

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

COMPETITION IN THE U.S.-CHINA ALL-CARGO MARKET

HON. JOHN S. TANNER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1999

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, the United States and the People's Republic of China completed a new civil aviation agreement. That agreement allows for one additional air carrier from each country to serve routes between these two nations. It has recently been suggested by some that Federal Express has a "monopoly" in the China market and that the Department of Transportation should grant another all-cargo carrier, such as UPS, the authority to serve China as opposed to expanding passenger carrier or Federal Express' service in this market. I believe that argument is meritless.

Federal Express initially applied to DOT in early 1992 for the authority it now holds. They pioneered U.S.-China express all-cargo services by acquiring an initial allocation of only 2 flights a week, under the old, more restrictive agreement. Only two other carriers, American International Airways and Evergreen International Airlines applied at that time. No other carriers even bothered to apply.

The Department selected Evergreen to operate the route and gave Federal Express backup authority. In early 1995, Federal Express and Evergreen jointly applied to transfer the primary authority to Federal Express because of problems experienced by Evergreen in its efforts to develop the market. At that time, DOT did consider, in response to comments filed by DHL, another air express carrier, whether the award to Federal Express would create a monopoly for express services. DHL was the only carrier to offer comments during these 1995 proceedings.

In its order approving the transfer from Evergreen to Federal Express, the Department concluded that Federal Express would not have monopoly power in the market, stating: "Moreover, in this case, we found that there are alternative means of transportation. Not only does DHL have the opportunity to use U.S. and Chinese carriers in the market, Chinese carriers on both their combination and all-cargo services and the U.S. carriers on their combination services, but there are also third country carriers in the market available for use."

Indeed, the market is already very competitive. Due to the historic imbalance in the number of flights DOT has allocated to passenger and air cargo services, U.S. passenger carriers, Northwest and United, can offer more freight capacity than Federal Express. Furthermore, I understand that both UPS and DHL already offer a wide range of express services through their joint ventures with SINOTRANS—the government-owned China

National Foreign Trade Transportation Group Corporation. DHL has represented that it controls, with the help of its joint venture relationship with SINOTRANS, 35% of the China express market and UPS operates an extensive ground network in China. In addition, the U.S. Postal Service offers U.S.-China express and parcel services. There are also two Chinese airlines, and at least 18 other foreign airlines that can offer U.S.-China cargo services, including some of the world's largest airlines like British Airways, Japan Air Lines and Lufthansa.

Because of the limited number of flights that it has been allocated, Federal Express today accounts for only 11.5% of the air express volume from the U.S. to China, and 4.8% of that volume in the opposite direction. That is hardly a monopoly.

Federal Express has pioneered the development of markets throughout Asia for the benefit of U.S. exporters. It was difficult in the early stages, but Federal Express made China a high priority in the development of its Asian network. Their commitment to this market has helped ensure that U.S. companies can even expand their trade and presence in China's major markets. In many of the Asian markets, such as Hong Kong, Japan, and the Philippines, other express carriers entered the market much later to compete with Federal Express. In each of these cases, Federal Express' rates were the same before as they were after the others entered the market.

Federal Express can only operate 8 flights per week today, increasing to 10 on April 1, 2000. It currently is the only incumbent U.S. airline that lacks the frequencies necessary to offer even two daily flights. Due to its limited number of frequencies, Federal Express operates a complex but incomplete schedule in the major markets it services in China. For example, it can offer daily service to Beijing in one direction only—westbound from the U.S.—with only three eastbound flights from the capital. It operates only five flights a week to and from Shanghai, and it is able to offer only eastbound service from Shenzhen.

Trade is the key to our competitiveness and prosperity in the global marketplace. Federal Express must be able to continue to develop this market to provide U.S. exporters the transportation services they require to be competitive. Federal Express has the presence in China to make this goal a reality in the near term.

The attempt by others to justify their belated interest in this market by characterizing Federal Express as a monopoly is not supported by the facts. The U.S.-China market for air express cargo services is competitive today.

TRIBUTE TO THE REGIONAL BOARD PRESIDENTS OF THE ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

HON. BRAD SHERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1999

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, we rise to pay tribute to the past Regional Board Presidents of the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) for their fifty years of service and leadership. These men and women have contributed their wisdom, knowledge, and dedication to the ADL and our community.

The past presidents of ADL have been at the forefront of efforts to deter and counter hate-motivated crimes. Not only has the ADL played a fundamental role in hate-crime legislation, it has organized rallies to increase public awareness of such acts. The pivotal role played by the ADL during this past year's shooting at the Jewish Community Center was a clear example of the efforts of this organization.

