```
1
        NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.
 2
        RPTS MICHON
        HIF111040
 3
 4
 5
        THE PRICING OF FETAL TISSUE
        Wednesday, April 20, 2016
 6
        House of Representatives
 7
        Select Investigative Panel
 8
 9
        Committee on Energy and Commerce
10
        Washington, D.C.
11
12
13
             The panel met, pursuant to call, at 10:00 a.m., in Room
        HVC-210 House Visitors Center, Hon. Marsha Blackburn [chairwoman
14
15
        of the panel] presiding.
16
             Members present: Representatives Blackburn, Pitts, Black,
17
        Bucshon, Duffy, Harris, Hartzler, Love, Schakowsky, Nadler,
18
        DeGette, Speier, DelBene, and Watson Colman.
19
             Staff present: Mike Bloomquist, Deputy Staff Director; Karen
20
        Christian, General Counsel; Jay Gulshen, Staff Assistant; Peter
21
        Kielty, Deputy General Counsel; Graham Pittman, Legislative
        Clerk; Heidi Stirrup, Health Policy Coordinator; Jean Woodrow,
22
23
        Director, Information Technoglogy; March Bell, Minority Staff
```

Director; Rachel Collins, Minority Investigative Counsel and
Clerk; Chuck Flint, Minority Legislative Director (Congressman
Blackburn); Mary Harned, Minority Investigative Counsel; Pierre
Kamga, Minority Detailee - GAO; Mike Reynard, Minority
Communications Director; Frank Scaturro, Minority Special
Counsel; and Matthew Tallmer, Minority Investigator.

1 Mrs. Blackburn. The Select Investigative Panel will come 2 to order. And before we begin, I would like to take a moment to 3 address the guests who are in our audience today.

First of all, we thank each of you for taking the time to come. We think that engaged citizens are a welcome and valuable part of the political process. I only wish every hearing drew the amount of interest that this hearing has drawn.

For the purpose of this hearing, we are going to be examining the pricing of fetal tissue. It is an opportunity for the Select Investigative Panel to ask questions and have a thoughtful discussion. The number of people in the audience this morning demonstrates the strong interest in the topic and we welcome you.

I do want to remind our guests in the audience that the chair is obligated under the rules of the House and the rules of the committee to maintain order and preserve decorum in the committee room. And I know that we all have deep feelings on the issue, but we appreciate the audience's cooperation in maintaining order as we have a full discussion that we would like to have this morning on this important issue.

I also want to welcome each of our witnesses who are here today. And at this time, I am going to yield myself 10 minutes for an opening statement.

Ms. Black. Madam Chair?

1 Mrs. Blackburn. The gentlelady is recognized.

Ms. Black. Thank you, Madam Chair. Regretfully, I need to bring up an issue regarding to the packet of materials, the so-called exhibits, that was provided to your staff yesterday before the opening statements. And the reason is because we have just received your opening statement, which was released to the press.

I just saw it for the first time, and in your opening statement you make extensive reference to this package of so-called exhibits. And so before you make your opening statements, maybe we can resolve the issues. Otherwise, we are going to even have to object to the documents referenced in your opening statement.

And if I may, Madam Chair, I will go over what our issues are with those so-called exhibits. Your staff told us that you and other Republican members intended to use these materials to question witnesses today, and it is my understanding that these documents have been given to the witnesses. In fact, several of the witnesses mentioned the documents in their written statements.

Now, I reviewed the documents yesterday. Some of them were created wholesale by Republican staff. There was no explanation of the underlying factual foundation for those materials, the

methodology that was used in coming up with these charts, or some of the graphs that we had and, frankly, I believe them to be misleading and, moreover, the conclusions that are drawn and, frankly, stated as fact in the staff-created annotated index are false.

There were other documents that were sourced to a "procurement business" which also have nothing to do with the topic of this hearing, although they were presented as if they did. They don't distinguish between the various services of the company, which provides a variety of different specimens, including adult blood and bone marrow for use in biomedical research.

Now, just to add to this, Madam Chair, yesterday the company who we believe these so-called exhibits came from, StemExpress, sent a letter to you and a copy to us about the serious, serious problems with these so-called exhibits. I would ask unanimous consent to put that into the record.

But I guess my point is, I am concerned because the so-called exhibits, I don't think they are really designed to find the facts about fetal tissue research. If they were, we would have called StemExpress in, or we would have taken depositions. And I don't believe that they are germane as required by Rule 16, Clause 7 of the House, because they don't reflect credibility or -- but,

1 instead, they cast dishonor on the House. But, you know, in addition, I just may, because we just got 2 these exhibits yesterday and then we got the letter from 3 StemExpress, it has really -- it also raises troubling questions 4 5 about where this material came from. If you look at StemExpress' 6 letter -- and I hope you have read it, Madam Chair, what it says 7 is that -- what StemExpress is saying is they believe that the Panel may have received material directly from Mr. David Daleiden 8 9 that have not been authenticated and that were obtained by Mr. 10 Daleiden unlawfully. This is part of the whole issue of the investigation in Texas, 11 12 and some of these even may have been created by Mr. Daleiden 13 himself. And what the company did was they asked that we withdraw these documents until the general counsel of the House of 14 15 Representatives, Kerry W. Kircher, has an opportunity to review 16 them and approve their list. 17 And so, Madam Chair, given the concerns about the factual 18 foundations of these exhibits, and also given the further concern 19 about how they were created, what they are saying, I would just ask if we could withdraw these exhibits until these things are 20 figured out. 21 22 Mrs. Blackburn. I thank the gentlelady for her inquiry.

Yes, we were in receipt of the letter. I don't know anything about

23

the attorney or how truthful their letter is. We do intend and 1 will accept -- I accept your request, and we will UC that letter 2 into the record for the hearing today. 3 The documents, let me speak to that for a moment. 4 5 documents have all been obtained through our regular investigatory work. We have had things that have come to us from 6 7 whistleblowers, from subpoenas from former employees, citizens that have filed FOIA requests, the Panel's whistleblower portal, 8 9 as I said, and also an internet search archive search engine. And 10 that is the way these documents have come to us. So the documents that we are going to use for the hearing, 11 12 or the documents that we intend to use for the hearing, we will, accepting UC the letter into the record. And when --13 14 Ms. Black. But, Madam Chair, may I make a farther 15 parliamentary --16 Mrs. Blackburn. Parliamentary inquiry. Go ahead. 17 Ms. Black. Madam Chair, you had just stated that all of the 18 documents that formed the basis of these exhibits were received 19 from a variety of sources by the committee, including whistleblowers. Have all of those documents and their sources 20 been provided to the minority staff of this committee? 21 22 Mrs. Blackburn. We have provided documents to the minority 23 staff.

1 Ms. Black. Have you provided all of the documents, Madam Chair, that you refer to that were used as the foundation for these 2 exhibits? 3 Mrs. Blackburn. I think all of those documents have been 4 5 provided to you, and then you all leaked -- you have staff that leaked the documents to one of the entities. 6 7 Ms. Black. Okay. So they have all been -- okay. Madam Chair, I would ask a further parliamentary inquiry then. Before 8 9 we continue then, might I be asked to inquire of the appropriate staff member of the foundational basis for these exhibits, 10 particularly Exhibit B1, B2, some of those there is a chart, 11 12 Exhibit B4, which you intend to use. 13 There is an Exhibit B6, an excerpt of a draft contract between 14 the PB and abortion trade association, which appears to have been 15 created by staff. I would like to be able to ask the staff how 16 these documents were created and what --17 Mrs. Blackburn. What do you mean by "foundational basis"? 18 Ms. Black. Well, for example, Madam Chair, if you take a 19 look at Exhibit B1, so Exhibit B1, Madam Chair, appears to be a 20 chart, and it has three boxes -- abortion clinic, procurement business, researcher, and between the three boxes there are dollar 21 22 signs and arrows going back and forth, there are questions, and 23 so on.

I don't know what information this is based on. I don't know -- I would like to know how this was created. Or if you look at Exhibit B2, for example, Exhibit B2 is some document. It doesn't say where it is from. It appears to have been taken from some website, but this is one of the documents that StemExpress is saying that they think might have been taken from -- not from their company but from someplace else and not talking about fetal tissue. But I don't know where that comes from.

The exhibit is not identified where it comes from, but I suspect that the witnesses today and the majority intend to somehow try to use this to talk about the so-called sale of fetal tissue.

Exhibit 3 is just, again, something taken off a website. We don't know the source of that. Exhibit 4 appears to be a bar graph, and what it says is procurement business clinic growth strategy, number of partnerships with abortion clinics, then it has got a bar graph.

Then Exhibit 5, B5, procurement business revenue growth, then it has got another bar graph, but we don't know who made those bar charts, and we don't know where that information came from. So if you or the witnesses are relying on this, this is being presented as if it is a fact, but in fact it is not.

And then B6, this is one that particularly disturbs me. It

```
1
        says in parentheses "excerpt of a draft contract between the PB
 2
        and the abortion" --
 3
             Mrs. Blackburn. If the gentlelady will yield?
             Ms. Black. Sure.
 4
 5
             Mrs. Blackburn. Okay. The B1 graph that you are
        referencing was created by staff for discussion purposes. It is
 6
        created by material that has been submitted to us, to the
 7
        committee. And so the document B1 exhibit that you are going to
 8
 9
        is something, again, that was submitted to us, and B4 is something
        created by staff from material that has been submitted.
10
11
             Now, does the gentlelady have a motion?
12
             Ms. Black. Yes. Just to finish my statement, Madam Chair,
13
        that is my concern. I would like to be able to question the staff
        member who created all of these documents. I assume --
14
15
             Mrs. Blackburn. They are created for discussion, and if you
16
        would like to include in your questioning in your time discussion
17
        about that that is fine.
18
             Ms. Black. Well, Madam Chair, I think that these exhibits
19
        were created from whole cloth. And if you won't let me find out
20
        what the basis for these are, then I object to the use of any --
21
             Mrs. Blackburn. I would --
22
             Ms. Black. -- of these exhibits --
23
             Mrs. Blackburn. I would --
```

1 Ms. Black. -- and I --2 Mrs. Blackburn. -- the gentlelady that information has been submitted to us. 3 Ms. Black. And I would make a point of order that these 4 5 materials are against Rule 16, Clause 7 of the House, and I would ask for their exclusion. 6 7 Mr. Duffy. Madam Chair, I move to table the point of order. Mrs. Blackburn. The gentlelady's motion has been --8 9 Ms. Black. Madam Chair, I appeal the ruling of the chair. 10 Mrs. Blackburn. The gentlelady's motion has been made, and the motion is tabled. 11 12 Ms. Black. Madam Chair, I appeal the ruling of the chair. 13 That was the motion I just made, Madam Chair. 14 Mrs. Blackburn. You made the motion to exclude. 15 Ms. Black. No. And then he moved --16 Mrs. Blackburn. The motion to --17 Ms. Black. -- to table it, and then I moved to appeal, and 18 then you ruled -- you moved to table it, and I moved to appeal 19 it. 20 Mrs. Blackburn. We will rule on the motion to table first. 21 Ms. Black. Yes. 22 Mrs. Blackburn. Okay. And the motion is tabled. 23 Ms. Black. I appeal the ruling of the chair.

```
1
             Mrs. Blackburn. And the appeal --
 2
             Ms. Black. And I ask for a recorded vote.
 3
             Mrs. Blackburn. And the appeal is denied. We will have the
        clerk call the roll on the -- for the recorded vote on the motion
 4
 5
        to appeal.
 6
             The Clerk. Mr. Pitts?
 7
             Mr. Pitts.
                         Yes.
             The Clerk. Mr. Pitts says aye.
 8
 9
             Ms. Black?
10
             Ms. Black.
                         Yes.
11
             The Clerk. Mr. Pitts says aye. Ms. Black says aye.
12
             Mr. Bucshon?
13
             Mr. Bucshon. Yes.
14
             The Clerk. Mr. Bucshon says aye.
15
             Mr. Duffy?
16
             Mr. Duffy. Aye.
17
             The Clerk. Mr. Duffy says aye.
18
             Mr. Harris?
19
             Mr. Harris. Aye.
20
             The Clerk. Mr. Harris says aye.
21
             Mrs. Hartzler?
22
             Mrs. Hartzler. Aye.
23
             The Clerk. Mrs. Hartzler says aye.
```

```
1
             Mrs. Love?
 2
             Mrs. Love. Aye.
 3
             The Clerk. Mrs. Love says aye.
 4
             Ms. Schakowsky?
 5
             Ms. Schakowsky.
                             No.
 6
             The Clerk. Ms. Schakowsky says nay.
 7
             Mr. Nadler?
 8
             [No response.]
 9
             Ms. DeGette?
10
             Ms. DeGette. No.
11
             The Clerk. Ms. DeGette says nay.
12
             Ms. Speier?
13
             Ms. Speier. No.
14
             The Clerk. Ms. Speier says nay.
15
             Ms. DelBene?
16
             Ms. DelBene. No.
17
             The Clerk. Ms. DelBene says nay.
18
             Mrs. Watson Colman?
19
             Mrs. Watson Colman.
                                  No.
20
             The Clerk. Ms. Watson Colman says nay.
21
             Madam Chair?
22
             Mrs. Blackburn. Aye.
23
             The Clerk. Madam Chair says aye.
```

1 Mrs. Blackburn. The clerk will report the tally. The Clerk. Chairman Blackburn, on the vote there were 8 ayes 2 3 and 5 nays. Mrs. Blackburn. The motion to exclude is tabled. 4 5 At this time, I will begin the opening statement, and we will then move to our first panel of witnesses who have come to --6 7 Ms. Schakowsky. Madam Chair, may I? I really want to ask at this point that your words be taken down regarding the assertion 8 9 that staff "leaked documents to the entity," actually to 10 StemExpress. These documents had already been given to witnesses and the press, and then were posted to your website. And so I 11 12 think your words need to be taken down. Accusing our staff of 13 leaking that is not true, and those words should be taken down. 14 Mr. Duffy. Madam Chair? 15 Mrs. Blackburn. Ms. Schakowsky, the staff had asked for the 16 They were shared -- this was shared before they went 17 to the website, and then they were released to the entity. And 18 in order to take the comments down, the comments have to be 19 personal in nature. 20 So with that, let's begin with our opening statements, and then we will receive our first panel of witnesses. 21 As I was beginning earlier, I want to welcome all of our 22 witnesses who are here today. I am going to introduce each of 23

you later as we move forward with our testimony on the pricing
of fetal tissue.

As part of my opening statement, I will present a narrative about the exhibits that today's hearing will discuss. I have said many times my hope is that both parties can work together on some things, and today's subject matter should be an opportunity to do so for a couple of reasons. First, at our initial hearing on bioethics and fetal tissue, all witnesses from both sides agreed that no one should profit from the sale of baby body parts. Nobody.

Second, the Democrats overwhelming supported a prohibition on profiting from fetal tissue sales during the 1993 passage of the National Institutes of Health Revitalization Act. Former Congressman Dingell passed this legislation out of the Energy and Commerce Committee, and former Congressman Henry Waxman amended the NIH bill on the floor to make clear that profiting from the sale of baby body parts was a crime.

Folks, these two Democrat leaders took the offense so seriously that they made profiting from the sale of fetal tissue punishable by a 10-year felony. They understood that unborn children do indeed have constitutional rights.

Now, there has been a lot of heated debate about the horrible videos that came out last year, but today's hearing will present

business documents, invoices, marketing brochures, and management documents that reveal that one for-profit procurement business and several abortion clinics may have violated the intent of the statute. And the Waxman prohibition passed overwhelmingly by a Democrat-controlled House.

We have invited former U.S. attorneys and others to help us understand this conduct in light of the existing statute. We look forward to working through this material in a thoughtful way, and I ask my colleagues on the other side to join in a productive discussion about the statute that your side passed.

Before I turn to introducing the documents, I want to call your attention to five posters that will help to visually follow the discussion. The first chart presents three entities involved in the business of selling the body parts. That chart depicts that the middleman, the procurement business, pays the abortion clinic for fetal tissue and is then paid by the researcher or the customer.

The second chart is a website screen grab from the procurement business of how to buy baby body parts online. Now, there is a new website, and the baby body parts procurement business has been spun off to a new entity. That chart shows the dropdown box for every part imaginable -- heart, eyes, scalp, liver, hands. Then you click on the next box and you pick the

gestation period. Then you click and proceed to checkout to select your form of shipping. The third chart shows the daily tasks performed by the procurement business employee inside the abortion clinic.

Once the order is communicated, the procurement tech starts her work checking gestation periods, getting consent, procuring tissue, and sending to the customer. These are clear HIPAA violations. Our Democratic colleagues have voiced concerns over privacy throughout the investigation.

I would hope, at a minimum, they will join us in condemning obvious violations of HIPAA, which was signed into law by President Clinton on August 21, 1996. The fourth chart summarizes several sample actual payments from the procurement business to the abortion clinic and from the customer to the procurement business. These are just samples for discussion today. They do not present the entire financial picture. And the fifth chart shows who bears the responsibility for the reasonable cost involved in the procurement and sale.

