COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

PUBLIC HEARING IN RE: HOUSE BILL #2299

COMMERCIAL DISPLAY OF HUMAN REMAINS

* * * * * * * * * *

BEFORE: THOMAS R. CALTAGIRONE, Majority Chairman

RON MARSICO, Minority Chairman

Kathy Manderino, Member

Sean Ramaley, Member

Thomas Creighton, Member

Bernard O'Neill, Member

John Evans, Member

John Pallone, Member

Carl Mantz, Member

Mark Keller, Member

Harold James, Member

Craig Dally, Member

William Andring, Counsel

Karen Cotes, Counsel

HEARING: Tuesday, August 5, 2008

Commencing at 10:00 a.m.

Reporter: Alicia Brant

Any reproduction of this transcript

is prohibited without authorization

by the certifying agency

```
2
               Bedford Springs Resort, Eisenhower Room
 1
   LOCATION:
 2
               2138 Business Route 220
 3
               Bedford Springs, Pennsylvania
   WITNESSES: Mike Fleck, Dr. Dennis Wint, Dr. Harry Wu,
 4
 5
               Dr. Walter Hoffman, Attorney Brian Wainger,
 6
               Georgina Gomez
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

					3
1	I N D E X				
2					
3	OPENING REMARKS				
4	By Chairman Caltagirone	5	_	7	
5	TESTIMONY				
6	By Representative Fleck	7	_	16	
7	QUESTIONS	17	-	26	
8	TESTIMONY				
9	By Dr. Wint	26	_	33	
10	QUESTIONS	33	_	42	
11	TESTIMONY				
12	By Dr. Wu	42	_	52	
13	QUESTIONS	52	_	53	
14	TESTIMONY				
15	By Dr. Hoffman	5 4	_	57	
16	QUESTIONS	57	_	78	
17	TESTIMONY				
18	By Attorney Wainger	79	-	88	
19	QUESTIONS	8 9	_	118	
20	TESTIMONY				
21	By Ms. Gomez	119	-	126	
22	QUESTIONS	126	-	140	
23	CERTIFICATE			142	
24					
25					

```
EXHIBITS
 1
 2
 3
                                                        Page
 4
            Description
                                                      Offered
   Number
 5
                           NONE OFFERED
 6
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1 REPRESENTATIVE CREIGHTON: 2 Tom Creighton, 37th District, Lancaster 3 County. REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL: 4 5 Good morning. Bernie O'Neill, 29th 6 Legislative District in Centre and Bucks County. CHAIRMAN MARSICO: Good morning. Ron Marsico, 105th 8 Legislative District in Dauphin County. 10 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: 11 Tom Caltagirone, City of Reading, Berks County, 127. 12 13 REPRESENTATIVE EVANS: 14 Good morning. I'm John Evans 15 representing the 5th Legislative District, Erie and Crawford Counties. 16 17 REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE: 18 Good morning. I'm John Pallone. represent the 54th Legislative District, which is 19 20 Northern Westmoreland County and Southern Armstrong 21 County, about 22 to 25 miles from Pittsburgh. 22 REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: 23 I'm Craig Dally from Northampton County, 24 138th District, Lehigh Valley. 25 ATTORNEY KOTES:

Karen Kotes, Counsel on House Judiciary

2 Committee.

1

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.4

25

ATTORNEY ANDRING:

Bill Andring, Counsel.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:

A couple other members have joined us.

REPRESENTATIVE KELLER:

Representative Mark Keller of the 86th District of Perry and Franklin County.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:

Thank you, Mark. And coming in to join 12 us is Carl Mantz, Kutztown, Berks County and Lehigh. 13 We can start off with Representative Fleck. If you would introduce yourself for the record and begin your testimony, sir?

REPRESENTATIVE FLECK:

Thank you, Chairman Caltagirone and Chairman Marsico, members of the Committee. Representative Mike Fleck of the 81st District, Blair, Huntingdon and Mifflin Counties. Thank you for the opportunity to discuss House Bill 2299. I became aware of the commercial display of human remains this 23 past February after watching an episode of ABC's 20/20.

I was definitely appalled that this would

1 be taking place in the United States. The real issue for me and the very core of my legislation is the issue of donor's intent, i.e. the use of unclaimed 3 cadavers from foreign countries, namely China. 20/20 report documented the controversy in great detail. They traveled to China undercover and showed how easy it was to obtain an unclaimed body.

I'm not going to elaborate on China's record on human rights. I'll leave that to the 10 experts. And I'm glad that we have Mr. Harry Wu here this morning to enlighten us on that important issue. 11 12 However, what I did know about China is that in the 13 last few years, we've had tainted test food, 14 children's toys coated in lead and the list goes on 15 and on, and on and on.

8

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

As the 20/20 episode came to a conclusion, I probably would've dropped the issue. But my wife walked into the room and informed me that the bodies exhibit was on display at Carnegie Science Center in Pittsburgh. Up to that point, I thought that this was something that was only happening in New York City or Los Angeles. Nevertheless, I soon read about the controversy surrounding the Science Center Exhibit.

The Science Center's a great institution.

I'm proud we have it here in Pennsylvania. I think
they need to examine in forming an ethics panel to
discuss if this was right for them. They reviewed the
paperwork that Premier Exhibitions, the owner of the
bodies, the exhibition had submitted to them and found
it to be in order. They dismissed the 20/20 report as
sensationalism. If I were in their shoes, I probably
would've done the same thing.

However, when Andrew Cuomo, the New York
Attorney General, released his findings that under
subpoena, he didn't feel that Premier could produce
documentation guaranteeing that the bodies on display
weren't executed political prisoners or religious
workers. I said to myself, how could the ethics panel
be privy to documentation that even the New York
Attorney General couldn't obtain under subpoena.

Nevertheless, the exhibit at the Science Center was gone and it was no longer their problem. However, a new exhibit has opened up at the Whittaker Science Center in Harrisburg, and once again it brought controversy. I soon realized that great institutions all across America were dealing with this controversy. Who were these bodies? Are we aiding foreign government in providing a quick fix in helping dispose of bodies that they don't want to deal with,

or bodies that they'd be otherwise stuck with, burial costs, et cetera, et cetera.

2

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

2.4

It saddened me because the reputation of many great museums have been somewhat guestioned, if not tarnished, depending on the exhibit they used. I, like many representatives, have introduced legislation that will verify the validity of documentation and hopefully cut down on the controversy. I have two letters from representations there that I passed out, one from Hawaii, one from Michigan.

I'm also in contact with representatives in California, Florida, New York. And ideally, something needs done at the federal level. And Congressman Todd Aiken has introduced similar legislation. However, as we know in our chamber, how slow the process can sometimes be. Until then, this will continue to affect Pennsylvania simply because we are a populous state that has a booming tourism industry, and we're blessed with some of the great 21 museums in the world. The same can be said about the aforementioned states that I've listed, all large states with a booming tourism industry.

In America, we have a long history of 25 respect for the dead. Oftentimes during the Civil

War, at the end of the day after the battle was fought, both sides would be present on the battlefield to gather up the dead, often unknown and unclaimed.

One of the greatest speeches in the world was given at the dedication of the cemetery, the Gettysburg Address. We have no idea if unclaimed cadavers on display in some of these shows were war heroes or religious workers, fighting to make their country a better place, only to end up on display here in America. We've spent millions, and rightfully so, on the tomb of the unknown soldier; once again unclaimed bodies.

We have numerous laws regarding the desecration of graves, and yet we have few laws regarding the donation of unclaimed or unknown individuals. We have more laws on taxidermy. I'm a religious man. I do believe the Bible is literal. And you may not believe the same as I do, but you can't dispute the Bible as a great history book. In the Old Testament, we read about the children of Israel and their slavery in Egypt, and more importantly, their deliverance from bondage.

Upon leaving Egypt, they went and dug up Joseph, who had been entombed for hundreds of years, because he didn't want to be left in Egypt. I say

1 this not to preach, but to illustrate the view that 2 civilized people have had for thousands and thousands 3 of years on how important is the right of your own body, even in death. In America, you can't sell your body. You can't go on Ebay and auction off a kidney. It's illegal, they'll arrest you. I can't even sell my blood; it has to be donated.

8

12

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And yet, we can go to a foreign country and purchase a body. We can ship it here 10 circumventing customs by waiving a body teaching model or what have you. We can't ship produce or meat or 11 anything else into the country without a fair 13 inspection. Each and every one of us determines our 14 definition of modesty and how we present ourselves, and how we want to be remembered.

The portion of Mifflin County that I represent is the second largest Amish community in the state. Just a few miles up the road in State College, you have a man who likes to mow his grass in a Speedo. And occasionally he would take that off, which the neighbors didn't like. Perhaps if he had the body for it, there wouldn't have been a big issue, but they sued.

Whatever the case is, you have two very different interpretations of modesty, and how these

individuals presented themselves in life and how they would want to be remembered in death. The use of unclaimed bodies for commercial profit is wrong. in death, their last wishes should be carried out. Just because we don't know them doesn't give us the right to exploit them.

3

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We have no right to infringe on the dignity of the deceased's most sacred of human rights. I look at the exhibits that use unclaimed Chinese 10 cadavers and I'm appalled. Here we have a man void of his skin, basically buck naked, holding a soccer ball 11 like he's David Beckham. And this is what your body 12 looks like if you're a professional soccer player. Educational? 14 Yes.

Wouldn't it be more educational if you put that same skinless Chinese cadaver, but instead of a soccer ball have the background of a sweatshop, which is probably more in tune with some of these Chinese cadavers? How their environment affected their genetic make-up. Many people misunderstand my legislation.

For one, it doesn't prohibit the display of human remains, but it makes sure that the donor gave their consent to be displayed for commercial enterprise, end of story. If the company wants to

pose you with a soccer ball, so be it. At least you know that and you signed on the dotted line. There's no doubt that these exhibits are educational. But we're not talking about the educational factor here. We're talking about big business. These companies have made millions and millions of dollars off of these exhibits.

1.3

And if they couldn't make any money, they probably would be marketing a different exhibit.

Furthermore, because of the high profit margin, only more and more companies will be looking to open new operations. And the argument can be made that we have a lot of unclaimed bodies here in America that we get for research. Just last month, Huntingdon County was faced with an unclaimed body that they respectfully cremated and buried in the county cemetery that no one even really realizes that the county has.

I don't think it ever crossed their mind that they could sell it or donate it to a private company who then in turn would put it in an exhibit. I don't mean to stereotype, because we have two very different companies here today, and I look forward to their testimony. We've learned a great deal about the human body largely because willful participants have donated their bodies for science.

My legislation doesn't affect the academic community. I'm working on an amendment that places a permit process under the State Department of Health instead of the county. That way, you would have one agency deciding the validity. Museums would still be encouraged to form an ethics panel and decide if it is right for our museums. But the legislation will remove a great deal of the controversy and respect the identity of the donor.

1

2

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

2.4

25

That doesn't mean you couldn't exhibit executed prisoners, but they too would have to consent prior to execution. You have before you the written testimony of Dr. Arthur Caplan, Chair of the Department of Medical Ethics at the University of Pennsylvania. He's one of the leading authorities on ethics.

On page four he states, consent is the key. Proper informed consent of the donor and the display has to be in manner that its educational goal and purpose is clear. And the marketing is done in a 21 non-exploital fashion. At my press conference in March, Representative Barbara McIlvaine Smith spoke about being a Native American, how important the Indian Reformation Act was and how museums were forced to relinquish any of them, sending them back to their

native tribes.

2

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Today we meet at Bedford Springs, known 3 for its wonderful history for over 200 years. presidents have visited here. But the grand hotel has seen other guests, including the 200 Japanese diplomats who were captured in Nazi Germany and housed here as prisoners of war. It was during that great war that we saw the evil inflicted upon a race and other people groups simply because the Nazi regime 10 didn't respect their right to even exist. And they did horrific things to them.

