- 1380 you to all of the witnesses.
- 1381 Let me start with Ms. Alvarado. I was--I want to thank you
- for your service, first of all, and I was very moved by the fact
- that, you know, we are--we rely on you to keep us safe but we,
- in some instances, don't want to give you the opportunity to do
- what you feel is right with your own body and I thought that your
- 1386 testimony was very heartfelt.
- 1387 Ms. <Alvarado.= Thank you.
- 1388 Mr. <Engel.= The abortion issue has always been an issue
- that both sides take stands and kind of butt heads with each other.
- You know, my third child was born when I was 46 years old and
- my wife was 40. We didn't expect it, and we made a choice to
- have the child.
- 1393 But that was our choice. I do think that people have the
- right to make that choice for themselves and people who feel that
- abortion is not something they would consider for moral reasons
- or anything else, then I believe that they need to do whatever
- they feel in their heart.
- I don't believe that they ought to be restricting other

people who may feel differently and that, to me, is very, very important.

Now, since 2011 we have seen a tide of Republican-controlled states pass about 450 medically unnecessary restrictions that limit access to abortion care and make it harder for women to get comprehensive health care services.

Ms. Northup, can you describe how these state laws and restrictions limit access to abortion care and what outcomes have been in states that have enacted them?

Ms. <Northup. = Yes. The outcome of the state restrictions, many which are designed to make it very hard to provide abortion services, is that clinics do in fact close and when clinics close women have to travel farther. They need to take time off. They need to sometimes make multiple trips and drive hundreds of thousands of miles.

And an example of this is the state of Texas, which is the case we took to the Supreme Court in Whole Women's Health v. Hellerstedt.

Texas passed an admitting privileges law, which is not medically justified which the Supreme Court found did not advance women's health at all because hospitals within, you know, 30 miles of an abortion provider can turn down admitting privileges for every reason that they want--economic basis of the hospital or that they don't like the provision of abortion services and

they're not going to give providers privileges, and half the clinics in the state of Texas closed. And that was the case until we won the Supreme Court case and they could never reopen because it had been years of litigation.

So it's an example of the devastation and when those clinics close it's not just abortion services that lost but can be family planning services, STI services, and other important parts of women's health care.

Mr. <Engel.= Well, how do states justify these laws when they know that so many of these restrictions are designed to limit access to what's really a constitutionally protected right?

Ms. <Northup.= Well, I think it shows the fact that they are pretextual laws. They purport that they're about health care but it's proved in court case after court case that they are not, and again, it is why the American Medical Association and 14 medical groups have filed a brief in the Supreme Court and the case will be argued in three weeks to say that these are—abortion is a safe procedure and the admitting privilege law in Louisiana, just like Texas, doesn't advance women's health.

Mr. <Engel.= Well, a number of the state laws and regulations you have described have been struck down by the courts and most notably in 2016, as you just mentioned, the Supreme Court struck down two Texas state laws that required abortion providers to have hospital admitting privileges and retrofit their clinics

1447 as ambulatory surgical centers.

So could you again tell us why it is critical that we have a legislative solution to address state abortion restrictions instead of just relying on the courts to ensure that the constitutional right to abortion is maintained?

Ms. <Northup. = Absolutely. So for those of us who litigate in the courts it is like playing whack-a-mole. We win a case and the next thing comes up again. After Whole Women's Health more than a hundred restrictions have been passed.

The Women's Health Protection Act would provide statutory guidelines that are very clear about what is not permitted and also a statutory test that would make sure that courts had to follow it.

Right now, unfortunately some courts are not following the Supreme Court's jurisprudence and that is the case in Louisiana with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 5th Circuit, which is why we are back in the Supreme Court again on the same issue we already won.

And also we don't want to necessarily rely only on the courts. Congress has the authority to protect our constitutional rights as well.

1468 Mr. <Engel.= Thank you. I know my time is up. Thank you,
1469 Madam Chair.

1470 Ms. <Eshoo. = The gentleman yields back.

1471 It is a pleasure to recognize the gentleman from Kentucky,

1472 Mr. Guthrie, for his five minutes of questions.

Mr. <Guthrie.= Thank you very much.

When we were having our first child--she's 26 now--almost 27 years ago we went to--we thought we were going to have twins and we thought that it could be twins so we--back then they did the ultrasound, and at 10 weeks old she was the size of a Teddy Graham and if you're not as old as I am I guess about the size of a gummy bear.

She was sucking her thumb and had her own little personality and her own--so, I mean, no matter where you are on this issue you can't deny these are human beings, I mean, and whether you feel they have the right to life or not that is a different question, I guess, for some people. But they are human beings.

Well, now my 26-year-old is going to have our first grandbaby. When she was 13 or 14 weeks along we went to see the ultrasound and our little granddaughter-to-be, hopefully on May 19th, was sucking her thumb just like her mother and it was just amazing.

It was almost looking at the same picture other than it's clearer. And so these are distinct and individuals with their own personalities and they require their mothers to come into this world and to be life--to get into life.

And so as we were looking at some of the questions my

colleague just asked, I was going to ask about so H.R. 2975 states that women's health is--access to health care is reduced because of abortion--anti-abortion laws.

And, Ms. Collett, I mean, if you'd just kind of answer, maybe rebut some of the stuff that we just heard. My understanding is they have--federal qualified health centers are available.

Just because a place providing abortion services isn't available everywhere doesn't mean women aren't getting access to good health care.

Could you comment on what was just said?

Ms. <Collett.= Certainly.

Ms. Northup I believe mischaracterized the Hellerstedt case. The Texas evidentiary record in that case was that there were some difficulties in obtaining admitting privileges. But they did not have a legislative record nor did they have the disciplinary record of physicians and clinics that exist in Louisiana.

In my written testimony, which I would ask to have submitted as part of the record, I actually quote the 5th Circuit.

Ms. <Eshoo. = All written testimonies are part of the record.

Ms. <Collett.= Thank you, Madam Chair.

I quote Judge Elrod of the 5th Circuit where she notes that there was even a challenge on the part of the abortion clinics as to whether the Supreme Court could see the evidentiary record

because of the overbroad protective order that was given at the trial court level.

Nonetheless, the Louisiana Department of Health has multiple findings that clinics had unsanitary conditions that physicians were—that were hired were unqualified in the area. In one case, they hired an ophthalmologist to perform abortions.

And so the record in the Louisiana case is very, very different than the record that was in Hellerstedt. I am very optimistic, in fact, that the state of Louisiana will prevail in that case. But that is the distinction. As far as access, even the Guttmacher Institute has published multiple papers showing that regulation is not the primary cause for the decline in access.

They have as late as 2018 said that there are other reasons for the decline in the abortion rates that, while it is a factor, things like the fact that abortion rates have declined by 50 percent.

Women are making different choices, and when that—when you lose 50 percent of your market for services you are going to have clinics close. It is very simple. And as I testified earlier, Planned Parenthood has the strategy of mega clinics now. One exists in St. Paul near my home. Another exists in Houston.

The newspapers report that they expect to increase their patient rate to a thousand more people. That is going to affect

the smaller clinics. And, as Dr. Robinson herself testified, there are times when clinics are located nearby but that patients choose to go to other clinics for various reasons. Part of that might be the reputation of the clinic, in part.

So the simple fact is that as far as STI treatment, as far as prenatal care, that is available from other facilities and if you really are worried about women's health let's deal with the fact that over 50 percent of the counties in this country do not provide obstetrical care in their hospitals.

Mr. <Guthrie.= Well, thanks.

I also have a question. So the bill before us, H.R. 2975, forces states to allow abortion regardless of a patient's reasons for seeking abortion. Does that mean that you can have an abortion for any reason—for any reason along with this bill, Ms. Collett?

Ms. <Collett.= Congressman, that is the state of the law currently pre-viability, and even in many states post-viability.

For example, in my home state of Minnesota--

Mr. <Guthrie. = So I only have 15. So sex selection would be a viable reason?

Ms. <Collett.= Sex selection would be permitted, yes, as would for racial reasons or for the disabilities of the child.

Mr. <Guthrie. = Okay. Thank you. I only have five seconds to ask another question. So I will yield back. Thank you for

your answers.

1578

1579

1580

1581

1582

1583

1584

1585

1586

1587

- 1568 Ms. <Eshoo.= The gentleman yields back.
- 1569 It is a pleasure to recognize the gentleman from North
 1570 Carolina, Mr. Butterfield, for his five minutes of questions.
- 1571 Mr. <Butterfield.= Thank you very much, Madam Chair, for 1572 yielding time and let me thank the five witnesses for their 1573 testimony today.
- I know this is an important topic that we all must continue to have a conversation about. I spent 30 years in a courtroom--15 years as a lawyer, 15 years as a judge--and I know that people feel very strongly about this subject.
 - Years ago I was very conflicted on the whole subject of abortion and where I should come down as an American citizen, as a human being. But Roe v. Wade seems to be the guiding star. That is the law of the land and that is what is guiding me in my thinking.
 - And so I want to first begin by saying that I am struck that the Supreme Court has chosen to consider a case that will reevaluate settled law and, once again, throw in the question nearly 50 years of precedent. And so that is where I want to go this morning.
- 1588 Ms. Northup, can you--before I go to Ms. Northup, let me 1589 just ask Ms. Collett. We keep straying away from the whole 1590 conversation about contraception.

1591	Now, where are you on contraception? Do you support
1592	contraception as a means of birth control?
1593	Ms. <collett.= answered="" by<="" congressman,="" question="" td="" that="" was=""></collett.=>
1594	the Supreme Court in the Eisenstadt case as well as
1595	Mr. <butterfield.= aboutms.="" am="" collett,="" i="" talking="" td="" where<=""></butterfield.=>
1596	are you on contraception?
1597	Ms. <collett.= am="" congressman,="" i="" it<="" post-menopausal,="" so="" td=""></collett.=>
1598	is really not a relevant question to me.
1599	[Laughter.]
1600	Mr. <butterfield.= and<="" determine="" i="" is="" relevant="" td="" well,="" what=""></butterfield.=>
1601	I would hope that you would answer the question. But let melet
1602	me continue. Time istime is precious.
1603	Ms. Northup, can you tell us a little bit about this case
1604	the Center for Reproductive Rights is currently litigating and
1605	what yourwhat the outcome means for abortion jurisprudence in
1606	this country?
1607	Ms. <northup.= as="" before,="" have="" i="" so="" td="" testified="" the<="" yes.=""></northup.=>
1608	Center for Reproductive Rights won the case of Whole Women's
1609	Health v. Hellerstadt against Texas, both striking down its
1610	admitting privileges law and its requirement that every abortion
1611	clinic in Texas be an ambulatory surgical center.
1612	The state of Louisiana, despite that ruling, has persisting
1613	in insisting that it can have an admitting privileges law and
1614	that admitting privileges law will have just as devastating

- 1615 effects in Louisiana.
- 1616 It would close all but one clinic and leave a million women
- in the state of Louisiana to have access to just one abortion
- 1618 provider.
- 1619 And so the district court agreed that it was
- unconstitutional. It found that it had no medical basis as in
- the Texas case in the Supreme Court and that it would harm women.
- 1622 The U.S. Court of the 5th Circuit, as we argued in the Supreme
- 1623 Court, disregarded both the fact findings of the trial court and
- disregarded the Supreme Court's standard.
- 1625 So we are back in the Supreme Court to make sure this law
- doesn't go into effect.
- 1627 Mr. <Butterfield.= You are a 501(c)(3). Is that right?
- 1628 A (c) (3)?
- 1629 Ms. <Northup.= Yes, we are. Yes, we are nonprofit.
- 1630 Mr. <Butterfield.= Correct? Okay.
- 1631 Ms. <Northup.= That is correct.
- 1632 Mr. <Butterfield.= All right.
- 1633 Ms. <Northup.= I would also like to just straighten out
- what was said by Ms. Collett about the Louisiana case. Louisiana,
- 1635 indeed, tried to muddy up the record and put allegations that
- she went through into the record.
- 1637 The Supreme Court denied their attempt to do that.
- 1638 Mr. <Butterfield.= Is it fair to say that the major

difference between the June medical case and the 2016 Whole Women's Health decision is that the Supreme Court now has two new justices? Would that factor into your opinion?

Ms. <Northup.= Well, the only thing that has changed is there are two new justices on the Supreme Court. Otherwise, it is still not a medically benefiting law. It still harms women. That has not changed.

Mr. <Butterfield.= Is there any meaningful difference in the current case that would warrant a different outcome from the court's decision just four years ago?

Ms. <Northup. = No. The law that is challenged is identical, not similar. It is identical.

Mr. <Butterfield.= I fear that the court's decision to hear this case less than four years after its decision has ramifications not just for abortion access but for the impartiality of the entire court system.

I am disturbed by the implications of injecting ideology and distrust into our legal process. I am really concerned about that. You know, you and I are lawyers and when we take our attorney oath, you know, not only do we swear that we will represent our clients zealously but we will protect the integrity of the judiciary. We would hold public confidence in the court system and I am really—I am disturbed about the implications of injecting ideology into the legal process.