Next, I want to walk the witnesses through the exhibits. I know that all the lawyers in the room like to focus on every detail, and that is why you are here. But it is also important to understand the big picture of what the procurement business was trying to do, especially in light of the Waxman prohibitions

1 against profiting from the sale of baby parts in the '93 NIH 2 Revitalization Act. Please turn to the B exhibits beginning with B2. This is 3 the procurement company brochure that is handed out at national 4 5 conferences where abortion clinic managers were in attendance. 6 Notice it says financially profitable, fiscally rewards, financial benefit to your clinic. 7 Look at Exhibit B3, which is a website screen grab of the 8 9 procurement business, once again, financially profitable, while 10 also providing a financial benefit to your own clinic. 11 Evidently, the procurement business is not familiar with the 12 Waxman prohibition. 13 Now, turn the page and look at Exhibits B4 and 5. The procurement business started in 2010 with three clinics. 14 15 years, it was up to 30, and in two more years it had nearly 100. 16 Further, they were negotiating a contract to have over 250 clinics 17 by this year, but the co-marketing negotiations with the national 18 abortion trade organization fell apart just about the time the 19 videos came out last year.

Now, you do not have to be a lawyer to see what is going on here. You put up a website that offers the parts imaginable, and why on earth would anybody ever need a baby scalp? Then you pick the gestation period and you check out. To offer that service

20

21

22

23

```
you need abortion clinics, a lot of abortion clinics. So you grow
 1
 2
        your number of clinics, and you offer the clinics money to sign
        up. You offer them financial benefit to join.
 3
             You tell the clinic that you will do all of the work, all
 4
 5
        of the items on the chart that show the workflow of the procurement
                     This does not sound to me like tissue donations for
 6
        technician.
 7
        research. This sounds like someone who wants to make money, a
 8
        lot of money, selling the baby body parts.
 9
             So I thank our witnesses for their generous time today. I
        welcome them. And at this time, I yield 10 minutes to Ms.
10
11
        Schakowsky.
12
             [The prepared statement of Mrs. Blackburn follows:]
13
        *********INSERT 1******
14
```

Ms. Schakowsky. From the outset, this investigation has not been an objective or fact-based search for the truth, but a political weapon to attack women's health care and lifesaving research and harass and intimidate those who provide these services. This was clear during our first hearing where one of the witnesses invited by the Republicans drew a comparison between researchers who use fetal tissue and Nazi war criminal Dr. Josef Mengele, a comparison echoed by Chair Blackburn in her opening statement.

Another Republican witness testified that women who have abortions are "morally disqualified" from choosing to donate tissue for research purposes. For today's hearing, Republicans have again invited witnesses who believe that abortion should be illegal, that women should not be permitted or trusted to decide whether to carry a pregnancy to term. Some continue to decline that Planned Parenthood is selling fetal tissue, as you just heard, for profit, despite the fact that three House committees, 12 states, and a Texas grand jury have already cleared the organization of wrongdoing.

These witnesses, like our Republican colleagues, endorse and rely upon the video allegations of anti-abortion extremists,

David Daleiden, and his associates to support their inflammatory claims. Anyone who has been following the facts knows the truth.

Mr. Daleiden's videos are not accurate or reliable, and they do not show the unlawful sale of fetal tissue, and we will argue today that the so-called exhibits do not make that case either.

A grand jury in Texas already put Mr. Daleiden to the test under oath and he failed. That grand jury, instructed by the Republican Lieutenant Governor to investigate Planned Parenthood, instead indicted Daleiden for breaking the law through his efforts to entrap Planned Parenthood.

The district attorney handling the case refused to represent it to another grand jury, explaining that "we must go where the evidence leads us." And then she explained, and I quote, "Anyone who pays attention knows that I am pro-life. I believe abortion is wrong, but my personal belief does not relieve me of my obligation to follow the law." That standard should apply with equal force here.

There is no reason to believe that Daleiden, a proven liar when it comes to Planned Parenthood, would be any more truthful about anyone else involved in reproductive health care or fetal tissue research, yet instead of correcting the record on the Daleiden videos, the chair continues to invoke them.

Today my Republican colleagues likely will claim that it is not just the videos, actually. She has claimed -- the chair has already claimed that. They may assert that documents that this

Panel has received or that Republican staff have created show the need for further investigation, and this is also false.

Sixteen years ago, the Subcommittee on Health and

Environment of the House Commerce Committee considered similar

materials -- 16 years ago -- that hearing titled "Fetal Tissue:

Is it Being Sold in Violation of Federal Law?" featured a "fee

for service schedule" showing amounts charged for types of tissue,

"transaction logs," with charges for tissue on particular dates

and agreements between providers and procurement organizations.

And that hearing also featured an employee, Dean Alberti, who had worked at two tissue procurement organizations. The anti-abortion group "Life Dynamics" had filmed and released a video interview where -- is it Alberti? Alberti claimed to have witnessed fetuses "born alive," doctors changing procedures for donation purposes, and unlawful payment for fetal tissue, exactly the types of claims made in the Daleiden video.

In statements under oath, however, Alberti contradicted his inflammatory claims and admitted during the 2000 hearing that his sworn statements, not the remarks on the heavily edited video made by anti-abortion extremists, were the truth. The Department of Justice also investigated the allegations of unlawful profiteering that was at the heart of that hearing and concluded that no laws had been broken.

No one believes that companies should be allowed to profit by selling fetal tissue, and we firmly support the prohibition.

However, just as it does for adult organ donation, the law expressly allows reimbursement for cost. In fact, 42 U.S.C.

289g, the provision that we are focusing on today, is modeled on the National Organ Transplant Act, which similarly prohibits

"valuable consideration" but allows reimbursement for costs associated with organ donations which can be considerable.

Allegations regarding possible unlawful profit from adult organ transplantation would not result in a call to ban all organ donations, yet Republican lawmakers in the House want to ban fetal tissue donation and research altogether, something that some states have already done. Florida, for example, recently enacted a sweeping bill attacking women's health care and banning the donation of fetal tissue.

This is tragic for women and families on the Gulf Coast as summer approaches and researchers race to understand and solve the Zika Virus. Despite Chair Blackburn's claim that Democrats are exaggerating, she says, its importance, key studies have relied heavily on fetal tissue to increase our understanding of the Zika Virus.

These bans have been proposed despite the fact that there still is no evidence of wrongdoing related to fetal tissue

donation. Instead, the documents received by this Panel actually show that health care providers are losing money through programs that allow women to donate fetal tissue for research purposes.

This was not what Congress intended when it voted on a bipartisan basis to allow reimbursement of costs. It is absurd that even when they are losing money, providers are still attacked by those who appear to be motivated by their opposition to abortion, not the actual facts regarding fetal tissue donation. This Panel is a perfect example.

Over the course of the investigation, the chair has targeted one clinic, one university, and one tissue procurement organization, all of whom were cooperating voluntarily before the chair served them with unilateral subpoenas. The Panel has known since January that Southwestern Women's Options does not take any money for ensuring that women who want to donate tissue to the university can do so. And let me underscore that fact: no money is exchanged in connection with a woman's choice to donate fetal tissue to researchers at the University of New Mexico.

Already knowing this, the chair served subpoenas and issued press releases tying them to what she repeatedly described as an investigation into the unlawful sale of baby body parts, words we heard today.

As a result, the university and clinic have been subject to

unwarranted accusations from state and federal officials on additional targeted harassment from anti-abortion extremists.

Is it any wonder that universities, clinics, and others are reluctant to hand over the names of their researchers, students, clinic personnel, and doctors, so that the chair can amass a dangerous database of their names?

For its part, the tissue procurement company StemExpress already offered to have its procurement director explain its cost structure. The chair ignored that offer and instead called this public hearing and invited witnesses who have no firsthand knowledge of the facts to opine about potential criminal misconduct.

On its own initiative, StemExpress has now submitted a letter to ensure that the Panel has the information needed to bring this investigation to an end. This investigation has never been, and has no promise of becoming, fair or fact-based. Our Republicans colleagues' disdain for the facts and for women and their doctors is putting researchers, doctors, and women at risk. It is time for Republican leadership to bring this investigation to an end.

I ask unanimous consent to have the April 18 letter from StemExpress included as part of the record for this hearing and yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. Blackburn. The gentlelady yields back. On her UC

1 request, we had already agreed to put that into the record. 2 At this time, I want to welcome our first panel. Senator Jeanne Shaheen is a U.S. Senator from New Hampshire. She is the 3 only woman in U.S. history to be elected both a governor and a 4 5 U.S. Senator. Senator --6 Ms. Schakowsky. Excuse me. Can I just say the letter I wanted inserted in the record is a different letter that we 7 received from her yesterday, so if you could --8 9 Mrs. Blackburn. So moved. 10 Ms. Schakowsky. Okay. Mrs. Blackburn. So moved. 11 12 Ms. Schakowsky. Sorry. Mrs. Blackburn. Senator Shaheen has served in the U.S. 13 Senate since '09 and is a member of the Senate Committees on Armed 14 15 Services, Foreign Relations, Appropriations, and is ranking 16 member of the Small Business and Entrepreneurship Committee. 17 Senator Shaheen is a former small business owner and formerly 18 served as the Director of Harvard University's Institute of 19 Politics at the Kennedy School of Government. Welcome. Senator Ben Sasse is a U.S. Senator from Nebraska. Senator 20 21 Sasse comes to the Senate having spent the last five years as a 22 college president, one of the youngest in the nation. During the 23 first and second terms of President George W. Bush, he worked in

the Department of Justice and the Department of Homeland Security
before becoming Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation
at the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Welcome to
you, Senator Sasse.

At this time, we will begin with Senator Shaheen for your
five-minute remarks, and we welcome you.

STATEMENT OF HON. JEANNE SHAHEEN, A UNITED STATE SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Senator Shaheen. Thank you very much, Chairwoman Blackburn and Ranking Member Schakowsky, members of the committee. I very much appreciate the opportunity to appear before you this morning, but I do so with great concern. I know you will hear from my colleague, Senator Sasse from Nebraska, and I respect his deeply held personal beliefs.

But if we want to have a civil discussion on this issue, we should begin with the facts. Already news articles today have called into question the validity of the exhibits that will be presented to the Panel. This committee's very existence was founded on the basis of highly deceptive edited videos. These videos have since been proven to be misleading and false by multiple independent investigations across the country.

In January, after thorough investigations into the videos, a Texas grand jury cleared Planned Parenthood of any wrongdoing and indicted the individuals responsible for their creation. In fact, 12 other states have also cleared Planned Parenthood of any wrongdoing, and 8 additional states have declined to investigate, citing a lack of evidence.

I believe it is now time for the special investigations to

end. And I would also like to point out that fetal tissue research has long had bipartisan support. In 1993, Congress passed the National Institutes of Health Revitalization Act, which permits fetal tissue research. That bill passed with overwhelming support, 94 to 4 in the Senate, and 290 to 130 in the House.

And I think it is important to note that that bill was passed on recommendations of a Blue Ribbon Panel convened under President Reagan, which was tasked with studying the ethics of fetal tissue research. Millions of people have benefitted from fetal tissue research. Vaccines for polio and rubella were developed as a result of research done on fetal tissue, and research on health issues that touch so many of us -- Parkinson's disease, diabetes, HIV/AIDS, eye disorders and spinal cord injuries -- have also benefitted from the 1993 law.

If it is the Panel's desire to change the law, obviously you, as legislators, are able to do that. But I believe it would be a grave error. Sadly, it is my belief that this Panel was formed with political motivations. There is very little real interest in an unbiased investigation to uncover facts related to women's health or research. Instead, I believe that this Panel serves as an opportunity for some to once again attack the health care providers who millions of women and families depend on.

In February, I joined with colleagues in both chambers to

ask House and Senate leadership to disband this Panel and all other Congressional investigations that would undermine women's access to health care. Not only do I believe that this Panel is an inappropriate and wasteful misuse of federal resources, but I am gravely concerned that it also puts researchers, providers, and patients across the country at risk.

Unfortunately, as a result of the political rhetoric surrounding this issue, we have seen violent acts and threats against women health providers and researchers across the country. And I am very sad to report that this fall, the same month that this panel was formed, a women's health clinic in Claremont, New Hampshire, was vandalized not once but twice. The second attack caused so much damage that the clinic was forced to close for nearly six weeks, and this was a real disservice to the women, men, and families who rely on the full range of services that the clinic provides.

And, unfortunately, New Hampshire is not alone. After the release of the deceptive, highly edited videos, incidents of harassment against some health centers increased nine-fold in just one month. I don't believe that today's hearing is a fact-based objective investigation, but, rather, it is a taxpayer-funded political attack based on discredited evidence. I hope it will finally be time to move on.

```
And, Madam Chair, if I could apologize for the need to leave
early and go back to a hearing. I appreciate, again, the
opportunity to be here.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Senator Shaheen follows:]

**********COMMITTEE INSERT 2*********
```

Mrs. Blackburn. We thank you so much, and we know that you
do have to leave and get back, that you all are having votes this
morning, but thank you for the courtesy of your time and for
waiting for us.

Senator Sasse, you are recognized for five minutes.

Ms. Schakowsky. Let me just thank Senator Shaheen as well.

I appreciate your being here.

STATEMENT OF HON. BEN SASSE, A UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE STATE

OF NEBRASKA

Senator Sasse. Thank you, Madam Chairman. Good morning, Ranking Member. Thank you for including me. Many of us in the Senate, like many of you in the House, and, more importantly like millions of Americans, watched with grief the video footage of abortion doctors and others discussing the sale of baby body parts for profit.

As a legislator, but more importantly as a father -- I have three little kids, three precious ones, one of my little girls traveled with me from Nebraska to D.C. this week, and she is here with us today. More importantly, as a father, I support your investigation and your commitment to get to the bottom of what is going on here.

Let's begin by stating clearly that we should not have to be here today. The 1993 NIH Revitalization Act includes testimony where California Democrat Henry Waxman said, and I quote, "This amendment that I am offering would enact the most important safeguards to prevent any sale of fetal tissue for any purpose, not just for the purpose of research, any sale for any purpose. It would be abhorrent," Waxman continued, "to allow for the sale of fetal tissue and a market to be created for that sale."

Words are important. The report language and the floor debate created a very clear legislative intent that no one should profit -- no one -- from the sale of fetal tissue, yet here in today's documents and exhibits we see a business brochure and a website urging "Partner with us and improve the profitability of your clinic. Improve your bottom line. Be financially profitable." These are quotes.

That procurement business offers a payment per tissue to abortion clinics, and it offers to do all the work. That would appear to mean that the abortion clinic has no costs and it would, thus, appear to be precisely about profit as their marketing literature says.

Questions of profit and legality matter because we are talking about people. It matters whether or not procurement businesses broke the law. It matters whether or not abortion clinics are lining their pockets through the dismemberment and distribution of children, all while receiving tax dollars. It matters because we are talking about the tiny limbs of little babies that have dignity. They are broken, yet still precious, children of actual mothers and fathers.

As the committee's exhibits indicate, web pages exist where a customer can click on a dropdown box that lists every organ of a baby for sale. You can click on a brain, a heart, eyes, or a

scalp. Then you select your gestation period, then you proceed to checkout and you decide the method of shipment.

We should pause to linger here. Our humanity should be repulsed. We should all be sad by this. In this committee room and across the country, we will obviously have passionate disagreements and discussions about the legality, the justice, and the social implications of abortion policy. Like many in this room, like a majority of Nebraskans, and like a majority of Americans, I believe that every baby is precious and worthy of legal protection, even at earliest phases of development.

I am unashamedly pro-life, but I also understand that many others disagree on abortion policy. Our disagreements on abortion will sometimes be heated, but wherever possible we should be looking for consensus, and here, on this basic reality, we can and should agree babies are not the sum of their body parts. Babies are not meant to be bought, and babies are not meant to be sold. Babies are just that; they are babies. They are meant to be welcomed and rejoiced over, held and nurtured.

Outside of our Congressional responsibilities here, many of us do in fact welcome, hold, and nurture little children. We adopt and we foster and we mentor them. We offer hope, support, and encouragement to their parents. Madam Chairman, your work can and does transcend politics.

I appreciate also your concern with children born alive inside abortion clinics and with the treatment that they receive. When I think of all the survivors of abortion, and I think about your investigation into the sale of baby body parts for profit, it makes born again -- born-alive legislation all the more important. The Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act has already passed the House by a bipartisan vote of 248 to 177, and I have had the privilege of introducing the companion legislation in the Senate, and I invite my Senate colleagues on both sides of the aisle to be working together to pass this bill in our chamber.

This law would simply ensure that babies who survive abortions get a fighting chance by requiring medical attention that is equivalent to what would be offered to any other premature baby born at the same stage. No life is disposal. No child deserves to have her life ended cold and alone, struggling for breath outside the womb in an abortion clinic.

We Americans frequently cheer for the vulnerable, we fight for the minority, we protect the powerless against the powerful, and baby girls and boys are fighting for their lives. I encourage my colleagues to fight for them and to support Senate 2066, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act.

Madam Chairman, we look forward to monitoring the progress

1 Mrs. Blackburn. Thank you, Senator Sasse. We appreciate your time. We are sorry for our delay. And we know that you have 2 to scoot back across to the Senate for votes, but thank you for 3 vour time. 4 5 At this time, I would like to call forward our second panel. And as they move forward to be seated on the panel, I will move 6 7 forward with introducing this panel to our audience, so that we can move forward expeditiously. Fay Clayton is an attorney with 8 9 Robinson Curley & Clayton. Ms. Clayton practices civil 10 litigation for a wide range of clients from major corporations to individuals in cases involving fraud, RICO securities, general 11 12 commercial matters, contract disputes, officer and director liability, and shareholder and partnership concerns. 13 Mr. Robert Raben served as Assistant Attorney General for 14 15 Legislative Affairs with the U.S. Department of Justice where he 16 drove Attorney General Janet Reno's legislative initiatives and 17 handled the political challenges of Congressional oversight of 18 the department. He founded The Raben Group, a public policy 19 consulting organization, in 2002 and continues to serve as 20 president. He is a graduate of the Wharton School and the New 21 York University Law School. 22 Mr. Brian Lennon served as a federal prosecutor in Michigan 23 and Virginia for 15 years and a trial attorney for the U.S.