Inevitably, they lost all rights to their bodies, and in the end they were simply exterminated. To use somebody's body against their will in life or death is exploitation. We've come a long way since then, let's not go backwards. The bodies exhibit has made people think about their own mortality, and that is good. Personally, through this process I've decided to become an organ donor. Body donation may not be for everyone, and that's fine. But ultimately, that should remain the individual's decision to make; not ours. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:

Thank you. And for the record, I do want to mention, we do want to submit the written testimony of Dr. Caplan. Two representatives, Michigan and
Ohio, and also we received some written testimony here
from the County Commissioner's Association of
Pennsylvania. We'd like to also submit that for
public record. Questions from the members, Kathy?

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO:

6

23

Thank you. Thank you, Representative I don't mean to put you on the spot, so I'm 8 Fleck. kind of going to look to counsel, too, in case one of 10 them is carrying a Title 20 with them. But do you know what it takes for a person duly authorized to 11 12 make an anatomical gift under 20 Pa. Consolidated 13 Statutes, the two sections that your bill references? 14 Even in layman's term. I don't need you to do --- but 15 basically, we're creating a permit process and then we're saying there are two ways that you have to prove 16 17 that you can get this permit. One, you have the 18 express authorization of the person themselves, or another duly authorized person who is authorized under 19 20 our state statutes, not some sort of federal or 21 national standard to make this. And I just don't know 22 what that is.

REPRESENTATIVE FLECK:

And with all due respect, you're an attorney, I'm not. So if you don't know --- I was a

1 history major. And that's going to take some research, because I don't know if that just pertains to Pennsylvania or to ones who donate their bodies versus the bodies that have been donated elsewhere and coming into the state. Then are not necessarily --- I don't know.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO:

I didn't mean to --- I Okay. Thanks. don't know if Bill or Karen, if either of you know that, only because I think it will help me listen to the rest of the testimony from folks.

ATTORNEY ANDRING:

3

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

One of the issues with the drafting of the bill is that Pennsylvania law essentially limits the donations to nonprofit charitable type of medical institutions. So it's possible with the way the bill was put together that somebody in Pennsylvania could not donate their body to one of these organizations, which I understand are actually for profit. So that's an issue that would have to be addressed by the committee, in terms of whether they want to allow for that type of a donation or not.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO:

Okay. And then my second --- if I can 25 make a follow-up question to that, do you read --- and

again, because if we're going to be talking amendments I want to put all the potential issues on the table. Do you then read this language as it's drafted in the 3 bill to say assuming that that's the only thing that fits our title, then in essence not only could a person from Pennsylvania not be able to donate, but no show would meet the Pennsylvania standard if this was written as part of our Pennsylvania standard?

Because you wouldn't --- unless you could show proof that you had actual permission from the decedent themselves, no other body in any kind of show would ever fit a definition that would allow it to be shown in Pennsylvania, regardless of where the body comes from? That's the way I'm reading this.

ATTORNEY ANDRING:

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

Yes, that's how I would read it.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO:

Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:

Karen, do you have ---?

ATTORNEY KOTES:

No, I agree. I think there would need to 23 be a tweak to the anatomical gift statute. I think we talked about that, in the specifity of doing that, because they could not --- that would be for profit

--- obviously not accept a donation of a body under the current anatomical gift statute of Pennsylvania.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO:

Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:

Chairman Marsico, what is your reaction?

CHAIRMAN MARSICO:

Yes, thank you, Chairman. The County Commissioner's Association in the present form is opposed to it due to a governing process. You said you're going to offer an amendment that would remove that and put it in the Department of Health?

REPRESENTATIVE FLECK:

Right. This is a whole new arena to me, or it was back in March when I introduced the legislation. And my bill is almost verbatim with what the democratic majority whip in California, assembly woman Fiona Ma had introduced, as well as all the other states. Now, out there they wanted to keep it at the local level. Obviously, every state's different. We have 67 counties. Each county doesn't 22 have a department of health.

The thing is, is just the very nature of 24 these exhibits, that county's going to have to have a large enough venue, like one of our great museums.

And if they do have that venue, chances are they're in one of our major counties. So that's less of an issue. But I think by just having one agency taking care of the documenting authority, you cut down on the various interpretations of how each county would do that.

And plus, there's only been about one a year here since they started. I think they're now in our third exhibition. So you're not talking about a big onus being put on the Department of Health. And plus, then they can't reject the permit in and of itself. Where the counties I think had that authority where no, this is something we don't want to bring to our town or one of our towns, the Department of Health is simply going to say okay, the paperwork's in order, these are all donor intended bodies.

And that's all they're going to be verifying. Because this is a large business, and I know no one wants an unfunded mandate on their agency. We do plan on working into the amendment a fee that would cover the reasonable cost for that, but I think because these are profitable companies in and of themselves would be able to offset.

CHAIRMAN MARSICO:

And that was going to be my next question

actually. We touched on municipal analysis. Would you have any idea what this would cost for ---?

REPRESENTATIVE FLECK:

2

3

4

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

2.4

25

No, there again, like I said, we're dealing with one show a year probably on average. it just depends on what the standards end up being and what the paperwork --- the Department of Health is going to have to hire a whole new group and put them on the fourth floor or something. But you know, to reasonably cover their expenses. And in California, the Senate amended that bill and it is now under the California Attorney General.

So each state started out with pretty much the same legislation, but they're trying to tweak The Department of Health does have limited oversight to autopsies. It's my understanding autopsy's a criminal matter and that sort of thing. We don't get involved in that.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:

We've also been joined by Representative 21 | Harold James, Philadelphia and Representative Petrarca from Westmoreland County. Are there any other questions? Representative Pallone?

REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you

1 Representative for your presentation this morning. Ι 2 have a couple of questions that I may again have 3 exceeded the knowledge of our own panel today. I'm curious as to whether or not this proposed legislation will have any impact on the use of cadavers in medical training facilities.

The University of Pittsburgh, the University of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia both host major learning and fabulous medical facilities. cadavers are oftentimes used in their training. Do you know if this will ---?

REPRESENTATIVE FLECK:

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

That is definitely not the intent, but if we have to further clarify that in the legislation, we will. And it's strictly for the commercial profit display in a public setting, where someone's buying a ticket and they're making a profit off of that. Whereas a medical student who, I quess in essence is paying tuition per se, but it's two different issues there.

REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE:

And this wouldn't have any impact on the 23 disposition of remains relative to John Does and Jane Does who may pass in a particular county? The process now is, I believe in most of the counties, a local

mortuary school or something like that.

2

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

REPRESENTATIVE FLECK:

3 It runs the gamut depending on the county. And then to try and track what each state's doing, it's difficult. As I said, Huntingdon County, a small county, 45,000 people, have --- I don't know how many unclaimed bodies they have a year, not many. We don't have homeless people, or at least that are homeless very long. And with this, the body was 10 cremated and interned at the county cemetery. Your larger counties, Allegheny, those 11

you are going to have a higher volume. And a lot of those, too, make it into a medical facility. I would be surprised if any of those are in for profit exhibitions. I could be wrong, but there again, it's 16 hard to track that. That's really not their market, looking for a company that's going to take the body and ---.

REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE:

And the last question I have, I quess, is again more logistical. Does a 100 year look-back, so to speak, in your proposed legislation that the cadaver or the body is 100 years old that --- given that technology, probably 99 percent of the medical technology and advancement has probably been enjoyed

somewhere in the last 50 to 60 years rather than the last 100 years. Do you think it's something we should be looking at differently rather than 100 years old, maybe a shorter time frame?

Because obviously, 100 years ago, now two centuries ago, the technology didn't exist to be able to preserve the organs, the fiber in the body and so forth as we have today. Is that something that you think we should be looking at ---?

REPRESENTATIVE FLECK:

And there again, using a cookie-cutter legislation that you're trying to tweak, the 100 years were so it wouldn't affect like the Egyptian mummies, King Tut. Hair and teeth aren't in this because George Washington's teeth are floating around out there someplace, and the lockets of presidents' hair and that sort of thing. But yeah, we can probably address --- I've had a couple requests for taking it down to 75 years because the process in the 1920s with formaldehyde revolutionized and such.

REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE:

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:

I had forgotten, and I apologize,

25 Representative Deb Kula from Fayette County also joins

Other questions from the panel? No other us. questions? Thank you, Representative.

REPRESENTATIVE FLECK:

Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:

Please join us. And we're going to have some other testifiers. We'll next hear from Dennis M. Wint, President and C.E.O. of Franklin Institute.

DR. WINT:

Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the Judiciary Committee. You have my written 12 testimony before you. I do wish to thank you for the opportunity to speak with regard to House Bill #2299. I am Dennis Wint, President and C.E.O. of Franklin Institute.

The mission of the Franklin Institute is to create a passion for learning about science and technology. Since our founding in 1824, the Franklin Institute has played a continuing and evolving role in supporting science education in the industry in our society. The Institute continues to pioneer ways to 22 make science and technology accessible to all.

Today, the Franklin Institute is the most 24 visited museum in Pennsylvania. In 2007, with more than 1.7 million visitors, the museum was the 19th

most visited museum in the United States. The
Institute is also the central cultural indication of
sorts of Pennsylvania, with more than 300,000 school
age children visiting on field trips, all at a
discounted rate, and 50,000 of whom come free of
charge, with an additional 280,000 students who
participate in our Traveling Science Show every year.

We provide educational services to every county in the Commonwealth. For example, our staff has provided special development opportunities for public school teachers in 49 of the 67 counties.

We're a national leader in the science education program for girls, for families and minorities. And additionally, our website is one of the largest for any science museum in the world, with over 20 million unique electronic visitors on an annual basis.

The fundamental vision behind the

Institute's education program is to help the public

keep pace with scientific advancements that have

become more crucial to our contemporary life. The

Institute's program for school children, underserved

communities and professional educators help cultivate

tomorrow's scientific leaders as well the

scientifically literate citizenry.

In addition to our educational impact on

28

```
the community, it is also an anchor for economic
            In 2004, we became the premier designation
 3
   name for international blockbuster traveling
   exhibitions, like Titanic, King Tut and Body Worlds.
   In the case of King Tut, 1.3 million visitors came to
  Pennsylvania, making it the most popular exhibition in
   the world in 2007. The audiences of the Franklin
   Institute have doubled and we have contributed more
   than $200 million in economic impact to the
10
   Commonwealth in the past five years.
11
                For more than 50 years, the Franklin
   Institute has been a leader in health and wellness
12
13
   education, boasting one of the nation's most popular
14
   and well-known permanent exhibitions, the human heart.
15
   This extraordinarily successful exhibition is a tool
   which allows the Institute to educate the public about
16
17
  how to make healthy choices in their everyday lives.
18
   That's exactly why several years ago, when the
  Franklin Institute began to consider Gunther von
19
20
   Hagens' Body Worlds exhibit, we were excited about the
```

The Institute does not take lightly the topic of displaying human remains. And it's particularly concerned about the issue of informed

extraordinary educational impact this exhibition would

21

22

have.

consent as well as the respectful exhibition of the human body. As a part of our consideration process, senior executives from the Institute visited the 2004 Body Worlds exhibition at the California Science Center to witness first-hand the quality of the exhibition.

2

3

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

The California Science Center convened an ethics advisory committee during their consideration The committee carefully researched and process. documented the validity of the Body Worlds informed consent and death certificates and verified that the informed consent include permission for use in public education and exhibition. The Franklin Institute assembled its own ethics advisory committee chaired by Dr. Arthur Caplan, director of the Center for Bioethics at the University of Pennsylvania.

The committee included religious leaders, scientists from area universities, bioethics professionals, medical professionals and community representatives. The responsibility of this committee was to review the quality of the Body Worlds exhibition material, the California Science Center's ethics committee report and to determine whether the human remains were respectfully and appropriately 24 displayed for educational purposes.

The Franklin Institute's ethics committee reviewed the California Science Center's report on informed consent. And our committee also developed recommendations dealing with sensitivities around the display of human remains, which were properly addressed through respectful display and placement of bodies, and widespread public communication about the content of the exhibition.

The public response to the exhibition of Body Worlds was phenomenal. If you did not have the opportunity to see the exhibit, let me share with you just some of the experiences that remain with me today. Seeing children of all walks of life in absolute awe and wonder exploring the circulatory system. Listening to medical students discuss the incredible preservation and presentation of the body remains, and how much better they were than the cadavers that they were using in their classes.