1663	What signal does it send that the court is considering a
1664	factually identical case less than four years after the earlier
1665	case?
1666	Ms. <northup.= ask="" court="" did="" for="" take="" td="" the="" the<="" to="" we="" well,=""></northup.=>
1667	case because of the 5th Circuit not following their precedent.
1668	So we are hoping that the Supreme Court, indeed, does follow
1669	their precedent because otherwise the floodgates will open to
1670	even more restrictions. States will know that anything goes.
1671	Mr. <butterfield.= and="" country="" divide="" it="" more<="" td="" this="" will=""></butterfield.=>
1672	than anything that we have seen in recent years and I don't want
1673	to see that happen.
1674	Thank you, Madam Chair. I yield back.
1675	Ms. <eshoo. =="" back.<="" gentleman="" td="" the="" yields=""></eshoo.>
1676	A pleasure to recognize the gentleman from Virginia, Mr.
1677	Griffith, for his five minutes of questions.
1678	Mr. <griffith.= much.<="" td="" thank="" very="" you=""></griffith.=>
1679	Ms. Collett, would H.R. 2975 eliminate state laws requiring
1680	a person to wait for a period of time between first visiting a
1681	provider and having an abortion?
1682	Ms. <collett.= it="" td="" would.<=""></collett.=>
1683	Mr. <griffith.= eliminate="" it="" laws="" requiring<="" state="" td="" would=""></griffith.=>
1684	providers to obtain informed consent before an abortion takes
1685	place?
1686	Ms. <collett.= certainly="" it="" limit="" required<="" td="" was="" what="" would=""></collett.=>

1687	for informed consent.
1688	Mr. <griffith.= eliminate="" it="" laws="" requiring<="" state="" td="" would=""></griffith.=>
1689	abortion clinics to meet certain medical standards?
1690	Ms. <collett.= it="" td="" would.<=""></collett.=>
1691	Mr. <griffith.= eliminate="" it="" laws<="" state="" td="" would=""></griffith.=>
1692	Ms. <collett.= am="" congressman.<="" i="" mr.="" sorry,="" td=""></collett.=>
1693	<pre>Mr. <griffith.= pre="" yes?<=""></griffith.=></pre>
1694	Ms. <collett.= extent="" in="" like="" louisiana="" td="" the="" to="" where<=""></collett.=>
1695	abortion clinics are regulated in the same way as ambulatory
1696	surgical centers, it might allow that since it is a general law.
1697	Mr. <griffith.= eliminate="" it="" laws="" state="" td="" that<="" would=""></griffith.=>
1698	establish certain educational professional standards for those
1699	who perform abortions?
1700	Ms. <collett.= could.<="" it="" td=""></collett.=>
1701	Mr. <griffith. =="" and="" eliminate="" have<="" it="" laws="" state="" td="" that="" would=""></griffith.>
1702	
1702	created licensing and inspection requirements for abortion
1703	created licensing and inspection requirements for abortion clinics?
1703	clinics?
1703 1704	clinics? Ms. <collett.= differ="" extent="" from="" many<="" td="" that="" the="" they="" to=""></collett.=>
1703 1704 1705	clinics? Ms. <collett.= differ="" extent="" from="" many="" others,="" td="" that="" the="" they="" to="" yes.<=""></collett.=>
1703 1704 1705 1706	<pre>clinics? Ms. <collett.= <griffith.="Okay." asked="" differ="" extent="" from="" i="" know,="" many="" mr.="" others,="" pre="" questions<="" that="" the="" they="" those="" to="" yes.="" you=""></collett.=></pre>
1703 1704 1705 1706 1707	<pre>clinics? Ms. <collett.= <griffith.="Okay." all="" are="" asked="" because="" differ="" extent="" from="" i="" know,="" many="" mr.="" others,="" pre="" questions="" reasonable,<="" that="" the="" they="" things="" think="" those="" to="" yes.="" you=""></collett.=></pre>

- 1711 litigation, all right, here's where--here is where we are at.
- 1712 Here is what I would recommend if you choose to go forward.
- 1713 Go home and sleep on it.
- 1714 That seems to be very reasonable. Do you do the same in
- 1715 your practice? Do you think that is a reasonable request, that
- people sleep on it before they make a final decision? Even on
- 1717 litigation—we are talking about something much more serious than
- 1718 that.
- 1719 Ms. <Collett.= Just for purposes if my dean is reading the
- 1720 transcript, I am a full time academic with an active practice
- 1721 as well.
- 1722 Mr. <Griffith.= As well. Right.
- 1723 Ms. <Collett.= But yes, when I counsel clients--I started
- in estate planning and when people wanted to file a will contest
- I would, obviously, say you need to go home and think about this
- and its impact on your family.
- 1727 Mr. <Griffith.= Right. Because an estate fight means that
- the family may never get back together again and that there are
- going to be a lot of hurt feelings.
- 1730 Ms. <Collett.= That is exactly right.
- 1731 Mr. <Griffith.= Here we are talking about a life. It seems
- 1732 very reasonable to me. Now, you and Ms. Northup have got a battle
- going on and she made comments earlier to straighten you out.
- 1734 Is there anything that you would like to respond to that she

- 1735 made in those comments?
- 1736 Ms. <Collett.= Well, I just mentioned that unlike Texas,
- 1737 Louisiana's requirements are mirrored in their ambulatory
- 1738 surgical center requirements. And so that, too, makes the case
- unique.
- 1740 Mr. <Griffith.= Yes. You know, it is interesting. The
- 1741 Virginia legislature this year is changing a lot of our laws
- 1742 related to abortion. But the Senate bill that was decided on
- a tie-breaking vote by the lieutenant governor, Justin Fairfax,
- does not eliminate Virginia's requirement for informed written
- 1745 consent.
- 1746 This bill would impact that possibly?
- 1747 Ms. <Collett. = Again, the general requirement of informed
- 1748 consent could possibly be successfully defended. But specific
- types of information that would be required could be struck down.
- 1750 Mr. <Griffith.= Now, I am going to ask you this one and
- I am not sure the bill directly deals with it. But I want your
- interpretation of it.
- 1753 Last year there was a controversy in Virginia related to
- time of birth abortion. It came up as a result of the Kathy Tran
- 1755 bill.
- 1756 Would this bill make time of birth abortion available?
- 1757 Ms. <Collett.= If I understand that phrase, I suspect it
- 1758 comes from the governor's statement that a child would--

	On the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
1759	Mr. <griffith.= actually,="" came="" from="" it="" td="" testimony.<="" tran's=""></griffith.=>
1760	The governor went furtherwent a step further to infanticide.
1761	The Tran bill actually didn't do that.
1762	It just said that if there was an emotional reason that a
1763	single doctor and the mother could decide to abort the baby even
1764	after contractions had begun and the mother was dilated and ready
1765	to deliver. Would this bill impact that in any way?
1766	Ms. <collett.= but<="" considered="" have="" i="" not="" question.="" td="" that=""></collett.=>
1767	it seems likely.
1768	Mr. <griffith.= be="" enough="" kind="" td="" to<="" would="" you="" youwould=""></griffith.=>
1769	consider it after today's hearing and let me know?
1770	Ms. <collett.= be="" delighted.<="" i="" td="" would=""></collett.=>
1771	Mr. <griffith.= all="" appreciate="" i="" much.="" of<="" td="" thank="" very="" you=""></griffith.=>
1772	your testimony. I know this is an emotional issue for everybody.
1773	We are just trying to do what we think is right.
1774	And I yield back.
1775	Ms. <eshoo. =="" back.<="" gentleman="" td="" the="" yields=""></eshoo.>
1776	And it is a real pleasure to recognize the gentlewoman from

Ms. <Matsui.= Thank you very much, Madam Chair, and I want to thank the witnesses for being here today on this very important discussion that we are having here today.

California, Ms. Matsui, for her five minutes of questions.

1777

1778

1779

1780

1781

1782

First of all, Ms. Northup, I want to--following up on the previous question, would you please clarify what you believe this

1783 bill would and would not do?

Ms. <Northup.= Yes. There is nothing in this bill that
would change anything about the viability standard of the Supreme
Court and the fact that post-viability--it is up to states to
decide as long as there is an exception for women's life and
health.

So we have heard things this morning that suggest that this would do something else. It doesn't change Roe v. Wade in any way in that regard.

What it does is simply say that if there is a regulation targeted just at abortion providers that is not medically justified that it doesn't stand, because that is what we have been dealing with.

It is a very precise bill to address the fact that there has been this underhanded attempt to shut down clinics, block access to services with these pretextual bills.

Ms. <Matsui. = Thank you very much for that clarification.

I am particularly shocked by state laws compelling mandated speech for abortion providers. It is unsettling to me that policymakers are requiring doctors to give medically inaccurate misleading counselling sessions before an abortion. It is difficult enough.

Most concerning to me are state laws that mandate the inclusion of inaccurate information about mental health outcomes

such as post-traumatic stress disorder, anxiety, and depression, even though the evidence does not demonstrate that this is the case.

The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists states that laws compelling physicians to provide patients with medically inaccurate scripted information are in direct violation of physicians' oath of care.

Dr. Robinson, do you agree?

Dr. <Robinson.= Yes, I do.

Ms. <Matsui.= In their written statement in support of the Women's Health Protection Act, the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, ACOG, states that mandating medically inaccurate counselling manipulates informed consent, an ethical doctrine rooted in the concept of self-determination and the belief that patients have a right to make their own decisions regarding their health.

Dr. Robinson, can you describe what it is like for you to have to tell your patients medically inaccurate information?

Dr. <Robinson.= Well, with my patients it is already difficult for patients to make some health care decisions, and so complicating that situation and that interaction between me and my patients with requiring me to give them misinformation makes this even more complicated for the patients to make these decisions.

And then I know that it is difficult for the patient sitting there to hear me tell them one thing and then go back and tell them medically accurate information but tell them that my state requires them to do that.

And if you don't mind, I just wanted to correct or just to go back to this thing that we keep talking about, about viability.

We talk about the child that President Trump brought on the stage a couple of--about a week ago.

The thing about viability is that is something that varies. We can't just put a gestational age on it. I know that he brought a child that was allegedly 21 weeks and six days at that time. In 15 years of practice, I have never seen a 21-weeker survive.

And, you know, as the Health Care Committee I think it's important for us to keep in mind that our job is to make sure that we make health care available for everyone and one of those things that we have to think about when we are talking about viability is the resources of the area.

If you have hospitals that don't have the resources to support a 23-weeker or a 24-weeker--I can't talk about a 21-weeker--I have never seen that medically happen--then they can't take care of--they can't even begin to try to keep these children alive.

The other thing about it is that as hospitals are closing

1855	there is nowhere for these women to go. So one of the things
1856	that we can do to ensure health and safety for everybody is, like,
1857	looking at ways tofor states that didn't take Medicaid expansion
1858	to do that so that these hospitals aren't closing at alarming
1859	rates.

- 1860 Ms. <Matsui.= Thank you very much.
- Dr. Robinson, in your professional opinion is there any medical necessity for a mandatory delay between an initial counselling session and the follow-up visit for an abortion?

 Yes or no?
- 1865 Dr. <Robinson.= Absolutely not.
- 1866 Ms. <Matsui.= Okay.
- Dr. <Robinson.= These women, when they come into my clinic,
 they have already thought about this long and hard. They put
 a lot of thought into this decision before they come through my
 doors.
- 1871 Ms. <Matsui.= Right.
- Dr. <Robinson. = And so to require them to wait an additional time frame only just puts an undue burden on them.
- 1874 Ms. <Matsui.= Okay. Given this, do you believe that the
 1875 Women's Health Protection Act is needed to ensure states cannot
 arbitrarily and unnecessarily restrict access to care?
- Dr. <Robinson.= Absolutely. My state went from having a 24-hour waiting period to a 48-hour waiting period. I can tell

you I	have	never	met	a 1	woman	in	15	yea	ırs	who	felt	like	the
counse	lling	g that	she	re	ceive	d fi	com	me	cha	anged	l her	mind	about
whethe	r she	e wante	ed to	o ha	ave a	n ak	ort	cion	01	not			

- Ms. <Matsui. = Thank you very much, and I yield back.
- 1883 Ms. <Eshoo.= The gentlewoman yields back.

- I now recognize the gentleman from Florida, Mr. Bilirakis, for his five minutes of questions.
- 1886 Mr. <Bilirakis.= Thank you, Madam Chair. I appreciate it
 1887 very much.
 - In my limited time I would like to use this time to highlight pro-life voices in my district. Where appropriate, names have been changed to protect the privacy of the patients.

I sincerely appreciate the faithful work of our nonprofit pregnancy centers like A Woman's Place medical clinic and A New Life Solutions and many others in and out of my district in the state of Florida, and the courage of my constituents to share their personal stories with our committee in order to better inform and guide.

"Sandy came to us, having experienced multiple abortions in her past. She decided to choose life for this pregnancy.

As a single woman she needed support. She has been attending our Elevate class program during her pregnancy and receiving emotional and spiritual support. We also gave Sandy information about the Passages of Hope post-abortion recovery program."

Next, we have "Our clinic staff recently met with a young college student who was unsure about whether she could be pregnant because she had been on birth control. She shared that the timing would not be good for being pregnant because of school and finances, and was emotional even discussing how she could tell her parents.

The father of the baby also shared concerns and said he did not feel he could be supportive of a decision to have a baby.

During her sonogram, the client discovered she was very advanced in her pregnancy and left planning to find a late-term abortion clinic.

Our clinic staff—these are the pregnancy centers again—our clinic staff faithfully followed up with this vulnerable young woman who eventually chose life for her baby. She and the father signed up for classes and have been regularly attending, receiving love, encouragement, and support.''

And I have another constituent. She says, "I am a pro-life woman''--her name is Cindy--in my particular congressional district in Florida. "I found myself pregnant at 16 after a challenging childhood. I went to an abortion clinic to have an abortion because I wanted to break the cycle of generational poverty and abuse in which I have been raised. I didn't think I could do that while raising my own child. While in the clinic I was struck by the fact that if my own mother who had given birth

to me at 17 had made the choice I was about to make that I wouldn't exist. I couldn't go through with it and I left the clinic.

I thank God for that choice every day. My daughter will be 23 this month. She is about to graduate from college and will undoubtedly make a profound impact on the world. Having her changed my life for the better. I went to college and graduate school and I have spent more than 20 years working in public service. My child deserved the same choice I deserved—the chance to live.''

Then we have Susan. Susan opened up to us and shared that she had a history of multiple abortions. She shared her circumstances and insecurities surrounding her current pregnancy.

Susan said she was anxious regarding the father of the baby not being someone she was in a committed relationship with and that it is her son's friend's father.

She also shared her desire to find connection and that she had been feeling very lonely. She agreed to an ultrasound, revealing that she was past her first trimester.

Although feeling overwhelmed, she decided to move forward with her pregnancy and enrolled in our Elevate class program for support and encouragement.

Again, I have additional testimonies, Madam Chair, from Floridians that due to time constraints I was unable to get to.

1951	However, I ask unanimous consent, Madam Chair, for these voices
1952	to be included in the record, and I have
1953	Ms. <eshoo. =="" and="" documents="" examine="" td="" the="" we="" will="" will<=""></eshoo.>
1954	Mr. <bilirakis.= and="" i="" much,="" td="" thank="" the<="" very="" you=""></bilirakis.=>
1955	witnesses for their testimony.
1956	Ms. <eshoo. =="" gentleman="" td="" the="" yields.<=""></eshoo.>
1957	Pleasure to recognize the gentlewoman from Florida, Ms.
1958	Castor, for her five minutes of questions.
1959	Ms. <castor.= chair.<="" madam="" td="" thank="" you,=""></castor.=>
1960	Since we are in the Health Subcommittee, I would like to
1961	focus on the health impacts of and implications of theof
1962	medically unnecessary restrictions on abortion care and how they
1963	interfere with the important doctor-patient relationship.
1964	The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists
1965	notes that, like all medical matters, decisions regarding
1966	reproductive health care including abortion care should be made
1967	by patients in consultation with their providers and without undue
1968	interference by outside parties.
1969	Like all patients seeking medical care, women seeking
1970	abortion care are entitled to privacy, dignity, respect, and
1971	support.
1972	Dr. Robinson, please discuss the value of the doctor-patient
1973	relationship in the care that you provide and how do waiting

periods, inaccurate counselling mandates, criminal penalties on

1974

1975	doctors,	and	other	restrictions	on	abortion	impact	that
1976	doctor-pa	atier	nt rela	ationship?				