Department of Justice's Civil Division. As the Deputy Chief of 1 the Criminal Division for the U.S. Attorney's Office in the 2 Western District of Michigan, Brian supervised the health care 3 fraud and computer-related crimes units, among others. 4 5 He also spent four and a half years as a judge advocate for the U.S. Marine Corps, handling both civil and criminal matters. 6 7 Now in private practice with Warner Norcross and Judd, he specializes in criminal defense, particularly health care fraud 8 9 and other white collar and drug offenses, corporate internal investigations, and compliance matters. 10 11 Mr. Michael Norton served as U.S. Attorney for Colorado from 12 1988 to '93. He was appointed by President Reagan and reappointed by President George H.W. Bush. Mr. Norton has been practicing 13 law since 1976 and is admitted to the bars in the states of Colorado 14 15 and Virginia as well as Washington, D.C. 16 Catherine Glenn Foster is an associate scholar with the 17 Charlotte Lozier institute, where she authors research papers on 18 science, medicine, and research in the service of human life. She 19 was formerly an attorney with Alliance Defending Freedom and is 20 a graduate of Georgetown University Law Center. Kenneth Sukhia was appointed U.S. Attorney for the Northern 21

as litigation counsel to numerous corporations and officials.

District of Florida by President George H.W. Bush and has served

22

23

1 Mr. Sukhia has also served as law clerk at the Florida Supreme Court and the U.S. Court of Appeals and as a senior partner in 2 one of Florida's oldest and largest statewide firms. He began 3 his own firm, the Sukhia Law Group, in the Florida state capital 4 5 in 2008. You are aware that the Select Investigative Panel is holding 6 7 an investigative hearing and that we will take your testimony under. Do you have any objection to testifying under oath? 8 9 Okay. The chair then advises you that under the rules of the House Committee on Energy and Commerce, you are entitled to 10 be advised by counsel. Do you desire to be advised by counsel 11 12 for today's hearing? In that case, will you please rise and raise your 13 hand, and I will swear you in. 14 15 [Witnesses sworn.] Mrs. Blackburn. Thank you. You are now under oath and 16 subject to the penalties set forth in Title 18, Section 1001 of 17 18 the U.S. Code. 19 You will each give a five-minute summary of your written 20 statement. Ms. Clayton, we will begin the testimony with you, 21 and you are recognized for five minutes.

STATEMENTS OF FAY CLAYTON, ROBINSON CURLEY & CLAYTON, P.C.; ROBERT RABEN, PRESIDENT AND FOUNDER, THE RABEN GROUP; BRIAN LENNON, WARNER NORCROSS & JUDD; MICHAEL NORTON, THOMAS N. SCHEFFEL & ASSOCIATES, P.C.; CATHERINE GLENN FOSTER, CHARLOTTE LOZIER INSTITUTE, SOUND LEGAL; AND KENNETH SUKHIA, SUKHIA LAW GROUP

STATEMENT OF FAY CLAYTON

Ms. Clayton. Thank you, Madam Chair. I have been a corporate litigator since 1978, and I am here today despite a family medical situation for two reasons. One is that women's reproductive health and medical research are being threatened by these hearings. The second reason is that I have instructive experience to share with this Panel on the topic that you are considering here.

Sixteen years ago, a client of mine, Anatomical Gift
Foundation, a nonprofit corporation that provided donated tissue
to medical researchers in hopes of curing the diseases, including
the ones Senator Shaheen mentioned earlier, that nonprofit was
falsely accused by life Dynamics, the anti-abortion group
Congresswoman Schakowsky mentioned, accused of selling fetal
tissue.

These baseless charges were made in a videotape sent by Life Dynamics to Congress, and in that video the person making the

accusations was anonymous. As it happened, an employee of
Anatomical Gift Foundation, my client, had gone to work for
another company in violation of his contract. AGF hired me to
sue. That man's name was Dean Alberti.

In Alberti's deposition, which was under oath, like all of us today, but unlike what he said in the videotape -- the videotape that Life Dynamics had sent to Congress, Alberti admitted that he was the person in that video, and he admitted that what he had said in that video was fictional.

He testified that he told those lies because Life Dynamics had paid him to, and he said, "I needed the money." He had repeated those falsehoods on TV's 20/20, but he knew better than to lie under oath when I deposed him, where the penalties of perjury, as the chair acknowledged, do arise.

Those of you who were here in the year 2000 may recall the humiliation that certain members of the House Committee suffered when their star witness, Dean Alberti, went up in flames and admitted that that much-touted video had been fabricated. Those House hearings established that my client had done nothing wrong, that fetal tissue wasn't for sale at all, and that anti-abortion zealots -- Life Dynamics -- had foisted a false witness on Congress. What was for sale wasn't fetal tissue; it was a phony witness statement, and it had been bought and paid for by

anti-abortion extremists.

I find it curious, given the not-so-distant history of the strikingly similar scenario, that this Panel has not demanded sworn testimony of the accusers, the latest batch of anti-abortion accusers, as you have asked of us, Chair Blackburn, haven't asked for that, haven't asked them to go under oath, and that seems strange to me, particularly when they come up with such a similar tale about the so-called sale of fetal tissue, which again is a lie.

This suggests to me that someone is afraid to put David
Daleiden and his star witness, Holly O'Donnell, under oath
because, as we saw with the Dean Alberti fiasco, when penalties
of perjury attach, sometimes instead of fiction the actual truth
comes out. We know Daleiden and his crew doctored videos to the
point that the federal judge blocked the release of further tapes
because they were fraudulent.

Another fact we know about them comes from the Los Angeles Times' examination of Daleiden's unedited videos. They show Daleiden coaching and manipulating the testimony of Holly O'Donnell, whose video interview, by the way, looks more like playacting than any genuine emotion. Without cross-examination of Daleiden and his crew under oath, we have no way of knowing what he offered or said to Ms. O'Donnell when his camera was not

1 running.

And in Texas, when Daleiden went before a grand jury convened for the express purpose of prosecuting Planned Parenthood, the grand jury did something very different. It didn't indict Planned Parenthood. It indicated Daleiden for falsehoods. And the Texas grand jury found, of course, that Planned Parenthood had done nothing wrong.

For nearly four decades, I have been representing corporations and individuals in business litigation, and I have to say there is no bigger tell about the veracity of an accusation than when the person who is making the accusation will not stand by his or her accusation under oath.

As Alberti told the House committee in the year 2000, "When I was under oath, I told the truth. Anything I said in the video, when I was not under oath, that is a different story." So I have to ask, is this Panel looking for the truth or for another story? A real inquiry would start with sworn testimony from Daleiden and O'Donnell, and that would be true even if the doctored videotapes didn't have so much in common with the deceitful tapes that the abortion opponents, including Life Dynamics, staged 16 years ago.

This Panel's failure to allow cross-examination of Daleiden and his cohorts sends the message loud and clear that those stories would not hold up under penalty of perjury any more than the

```
1
        baseless slurs Dean Alberti made back in the year 2000 when Life
 2
        Dynamics bought and paid for his testimony.
 3
             And, by the way, you know, Crutcher is one of the trainers
        of Daleiden.
 4
 5
             It just strikes me as inexcusable that the Panel has been
        using its subpoena power to compel testimony from health care
 6
 7
        providers and medical researchers who have far better things to
        do with their time like providing health care, working to cure
 8
        disease, than Daleiden and his crew.
 9
10
             Mrs. Blackburn. Ms. Clayton?
             Ms. Clayton. I just ask that until and unless this Panel
11
12
        puts Daleiden and O'Donnell under oath, and gets down -- and tries
13
        to get to the bottom of what they did, that these proceedings be
14
        terminated and our elected officials be allowed to return to doing
15
        the people's business.
16
             Thank you.
17
             [The prepared testimony of Ms. Clayton follows:]
18
        ***********************
19
```

```
1 Mrs. Blackburn. Thank you, Ms. Clayton.
```

2 Mr. Raben?

STATEMENT OF ROBERT RABEN

Mr. Raben. Good morning, Chair Blackburn, Ranking Member Schakowsky, members of the committee, thank you so much for having me this morning. My name is Robert Raben. I am in private practice. Over the years, I have served as counsel to the House Judiciary Committee and was confirmed as Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Legislative Affairs at the Department of Justice.

In 1999, as I was watching you this morning and the decorum and kindness with which you obviously run this committee, I was reminded that my then-chair -- I was Democratic counsel, but the chair of our committee, Henry Hyde, walked across the Capitol to testify for my nomination, and what a wonderful day that was and how much I miss him and appreciated him.

I have taught law, practiced at a large law firm, and clerked after law school. I deeply appreciate the law and this committee's attention to it.

For over 20 years, my work has involved the representation of people and organizations before the Congressional executive branch. I give this testimony today as someone who has experienced both sides of advocacy and representation around investigations of all forms. This committee has asked us to opine

on the questions of whether the current legislative language adequately prevents profiteering in the sale of fetal tissue and the parameters around what constitutes a sale of profit of fetal tissue.

In 2000, in my capacity as Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Legislative Affairs at the Department of Justice, I was called upon to respond to almost identical concerns expressed by members of the Congress regarding the alleged transfer of fetal tissue for profit. On March 9, 2000, I communicated with Congress by signed letter, a willingness to investigate and learn further about credible claims and allegations.

While I don't have specific recollection of further oral conversations within the Department subsequent to that written communication, I know from the public record that in July of 2000, Acting Kansas U.S. Attorney Jim Flory decided, after a thorough review of the issues involved, that there were no violations of federal statutes, thereby announcing the closure of a thorough investigation into related facts. That is a matter of public record. I also recalled yesterday a second investigation from the Colorado U.S. Attorney and FBI that was similarly closed.

We are today witnessing virtually identical allegations. While I am unaware as to whether DOJ or the FBI presently have

ongoing inquiries into the factual allegations, it is significant to note that 12 states have affirmatively looked into related matters and declined to pursue any charge. An additional eight states have affirmatively declined to even investigate.

Given the importance that some people have about deferring to the states, I would like to just read into the record the 12 states that have affirmatively said they have investigated and decided not to pursue charges around related allegations -- Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Kansas, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Texas, and Washington.

Innumerable reasons exist as to why federal law enforcement has little record of indictment under the existing language, which may include the dearth of actual profiteering and fact, the deference to state law enforcement authorities which are certainly capable of determining the same predicate, past failed attempts to establish wrongdoing, or, paramount in this area, a lack of credibility of those presenting facts to the law enforcement officials.

Of the ultimate question on which this committee is presently engaged, whether or not the existing statute merits either change or more rigorous enforcement, I believe that the statute is sound and fully addresses its intended aims, as important today as it

```
was when it passed with overwhelming bipartisan majorities in
 1
 2
        1993.
             The statute, a considered bipartisan judgment of Congress,
 3
        was meant to address profiteering from the sale of fetal tissue.
 4
 5
        There is no evidence of an outbreak of such behavior in this
        nation. Further, I am confident that any acts of intentional
 6
 7
        misbehavior would be investigated and punished by law
 8
        enforcement, both federal and state.
 9
             Thank you for having me.
             [The prepared testimony of Mr. Raben follows:]
10
11
12
        *************************
```

- 1 Mrs. Blackburn. Thank you, Mr. Raben.
- 2 Mr. Lennon, you are recognized for five minutes.

STATEMENT OF BRIAN LENNON

Mr. Lennon. Chairman Blackburn, Ranking Member Schakowsky, and distinguished members of this Panel, thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today about the pricing of fetal tissue. I am currently a partner at the law firm of Warner Norcross and Judd in Grand Rapids, Michigan. For 13 years before entering private practice, I was an Assistant U.S. Attorney in the Western District of Michigan.

I am not a medical ethicist or a theologian. I do not represent any advocacy group on either side of the life versus reproductive rights debate, and I am not here to advocate for any change in federal legislation.

But as a former federal prosecutor, and now criminal defense counsel, I hope to provide some value to this Panel through objective legal analysis of the exhibits to determine whether the abortion clinics and/or the procurement business identified in the exhibits violated the statute.

Based on my review of the exhibits, and I looked at this as if an agent had showed up at my office on any work day with these exhibits and asked me to examine them. But based on that review, I believe a competent and ethical federal prosecutor could establish probable cause that both the abortion clinics and the

procurement businesses violated the statute, aided and abetted one another in violating the statute, and likely conspired together to violate the statute.

In fact, for five of the six elements of the substantive offense, in my opinion there is proof beyond a reasonable doubt. The only element where investigation is needed, and that would include I believe forensic accounting and analysis thereof, is whether the payments made by the research institutions that ultimately receive the human tissue to the procurement businesses were a valuable consideration or, alternatively, reasonable payments associated with the specific allowable services in the statute.

With respect to the abortion clinics, in my opinion, the proof is more clearly established that the compensation they receive from the procurement business, a price per tissue payment, is indeed valuable consideration, as none of the identified services excluded from the definition were provided by the clinics.

Now, prosecutors and jurors clearly prefer to define and establish elements of the offense. Five of the six elements of that offense are both clearly defined and established through the exhibits. As for the final element, valuable consideration, that element and those proofs are admittedly more nuanced.

The statute itself defines valuable consideration by describing what it is not. It does not include reasonable payments associated with the transportation, implantation, processing, preservation, quality control, or storage of human fetal tissue. If valuable consideration is payment for something other than this exhaustive list of delineated services, this element is also established.

As for the abortion clinics, the marketing materials that I have reviewed clearly state that there is a financial profit from this partnership. Several of the exhibits indicate the procurement business pays for per -- per the tissue, not a reasonable payment for the listed services. Therefore, the exhibits indicate, in my opinion, that these services are provided by the procurement business through their embedded technicians, and not the abortion clinics, therefore, that these payments appear to be a valuable consideration. Indeed, they could be profits.

As for the procurement business, it is my opinion that a much deeper analysis of the company's financials is necessary in order to establish the valuable consideration element beyond a reasonable doubt. Because the businesses do in fact incur costs associated with these delineated services, a forensic accounting would be essential to breaking down the company's financials.

Just looking at the growth and looking at their revenue doesn't tell you whether they are profiting. And if they are profiting, in my opinion, they violated the law.

I think there are some other theories here although that I think a prosecutor would pursue that may be more important in looking at the potential criminality of the businesses, the procurement businesses, and those are aiding and abetting and conspiracy.

Based on my limited review of the exhibits reviewed and the strength the substantive case against the abortion clinic, pursuing an aiding and abetting or conspiracy count against the procurement business, rather than a substantive count, may be a stronger theory of culpability.

As I conclude, I would just say that I believe federal prosecutors take pride in protecting the most vulnerable among us. The ones I probably served with in the Western District of Michigan did not shy away from the tough cases, and they put their personal politics aside when asked to evaluate cases for prosecution.

Evidence, or the lack thereof, not politics, should determine whether a U.S. attorney impanels a grand jury to investigate abortion clinics and human fetal businesses in their district.

- 1 Mrs. Blackburn. Thank you, Mr. Lennon.
- 2 Mr. Norton, you are recognized for five minutes.

STATEMENT OF MICHAEL NORTON

Mr. Norton. Thank you, Madam Chair and Ranking Member Schakowsky, and esteemed members of the committee. My name is Michael J. Norton. I am an attorney in the private practice of law in Denver, Colorado.

I have had the privilege of serving as United States Attorney for the state and district of Colorado. I was first appointed by President Ronald Reagan and then reappointed by first President Bush.

Ms. DeGette, nice to see you again.

I have a written statement which I respectfully request be incorporated into the record. I simply just want to summarize my comments and my remarks in the time that is available.

First of all, I will say to the committee that this is not about women's health. It is not about abortion, how one spins on the issue of abortion. It is whether or not there is probable cause to believe that crimes have been committed and, if so, what to do about that. To do nothing about the potential of the criminal -- of the commission of criminal crimes is indeed flouting the criminal justice system of this nation, and I think preferring those who are in well-connected places over those who are not.

So I suggest to you at the outset, Madam Chair and members of this committee, that what this committee is about is highly important and very critical to the criminal justice system and to the sanctity of that system in the United States of America.

It is really not about the issue of abortion because potential profiteering and trafficking in aborted fetal tissue is of grave concern, not only on a federal level but also in many states, including my own state of Colorado, which has adopted a law similar to the federal law that is being looked at by this committee today.

There are many, many people, therefore, concerned that not only this federal state, but also the state statutes at issue have been violated and are being flouted by the abortion industry. In 2015, it was revealed by one of these undercover videos that Denver's Planned Parenthood of the Rocky Mountains was indeed making a profit by harvesting and trafficking the hearts, the brains, the lungs, the eyes, the livers, and other body parts of babies whose lived Planned Parenthood had ended by abortion.

These gruesome revelations came from a series of videos released by the Center for Medical Progress that the committee has talked about. And it was clear from the videos that Planned Parenthood had been actively engaged in harvesting and trafficking for profit body parts of babies whose lives Planned

Parenthood had ended.

Those videos have not created a general queasiness about surgery and blood. No matter how one stands on the issue of abortion, no one who has viewed these videos can come away thinking that Planned Parenthood's harvesting and selling of these baby body parts is consistent with our values or consistent with the law.