Hearing family members discuss the pelvis and hip joints to better understand hip replacement surgery their grandmother just had. Witnessing physical therapists studying the body and examining the muscle tissue and the structure. Hearing children stunned and completely impassioned of how seeing a smoker's lung compared to a healthy lung solidified

1 their choice right there and then to never pick up a cigarette. Or a personal experience for me, seeing the brain of a stroke victim, that had only recently taken my father.

3

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

The 603,000 visitors to the Body Worlds exhibit at the Franklin Institute had an extraordinary lesson in anatomy, physiology, disease and health and This exhibit is about celebrating, wellness. understanding and appreciating life, the wonderfully complex systems that give us life, the diseases and afflictions that affect life, and the medical, surgical and the simple lifestyle changes that can protect and extend life.

Visitors to the Body Worlds set a new attendance record for Philadelphia and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania that eclipsed the previous record of Cezanne at the Philadelphia Museum of Art. Like Leonardo da Vinci 450 years ago, Dr. von Hagens refers to the experience of the democrization of anatomy. Rather than limiting the exposure of 21 human bodies to professionals in the medical and the science fields, the educational value of Body Worlds for the general public has been profound.

For most visitors, this is the first experience that they've had in seeing the inside of the human body. For medical students, it's the first time to see all systems in relationship to one another. Everyone had the opportunity to write comments in books at the end of the exhibition, and nearly everyone left with new attitudes about healthier lifestyles and perhaps an understanding of the afflictions that affect us and our loved ones.

The most powerful message this exhibit conveys is beneath the skin we're all the same. The Franklin Institute's decision to host Body Worlds occurred only after an extensive ethical review. The Institute decided it would host the exhibition if it included the following conditions, informed consent for educational and/or exhibition purposes, death certificates in place, exclusion of donor names and review and recommendations of our ethics committee.

The Franklin Institute took great care and concern in the way that the bodies were displayed, the placement for sensitive displays as well as the communication to the public about the content of the exhibition. The Franklin Institute supports the requirement of informed consent. However, we are concerned about the county-driven permit process and as an alternative to require legal documentation, which is included in the bill, but to have another

organization required to meet that condition.

We would be pleased to work with the

committee to determine the best solution to this

regulation. If this bill does move forward, we have

attached to my comments, written testimony for changes

and amendments and we would respectfully consider --
wish you to consider. I'd like to thank the committee

for inviting the Franklin Institute to speak today.

While this is a controversial issue, we believe it is

an important one.

Providing the public with the opportunity to see the human body is an incredible educational experience. It is our responsibility to ensure that the appropriate ethical standards of informed consent and sensitive presentation are upheld. We look forward to working with you, Mr. Chairman and the Judiciary Committee, towards our shared goal of requiring informed consent for the exhibition of human remains.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:

Questions? Kathy?

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO:

Thank you. Good morning, Dr. Wint.

Thanks for being here. A couple of questions. I did
have a chance to review the written testimony that Dr.

have a chance to leview the wifeten testimon, that bi

Caplan, who chaired your ethics committee, submitted to us. One of the things that he said in his statement is that the committee was assured that the exhibit that was coming to Franklin Institute had already appeared to have checked into the issue of informed consent and were satisfied that adequate consent had been obtained from each person whose body was on display.

The committee remained concerned about this issue, and is still very concerned about how consent could realistically have said to have been obtained from a young child or a fetus. In the future it should be made clear to all exhibitors who come to Pennsylvania that they would be expected to show documentation of informed consent, et cetera.

statement. I read it and I think what he's saying is we felt confident that informed consent was obtained to the extent that we can make sure that informed consent was obtained, but we really weren't sure if informed consent was obtained in all circumstances.

Is that kind of the bottom line of where you were left with your exhibit?

I'm not sure what I make of that

DR. WINT:

1.3

I want to be careful not to try to

interpret Dr. Caplan. I think what he was referring
to is that there were specimens on exhibition that
were of a historic nature, which is one of the reasons
why there is a limit so that the fetuses and the
embryo development were from --- I believe they were
from museum collections that had been in excess of
something like 75 years old. The question is how does
a child provide informed consent.

One of the exhibitions was of a woman who had died with her child unborn. There was no consent there obviously. That is, I think, an important question in the case. I believe that the legislation says that there would be documentation by the individual or a person representing that individual in the case of a parent.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO:

And that was going to be my next question. I did also have a chance to review the suggested amendments that you were asking us to consider. You did not really touch on the definition that I had asked Representative Fleck about, the definition that goes to the issue of who has the ability to give informed consent.

So can I take it from that that you had concluded that the definition of who has the ability

to give informed consent in the proposed legislation would have fit the parameters for the exhibit that showed at the Franklin Institute, and there would not have been a problem with this definition and the show that showed at Franklin Institute?

DR. WINT:

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Yes, I think that's correct.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO:

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

REPRESENTATIVE EVANS:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you again, Mr. (sic) Wint, for your testimony this morning. You mentioned in your testimony that there 14 are comment books at the end of the exhibit that people fill out information about their impressions of the exhibit they had seen. Is it safe to say in those comment books there were some negative comments as well as positive?

DR. WINT:

Yes, I think there were some negative comments. But I think in overall, they were a significant minority versus the positive comments. would say also that when you have a group of teenagers looking at some of this material, it becomes interesting commentary. But overall, both our formal

review of visitors --- which we do a very formalized process as well as the comment books --- overwhelmingly were positive for the exhibition.

REPRESENTATIVE EVANS:

Could you possibly characterize some of the criticisms that you did encounter along the way?

DR. WINT:

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

14 nature?

I think probably the most common, and I'm drawing this now from memory, would be the one of is it appropriate to display the human body at all, regardless of the intent of the donor.

REPRESENTATIVE EVANS:

Were some of the comments of a religious

DR. WINT:

Some of the contents were religious, yes, which is why the ethics committee had a wide variety of religious representatives on the committee.

REPRESENTATIVE EVANS:

Are there plans by the Franklin Institute at this time to host another event of this nature in the near future? Is that on your timetable for future exhibits?

DR. WINT:

We do have plans for Body Worlds 2, I

So

believe, at the end of '09 and beginning and '10.

2

1

REPRESENTATIVE EVANS:

3

Thank you, Mr. Wint.

4

5

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL:

6

--- the Institute, you said, was based on the

committee and your process was comfortable with the

consent. What exactly did the --- what type of

research or whatever did the committee do to determine

Thank you, Mr. Wint. With the question

10

that consent? Did they receive some sort of legal

11

documentation or whatever ---?

12

DR. WINT:

13

The California Science Center contracted

14

with a individual professor, I believe from North

15

Carolina, although I'm not exactly sure, to go to the

16

laboratory and pulled consent cards of all of the

17

individuals in the exhibitions. That individual

18

submitted a report to the ethics committee at the

19 20 California Science Center. We reviewed that same document rather than having our own documentation.

21

we used the documentation that California Science

22

Center used.

23

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL:

24

Is Body Worlds privately owned?

25

DR. WINT:

I believe it is.

1

2

3

5

6

8

10

11

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL:

The information that the California association ---.

DR. WINT:

California Science Center.

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL:

Science Center. Was that documentation that they had given to them by Body Worlds?

DR. WINT:

There's a Body Worlds representative 12 here. I don't want to --- I'm not exactly sure of all 13 the details. What I believe happened is that this professor from North Carolina went to the laboratory there and then pulled all the documentation. 16 was at Body Worlds laboratory.

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL:

And I guess my last question is, the nationality or race of the bodies that were on display, was it a varying display of nationalities across this earth, or was it made up of one ---?

DR. WINT:

The Body Worlds exhibition that the 24 Franklin Institute had I believe were largely 25 European.

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL:

Okay. Thank you. Appreciate it.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:

Are there any other questions? Yes, Representative Mantz?

Representative Mantz:

REPRESENTATIVE MANTZ:

I didn't have the opportunity and probably other members of this committee did not have an opportunity to personally visit the Body Worlds exhibition. Is there a way that you might verbally identify the display, a description of the display, that was provided?

DR. WINT:

The way the exhibition is prepared is that at the beginning of the exhibition you have a full-sized skeleton very much like we've all seen in anatomy classes in high school or college. As you enter the exhibition there will be then a section that will have some of the muscular systems in place. And as you keep on entering the exhibition, there is more and more of a context of the total human body.

It is divided into sections so that the circulatory section, the vascular section, the nervous section, so each one of those then is displayed both in terms of individual body parts as well as in the

total body structure, dissected in a way that
illustrates that particular body system. So if you
are looking at the circulatory system, all you will
see is the circulatory system or the vascular system,
none of the muscular systems, none of the nervous
system, none of the bone system, none of that will be
--- it is an interesting experience because there's a
certain hesitation that people have about seeing this
exhibition.

And I watched this very carefully. After about the first ten minutes, all that hesitation that people had sort of disappears because they become so intrigued and fascinated by seeing the human body in a way that they have never experienced it ever before. It is an extraordinarily educational tool.

REPRESENTATIVE MANTZ:

Did you witness any individual revulsions as to what was seen ---?

DR. WINT:

We sort of joked there were two kinds of people who were in Philadelphia, those who saw the exhibit and those who were too concerned to see the exhibit, I should say. So I think they sub-selected before they got there. I did not see anyone who just found it revolting. And I spent a lot of time in the

We will

exhibition. 1

2

REPRESENTATIVE MANTZ:

Thank you very much for your

3

presentation.

5

9

10

11

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:

6 No more questions? Thank you. next hear from Dr. Harry Wu, executive director of the Laogai Institute Chinese Research Center.

DR. WU:

I'm very glad to be here to testify about the body exhibition. Before I get into the testimony, 12 because I'm only Asian some poor English and what is my past, what I am doing. I like to say a few 14 minutes. Last week, I met President Bush and he said, what is the problem today in China? I said human rights. And he said right, human rights. And right away I give him a resolution.

It was pass in the Congress December 2005, condemned the Chinese Laogai System. I said would you as the President of the United States publically condemn Chinese Laogai. And he said I will. I set up Laogai foundation since 1992, but almost no one knows about it. Everybody heard about the Holocaust and everybody heard about the communists. This a system in this dictatorship

country to make the people fear, you disagree with the government, you wrote an article criticize government, you go over there.

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Chinese have the same systems. Chinese at this moment is communist regime. It's not a free capitalist country. In 1957, that's almost 50 years ago, I was college student, I major geology. I'm 20 years old. I was invited by the communist secretary to make some comments about the politics. Twenty (20) year old kid, you know, I have no idea. But I do not realize that I have two problems. One, I was a Catholic. Number two, my father was a banker. Ιt means outcast. This is my background.

The first sentence I say, the Soviet invasion in Hungary in October 1956 is a violation of international law. And second comment I say, communist party in China divide the people into second class, third class, this is human rights problem. That only I said in the conference. That become my charge. They charged me as a counter-revolutionary rightist. And later they arrest me without any court paper and sent to the labor camps.

And on the meeting, I say two sentence.

I spent 19 years in the labor camps. 25 I know one thing, I'm not single person. In 1957, the

so-called anti-rightist movement is around one 1 2 million. The government recognized is 550,000, but we 3 estimate probably one million. Include university students, engineer, author, reporter, whatever, intellectuals. Sent to the labor camps. After almost 20 years, I was surviving.

But many of them, they die. My mother commit suicide when she heard I was arrested. father was tortured and died. My youngest brother was killed by the police. The whole family destroyed. Moa Zedong. The first time period of 30 years of communist regime was ended in 1979. The whole country was collapsing. I don't care what be the color of the cat. Whatever it is, black or white, if the cat can catch the mouse, it is a good cat.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

So he invited the captives and come back to China. He spent big money review the charges, so he can set up a control system today inside China. But the political system entirely no change until today. One party ruling, one party controlling the 21 military system, control the media, control the education, control the government. Even today, you wrote an article on the internet against the government, go to the jail seven years, eight years, ten years.

But economy system very different now. 1 2 American businessmen, German, Japanese, Hong Kongese, 3 they do have a lot of business inside China. You can set up a factory, you can set up a state bank, you can do all kind business, sign contracts, sell the product, buy the products cheap. Because China have 1.3 billion population. Except one thing, nobody can involve the media business. You cannot set up T.V. station, you cannot set up a radio station, you cannot 10 set up a publish house you cannot set up this because of area control by the communists. 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Anyway, the government today have a lot of money. That's why we have Olympic game be going on. But we fine. China spend \$42 billion for the Olympic game. Thinking about 1936, how much money Hitler spent. How many people spend their lives in the prison system? The Chinese never publicized how many prisons today inside China, in the past, never. How many people they arrested, never. But according to our research, probably 50 million people, including me, who are there.