Dr. <Robinson.= Well, the relationship that I have with my patients is one of the most intimate relationships that I have.

A lot of times these patients come to me in critical times needing guidance, needing support, and one of the things that I can tell you that they don't need is judgment.

And with some of the regulations that are passed a lot of them are aimed at judging the patients, punishing them, and also punishing physicians, and this limits care. It limits options for patients.

And as far as providers coming to the community it also weakens the community because it decreases the likelihood of other physicians being willing to come and practice in those areas, especially hostile areas.

I am an obstetrician in addition to providing abortion care, and I see how this type of legislation is affecting the patients that I care for right now.

I had a patient that was admitted to the hospital. She was pre-viable. She was not what has been recognized as the standard gestational age for viability, which is about 23 to 24 weeks. She was not that far along.

And I saw that there was a physician who was co-managing this patient who was pushing this woman, trying to--focusing at

that time more on the fetus and not on the patient in front of them.

And so this young lady, she actually had pre-eclampsia, which is a pregnancy-related condition where her blood pressures were really high. She had systolic blood pressures that were greater than 200 and diastolic blood pressures that were greater than 120.

We had tried to control her blood pressures with medication.

But we do know that the only cure for pre-eclampsia is delivery.

My hospital requires that I get consensus from another provider before I can proceed with doing what is best for that patient, which was emptying her uterus at that time.

And I know, as a medical professional, that if I emptied her uterus at that gestational age her baby would not live outside of the womb. But that is what was needed.

And I think that these type of restrictions and the threat of penalties to physicians it affects the way we care for patients and it further puts women in harm's way.

And so this is going to add to the mortality--the infant mortality rates--maternal mortality rates that we are already seeing.

Ms. <Castor.= That is a serious issue in America.

Ms. Northup, I have taken some notes on some inflammatory language here today. Abortion on demand. Unlimited abortions

2023 at every stage of pregnancy. Late-term abortion clinics.

That is not how abortion care works, is it? I mean, Roe allows for restrictions on post-viability abortions so long as they contain adequate exceptions to protect the woman's life and health. Isn't that correct?

Ms. <Northup.= That is absolutely correct. It is the constitutional standard and it is what is in the Women's Health Protection Act.

Ms. <Castor.= I mean, for over 50 years Roe v. Wade has provided a right to privacy for women and families to make personal medical decisions. That was a landmark decision. It followed another very important decision that outlawed a--that said states cannot prohibit contraceptives--make that illegal. And these decisions have been fundamental to the wellbeing of women and families across America.

Now we are dealing with politicians across the country who are mostly older men--let us be honest--in state legislatures and here in Congress.

They are enacting undue burdens on health services and contraceptives, and you have the Trump administration that wants to take away the protection for preexisting conditions and eliminate health coverage, insurance coverage, that covers contraceptives.

States and some in the GOP have urged that doctors be subject

2047	to criminal penalties for necessary abortion care, have
2048	restricted what doctors can and can't say to their patients.
2049	That is dangerous.
2050	It is unsafe and it is wrong, and that is why we need to
2051	pass the Women's Health Protection Act so these decisions are
2052	made in consultation with physicians and not politicians.
2053	Thank you.
2054	Ms. <eshoo. =="" back.<="" gentlewoman="" td="" the="" yields=""></eshoo.>
2055	I now get to recognize the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. Long,
2056	for his five minutes of questions.
2057	Mr. <long. =="" chairwoman.<="" madam="" td="" thank="" you,=""></long.>
2058	And I am one of those older gentlemen that Ms. Castor was
2059	referring to, and the reason I am older is because I graduated
2060	high school in 1973.
2061	1973 was when they passed Roe v. Wade, as everyone knows,
2062	and I didn't understand it then and I don't understand it now.
2063	I don't make any apologies but to think that you can go in and
2064	take a human life never registered with me as a high school senior,
2065	and as an old man, as Ms. Castor calls me now, it still doesn't
2066	register with me.
2067	Ms. Forney, I want to thank you for being here today and
2068	sharing your story and the work of Silent No More awareness
2069	campaign, which you co-founded.
2070	As you know, there is close to 20,000 women associated with

this campaign and many thousands have shared their stories about the emotional and physical pain of abortion.

Can you speak to the common thread in these women's lives following their decision to get abortions? What are the physical and emotional aspects the women who have reached out to you go through?

Ms. <Forney.= Yes. Thank you, sir, for asking the question.

The common thread is that the belief we had when we were facing a pregnancy that was unplanned, unwanted, that somehow or another that the abortion was going to solve it. The reality became after the procedure was done that it generated a trauma to us that created emotional and sometimes physical and certainly just a sense of unease. A lack of self-worth often is a common way that we describe how we feel about ourselves. I think a lot of that—and this is just my opinion—but that women are—we are designed physically to create life, to support life in our uterus and in our womb. And the idea that when we take those lives it kind of goes against the actual nature of how we were created.

So what the common thread becomes is that sense of regret, that sense of realizing that we didn't take the time to think about what we were doing and we wish we would have because now we look back and we recognize that the abortion didn't fix

everything as we had hoped it would.

We can't reset the clock after a pregnancy. We can't go back to being un-pregnant. What we are dealing with now are women who have taken the lives of their unborn babies in the womb.

And so living with that physical trauma of having an abortion happen to your body is physically traumatic. Then going through and seeing the emotional side of it—seeing other women pregnant, hearing a vacuum cleaner—these all become triggers that change how we can move forward.

So that becomes the common thread. Thank you for asking the question.

Mr. <Long. = Okay. You touched on my other two points there.

Also going to ask you, you're also part of the Abortion Recovery

Coalition. Can you tell us what this coalition is and what some

of the programs are?

Ms. <Forney.= Yes. It is really just an informal group of the different leaders--Save One, the Deeper Still Ministry, Surrendering the Secret, Forgiven and Set Free.

We were all here in Washington last year for a meeting and afterwards we got together and we said, gosh, we should keep meeting and having opportunities to, you know, get to know each other better, get to know best practices of all these different ministries.

And for Silent No More, we take all of those ministries and

- we promote them as the healing resources that women and men and families can go to after they have had an abortion.
- So we really just--it is a very informal coalition. There is nothing--I mean, there is nothing more than a spreadsheet that created, you know, a conference call--a set of conference calls that we have named ourselves the Abortion Recovery Coalition.
- 2125 But it is that informal and I actually am the one who send out 2126 the emails and host the conference calls.
- 2127 Mr. <Long. = Okay. Thank you.
- 2128 And let me go to Ms. Collett for just one second in my last
 2129 minute that I have here. Federal law and most state laws provide
 2130 protections to individuals and institutions that consciously
 2131 object to performing abortions, especially under religious
 2132 freedom grounds.
- Does this bill maintain protections based on religious freedom?
- 2135 Ms. <Collett.= It does not. It specifically refers to the 2136 restoration of Religious Freedom Act and exempts this law from 2137 that. So the attack on providers of conscience will be swift 2138 and brutal.
- 2139 Mr. <Long. = Okay, and I had a little more but I am out of time. So I yield back. Thank you.
- 2141 Ms. <Eshoo.= The gentleman yields back.
- 2142 And I now recognize the gentleman from Maryland, Mr.

2143 Sarbanes, for his five minutes of questions.

Mr. <Sarbanes.= Thank you, Madam Chair. Thanks to the panel. Thank you to you, Ms. Alvarado, for your testimony. Very powerful testimony, particularly towards the end when you talked about how we trust you to protect us when you deploy on behalf of the country.

But yet, some of these obstacles that are being thrown in the way of being able to have a safe abortion don't seem to trust your judgment to make what is a very deeply personal decision and I think you conveyed that it is not one you made lightly. You have thought about it and you reached a judgment and you made that decision.

And the law of Roe v. Wade empowers you to make that decision.

But your right to do that is increasingly imperiled by what we are seeing and what Ms. Northup has described.

And I thought that it might be helpful to have you just touch again on the things that—the obstacles you encountered, the things that you felt challenged your own judgment in a way that was kind of disrespectful.

And then perhaps, Ms. Northup, you could comment in each instance on how we are seeing that kind of roadblock or obstacle intensifying around the country. And at least three things that I think you touched on, Ms. Alvarado, that maybe you could talk about again was just limited accessibility and what that presented

as a challenge to those services, the waiting period requirement and then some of these very sort of customized prescribed counselling or materials that you required to review.

So if you could just speak to that again and then, Ms.

Northup, to the extent there is time if you could maybe jump in and talk about why those sorts of things are an increasing problem that we are seeing across the country, which really, I think, the sense on the part of many women is that rights that they thought were well protected and intact are now threatened and that is generating, I think, a high level of anxiety across the country.

So--

Ms. <Alvarado. = Thank you so much.

I would like to first discuss the 24-hour waiting period. There were many 24 hours prior to the mandated 24 waiting period that Mr. Griffith described. So there was that prior to the actual procedure, two separate appointments.

Because of health care access in North Dakota there is only one clinic, which meant that the two weeks prior to deployment there weren't any open availability appointments for not only the first appointment but the second appointment as well.

This--as a law enforcement officer, these restrictions that were put in place made me feel unsafe. I had to travel 600 miles out of--300 miles out of Grand Forks, North Dakota, to a location that I did not know to undergo a process that I did not entirely

understand or know how expensive it would be, and I told no one where I was going. These put me at greater risk. These restrictions are dangerous for women and only serve to reinforce stigma.

I was also given scripted counselling, which has nothing to do with patient-centered care. It was scripted. It was not based on my needs or my body. And then on top of that, I had ultrasounds—two separate ultrasounds. Two separate appointments. And, again, none of that was patient—centered care. Those are obstacles to health care because abortion is health care.

Ms. <Northup.= Yes. And so the waiting periods that Ms. Alvarado talked about--24-hour waiting periods--there is increasingly even 48 hours, even 72 hours, and they create a huge burden of travel on women and increased costs, time off from work, having to get childcare and the like.

She has also talked about the false scripted counselling and, again, we have been fighting those from years, false--doctors falsely having to talk about an untrue link between abortion and breast cancer or between abortion and psychological issues, and now the new false counselling on medication abortion is reversible, which is not true.

AMA is suing on that in North Dakota, and the forced ultrasounds, which are an insult to women. As the 4th Circuit

2215	Court of Appeals found, it was a First Amendment violation to
2216	force doctors to perform an ultrasound and talk to the woman about
2217	the ultrasound against her wishes and needs.
2218	Mr. <sarbanes.= back.<="" i="" much.="" td="" thank="" very="" yield="" you=""></sarbanes.=>
2219	Ms. <eshoo.= back.<="" gentleman="" td="" the="" yields=""></eshoo.=>

The chair now recognizes the gentleman from Georgia, Mr.

Carter, for his five minutes of questions.

Mr. <Carter. = Thank you, Madam Chair, and thank all of you for being here.

I want to——I want to talk about an area. Professor Collett,

I will direct this to you. I don't know if you have ever heard

of Rincon, Georgia. It is in Effingham County in south Georgia.

It is in the 1st Congressional District that I have the honor

and privilege of representing.

In Rincon, there is the Pregnancy Care Center of Rincon, and they offer a number of different services including a free ultrasound to patients who are thinking about having an abortion.

And I had the opportunity and my staff had the opportunity to speak to one of the patients there. Her name was Paige, and Paige tells the story about how she was totally overwhelmed with what was going on.

She was young, she was confused, and she was pregnant. And she visited the Pregnancy Care Center and on the day that her abortion was scheduled, and actually had an ultrasound. Paige

2239 ended up changing her mind and decided to keep the baby and not 2240 to have an abortion.

And I mention this because, you know, this feeling of overwhelming uncertainty I think is certainly something that I would imagine happens to a lot of people in this same situation.

So tell me how it is, in your opinion, Professor Collett, that a state that requires an ultrasound before someone has an abortion that patients have a full understanding of their decision. How is that viewed as preventing a woman from accessing an abortion?

Ms. <Collett.= Thank you, Congressman. I am very pleased to have that question because there does seem to be some misinformation on that fact.

According to Contraception Magazine, a pro-reproductive rights peer-reviewed publication, over 90 percent of all abortion providers provide ultrasounds prior to abortions.

They do so because, number one, they need to confirm that the pregnancy is inter-uterine--that it is not ectopic, which is a major threat to women's lives in this country. It is one of the causes of maternal mortality.

Number two, they need to confirm the gestational age because the gestational age of the pregnancy will determine what an appropriate technique of abortion is.

For example, medical abortions or abortions using RU486 are

limited, according to the FDA, for the time period that they can be used and in fact will be unsuccessful if used outside that time period in certain instances and is teratogenic, meaning it can cause birth defects.

They also do an ultrasound in order to make sure, and the reason--I was just puzzling about why Ms. Alvarado had to have two ultrasounds. But it is possible either that she--because the North Dakota clinic did one and Minnesota.

Or the other possibility is that the physician was worried about fetal demise. If there has already been fetal demise prior to the abortion then it's simply an evacuation of the uterus.

And so in that instance, the emotional response to it will feel different.

So ultrasound is something that any responsible care provider would do prior to performance of an abortion. Where the dispute typically is is whether or not the woman--whether or not the view of the ultrasound should be positioned in such a way that the woman could see it, whether or not it is in her field of vision or not.

The woman, to my knowledge under all of these laws, has the right to look away. But that is really the question.

Mr. <Carter. = So in your--in your view, this bill that we are considering what would it mean to patient safety? I mean, when we talk about--when we talk about abortion services and it

is said that one of the safest medical procedures in the United States, yet in your testimony you question the evidence used to back that claim.

Ms. <Collett.= That is correct, Congressman.

Again, I would use the analogy of trying to regulate the tobacco industry based on the Tobacco Research Institute. The simple fact is in this country the abortion industry controls the research, and as the formal editor in chief of the New England Journal of Medicine, one of the most prestigious medical journals in the country, has written in an op-ed regarding pharmaceutical research, when you have the industry controlling the research a couple of things happens.

Number one, research that results in negative information about the product simply doesn't get published. And number two, bias in the design of the research, bias in the selection of the question, all of that—bias in the interpretation of the results is a problem.

If we are serious about women's health in this country, we need to fund independent, not industry-related, research in this area.

Mr. <Carter.= I don't know how anyone could disagree with that. I have to adamantly agree with you. You know, it is obvious I am pro-life and I feel very strongly about it. My constituents are--most of them are that way as well.

- 2311 So thank you for your work. Thank you for being here.
- 2312 And I yield back.