If wrongdoing has occurred, and I concur with the assessment Mr. Lennon has made of the facts and the circumstances as to the commission of crimes in this case, and I would add that it appears to me, quite frankly, that criminal violations of the Health Insurance Portability Act, HIPAA, have also been committed by the embedding of the procurement business technician in the abortion facility itself. And the review by that technician of privileged medical records of patients in order to determine which body parts that technician wants to harvest — have harvested and sold to him has also been committed.

There are some facts that need to be determined, and a competent criminal investigation could determine those facts. But to do nothing is simply wrong, Madam Chair and members of this committee, and I thank the committee for its courage in moving into this area, investigating this area. I urge it to complete its investigation and to refer this matter to the U.S. Department

- 1 Mrs. Blackburn. Thank you, Mr. Norton.
- 2 Ms. Foster, you are recognized for five minutes.

STATEMENT OF CATHERINE GLENN FOSTER

Ms. Foster. Thank you. Ms. Chairman, Ms. Schakowsky, distinguished members of this Panel, I am privileged to present this testimony concerning the pricing of human fetal tissue. My views are consistent with those of the Charlotte Lozier Institute where I am associate scholar, which is dedicated to advancing science, medicine, and research in the service of human life and to promoting a culture and polity of life.

My views are similarly consistent with those of Sound Legal, a law firm and legal organization advocating for the universal right to life. As an attorney, I have dedicated my career to advocating for the right of every innocent human being to be protected. And so I am troubled by those in the abortion and tissue procurement industry who scheme to trade in baby body parts for their own financial enrichment.

The public learned of these back alley transactions last year when undercover videos of the organ business brokers surfaced online. Indeed, the trade in fetal body parts is a business. As demonstrated by the evidence presented by this Panel, clinics and procurement companies have been getting away with charging far more than the allowed costs for harvesting, transporting, and warehousing body parts as they wait for customers.

In doing so, they have violated both the intent and the letter of Section 289g-2, which bars, among other things, the transfer of human fetal tissue for valuable consideration. The statute's definition of "valuable consideration" is straightforward. If payment is not reasonable or not associated with the transplantation, implantation, processing, preservation, quality control, or storage of human fetal tissue, it is not permitted.

We can all agree on this statute. It passed with bipartisan support in a Democratic Congress and was signed into law by President Clinton. Representative Waxman at the time called the fetal corpse market abhorrent, and yet the Panel's evidence reveals that abortion clinics are being promised a profit, and are paid, even when they have no apparent costs to be reimbursed, and further multiplying a clinic's windfall via savings on disposal services.

Tissue procurement companies are likewise paid exorbitantly by their customers. This market in baby organs and tissues demonstrates a flagrant and repeated disregard for the rule of law. It was no surprise when America's biggest abortion business, facing public and prosecutorial exposure, relented and agreed to end its longstanding practice of receiving direct payments for baby body parts.

And yet in my years of work in this field, and in the 23 years that Section 289g-2 has been law, I am unaware of a single instance in which it has been enforced. This payment is right to shine a light on big abortion's back alleys.

For perhaps we forget that this law was meant to protect the ethical imperative that recognizes the dignity in every human life. In the face of clinical, sanitized language, we may become desensitized. In the abortion clinic, a human baby is called "tissue" or a "fetus." A head is a "calvarium" or "cal." The technician who counts body parts is a products of conception, or POC, worker.

And by converting human lives into a bulk commodity, public discussion has been stifled. But we are in fact talking about real and unique human beings whose lives were tragically snuffed out. We are talking about affording them the minimal dignity that comes with not having their remains further picked through to be bought and sold like chattel.

I know that the abortion industry and its allies are waging a campaign against any effort at transparency or accountability. It is what we can expect from a big business with an emphasis on maximizing profits and a lot of money to lose. And so big abortion is fighting back with all its financial and political might, investing its political and monetary stockpile to buy public

```
sanction, an weighing its thumb down on the scales of justice with
 1
 2
        high-profile PR firms, pocket politicians, and spellbound media.
 3
             With these allies, until now the abortion industry has
        succeeded in shouting down the voices acknowledging the public
 4
        evidence of guilt and crying out for justice. But no more. We,
 5
        the people, are not afraid of confronting the truth, and we
 6
 7
        encourage this Panel and those in law enforcement do pursue it.
        Common sense and common decency demand enforcement of Section
 8
 9
        289q-2.
10
             Thank you.
             [The prepared testimony of Ms. Foster follows:]
11
12
13
        *********INSERT 8******
```

- 1 Mrs. Blackburn. Thank you, Ms. Foster.
- 2 Mr. Sukhia, you are recognized for five minutes.

STATEMENT OF KENNETH SUKHIA

Mr. Sukhia. Thank you, Madam Chairman, and the members of this committee. I was privileged and honored to serve as the United States Attorney for the Northern District of Florida, and before that was an Assistant U.S. Attorney for 10 years.

Much of my expertise that I could lend to the committee would be in, of course, the area of determining whether a grand jury should be empaneled, whether a case should proceed, whether investigation should be pursued. And I have heard it said today that this is a committee that has disdain for the truth, that this is not a fact-based inquiry, and I -- when I look at the exhibits that were submitted, but also of course when I looked at the videos that were presented, it strikes me as odd that there would not be an aggressive and meaningful investigation into the allegation that indeed human baby parts are being sold for profit.

Article II, Section 3, of our United States Constitution in fact requires of the executive branch that it faithfully execute the laws of the country. By not faithfully executing those laws, you are in fact taking specific affirmative action to defy what is required by the Constitution.

And in this situation, it is beyond my assessment and belief that when you have a procurement industry that is actually

marketing to the abortion clinics that they can procure or work to gain more profits by this method. And when they are seeding their own employees in the clinic to do those jobs that would indeed cost and would indeed be the services that would compromise the legitimate cost or payment for those services, then the question clearly arises, have these clinics profited from this process? It is a very simple basic issue.

And so we are not saying as a prosecutor when someone comes in the door with this evidence, oh, this is absolutely positively a fact. We are saying, no, this justifies a full and complete and a thorough investigation. And I think it is — there does seem to be a pattern when, oh, this can't possibly have any basis because, let's see, 16 years ago someone lied. So we can't take this. This is the same sort of thing that has happened before.

And we should also stop the prosecution of all murders because there have been cases where persons have lied and people have been wrongly convicted. And the whole argument is nonsense and, in fact, this whole notion that, oh, let's fall all over ourselves to insist that, oh, we are being — this is nothing but an effort to attack the reproductive rights of our citizens, when it is in fact an effort to enforce the law, which is required of our Constitution.

Thank you.

```
1
             Mrs. Blackburn. Thank you, Mr. Sukhia.
 2
             At this time, we will begin the --
             Mr. Nadler. Madam Chair?
 3
             Mrs. Blackburn. -- questioning on our --
 4
             Mr. Nadler. Madam Chair?
 5
 6
             Mrs. Blackburn. -- side. Yes, the gentleman is
 7
        recognized.
 8
             Mr. Nadler. Parliamentary inquiry, please.
 9
             Mrs. Blackburn. Parliamentary inquiry. State your
10
        inquiry.
             Mr. Nadler. Yes. Madam Chair, the witnesses appear to have
11
12
        relied heavily on the premise from your staff that clinics incur
        no costs related to fetal tissue donation. That premise is
13
        captured in Exhibit G, which you previously had up on the screen.
14
        Could you put that up on the screen for a moment again, please,
15
16
        while I complete the parliamentary inquiry? Exhibit G.
17
             Mrs. Blackburn. Let's bring up Exhibit G, and please state
18
        the inquiry.
19
             Mr. Nadler. Is that Exhibit G? That is not Exhibit G.
20
        That is it. Thank you.
21
             Madam Chair, this chart says that the clinic has "no costs,
22
        so the payments are pure profit for the clinic." This is
23
        contradicted by Exhibits C6, C9, and C17, which show that some
```

clinics obtain consent, draw blood, fill out paperwork, among 1 other things, related to fetal tissue donation. These are all 2 requests that the Government Accountability Office recognized 16 3 years ago as reimbursable "direct costs." 4 5 Madam Chair, can you explain how this document, Exhibit G, was created and its factual foundation, including the discrepancy 6 7 between what this staff-created chart asserts, namely that there are no costs, and information on other documents in your packet, 8 9 Exhibits C6, C9, and C17, which detail such costs? 10 Mrs. Blackburn. I thank the gentleman for the inquiry. 11 discussed this previously before you arrived at the hearing, and 12 all of the documents today come from the investigative work that 13 took place by submissions that came to us, whistleblower information. The charts for discussion, of which G is one, were 14 15 compiled from that work by our staff, and at this time we begin 16 our questioning --17 Mr. Nadler. Madam Chair, further parliamentary --18 Mrs. Blackburn. -- and I turn to Mr. Pitts. 19 Mr. Nadler. -- further parliamentary inquiry, and I don't 20 believe --21 Mrs. Blackburn. State the inquiry. 22 Mr. Nadler. Thank you. I don't believe this was discussed 23 while I was at the Judiciary Committee. How can you explain the

discrepancy between the information on Exhibit G, namely that

1

no costs were incurred, and the information on Exhibits C6, C9, 2 and C17, which lists some of those costs? That didn't happen. 3 4 Mrs. Blackburn. There is no discrepancy, and I thank the gentleman for the inquiry. At this time, we begin --5 Mr. Nadler. A discrepancy --6 7 Mrs. Blackburn. -- we begin our hearing with Mr. Pitts. Mr. Nadler. Further parliamentary -- discrepancy, of 8 9 course there is a discrepancy. Mrs. Blackburn. Do you have a motion? 10 Mr. Nadler. No. I have a parliamentary inquiry, and I will 11 12 13 Mrs. Blackburn. Okay. Mr. Nadler. -- which is being sidestepped and not 14 15 answered. This Exhibit G says abortion clinic explanation, the 16 abortion clinic has no costs, so the payments from the PB, the 17 procurement business, to the AC, the abortion clinic, are pure 18 profit. All costs are borne by the PB or the customer. 19 Exhibit C9 says -- it is an exhibit of clinic procedures and 20 policies and it says, "You must inform," you, the employee, "must inform the assistant manager and HSSs when you have completed your 21 work." This will ensure that they do not continue to consent and 22 23 draw unnecessary blood samples. The interaction of --

1 Mrs. Blackburn. If the gentleman will yield, you are citing a procurement business procedure. So one is the clinic, one is 2 3 the procurement business. I thank the gentleman for the inquiry. Mr. Nadler. Procurement business has to tell the clinic 4 staff, which has to be satisfied, and that takes time and there 5 is a direct cost. 6 7 Mrs. Blackburn. At this --Mr. Nadler. So they have to tell the abortion clinic that 8 9 they are done, so that the abortion clinic does not continue to take more samples, et cetera, which is a direct cost for the 10 11 clinic, not the procurement business. So that is a direct contradiction of --12 13 Mrs. Blackburn. The documents are separate. It is not a direct contradiction, and the documents are separate. One 14 15 relates to abortion clinic; the other to the permit business. 16 Mr. Nadler. If this is not a direct contradiction, what is 17 the methodology to determine that there are no costs for the 18 abortion clinic as asserted in Exhibit G, which apparently has 19 no basis? 20 Mrs. Blackburn. It is all based on the investigatory work, and I thank you for the parliamentary inquiry. 21 Mr. Nadler. Well --22 23 Mrs. Blackburn. At this time, we are going to Mr. Pitts.

```
1
             Mr. Nadler.
                           -- investigatory -- and further parliamentary
 2
             Mrs. Blackburn. We have --
 3
             Mr. Nadler. -- further and final, I hope, parliamentary
 4
 5
        inquiry, can you explain how using a chart that draws conclusions
        that have no objective basis in fact, other than your statement
 6
        that somebody investigated, does not violate House rules
 7
        prohibiting conduct that does not reflect credibility or may
 8
 9
        discredit or dishonor the House and this Panel, Rule 11, Clause
10
        4, and Rule 23, Clause 1? Because what I am hearing is that there
        is -- that staff people somehow derived this information -- we
11
12
        are not told how, what --
13
             Mrs. Blackburn. Mr. Nadler, you know, this is not a
14
        parliamentary inquiry.
15
             Mr. Nadler. Oh, yes, it is.
16
             Mrs. Blackburn. Basically, you are trying to debate the
17
        documents, and we need to move on with our questions.
18
             Mr. Nadler. How is this not --
19
             Mrs. Blackburn. And I am turning to Mr. Pitts. Mr. Pitts,
20
        you are recognized for five minutes for questions.
21
             Mr. Pitts. Thank you, Madam Chair, for calling this
22
        important hearing on the pricing of fetal tissue. This issue has
23
        caused me considerable concern because one of the underpinnings
```

and safeguards of the statute that allowed for the donation of fetal tissue for transplantation and research was that this tissue would not be sold.

The author of the statute, Representative Waxman, stated during the floor debate in 1993, and I quote, "It will be abhorrent to allow for the sale of fetal tissue and a market to be created for that sale." And yet this is what is happening, as one of the witnesses said, in the back alleys today.

As seen on Exhibit B2 and B3, the procurement business markets itself on its brochure as a way for clinics to make additional income by allowing the procurement business, procurement technicians, to take fetal tissues and organs from aborted babies immediately after the abortion was completed using the words "financially profitable, fiscally rewards, financial benefit" on its brochure.

The Select Panel investigation reveals that every conceivable harvesting task is performed for the technician employed by the procurement business. And so procurement businesses, essentially the middleman, are paying fees to abortion clinics, but the abortion clinics are incurring no costs. Exhibit D shows payments from the procurement business to abortion clinics for aborted babies and baby blood. Exhibit D1.

The abortion clinic charged the middleman with a bill for

\$11,365 in August of 2010 for baby parts and blood that the 1 2 middleman's technicians harvested. Another invoice in January/February of 2011 charged \$9,060 for harvested baby parts 3 4 and blood. The middleman even makes it easy for the researcher 5 to purchase baby body parts. Exhibit C3, the procurement 6 business order form, or the dropdown menu for baby organs, shows 7 just how easy this is. 8 First, it asks on the left side, "What type of tissue would 9 you like to order?" And I suppose you could respond, anyone could 10 respond to this, "I would like to order brains." And then it says, "Number of specimens." Well, six, let's say, baby brains. 11 12 Gestational range, start and end. Well, that would be 16 to 18 13 weeks. And then here is another question. Add another tissue type? 14 15 You could say yes. Another tissue type listed, female 16 reproductive system and ovaries. You could say, "I take five of 17 those at 15 weeks." You could add, you know, five baby tongues. 18 Shipping options. You could response, yes, I want it rush 19 ordered. So, for crying out loud, this is the Amazon.com of baby 20 body parts. There is a market for baby body parts, and you get what you pay for. This is absolutely repulsive. And we must not 21 22 forget, as was testified here, each one of these, you know, little 23 baby brains or tongues represent a baby. How can anyone defend

1 this practice?

All this shows, that in both intent and in practice, these organizations were making money well above the actual cost. So going back to Exhibit B2 and B3, the company brochure, the website, show intent, their publicity, marketing materials.

My question for the former prosecutors for DOJ -- we will start with Mr. Sukhia, Mr. Norton -- what communications or information would you seek to learn whether the intent of the procurement business and the abortion clinic was to profit from selling baby body parts? Mr. Sukhia, let's start with you.

- Mr. Sukhia. Yes, Congressman Pitts.
- 12 Mr. Pitts. Put on your mike.

Mr. Sukhia. Yes, sir. I had pressed the button, and then it went off. Well, some of that evidence is already in this record. I have heard, again, everyone quickly rushing to insist that these videotapes are just deceptively prepared. In other words, do what we are extremely deft at doing, this industry, which is deflecting, and everyone else is at fault.

Let's shift the focus so everyone is focused on, hey, what this -- these videos did and what this person said in the -- how he prepared the videos. But those videos were posted; all of those videos were posted. And there are some things that, when people say them on tape, it doesn't matter what they didn't say

1 or did say elsewhere. If someone is saying that would be good, and we are talking 2 about profiting from this, and they are talking about that, that 3 is corroborative evidence. It corroborates the evidence that you 4 5 were identifying, Mr. Congressman, which is very strong evidence when someone is actually marketing for it. So I would --6 7 Mrs. Blackburn. Let's answer quickly. Time has expired. Mr. Sukhia. I would also want to know what communications 8 9 occurred between -- other communications, email and so forth, back and forth between those people. We would seek those items as 10 11 well, and of course the accounting records. 12 Thank you. 13 Mr. Pitts. I yield back. Thank you. Mrs. Blackburn. The gentleman yields back. 14 15 Ms. Schakowsky is recognized for five minutes. 16 Ms. Schakowsky. Unfortunately, we have -- the majority has 17 refused to even bring in the one party that actually could answer 18 these questions, and that is StemExpress. 19 And I want to say, Mr. Sukhia and Mr. Norton, as lawyers, 20 the fact that you keep referring back to these completely discredited by 3 Congressional panels, by 12 states that looked 21 22 into this, by a grand jury that ended up -- you talk about the 23 Center for Medical Progress, Mr. Sukhia, Sukhea, which is it?