The Anti-Defamation League serves as a community resource for the government, media, law enforcement agencies, and the general public. Through ADL's monitoring and educational programs, public awareness of racism, extremism, bigotry, and anti-Semitism has been raised. In addition to these programs, ADL works as a liaison between Israel and U.S. policy-makers to educate the public about the complexities of the peace process. These are only a few of the accomplishments of the ADL. We applaud the current and past presidents for their invaluable service to the ADL and for their invaluable contributions to our community. These men and women are an example to us all.

The ADL's Gala Dinner Dance is certainly a very special event and we are pleased to recognize your organization for its achievements. Again, congratulations to the dedicated presidents for their many years of contributions to the cultural and social well being of our society. Please accept our very best wishes for many more years of continued success.

Mr. Speaker, we ask our distinguished colleagues to please join us in honoring Harry Graham Balter, I.B. Benjamin, Jack Y. Berman, Judge David Coleman, Faith Cookler, Hon. Norman L. Epstein, Hon. Robert Feinerman, David P. Goldman, Charles Goldring, Maxwell E. Greenberg, Bruce J. Hochman, Bernard S. Kamine, Harry J. Keaton, Joshua Kheel, Moe Kudler, Alexander L. Kyman, Myra Rosenberg Litman, Hon. Stanley Mosk, George E. Moss, Hon. Irwin J.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

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

Nobron, Hon. Jack M. Newman, Hon. Marvin D. Rowen, and Barry R. Weiss for their ongoing service to the Jewish community and the community at large.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 350

HON. BOB SCHAFFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 16, 1999

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, the House passage of H. Res. 350 advanced the firm position of the Congress in contradiction to the practice of trafficking in baby body parts for profit.

The topic, sir, is among the most ghastly imaginable. America's traditions of life and liberty are certainly challenged by procedures required to support such a barbaric trade as that addressed by the Resolution.

As further support for our efforts, I hereby commend to the House an article delivered to me by Mrs. Kay Schrapel of Greeley, CO. Mrs. Schrapel requested I share this report with all Members and to fully honor and fulfill her humble request, I hereby submit the text of the report for the RECORD.

[Reprinted By Permission, For Personal Distribution, by WORLD, Asheville, NC, Oct. 23, 1999]

THE HARVEST OF ABORTION

(By Lynn Vincent)

WARNING: This story contains some graphic detail.

As Monday morning sunshine spills across the high plains of Aurora, Colo., and a new work week begins, fresh career challenges await Ms. Ying Bei Wang. On Monday, for example, she might scalp her way through the brain stem of an aborted 24-week-preborn child, pluck the brain from the baby's peach-sized head with forceps, and plop it into wet ice for later shipment. On Tuesday, she might carefully slice away the delicate tissue that secures a dead child's eyes in its skull, and extract them whole. Ms. Ying knows her employer's clients prefer the eyes of dead babies to be whole. One once requested to receive 4 to 10 per day.

Although she works in Aurora at an abortion clinic called the Mayfair Women's Center, Ms. Ying is employed by the Anatomic Gift Foundation (AGF), a Maryland-based nonprofit. AGF is one of at least five U.S. organizations that collect, prepare, and distribute to medical researchers fetal tissue, organs, and body parts that are the products of voluntary abortions.

When "Kelly," a woman who claimed to have been an AGF "technician" like Ms. Ying, approached Life Dynamics in 1997, the pro-life group launched an undercover investigation. The probe unearthed grim, hard-copy evidence of the cross-country flow of baby body parts, including detailed dissection orders, a brochure touting "the freshest tissue available," and price lists for whole babies and parts. One 1999 price list from a company called Opening Lines reads like a cannibal's wish list: Skin \$100. Limbs (at least 2) \$150. Spinal cord \$325. Brain \$999 (30% discount if significantly fragmented).

The evidence confirmed what pro-life bioethicists have long predicted: the nadir-bound plummet of respect for human life—and the ascendancy of death for profit.

"It's the inevitable logical progression of a society that, like Darwin, believes we came from nothing," notes Gene Rudd, an obstetrician and member of the Christian Medical and Dental Society's Bioethics Commission. "When we fail to see life as sacred and ordained by God as unique, this is the reasonable conclusion . . . taking whatever's available to gratify our own self-interests and taking the weakest of the species first . . . like jackals. This is the inevitable slide down the slippery slope."

In 1993, President Clinton freshly greased that slope. Following vigorous lobbying by patient advocacy groups, Mr. Clinton signed the National Institutes of Health (NIH) Revitalization Act, effectively lifting the ban on federally funded research involving the transplantation of fetal tissue. For medical and biotech investigators, it was as though the high government gate barring them from Research Shangri-La had finally been thrown open. Potential cures for Parkinson's, AIDS, and cancer suddenly shimmered in the middle distance. The University of Washington in Seattle opened a NIH-funded embryology laboratory that runs a round-the-clock collection service at abortion clinics. NIH itself advertised (and still advertises) its ability to "supply tissue from normal or abnormal embryos and fetuses of desired gestational ages between 40 days and term."