2319

2320

2321

2322

2323

2324

2325

2326

2327

- 2313 Ms. <Eshoo.= The gentleman yields back.
- I would like to give Ms. Alvarado a minute to respond to
 what Ms. Collett characterized relative to you. Is it--do you
 think that what she said is correct about you and what took place?
 So you have a minute or less to respond to that and I think it
 would be fair for you to do so.
 - Ms. <Alvarado. = Absolutely not. Ms. Collett was incorrect in her speculation at my story. Both ultrasounds were done at the Planned Parenthood of St. Paul, Minnesota. They were two separate. The first one was to verify the pregnancy and give a ultrasound picture, which I believe was purely to find out that I was pregnant and confirm that, but also an attempt to shame the fact that I wanted these services and I think what that law is there for to have those two ultrasounds. Not for any medical reason, but to reinforce the stigma of my choice.
- 2328 Ms. <Eshoo.= Thank you.
- 2329 Mr. <Carter.= Professor Collett pointed out that there were 2330 safety measures in this, that that was--is that not correct?
- 2331 Ms. <Collett.= That is correct, and I also said that I was speculating. I was puzzled why she had two ultrasounds prior to that.
- 2334 Ms. <Eshoo.= Well, because you were speculating about

2335	someone else. I think that someone else at the table could clear
2336	the air on the speculation. That is why I called on Ms. Alvarado.
2337	So I don't think that that is out of order.
2338	I now would like to recognize the gentleman from New Mexico.

I now would like to recognize the gentleman from New Mexico, Mr. Lujan, for his five minutes of testimony.

Mr. <Lujan. = Thank you, Madam Chair.

Last year, a U.S. district court judge in Mississippi ruled that Mississippi's laws, quote, "unequivocally,'' closed quote, violated the Fourteenth Amendment and found that the law demonstrated that Mississippi was, quote, "bent on controlling women and minorities,'' unquote, and that the state professed interest in women's health was nothing more than, quote, "gaslighting,'' closed quote.

Ms. Northup, do you agree and can you describe how abortion restrictions disproportionately impact medically underserved and minority communities?

Ms. <Northup.= Yes, and I will begin by addressing the gaslighting comment of the federal district judge. That is what we have seen and established in case after case after case, that the purported interest of women's health is just a pretext for actually making it harder to access abortion services.

And the reality is that most women in the United States who access abortion services are low income and so the burdens fall heavily on them. And it is also the case that it is

disproportionately women of color who have abortions so these restrictions fall more heavily on them.

And so the people with the hardest structural barriers to get good health care are the ones that these laws which make it harder to get the health care are falling on.

Mr. <Lujan.= Dr. Robinson, recently Dr. Horvath-Cosper, who is now a reproductive health advocacy fellow, said, I quote, "If we are having to give people incorrect information and then saying well, you know, the state requires me to say this, it is not actually true. It undermines the patient's confidence in us as providers.''

I know you touched on this in your testimony. But my question for you, Dr. Robinson, is what impact does it have on patients when you are required by state law to give them medically inaccurate information when some of your patients may also be distrustful of the health care system?

Dr. <Robinson.= One of the biggest impacts is that it further pushes this stance that patients have where they feel like they are powerless when it comes to their health care.

I mean, I am their physician. I am a health care professional. They are coming to me for help and advice and then I have to sit there and tell them that I have no power over what I have to tell them.

So it puts them and me too in a position where we feel

powerless. And if you don't mind, I wanted to respond to the question about the ultrasounds and mandatory ultrasounds.

There was a comment by Ms. Collett saying that it's used for us to determine gestational age to decide how to--what type of procedure the woman needs to have to make sure we rule out an ectopic.

As a medical professional, I have other means of determining the gestational age for my patients and I know how to do that and do it well. I learned that in my training at University of Alabama Birmingham.

I also have other means of determining whether there is an ectopic pregnancy. I can do that by my physical exam. And if I am unsure then I am responsible enough to know how to perform an ultrasound and make sure that patient receives that service prior to me proceeding.

And then as far as determining whether there is a miscarriage or if there is already a fetal demise, in performing that second ultrasound that is not necessary because with a fetal demise or what we would call a miscarriage the patient still needs the same procedure. She is still going to need a D&C.

So that doesn't change anything. The woman is there. She wants her uterus emptied. If there is a fetal demise she needs her uterus emptied and I am still going to do it the same way. It doesn't change my medical management at all.

2407 Mr. <Lujan.= Thank you.

Look, what seems clear to me is there must be better access to health care for all Americans, especially the medically underserved, not further restricting access.

And with that, I want to turn it over and yield to Ms. Kelly from Illinois. I will tell you, there has been no stronger advocate that has been working on maternal mortality for people of color.

2415 Ms. <Kelly.= Thank you to my colleague and thank you, all the witnesses.

With all due respect to my colleagues that are sharing stories about people that regret having abortions, I always find it so interesting that we tend to care more about the fetus than the adult or our children.

Because I worked on a maternal mortality bill for three years and I could not get one person on the other side of the aisle to sign up for it until we made, you know, some changes. And the biggest thing that we need--Medicaid expansion, and that is according to ACOG--no one has signed up for that.

So I find it a little hypocritical. And then I won't even go to issues around gun violence—that we don't care about those kids that are two, three, four, five, and six. But I wanted—in your state of Alabama you rank 45th as far as women's health and Louisiana is absolutely one of the worst as is Indiana and Georgia.

2431	So can you talk about the connection between abortion
2432	restrictions and maternal health?
2433	Dr. <robinson. =="" is="" it's="" patient<="" same="" sameit="" td="" the="" well,=""></robinson.>
2434	population that has been affected by these abortion restrictions
2435	that are also affected by these other disparities in health care.
2436	We do know that when women can't access health care early
2437	in their pregnancies that they are more likely to have
2438	complications like preeclampsia.
2439	They are more likely to have pre-term deliveries, go into
2440	pre-term labor, and they are not able to access a medical
2441	professional until they go in labor.
2442	Because at that point, they can present to the emergency
2443	room and they can't be turned away because of EMTALA laws. But
2444	we know that they canthey can benefit from care early on.
2445	So Medicaid expansion, making it more accessible for women
2446	to access the health care system before their time of need, even
2447	prior to pregnancy, will go a long way as far as decreasing these
2448	maternal and fetal mortality rates.
2449	Ms. <eshoo.= dr.="" robinson.<="" td="" thank="" you,=""></eshoo.=>
2450	The gentlewhose time was it? Oh, it was Mr. Lujan's.
2451	The gentleman yields back. Thank you.
2452	It is a pleasure to recognize the gentlewoman from Indiana,
2453	Mrs. Brooks, for her five minutes of questions.
2454	Mrs. <brooks.= and="" chairwoman.="" let="" madam="" me<="" td="" thank="" you,=""></brooks.=>

thank all of the witnesses for being here. I think it is very important for everyone to listen to each other, to your stories, to your legal perspectives.

These are issues that this country and my state of Indiana has been grappling with for a very long time. I do believe and have tremendous faith in physicians and we don't want patients to be powerless.

But in my view, information is power and having more information is power, and having—in Indiana I think we have some common sense laws that provide those protections both to mothers and to the unborn, all while making sure that mothers and doctors are well informed on their options and on the choices before them.

In Indiana, doctors do have to provide mothers with basic information about alternatives to abortions including adoption, providing assistance about being a mother before performing an abortion procedure.

We don't ban abortions or tell mothers they can't make their own choice. But we do require physicians to have the responsibility to make sure that people do know they have a choice to her than an abortion.

This bill, H.R. 2975, I believe would restrict the ability of states to provide that sort of guidance to health care providers about these challenging discussions with patients.

I am also concerned that it would restrict the amount of

information, which I do believe, again, is power for any patient, rules around and Indiana's rules around late-term abortions.

I would like--while Ms. Northup was asked by my colleague across the aisle, Ms. Matsui, clarifying what she though this bill would do and would not do, I would ask the other legal expert here at the table, Ms. Collett, would you please tell us what you believe H.R. 2975 would do and would not do.

Ms. <Collett.= I am sorry. Thank you, Congresswoman.

Based on the evidentiary standard, it establishes a clear and convincing standard for the state's responsibility to show that in fact the limitation or requirement significantly advances the safety of abortion.

Given the lack of clear data on many of these things, that standard cannot be met. The Supreme Court has recognized clear and convincing evidence is the highest standard of evidence that we impose for civil matters.

In addition to that, the definition of significantly advances is not defined in the bill itself. But there is a direction to the courts to provide the broadest possible interpretation of the legislation.

And so it override--it would override the Hyde Amendment and it would override conscience protections that might find refuge in state RFRAs.

It is a bill that would essentially eliminate almost every

state protection that are afforded women against the malpractice or misconduct of others.

For example, I cite in my written testimony a couple of cases where the abortion industry has gone to court to avoid informing public officials where a young girl has been the subject of statutory rape, had become pregnant, and had an abortion in that instance.

I represented the Kansas district attorneys in a case where that was alleged on the part. They argued that the girl had a privacy right not to have the public officials—the law enforcement officials—know that she was raped.

Those sorts of laws probably would fall as well.

Mrs. <Brooks.= Can you talk about--Indiana law, for instance, requires parental consent for girls under the age of 18. Can you explain why--what some of the reasons are why states do put parental notification laws in place and why they have been found constitutional and would this bill have any impact on that, in your opinion?

Ms. <Collett.= Those sorts of laws have been found constitutional where properly crafted. Many states have parental notification rather than parental consent.

The court has only addressed parental consent in requiring a judicial bypass in cases where the girl is mature and well informed, or in the alternative, it is not in her best interest

2527 to inform the parents.

The reason the court has upheld these laws is because, number one, it is the common standard for almost every medical procedure that parents are involved in their minor children's decisions. So that is an important factor.

But number two, they also recognize the benefit of the parent guiding the child in what the court calls the selection of an ethical and competent provider.

Dr. Gosnell has been referenced earlier. There are cases in Louisiana that are part of the record in the case before the Supreme Court right now where providers have been operating without a license, where their license has already been taken from them.

And so a parent would want to know that and a parent would be able to help the girl with that. They have also found that the parents have responsibilities to those minors as far as support and proposed medical care. That is one of the biggest concerns.

Mrs. <Brooks.= Thank you. My time is up. I yield back.

Ms. <Eshoo.= The gentlewoman yields back.

It is a pleasure to recognize the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. Kennedy, for his five minutes of questions.

Mr. <Kennedy.= Thank you, Madam Chair. I want to thank our witnesses for being here today. I especially want to thank

Ms. Alvarado for your service to our country that continues today, and also for your willingness to share your lived experience with all of us.

Access to abortion enables people to decide when and if they want to have children. Limiting or restricting that access not only negatively impacts maternal health outcomes, but the more restrictions that are in place the worse children's health outcomes become.

These barriers impact education levels for women and pregnant people, their ability to get better jobs, their ability to provide for their current children and families, their ability to be financially stable and independent.

When we think about limiting access to health care, we need to think about the tertiary and unintended consequences that may come with it.

Ms. Alvarado, there is one provider in your state, as you testified. Due to the time it took to see that provider, you were forced to travel to another state for care. You were forced to have a mandatory ultrasound.

You were forced to wait 24 hours for a procedure even though there was no medical rationale as to why. You were forced to have biased counselling about options that you were probably well aware of before you entered that exam room.

You were forced to listen to lies about how an abortion is

2575	dangerous.	You faced ed	conomic, phy	ysical, and	emotional hardship
2576	just to rece	eive access t	to health c	care as you	defend our nation.

Tragically, ma'am, your story is far from unique, because in this country women and pregnant people are forced to be seen by a licensed physician, even though another clinician can perform an abortion service.

Many people can pay for abortion--many people pay for an abortion out of pocket because insurance is restricted from covering it, as you testified.

The federal government is no better. We restrict Medicaid from covering abortion services--again, basic health care restrictions.

In no other circumstance would any one of these be acceptable let alone all. We put women, pregnant people, and their families in harm's way and the repercussions negatively impact our emotional, physical, and economic wellbeing.

So, ma'am, can you talk a little bit about how important it was for your economic security and personal future to access the care that you need?

Ms. <Alvarado. = Absolutely. Thank you, sir.

Like you said, a lot of the information that they shared with me is information that I already knew. Information is not the only power. It is also about having access. Information and access are power.

2599 Before--as soon as I knew I was pregnant I had to think about 2600 the financial considerations of my life from that point forward 2601 and how that would change. 2602 I had seen so many barriers for women in the military 2603 including child care, continued deployment schedules, duty, and other responsibilities. 2604 At the time that I got pregnant, I was an E-4 making \$1,000 2605 2606 a paycheck and out of that came rent, food, gas. And then--Ms. <Eshoo. = Can you--I didn't hear what you said your 2607 2608 paycheck was. Can you restate that? 2609 Ms. <Alvarado. = My paycheck was \$1,000 every two weeks and 2610 out of that came rent, gas money, food. And at that time, I 2611 already knew that I would making a career outside of the military. So there were professional and educational aspirations that I 2612 2613 had and I knew that having a child and raising a child would require 2614 so much--something completely different than I had planned. Mr. <Kennedy. = Can you talk a little bit about--you 2615 2616 mentioned this in your testimony but just I will give you about

a minute and a half left.

2617

2618

2619

2620

2621

2622

So I want to get you to articulate, if you can, the burden and the honor that a nation puts on your shoulders to defend our country and the responsibilities you have with it while also saying that you are not empowered to make these decisions over your own life.

2623	Ms. <alvarado.= absolutely.<="" td=""></alvarado.=>
2624	I think the only word that really encompasses that feeling
2625	is infuriating. It is highlighting the hypocrisy that here I
2626	am, in a position to change the lives of so many people in my
2627	chain of command and lead a 10-man team into a combat zone that
2628	I was questioned multiple time and had to face multiple barriers
2629	in accessing health care that is so deeply personal to me.
2630	Mr. <kennedy.= and,="" any="" do="" is="" logic<="" ma'am,="" td="" there="" think="" you=""></kennedy.=>
2631	as to why a series of politicians like those of us on the dais
2632	should be inserted between that decision between you and your
2633	partner, your family, your doctor?
2634	Ms. <alvarado. =="" ask="" continue<="" fact,="" i="" in="" no,="" sir.="" td="" that="" you=""></alvarado.>
2635	to protect the fact that this is a decisiona deeply moral and
2636	ethical and personal decision that should be left to a doctor,
2637	a woman, and the people that she trusts most in her life.
2638	Mr. <kennedy.= for="" ma'am.="" td="" thank="" you="" you,="" your<=""></kennedy.=>
2639	service.
2640	Ms. <alvarado.= td="" thank="" you.<=""></alvarado.=>
2641	Mr. <kennedy.= back.<="" td="" yield=""></kennedy.=>
2642	Ms. <eshoo. =="" back.<="" gentleman="" td="" the="" yields=""></eshoo.>
2643	Pleasure to recognize the ranking member of the full
2644	committee from Oregon, Mr. Walden.
2645	Mr. <walden.= chair.<="" madam="" td="" thank="" you,=""></walden.=>
0.646	

Professor Collett, Section 4(e)(2) of H.R. 2975 includes

2646

a list of	exceptions	including	one	which	states	the b	ill does
not apply	to, quote,	"insurance	e or	medica	al assis	stance	coverage
of abortic	on services,	,'' closed	quot	te.			