1 Sukhia? Mr. Sukhia. Sukhia. Thank you. 2 3 Ms. Schakowsky. Oh, sorry. And yet Mr. Daleiden and his partner were actually indicted as a consequence. So, you know, 4 5 that is a comment. It is not a question. It is a fact that that has been looked into. 6 7 The other thing is, before -- I want to ask Ms. Clayton a question, but I also want to go back to a letter and numbers of 8 9 documents presented by StemExpress that would completely discredit the exhibits that have been mentioned. And I want to 10 11 just, as far as B2, the majority's use of this brochure is 12 misleading at best. It was used by StemExpress with hospitals and clinics involved in a broad spectrum of work that the company 13 supports related to adult blood, adult tissue, biopsies, et 14 15 cetera, not fetal tissue donation. 16 Exhibit B3, the StemExpress website screenshot makes 17 absolutely no reference to fetal tissue. In fact, it pertains 18 to the overwhelming majority of StemExpress' work with adult blood 19 and tissue that has nothing to do with fetal tissue, which 20 accounted for less than 1 percent of the company's revenue in 2014 21 before losses. 22 They have repeatedly offered to come in and provide exactly 23 the specific information that is raised in these exhibits and that

has been turned down. I think it is shameful for an investigation that seeks to get supposedly to the truth.

Now, I want to ask Ms. Clayton a question, and I think that this parallel is worth examining because the facts are the same -- discredited video which led to an investigation that found no quilt.

So I want to skip part of this but ask, there were accusations made against your client that impacted him, the client that was found to have done nothing wrong. And I wonder how it affected his business reputation, his own safety, and that of his family.

Ms. Clayton. Yes, Congressman Schakowsky. The company—it was a company, Anatomical Gift Foundation, and it was threatened by terrorists on the anti-choice side, including the Army of God. That is the group that shot Dr. Tiller, not the time he was murdered but the time he was shot before his murder. Army of God is one of the most violent, outrageous, anti-choice groups around, and AGF, my client, received threats of that as soon as these outrageously fallacious videotapes were sent to Congress and got circulated, when they were on 20/20, and everybody believed they were true. Oh, it must be true. We saw it on a videotape, not under oath.

I would just comment that anyone who wants to look at a defense of any of this, first thing you do, get Mr. Daleiden under

oath, see what he says when the penalty of perjury would attach, because when Mr. Alberti was under oath in the deposition that I took, he suddenly started telling the truth, and what he told was that everything else was a lie.

Meanwhile, these threats endanger the life and safety of people at clinics all over the country as in Colorado. A crazy Mr. Dear murdered three people because he thought it was true about these tapes, the sale of baby body parts, even though 12 states, the Texas grand jury have found that is completely fallacious.

Ms. Schakowsky. I just want to say your client provided a letter sent by this anti-abortion group to your client's wife. In that letter, the group referenced baby parts — that is a quote — and warned her that it was "watching you and your husband" and that this is "this is only the beginning." And I seek unanimous consent to enter this March 9, 2000, letter.

Mrs. Blackburn. So ordered.

Ms. Schakowsky. And I believe that there is a connection between the murders at the clinic in Colorado Springs following these deceptive videos where the murderer said, "No more baby body parts," and the repeat of that language and the repeat of the false accusations and the collection of names, a database of names of people involved in research and in clinics is dangerous. It is dangerous. We should not be doing that in the United States of

1 America, and I yield back.

2 Mrs. Blackburn. The gentlelady's time has expired.

I yield to Ms. Black for five minutes.

Ms. Black. Thank you, Madam Chair, and I thank the panel for being here today. I do want to focus on Exhibit G, on who bears the responsibility for the tissue procurement chart. As a nurse, I am well aware of how important it is to follow procedures, especially in performing your duties when you are caring for a patient that has trusted you as a care provider for their medical treatment.

So let's walk through the day -- a day in the life of a procurement tech. And if you will please turn to Exhibit C for this question. In Exhibit C4, you will see that the tech gets an email from -- gets an email like the one that is on C4, and she reads the order for certain baby body parts, including the gestation period, and knows what she needs to harvest for that day. And I want to reference the second from the bottom line it says that she will need a brain, 16 to 20 -- excuse me, 16 to 18 weeks, and complete but can be in pieces. So she has a very specific tissue that she is looking for.

Now, if we can turn to C9, Exhibit C9, and then she informs the abortion clinic staff of what she will be procuring on that day. And we actually see there on the first line where she

communicates with the assistant manager, says, "Upon arrival, inform the staff clearly of what you are procuring for the day."

So let's follow on, then, with Exhibit C5. The procurement

So let's follow on, then, with Exhibit C5. The procurement tech then reviews the medical files, which is another subject of whether this is a HIPAA violation, whether she has the rights to be looking at those files of the patients to learn their names and the gestation time of their baby, and she records this in a gestation tracking log, essentially matching the patient with her needs, not the patient's needs but with her needs of what she has been given as her job for the day.

Let's next turn to Exhibit Number 8. Next, the procurement office -- the procurement tech approaches the patient waiting for this abortion, and many times this is a young woman who is afraid, not always certain about what she is doing, and needs advice and counseling, but that is not what we see her getting here. She doesn't have -- this tech doesn't have much time, and she must match her orders with the patient who are at the right gestation time.

So she asks for the patient by name, and then she consents with them to donate by saying that her baby tissue is about curing for potential diseases, such as diabetes, Parkinson's, and heart disease.

And I want to also reference the second paragraph here where

she actually says that the law in the state of California, which is where this is being done, requires that the tissue from your procedure be incinerated. If you go and look at the law there, you do -- she is leaving one thing out. She could offer to this mother to actually bury this baby, but that is left out.

She is given I think decisions that are very difficult, either you are going to incinerate this baby, or you are going to give this baby up for research. I think that you certainly should be counseling and giving all options to this young woman who is in a very difficult situation in making that decision.

Now let's turn to Exhibit C12 and then after that C13, because after the abortion the procurement tech collects the tissues and procures the baby body parts needed. She carries all of her supplies with her, and you will see here in this particular exhibit that she has very detailed instructions about what she is putting these body parts into. So this is not coming from the abortion clinic. This is actually coming from the procurement agency that she is working for.

And then the tissue tech then arranges for the delivery. We can see that that is by FedEx. It is clear on the first exhibit and also on this one about who is paying for the delivery of this, not only the test tubes, and so on, that she will be using to put the specimen in.

So let's go back again to Exhibit G where we see here in Exhibit G a blank on where the expenses are for the abortion clinic because, as I walked you through her day, there is nothing to indicate that the abortion clinic has incurred any expenses.

So let me ask you, Mr. Lennon, if you were to walk through this, how does this comprehensiveness of the tissue tech's work inform your thinking about whether the abortion clinic is profiting from the sale of baby body parts?

Mr. Lennon. Thank you. I did consider that in my analysis here, and so the question that was raised earlier in the parliamentary question by the representative from New York was that maybe there is a conversation, and in this case there was a conversation. But then the payment should be maybe for that conversation in the processing, because that is the only thing I see where the abortion clinic would have any cost incurred for that conversation, not a per tissue — price per tissue payment. That informs me that we are talking about the sale of a part and not some reasonable cost.

The other I think attack that a defense counsel -- which I now do -- would say is, well, they are also involved in the processing because, you know, the client, the patient is there, but the abortion itself is not the processing of the tissue. It is the creation of the tissue through the destruction of a human

```
life.
 1
 2
             So I think there is really no argument I saw from any of this
        that the abortion clinic had any other costs. They are getting
 3
        a per tissue payment.
 4
 5
             Ms. Black.
                         Thank you, Mr. Lennon. I yield back.
             Mrs. Blackburn. The gentlelady's time has expired.
 6
 7
             Ms. DeGette, you are recognized for five minutes.
 8
             Ms. DeGette. Thank you so much, Madam Chair. As a former
 9
        litigator myself, there is nothing I like better than a panel of
        lawyers. I have a series of questions that I would prefer a yes
10
11
        or no answer, if I may,
12
             The first question I have for the panel is, we received a
        packet of documents from the majority. I believe I have seen you
13
        all referring to it during this hearing in a binder. So my first
14
15
        question is: have you seen these documents before today's
16
        hearing? Ms. Clayton, yes or no?
17
             Ms. Clayton.
                           Yes.
18
             Ms. DeGette. Mr. Raben?
19
             Mr. Raben. Yes.
20
             Mr. Lennon. Yes.
21
             Mr. Norton. Yes.
             Ms. Foster. Yes.
22
23
             Mr. Sukhia. Yes.
```

```
1
             Ms. DeGette. Thank you. And did you personally author any
 2
        of these documents? Ms. Clayton?
 3
             Ms. Clayton. No.
             Mr. Raben. No.
 4
 5
             Mr. Lennon. No
 6
             Mr. Norton. No.
 7
             Ms. Foster. No.
             Mr. Sukhia. No.
 8
 9
             Ms. DeGette. Have you spoken with anyone who authored any
        of the documents about the information that the documents contain?
10
11
             Ms. Clayton. Not to my knowledge.
12
             Mr. Raben. No.
13
             Mr. Lennon. Not to my knowledge.
14
             Mr. Norton. Not to my knowledge.
15
             Ms. Foster. Not to my knowledge.
16
             Mr. Sukhia. Maybe. But I don't know.
17
             Ms. DeGette. Who have you spoken with, then?
18
             Mr. Sukhia. Just the folks who contacted --
19
             Ms. DeGette. Do you have names?
20
             Mr. Sukhia. Of the folks -- March Bell, and I think that
21
        might be it.
22
             Ms. DeGette. And that is from majority staff?
23
             Mr. Sukhia. Yes.
```

```
1
             Ms. DeGette. Thank you. Now, for the documents that are
 2
        listed in the index that accompanied the packet as coming from
        a "procurement business," have you spoken with that procurement
 3
 4
        business about the documents? Ms. Clayton?
 5
            Ms. Clayton.
                          No.
 6
            Ms. DeGette. Mr. Raben?
 7
            Mr. Raben. No.
            Mr. Lennon. No.
 8
 9
            Mr. Norton. No.
10
            Ms. Foster. No.
11
            Mr. Sukhia. No.
                               No, and that is why there needs to be --
12
            Ms. DeGette. Now --
                          -- an investigation.
13
            Mr. Sukhia.
14
            Ms. DeGette. Excuse me. Now, do you have any firsthand
15
        knowledge of how the procurement business in question created the
16
        documents used in today's exhibits? Ms. Clayton?
17
            Ms. Clayton. Absolutely no.
18
            Ms. Foster. No.
19
            Mr. Lennon. No.
20
            Mr. Norton. No.
21
            Ms. Foster. No.
22
            Mr. Sukhia. No.
23
            Ms. DeGette. And for the documents that are listed as
```

```
1
        staff-created, for example, Exhibits B4 and B5, did the Republican
 2
        staff discuss those documents with you? Ms. Clayton?
 3
             Ms. Clayton. No.
             Ms. Foster. No.
 4
 5
             Mr. Lennon. Could you remind me what exhibits you are
 6
        talking about?
 7
             Ms. DeGette. Well, the exhibits like the charts that were
        clearly staff-created.
 8
 9
             Mr. Lennon. No.
10
             Mr. Norton. No.
             Ms. Foster. No.
11
12
             Mr. Sukhia. I think -- I think we did discuss that.
             Ms. DeGette. You did discuss that with --
13
             Mr. Sukhia. I think the staff member indicated that those
14
15
        are --
16
             Ms. DeGette. Did they tell you the documents, sir, that
17
        formed the foundation of those?
18
             Mr. Sukhia. No. The nature of --
19
             Ms. DeGette. Thank you very much.
20
             Mr. Sukhia.
                          -- their -- well, the --
             Ms. DeGette. My last question, do you have any firsthand
21
22
        knowledge of what documents and facts the majority staff relied
23
        upon in the staff-created documents? Ms. Clayton?
```

```
1
            Ms. Clayton. Absolutely no idea.
 2
            Mr. Raben. No.
 3
            Mr. Lennon. No.
            Mr. Norton. Yes.
 4
 5
            Ms. DeGette. Okay. And how do you know that, if you didn't
        talk to the staff, Mr. Norton?
 6
 7
            Mr. Norton. The exhibits that were provided to me obviously
 8
        support the --
 9
             Ms. DeGette. Well, take a look --
10
                          -- summary of the documents that you --
            Mr. Norton.
            Ms. DeGette. -- Mr. Norton, at Exhibit B5 --
11
                          -- have identified --
12
            Mr. Norton.
13
            Ms. DeGette. No. I am talking about --
14
            Mr. Norton.
                          -- Ms. DeGette.
15
            Ms. DeGette. -- the staff --
16
            Mr. Norton. I am just trying to answer you question.
17
            Ms. DeGette. Mr. Norton, I am talking about the
18
        staff-created documents like the charts. Did they tell you what
19
        data they used in creating the staff-created documents?
20
            Mr. Norton. That is not what you asked, but the answer to
21
        that --
22
            Ms. DeGette. Yes, it is what I asked.
23
            Mr. Norton.
                          -- is no.
```

```
1
             Ms. DeGette. Thank you. Ms. Foster?
 2
             Ms. Foster. No.
 3
             Mr. Sukhia. No.
             Ms. DeGette. Thank you. Now, Mr. Raben, I want to ask you
 4
 5
        a couple questions. Given that no witness on the panel has
        firsthand knowledge of how these exhibits were created or the
 6
 7
        underlying facts captured in any of them, do you think it is
        appropriate for the witnesses to speculate about possible
 8
 9
        criminal misconduct based on those documents?
10
             Mr. Raben. I think calling it speculation is entirely
        accurate. It would be pure speculation. It wouldn't be
11
12
        probative.
13
             Ms. DeGette. Now, you heard in his testimony, you heard Mr.
14
        Lennon testify that not -- based on his experience as a prosecutor,
15
        that he believed that these documents, in and of themselves, not
16
        only establish probable cause but proof beyond a reasonable doubt.
17
        What is your opinion of that analysis?
18
             Mr. Raben. I would be a little frightened if that were the
19
        regime in which --
20
             Ms. DeGette. Why?
21
             Mr. Raben. -- we live.
22
             Ms. DeGette. Why?
23
             Mr. Raben. Well, several reasons. One, the context in
```

which all of these facts come, and I don't have to go back to 2000,

1

although I do think that is illustrative, just in the last --2 Ms. DeGette. If you can just be brief, I only have five 3 4 minutes. 5 Mr. Raben. There has been a volume of inaccurate and deceptive information thrown at committees and the media about 6 7 this issue. If I were an investigator or prosecutor looking at it, I would be extremely skeptical, and I want to know more before 8 9 I proceeded. 10 Ms. DeGette. And wouldn't you want to bring in the people 11 that actually created those documents --12 Mr. Raben. Clearly. 13 Ms. DeGette. -- and put them under oath? 14 Mr. Raben. Yes. 15 Ms. DeGette. Thank you. Now, Madam Chair, the reason why 16 I am kind of stuck on this is because if people are selling fetal 17 tissue in violation of the law, we need to get to the bottom of 18 it. We need to find it out. But we can't just have some witch 19 hunt based on some things that were taken off of screenshots and 20 off of documents and charts created by staff. And I will tell you, even though 12 states, including my home 21 22 state of Colorado, by Attorney General Cynthia Coffman, who is 23 a Republican, who investigated these claims Mr. Norton was talking

1 about against Planned Parenthood of the Rocky Mountains, and found no cause of action to investigate, even though 12 states have 2 3 investigated and found there was nothing, if you want to send it to the Department of Justice for investigation, I will guarantee 4 5 you they won't make up little charts with their staffs. They will get to the bottom of it with original documents, 6 7 and I suggest that is what you should do if you think there is a criminal violation. 8 9 I yield back. 10 Mr. Norton. That is not correct about Colorado Attorney General Coffman, Ms. DeGette. 11 12 Mrs. Blackburn. The gentlelady yields back. Her time has 13 expired. 14 Dr. Bucshon, you are recognized for five minutes. 15 Mr. Bucshon. Thank you. Mr. Norton, do you want to expand 16 on that about the Attorney General quickly? 17 Mr. Norton. Yes. Attorney General Coffman has not 18 investigated the allegations of Rocky Mountain Planned Parenthood 19 or other Planned Parenthood facilities around the country in 20 trafficking in baby parts of bodies. 21 She has taken the position she has no authority to 22 investigate the matter whatsoever.

Mr. Bucshon. Than you.

23

```
1
             Mr. Norton. Unless asked by the Governor to do so, with the
 2
        Governor as a --
 3
             Ms. DeGette.
                           Will the gentleman yield?
                           -- supporter of --
             Mr. Norton.
 4
 5
             Mr. Bucshon. I will not yield.
 6
             Ms. DeGette. Well, then, I guess we won't get to the truth
 7
        of it.
                           Thank you. A couple things. First of all,
 8
             Mr. Bucshon.
 9
        you know, the indictment in Texas was for using a fake ID. And
10
        I am the dad of a couple of college students, and I can tell you,
        you know, half the college campuses would be indicted over that.
11
12
             Also, it was stated that researchers are losing money on this
13
        fetal tissue. If they are losing money, how are they losing money
        if there is not a financial transaction?
14
15
             The other thing is, I agree that past investigations are
16
        completely irrelevant to today's discussion. You know, if that
17
        was the case, we would never investigate anything. And the other
18
        thing is, the person in Colorado who tragically murdered some
19
        people had very severe mental illness, and that was what was --
20
        impacted that situation, which is tragic.
             During the time of the 1993 NIH Revitalization Act, everyone
21
22
        had high hopes about fetal tissue transplantation. Just so you
23
        know, I was a doctor before I came to Congress. Unfortunately,
```

that didn't work out. And so in reference to this particular 1 procurement agency, which has been mentioned multiple times by 2 the minority, this whole section of the Act was passed to reverse 3 the ban on fetal tissue transplantation. 4 5 The statute which applies to all fetal tissue allows 6 reasonable payments associated with transportation, 7 implantation, processing, preservation, quality control, or storage of human fetal tissue. I know a little bit about this 8 9 because I was a doctor, and it appears to me that all of these 10 are upstream activities from the abortion clinic in reference to this particular full service procurement agency. 11 12 So the question is is I am going to -- I will start with Mr. Lennon. Assuming that that is correct, under this particular 13 14 procurement agency we are discussing today, do you see any 15 language in the statute that forms the basis to reimburse the 16 abortion clinic for any costs at all? 17 Mr. Lennon. I don't -- the statute itself doesn't delineate 18 between the two, but I would want to quickly respond to Mr. Raben. 19 My written testimony submitted makes clear that there were 20 assumptions made, that all this evidence is admissible in court, and that an ethical prosecutor would also have storytellers, 21 22 either credible insiders or people who are compelled to testify 23 to support this.

