

THE PRICE OF GAS

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

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Americans, it's been 1,044 days since the United States Senate has passed a budget for America. Back in 2009, the average American family spent \$173.80 a month on gasoline. In 2011, that number had risen to \$368.09 a month on gasoline. What could you use that difference, \$194, what could you use that money for?

I guarantee you, with the policies coming out of this administration, gasoline prices are going up. It will be more than \$368 a month for gasoline unless we make changes to American energy policies and be energy independent.

STUDENT LOANS

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

Mr. CLARKE of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced H.R. 4170, a bill that will forgive student loan debt for millions of hardworking Americans.

This bill provides that if a student loan borrower makes payments equal to 10 percent of their discretionary income for a period of 10 years, the balance of their Federal student loan debt will be forgiven. This provides student loan borrowers with a second chance, those who have been struggling financially. By cutting this debt, this frees up their money to invest on their own. That will create new jobs throughout this country.

It's time for Congress to stand for the rights of student loan borrowers. It's time to forgive these student loan debts.

CONGRATULATING UALR WOMEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM

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

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the University of Arkansas at Little Rock women's basketball team for securing a spot in this year's NCAA basketball tournament.

The game that put them into the tournament was an exciting one. The Lady Trojans came back from a 22-point deficit in the second half against Middle Tennessee and went on to win by one point in overtime.

With Taylor Ford's game-winning shot, the lady Trojans earned their second straight Sun Belt Conference tournament title and their third straight NCAA berth.

Congratulations to the entire UALR community, to Coach Joe Foley for his leadership this championship season, and to the student athletes on this

year's team. Thank you all for representing your school, the city of Little Rock, and our great State of Arkansas.

Good luck.

□ 1310

IN HONOR OF THE CYSTIC FIBROSIS FOUNDATION

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

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation. Cystic fibrosis is not a disease that affects a lot of Americans; but of the Americans it does affect, it compromises and, all too often, prematurely ends their lives.

I had the good and great fortune to just meet with a number of my constituents, including some young constituents who are with me in the Chamber today, who are very concerned and involved with cystic fibrosis.

We are an enlightened and good society because we invest the money necessary to solve the problems that affect our children, our people. We spend money on cures to eradicate diseases that compromise and end the quality of life for so many of our citizens. So as we do the hard work of getting our budget in order, I ask that this Chamber not erode that good work that we do.

16TH ANNIVERSARY OF BROTHERS TO RESCUE AIRPLANE SHOOT-DOWN BY CUBAN AUTHORITIES

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

Mr. RIVERA. I am here today to honor four American heroes—Carlos Costa, Mario de la Pena, Pablo Morales, and Armando Alejandro, Jr.—who tragically lost their lives 16 years ago at the hands of the Castro dictatorship.

On February 24, 1996, two planes from the humanitarian organization Brothers to the Rescue were shot down under Fidel Castro's and Raul Castro's direct orders as they conducted air search and rescue missions for Cuban refugees trying to reach freedom.

Raul Castro, himself, has publicly admitted to ordering the shoot-down over international waters so that there would be no evidence of the crime; but the Castro brothers have yet to be indicted for their role in ordering the murders of four innocent Americans, and they continue to commit blatant human rights violations towards peaceful civilians every day.

The United States should move immediately to indict the Castro brothers for this crime. We must not turn our backs on the Cuban people, who so tirelessly fight for freedom. I also ask, on

this tragic anniversary, that we continue to push forward for democratic change in Cuba.

THE FACTS ABOUT THE PRICE OF GAS IN AMERICA

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. It is time that we emphasize the facts about the price of gas in our country.

On inauguration day for President Obama, the average price of gasoline was \$1.84 per gallon. Today, it's \$3.75. That's an increase of 103 percent. The estimate is that it will be \$4.50 by May. A 1-cent increase in the cost of gas equals \$1 billion out of the economy, and it's a \$4 million-per-day cost to consumers.

As the price of oil continues to rise at an alarming rate, the President and the congressional Democrats have tried to deflect the blame of their failed energy policies and point the finger at Wall Street speculators for the rise of the cost of a barrel of oil. But that's not the problem, Mr. Speaker. The Obama administration's energy policies are creating uncertainty in the marketplace and are driving up costs.

