



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 10, 2016

No. 73

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 10, 2016.

I hereby appoint the Honorable RANDY K. WEBER, SR., to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 5, 2016, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m.

MARIJUANA V. HEROIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, today on our calendar we have got about 10 bills dealing with a very serious issue in America: opioids and heroin. This is an awful problem we have in our Nation. There is more and more use of opioids and heroin and death resulting from it than at any time that I can recall in the past.

I had a young friend a few years back who died of a heroin overdose. I have known of other promising young people

in Memphis who have died of heroin overdoses. This is a problem all over the country, but predominantly in the northeast and predominantly in Caucasian areas. It has become an issue, as it should, of importance. But none of the bills that we are going to deal with today—all of which are good, and all of which I will support—deal with the real problem; and that is, the recognition in our country that we treat all drugs as a law enforcement problem, a criminal problem, and not as a health problem; and that we treat most all drugs on the same level and give law enforcement the same incentives to arrest dealers and/or users for any drug and not encourage them and give them reasons—besides public safety—to emphasize their enforcement on opioids and heroin.

In the drug schedules which we have in our country that lay out the order in which we think drugs are the most serious, Schedule I is at the top; and in that classification are heroin, LSD, ecstasy, and marijuana.

I ask you each not to answer reflexively which of those four don't fit. Marijuana does not fit.

Our laws should show that heroin is a serious problem and that marijuana is not as serious a problem; that users should be dealt with in ways that don't put them in jail and, in the case of marijuana possession, don't cause them to lose scholarship opportunities, housing opportunities in Federal facilities, or jobs later on.

We also shouldn't have law enforcement, through asset forfeiture, get moneys from people they arrest; fund their activities by making arrests; and have it be presumed in law that moneys and/or properties that are involved in the transactions of those drug deals are involved and that law enforcement gets to keep those items. It gives law enforcement a reason to go after marijuana—which is easier to find and make money—rather than heroin.

We need to study marijuana to see what its medical uses are. We don't need to use it to incarcerate and cripple for the future jobs for young people. We need to encourage young people not to do any drugs at all, not to do alcohol, not to smoke cigarettes, and to take their time as youths to be youths, to be young, to learn, and to fill their minds with knowledge for a better life later. But if, as a youth or as an adult, they should use an illegal substance, they should be dealt with as having a problem and not be given a scarlet letter that stays with them for the rest of their lives.

So my work has been and will continue to be to try to make more sense of our drug laws; to see that the scheduling is smarter, that heroin and opioids continue to be at the top, and that marijuana is not in that listing; and to do things that encourage law enforcement to arrest people that are dealing in and selling heroin and opioids, which cause death and cause people to be addicted to the point where they will commit crimes to secure moneys to keep their habit going, and to not have equal incentives to go after marijuana that does none of those things.

BABY BODY PARTS FOR SALE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to the research that the Select Investigative Panel on Infant Lives is conducting. I encourage everyone to examine the exhibits from the Select Investigative Panel on Infant Lives' investigation on their Web site: energycommerce.house.gov/select-investigative-panel.

On April 20, 2016, Chairman MARSHA BLACKBURN held a hearing on the "Pricing of Fetal Tissue" and found

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H2161

broad consensus among witnesses that Federal law may have been violated when abortion clinics profited from the sale of baby body parts.

This grave circumstance has caused considerable concern because one of the underpinnings and so-called 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, former Congressman Henry Waxman, stated during floor debate in 1993:

This amendment would enact the most important safeguards to prevent any sale of fetal issue for any purpose, not just the purpose of research. It would be abhorrent to allow for a sale of fetal tissue and a market to be created for that sale.

Yet this is what is happening today.

As seen on Exhibit B2, the "Procurement Business"—the name is redacted—markets itself in its brochure as a way for clinics to make additional income by allowing procurement business technicians to collect fetal tissue and organs from aborted babies immediately after an abortion is completed. The brochure uses the words "financially profitable," "fiscally rewards," and "financial benefit."

The Select Investigative Panel on Infant Lives' investigation revealed that the procurement business technician performs every conceivable task in the harvesting process immediately after an abortion occurs. However, procurement businesses—essentially the middlemen between the abortion clinics on the one hand and the end users, the experimenters or researchers, on the other—still pay abortion clinics a fee, even though the clinics are not incurring any additional costs in the process.

Exhibit D1 shows the abortion clinic charged the middleman \$11,365 for harvested baby parts—called POCs—and blood.

Exhibit D2 shows the abortion clinic charged the middleman, again, this time \$9,060 for harvested baby parts, or POCs, and blood, even though the clinic did not incur any additional expense in the harvesting process. After obtaining the organs from the clinic, the middleman then made it easy for end users to purchase baby body parts.

