

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