We need this President to assume the responsibility for the problems that he has caused the average hardworking American taxpayer and to do something about the price of gas.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO PRESIDENT'S EXPORT COUNCIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to Executive order 12131, and the order of the House of January 5, 2011, of the following Members of the House to the President's Export Council:

Mr. REICHERT, Washington
Mr. GERLACH, Pennsylvania
Mr. TIBERI, Ohio
Ms. SUTTON, Ohio
Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ, California

THE PREMEDITATED MURDER OF NEW-BORN BABIES JUSTIFIED AS MORALLY EQUIVALENT TO ABORTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FOXX). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

Late last month, two bioethicists—Dr. Alberto Giubilini and Francesca Minerva—published an outrageous paper in the Journal of Medical Ethics, justifying the deliberate, premeditated murder of new-born babies during the first days and even weeks after birth.

Giubilini and Minerva wrote: "When circumstances occur after birth that

would have justified abortion, what we call after-birth abortion should be permissible.”

Madam Speaker, they’ve just coined a brand-new phrase, “after-birth abortion,” which is the killing of newborns, the killing of little children—boys and girls—immediately after their births and up to weeks later. These bioethicists argue that if a newly born child poses an economic burden on a family or is disabled or is unwanted that that child can be murdered in cold blood because the baby lacks intrinsic value, and according to Giubilini and Minerva, it is simply not a person.

Giubilini and Minerva write: “Actual people’s well-being—” and you and I, Madam Speaker, are actual people; adults are actual people according to them “—could be threatened by a newborn, even if healthy child, requiring energy, money and care which the family might happen to be in short supply of.”

As any parents—especially moms—will tell you, children in general, and newborns in particular, require an enormous amount of energy, money, and boatloads of love. If any of those things, however, are lacking or pose what Giubilini and Minerva call a “threat,” does that justify a death sentence? Are the lives of new-born children and new-born babies so cheap? so expendable?

The murder of newly born children is further justified by Giubilini and Minerva in this renowned journal’s article—why they carried it is certainly suspect—because new-born infants, like their slightly younger sisters and brothers in the womb, “cannot have formed any aim that she is prevented from accomplishing.” In other words, no dreams, no plans for the future, no “aims” that can be discerned, recognized or understood by adults equal no life at all.

This preposterous, arbitrary, and evil prerequisite for the attainment of legal personhood is not only bizarre; it is inhumane in the extreme. Stripped of its pseudo-intellectual underpinnings, the Giubilini and Minerva rationale for murdering newborns in the nursery is indistinguishable from any other child predator wielding a knife or a gun.

Giubilini and Minerva say the devaluation of new-born babies is inextricably linked to the devaluation of unborn children. Let me say that again. The devaluation of new-born babies, even into weeks of their lives outside their mothers’ wombs, is inextricably linked to the devaluation of unborn children and is, indeed, the logical extension of the abortion culture. They also write this: that they “propose to call the practice after-birth abortion rather than infanticide in order to emphasize that the moral status of the individual killed—” that is to say the baby “—is comparable to that of a fetus . . . Whether she will exist is exactly what our choice is about.”

So let’s again get this right because the unborn child has been deemed to be

a nonperson and can be killed at will. For the new-born child, who is very, very similar in almost every aspect except dependency and its not being a little bit more mature, the choice is, if it is unwanted, that the parents can order the killing, the execution, of that child.

□ 1320

Madam Speaker, these anti-child, pro-murder rationalizations remind me of other equally disturbing rants from highly credentialed individuals over the years. Princeton’s Peter Singer suggested a couple of years ago—and I quote him in pertinent part:

There are various things you can say that are sufficient to give moral status to a child after a few months, maybe 6 months or something like that, and you get perhaps a full moral status, really, only after 2 years.

Break that down. Only after 2 years, Madam Speaker, should we really confer a sense of personhood to a child who is no longer a baby anymore because of this particular intellectual’s perspective.

Dr. James Watson, the Nobel Laureate for unraveling the mystery of DNA many, many years ago, wrote in *Prism Magazine*:

If a child were not declared alive until 3 days after birth, then all parents could be allowed the choice only a few have under the present system. The doctor could allow the child to die if the parents so choose and save a lot of misery and suffering. I believe this view is the only rational, compassionate attitude to have.

Compassionate to allow a newborn to die? I think not.

In like manner, Dr. Francis Crick, who received the Nobel Prize along with Watson said:

No new-born infant should be declared human until it has passed certain tests regarding its genetic endowment and that if it fails these tests it forfeits the right to live.

Madam Speaker, the dehumanization of unborn children has been going on for decades. What is less understood and appreciated is the dehumanization of new-born and very young infants. That too has been going on for years, but it has gotten in the last few years demonstrably worse.