Now, a legal analysis by the Lozier Institute points out that since there is no definition of insurance or medical assistance coverage of abortion services the bill may invalidate the Hyde Amendment, at least in certain situations.

So my question, as you read through that, is would you agree with that analysis that that section might invalidate the Hyde Amendment?

Ms. <Collett.= Congressman, it is quite possible, given the broad interpretation and the purposes of the bill that a district court would rule that way.

Mr. <Walden. = And what other federal laws and policy riders do you think could be overturned by this legislation? I know you spoke to some, I think, with Mrs. Brooks. But what other things would be overturned you are aware of?

Ms. <Collett.= Independent of the insurance aspect? I am sorry. I misunderstood the question initially.

I am concerned that it will overturn things like the ultrasound law, like admitting privileges where there is a strong evidentiary basis there is in Louisiana, things like requiring physicians to perform abortions.

There are some states in which you don't even have to be

- 2671 a licensed medical professional to perform an abortion.
- 2672 Mr. <Walden.= Say that again.

2684

2685

2686

2687

2688

2689

2690

2691

2692

2693

2694

surgery.

- Ms. <Collett.= There are some states in this country where
 you don't even have to be a licensed medical professional to
 perform an abortion.
- 2676 It will also overturn--yes, Congressman?
- 2677 Mr. <Walden.= That is amazing. I didn't realize that.
- Ms. <Collett.= Yes, Congressman. And so there are also some--it will overturn limitations possibly on the use of RU486.

 It will overturn certain informational requirements, because abortion is, to my knowledge, the only surgery people with the possible exception of vasectomies, that people seek out because of poverty, not because of a medical need for that particular

It would overturn numerous other important safety regulations that women are protected by in this instance.

And, arguably, because of the health exception being undefined in the bill, it's possible that post-viability abortions would become essentially available at all times.

Congress has received in the past testimony by abortion providers that they believe that a woman who is psychologically distressed with her pregnancy has a health condition that would justify a post-viability abortion.

Mr. <Walden. = And define in lay person's terms

- 2695 post-viability abortion.
- 2696 Ms. <Collett.= Post-viability is an abortion that occurs
- where the child could safely be delivered and surrendered for
- 2698 adoption. Instead, the abortion provider actually goes forward
- and terminates that child's life.
- 2700 Mr. <Walden. = And how late in the pregnancy can that occur?
- 2701 Ms. <Collett.= As this committee has already heard, the
- standard age right now is accepted in the medical community as
- 2703 23 to 24 weeks, although we do have some cases in which children
- 2704 before that have successfully survived.
- 2705 Mr. <Walden.= Right. Right.
- 2706 And do you know off the top of your head what states don't
- 2707 require licensed medical providers to provide abortion?
- 2708 Ms. <Collett. = Vermont is an example, I believe, your Honor.
- 2709 Mr. <Walden.= Okay. Thank you.
- 2710 Ms. <Collett.= I am sorry. Congressman.
- 2711 Mr. <Walden.= Yeah. We are not judges up here.
- 2712 Ms. <Collett.= I am used to courts.
- 2713 Mr. <Walden.= Yes. Thank you.
- Ms. Forney, in your testimony, you mentioned a Planned
- 2715 Parenthood Clinic in St. Louis that had its licensed revoked due
- 2716 to safety concerns. Can you elaborate on that? Why was its
- 2717 licence revoked?
- 2718 Ms. <Forney.= There were--

2719	Mr. <walden. =="" if="" mic,="" on="" please="" th="" thank<="" turn="" would.="" you="" your=""></walden.>
2720	you.
2721	Ms. <forney.= 75="" emergencies="" medical="" td="" that="" there="" were="" were<=""></forney.=>
2722	documented at the RHS Planned Parenthood abortion facility
2723	sinceand then there was a new facility that opened across the
2724	river in Illinois and in October of 2019 a similaranother
2725	incident occurred.
2726	The facility in Missouri has had numerous visits by
2727	ambulances taking patients out. I was there a couple of years
2728	ago just on a Saturday morning praying with some folks, and we
2729	had an ambulance show up.
2730	I was shocked. I had never seen an ambulance at an abortion
2731	clinic, and the normalness with which it was treated was very
2732	concerning.
2733	Mr. <walden. =="" can="" issues<="" safety="" speak="" specific="" td="" the="" to="" you=""></walden.>
2734	that were identified that caused the license revocation?
2735	Ms. <forney.= in="" issues="" related="" specific="" td="" the="" the<="" to="" well,=""></forney.=>
2736	license being revoked had to do with four womenyou know, four
2737	individual women specifically that each experienced a major
2738	complication and that is what brought this to the attention of
2739	the state authorities.
2740	Mr. <walden. =="" all="" expired.="" has="" my="" right.="" td="" thank="" time="" you<=""></walden.>
2741	all for your testimony and, Madam Chair, I yield back.
2742	Ms. <eshoo. =="" back.<="" gentleman="" td="" the="" yields=""></eshoo.>

It is now--let's see, who is next here? The chair recognizes the gentleman from California, Mr. Cardenas, for his five minutes of questions.

Mr. <Cardenas.= Thank you very much, Madam Chairwoman
Eshoo, and thank you also to Ranking Member Burgess for having
this important hearing today in the Health Subcommittee.

I think it is so important for us to understand that listening to the impacts of these unfair and unnecessary and stigmatizing restrictions on women across our country is very important for us to discuss and for the American people to hear.

My daughter, Alina, happens to be with me today and she reminds me that nothing is more personal than choices about family, including how and when to have one. That is true, no matter your zip code or the number on your bank account.

I have been blessed with an amazing family and, at the same time, I have never had to experience a pregnancy, me personally, or any other complications or any other matters that a human being has to go through to have a pregnancy.

I have never had to worry about becoming pregnant or face the health implications as a result of that. As a man, my health care is not picked apart and politicized because of judgments that lawmakers have about my personal circumstances or decisions.

This is one of the many reasons that it is so important to listen to women, to truly hear their experiences, to follow their

leadership on all of these issues. All the men in the world need to speak less and listen more.

I am a proud co-sponsor of the Women's Health Protection

Act and I am so grateful for the leadership of Chairwoman Eshoo

and all the other members who have signed on.

I have a question to Ms. Northup. Ms. Northup, are you aware of any laws in our country in the United States of America that require a man to sleep on it or to think twice about a medical procedure that they choose to take? Specifically to men.

Ms. <Northup. = I am not aware of any such laws.

Mr. <Cardenas.= Okay. Neither am I, and I have asked some of my colleagues who are very involved in many issues and they just shake their head and say no, matter of fact, I am not aware of one.

But yet, here we are, speaking about law across the country and legislatures across the country that, in my opinion, have proven over and over and over to violate the law of the land and the Constitution of the United States.

At this time, I would like to yield the balance of my time to my esteemed colleague, Ms.--Congresswoman Schakowsky.

Ms. <Schakowsky.= Thank you so much for yielding.

Ms. Collett, I just have to say how much I resent when you say if you really wanted to care about women you would do something about prenatal care or you would do something about maternal

2791 mortality.

The women, on this side of the aisle anyway, have been working so hard to do exactly that and the implication is very offensive to me that somehow we are blocking addressing these issues.

And the idea of abortion--the abortion industry is controlling the data--abortion industry. Do you mean like ACOG, the American of--what is it exactly, Dr. Robinson? ACOG?

Dr. <Robinson.= American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists.

Ms. <Schakowsky.= Yes. That industry, and they support this legislation. I want to talk to you, Dr.--

Ms. <Collett.= May I respond, please?

Ms. <Schakowsky.= No. No. I am not asking a question.

I am telling you how you make me feel with the kind of testimony

you have given.

So I just want to say to Dr. Robinson, so your home state of Alabama openly is hostile to abortion. You said that you have to give false information—false information. How do you get around—so then do you say but the truth is? How do you deal with that?

Dr. <Robinson.= Well, I basically waste my time and my patients' time to give them the information that the state requires that I give them, and then I go back and tell them true medical facts based off of my training and experience.

And there is no--there is this concern expressed around if this Women's Health Protection Act is passed that patients won't get informed consent. We are trained as medical professionals to give patients that anyway. We don't need politicians to tell us or to dictate exactly what is told to a patient in the room.

As an abortion care provider, I can tell you without a fact I am not ashamed of any of the care that I provide and I am not scared to tell my patients the facts about the services that they are there to receive.

And these patients are under delusion about what service they are there to--

Ms. <Schakowsky.= Let me just ask you one more question, though. Are you in danger? We have heard about people who provide care including abortions being under attack and even worried about their physical danger.

Dr. <Robinson.= Absolutely. My physical person is in danger at times and also my financial stability in my community, because my hospital sometimes will make it difficult for me to remain in the hospital and maintain hospital admitting privileges because sometimes they just may be opposed to having an abortion provider on their staff. But they are harassed and the facility is picketed.

And as far as my physical person, yes, I am in danger. When they talk about abortion providers--

Ms. <Eshoo.= Ms. Robinson, the gentlewoman's time has expired, and I always hate to cut people off but I have been generous on both sides of the aisle and witnesses from both parts of the--both sides of the issues that we are discussing today.

It is now a pleasure to recognize the gentleman from Montana, Mr. Gianforte, for his five minutes of questions.

Mr. <Gianforte. = Thank you, Chair.

While my colleagues on the other side of the aisle seek to further undermine the rights of the unborn with this legislation, I want to tell a story about a young woman from Montana and her beautiful baby boy.

For the sake of this story we won't use her real name.

Instead, I will call her Amy. When Amy was in her early 20s she took a home pregnancy test. When the result proves positive she thinks long and hard about her options.

Amy is a kind-hearted woman who, in her own words, wouldn't hurt a soul but is now weighing abortion as an option. Afraid of the unknown, her reasons for considering an abortion grow.

The next day Amy walks into a clinic to get another pregnancy test to verify the result the night before. The results are confirmed and an ultrasound indeed shows that she is carrying a six-week-old child.

The fears from the night before resurface. Through her tears she asks the nurse, what am I supposed to do, as the weight

of the decision comes crashing down on her.

Comforting her, the nurse says, just give it 24 hours. Don't make any final decisions for at least a day. Amy waits a day. Then she waits another. Twelve days later she schedules another ultrasound and signs up for parenting classes.

She decided to keep the baby. The advice to be patient that that nurse gave allowed Amy the time she needed to realize her fears were just that. Only fears.

For her birthday on May 20th, 2019, Amy gets what she will tell you is her greatest birthday gift ever—a happy and healthy baby boy. Amy's story is one of hope in the face of fear that acts as an inspiration for all of us. If it weren't for the nurse who counselled patients, it is a story would have ended very differently.

It is stories about nurses and clinics like this that I would like to hear more about from our esteemed witness, Teresa Stanton Collett.

Professor Collett, H.R. 2975 states that pro-life laws, quote, "Harm women's health by reducing access to other essential health care services.''

My question for you is what options besides Planned

Parenthood are there for women seeking comprehensive health care

services?

Ms. <Collett. = There are multiple resources including some

that are federally funded. So during the debate I believe over the contraceptive mandate in courts, since that was actually a regulation of an agency rather than a congressionally mandated situation, it was established that contraception is readily available to women throughout the country. I think at the time the cost of the pill was \$10 and something at Wal-Mart.

So, first, you have all sorts of general clinics that will provide that, increasingly even some of the doctors at some of the new models like Urgent Care are providing that sort of contraception access.

Sexually-transmitted diseases, also that testing is available. Usually the Department of Health in a state will have some clinics that are available to people as well.

Mr. <Gianforte. = Okay. So suffice it to say women have options beyond Planned Parenthood?

Ms. <Collett.= They absolutely do, and better options.

Mr. <Gianforte. = Okay. And why would you say they are better options?

Ms. <Collett. = Because Planned Parenthood, although it does report that a few of its locations offer adoption services, the actual numbers that are revealed in their annual report show that that is not an option that they actually proceed with nor do they provide prenatal care beyond the most basic during the first trimester, whereas many of these other clinics will provide

2911	obstetric care throughout the pregnancy as well.
2912	Mr. <gianforte. =="" in="" last="" of="" okay.="" questions,<="" series="" td="" the=""></gianforte.>
2913	my colleague, Ms. Schakowsky, addressed some comments to you.
2914	Is there anything you would like to say in response?
2915	Ms. <collett.= american="" certainly.="" college="" of<="" td="" the=""></collett.=>
2916	Obstetricians and Gynecologists has never taken a position
2917	against abortion or recommended any regulation.
2918	There is a brief that has been filed in the Louisiana case
2919	that specifically gives the history of how the American College
2920	of Obstetricians has become politicized on this particular issue.
2921	Mr. <gianforte. =="" for="" okay.="" td="" testimony.<="" thank="" you="" your=""></gianforte.>
2922	With that, I yield back.
2923	Ms. <eshoo. =="" back.<="" gentleman="" td="" the="" yields=""></eshoo.>
2924	It is a pleasure to recognize the patient gentlewoman from
2925	Michigan, Mrs. Dingell, for her five minutes of questions.
2926	Mrs. <dingell.= chair.<="" madam="" td="" thank="" you,=""></dingell.=>
2927	I sort of have two different ways that I want to go because
2928	I want to talk to Ms. Alvarado. We allI want to say that this
2929	is a deeply personal issue for every woman and we have seen and
2930	heard that today from the advocates, the providers, and the woman.
2931	I am somebody that believes that these decisions are best
2932	made by the individual woman and her doctor. We owe each woman
2933	to treat them with trust and with dignity and uphold that

2934 principle.

Having said this, Ms. Alvarado, we all thank you for your service, no matter--I think there is nobody at this table that isn't grateful, and I am looking at the pain in your face today and I know how hard it has been for you to come and testify.

But before I get to you, I am going to do two things you are never supposed to do. First of all, I am just going to go off script.

Ms. Collett, and I appreciate——I know everybody here cares deeply. So but when you say that this procedure is the only one that you know someone gets because of poverty, last week I was with a 24-year—old woman who had been diagnosed with breast cancer and chose to have a double mastectomy because she couldn't afford her chemotherapy.

So I think what too many people don't understand is that the number of women that have no option. In parts of my state the only--Flint, by the way, being one of them, the only place women, who have no desire--the just need health care--the only place they can go is Planned Parenthood.

Ms. Northup, I heard you listening carefully to what she said. Is there anything you would want to add?

Ms. <Northup.= Well, I would like to respond to the characterization of this bill, which I think that Ms. Collett has not properly characterized, and again, I appreciate that we differ here about whether or not abortion should be safe and legal

and a woman's decision.