1 So my analysis -- and the question I think was unfair. My written testimony points out that this evidence needs to be 2 corroborated. 3 Mr. Bucshon. Understood. 4 5 Mr. Lennon. But I do think that if the abortion clinic was able to show that there were reasonable costs that were delineated 6 7 there, and I have seen no evidence of that, then that would be complying with the statute. But I didn't see that in any of the 8 9 exhibits I was asked to review, and that is the basis of my opinion. Mr. Bucshon. Mr. Norton? 10 Mr. Norton. Yes, I would agree with that. I think that 11 12 there are a fair number -- first of all, let me say that in our 13 system of criminal justice, each and every individual is presumed innocent unless and until proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. 14 15 Even those clients Ms. DeGette would bring to my office when I 16 was United States Attorney, they would be presumed to be innocent 17 as well from the get-go. 18 Mr. Bucshon. Agreed. 19 Mr. Norton. And so that would be the case here, and so there are a number of unanswered issues I think that a competent 20 investigation could and should pursue. For example, how much 21

And what is the source of that? Is it from the patient, from

does the abortion clinic receive for an abortion from a client?

22

23

insurers, from Medicaid, from other sources?

1

What, if any, of the services that are provided to the 2 abortion client -- that is, the woman upon whom the abortion is 3 committed, are unbundled and billed to insurers, including 4 5 Medicaid? What is the actual cost of the abortion? What are the 6 amounts over and above that cost? And where do they go, and how 7 are they accounted for? In other words, what is happening to those profits? 8 9 How does the abortion clinic notify the procurement business or procurement business technician of the fact of abortions? 10 11 appears from the materials we have provided that the procurement 12 business technician is actually embedded in the abortion clinic and is given access to confidential medical records before the 13 14 patient even shows up on the scene, so that that technician can 15 select what organs the company seems to want at that point in time. 16 Mr. Bucshon. I am running out of time, so I am going to have 17 to -- Mr. Sukhia, you wanted to comment on something earlier. 18 Real quickly. 19 Mr. Sukhia. Well, thank you very much. The federal 20 provision is a federal provision. So all the talk about, well, states having looked at this --21 22 Mr. Bucshon. By the way, the states that looked at it, the services in question here weren't provided in the first place. 23

And I will speak for Indiana, so, obviously, nothing was done wrong because that wasn't even part of the equation.

Mr. Sukhia. Well, so there are different jurisdictions, and from a federal standpoint, from the standpoint of a federal prosecutor, he is not going to be swayed by what some states decided was or wasn't a violation of their state statutes.

Mr. Bucshon. Fair enough. I yield back.

Mrs. Blackburn. The gentleman's time has expired. Ms. Speier, you are recognized for five minutes.

Ms. Speier. Thank you, Madam Chair. You know, this hearing belongs in a bad episode of House of Cards. I am sure Frank Underwood is lurking somewhere here in the room. In fact, this hearing is literally based on a house of cards and the exhibits being used as a foundation are, in all likelihood, the product of a theft carried out by someone who is now under indictment in Texas and whose home has been the subject of a court-ordered search in California.

Is this hearing really going to proceed based on stolen and misleading documents? Even Frank Underwood would be blushing at this point. This committee's sole purpose is to hold fake trials of citizens and companies that comply with laws, but not with the political agenda of Republicans who want to restrict women's health care. Twelve states and four Congressional committees —

one Senate, three House -- have already investigated the videos released by the so-called Center for Medical Progress last summer and found absolutely no evidence of wrongdoing.

The same cannot be said for David Daleiden and his associates. This so-called committee is the very definition of a kangaroo court, a mock court that disregards the rules of law and justice to validate a predetermined conclusion. But this mock court has real consequences. While we are focusing on what goes on inside a woman's uterus, we are completely ignoring what happens to babies and children outside of them.

How else can you explain why this Panel is holding this hearing while children go hungry and research on pediatric cancer is desperately in need of more research dollars? What about the health implications for our children if we stifle fetal tissue research? After all, fetal tissue research was key to the CDC's recent confirmation of the link between Zika and microencephaly. This is the first step in developing treatment options and vaccines to stop the spread of Zika.

Considering Zika-affected infants suffer from brain damage, severe seizures, and other medical problems, why aren't we talking about protecting those infant lives. If this committee succeeds in abusing medical professionals so severely that they abandon promising research, not a single life will be saved, but many,

```
1
        many will be lost. Perhaps we should propose a new name for this
        committee, the Select Investigative Panel on Stopping Research
 2
 3
        and Letting People Die.
             Now, let me ask Mr. Raben, given that no witnesses on the
 4
 5
        panel have firsthand knowledge of how these exhibits were created,
 6
        or the underlying facts captured in any of them, do you think it
 7
        is appropriate for the witnesses to speculate about --
             Mr. Bucshon. Will the gentlelady yield?
 8
 9
             Ms. Speier. -- criminal misconduct based on those
        documents?
10
11
             Mr. Bucshon. Madam Chairman?
12
             Mrs. Blackburn. The gentleman is recognized.
             Mr. Bucshon. I take personal offense to being -- for it
13
14
        being said that, as a physician, I am here to allow people to die.
15
        I would like those words stricken from the record. It is a
16
        personal attack on me as a physician.
17
             Ms. Speier. You were not referenced by name.
18
             Mr. Raben, will you please respond?
             Mr. Bucshon. I don't -- I would quibble with -- inquiry on
19
20
        that?
21
             Ms. Speier. You have to be referenced by name.
22
             Mrs. Blackburn. If the gentlelady will yield.
```

Ms. Speier. I will yield.

23

1 Mrs. Blackburn. Thank you. You would have to be referenced by name. And I appreciate the inquiry, but you would need to be 2 3 referenced by name. Mr. Bucshon. Thank you. I would just like it part of the 4 5 record that I am offended by that comment. Thank you. Mrs. Blackburn. The gentleman is so noted. 6 7 Ms. Speier, you are recognized. Ms. Speier. Mr. Raben? 8 9 Mr. Raben. I can't -- thank you. I can't quibble with 10 speculation. It is important that everybody remember that it is just speculation, that this is not probative evidence of anything. 11 12 We have got very, very bright, experienced people speculating. Ms. Speier. So to Mr. Lennon, Madam Chair, even in her 13 opening remarks, referenced "horrible videos." These videos 14 15 have 30 minutes missing from them. The doctor interviewed said 16 10 times that Planned Parenthood does not profit from tissue 17 donations, and Ms. Daleiden -- Mr. Daleiden sent a proposed 18 transfer agreement with a specific clause, a compensation clause, 19 to Planned Parenthood when he was trying to negotiate a contract. 20 Planned Parenthood struck that particular compensation clause, and then Mr. Daleiden didn't pursue it. Is that a 21 22 reputable person on which to base an entire committee hearing? 23 Mr. Lennon. I have never met the gentleman that you refer

In fact, I don't know what House of Cards or Frank Underwood 1 is either. So, but I will tell you this. There is a difference 2 -- there is a difference between what a discredited whistleblower, 3 like Ms. Clayton unfortunately had to deal with, as opposed to 4 5 admissions made by an agent of a potential target. 6 So those are apples and oranges. I have not purported --I am not saying I have watched all of the videos. I have seen 7 some excerpts. I am just talking as an evidentiary matter there 8 9 is a huge difference between a whistleblower who is discredited 10 and an agent or director or employee or officer of a targeted industry. Those are admissions that could be admissible in 11 court. 12 13 So I think -- again, I don't want to opine. I have not looked at all of the videos. I don't even know where they were all --14 15 Ms. Speier. Thank you. My time has expired. 16 Mr. Lennon. Thank you. 17 Mrs. Blackburn. The gentlelady yields back. 18 Dr. Harris, you are recognized for five minutes. 19 Mr. Harris. Thank you very much. 20 Look, I am sorry, I am not a lawyer. I am a doctor. I have 21 worked, you know, in NA-sponsored research and at Johns Hopkins. 22 And I want to ask today not about profit, because, look, I think

the record speaks for itself. All of the costs were covered by

23

1 the procurement companies. The record speaks for itself.

What I want -- you know, on Exhibit B2, the procurement company's brochure, it says that, you know, these are IRB-certified consents. Exhibit C8, page 2, at the bottom says BioMed IRB approved, and in fact I am going to ask a legal question here because, you know, IRB approval is very important in human research.

And if you are looking at whether someone is out to make a profit, they are going to cut corners, they are going to save a dollar here or there, and so I am going to ask a question about specifically this company called BioMed IRB.

And I am going to ask, Madam Chair, to enter into the record two letters from the Department of Health and Human Services regarding the company, one from March 29, 2012, the other from January 16, 2013. The March 29, 2012, letter actually is a letter to that company basically asking it to cease and desist from doing approvals or, in fact, anything being obtained under one of their approvals because of the shoddy work that this apparently one room, single owner, IRB mill. That is the best way you can call it. You can look at -- look, you can go to their website, you can see their price list.

You know, I have submitted things to an IRB. They guarantee that if you have it in by Tuesday before noon, you are actually

1 going to have it before the IRB and approved that week basically. But for \$1,900 more, you can actually submit it after noon on 2 Tuesday and have it approved that week. It is unbelievable. 3 But I want to ask a specific legal question, because if in 4 5 fact the company continued to obtain specimens under that IRB approval between March 29 and January 16, 2013, who is liable for 6 7 that, if in fact when that IRB -- when the FDA said, "You cannot obtain specimens" told the IRB that that is true. Mr. Lennon, 8 9 who would be responsible for that? Mr. Lennon. I don't think I am -- I don't think I have a 10 11 foundation to answer that question. 12 Mr. Harris. Okay. Let me ask you a question. Is it a valid question to ask that, in fact, if the FDA had said you can't obtain 13 14 tissue -- you can obtain anything under the IRB approvals that 15 you have had until you have responded to us and they -- and the 16 letter came back almost a year later. 17 If in fact a procurement company was obtaining tissue in that 18 period of time, would that be a problem in -- because Title 45 19 of the Regulations Part 46 make it pretty clear you need IRB 20 approval. And, in fact, downstream federal research, where an IRB further downstream depended upon that information in that IRB 21 22 to be accurate. In other words, if I was obtaining, as a 23 researcher, tissue from this company, my IRB assumes that the

1 previous IRB approval is actually valid, that in fact that company represents they have IRB approval. 2 If they don't, is it valid to actually look downstream and 3 see whether those IRBs were notified downstream, whether in fact 4 5 those researchers were notified that this IRB approval in fact 6 had been suspected by the FDA? Is that valid? Is that something 7 we should look into? Mr. Norton, something we should look into? Mr. Norton. I think that is a very valid question, frankly. 8 9 And as I looked at the exhibits in preparation for this hearing, 10 that was a question that I had is exactly what was the effect of and the date of and the integrity of the IRB approval process. 11 12 As I understand Exhibit C15, it is a document that is being provided to the woman who is --13 14 Mr. Harris. Yes. Let me go on and --Mr. Norton. -- obtaining the abortion. So I think it is 15 16 a valid -- because essentially it is a false statement by --17 Mr. Harris. And let me go further to a false statement. On 18 the videos, pretty clearly a doctor says, "We modify the procedure 19 to get better body parts." Pretty clearly. I mean, look, this 20 is -- there is no doctoring going on here. This is you look at it -- and I urge anyone looking at this hearing, go look it up. 21 22 The doctor says, "We alter it to preserve the calvarium, so we 23 don't crush the calvarium, so we can actually get the amount of

```
1
        money we are going to charge for it."
 2
             The federal regulations say you actually have to tell the
        patient if you are going to change a procedure. Now, I look at
 3
 4
        the consent forms, which is Exhibit C8, page 2, it says
 5
        specifically your abortion procedure will not change in any way.
        We look at one of the consent forms that was actually entered into
 6
 7
        the record last time which says that your procedure will not be
        changed in any way.
 8
 9
             If in fact the procedure is changed in any way, is that a
        valid -- is that a violation of the IRB-approved consent which
10
11
        is necessary for federal research dollars? It is actually
12
        necessary for any research to be conducted downstream. Is that
        a violation of that, if you in fact modify the procedure after
13
        the patient signed a consent that said procedure will not be
14
15
        modified?
16
             Mr. Norton. Yes. I think that is also a violation of the
17
        statute itself.
18
             Mr. Harris. Thank you very much.
19
             Mr. Raben. May I --
20
             Mr. Harris. I yield back.
             Mr. Raben. May I just get in there to question the premise?
21
22
             Mr. Harris. My time has expired. I am sorry.
23
             Mr. Raben. Well, mine has not. The premise of --
```

Mrs. Blackburn. The gentleman's time has expired.

1

Okay. Let's -- Mr. Raben, go ahead. 2 Mr. Raben. I was going to question the premise of the "I 3 don't know a thing about the consent forms at IRB." I never work 4 5 on IRB, but your premise that the videos were not -- this part of the video was not distorted is not accurate. Every aspect of 6 7 the videos that were put out in the public were heavily edited, deceptive, and distorted, and independent analysis finds -- and 8 9 I don't think there is a sane prosecutor in the country that would 10 feel comfortable putting people who created those videos on a 11 witness stand in a case, because they would be impeached. 12 Mrs. Blackburn. Ms. DelBene, you are recognized for five 13 minutes. 14 Ms. DelBene. Thank you, Madam Chair. This hearing and, 15 frankly, this entire investigation is nothing more than an attempt 16 to limit a woman's right to choose under the false guise of illegal 17 tissue sales. And this isn't the first time we have seen this. 18 As Ms. Clayton stated, 16 years ago the House held a hearing 19 on nearly identical allegations. Those claims, also based on 20 secretly recorded videos by anti-choice extremists, were found to be fabricated and patently false. In fact, much of the 21 22 so-called evidence that was used back then mirrors what we are 23 seeing right here today.

In that hearing, the majority relied upon a whistleblower 1 who claimed that the entities were profiting from illegal tissue 2 However, while testifying, the whistleblower 3 sales. acknowledged that he had fabricated his statements and lacked any 4 5 knowledge of illegal activity. The Department of Justice, though, still investigated the 6 7 person in question, Dr. Miles Jones, and found that after a thorough review of the issues no violations of federal statutes 8 9 were found. So, Mr. Raben, if the Justice Department had uncovered evidence that Dr. Jones had violated the federal laws 10 on fetal issue donation, the statute, in particular Section 11 12 289g-2, would have permitted the Department of Justice to 13 prosecute. Is that correct? 14 Mr. Raben. Yes. 15 Ms. DelBene. And the majority appears to be saying that the 16 term "valuable consideration" isn't fully defined and, as a 17 result, the DOJ is incapable of enforcing the law. 18 opinion, does the Department of Justice lack the clarity that they 19 need to enforce the law? 20 Mr. Raben. No. Ms. DelBene. And if the Department had actual evidence of 21 22 federal violations in those cases, the DOJ would enforce the law, 23 would it not?

1 Mr. Raben. I have complete confidence that the men and women of the Department of Justice know what they are doing and take 2 issues like this seriously. Yes. 3 Ms. DelBene. So is it fair to say, then, that there really 4 5 isn't a problem with the statute in the 2000 case regarding the Miles Jones investigation but, rather, a lack of facts to support 6 7 the prosecution? Mr. Raben. That would be my inference, yes. 8 9 Ms. DelBene. And do you think we are in a similar situation 10 from what you have seen so far today? Mr. Raben. Yes. 11 12 Ms. DelBene. So do you think it is possible that the lack 13 of prosecutions that others have referred to over the years under 14 both Republican and Democratic administrations, signals that 15 there aren't widespread violations of the law as we have heard 16 alleged here today? 17 Mr. Raben. That is right. 18 Ms. DelBene. So then, once again, I think this hearing is 19 really another recycled attempt to show wrongdoing when there is 20 none or there is no evidence that there has been done, and we are, once again, watching history repeat itself. 21 22 You know, I would also point out that after the investigation 23 in 2000 women's health care providers were also subjected to false

allegations -- or false accusations on seven separate occasions between 2000 and 2013, all based on so-called evidence from anti-choice extremists. I don't know, Ms. Clayton, if you have any comments you want to make about those allegations that took place afterwards.

Ms. Clayton. I would be glad to. The false allegations and the attempts to stir up crazy people like Robert Dear have been ongoing. I think they have been ceaseless. In fact, anyone who saw Mark Crutcher talking at the Cleveland Right to Life last month saw him brag about stirring up people like Daleiden who will go out and do his business by any means necessary. How Crutcher has avoided prosecution, I don't know, but I think it is because he gets other people to lie for him.

These efforts by the radical anti-choice groups like Life Dynamics, Army of God, have been endless as far as I can tell, and they threaten the lives of everyone who uses a clinic for -- and the clinics, by the way, don't provide just abortions, they provide a host of health services. The people who were murdered in Colorado weren't getting abortions. It is just -- it is a terrible threat to the health and safety of the nation when these people are allowed to get away with that.