Today, many are prisoners, drug trafficker, robber, thief in a camp, and include the political prisoner. But everyone, whatever is a crime, two things. One, forced labor. Second, brain

washing. You have to give up your religions, give up your political view and accept the communism idea. So this is the prison system today in China. I very glad that President Bush willing to denounce the Chinese Laogai system.

3

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

6 According to our Laogai Research Foundation --- I have to explain what is Laogai. Laogai is pronounced Asian from two Chinese word. Lao, it means labor, forced labor. Gai, in Chinese means brain wash. Chinese characterize their system 10 as reform through labor. Each prison camp has 11 12 thousands of people there and forced labor, and each prison camp has two different names. In judiciary 13 14 system, it's number five prison of Shanghai maybe 15 number three prison camp of Beijing.

But at the same time, by law it's enterprises. It is hand tool manufacturer, automobile parts manufacturer. It's a garment factory, tomato test, or the farm or the coal mine. It is enterprises. The product for export, and also for import. It never stops. According to our foundation, we do some research not only on the Laogai systems.

We also working on the human rights violation.

Number one, China is the most populous country of the world. China have national popular

control policy. In this country, every woman, until
this moment, whatever what is their marriage status,
if they don't have a permit, they cannot give birth.

Otherwise, they are illegal pregnancy subject to
forced abortion. After you get a permit, you can make
love. You can pregnant and give birth. First child,
that's it. You cannot have second child. Only in
certain case approved by the government you can have a
second child. Basically one child, that's your
family. All the women in China.

2.4

Second national policy, China only have patriarchal, today is illegal. They nominate patriarchal church, bishop, priest, whatever. Maybe one day they nominate a pope. But this a communist bishop. Number three, freedom of media. All the station of radio, of T.V. or publishing house, postal, University High School is owned by the state, no private. Number four, China today become number one country of the world. They have the population of internet pass over the United States.

But funny thing is, China have an internet police department, probably 200,000 or 300,000 police for the website, take care of the internet. You cannot visit all kind website. That's why the Olympic game today they say, oh, we open it.

You can visit all kind of website Temporary. currently. After that, shut down. There is not any freedom of association.

1

2

3

4

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

25

Well, they are seriously suppressing two minorities inside China. I want to introduce you about China today because that relate to a very advanced, well, technology whatever about plastination. Since 1949 until today, China every year execute a lot of prisoners, but never publicized the number. We never know that this year they executed 5,553 or 6,000, whatever, never.

Even a family now may be different. receive the notice from the church after execution. And they have to pay money for the bullets, even five cents. You have to pay the bullets. And then you earn an urn of ashes. That's it. We have one indication from government. From 1983 to 1984, in 11 months, Chinese executed 24,000 prisoners. Chinese expert, Chinese lawyer, they said Chinese regularly executed around 80,000 to 10,000 a year.

In recently 30 years, China have national 22 policies, open house. The house is open from the death of prisoners for the transplant. 2006, China 24 become the number two country of the world. Number one country is United States. United States have

1 15,000 organ transplant. But none of the organ come
2 from executed prisoners. Come from donation. Even my
3 license have card --- I have card that says I want to
4 donate liver. China have 13,000 organ transplant, but
5 percent, that was recognized by the deputy minister
6 of the health of Chinese communist government, 95
7 percent the organs come from executed prisoners.

In the last two years, a new development, plastination, Body Shop, was imported by the company named Premier. They paid \$25 million and a Chinese professor, Sui Hongjin. Dr. Hongjin was student of Dr. von Hagens. Two years ago, von Hagens was in Germany. And Germany accusing that using the cadaver from executed prisoners. And they have a lawsuit. But finally they did not find evidence. So those people spent 25,000 Euro to compensate von Hagens.

North Carolina. I saw it. You suppose there is no cadavers or the plastinated model, come from executed prisoners. And all of these bodies was --- none of them come from Asia. Is come from Germany, whatever. And last year von Hagens, finally he met with me and he gave me some photos. Von Hagens have a big business inside China making these plastinated --- today he say, well, I'm working on the elephant. He

working on some of the animals because he cannot get many people donate their body for the show.

3

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

But anyway, he show me some photos from inside China. This is the photo in 1950, communist revolution just happen. They killed almost all of the landlord in China. Fifty-five (55) years later, this is 2005, Chinese still executed many prisoners. There's only one organization in the world and that's

the international. Only they try to do this from 10 1990, but I don't think it will succeed.

1996 and that's the international report, there were 5,073 execution inside China. But this is public document. And today China stop any publication, any public execution today. And the picture come from von Hagens. Von Hagens, every month he went to China. He working with Dr. Sui. Dr. Sui will right now set up a show in America. I do not know why von Hagens don't like it. But they separated.

The first pictures four cadavers. The 21 head was shot, bloody. There was cover by the plastic. The leg, the hand, was still tied. doctor tried to take away the class. Who take this photo? We know his last name. We know who is ABC 20/20 program producer, Ronald Ross. Ron Ross went to China and interview the guy, but he said keep me in secret. So they have his photo from the back. But they knew he working with Dr. Sui about four years. He come back more than 100 to 120 cadavers all of the country and pass over to the doctor. This is full body just arrive at hospital.

1.3

Finally, the truck is leaving. The first body was taken. Using the water clean up the body.

Even from children visiting, now, they got it put on a tray, go into the laboratory. They have the hole in the face, the bullet from back to the face. And he is ready for plastination. These 120 executed prisoners I do not know. These cadaver was in United States or is not in United States. But the person who collect these cadavers is working for Dr. Sui and plastinated.

Because Premier invite Chinese producer at the show in the America, four, five, six places. So maybe some of them come from executed prisoners and some of them not. That's all we have to go by Dr. Sui and by the Premier company. I want to tell everybody one thing. This is not an exhibition of computer or furniture or motor vehicle. It's human bodies. And it is not old body.

Most of the bodies we have maybe a couple a months ago, maybe a couple of years ago. But

anyway, this is the communist government. This not any country, not any government did it. All these cadavers, all these figures, whatever, you look at Chinese. I went over there for scientific education, for technology education. I like it. I like to see the system very clear, very good because plastination.

But later, I thought if this exhibition, all of the body is come from black people, what do you think? If this body all come from white people, what do you think? If all the body come from Jewish, come from Holocaust, if come from Soviet Cold War, what do you think? Why we allow the Chinese cadavers right here?

This not Chinese computer, not Chinese automobile. These are human beings. Some time ago, they were sitting right here with you. Unfortunately, today they become a statue. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:

Thank you, Doctor. Questions? Kathy?
REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO:

Thank you very much, Dr. Wu, for your testimony. I listened carefully and I also read your written testimony. You speak specifically about one company, Premier, and your understanding that their cadavers are coming from China. You don't say

anything about the other one. Is that because you don't know or you know that --- well, you did talk 3 about the other doctor, I forgot his name, that's with the other company. 5 DR. WU: 6 Von Hagens. REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Von Hagens. 8 9 DR. WU: 10 So far as I know, it's only Premier, the company from Atlanta. China, in the beginning, only 11 one company from Dr. Sui. Probably have two or three 12 13 company create a cover. 14 REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: 15 Thank you. 16 CHAIRMAN MARSICO: Thank you, Doctor, for your testimony. 17 18 We certainly appreciate that. Thank you. 19 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:

We now have, I think, Dr. Walter Hoffman, the coroner of Montgomery County, Pennsylvania.

DR. HOFFMAN:

20

21

22

23

24

25

Good morning. I'm here.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:

Okay. Is Brian on with ---?

54 1 CHAIRMAN MARSICO: 2 Well, Brian was going after him. 3 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Afterwards? 4 5 CHAIRMAN MARSICO: 6 Yes, sir. CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Doctor? 8 9 DR. HOFFMAN: 10 Hello? 11 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: 12 Go right ahead, Doctor. We're here. 13 DR. HOFFMAN: 14 Good morning. I'm Dr. Walter Hoffman, a 15 medical doctor, a Board certified forensic pathologist 16 and the elected coroner of Montgomery County, 17 Pennsylvania. I've been involved with the various 18 body shows for almost three and a half years. I have personally examined well over 60 of these bodies, many 19 20 in the original shipping crates when they came to 21 Baltimore, in Baltimore Harbor. 22 All of these bodies are the property of

23 the Chinese authorities. They are not owned by 24 | Premier, they are not owned Gunther von Hagens' Body 25 | World. They belong to the Chinese government.

the exhibitions are over, all of these bodies go back to China unless other arrangements are made. They are a tremendous educational tool, as you heard the C.E.O. from the Franklin Institute say.

3

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

These bodies have enlightened medical students, physicians, surgeons, in a technique and a demonstration of the human body that heretofore was not even present in books. We are in a democracy. Everyone has the right to make their own judgment of what they will and will not want to see. It is not up to government to dictate to the public what they can and cannot see.

These bodies are presented in a most honorable, ethical and discrete manner. There is no humor about that. There is no laughter about it. it allows the public to see and understand things that they have seen on television, that they read in books, that their physician speaks to them about. exhibits have been all over the world. It opened in May in Leon, France. It is now, as you know, in 21 Harrisburg. It has been in Pittsburgh. It was a game winner in Philadelphia.

The Chinese law permits the Chinese government to donate bodies to medical science, to exhibitions, to medical schools. The Chinese

government can cremate, the Chinese government can bury. And in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, I as 3 the coroner can likewise donate unclaimed bodies to medical science, to research institutes, I can cremate, I can bury, I can keep them in my freezer until whatever.

We operate under a similar law. This is not unique to China. This is not unique to many countries in the world. For centuries, people have been able to go to anatomic museums in almost every medical school city in the world and see exactly the 12 same thing. However, this new process, plastination, which has been around probably for almost 60 years, allows dissection in such a way that the organs do not degrade as rapidly as they do with embalming fluid, which is formaldehyde.

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

25

And just as an aside, probably within the next five years, the E.U., the European Union, will outlaw embalming fluid formaldehyde as we know it because formaldehyde is highly toxic. And therefore, plastination, the process, will come to be a universal 22 methodology.

The organs and the tissues are much more 24 | vibrant, they are a much more realistic appreciation of what the human body is and I don't think anyone

1 would deny anyone the right to educate themselves and 2 be better informed. A more better informed consumer can make much more better informed and intelligent healthcare decisions.

3

5

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

22

23

We have had traveling shows of various degrees since time immemorial. No one has said word one about being able to see the King Tut exhibit. And who, pray tell, gave informed consent to how King Tut should be shipped to the United States? These are not United States bodies. These are not bodies that originated in the United States or any of its 12 territories. And therefore, the laws of China are the laws of China. And we, the United States, cannot put new laws on China.

I appreciate the opportunity to discuss this with the judiciary committee and I look forward to further discussion about this issue. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:

2.0 Are there any questions from 21 Representative Dally, Evans, Manderino?

REPRESENTATIVE DALLY:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you, 24 Dr. Hoffman, for your testimony. I'm not sure if you 25 were listening to this hearing on the teleconference

or P.C.N. But you mentioned a couple things in your testimony about the matter of dealing with unclaimed bodies and how you can do a lot of the same things that they're doing with these Chinese bodies.

DR. HOFFMAN:

3

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

That's correct, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE DALLY:

And my question to you is what steps do you take in your office to notify any next of kin when you have an unclaimed body?

DR. HOFFMAN:

I am charged by state law to do as much as I possibly can with the assistance of law enforcement to find next of kin. But unfortunately in this very mobile society of ours today, we do have folks who have no relatives, no next of kin and no one who will come to speak for them. And therefore, once every two to three months, I do indeed have to cremate or bury someone at county expense.

REPRESENTATIVE DALLY:

And do you know what the procedure is in China to notify next of kin of these individuals?