But what I don't appreciate is mischaracterizing. I have been doing this for 17 years leading the Center, and over and over again we are trying to, you know, use these proxy fights.

This bill is very targeted at the problem of unjustified medical burdens on clinics and patients that are not justified by medicines and science.

It does not up-end the Hyde Amendment. The Hyde Amendment is an unfair restriction on low-income women's access. There is a bill, the Each Woman Act, which importantly addresses that.

This bill clearly excludes in its language and that language is not tricky. It is very clear that it's not just Hyde. It's any kind of insurance that doesn't cover it.

It was also suggested that doctors are going to have to provide abortions and that the objections that doctors can now make because they don't want to provide would be up-ended.

That is not what this bill does. It has also been suggested that it is going to allow abortions at times that Roe v. Wade doesn't allow abortions. That is not what this bill does. It adopts the Roe standard. It is very targeted to address a problem at this moment, which is 450 laws, that are shutting clinics, blocking women's access.

And I just think it's important to debate what this bill does and not to confuse it with things that aren't true.

2983 Mrs. <Dingell.= Thank you.

Ms. Alvarado, thank you again for your courage, and I am going to have many questions. But because I wanted you to talk about your personal experience and--but I want to ask you this.

Ms. Collett states in her testimony that there is little if any link to reproductive health care access in a woman's economic wellbeing. Do you think--feel that this is accurate, given your life experience?

Ms. <Alvarado.= No. I am able to live the life that I live now because of the decisions that I made at 22. The access--I am sorry. How do I say this? I had to travel outside of my state with balancing many restrictions and trying to pass those in order to make a safe health care decision for myself and that decision has now led me to a life that I live now. I was able to complete an education, working in a beautiful career and meet my partner, and that was all because I was able to make a safe decision for myself.

Mrs. <Dingell. = What would you say to the state legislators that are passing these laws, from your own personal experience?

Ms. <Alvarado. = That their philosophical beliefs and these restrictions that they impose on women are not for the women at all. These are only obstacles to health care and women deserve to make the best choice for themselves.

Mrs. <Dingell.= I yield back, Madam Chair.

3007	Ms. <eshoo. =="" back.<="" gentlewoman="" th="" the="" yields=""></eshoo.>
3008	I now would like to recognize the gentlewoman fromthat
3009	is not right. Do we have
3010	Mr. <duncan. =="" be="" carolina,="" ma'am.<="" south="" td="" that="" would=""></duncan.>
3011	Ms. <eshoo. =="" have="" i="" just="" let="" me="" note="" td="" that="" think<="" we="" well,=""></eshoo.>
3012	just one member left here that is waiving onto the committee.
3013	But because you are not a member of the subcommittee we need
3014	to take all the subcommittee members before you, and then I would
3015	be glad to recognize you, Mr. Duncan.
3016	So the gentlewoman from Illinois, Ms. Kelly, is recognized
3017	for her five minutes of questions.
3018	Ms. <kelly.= again="" being<="" for="" td="" thank="" the="" to="" witnesses="" you=""></kelly.=>
3019	here today.
3020	Due to restrictions on access to abortion care, many women
3021	must travel long distances, further delaying the access, as we
3022	have heard today, to care and increasing their risks to their
3023	health.
3024	As various states seek to decrease access to care by
3025	implementing harmful restrictions, many women must cross state
3026	lines to places like, where I live in Illinois, to receive care.
3027	It should not be difficult for women to have access to the
3028	constitutional care they need and are entitled to, and I am proud
3029	that my state has trusted women to make these decisions for

I want to talk about the implications of abortion access on women's long-term health. When access to abortion is restricted, we know there are negative health outcomes that can result, harming communities who already face the most challenges to accessing care as we have heard already.

A groundbreaking study from the University of California San Francisco found that women who are turned away from accessing abortion and forced to carry an unwanted pregnancy to term are almost four times more likely to live below the federal poverty line.

- Ms. Northup, are you familiar with this study?
- 3042 Ms. <Northup.= The study from USC? Yes.

Ms. <Kelly.= Can you describe the findings of the study and what it means for women's long-term health outcomes?

Ms. <Northup.= Yes, and we have cited this in our submitted testimony, that the study that looked at women who were turned away, who were unable to access abortion care that they had higher incidence of being in poverty, that they had higher challenges with meeting their basic needs in terms of housing and other economic needs, and that they did not have—that overall when they looked at women turned away or not turned away the issue about psychological health was not impacted on the women who were able to access.

3054 Ms. <Kelly.= And also, it is my understanding that women

who were unable to terminate unwanted pregnancies would stay with violent partners longer, putting them and their children at greater risk.

Ms. <Northup.= That is right. It was a very important finding of the study that women were more likely if they were turned away to stay with violent partners.

Ms. <Kelly.= And we just discussed the impact on economic security and I, again, want to thank you for sharing your story with us and you, Ms. Forney, for sharing your story, and Dr. Robinson for sharing your story. I know it is not easy, and I want to say something about myself that I am a pro-choice person that is pro-life. You know, the thing that either you are, you know, pro-life or pro-choice, I am pro-life but I believe in choice.

Thank you. I yield back.

Ms. <Eshoo. = The gentlewoman yields the remainder of her time to me. I appreciate it.

I think it is very important to set down--first of all, to Congresswoman Kelly, the UCSF study I raised in my opening statement and it is wonderful that you highlighted it and underscored it again because it contains very important information.

I think it's important to set this--the following down as part of the record here. Studies show that contraceptive access

is responsible for one-third of total wage gain women have made since the 1960s, and while I found your response, Ms. Collett, to, I believe, Mr. Butterfield asking you if you believed in contraception and it was interesting for you to share with us that you are post-menstrual you didn't answer the question.

Contraception is one of the answers to what is problematic in our country, and there is an entire movement against contraception. There is. There is.

When the Republicans were in control many years ago, they removed with a House vote contraception coverage in the health care coverage that members of Congress had. It was corrected later on.

So I think it's very important to put that on the record. And reproductive choice is vital for women to have economic freedom. It's a choice that they make. It is not forcing them to do one thing. They have a choice. It can be a spiritually—in the lane of spirituality. It can be many things. But it is a choice.

And so the whole issue, I think, that has been--some of our witnesses refuse to talk about contraception. But I think that it is really in the center of this discussion and this debate.

I now would like to recognize the gentleman from California, Mr.--Dr. Ruiz, for his five minutes of questions.

Mr. <Ruiz.= Thank you very much.

3103	A 2019 article in the Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology
3104	described the consensus guidelines for obstetric and
3105	gynecological care in the United States and brought together a
3106	broad group of clinicians, consumers, and representatives from
3107	accrediting bodies to review the available evidence in clinical
3108	practices to develop and evidence-informed policy.
3109	The report concluded that, quote, "Requiring facilities that
3110	perform office-based procedures including abortion to meet
3111	standards beyond those currently in effect in all general medicine
3112	offices and clinics is unjustified based on this thorough review
3113	and analysis of available evidence, '' unquote.
3114	I would like to request unanimous consent to submit this
3115	article for the record.
3116	[The information follows:]
3117	

3118

3119	Mr <puiz "false<="" -="" authors="" indeed="" noted="" quote="" th="" that="" the=""></puiz>
3119	Mr. <ruiz. "false<="" =="" authors="" indeed,="" noted="" quote,="" td="" that,="" the=""></ruiz.>
3120	concerns for patient safety are being used as a justification
3121	for promoting regulations that specifically target abortion,''
3122	unquote, and that, quote, "Targeting specific procedures based
3123	on ideology rather than evidence sets a dangerous precedent for
3124	the regulation of medicine,'' unquote.
3125	Dr. Robinson, are you familiar with this article?
3126	Dr. <robinson.= td="" yes.<=""></robinson.=>
3127	Mr. <ruiz. =="" clear="" it="" me="" on<="" restrictions="" seems="" td="" that="" the="" to=""></ruiz.>
3128	abortion care placed by some states, presumably under the label
3129	of, quote, "safety'' are not actually based on evidence or
3130	clinical guidelines. Would you agree?
3131	Dr. <robinson.= agree.="" correct.<="" i="" is="" td="" that=""></robinson.=>
3132	Mr. <ruiz. =="" does="" for="" it="" medical<="" okay.="" precedent="" set="" td="" what=""></ruiz.>
3133	standards not based on any evidence or clinical care guidelines
3134	to be imposed on medical procedures?
3135	Dr. <robinson.= do="" is<="" of="" one="" see="" td="" that="" the="" things="" we="" well,=""></robinson.=>
3136	that it reduces options for patients. It sets a standard where
3137	me, for instance, as an obstetrician gynecologist I can't offer
3138	all options to my patients because it is being restricted
3139	according to political interference.
3140	Mr. <ruiz. =="" agree="" and="" authors="" journal="" so="" td="" that<="" the="" with="" you=""></ruiz.>
3141	this sets a dangerous precedent for the regulation of medicine?

3142

Dr. <Robinson.= It does.

3143	Mr. <ruiz. =="" does="" how="" in="" influence="" outcomes="" patient<="" th="" that=""></ruiz.>
3144	care?
3145	Dr. <robinson. =="" areregulations="" if="" like<="" politicians="" td="" well,=""></robinson.>
3146	this are dictating what we can do as providers, then it puts
3147	patients' health at risk.
3148	It takes options that are viable options that are really
3149	pertinent for our patients' health careit takes them off the
3150	table.
3151	I talked earlier about one of the patients that I took care
3152	of in the hospital who, because of these regulations, abortion
3153	care is very restricted in our hospital.
3154	A patient who needed to have an abortion and sometimes these
3155	patients they present to our outpatient clinics but they really
3156	need inpatient care. I don't have that option, and these
3157	regulations only make itonly limit it more.
3158	Mr. <ruiz. =="" according="" authors="" journal<="" of="" td="" the="" this="" to=""></ruiz.>
3159	article, the panel of medical experts found that abortion
3160	procedures should be treated the same as comparable medical
3161	procedures in primary care and gynecology based on medical
3162	evidence and expert-driven clinical guidelines.
3163	It's what we do in medicine. I am a doctor. You know, you
3164	have your peers review what is best in terms of evidence, given
3165	the experts' recommendations to produce these guidelines.
21.66	

Do you agree and, if so, can you discuss with the committee

3166

why you feel this way that abortion procedures should be treated the same as comparable medical procedures in primary care and gynecology, based on those--that evidence?

Dr. <Robinson.= I think the best way to highlight that is to look at some of the examples that we talked about today.

Because we are not treating abortion and contraception in the same way that we are treating other areas of medicine, we are seeing clinics close--for instance, Planned Parenthood clinics that serve a lot of patients that do more than must abortion care.

They provide contraception. Many women go there for just their preventative health services, and because of the way we look at abortion and contraceptive care here, we have Planned Parenthood clinics that can no longer take care of patients that receive state funding like Medicaid funding.

And I know that Ms. Collett, she mentioned that you have federally qualified health centers and urgent cares that can see these patients. The one thing about it is a lot of these centers are not looking at the patient populations that centers like Planned Parenthood are serving.

There is a lot of urgent cares in my area that will not see a patient on Medicaid. So if you have commercial insurance you can go. Or if you are paying cash you can go.

But those patients who are already financially underprivileged, they don't have the option to just go there and

- pay cash. And urgent cares, a lot of them don't take Medicaid.
- 3192 So the reality--what you are talking about is not the reality
- in real communities. And so this legislation is hurting real
- 3194 patients.
- 3195 Mr. <Ruiz.= Thank you.
- 3196 Dr. <Robinson.= Those patients who would previously be
- 3197 served by a Planned Parenthood location.
- 3198 Mr. <Ruiz. = Thank you for your work. A medical decision
- 3199 should be made on the basis of science and evidence, not on the
- 3200 basis of politics and ideology.
- 3201 That is why I support the Women's Health Protection Act and
- 3202 urge my colleagues to do so as well.
- 3203 Ms. <Eshoo. = I thank the gentleman. His time has expired.
- Mr. <Ruiz.= If I may, just to submit this for unanimous
- 3205 consent for the record.
- 3206 Ms. <Eshoo.= We have that for the record.
- 3207 Mr. <Ruiz.= Thank you.
- 3208 Ms. <Eshoo.= Thank you.
- The chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California, Ms.
- 3210 Barragan, for her five minutes of questions.
- 3211 Ms. <Barragan.= Thank you.
- 3212 I want to thank the panel for being here.
- Ms. Alvarado, I want to thank you for sharing your very
- 3214 personal story with us, for your testimony. That was just very

3215 moving. This issue is very personal.

I am the youngest of 11 kids, and when I was very young my sister--one of my sisters got pregnant at 15 and my other sister got pregnant at 16.

And my third sister also got pregnant at a very young age.

And two of my sisters, one at 15 and one at 16, made a very personal decision to give birth.

My third sister made a very personal decision that it wasn't time for her and she wasn't ready. And it was an important life decision that all three of my sisters made. And if I talk to them they will tell you how grateful they are to have the ability to make a choice.

And so you coming forward today and sharing your story is not easy, because when I have had this conversation with my sisters they have told me that it wasn't easy.

And so having you here today means a lot because I believe it is important that other women, regardless of age, but especially our young people, hear from people like you, and I just want to give you an opportunity if there is anything that you want to add based on your own personal experience or perspective to emphasize why it is important that we hear from people like you and people like my sisters. I talk about the issue of reproductive health care and the importance of having a choice.

Ms. <Alvarado.= Thank you so much for sharing as well.

If I could just address that my story of no regret and the story that Ms. Forney shared of regret they live in the same world.

They co-exist. And I am only sorry that those individuals that regret their abortion were not empowered to make the best choice for themselves.

And at the heart of that is choice. Of the women that do have an abortion, 95 percent of those women do not regret their abortion and I am part of that majority.

And I think that the only way moving forward is to trust and empower women by giving them access without restrictions.

Ms. <Barragan.= Right. Well, thank you.

I also, like Dr. Robinson, want to thank you for bringing up Planned Parenthood and clinics that are just so critically important, especially in communities like mine.

I represent a district in south Los Angeles that includes areas like Compton and Watts. There is only four districts that are poorer in California than my district, and when I was a child after seeing my three sisters go through what they went through, I decided that I would have to find a clinic much like a Planned Parenthood.

Back in those days, we looked through the Yellow Pages and I found a clinic and I will tell you I was afraid to tell anybody that I was even going to go seek advice on what options there

3263 were.

But I remember walking in and I remember being welcomed and being told--my first question was how much is this going to cost me. I didn't have a lot of money and I was told it was a sliding scale and I didn't have to pay.

But it was just so important as a young person to have that opportunity to go and get access to health care. People think oh, well, there's health care everywhere. You can go wherever you want.