Ms. DelBene. You know, the majority seems determined to use this taxpayer-funded panel to continue pursuing the latest series

of false, unsubstantiated allegations, even though they have been 1 debunked by everyone who has looked at them, including state 2 attorneys general as well as committees right here in Congress. 3 So the truth is that the investigation, and this particular 4 5 investigation, isn't really about fact-finding at all. As we have talked about, we haven't had witnesses who can speak to the 6 7 facts here. So these are just baseless allegations made by Daniel Daleiden, and it is just another attempt, I would say, to smear 8 9 women's health care providers with falsehoods and fabrications. Women definitely deserve better. 10 I yield back, Madam Chair. 11 12 Mrs. Blackburn. I thank the gentlelady. 13 Mr. Duffy, you are recognized for five minutes. 14 Mr. Duffy. Thank you, Madam Chair. Is it fair to say that 15 the whole panel today thinks that we should look for the truth? Anybody disagree with that? Raise your hand if you disagree with 16 17 that. 18 Okay. And we should actually enforce the law. Does anybody 19 disagree with the fact that we should enforce the law? Because 20 we all -- all right. Great. We are starting out very well. 21 I have heard some conversation about how the Department of 22 Justice and investigations and so just to be clear on this, Ms. 23 Clayton, has there been an FBI investigation into this issue?

```
1
             Ms. Clayton. I am not privy to that sort of thing. I have
 2
        no idea.
 3
             Mr. Duffy. Okay. So how about this? Is there a lead DOJ
        attorney that has been assigned to lead the investigation into
 4
 5
        this matter?
 6
             Ms. Clayton. Mr. Duffy, I am a civil litigator. I have no
        knowledge or access to that sort of information --
 7
             Mr. Duffy. But just --
 8
 9
             Ms. Clayton. -- which I understand has to be kept -- I don't
10
        think it is allowed to be shared with people like me.
             Mr. Duffy. So you are not aware of any lead attorney at the
11
12
        Department of -- does anybody on the panel know of a lead attorney
        at the Department of Justice who is leading this investigation?
13
             Mr. Sukhia. No. I have heard nothing of --
14
15
             Mr. Duffy. I haven't either. I want to have the panel refer
16
        to Exhibit 2 -- I am sorry, Exhibit B2 and B3. Starting with B2,
17
        I believe that this was a document that was received from a
18
        national abortion provider conference, and it seems to indicate
19
        that there could be financial profitability for an abortion
20
        provider if they engage with the blocked out middle person, right?
21
             So if we look at the statute, it prohibits valuable
22
        consideration to be paid for the transfer of body parts, is that
23
        right?
```

1 Mr. Sukhia. Absolutely. 2 Mr. Duffy. And so if someone is getting reimbursed for a body part, it is pretty tough to make a profit, isn't it? If you 3 are just getting reimbursed, you can't make money. Am I missing 4 5 something, Mr. Sukhia? 6 Mr. Sukhia. I agree, totally. Mr. Duffy. Okay. So but if you are getting more than just 7 reimbursement, you can make a profit. 8 9 Mr. Sukhia. Yes. 10 Mr. Duffy. Does that concern anybody on the panel that then maybe the DOJ and the FBI isn't looking into this? Mr. Norton? 11 12 Mr. Norton. I think that is highly concerning. That is why 13 we are here, to encourage this panel to do that. 14 Mr. Duffy. I would agree with you. 15 Ms. Foster, I have heard a lot of my friends across the aisle 16 talk about this being an issue of women's health care. In regard 17 to Section U.S.C. -- I am sorry, 42 U.S.C. Section 289, this is 18 a section I believe that talks about valuable consideration for 19 fetal body parts. Is there anything in that section that you are aware of that relates to women's health care? 20 21 Ms. Foster. There isn't. And I would add that as a woman 22 and, in fact, as a post-abortive woman, I am deeply offended that 23 abortion clinics are permitting improper access by procurement

1 businesses to really exploit us, to potentially place us under duress, and to put our children on display for sale in the way 2 that chicken livers are in a grocery store. It deeply offends 3 4 me. 5 Mr. Duffy. Thank you. Ms. Clayton, I am sure you have had a chance to look at Exhibit B2. Is it your testimony that this 6 7 document has been altered in any way? 8 Ms. Clayton. B2? I have no knowledge of any of these 9 documents. And if these documents are anything like the 10 videotape, I would start with the assumption that they probably have been altered, but I don't have any personal knowledge one 11 12 way or the other. I never saw them until they were sent to me 13 by email I think it was yesterday. Mr. Duffy. So you are just -- so you have had a chance to 14 15 look at them since yesterday, you are an impartial witness today 16 who is making assertions that they are probably doctored. 17 Ms. Clayton. No. I said I would start with the assumption 18 that they might be because --19 Mr. Duffy. Well, take a look at them. Tell me what --20 Ms. Clayton. -- I have no knowledge of them, nor has anyone 21 in this room given any indication of the source of the document. Mr. Duffy. Look at the document. 22 23 Ms. Clayton. So as far as I know, they might have been

```
1
        invented --
 2
             Mr. Duffy. Ms. Clayton, this is my time.
 3
             Ms. Clayton. -- just like the videotape had been --
             Mr. Duffy. I would love to see -- tell the Panel today, what
 4
        has been doctored in Exhibit B2?
 5
             Ms. Clayton. Exhibit B2?
 6
 7
             Mr. Duffy. This is the document that shows that --
             Ms. Clayton. Let me find it.
 8
 9
             Mr. Duffy. -- an abortion provider can have financial
10
        profitability.
11
             Ms. Clayton. Well, actually, no, it doesn't say that at all.
12
        This obviously refers to adult tissue as well as any other kind.
        This is not limited. I looked at B2, sir, and it is clear that
13
        this is talking about adult tissue, which is far differently
14
15
        regulated --
16
             Mr. Sukhia. That is not true. It is talking about fetal
17
        tissue. It is clearly --
             Mr. Duffy. It says fetal to adult tissue.
18
19
             Ms. Clayton. It says fetal and adult --
20
             Mr. Duffy. Right on its face. It wasn't doctored enough.
             Mr. Sukhia. Stem cell-rich blood.
21
22
             Ms. Clayton. It has been redacted in certain ways that I
23
        can't tell what has been redacted.
```

```
Mr. Duffy. Right here, fetal DNA.
 1
 2
             Ms. Speier. Will the gentleman yield?
             Mr. Duffy. No, I will not.
 3
             Ms. Speier. Okay.
 4
 5
             Mr. Duffy. And it also talks about stem cell rich blood and
        raw materials. Does anybody know when they "raw materials" what
 6
 7
        that is referring to?
             Ms. Clayton. Perhaps adult tissue. It certainly applies
 8
 9
        to both adult and fetal, and I can't tell from the --
             Mr. Sukhia. Well, even if it does apply to both, it is still
10
        an offense because it does apply to fetal.
11
12
             Mr. Duffy. If this document is being sent out during the
        national abortion provider conference, and they are talking about
13
        adult tissue, is that your testimony today, Ms. Clayton, is --
14
15
        and we are not talking about fetal tissue?
16
             Ms. Clayton. Is what my testimony?
17
             Mr. Duffy. That this document is referring to adult tissue
18
        when it is being provided to the appropriate --
19
             Ms. Clayton. I have no idea. All I can --
             Mr. Duffy. -- national abortion provider conference.
20
             Ms. Clayton. Sir, all I can tell you is that it is clear
21
        from reading this document that it is not limited to fetal tissue
22
23
        and --
```

```
Mr. Duffy. One last --
 1
            Ms. Clayton. -- and, sir, if I may finish answering --
 2
            Mr. Duffy. One last question. I have one last question.
 3
            Ms. Clayton. -- the regulation --
 4
 5
            Mr. Duffy. One last question.
 6
            Ms. Clayton. -- are entirely different.
 7
            Mr. Duffy. There has been a lot of conversation on the Hill
 8
        about --
 9
            Mrs. Blackburn. The gentleman's time has expired.
            Mr. Duffy. -- money involved in politics. Has anybody on
10
11
        this panel made any --
12
            Mrs. Blackburn. The gentleman's time has expired.
            Mr. Duffy. -- contribution to any of the members that sit
13
        on this panel? If so, raise your hand if you have made a
14
15
        contribution. To anybody on the panel.
16
            Mrs. Blackburn. The gentleman's time has expired.
17
            Mr. Duffy. I yield back.
18
            Mrs. Blackburn. Mrs. Watson Colman, you are recognized for
19
        five minutes.
20
            Mrs. Watson Colman.
                                 Thank you very much. It is often said
        that Congress writes the laws and the executive branch enforces
21
22
        them. In 2000, when very similar allegations about tissue
23
        procurement organizations were made based on explosive video
```

1 interviews, the Justice Department was asked to investigate. 2 Then-Assistant Attorney General Robert Raben -- you, sir, 3 thank you for being here -- responded to a request from Fred Upton, 4 who had inquired about the potential criminal violations of the 5 federal statute against fetal tissue sales. In that letter, the Department noted that based upon a preliminary review of our 6 7 records, it appears the Department has not received any information -- information meeting our standards for triggering 8 9 a formal investigation that fetal tissue has been sold for profit. 10 And I ask unanimous consent that a copy of that letter be entered into this record. 11 Mr. Raben? 12 Mrs. Blackburn. So ordered. 13 14 Mrs. Watson Colman. Thank you, Madam Chair. 15 Mr. Raben, can you explain what the standards for triggering 16 a formal investigation are within the DOJ and why these standards 17 are necessary, and have these standards been met in this instance 18 that we are debating now? 19 Mr. Raben. These standards have not been met. 20 Mrs. Watson Colman. What the standards are. 21 Mr. Raben. Yes. 22 Mrs. Watson Colman. Why should they be met? 23 Mr. Raben. Right.

1 Mrs. Watson Colman. What triggers this? And are we there 2 now? Mr. Raben. Extremely briefly, there is different levels 3 that all investigative and prosecutive agencies go through. 4 There is an initial investigation, which can be begun with, you 5 know, any credible data. There is a formal investigation, which 6 requires a supervisor to sign off for the use of resources, and 7 then it is working with a prosecutor to figure out whether, with 8 9 a whole range of criteria, including sustainability of a conviction, are there other jurisdictions that could take it. 10 So I can refer you to the AG guidelines and the FBI 11 12 guidelines, and I can get that to you subsequently. But to answer 13 your question, it could well be that an agency is involved in an investigation. We have on the record 12 states that have opened 14 15 an investigation and closed. We have on the record 8 state 16 officials saying they wouldn't even open an investigation based 17 on the evidence that they have. 18 So I wouldn't be surprised if the Department has looked at 19 it and declined. And as I have stated before, the central problem 20 is there is so much duplicity and deception around how so much of this evidence was created that I think it would give most 21 22 prosecutors pause to go forward with a case. 23 Mrs. Watson Colman. So as in the Daleiden videos, the

1 deceptively edited videos, and sort of the out-of-contact 2 invoices, would they be enough to trigger a DOJ investigation? Mr. Raben. It would be an investigator and a prosecutor 3 going with incredible caution. He or she would have to find, in 4 5 my view, probative and credible evidence from other than that 6 source. 7 Mrs. Watson Colman. Right. And so would it involve also determining the validation of the Daleiden investigation -- I 8 9 mean, allegations? Mr. Raben. It is bad facts. If --10 11 Mrs. Watson Colman. So it would be -- I am sorry. 12 Mr. Raben. No, no. Go ahead. 13 Mrs. Watson Colman. Thank you. So it would be important to at least have the conversation with individuals with actual 14 15 knowledge of the facts contained in any documents under review. 16 Mr. Raben. Yes. 17 Mrs. Watson Colman. Any requests or investigations. 18 Mr. Raben. Yes. 19 Mrs. Watson Colman. Here today you have been asked by my 20 Republican colleagues to opine about possible criminal misconduct 21 based on a slew of documents that were sent to you late Monday afternoon without identification of the author of any document, 22 23 underlying source of information the documents contained, and

1 without the benefit of speaking to anyone with firsthand knowledge of that information. 2 3 Is this, in your opinion, a fair or legitimate way to determine if there has been a violation of federal law? 4 5 Mr. Raben. No. Mrs. Watson Colman. Madam Chair, unlike the Select Panel's 6 7 investigation, DOJ must -- must base its investigations on real facts and hard evidence. This Panel has, instead, based its 8 9 investigation -- and I put that in quotations -- so far on an indicted extremist and his discredited videos, and it is certainly 10 a time for the majority to rely on facts, not inflammatory 11 allegations of anti-abortion extremists. 12 And with that, I would just like to ask Ms. Clayton one 13 question, and that has to do with adult tissue versus fetal tissue. 14 15 You wanted to say something with regard to that, and I want to 16 give you that opportunity, because it is clear that wherever that 17 particular slide comes from it does refer to both. 18 Ms. Clayton. Okay. From my experience 16 years ago 19 representing a foundation that provided both fetal and adult

tissue for medical research, I know a little bit about it. My

knowledge is out of date, but among the things I know are that

fetal tissue donations are highly, highly regulated, as are

donations of fetal or adult for transplants, very highly

20

21

22

23

1 regulated. 2 When it comes to adult tissue that is just for research, there are still regulations of course but far fewer. So when I looked 3 at that exhibit, what was it, B or something? I immediately saw 4 5 they were -- the exhibit, assuming it is a real document, was conflating more things than one. It wasn't just about fetal. It 6 7 was --Mrs. Watson Colman. It was about a range of services. 8 9 Ms. Clayton. Yes. And so if you talk about what you can -- if the Amtrak -- if I die on the Amtrak and my liver goes to 10 somebody, you know, they can do a lot of things with that, not 11 12 highly regulated. 13 Mrs. Watson Colman. Thank you, Ms. Clayton. Thank you, Mr. 14 Raben. 15 Thank you, Madam Chair. 16 Mrs. Blackburn. Thank you. The gentlelady yields back. 17 Mrs. Hartzler, you are recognized for five minutes. 18 Mrs. Hartzler. Thank you, Madam Chairman. Nobody should 19 make a profit from the sale of baby body parts. That is something 20 that is shared by the majority party as well as minority party. I want to remind everybody that back in 1993 when this was first 21 22 introduced in Congress, the idea of this, Henry Waxman, who 23 introduced the amendment, a Democrat, said it would be abhorrent

to allow for sale of fetal tissue and a market to be created for
that sale.

And yet today we have seen that the procurement organizations in Exhibit 1, 2, 3, and 4 are receiving \$700 to \$850 per brain.

But I want to focus on the abortion clinic's part in this. Could we look at Exhibit D1? Here are the payments that we have obtained to various abortion clinics for these baby body parts. We have Fresno having 38 specimens, and they received \$2,090. Sacramento abortion clinic received \$3,740, San Jose \$3,575.

Now, nationwide the Panel investigation has found that there are many more of these middleman procurement organizations, and there are hundreds of abortion clinics. And I remember some of the abortion clinic doctors on the video that Mr. Sukhia referenced talking about making money from the sale of baby body parts, even joking about it.

So I want to hear from the former U.S. Attorneys, given their training and experience, how they would investigate the accounting records and anything else to document whether the abortion clinics profited for the sale of baby body parts.

So, Mr. Sukhia?

Mr. Sukhia. Yes, ma'am. Thank you. I have some experience both on the prosecutive side of this, not just being a former prosecutor for 13 years as an AUSA, and then a few years

```
1
        as a U.S. Attorney, but also in my experience fighting Planned
        Parenthood in a very grueling eight-day trial, one of the few in
 2
        the country, on the defense of Florida's Parental Notice of
 3
        Abortion Act.
 4
 5
             And I will tell you that "follow the money" is a concept that
        applies with special force in that area. And that was -- it was
 6
 7
        astounding what I learned about how money motivates that industry.
        And when I look at these figures -- let me give you an example.
 8
 9
        One of the doctors that testified acknowledged that he had
        performed over 100,000 abortions, and we -- based on the amount
10
11
        of time that he -- the one way we could do it, because I continued
12
        to try to find out how much are they making. And they fought tooth
13
        and nail to prevent that information from coming out.
14
             So to quickly just answer your question, I would say, yes,
15
        it is extremely important to find out where the money --
16
             Mrs. Hartzler. What specific documents would you look for?
17
             Mr. Sukhia. I would ask for bank records.
18
             Mrs. Hartzler. Okay.
19
             Mr. Sukhia. I would find out what -- you know, follow the
20
        money. I would find out, you know, who is getting paid, where
21
        are the checks going.
22
             Mrs. Hartzler. Okay. Thank you. Mr. Norton?
23
             Mr. Norton. Yes. I would do the same. First of all,
                                                                       Ι
```

would start by looking at the videos, which I have seen. I would start by reading the forensic accounting report by Coalfire Investigations made up of former FBI agents, which found that the videos were credible and the redacted versions say what the longer versions say.

I would obtain the accounting records, the financial records of the abortion clinic, of the procurement business, and, frankly, I would obtain the records of the end user as well, and subpoena both records and witnesses from all of those entities to flesh out the facts in this case, which I think are there.

Mrs. Hartzler. Thank you very much. In the last minute, I want to turn to Ms. Foster and ask you a question. As you have justified, post-abortive woman, please explain a little bit more about what you think regarding possible HIPAA violations that Mr. Norton raised, where the procurement tech has the ability, after receiving the order through email in the morning, to review the medical records of the patients without their knowledge, explain what you think. Has HIPAA been violated? And, if so, what should the penalty be?