DR. HOFFMAN:

Do I know the exact procedure? No, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE DALLY:

Okay. Because I think we heard testimony from Dr. Wu on that issue. And I know you spoke about the positive aspects of plastination. And I think that that's certainly credible testimony. But I'm not sure what this hearing is all about. I think this hearing is about whether those individuals' bodies who are displayed had the opportunity to provide consent, or the next of kin had the ability to provide consent, for their display. And that's what ---.

DR. HOFFMAN:

1

2

3

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

25

Well, I have seen the same documents that the Attorney General of the Commonwealth has seen as well as the documents that the New York Attorney General, Mr. Cuomo, has seen. And Mr. Cuomo and Premier came to an agreement. And I'm sure Premier's representatives can talk about that. But that was not based on a lack of documentation. It was based on something completely different.

REPRESENTATIVE DALLY:

But ---.

DR. HOFFMAN:

Different countries have different laws regulating the disposal of human remains.

REPRESENTATIVE DALLY:

All right. Doctor, do you think it's in

our best interest as a culture to continue that practice and not recognize human dignity just because another country may not? Is that some practice that we should just endorse by accepting these bodies without any kind of verification or consent?

DR. HOFFMAN:

I believe that the documents I have seen, and they came along with the bodies when the bodies came to the Harbor in Baltimore, adequately document that these bodies one, were not tortured in any manner, way, shape or form, and two, the appropriate documentation as to what the origin of these bodies were.

REPRESENTATIVE DALLY:

But basically your testimony was that these bodies were the property of the Chinese government; isn't that correct?

DR. HOFFMAN:

They not only were, they are, sir, the property of the Chinese government. They are not the property of Premier. They are not the property of any other show that's going around. These are bodies of Chinese origin and belong to the Chinese government. They are on loan for display purposes here in the United States. They don't belong to any of the

exhibitioners. 1 2 REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: 3 And is it your testimony that we shouldn't be concerned about how the Chinese government came in possession of these bodies? That's not our concern? DR. HOFFMAN: 8 I don't believe --- no. That's a political question. And I'm not here to discuss the 10 politics of different countries. 11 REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: 12 All right. Thanks very much, Doctor. 13 DR. HOFFMAN: 14 Thank you. 15 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: 16 Any other questions? 17 REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: 18 I do. 19 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: 20 Representative Evans? 21 REPRESENTATIVE EVAN: I hope you 22 Yes, thank you, Dr. Hoffman. 23 can hear us okay. Were you able to hear the testimony

of Dr. Wu, who preceded your testimony?

DR. HOFFMAN:

24

25

I did indeed, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE EVANS:

Does it not concern you that some of the bodies, perhaps not on the exhibitions you're familiar with, but that some bodies are in use around the world in some displays that may be potentially political prisoners who are being displayed? Does that not concern you?

DR. HOFFMAN:

Sir, that's an allegation that has yet to be proven. I cannot comment on political prisoners, but I reiterate that none of the 50 or 60 bodies that I have seen before they were put on exhibit have any evidence of injury, torture, abuse or violation of corpse. And I've been doing forensic pathology now for 40 years. I'm Board Certified in it. That is what I do for a living.

And I can reiterate to this committee
there is no evidence of physical abuse. I certainly
cannot comment on medical abuse or isolation,
et cetera, but these human beings, and they are human
beings, were not physically tortured in any manner.

REPRESENTATIVE EVANS:

Following on Representative Dally's question that the Chinese government does own these

1 bodies and that is a policy of that government, you can't help though but get into a political discussion here on that policy because it differs so vastly from what occurs in our country today. Is that fair analysis of where we are with this law?

DR. HOFFMAN:

There are certainly many countries in this world that do not agree or have similar political views as we do. But this is a free society and we the public should have the right to make a decision what 10 we will or will not see. And we do that with our 11 12 dollars. Everyone who has seen this exhibit and 13 appreciated --- we're not talking about several 14 hundred people, we're talking now millions of United 15 States citizens have seen this exhibit and walk away with a very positive feeling. That should mean 16 17 something.

REPRESENTATIVE EVANS:

That concludes my questions, Mr.

2.0 Chairman.

18

19

21

22

2.4

25

3

6

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:

Thank you. Any other questions? Ms.

23 Manderino?

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO:

Thank you. Good morning, Dr. Hoffman.

Kathy Manderino.

we?

DR. HOFFMAN:

Good morning. We know each other; don't

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO:

Yes, we do. Yes. Thank you very much for being here. A couple questions. You mentioned several times that you reviewed the paperwork, but what does that mean? I mean, what physically is the paperwork that accompanies these bodies or cadavers for the display? What are you reviewing, what does it say, what's the origin and authenticity, if you can kind of --- everyone keeps alluding to it, but I'm having a hard time visualizing specifics.

DR. HOFFMAN:

I saw the original Chinese documents. I cannot read Chinese nor do I understand Chinese. But I had --- the documents were translated by legitimate Chinese translators. And these documents say that these bodies are the property of the Chinese government, are loaned to the exhibitors, were not abused. I documented that they were not abused. And abuse of a human corpse --- you cannot brush that away. And that these bodies are to be returned to China upon completion of the exhibit. They are here

for a period of time.

2 REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO:

One of the issues we discussed early on and particularly is the focus of this proposed legislation is not an issue of torture or abuse, but an issue of informed consent. Was there anything in those documents that you reviewed that gave you a sense one way or another of whether or not there was informed consent between the decedent or somebody able to act on behalf of the decedent and the Chinese government?

DR. HOFFMAN:

No, I saw no document stating that I voluntarily donate my body to science, period. But we don't have that in the United States either.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO:

Okay. Well, actually, let me get to that. You described kind of Chinese law. And I wrote down kind of paraphrasing. But Chinese law permits the Chinese government to donate unclaimed bodies for --- and then you enumerated a whole list of reasons, medical science, et cetera, et cetera, including exhibition. And then you went on to say our laws allow the same thing with regard to unclaimed bodies.

Sargent's Court Reporting Service, Inc. (814) 536-8908

And you went through a list. And I don't

know if it was --- one of the things that I heard was in the list that you gave with regard to the United States, there wasn't anything about exhibition. And I don't know if that was just your paraphrasing or if there was some distinction that I was listening for that I'm inserting that doesn't belong there. Are you with me?

DR. HOFFMAN:

1.3

I certainly could not donate an unclaimed body for commercial purposes. That we can't do.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO:

Okay. One more time, explain to me --because we're kind of stuck. And at least the focus
of the legislation before us is this notion of
informed consent. Now, if I asked a living person,
say while I'm living I want my body to be donated to
medical science or for any other reason, for learning,
teaching, et cetera, then I have given informed
consent.

So we have a notion in our law of informed consent. So when you made the comment that we don't have informed consent in our law, you're talking about specifically how the law allowed you to dispose of an unclaimed body?

DR. HOFFMAN:

That is correct, ma'am.

1

2

3

4

5

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO:

So our law ---.

DR. HOFFMAN:

Either informed consent has to be given by a living person, or has to be given by the immediate next of kin for the disposition of deceased, if the deceased has not made previous arrangements.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO:

So in our country, or at least in our laws in Pennsylvania, the status of an unclaimed body 12 then kind of puts in government's hands, you as a representative of government, a decision about what to do with that body that could mirror what a living person could have done under informed consent, but in this case there was no informed consent because there was nobody to ask?

DR. HOFFMAN:

That is correct, ma'am.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO:

I thank you very much for your testimony.

22 And I think there's at least another question.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:

Yes, there is, Representative O'Neill.

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL:

Yes, thank you, Dr. Hoffman. Bernie
O'Neill from Bucks County.

DR. HOFFMAN:

Yes, sir.

2.4

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL:

A couple of quick questions. You said that the bodies that you were referring to were on loan from the government of China. So what you're telling me, there was no money that transpired from any exhibitors or anyone here in the United States to the government of China or whoever had control of these bodies, or anybody in between?

DR. HOFFMAN:

Oh, I am sure, but I leave that up to the representative of Premier who I understand is going to testify after I do. I am sure there's a fee paid to the government. It is no different than the fee paid to the Egyptian government for bringing King Tut over or the fee paid to the Louvre in Paris for bringing over the Cezanne exhibit to the Art Institute.

There are fees charged for exhibitions.

There's costs involved for shipping the bodies. There are costs involved for preparing the bodies. And these dissections are the most unique I've ever seen in 50 years of medicine. So I'm sure there is a fee.

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL:

Well, my question --- I understand that.

DR. HOFFMAN:

1

2

3

4

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

That would be ludicrous to think that these were simply --- the cost was totally absorbed by the Chinese government. I'm sure the Chinese government charged a fee.

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL:

And thank you for those comments. But what I'm looking for is to whether any profit was being made. I understand that there are costs involved, you know, transportation and for the body --- but I'm talking about profit ---.

DR. HOFFMAN:

I understand that the exhibitors are making a profit. They wouldn't be doing this for free. We are still a capitalistic country. And ---.

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL:

So then if there are profits being made then ---?

DR. HOFFMAN:

Then ---.

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL:

Well then, quite frankly, if there are profits being made, then they're not on loan? That's

my point.

2

DR. HOFFMAN:

3

I do not understand your question, sir.

4

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL:

5

6

I'm trying to get to the point whether they're on loan or not. We were ---.

7

DR. HOFFMAN:

8

They are on loan. They are the property of the Chinese government. They are not the property

10

of Gunther von Hagens. They are not the property of

11

Body Worlds. They are not the property of Premier.

12

They are the property of the Chinese authority.

13

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL:

14

I understand that, sir. If my neighbor

15

lent me his lawnmower to cut my grass ---?

16

DR. HOFFMAN:

17

I beg your pardon?

18

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL:

19

If my neighbor lent me his lawnmower to

20

cut my grass because my lawnmower broke down, but

21

that's loaning me something. But if my neighbor gave

22

me his mower and said I'm charging you a fee of \$100,

23

then he's not really loaning it to me. So that's what

24

I'm trying to drive at. And the reason why I say that

25

is because the presenter before you showed us some

pretty graphic and honest pictures of executed prisoners from China whose bodies were taken and apparently used for things such as what you're stating.

So I guess what we're trying to get to, the bottom line is it's not as much consent sometimes as it is the abuse and human rights issue here that seems to be the problem from China. They're executing people and just, consequently, giving their bodies away for whatever, and then in a lot of cases making profit on it.

DR. HOFFMAN:

I again reiterate to the committee that of the 50 or 60 bodies that I physically examined, there is no evidence of torture, abuse, abuse of corpse or any other evidence of blunt force or any other type of injury.

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL:

Okay. Thank you for that. You made a comment about we the public have a right to make our own decisions. I guess my question to you is during these exhibitions, was there any disclaimer or was the public informed that these bodies came from China and exactly how they were obtained by the Chinese government is unknown, or was there anything to that

effect? Because if the public is to make their own informed decision, do you not believe that they should have kind of background as to where they may come from, how they may get obtained or so forth?

DR. HOFFMAN:

3

5

6

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

25

I've now seen probably six or seven of the exhibits. I've not seen the one in Atlantic City yet. I was there at the opening day of the one in Harrisburg. I've seen them in Detroit, Orlando, in Leon, France, I saw the opening there. It was obvious from looking at the bodies that these are oriental 12 bodies. These are not African Americans. They are not Caucasians. They are not Eskimo's.

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL:

But there was no ---.

DR. HOFFMAN:

These are oriental bodies and they appear Chinese.

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL:

But was there any disclaimer as to where the bodies were obtained so the public can make an informed decision as to whether --- for their own personal moral reasons would want to go into the exhibit or not?

DR. HOFFMAN:

I didn't see any, but that I will leave to the representative from Premier who can talk to that issue far better than I can.

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL:

Okay. Thank you.

DR. HOFFMAN:

1

2

3

4

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

But there was no statement anywhere in the exhibits that I've seen from. And I've seen it now from three different organizations stating upfront that these are human beings that are from China, et cetera, et cetera.

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL:

Great. Thank you. And I guess my next question to you is as coroner, do you have the right to donate a body or body parts or organs of an unclaimed body as you said ---?

DR. HOFFMAN:

Yes, I do, sir. Why do you ask?

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL:

So you can donate it to science or to one of these exhibits if you choose to do so if the body's unclaimed?