But, this being the land of opportunity, fetal-tissue entrepreneurs soon emerged to nip at NIH's well-funded heels. Anatomic Gift Foundation, Opening Lines, and at least two other companies—competition AGF representatives say they know of, but decline to name—joined the pack. Each firm formed relationships with abortion clinics. Each also furnished abortionists with literature and consent forms for use by clinic counselors in making women aware of the option to donate their babies' bodies to medical science. According to AGF executive director Brent Bardsley, aborting mothers are not approached about tissue donation until after they've signed a consent to abort.

Ironically, it is the babies themselves that are referred to as "donors," as though they had some say in the matter. Such semantic red flags—and a phalanx of others—have bioethicists hotly debating the issue of fetal-tissue research: Does the use of the bodies of aborted children for medical research amount to further exploitation of those who are already victims? Will the existence of fetal-tissue donation programs persuade more mothers that abortion is an acceptable, even altruistic, option? Since abortion is legal and the human bodies are destined to be discarded anyway, does it all shake out as a kind of ethical offset, mitigating the abortion holocaust with potential good?

While the ethical debate rages in air-conditioned conference rooms, material obtained by Life Dynamics points up what goes on in abortion clinic labs: the cutting up and parting out of dead children. The fate of these smallest victims is chronicled in more than 50 actual dissection orders or "protocols" obtained by the activist group. The protocols detail how requesting researchers want baby parts cut and shipped: "Dissect fetal liver and thymus and occasional lymph node from fetal cadaver within 10 (minutes of death)." "Arms and legs not be intact." "Intact brains preferred, but large pieces of brain may be usable."

Most researchers want parts harvested from fetuses 18 to 24 weeks in utero, which means the largest babies lying in lab pans awaiting a blade would stretch 10 to 12

inches—from your wrist to your elbow. Some researchers append a subtle "plus" sign to the "24," indicating that parts from late-term babies would be acceptable. Many stipulate "no abnormalities," meaning the baby in question should have been healthy prior to having her life cut short by "intrauterine cranial compression" (crushing of the skull).

On one protocol dated 1991, August J. Sick of San Diego-based Invitrogen Corporation requested kidneys, hearts, lungs, livers, spleens, pancreases, skin, smooth muscle, skeletal muscle and brains from unborn babies of 15–22 weeks gestational age. Mr. Sick wanted "5–10 samples of each per month." WORLD called Mr. Sick to verify that he had indeed order the parts. (He had.) When WORLD pointed out that Invitrogen's request of up to 100 samples per month would mean a lot of dead babies, Mr. Sick—sounding quite shaken—quickly aborted the interview.

Many of the dissection orders provide details of research projects in which the fetal tissue will be used. Most, in the abstract, are medically noble, with goals like conquering AIDS or creating "surfactants," substances that would enable premature babies to breathe independently.

Other research applications are chilling. For example, R. Paul Johnson from Massachusetts' New England Regional Primate Research Center requested second-trimester fetal livers. His 1995 protocol notes that the livers will be used ultimately for "primate implantation," including the "creation of human-monkey chimeras." In biology, a chimera is an organism created by the grafting or mutation of two genetically different cell types.

Another protocol is up-front about the researchers' profit motive. Systemix, a California-based firm wanted aborting mothers to know that any fetal tissue donated "is for research purposes which may lead to commercial applications."

That leads to the money trail.

Life Dynamics' investigation uncovered the financial arrangement between abortionists and fetal-parts providers. The Uniform Anatomic Gift Act makes it a federal crime to buy or sell fetal tissue. So entities involved in the collection and transfer of fetal parts operate under a documentary rubric that, while technically lawful, looks distinctly like a legal end-around: AGF, for example, pays the Mayfair Women's Center for the privilege of obtaining fetal tissue. Researchers pay AGF for the privilege of receiving fetal tissue. But all parties claim there is no buying or selling of fetal tissue going on.

Instead, AGF representatives maintain that Mayfair "donates" dead babies to AGF. Researchers then compensate AGF for the cost of the tissue recovery. It's a service fee, explains AGF executive director Brent Bardsley: compensation for services like dissection, blood tests, preservation, and shipping.

Money paid by fetal-tissue providers to abortion clinics is termed a "site fee," and does not, Mr. Bardsley maintains, pay for baby parts harvested. Instead the fee compensates clinics for allowing technicians like Ms. Ying to work on-site retrieving and dissecting dead babies—sort of a Frankensteinian sublet.

"It's clearly a fee-for-space arrangement," says Mr. Bardsley. "We occupy a portion of their laboratory, use their clinic supplies, have a phone line installed. The site fee offsets the use of clinic supplies that we use in tissue procurement."