Giubilini and Minerva’s article must serve as a wake-up call. The lives of young children who are truly the most unprotected class of individuals in our society are under assault. Hard questions need to be asked and answered and defenders of life must be mobilized. I truly believe we have a duty to protect the weakest and the most vulnerable from violence; and now even the hospital nursery is not a place of refuge or sanctuary.

Madam Speaker, we must strive for consistency. I have been hearing about it for 32 years, and I’ve worked every single day of my congressional life on human rights issues, from human trafficking to religious freedom. I’ve written the Trafficking Victims Protection Act back in 2000 to combat modern-day slavery. I work against torture all over the world, wherever and whenever it

rears its horrific head. That is especially in places like China, North Korea, and elsewhere.

But I am left to wonder why so many who claim to be proponents of human rights systematically dehumanize and exclude the weakest and the most vulnerable human beings from legal protection.

Why the modern-day surge in prejudice and ugly bias against unborn children and now, by logical extension, new-born children? Why the policy of exclusion rather than inclusion? They are indeed part of the human family. We should embrace them, love them, and protect them. Why is lethal violence against children, abortion, and premeditated killing of new-born infants marketed and sold as somehow benign or progressive, enlightened, and compassionate? Why have so many good people turned a blind eye and looked askance as mothers are wounded by abortion and their babies in the womb pulverized by suction machines 20 to 30 times more powerful than household vacuum cleaners or dismembered with surgical knives or poisoned with chemicals? Looking back, how could anyone in the House or the Senate or President Clinton justify the hideous procedure called “partial birth abortion”?

Madam Speaker, since 1973, well over 54 million babies have had abortion forced upon them. Some of those children have been exterminated in the second and third trimester. These are known as pain-capable babies. Those kids have suffered excruciating pain as the abortionist committed his violence upon him or her. Why are some surprised that now the emerging class of victims, new-born kids, new-born children, are being slaughtered in Holland and elsewhere while a perverse proposal to murder any new-born children, sick or healthy, is advanced in an otherwise serious and respected ethics journal?

I urge Members to read this article. It will make you sick. It certainly is the opening salvo in an assault on new-born children.

In conclusion, Madam Speaker, children born and unborn are precious. Children sick, disabled, or healthy possess fundamental human rights that no sane or compassionate society can abridge. The premeditated murder of new-born babies, those who are 1 day old after birth, 2 weeks, 3 weeks old is now being justified as being morally equivalent to abortion.

I respectfully submit, Madam Speaker, that the Congress, the courts, the President, and society at large have a sacred duty to protect all children from violence, murder, and exploitation. We don’t have a moment to lose. The child predators are working overtime to create more victims.

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

TYRANTS AND DESPOTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 48 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, yesterday a good friend of mine, Senator JOHN MCCAIN, became the first U.S. Senator to publicly call for U.S.-led air strikes to halt the violence in Syria.

Respectfully, I disagree with the Senator from Arizona. Our main goal in the Middle East is to protect our interests and the interests of our major ally, Israel.

If we are to be dragged into a civil war in Syria for humanitarian reasons, I would respectfully remind Senator MCCAIN and the President that they do not have the power to unilaterally start a war. The authority to initiate war is vested by the Constitution exclusively in Congress. The War Powers Act was enacted into law over a Presidential veto—not an easy thing to accomplish—to fulfill the intent of the Framers of the Constitution of the United States in requiring that the President has to seek the consent of Congress before the introduction of the United States Armed Forces into hostile action.

Section 2(c) of the War Powers Act provides that no attempt by the President to introduce the United States Armed Forces into hostile action may be made under the War Powers Act unless, number one, there is a declaration of war; number two, a specific authorization; or, number three, a national emergency created by attack upon the United States, its territories or possession, or its Armed Forces.

□ 1330

The Constitution and the War Powers Act are not a list of suggestions; they are the law of the land, the law the President of the United States and every Member of Congress swears to protect and defend. Contrary to Defense Secretary Panetta's assertion before the Senate Armed Services Committee the other day, international permission does not trump congressional permission. If the President is even remotely entertaining the idea of engaging in military action in Syria, he must seek formal authorization from Congress to attack Syria first.

While the violence in Syria is appalling and Syrian President Bashar al-Assad is certainly no friend of the United States, before any military action is taken, the President must tell Congress and the American people by what right we attack Syria. Syria has not declared war on the United States nor attacked the United States, our territories, possessions, or Armed Forces. It is not our responsibility to intervene simply because violence erupts in another nation. If it were, then bombs should be falling on a number of countries, including Yemen,

Zimbabwe, Uganda, Sudan, Rwanda, North Korea, Burma, and I could go on and on.