DR. HOFFMAN:

No, I can donate it to science. I can donate it for anatomy purposes. I think that although

the act does not prevent me from donating it to a commercial venture, I don't think that would be palatable for the citizens of the Commonwealth.

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL:

Great. Thank you very much. appreciate it. Thank you for being with us today.

DR. HOFFMAN:

Sure.

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:

Representative Pallone?

REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE:

Thank you. Thank you, Doctor. This is Representative John Pallone. I represent Northern 14 | Westmoreland and Southern Armstrong Counties. I have seen the body exhibit at the Carnegie Science Center. And I agree with you that it was phenomenal. And I'm certainly not a doctor or a student of medicine. a graduate of business school and law school. So my view is probably different than yours in terms of the appreciation.

21 But I found it to be extremely 22 educational, extremely informative and very 23 overwhelming. In fact, the crowd of people who were 24 there when I was in this facility, you could've heard 25 a pin drop. It was incredible to witness other people witnessing the body exhibit. My question will focus more on the ball that's coming across the plate.

And the proposed legislation basically, in my paraphrased summary, is just to regulate Pennsylvania venues that would display the body exhibits or other exhibits like that. And your statement made a reference to you can't regulate what another country does with their government. I don't think we're trying to do that. Do you agree that we're able in Pennsylvania to regulate our local businesses, whether they be profit or nonprofit relative to how they conduct business?

DR. HOFFMAN:

2

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

Of course. That's the function of government.

REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE:

And do you agree or disagree that it's prudent on behalf of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to regulate our venues in such a way that they at least exercise due diligence relative to any exhibit that they bring into Pennsylvania?

DR. HOFFMAN:

I would agree with that. But as you are 24 probably aware, the Attorney General of the Commonwealth looked at the documents for the exhibit

in Harrisburg and approved it.

2

And I believe ---.

REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE:

3

1

DR. HOFFMAN:

5

But you know, if you're trying to kill authority I think that might be inappropriate because this exhibit has now been in multiple states.

3 And ---.

9

2.4

25

REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE:

10 I agree. And as I stated earlier, I 11 thought it was a very terrific exhibit. I guess the direction where I'm going is the legislation, or for 12 13 lack of any other term, we're going to establish the 14 policy. And I think that it's responsible on our part 15 to be able to do that. To be able to say that if you're going to bring whether it be the King Tut exhibit or an art exhibit or whatever the case may be 17 18 into this state, that we, in fact, make sure that with all reasonable due diligence --- and be able to prove 19 20 beyond a reasonable doubt that all of these exhibits, 21 whether they be pieces of art, they may be stolen, 22 they might not be. We don't know that, but we're 23 going to at least do our due diligence.

I think that's the crux of Representative Fleck's intent with his legislation, is that we do our

due diligence and not get into the morality and the
ethnicity of the display or whatever. And I don't
believe that's where we're going. But my last
question was a point of clarification. When you were
using the word loan --- and I think I understand what
you're saying as well as anyone else. But loan is no
different than when you borrow money from a bank and
you pay it back. There's a fee of interest that goes
with that.

DR. HOFFMAN:

Sir ---.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE:

While these bodies are on loan, they're actually owned by somebody else. And they're being loaned to whether it be Premier or any other exhibitor or venue for a fee. And they will ultimately be returned to the owner; correct?

DR. HOFFMAN:

That's correct because if something goes wrong with the bodies and accidents happen with them, the owners have a representative who comes and makes repairs. Not Premier, not Gunther von Hagens; the company does.

REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE:

Thank you, Doctor.

1 DR. HOFFMAN: 2 Thank you, sir. 3 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Representative Mantz? 4 5 REPRESENTATIVE MANTZ: 6 Dr. Hoffman, my name is Representative Carl Mantz. I represent portions of Berks and Lehigh Counties. Doctor, do you believe that the Chinese government, controlled as it is by the Chinese 10 Communist Party, is capable of deceit or misrepresentation or dissimulations in its preparation 11 12 of documentation, the documentation of the company, of the bodies, transported to the shores of Baltimore? 13 14 DR. HOFFMAN: 15 Representative, every government in this 16 world, all 160 plus nations, have the ability to deceive, counterfeit, create fraud, et cetera. And 17 unfortunately, including ours. 18 19 REPRESENTATIVE MANTZ: 20 Thank you very much for your testimony. 21 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:

Are there any other questions from the Thank you, Doctor. We appreciate your members? testimony.

DR. HOFFMAN:

22

23

24

25

79 Thank you very much, sir. 1 2 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: I'd like to next move on to Ms. Georgina 3 Gomez, director or development --- oh, is Brian there? 5 CHAIRMAN MARSICO: 6 Yes, sir. CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: 8 I'm sorry. Excuse me. Brian, are you there? 10 ATTORNEY WAINGER: 11 I'm here. 12 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: 13 I'm sorry. I apologize. Brian, general 14 counsel for Premier Exhibitions, Incorporated. Do you 15 want to make some comments? 16 ATTORNEY WAINGER: 17 Please. I'll try to speak loudly and 18 clearly. If you all have the need for me to speak up, please let me know. 19 20 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: You're coming through loud and clear. 21 22 ATTORNEY WAINGER: 23 Majority Chairman Caltagirone, Minority 24 Chairman Marsico and members of the House Judiciary 25 Committee. After carefully reviewing House Bill

#2299, I must respectfully oppose the measure in its current form. I serve as general counsel to Premier Exhibitions, a company which you have heard much about so far this morning. Premier Exhibitions is a publically traded entertainment company. It is a major provider of museum quality exhibitions throughout the world.

In addition to its presentation of the body and the exhibition on Bodies Revealed, Premier also presents a number of other exhibitions, including but not limited to Titanic, the Artifact Exhibition, an exhibition which was referenced by Mr. Wint from the Franklin Institute, Dialogue in the Dark, Sports and Morals, Star Trek Exhibition. Premier's body exhibition has been seen in a number of venues throughout the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, including at the Carnegie Center in Pittsburgh.

And currently, Premier is promoting the presentation of Our Body, the Universe Within at the Whittaker Center in Harrisburg. Millions of people worldwide have seen these anatomy exhibitions, a vast majority of whom, perhaps approaching 95 percent, find it a positive, enlightening and educational experience. All of the specimens that these exhibitions undergo a power preservation process which

transform them to silicon and which we know is of no public health risk.

The end result is an anatomical model which is plastic to the deepest cellular level. These exhibitions have been examined by medical officers and health departments throughout the country, all of whom have agreed that there's no public health risk. This point appears to be beyond dispute.

Premier utilizes specimens from China.

Most of them come from unclaimed remains that have been supplied to medical schools in China from the Chinese Bureau of Police. And then have been provided by these medical schools with the plastination facilities. In addition to these unclaimed specimens, Premier also utilizes plastinates from suppliers who have confirmed via affidavit that the specimens have been donated for use in public exhibitions.

Nevertheless, even for these specimens,

Premier may not have the level of documentation that

apparently would be required by House Bill #2299. In

its current form, House Bill #2299 will undermine the

efforts of Premier and other providers of this content

to educate and enlighten the general public about

human anatomy. The language in the bill will make it

impossible for Premier to comply and will vastly

diminish the opportunity for the people of Pennsylvania to learn about human anatomy in this breathtaking, up-close way.

2

3

4

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

It appears that the goal of House Bill #2299, if not the unintended consequences, is to outlaw and shut down lawful exhibitions which are extremely educational and constructive on moral and ethical grounds not related to public health, safety or welfare. And as you know, it is highly unusual if not extraordinary to shut down a lawfully operated business for concerns not related to public health, safety and welfare.

In this respect, I submit to you that the citizens of this Commonwealth should have the right to decide for themselves whether to attend these exhibitions and under what circumstances. In reaching millions of people in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania alone, these exhibitions provide an exquisite anatomy lesson to the general public. They say a picture is worth a thousand words. But even a thousand pictures can't tell the stories of these specimens in these exhibitions.

They spark awareness in a truly unique 24 and visual way of the importance of healthy living. And they do it on a grand scale. Millions of people have seen and understand what cigarettes actually do
to a lung because of these exhibitions, what
cholesterol actually does to blood vessels and what
excessive alcohol intake actually does to a liver.

Unless you have actually taken the time to see one of
these exhibitions, you cannot appreciate or fathom the
profound impact that they have on the viewing public.

In this respect, these exhibitions are just as important as are those bodies donated by Dr. Hoffman and his colleagues to be used in the human anatomy courses taken by this Commonwealth's future doctors and dentists. To be clear, and as Dr. Hoffman explained a few minutes ago, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, like virtually every other state in this country, accept unclaimed bodies to be used for the advancement of medical science.

2.0

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania does not have consent forms for these unclaimed bodies, the same bodies that are dissected and disposed of in the name of medical science. It would be extraordinary to allow unclaimed bodies to be used in this manner for private education, but not for public education. But to be clear, if passed this bill would do just that.

Putting aside for the moment the policy questions raised by House Bill #2299, the lawyer in me

also has chief concerns about its statutory and procedural framework. The bill does not require a county to issue a permit, it allows them to. Can one county deny a permit based on the same documentation accepted by a neighboring county? What is the objective criteria on which a county could make its determination?

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

I understand Representative Fleck has already decided to address those concerns. But the flaws in the bill extend beyond just a county process. What is, quote, valid business authorization? Is that a subjective determination? In essence, this statute is devoid of any standards, quidelines or criteria, let alone objective or standardized ones that guide the permitting process. It creates a subjective, if not arbitrary, permitting framework, in fact, in the counties' unbridled discretion.

This subjective framework coupled with the actual language in the bill extends far beyond how states typically regulate museum quality exhibitions. Premier has no way to provide indicia of consent as required under this bill as the specimens were obtained years ago. And since the company does not 24 plan on obtaining new specimens, it has no way to meet the requirements of this law.

It is hard to fathom or understand why the legislature would choose to prohibit a major company from legally operating educational shows on moral, ethical or religious grounds unrelated to health and safety, and where literally hundreds of thousands of your citizens have already seen it and have already approved of it. Controversy itself need not be feared. It sparks awareness, creativity and a healthy dialogue.

1

2

3

21

22

23

24

25

10 I ask you to consider for the moment the irony of some earlier comments we heard today. 11 Representative Fleck said the core issue of this bill 12 13 is to require informed consent for these specimens, informed consent. Mr. Wint, the President and C.E.O. 14 15 of the Franklin Institute, spoke to us on the apparently rigid requirements of its ethics committee 16 17 before agreeing to host Body Worlds. 18 Representative Fleck would point out an exception for mummies, like King Tut and the other human remains in 19 20 that show.

And the Franklin Institute welcomed with open arms over 1.3 million paying customers to see the mummy and other human remains of the King Tut exhibition, none of which gave informed consent. And this was done, apparently, without convening the same

ethics committee that was required for the human anatomy exhibition. The stark reality is that the human remains of the King Tut exhibition are no different than the human remains in these other exhibitions.

The point here, it's not obvious. It's that we should not legislate convenience. We should not legislate to fix our unique agendas. Whether to patronize any of these exhibitions should be based on personal decisions and prerogatives, not legislative decisions and not legislative prerogatives. In conclusion, I listened very closely to Dr. Wu. He had moving, poignant testimony.

I listened to everything he said. And I specifically listened to what he said about Premier Exhibitions Incorporated, a Florida corporation doing business in Atlanta, Georgia, and listed on the NASDAQ stock exchange. I'm not here to defend the history of human rights violations in China. I am here, however, to discuss this legislation and to make sure the record is quite clear and quite truthful when it comes to Premier Exhibitions.

Without getting into too much detail unless further asked by questions, I will tell you that as those pictures relate to Premier Exhibition,

there has never ever been any credible information or evidence suggesting that those specimens went to any of the plastination facilities utilized by Premier Exhibition. And we take great exception with that allegation.

As Mr. Wu candidly stated, he received those pictures from Gunther von Hagens, a competitor of Premier Exhibitions. A competitor of Premier Exhibitions who has engaged in an impressive marketing and P.R. campaign to try to distinguish between consented specimens and specimens that have been donated as unclaimed.