Exhibit C3, the procurement business order form, or drop-down menu, for baby organs, illustrates just how easy this is. On the left side of the menu, one can choose: What type of tissue would you like to order? And under a multitude of options—a few of which are listed on the right—one could choose up here at the top, brains. These are little baby brains. Next you must select the number of specimens. And I suppose one could say six baby brains. Continuing down the list of questions, gestational range from start to end? One can select 16 to 18 weeks.

Then it asks: Add another tissue type? One could answer yes and scroll through the numerous options and

have the opportunity to pick, for instance, female reproductive system and ovaries. You could then ask for five of those at 15 to 16 weeks. Then you could add, down at the bottom here, tongue.

So these are the options.

For crying out loud, this is the Amazon.com of baby body parts, a market for baby body parts. It is repulsive, outrageous, and I urge you to go to the Web site to see the exhibits.

This is a market for baby body parts where you get what you pay for.

This is utterly repulsive. Absolutely outrageous. Each one of these baby tongues or baby brains belongs to a little human baby. This business is nothing more than a fetal corpse market. How can anyone defend such an abhorrent practice?

These exhibits illustrate that, in both intent and practice, these clinics make money well above any actual costs they incur. They are making a profit. Go to the Select Panel's website energycommerce.house.gov/select-investigative-panel and see for yourself the revealing exhibits that show how these organizations may have broken the law and profited from this gruesome, inhumane practice of baby body part harvesting and trafficking.

URGING BOEING NOT TO SELL AIRPLANES TO IRAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned about some news that has come to my attention and to the attention of the House recently, and that is that there is an iconic American aviation company—that is, the Boeing Company—that that has entered into preliminary talks with Iran. And the thinking is for Boeing to sell planes to Iran.

I guess when you first hear about that, you say: Well, what is the big deal? Why is everybody so uptight about this? Why can't everybody relax and just let some commerce happen?

Here is what is the big deal; here is why we ought not relax; and here is why Boeing shouldn't be in these discussions; and, ultimately, it is my sincere hope, Mr. Speaker, that Boeing does not sell planes to the Iranians:

The entire Washington foreign policy establishment; that is, the House of Representatives, the Senate, the United States State Department, and the administration all agree on one thing. They all agree that Iran is still the world's leading state sponsor of terror.

There is no credible organization; there is no credible voice today that says: No, no, no. That is not true anymore. In fact, the President has acknowledged this; the Secretary of State has acknowledged this; the national security adviser has acknowledged this.

And if that is true—and it is true—how can someone, how can a company, how can an American institution say, we are going to do business with them? And how can it be true that we are

going to sell something that can be easily converted for the use of terrorism?

You see, planes are fungible. Airplane parts are fungible. Unless we think that only Boeing is beginning these sorts of discussions—we know what Airbus is doing. Airbus has made a decision to go in and do business with this terrorist regime.

Why I am urging these companies—and particularly Boeing, as an iconic American company, as a company that has come to symbolize what? American strength, American innovation, and American greatness. And then to be complicit with the Iranians and the sheer possibility and, I would argue, probability that those airplanes will be converted to warplanes.

Now, just so I am clear, I am not making an argument nor a suggestion today that Boeing is doing anything illegal. I am not making that argument.

But here is my point: just because something is legal doesn't make it good; just because something is legal doesn't make it right.

□ 1215

There are some people who are saying: Well, look, other manufacturers are selling into that marketplace. And let me ask you this, Mr. Speaker. When has history ever been kind to the excuse: Well, somebody else was doing it, so I decided to do it too? History, Mr. Speaker, is a merciless judge and disciplinarian against that sort of argument.

So what is the problem? Here is the problem. It is the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps that completely dominates the Iranian economy, and they certainly completely dominate the aviation sector of the economy. Iran Air was recently taken off the terrorist watch list by the State Department. Most people think that it was an agreement through the Iran nuclear deal and that it wasn't really deserved, but they were only recently on it. Regardless, the fungibility of these products can easily move into other areas of the sector.

There are some people that say: Look, it is an emerging market and we ought to be selling American products there. No, Mr. Speaker. What we ought to do is recognize that there are things that are more important than American profits, and that is the integrity of American businesses not to be complicit in this shameful activity and to sort of draw a blind eye towards this activity to say we can somehow sell these products and they won't end up in the hands of terrorists. It is naive, it is a wrongheaded move, and I urge Boeing in the strongest possible terms not to be complicit in this activity.

HONORING BILL KNAPP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. YOUNG) for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor of the U.S. House of