But there is many people in low income communities and communities of color that don't have the access to health care, and access is something that we have been fighting for and it is not as easy as going to wherever you want, especially not when you are 14 or 15 and you just want to go get advice and get some guidance.

Dr. Robinson, we talked a lot today about how TRAP laws are medically unnecessary requirements imposed on abortion providers and women's health care centers.

Can you maybe elaborate a little bit on the hardships that low-income women must face in states that have the TRAP laws?

Dr. <Robinson.= Forcing women to continue a pregnancy that is just kind of a basic violation of a woman's basic humanity,

her rights, and her freedoms.

We know that when women can't access the health care that

3287	they need, be it an abortion or contraception, that it can further
3288	push them into poverty and there are studies that support that.
3289	It is not just our opinion as to the absolute fact. It is
3290	just really important for patients to be able to access the care
3291	that they need in a timely fashion and that women should be able
3292	to access the care they need in their community.
3293	Ms. <eshoo. =="" gentlewoman<="" td="" thank="" the="" you.=""></eshoo.>
3294	Dr. <robinson. =="" and="" are="" difficult<="" it="" laws="" making="" td="" these="" trap=""></robinson.>
3295	for them to do that.
3296	Ms. <eshoo. =="" gentlewoman's="" has<="" td="" thank="" the="" time="" you.=""></eshoo.>
3297	expired.
3298	I now recognize the gentlewoman from Delaware, Ms. Blunt
3299	Rochester, for her five minutes of questions.
3300	Ms. <blunt and<="" chairwoman,="" madam="" rochester.="Thank" td="" you,=""></blunt>
3301	thank you to all of the witnesses, to my colleagues, all of you
3302	who have shared your stories.
3303	This is a very personal conversation as well as public, and
3304	I was sitting her thinking I am a daughter. I am one of three
3305	sisters and I am a mother of a 31-year-old and also a
3306	mother-in-law. And it is surprising to me that in 2020 we are
3307	still having to fight for this right.
	Delia naving de ligne lei ente ligne.

conversation. I really appreciate it also hearing from the men

who spoke up and shared their perspectives.

3309

I come from a state, the state of Delaware, that has been a leader in protecting women's health and safety. In 2017, Delaware passed a law recognizing the constitutional right to abortion.

But instead of seeing more states across the country expand and affirm abortion care and access to comprehensive reproductive health services is being delayed and obstructed by harmful and medically unnecessary barriers.

Every American deserves the freedom to make personal decisions about their health and their future. I really appreciated what you said, Ms. Alvarado, about the fact that these stories are, you know, really two sides of the same story and that the piece that I think links them together is that choice.

We must pass the Women's Health Protection Act to safeguard abortion care and the ability for an individual to make personal decisions with fairness, safety, and respect.

And I know there was conversation about speaking for those who can't speak. But there were many women who came before us who had to go in back rooms and alleys and have things done to them that were unsafe and unhealthy, and they had to either live or perish with the consequences, which is why what we are talking about today here is so important.

I am glad we clarified some of the aspects of the bill and,
Dr. Robinson, I really appreciated your bravery as well and your

continued strength.

Earlier this month, an individual in Delaware defaced our Planned Parenthood with an explosive. Thankfully, no one was hurt. But the incident shows that there can be personal safety risks for physicians and staff who provide or speak out to protect access to abortion care.

So, again, I want to thank you for being here and really in the little bit of time I have I just want to ask you if you could talk about how Alabama's law has forced you to practice substandard care and what stigma has meant to your patients.

Dr. <Robinson.= Well, the law has forced me to practice substandard care and do things that I would not normally do in the sense that, like I said, sometimes I have patients that present to our clinic that if I had my choice they would be taken care of. Their abortions would be provided in a hospital setting.

This may be women who have, for example, like very low hematocrits. They have a history of any type of bleeding disorder where they are on blood thinners. We need to take them off that medication for a period of time to be able to perform their procedure.

If I could take care of them in the hospital we could reverse their blood thinners in the hospital setting and take care of them and then get them started on their medication again.

Patients who have a low hematocrit sometimes will be served

better by being taken care of in a hospital. When I say low hematocrit I mean a low blood count. Because there is a blood bank available in the hospital where is—where they can access the resources they need if that becomes necessary. I don't have that available to me in my clinic setting. But these women still need abortion care.

We have many women who have had multiple other abdominal procedures like multiple Cesarean sections. Our C-section rates are really high. And these women, when they present for abortion care, sometimes there is concern about the placenta being very adherent to the previous surgical scar.

These women sometimes would be served better by being taken care of in a hospital setting. But I don't have that choice. So I have to give them the very best care that I can in my clinic setting, and this is the only area of medicine where it is like a zero sum game. You can't have any mistakes or any mishaps. But sometimes these patients may suffer complications in an abortion clinic and need for me to call an ambulance for them. That does not mean that we didn't provide good care. It just means that I was forced to care for them in a setting that I didn't--

Ms. <Blunt Rochester.= Thank you, Dr. Robinson. My time has expired.

Ms. <Eshoo. = The gentlewoman's time has expired.

3383	I thank the gentlewoman.
3384	We will now hear from two members that are waiving onto our
3385	subcommittee today and I will call on and recognize the
3386	gentlewoman from New York, Ms. Clarke, for her five minutes of
3387	questions, followed by the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr.
3388	Duncan.
3389	Oh, we just had a Democrat. Mr. Duncan, you are recognized.
3390	The gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. Duncan, is recognized
3391	for five minutes for his questions.
3392	Welcome to the subcommittee.
3393	Mr. <duncan.= and="" chair,="" for<="" madam="" td="" thank="" thanks="" you,=""></duncan.=>
3394	allowing members to be waived on.
3395	I want to thank the ladies on the panel today for your
3396	stories. A lot of them are very, very touching, and I have five
3397	stories from the Carolina Pregnancy Center in South Carolina I
3398	would like to submit for the record.
3399	[The information follows:]
3400	
3401	*********COMMITTEE INSERT******

3402 Mr. <Duncan.= Thank you.

I am an author of the ultrasound bill. I believe that requiring a woman to look at an ultrasound could save the lives of many, many babies.

As a father of three sons, one of which was born very premature, I saw the ultrasounds of my boys. Saw the heartbeats, saw the little legs and arms kicking.

And I am an evangelical Christian, a sinner saved by grace, and I want to read some scripture because as a Protestant I have studied the Bible not nearly as much as I should.

But I do know that in Psalm 139 verse 13 it says this, speaking of God: For you form my inmost being. You knit me together in my mother's womb. Job 10:11, you clothed me with skin and flesh and knit me together with bones and sinews. Psalm 119:73, your hands have made me and fashioned me. Give me understanding to learn your commandments. Ecclesiastes 11:5, as you do not know the path of the wind or how the bones are formed in a mother's womb so you cannot understand the work of God, the maker of all things.

Isaiah 44:24, thus says the Lord, your redeemer who formed you from the whom I am the Lord who has made all things, who alone stretched out the heavens, who by myself spread out the earth. See in Genesis, God says let us make man in our own image and our likeness—after our likeness and let them have dominion over

the fish, of the sea, over the birds of the heavens, over the livestock and over all the earth and over every creeping thing that creeps on the earth. Genesis 1:26.

What that tells me is that as we are being stitched together in our mother's womb we are created in God's image and that God is in the womb as well.

And when that baby--that little boy or little girl has his life taken in the womb, God is in there present for that murder. Scripture says we are made in the image of God. Are we are made in the image of God while we are stitched together in our mother's womb or after we take that first breath of life? When does that happen?

To me, it happens at conception, because God knows me, know us as we are there. I guess I am here today to speak on behalf of the little boys and girls that are killed in the womb are those forceps are reached in and that back of the neck is pinched and brains are sucked out. Parts are pulled apart.

Somebody has got to speak for them. Those are human lives.

I am not going to sit here and say I understand what a woman goes through because I don't.

But I understand what a father goes through. I understand what a father goes through that had a premature son who was in an incubator and I couldn't get my hands on him to hold him and how my arms ached wanting to pick up my son and hold him, not

3450	knowing whether he was going to live or die, because at that point
3451	when you are in the neonatal intensive care unit you don't know.
3452	
3453	But I am not going to profess to know what the women feel.
3454	But the little boys and girls in the wombs they are feeling pain.
3455	We can kid ourselves that they are not. But they are human lives
3456	and they feel pain.
3457	Ms. Forney, I wasn't present for your story earlier but my
3458	staff told me, and I want to thank you for that. One quick
3459	question in 19 seconds.
3460	If a woman is required to look at an ultrasound do you think
3461	more lives would be saved?
3462	Ms. <forney.= absolutely.="" data="" out.<="" proves="" td="" that=""></forney.=>
3463	Mr. <duncan. =="" a="" an<="" at="" collett?="" has="" if="" look="" ms.="" td="" to="" woman=""></duncan.>
3464	ultrasound do you think more lives would be saved?
3465	Ms. <collett.= conclusive="" data="" i="" is="" not="" on="" td="" that<="" the="" think=""></collett.=>
3466	question. It depends on where the ultrasound is performed.
3467	Mr. <duncan. =="" all="" being="" for="" here.<="" td="" thank="" you=""></duncan.>
3468	Madam Chair, I thank you for being waived on.
3469	I yield back.
3470	Ms. <eshoo. =="" didn't<="" i="" like="" revisit="" something.="" td="" to="" would=""></eshoo.>
3471	catch what you said that you would like to place in the record.
3472	Can youwe will review it. Thank you very much, and thank you
2472	for deladar of the cubecommittee

for joining us at the subcommittee.

3474 We have the gentlewoman from New York, Ms. Clarke, is recognized for her five minutes of questions. 3475 Ms. <Clarke. = Let me thank you, Madam Chair, for giving 3476 3477 me the opportunity to waive on today. As vice chair of this committee, this is a very, very important subject matter that 3478 we must confront in the 21st century. 3479 3480 We have a constitutional law and at the end of the day we 3481 are still engaged in a debate that pulls at every one of us. 3482 Let me say that I am in full support of the Women's Health 3483 Protection Act. Full support. Full stock. 3484 The first Planned Parenthood facility was opened in my 3485 district--Brownsville, Brooklyn. That is right. And I believe 3486 The choice is whether you want to bring a life into in choice. 3487 this world and your circumstances support that, or the choice 3488 to have abortion care because your circumstances demand that. 3489 And when we get to the point where we are imposing upon our 3490 fellow Americans, women in particular, our preferences, we are 3491 going down a pathway that we should have evolved out of centuries 3492 ago. 3493 So let me thank you again, witnesses, for being here today. 3494 I want to talk to you about the provision of abortion care and

We know that abortion is a safe medical procedure and yet targeted regulations on abortion providers, often called TRAP

what state bans are really about.

3495

3496

3498	laws, make providing abortion care more difficult but not any
3499	safer.
3500	According to a 2018 report by the National Academies of
3501	Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, abortion is safer than
3502	childbirth, colonoscopies, certain dental procedures, plastic
3503	surgery, and tonsillectomies.
3504	Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to put this report into
3505	the record.
3506	[The information follows:]
3507	
3508	*********COMMITTEE INSERT******

Ms. <Clarke.= However, we have seen hundreds of state laws and restrictions that single out abortion care under the guise of safety that seemed more focused on making access to abortion care more difficult.

An American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists in a published committee opinion on the topic found that government restriction on abortion results in the, quote, "marginalization of abortion services for routine clinical care,' end quote, and are, quote, "harmful to women's health,' end quote.

The same national academy study found that the greatest threat to the safety and quality of abortion are unnecessary government restrictions.

So my question is to you, Dr. Robinson. Will you discuss the safety profile of abortion in relation to other routine medical procedures like colonoscopies, tonsillectomies, or plastic surgery?

Dr. <Robinson.= Abortion care is very safe. The risk of women having a bad outcome or having a complication with an abortion is less than 1 percent. According to the CDC it's less than the chances of having an adverse reaction to a penicillin shot.

So abortion is already very safe and these restrictions that are being placed do not make abortion any safer for women. It only blocks access to care.

3533	Ms. <clarke. =="" academies<="" agree="" do="" national="" th="" the="" with="" you=""></clarke.>
3534	report that found that state restrictions are more harmful to
3535	the quality and safety of abortion care than anything else?
3536	Dr. <robinson.= agree="" do="" i="" td="" that.<="" with=""></robinson.=>
3537	Ms. <clarke. =="" abortion<="" are="" of="" some="" td="" that="" the="" ways="" what=""></clarke.>
3538	restrictions threaten the quality and safety of the care that
3539	you are able to provide?
3540	Dr. <robinson.= pushthey<="" restrictions="" td="" these="" they="" well,=""></robinson.=>
3541	push a lot of women out of the medical system altogether where
3542	they are not able to reach a safe provider to counsel them and
3543	give them proper care.
3544	Some of them are having to access care by the best means
3545	that they know, which is sometimes just accessing the care through
3546	the internet.
3547	They would be served better sometimes by being able to have
3548	a provider locally in their area. It decreases the number of
3549	providers who are available to provide care for women so that
3550	means that some patients will never reach a facility when they
3551	do need it.
3552	Ms. <clarke. =="" a="" and="" have="" heard="" lot="" of<="" td="" very="" we="" well.=""></clarke.>
3553	conversation here today, some factual, some based on opinions.
3554	It is valuable to hear the perspectives of everyone here.
3555	But at the end of the day, part of the freedom of being an

American is self-determination, self meaning every human being

irrespective of gender, and I resent the fact that in the 21st century this next generation is being imposed upon. They have a choice. Ladies, young ladies, you have a choice and you have a right to exercise that choice.

With that, Madam Chair, I yield back.

Ms. <Eshoo. = I thank the gentlewoman. She yields back.

And let's see. We have one more member waiving on to the subcommittee and that is Ms. Schakowsky from Illinois, and I believe that will be the end of questions from members.

The gentlewoman is recognized.

Ms. <Schakowsky.= I also thank our chairman for allowing me to waive onto this subcommittee. It has been very, very meaningful.

I know that when I stepped out of the room Mr. Gianforte allowed Ms. Collett to make incorrect claims about the opinions of medical professionals on the importance of abortion access.

And I just wanted to read a little bit about the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, which is the nation's leading medical specialists for women's health and the authoritative body in the development of the standards of care for women and not part of the abortion industry.

And I am just wondering if Ms. Northup or Dr. Robinson, can you clarify maybe once and for all, probably not once and for all, what medical professionals have said about the legislation

3581 that we are talking about today?

Dr. Northup--Ms. Northup first.

Ms. <Northup.= Well, what I can say is about what medical professionals have said about the type of laws that the Women's Health Protection Act would address, which is that both ACOG, as we have talked about, and the American Medical Association have taken positions against many of these laws because they are not based on medicine and they are not based on good care of patients.