Ms. Foster. I am very concerned that HIPAA may have been violated. Obviously, Planned Parenthood has gone to court time and time again to keep secret and confidential the records of women who have abortions, and yet these very same abortion clinics are

1 allowing procurement businesses into their doors, sharing records, and allowing them to find out some of the most personal 2 health care information imaginable. So that obviously is an 3 extreme concern for me and something that I definitely want 4 5 investigated. 6 Mrs. Hartzler. Thank you for sharing that. Certainly, we 7 are here because we care about the women, too. Make sure they are not being manipulated or hurt in any way. 8 9 Thank you. I yield back. Mrs. Blackburn. The gentlelady yields back. 10 Mr. Nadler, you are recognized for five minutes for 11 12 questions. Mr. Nadler. Thank you, Madam Chair. Just when I think my 13 Republican colleagues cannot find a way to make this investigation 14 15 more of a farce, we have a farcical hearing like this one. None 16 of the documents the Republicans are showing today contain any 17 evidence of wrongdoing. In fact, these misleading documents, 18 many of which the Republican staff produced themselves with no 19 basis in reality, do not provide any foundation for an investigation of this nature. 20 21 Cutting and pasting sections of draft contracts that were never signed or formalized, creating charts and graphs with no 22 23 analytical basis, and printing off random invoices with no

explanation for their contents does not meet the standard of evidence for any court of law, let alone for a Congressional investigation.

I would think the Republicans should have learned this lesson after the mess of a hearing in 2000 when a tissue procurement organization, a TPO, then stood accused of profiting from the sale of fetal tissue research. The source of these accusations — heavily edited videos produced by anti-abortion extremists.

Some of the same documents we are looking at today were tossed around by the Republicans in 2000 with the same misrepresentation of the facts.

As we all know, that hearing fell apart when the key witness, Dean Alberti, the man who accused the TPO of profiting from fetal tissue donations admitted under oath that he had lied in the videos. Suddenly, those invoices and the fee schedules didn't seem like such a smoking gun. Well, they weren't then, and they aren't now, yet here we are again.

This hearing is another example of the Republican majority going to extreme lengths to advance their dual agendas of smearing organizations against whom all federal and state investigations have found no evidence of any violations of law, knowing that the smears will endanger the lives of people who work for these organizations, and that is why I have said this committee is worse

1 than McCarthy investigations because McCarthy endangered people's lives. This committee -- I am sorry, endangered 2 people's jobs. This committee is knowingly endangering people's 3 lives, and their other goal of eliminating women's choices and 4 5 degrading their doctors. Now, Mr. Raben, I would like to ask you a couple of questions. 6 7 We just received yesterday -- just yesterday we received a letter from the counsel for StemExpress who informed us, and I quote, 8 9 "It appears that majority staff may have repurposed 10 unauthenticated, stolen documents illegally obtained by David Daleiden and the Center for Medical Progress, and that some of 11 12 the majority's exhibits have never appeared publicly, suggesting 13 that perhaps the Select Panel may be receiving so-called evidence directly from Mr. Daleiden or his associates." 14 15 Does that not call into question the validity of the entire 16 investigation, or at least what the majority appears to be relying 17 on? 18 Mr. Raben. It sounds like bad form, yes. 19 Mr. Nadler. More than bad form, I would think. And what 20 do you think of the refusal by Republicans even to question Ms. Daleiden or to test the credibility and objectivity of his 21 allegations? What should that tell us about this investigation? 22 23 Mr. Raben. I am not going to comment on the -- on my good

1 friends across the aisle, their motivation. What I am concerned about is, you know, whether the point of this hearing is to 2 politicize an investigation and to press DOJ to do its job in a 3 way different than they think they ought to do. I think there 4 5 is a very sad history of that, and it is always dangerous. Mr. Nadler. A history of using Congressional pressure to 6 7 Mr. Raben. Yes. 8 9 Mr. Nadler. -- pressure to press prosecutorial decisions. Mr. Raben. Yes. It is one thing to refer information and 10 11 to have comity between the branches; it is another to use politics 12 to pressure a particular agent or investigator into doing his or her job. 13 Mr. Nadler. In that connection, isn't this entire hearing, 14 15 this entire investigation, having no purpose essentially other 16 than to suggest that since it is obviously that these 17 organizations are guilty of what they are being accused of, that 18 the DOJ and the various state investigating agencies have not done 19 their job properly if they haven't brought indictments? 20 Mr. Raben. That is the implication. Mr. Nadler. Thank you. And let me ask you this. We have 21 22 heard before that Mr. Daleiden was indicted only for a false 23 identification, and every college kid -- or not every, but half

1 the college kids have false identification, so big deal. But 18 U.S.C. Section 1001 criminalizes any personal who knowingly 2 submits false material to Congress in connection with an 3 4 investigation. 5 And I think, and I would like your comment, from what we have seen and what we have heard in this entire thing, that does seem 6 7 to be a serious problem, that Mr. Daleiden and the Center for Medical Progress were submitting knowingly false information to 8 9 Congress, and that is a very serious problem. Mr. Raben. Yes. 10 Mr. Nadler. Ms. Clayton, would you comment on that? 11 12 Ms. Clayton. Oh, yes. I agree completely, and what Life 13 Dynamics admitted back in 2000, I have always wondered why didn't get prosecuted for it because it was an admitted fact by the guy 14 15 they hired. That is who the DOJ should be going after if they

Mr. Nadler. In summary, we have the refusal by the committee to -- who are making all sorts of accusations against StemExpress. We have a refusal by the committee to talk to them, to ask them for explanations. Then we have the committee or Mr. -- apparently taking, directly or indirectly, material from Mr. Daleiden, stolen from the StemExpress website without asking StemExpress whether -- and that material seems to be doctored, all to say that

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

have time?

1 StemExpress and other similar organizations are doing illegal 2 activities. 3 But you don't want to talk to them and see if they have an explanation, and you do take apparently false material stolen for 4 5 that purpose in order to pressure the DOJ. Is that a fair summary 6 of what seems to be going on? 7 Mr. Raben. Yes. Mr. Nadler. Is that a legitimate function of Congress? 8 9 Mr. Raben. I won't -- I will repeat what I said, that the concern that I have after 20-some years of being on both sides 10 of it is when a Congressional gavel is used to intimidate or 11 12 pressure an investigative agency to take action that they think it ought to be taken, particularly in the face of now 20 states. 13 14 Twenty state officials, non-partisan, have said on the record they 15 have looked into this or related facts and declined to go forward 16 with prosecutions. 17 Mr. Nadler. Thank you very much. My time is expired. 18 Mrs. Blackburn. Mrs. Love, you are recognized for five 19 minutes. 20 Mrs. Love. Thank you, Chairman. And thank you to the panel 21 for being here. 22 I want to contrast and focus on two different things -- organ 23 donations and fetal tissue donations. First, you know, many say

that organ donation is a gift that one can give. It is a beautiful thing when you think about somebody donating their organs. And organ donations are done with dignity, disclosure of where and how the organs will be used, and in every hospital in the nation there are uninfluenced counselors to help with the process and no money is made from the organ donation. The process is transparent and seen as ethical.

On the other hand, when it comes to fetal tissue donation, it is different. A scared, vulnerable woman, including a minor who is under age, can come into a clinic on the morning of her surgery, and first she needs to give consent to the procedure without any parental guidance or anyone there.

Then, before the event, before this invasive procedure, a tissue technician comes to her and gets her to donate her baby body parts. Instead of an unbiased counselor, the tissue technician may be focused on making a commission, rather than protecting that woman's best interest. It is not transparent how the fetal organs will be used or what -- or by what organization.

To me, the contrast is astounding. It is ethical -- it is unethical for this procedure to happen this way. So my question is: who protects the woman's interest in each case? Who protects the minor's interest in this case? There are no laws existing -- there are no existing laws related to consent for fetal

```
1
        tissue donation.
             How many organs are needed? How much will be paid out for
 2
        each body part? And as a mother of two teenage girls, I am
 3
        absolutely astounded and outraged that we don't have laws in place
 4
 5
        to protect our minors.
 6
             Mr. Lennon, why is there uniform law for organ donation for
 7
        every -- in every hospital in this nation and an entirely different
        practice for donations of fetal organ tissue?
 8
 9
             Mr. Lennon. I don't know, and I would have to speculate.
10
        That is a good question.
             Mrs. Love. Mr. -- is it --
11
12
             Mr. Sukhia. Sukhia.
13
             Mrs. Love. -- Sukhia.
             Mr. Sukhia. Yes. My father was Persian and came -- he was
14
15
        actually from India, but his people were from Persia. My cousins
16
        all say Keniya, but it is Sukhea. But so Sukhia.
17
             Mrs. Love. Is there any evidence that -- if there is any
18
        evidence that a law is being broken, or suggestions of
19
        profiteering from baby organs, should there be investigations to
        ensure this -- that this is not the case?
20
21
             Mr. Sukhia. Yes. And I thought that was the focus of this
22
        hearing, which is to ask of a federal prosecutor, if you had this
23
        information, would it justify a thorough investigation to
```

1 ascertain those facts? Mrs. Love. That is right. At the end of your comments, you 2 mentioned that it is actually the duty to investigate to make sure 3 that laws aren't being broken. 4 5 Mr. Sukhia. Yes, ma'am. 6 Mrs. Love. Thank you. Ms. Foster, I want to point out five immediate differences when it comes to organ donation and fetal 7 tissue donation and ask why there would be such a gross difference. 8 9 And I want to ask your thoughts after you hear these five. 10 First, organ donation is done with protections and advocates 11 for the donor and/or the person giving consent for the donation 12 of the organs of a loved one sometimes that is already deceased. There is no profit being made, or monies exchanged, with organ 13 14 donation. Furthermore, if there was any evidence of such, there 15 would be great cause to investigate. 16 Three, there is never a minor under duress having to make 17 these decisions alone without the consent or advocate of an adult 18 or for any operation procedure, let alone an invasive procedure. 19 Furthermore, a minor would never be in a position to make the 20 decision to donate the organs of another person. 21 There is no contact, when it comes to organ donation, between 22 the recipient of the organ, the physician procuring the organs, 23 or the transfer team with the consent-giver -- the transfer team

1 of the consent-giver before the consent is being given. And the 2 HIPAA violations would never be allowed when it comes to organ donation. 3 4 So I want to ask you this. If you are ever in a clinic sitting 5 in that room, understand that those protections are different, 6 who is there advocating for you? Ms. Foster. In an abortion clinic? 7 Mrs. Love. Yes. 8 9 Ms. Foster. No one. Mrs. Love. No one. Now, furthermore, who is there 10 advocating for a minor who this country would not let get behind 11 12 the wheel of a vehicle, would not allow to vote, would not allow 13 to join the military, would not allow -- be allowed to smoke, would not even be allowed to join a gym because there is a financially 14 15 binding contract? 16 Ms. Foster. No one. 17 Mrs. Love. No one. 18 Mrs. Blackburn. The gentlelady yields back. 19 I recognize myself, five minutes, for questions. And as a 20 reminder my colleagues, I leave myself until last in the 21 questions, so that everyone is clear. 22 I want just to go back to a couple of comments that were made,

and I do have a couple of questions for you all. The pricing

23

documents, the Exhibits D, we looked at some of those on the pricings of items, brains, things of this nature. If you are looking at a customer paying, say, \$2,000 for a brain, and over the course of the year that customer is paying \$42,000 for the body parts, it is hard to imagine how the procurement business is operating at a loss.

And what we are seeking to do is to figure out if there is a violation of law, and if someone is selling these fetal tissue parts for a profit. And that is what we are digging down on is we are looking at the pricing of fetal tissue represented in those D series documents, and then it is why we have constructed the chart, the G chart, that shows where there seems to be movement of the money.

So you all have heard this debate. You have heard it from both sides. You have heard the questions coming from both sides. And I am going to start, Ms. Clayton, with you, and work my way down to Mr. Sukhia.

Very quickly, what I would like to hear from you, what documents would you request or subpoena from these procurement organizations in order to find out -- we have asked for banking records from the procurement business that has been the point of discussion today and they have refused to give us those. We thought that would help clear the way, if you will, to figure out

1 what the profiting is. So let's start there. Very quickly, we have only got 2 2 minutes and 45 seconds left. 3 4 Ms. Clayton. I would start with the -- with accepting the 5 invitation from the procurement business. I understand its name 6 is StemExpress. And I would have them come in, put them under 7 oath, as I understand they have offered to do, and ask them, how did you come up with this charge? Why is it so much more expensive 8 9 to --10 That would be an incorrect assumption, but, Mrs. Blackburn. 11 yes, we would like to have --12 Ms. Clayton. The second thing I would do is ask them, in 13 each particular case, what aspect of the actual costs does a 14 particular clinic incur? For example, does the clinic provide 15 space? Does the clinic, as we have seen in your charts, provide 16 the blood draws which requires a technician, perhaps a nurse, 17 materials? Does the clinic have to do paperwork? And, if so, 18 how much? And, therefore, how much of the actual reasonable cost 19 is incurred by the clinic itself as opposed to by the procurement 20 business? 21 Mrs. Blackburn. Okay. 22 Ms. Clayton. That is where I would start. 23 Mrs. Blackburn. Okay.

1 Mr. Raben. Similar. Sterilization of equipment, what is the cost capital of the equipment, the processing, the 2 preservation, are there transportation costs. I wouldn't look 3 at banking records. I would want to -- it is an HR function as 4 5 well, staff time for the consent forms that are put together. Mrs. Blackburn. All right. Mr. Lennon? 6 7 Mr. Lennon. As I said in my opening, you need a forensic -- if I was a prosecutor, you have to have a forensic evaluation 8 9 accounting of the procurement business, because that is not clear 10 from the records here. So following the money, you have got to 11 have the entire picture. 12 Mrs. Blackburn. Okay. Mr. Norton? Mr. Norton. The first thing I wouldn't do is ask the 13 StemExpress or others, are you innocent or guilty? Every 14 15 defendant I have ever prosecuted or even represented has claimed 16 innocence. That is just not the case. There is some culpability 17 here. 18 I would do the same thing. I would get forensic accounting. 19 I would get all of the financial records. I would get the profit 20 and loss statements, the income and expense statements, and I would get people under oath before a grand jury. Letters are not 21 22 particularly valuable.

Mrs. Blackburn. Ms. Foster?

23

Ms. Foster. There are two things that I would specifically seek among many different documents. First of all, financial records. That is something that must be brought to light. And, second, women of every generation are unique human beings who can speak for themselves, but the baby body parts profiteers have created a market in which their profits rise if they pressure and coerce women into signing donation consent forms.

So I would want to find out exactly what their procedures are, what documents, what training they have on how to speak to women and how they get those consent forms signed.

Mrs. Blackburn. Mr. Sukhia?

Mr. Sukhia. I would just echo the comments of the other members on the panel. I would note that in the case that I handled, many of the minors were under -- there were reports from people who owned and ran clinics that many minors would be under the age of 14 who often would cry out for their mothers, and so forth. They are in no position to give meaningful consent, such as those suggested by the exhibits that were presented here.

Mrs. Blackburn. Okay. Thank you. My time has expired, and I yield back.

I ask unanimous consent that the members' written opening statements be introduced into the record.

Ms. Schakowsky. And, Madam Chair, we have provided you a

- 1 packet of materials to be entered into the record, and ask unanimous consent that those be made part of the record. 2 Mrs. Blackburn. So ordered. 3 And we also will submit the document binder, ask that that 4 5 be submitted for the record, and that staff make the appropriate redactions. So ordered. 6 7 We will also submit an article from the Sacramento Business Journal from Cate Dyer, the founder and CEO of StemExpress. 8 9 will go into the record with her -- the ranking on StemExpress 10 by biz journals. 11 We also would put into the record a screenshot we pulled from 12 StemExpress' website just this morning, which still has the fetal tissue sales components in --13 Ms. DeGette. Madam Chair, have we reviewed that document? 14 15 Mrs. Blackburn. From this morning? No, you have not. 16 Ms. DeGette. Yes. 17 Mrs. Blackburn. Because we pulled it this morning, but you
- 19 Ms. DeGette. I would like to look at it.
- 20 Mrs. Blackburn. Yes. So ordered.
- 21 We also have the sourcing of --

are welcome to look at it.

18

Ms. DeGette. Well, wait a minute. Before -- I am going to reserve the right to object.

1 Mrs. Blackburn. You can reserve the right, and we will come back to that one. We also have the source of exhibits that we 2 will put in the record with the exhibits, so that you will know 3 where they came -- there was a question on Exhibit B5, the chart 4 5 that showed the growth of the procurement business' revenue. That came from business magazine articles and the Congressional 6 7 Research Service. So that you all are aware of that. And then there was also a question on Exhibit B4, that chart 8 9 with the growth in the number of abortion clinics. That information for that chart came from the procurement business 10 11 owner and a contract with the abortion organization. So ordered. 12 Ms. DeGette. Madam Chair, I withdraw my reservation. Mrs. Blackburn. It is submitted --13 14 Ms. DeGette. But I will also state -- but I take umbrage 15 at the last statement you made about that last document. It was 16 never ratified. That contract was never ratified. It was a 17 It says that on your specific --18 Mrs. Blackburn. Right. And the sourcing, this is what we 19 are putting into the record with the document. 20 Ms. DeGette. Well, as you know, we have already litigated that and I object to them, but, you know, you overruled it. 21 22 Mrs. Blackburn. With that, the hearing is adjourned, and

I thank our witnesses.

23

1 [Whereupon, at 12:50 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]