In fact, just this past Tuesday, March 6, the former top United Nations humanitarian official in Sudan warned that the country's military is carrying out crimes against humanity in the country's southern Nuba Mountains in acts that remind him of the 2003-2004 genocide in Darfur. Sudan President Omar al-Bashir is under indictment for war crimes by the International Criminal Court for killings and rapes committed in Darfur. Roughly 5,000 people have died in Syria compared to 400,000 in Darfur. How are the actions of al-Assad any worse than the actions of al-Bashir? Where is the call to bomb Sudan?

Madam Speaker, we could have a war of the week if we went after every tyrant that is committing these kinds of atrocities. Well-respected organizations, including Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International, have documented the crimes committed by Burma's military. Many of the abuses committed by the Burmese regime represent some of the world's most horrific ongoing atrocities. For example, the regime has destroyed over 3,300 ethnic minority villages in eastern Burma alone, recruited tens of thousands of children, child soldiers, forced up to 2 million people to flee their homes as refugees and internally displaced, and used rape as a weapon of war against the women of Burma. How is the violence going on in Syria any worse than the destruction and degradation committed by the Burmese junta?

North Korea is widely acknowledged to be the worst violator of human rights in the world. The regime cares so little for its people that authorities are imprisoning, for 6 months in labor training camps, anybody who did not participate in the organized gatherings during the mourning period for the late Kim Jung Il, or who did participate but didn't cry and didn't seem genuine. Six months in a labor camp for not crying? North Korea is a recognized state sponsor of terror, a proliferator of nuclear weapons, and a direct threat to United States forces in South Korea, yet no one is urging the bombing of North Korea.

The world is full of despotic and oppressive regimes. The sad fact is that even in 2012, more of the world labors in the shadow of tyranny than in the daylight of democracy and the rule of law. Many of the world's leaders are at least as bad as Qadhafi and al-Assad, and many are even worse. We are not the world's policeman.

Even if we are willing to ignore the hypocrisy of using military force in Syria for "humanitarian reasons" while we turn a blind eye to the other equally pressing humanitarian crises around the world, there are several practical issues surrounding an operation in Syria that make it ill-advised, and this case should be made to the

Congress if the President or Senator MCCAIN push for military action against Syria.

Libya and Syria are very different countries with different geographies and different militaries. The Libyan army of Qadhafi was far less capable than Syria's army under al-Assad. Its forces were not as well-trained, well-fed or well-armed. In fact, Qadhafi had decisively turned on his military forces after a series of military coup attempts in the 1980s and 1990s. In the place of a professional military, Qadhafi increasingly relied on the revolutionary committees, many of whom defected en masse within days of protests breaking out against his rule.

Even against such a weak opposition, NATO's bombing campaign only succeeded in pushing the loyalist forces back. The rebels were unable to advance very far. As the battle turned in a stalemate, NATO and others were forced to raise their commitment, and the United States spent billions of dollars in that conflict as well, without congressional approval. Trainers were sent in, and NATO personnel shared space in the rebels' operations room in Benghazi. Qatar had to ship in approximately 30 consignment of Milan anti-tank cannons and Belgian FN rifles. During the final assault on Qadhafi's compound, Qatari forces even found themselves leading the charge.

Nearly a year into the civil war to oust President al-Assad, the Syrian army remains largely intact. In addition, Syria has a substantial chemical and biological weapons capability and thousands of surface-to-air missiles and shoulder-launched missiles, making Syria much more of a threat to attacking air forces than anything Libya had. How will the American people react if an American pilot is shot down and captured by the Syrian army, or worse, Syria's terrorist proxy, Hezbollah? And that's why Congress must be consulted before we take any action; and I would urge any of my colleagues who are considering urging the President to take unilateral action, that they remember the War Powers Act and the Constitution.

In addition, if air power is to be used against Assad's regime, as it was to overthrow Qadhafi's, then it is certain that the venture will take longer than the 6 months it took in Libya. The price in Syrian blood on both sides, the rebels and the government, will be higher, and the geography of the country, without the vast stretches of desert between towns that were turned into shooting galleries when Qadhafi tried to remove his forces, would guarantee more civilian casualties from NATO bombs than occurred in Libya. How many civilian casualties are acceptable to prevent a humanitarian crisis?

Other questions that need to be addressed: What will Israel do if Hezbollah responds to Western military actions against Syria by launching rockets into Israel? What will Iran do to protect its ally in Damascus?