And I would also just point to the American Medical Association has a brief in the Supreme Court case, along with 13 other processionals, in which they are very clear when they talk about the admitting privileges law that the Supreme Court will look at, it is not medically necessary.

Abortion is a safe medical procedure and nationwide they say patients are being harmed by medically unnecessary restrictions on abortion clinicians.

The American Medical Association doesn't take a position on whether its members should or should not provide abortions.

But they take a position on these types of regulations that are not based on science and medicine.

Ms. <Schakowsky.= And Dr. Robinson, are you part of the abortion industry? Is there some such thing as the abortion industry that is pushing a skewed view of the health care that

200			
3605	√/O11	provi	45.5
J 0 0 J	y C G	$D \perp D \vee \perp$	ac.

Dr. <Robinson.= No. I am part of the American Medical Association, the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. I am a proud abortion provider and an obstetrician-gynecologist who cares very deeply for my patients.

Ms. <Schakowsky.= And I am assuming that you also provide prenatal care to women who want children and help facilitate that as well, right?

Dr. <Robinson.= Yes, I do.

Ms. <Schakowsky.= I also wanted to point out that in addition to--we have the, supporting this bill, the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, the American College of Nurse Midwives, and the Society for Maternal Fetal Medicine.

So, you know, again, I think this idea, and you had time to talk about this abortion industry, that what we are talking about and what we are trying to protect—look, I am a mother of three, a grandmother of six, and we embrace our children and we call this choice because you, Ms. Collett, and you, Ms. Forney, are free to organize around this issue, to promote the issue.

But we are talking about women having the opportunity to choose, not to prescribe one thing or another or to invite politicians into the room.

I think that is what is so offensive. Ms. Alvarado, can

3629	you just talk about that for a minute? Or less, 41 seconds.
3630	Ms. <alvarado.= absolutely.<="" td=""></alvarado.=>
3631	No, it is incredibly infuriating that so many women not only
3632	face these restrictions thatsimilar ones that I face but they
3633	face even greater restrictions in their home states.
3634	Abortion access is health care and women are capable with
3635	their partners and their doctors if they so choose to make the
3636	decision to access this health care.
3637	Ms. <schakowsky.= be="" frustrating="" i="" it="" know="" must="" some.<="" td="" to=""></schakowsky.=>
3638	This is a pro-choice House of Representatives and all of the
3639	polling suggests this is a pro-choice nation.
3640	And I yield back.
3640 3641	And I yield back. Ms. <eshoo.= back.<="" gentlewoman="" td="" the="" yields=""></eshoo.=>
3641	Ms. <eshoo. =="" back.<="" gentlewoman="" td="" the="" yields=""></eshoo.>
3641 3642	Ms. <eshoo. =="" back.="" colleague="" from="" gentlewoman="" has="" i="" joined="" our="" pennsylvania="" see="" td="" that="" the="" us.<="" yields=""></eshoo.>
3641 3642 3643	Ms. <eshoo.= back.="" colleague="" doyle="" from="" gentlewoman="" has="" i="" joined="" mr.="" of<="" on.="" our="" pennsylvania="" see="" subcommittee,="" td="" that="" the="" to="" us.="" waiving="" welcome="" yields=""></eshoo.=>
3641 3642 3643 3644	Ms. <eshoo.= and="" back.="" colleague="" doyle="" five="" for="" from="" gentlewoman="" has="" i="" is="" joined="" minutes="" mr.="" of="" on.="" our="" pennsylvania="" questions="" recognized="" see="" subcommittee,="" td="" that="" the="" to="" us.="" waiving="" welcome="" yields="" you<=""></eshoo.=>
3641 3642 3643 3644 3645	Ms. <eshoo.= and="" back.="" colleague="" doyle="" five="" for="" from="" gentlewoman="" has="" i="" is="" joined="" may="" minutes="" mr.="" of="" on.="" our="" pennsylvania="" proceed.<="" questions="" recognized="" see="" subcommittee,="" td="" that="" the="" to="" us.="" waiving="" welcome="" yields="" you=""></eshoo.=>
3641 3642 3643 3644 3645 3646	Ms. <eshoo.= <doyle.="Thank" and="" back.="" chair.<="" colleague="" doyle="" five="" for="" from="" gentlewoman="" has="" i="" is="" joined="" madam="" may="" minutes="" mr.="" much,="" of="" on.="" our="" pennsylvania="" proceed.="" questions="" recognized="" see="" subcommittee,="" td="" that="" the="" to="" us.="" very="" waiving="" welcome="" yields="" you=""></eshoo.=>
3641 3642 3643 3644 3645 3646 3647	Ms. <eshoo.= <doyle.="Thank" all="" all,="" and="" back.="" chair.="" colleague="" doyle="" first="" five="" for="" from="" gentlewoman="" has="" i="" is="" joined="" madam="" may="" minutes="" mr.="" much,="" of="" on.="" our="" pennsylvania="" proceed.="" questions="" recognized="" say="" see="" subcommittee,="" td="" thank="" that="" the="" to="" us.="" very="" waiving="" want="" welcome="" witnesses<="" yields="" you=""></eshoo.=>

story is one that I really hope has resonated with my colleagues

on both sides of the aisle and I hope has made everyone on this

3651

committee think about our own history, our hopes and plans for our families and, most importantly, how we treat our neighbors.

I, for one, am a co-sponsor of the Women's Health Protection Act because I believe that we need to treat our neighbors, women across America, with basic respect that allows them to make the best health care decision that is best for themselves and their families without interference of the state or federal lawmakers.

So with that said, I know that I am the last person to speak here today and you have all answered a lot of questions. I would just like to start by asking both Dr. Robinson and Ms. Northup, are there any false or misleading claims that you have heard here today that you would like a few minutes to clean up or correct the record on?

Anything you would like to add? I want to give you some time if there is.

Dr. <Robinson.= Yes. One, the implication that women, when they come in to have an abortion procedure, that these women that they may need additional time. I am the physician. I have the opportunity to establish a rapport with my patients.

I have the insight to know these women who may additional time and these patients, after we counsel them, even though we have a mandatory 48-hour waiting period, there have been times when I have talked to a patient and have told her that perhaps she needs to go and take a little bit more time and come back.

I don't need the state to put that restriction in place for me.

I am already doing that for my patient.

So every woman that comes through the door for an abortion doesn't necessarily leave with an abortion. Sometimes they are really just coming because they need someone to talk to and we are doing that already in our center and we are doing it well.

Mr. <Doyle.= Thank you.

Ms. Northup, do you want to add anything?

Ms. <Northup.= Yes, just to correct what has been said about the breadth of this statute. The statute is very targeted to aim at being able to provide abortion care and get abortion care free from medically unnecessary limitations.

So this is only about those directed abortion providers that are not medically necessary, and we have heard a lot about it will overturn the Hyde Amendment. That is not the case. That you will be forced to provide abortions. That is not the case. That it will change the standard of viability from Roe. That is not the case.

It is directed at—this reason that in the 21st century we are still arguing about this is that these laws are unfair attempts to close clinics, deprive women of access, and they make it unfair across the nation so that your zip code is driving whether you can access services. That is the target of this law. It is right for this moment and urge again for the committee to recommend

- 3701 its getting a floor vote.
- 3702 Mr. <Doyle.= Thank you.
- 3703 And finally, Ms. Alvarado, is there anything you would like
- 3704 to add?
- 3705 Ms. <Alvarado.= Thank you so much.
- I share my story here today because these restrictions don't just live in a vacuum. I am a testament to these restrictions
- and how they affected my life.
- And I am only grateful that I had been empowered to make
 the best decision for myself and I am grateful to that 22-year-old
 who had the fortitude to not only face those obstacles but pass
 them to make the best decision for herself.
- 3713 Thank you so much.
- 3714 Mr. <Doyle.= Thank you for being here today and I want to thank the witnesses.
- 3716 Madam Chair, thank you so much for your indulgence, and I 3717 yield back.
- 3718 Ms. <Eshoo.= The gentleman yields back and I thank you for coming. You are always welcome at this subcommittee.
- I now would like to once again thank all of our witnesses.

 Dr. Robinson, you have done an extraordinary job. I am sorry

 I had to cut you off. But I am generally very generous with time

 and go over, much to frustration of members on both sides of the

 aisle, because every word really counts and witnesses come here

really loaded with very important information but know that it's--I am trying to adhere to the rules of the committee.

Ms. Forney, thank you for coming and testifying. Ms. Collett, thank you. Ms. Northup, 17 years plus lawyering, and to Ms. Alvarado, you have heard the expressions I think from--I believe from both sides of the aisle thanking you for your service to our country and for--I always say it takes courage to have courage. Thank you for yours.

So I would like to know submit the following statements for the record. What Mr. Duncan requested be placed in the record will be. Mr. Bilirakis's request will also be placed in the record, and I am requesting unanimous consent to enter the following documents into the record. It's a very long list.

A letter from Dr. Steve Weinberger, executive vice president and CEO emeritus of the American College of Physicians, Dr.

Barbara Levy, clinical professor of obstetrics and gynecology at George Washington University, and Debra Ness, president of the National Partnership for Women and Families, a letter from the Reproductive Justice Community in support of the Women's Health Protection Act, a statement from the Guttmacher Institute in support of the Women's Health Protection Act, a 2018 report from the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine entitled "Safety and Quality of Abortion Care in the United States.'"

A report from the National Bureau of Economic Research entitled, "The Economic Consequences of Being Denied an Abortion.'' A 2018 article from the American Journal of Public Health entitled, "Socioeconomic Outcomes of Women Who Receive and Women Who are Denied Wanted Abortions in the United States.''

A 2017 article from the Journal of the American Medical Association entitled, "Women's Mental Health and Well-Being Five Years After Receiving or Being Denied an Abortion.'' A 2018 article from the Journal of Medical Internet Research entitled, "Identifying National Availability of Abortion Care in Distance from Major U.S. Cities'' systemic online search.

A report from the Center for Reproductive Rights entitled,
"Roe and Intersectional Liberty Doctrine: The Supreme Court
Amicus Brief of 11 Story Tellers'' filed in the Supreme Court
case June Medical Services v. G.

A 2017 report from the Center for Reproductive Rights entitled, "Evaluating Priorities: Measuring Women's and Children's Health and Well-Being against Abortion Restrictions in the States.''

A 2019 report from the Center for Reproductive Rights entitled, "What if Roe Fell?'' A statement from the ACLU in support of the Women's Health Protection Act. A statement from various LGBTQ groups in support of the Women's Health Protection Act. A statement from the Hope Clinic for Women in support of

3773 the Women's Health Protection Act.

Testimony from the National Council of Jewish Women in support of the Women's Health Protection Act. A statement from the National Family Planning and Reproductive Health Association in support of the Women's Health Protection Act.

A statement from Platform in support of the Women's Health Protection Act. A statement from various reproductive justice groups in support of the Women's Health Protection Act.

A letter from various independent abortion care providers in support of the Women's Health Protection Act. A letter from 53 faith-based religious and civil rights organizations in support of the Women's Health Protection Act.

A statement from Representatives Chu, Frankel, and Fudge in support of the Women's Health Protection Act. A statement from Kristen Clarke, president and executive director of the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights under the Law in support of the Women's Health Protection Act.

A statement from Toni Van Pelt, president of the National Organization for Women in support of the Women's Health Protection Act.

A letter from MomsRising in support of the Women's Health Protection Act. Testimony from Martin H. Wolf, director of Sustainability and Authenticity for Seventh Generation, Inc., in support of the Women's Health Protection Act.

A letter from 14 state attorneys general and the attorney general from the District of Columbia in support of the Women's Health Protection Act.

A letter from the Freedom from Religion Foundation in support of the Women's Health Protection Act. A letter from the Women of Reformed Judaism and the Religious Action Center of Reformed Judaism in support of the Women's Health Protection Act.

A letter from the Planned Parenthood Federation of America and the Planned Parenthood Action Fund in support of the Women's Health Protection Act.

Testimony from the National Network of Abortion Funds in support of the Women's Health Protection Act. A letter from S. Nadia Hussain, Maternal Justice Campaign director for MomsRising in support of the Women's Health protection Act.

A letter from Vanita Gupta, president and CEO of the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights in support of the Women's Health Protection Act.

A letter from Catholics for Choice in support of the Women's Health Protection Act. A letter from NARAL, Pro-Choice America in support of the Women's Health Protection Act.

Testimony from Lela Abolfazli, director of Federal Reproductive Rights at the National Women's Law Center in support of the Women's Health Protection Act.

A statement from the American College of Obstetricians and

Gynecologists in support of the Women's Health Protection Act.

A 2019 article from the Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology entitled, "Consensus Guidelines for Facilities Performing

Outpatient Procedures: Evidence Over Ideology.''

A letter from five law professors in support of the Women's Health Protection Act. A compilation of 114 abortion stories—I believe I mentioned this right off the top—submitted by Representative Bilirakis. An abortion story from Elizabeth Gillette. An abortion story from Pam Thompson. An abortion story from Terry Fordone. A press release from the Susan B. Anthony list dated February 12th, 2020. A letter from March for Life Action opposing the Women's Health Protection Act. A statement from Americans United for Life opposing the Women's Health Protection Act. The Supreme Court amicus brief of Priests for Life and Rachel's Vineyard followed in the Supreme Court case June Medical Services v. G. An article by Thomas M. Messner, J.D., entitled "The Women's Health Protection Act of 2019: Ten Things You Need to Know About H.R. 2917.''

3839 So without objection, so ordered.

[The information follows:]

3843	Ms. <eshoo.= ahead.="" and="" are="" go="" recognized.<="" th="" you=""></eshoo.=>
3844	Mr. <burgess.= a<="" also="" but="" covered="" have="" most="" of="" td="" them="" you=""></burgess.=>
3845	unanimous consent request to add a legal analysis by the Charlotte
3846	Lozier Institute and just to be certain on the Susan B. Anthony
3847	list press release entitled "House Democrats Hold Hearing
3848	Promoting Abortion on Demand.''
3849	Ms. <eshoo.= ordered.<="" so="" td=""></eshoo.=>
3850	[The information follows:]
3851	
3852	**************************************

Ms. <Eshoo. = So I would like to remind members, there are all of what, three of us left here—that pursuant to committee rules we each have 10 business days to submit additional questions for the record—I certainly plan to do so—to be answered by the witnesses or witness who has appeared and I ask that each one of the witnesses respond promptly to any questions that are submitted to you by—that you may receive from a member or more than one member.

So thank you again to each one of you. We have not taken a break. You have been at the table as long as I have for almost--let's see, almost four hours. And thank you to everyone that is in attendance here today.

I think everyone has really comported themselves with a great deal of dignity, with professionalism, and as chair of the subcommittee I wanted to recognize all of you for doing that and thanking you.

With that, the subcommittee is adjourned.

Whereupon, at 1:44 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]