I will tell you if Premier Exhibitions had any information, any scintilla of information, that the allegations made by Mr. Wu in his touching remarks --- and by Dr. von Hagens previously recorded in television shows, that if any of that was true, if we had any information, Premier would not be presenting these specimens. The grim, stark reality, no matter how much we want to believe it, is that Premier Exhibitions does extensive due diligence to ensure that these specimens do not come from executed prisoners.

Premier Exhibitions retained a professor emeritus, formerly of the University of Michigan

1 Medical School, and an additional medical personnel who examined the specimens and have never ever seen any evidence associated with trauma, abuse or 3 execution. In the end, I am not here to defend human rights abuses in China. But I am here to say that the people that Premier does business with are reputable people associated with esteemed medical universities.

And the allegations, while convenient and serve a point about the history of abuses in China, do not prove a case. And Premier Exhibitions will continue to operate in the same honorable fashion that 12 it has. It will continue, we hope, to present these educational exhibitions in a manner that allows the public to choose for themselves in how to educate themselves. I thank you for listening and taking the time. And I am here to answer any questions you may have.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:

Thank you. Representative Dally?

REPRESENTATIVE DALLY:

Oh, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you,

is it Wainger?

8

10

11

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ATTORNEY WAINGER:

It's Brian Wainger, yes, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE DALLY:

Thank you for your testimony. Wainger. I don't know whether you were listening to the earlier testimony. I guess probably on the basis of some of the comments you made, you were. How many of these specimens do you exhibit in your business?

ATTORNEY WAINGER:

1

2

3

6

8

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

I don't have the answer to that precisely. Premier Exhibitions operates or promotes upwards of 17 separate exhibitions. All of these exhibitions have full human body remains and individual organs and individual organ systems. that's a key point that hasn't been made. We talk about informed consent for the human bodies.

But what we have to understand is that the majority of these exhibitions are comprised of individual organs and individual organ systems, usually which have some sort of pathology to explain the source of disease, to explain through experience what, as I said, cardiovascular disease looks like.

And there is absolutely no way to prove sufficiently to the satisfaction of this subjective criteria that any of these organs or organ systems 23 were donated with informed consent. It creates a logistical problem that we haven't addressed but is very, very real.

REPRESENTATIVE DALLY:

To your knowledge, are there new bodies that are being provided for the plastination process?

ATTORNEY WAINGER:

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

origin?

Premier has stated publically, I believe, that it has all the specimens it intends to obtain and has no present plan to obtain any further specimens.

REPRESENTATIVE DALLY:

And these specimens that you have in your exhibits, are they the property of the Chinese government?

ATTORNEY WAINGER:

They are the property of others. In some cases, I believe they are the property of the Chinese government. In some cases, I believe they are the property of the suppliers of the specimen. But what I know for sure is they are not the property of Premier Exhibitions.

REPRESENTATIVE DALLY:

And are these specimens all of Chinese

ATTORNEY WAINGER:

They are.

REPRESENTATIVE DALLY:

So there are no Caucasians or no African

American or African, no specimen ---?

ATTORNEY WAINGER:

2

3

4

5

10

11

19

22

23

24

25

They are all of Asian descent.

REPRESENTATIVE DALLY:

Obviously, if this bill were to become law, we can't obviously get consent from those bodies that are already being utilized. But you're saying that your company would not secure additional bodies to be utilized in the future?

ATTORNEY WAINGER:

That's correct. And I will tell you that this issue has been dealt with before. And our 12 13 opposition to this bill would be very carefully 14 reconsidered if the bill would allow a legally 15 operated company to utilize the specimens that it currently has without obtaining new specimens and 16 17 without invoking further scrutiny of people like Mr. 18 If these specimens were grandfathered in and let Wu. legally operating entities continue operating in the 20 state of Pennsylvania as officials in other states 21 have done.

REPRESENTATIVE DALLY:

And I just would, for my last comment ---I think you mentioned that we shouldn't be legislating for moral and ethical grounds. I think that's part of

our role as public policy makers. And certainly, listening to the testimony especially of Dr. Wu today, that does give us pause, it gives me pause, when you're considering that some of these specimens may be from political prisoners and obviously were provided without their consent or their family's consent.

And I think that is a concern, albeit moral and ethical. And I think that's part of the issue that we have to consider as we consider legislation. I wasn't quite sure of your comment legislating for convenience. Maybe you can elaborate on that.

ATTORNEY WAINGER:

Sure. It's convenient given the outcry toward China to require informed consent as we generally understand that concept. It's inconvenient to require informed consent for King Tut, for the human remains in the King Tut exhibition, when, in fact, there is no real difference. The difference comes in our current opinions about the government of China versus our current opinions about the historic and educational value of mummies and King Tut.

That is what I refer to as a legislation of convenience, but as you suggest, you believe that it is the legislature's goal, the legislature's duty,

to legislate morality.

2

3

10

11

22

23

25

REPRESENTATIVE DALLY:

I didn't say that. Don't put words in my mouth, please. What I said is we have to consider moral and ethical standards of society. I mean, I think that's only natural. And I think it's our job as public policy makers. We're not here to legislate morality, but we have to take issues of morality into consideration. And I think you would do the same in your business in displaying these specimens, that it's done in a moral and ethical manner.

12 You mentioned in your testimony that you 13 highlighted the public health, safety and welfare. 14 But I would have to suggest to you that if your 15 company wasn't making a profit on the display of these specimens that you wouldn't be too concerned about the 16 17 public health, safety and welfare. So the bottom line 18 is profit, and there's nothing wrong with that. 19 is a capitalist society, but let's be truthful in our 20 presentation. I don't have any further questions, Mr. Chairman. 21

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:

I was curious about --- you say about you 24 wouldn't want any more bodies. How many do you currently have that you wouldn't need ---?

ATTORNEY WAINGER:

1

2

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

number. I would just be speculating. But we have
between --- we license between 10 and 20
full-body specimens per exhibition, and then several
hundred organs and organ systems, or at least a couple
hundred, per exhibition. And we currently present or
promote upwards of 17 exhibitions.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:

Okay. Chairman Marsico and then ---.

Again, I can't give you the specific

CHAIRMAN MARSICO:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just have two quick questions. Are there any children specimens on display in your exhibits?

ATTORNEY WAINGER:

We present fetuses in specially designed fetal galleries to educate about the development of the fetus. All of those fetuses, we understand, have been terminated naturally, not unnaturally or through any intervention. But other than the fetuses, we do not have on exhibition any children.

CHAIRMAN MARSICO:

Do you have proof of that?

ATTORNEY WAINGER:

Proof of what, sir?

CHAIRMAN MARSICO:

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The fact that the fetuses --- how did you say that, Kathy?

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO:

Were terminated naturally.

CHAIRMAN MARSICO:

Were terminated naturally.

ATTORNEY WAINGER:

You know, proof is in the eye of the beholder, I quess. That's what I've learned over the last several months. What I can tell you is if you 12 know a little bit about a D and C procedure, you understand that the specimens don't emerge in the same fashion that these specimens are presented. addition to that, we have representations, warranties, affidavits, et cetera, of that nature.

CHAIRMAN MARSICO:

The other question is real simple. Okay. The specimens that are on exhibit --- I think you said about 20 or so. How long were they expected to last before they deteriorate? How old ---?

ATTORNEY WAINGER:

These specimens ---.

CHAIRMAN MARSICO:

I'm sorry.

ATTORNEY WAINGER:

I didn't mean to interrupt you.

CHAIRMAN MARSICO:

How long are they expected to last? How much time before they deteriorate when you have to replace with another specimen?

ATTORNEY WAINGER:

Right. These specimens, we understand, are virtually permanent. They have been converted to silicon and they don't degrade. These specimens or specimens like them have been created and have been existing now for at least 20 years. And I believe Dr. Hoffman said that this procedure was developed back in the 1950s.

We have not seen any degradation or deterioration in any of the specimens that we have. And that is part of the beauty of this process, unlike in medical school where first anatomy classes and students each get a specimen, dissect it and dispose of it each year. These specimens can last forever and can teach, we believe, generations of children.

CHAIRMAN MARSICO:

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL:

Thank you, Brian, for being with us

I'm Representative O'Neill from Buck County. today. Premier's a for-profit company; correct?

ATTORNEY WAINGER:

I lost you. I heard Premier is a what?

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL:

A for-profit company?

ATTORNEY WAINGER:

It is.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL:

Then I have a question to ask you. bodies that you have on display, they came from and they are the property of the government of China, or is ---?

ATTORNEY WAINGER:

Right. Certainly Dr. Hoffman had 16 mentioned that. And I believe I was asked that question a few minutes ago. I believe that some of these specimens are indeed the property of the Chinese government, though I'm not certain of that. I know that some or most of the specimens are the property of the suppliers of the specimens.

The majority of our specimens come from one supplier who is the chairman or the director of the anatomy department at Dalian Medical University. Dalian Medical University is a school and medical

> Sargent's Court Reporting Service, Inc. $(814) \quad 536 - 8908$

facility in Dalian, China, recognized by the World Health Organization.

1

2

3

4

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

2.4

25

lease fee.

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL:

Then other than the cost of transportation and care and exhibition of these, did Premier pay these companies or whoever the bodies came from?

ATTORNEY WAINGER:

Yes, Premier pays a license fee or a

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL:

So they're not on loan, then?

ATTORNEY WAINGER:

Not the specimens that Premier has. I will tell you that certainly there are other exhibition companies, specifically a Universe Within, to which I believe Dr. Hoffman was referring.

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL:

Great. Thank you. You stated that 20 Premier's an entertainment company. Given that, why is Premier, if it's an entertainment company, in the business of displaying something for its educational value?

ATTORNEY WAINGER:

Well, just as I do not see for-profit and

educational purposes as being mutually exclusive, nor do I see entertainment value and educational value as being mutually exclusive. There is no question that people can be entertained and enlightened at the same time. And indeed, that is exactly the experience that the customers of these exhibitions enjoy. Not only have literally thousands of children come through our exhibition both with their parents and with school groups, but we have had physicians tell us that every medical student should be obligated to see these exhibitions.

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL:

I'm not going to argue that point with you because I've just been informed that the exhibition is still at the Whittaker Center, I believe. So I intend to go over and look at it. And I'm not going to argue the educational value of it. And I don't think that's what Representative Fleck is --- or what his problem is with what's going and what his bill addresses.

These companies that --- or suppliers as you call them, that you're dealing with, do they supply do you know to anyone else, since Premier only has bodies from China? Do they supply any other bodies or body parts to any other parts of the world

100

other than China? 1 2 ATTORNEY WAINGER: 3 Do they supply ---? REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL: 4 5 Yes, do they currently get bodies from Africa, from, you know ---? 6 ATTORNEY WAINGER: It's ---. 8 9 REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL: 10 Or is it just China? 11 ATTORNEY WAINGER: 12 Just China. 13 REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL: 14 Would you consider, because you've talked 15 about the human right issues, would you consider that human rights shouldn't be a public welfare in this 16 17 country? 18 ATTORNEY WAINGER: 19 Human rights issues in this country are 20 absolutely rights associated with the welfare of this 21 country, yes, sir. 22 REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL:

And given that, you also stated that 24 people should have the right to make up their own 25 mind, or basically paraphrasing what you said, to

23

attend these exhibitions. Would you believe that a 2 disclaimer had to be placed at your exhibition, that you cannot guarantee that these bodies are not of 3 executed prisoners whose human rights were violated in China, that that would cause your company great harm in its profit-making business?

ATTORNEY WAINGER:

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

No, sir, I do not. In fact, Premier Exhibitions has taken the voluntary step to put up disclaimers of that ilk in all of our exhibitions that we present. Again, we present or promote about 17. About 14 of those we present.

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL:

When I go see the Whittaker Center to see your exhibition, then I'll see disclaimers saying that Premier cannot guarantee that these bodies were not unclaimed executed prisoners or something like that?

ATTORNEY WAINGER:

Sir, at the Whittaker Center, it has an exhibition of Our Body, the Universe Within. promote four Our Body, the Universe Within, through one of our wholly owned subsidiaries of that exhibition. We do not own that exhibition. And so you will not see a disclaimer at that exhibition, 25 because that is not one of the exhibitions that

Premier owns. 1

2

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

Premier does own approximately 14 3 exhibitions that are broken down to either Bodies Revealed or Bodies, the Exhibition. They are all over the country and they are all over the world. And you go to those exhibitions and you will most definitely see the disclaimer of which you are talking about. And by the way, as I said, we have done that voluntarily because we do indeed agree that people 10 should be able to make that decision, whether to attend these exhibitions, based on the information that we have available. And that's why we do it.

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL:

I thank you. One of the reasons why I was asking that is because you were contradicting, or challenging what Dr. Wu --- some of the statements that he had made in his testimony to this committee. However, there was an investigation done, which he has in his testimony done by 20/20, an underground investigation undercover when it was on back in February that apparently proved that these bodies and many bodies like it may be obtained inhumanely because they're executed prisoners and stuff. And they're sold on the black market.

And that is coming from that university

or medical center in China that you referred to; that you, in fact, do business with. I quess my last thing is, one thing I don't agree with you is you keep 3 referring to King Tut. I think everybody in this world, or just about everybody in this world that has any kind of education knows who King Tut was and so forth and so on.

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

I would say to you that if you had some men from Egyptian --- weren't King Tut, weren't as well known as King Tut, on display, you would not have the millions and millions of people going to visit as they do. I don't think you should be comparing King Tut to some common folk or political prisoners in China who have been executed and then their families have not been told they've been executed and their bodies and their human parts have been sold for profit. I think that's a real reach.

I understand the validity of the educational value of both exhibitions. But I think the source of this whole thing, and what Representative Fleck's trying to get to, is how these bodies end up where they are and the human rights issue behind that. And that is something that I think 24 most people in this country would, in itself, would support. But thank you very much. I appreciate your

1 comments.

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

ATTORNEY WAINGER:

4 question?

Sir, may I respond or was that not a

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL:

Oh, no, you can respond. I was kind of closing up, but that's fine.

ATTORNEY WAINGER:

Well, I heard a couple of things that deeply concern me. One was you have concluded that Premier Exhibitions uses the bodies of executed prisoners.

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL:

No, I concluded that you can't prove that you're not using ---.

ATTORNEY WAINGER:

Oh, well ---.

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL:

And that's totally different.

ATTORNEY WAINGER:

Right. On that we agree. On that we absolutely agree. But we definitely disagree when you say that 20/20 proved that some of these specimens came from the black market. We have had a number of inflammatory, sensational and less than completely

accurate stories. But ---.

2.0

2 REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL:

I didn't --- see, you're putting words into my mouth. I didn't say that 20/20 proved that the bodies that you have right now were obtained inhumanely as Dr. Wu described earlier. What I said was that apparently 20/20, through its investigation, has proven that this black market is going on. And therefore, you can't prove that you have obtained such bodies.

ATTORNEY WAINGER:

Yes, the source for that 20/20 story, whose identity was hidden and that Mr. Wu referenced, is an employee of Gunther von Hagens. And I want you to understand that the black market and those photographs came from a competitor of Premier. It is part of carefully calculated P.R. and marketing campaign to discern between two sets of exhibition companies.

You have to understand where the source of that comes from. And it is absolutely, categorically denied by Hong Jin Sui, the director of anatomy at the Dalian Medical University, that he has ever seen those pictures or that he has ever received or supplied to Premier any specimens that bear any

evidence of trauma.

And of course as I said earlier, the specific medical personnel who work for Premier and who have reviewed all of its specimens have never found any evidence of trauma or bodily injury associated with the types of abuses that Mr. Wu articulated and that we all find unbearable.

REPRESENTATIVE O'NEILL:

Great. Thank you very much. Appreciate

10 | it.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:

Representative Manderino?

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO:

Thank you, Mr. Wainger. Kathy Manderino asking questions. I don't know if you have a copy of the proposed legislation in front of you, but I want to focus specifically --- and I thank you for calling my attention to the distinction in the language used in the bill, which we had been I guess calling informed consent, although the words informed consent are not in the proposed legislation. The words in the legislation is valid written authorization to display the human remains.

Now, when Dr. Wint from the Franklin Institute was here, I asked him if he believed that

based on this definition of valid written authorization, and who they had to get it from and how, he thought that the show that showed at Franklin 3 Institute could still be showed today if this definition was law. And his answer was yes. heard you say that it's not possible to meet the definition in this bill. What am I missing? I hearing differently from Dr. Wint versus you?

ATTORNEY WAINGER:

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

You hit on a tremendously important point, Representative Manderino. And that is that 12 because the framework is so vague, it is left up to the discretion of the interpreter to decide for themselves what indeed is valid written authorization. And so there is no standardized formula for making that determination. And in addition, we have to consider the discrepancies between state law, laws in other states and laws in other countries.

Is an affidavit by a next of kin in China sufficient? Is an affidavit by a cousin in China sufficient? Is an affidavit in the United States sufficient? Or do we require that valid authorization be given by a will under Pennsylvania law? And does the People's Republic of China or other foreign countries, do they have wills? Do they have similar

laws? The questions of ---.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO:

Okay. I don't mean to cut you off, but the answer at least with regard to Representative Fleck is written in his legislation, one by the decedent, including but not limited to authorization given under the will, or two, by a person authorized to make an anatomical gift under Pennsylvania's anatomical gift law. So there is Representative Fleck's definition.

Now, what you're saying is, and I don't have the luxury, but I can go back to Dr. Wint and I can ask my next testifier, if they think that they would meet that definition. I just want to make sure that I'm clear that you're saying --- well, I want to make sure whether you're saying we, Premier, could not meet that definition or nobody can meet that definition.

ATTORNEY WAINGER:

Well, I think what I'm saying is first of all, Premier, because these specimens died years ago, we don't have this type of documentation. Most of these specimens are unclaimed. And we would not have this type of documentation. But the language in the actual statute is not as clear as I think you may

The statute says it can be given by the believe. decedent, including but not limited to authorization given by will. Does that mean only by will or does that mean by ---?

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO:

No, it means including but not limited

ATTORNEY WAINGER:

Right. That means there theoretically could be other indicia of consent. And in addition, you have the same problems with respect to subsection 12 two, with regard to who is allowed to make an anatomical gift. The question becomes the quantum of proof. If you have the right person that's authorized to give that gift, you still have the guestion of what is decision proof; is it an affidavit, et cetera.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO:

Okay.

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

24

25

to.

ATTORNEY WAINGER:

And then with respect to the second part of your question, is it just Premier or others, I 22 believe not just Premier because we can't meet some of 23 these definitions for our unclaimed bodies, but certainly most if not all of the current human anatomy presenters would have problems.

And I say that specifically because remember, we talked about not just the whole human bodies, but also the hundreds of organs and organ systems in these exhibitions. And the form of proof to tie those organs and organ systems to particular bodies and particular donations is difficult if not impossible.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO:

The second thing which is related that I want to ask you about is, I listened very carefully to your testimony. You made a distinction that I want to pick up on.

You made a distinction between consented and unclaimed specimens in the context of that this was a standard put forward to distinguish the different ways that the two main competitors of these kinds of exhibitions had in having obtained the bodies or body parts, and that it is a manufactured distinction for the purposes of competitive advances and not one that we should be buying into as a distinction under the law. Did I misunderstand the point you were trying to make? Or if not, please elaborate.

ATTORNEY WAINGER:

No, you understood the point I was trying

to make, Representative Manderino.

2

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

25

Okay. So what you're saying to us as legislators, for consent is not the proper standard because consent from where you're looking at it is a manufactured standard that is trying to distinguish one company or not? Then tell me, if I am a person --- and I don't want to have a debate about whether or not we should have a standard. Let's assume that I believe we ought to have a standard. What should that standard be?

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO:

ATTORNEY WAINGER:

Full disclosure.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO:

Now, if I decided Representative Great. Fleck's idea, he has something here, but I don't think that this issue of consent or valid written authorization makes sense and I want to go the disclaimer route. I would appreciate seeing --- and so part of what I'm going to do is I'm going to look at what kinds of disclaimers exist now.

What kind of disclaimers exist now for 23 these kinds of exhibits and what kind of disclaimers 24 might exist in other similarly situated kinds of displays, so that I can figure out whether or not I

want to have a one size fits all standard or disclaimer for anything that would be shown in Pennsylvania, or if I want to leave it up to each 3 individual presenter of an exhibit.

2

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Can you share with us --- and you may not have it in front of us. It'd probably be easier if you send us the disclaimers in however many forms they take of the various shows that you have that you say are wholly within your control and you put disclaimers on them for us to look at.

ATTORNEY WAINGER:

I would be very pleased to do that. if you give me about ten seconds, I will read you one of our disclaimers. I'm optimistic and ambitious in my ability to find it. I need more than ten seconds.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:

You know --- if I can interrupt you for that. I keep coming back to the same point. How can you prove it? You know, if I was a Chinese official, and if you want a disclaimer, I'll give to you a disclaimer. How are you going to prove it? I mean, really, how do you prove it?

ATTORNEY WAINGER:

I couldn't agree more with you. 25 cannot prove a negative. You cannot prove that things aren't what they appear to be. You cannot prove that

--- the whole problem that we have seen in other

settlements, such as with the New York Attorney

General, is when I said to them we've had medical

experts review all of our whole body specimens, they

say yeah, but you know what, Brian, your medical

expert can't take a liver and tell you that that liver

didn't come from somebody who was executed.

And the answer is you're right. We can't. We can't prove a negative. And so what we can do is rely on credible people who are associated with credible institutions and universities and rely on them. And at the end of the day, be upfront and open about what we know and what we don't know. And let everyone make their decisions for themselves. One of the questions earlier was, you know, do people know these specimens come from China.

Well, obviously, they are all of Asian descent. You can look and you can determine that. And so there is no secret that these specimens come from China. But the type of disclosure that I'm about to read is similar to what we put everywhere and what we wanted voluntarily, and what we would encourage you all to consider appropriate legislation. In fact, it reads as such. Welcome, and this is in quite

conspicuous language at the front of our exhibition so people can make this decision.

The specimens in this exhibition are actual human cadavers that have undergone a polymer preservation process and have been dissected and posed by field anatomists. In this process, all tissue water is replaced with silicon rubber to the deepest cellular level. This creates a preserved human specimen without changing any of its structure, allowing you the experience of an amazing connection to your own body or ones closest to you.

Premier suppliers certify that specimens are unclaimed bodies received by the Chinese Bureau of Police and then donated to universities in China for education and research, and that the persons died of natural causes. Premier employs a retired anatomy professor and a biological anthropologist who examined the specimens and they have never found any evidence of trauma associated with bodily injury.

Premier cannot, however, independently guarantee the origin of the specimens. Please enjoy the exhibition. This is one voluntary sign we put up. We have also entered into an agreement with the New York Attorney General under which we put a similar, not precisely exact, but a similar disclaimer at our

exhibition in New York. Essentially, the key is that Premier cannot independently guarantee or confirm the origin of the specimen.

2

3

4

10

11

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

And one of the questions --- and I apologize that I'm not there to see the actual representative who asked. The question that they had was if we had to put these disclaimers up, it would certainly affect our business or put us out of business. I think that was the insinuation. And we have found quite the contrary. The public does not make a decision, as a general rule, to see these 12 exhibitions based upon whether or not there is informed consent.

Certainly some do. We don't want to diminish that. Some people have moral, ethical or religious reasons why that is quite important to them. But a vast majority do not. And in fact, we have seen these signs, have been embraced with welcome arms by the public that sees our exhibitions, and we have not seen a substantial or material deterioration in our numbers since we started using these signs.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO:

Thank you very much, Mr. Wainger. appreciate that you read that to us. I would also appreciate if you could forward it to whoever was our staff contact for you. You probably just send it in e-mail so that we have it in written form.

ATTORNEY WAINGER:

2.4

I'd be happy to.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO:

Mr. Chairman, the one point that I just want to make right now is when we're talking about the tough issues around this with regard to these exhibits and whether the bodies or the specimens were from China, I would just remind members that we have similar precedents, similar issues, right here in our own country. We have had cases where there have been news and media reports of abuses, of cutting corners, things with obtaining the proper consent even for our own purposes for cadavers for medical experimentation.

We have had cases that have risen to the area of criminal prosecution with regard to selling of body parts, one is currently ongoing in Philadelphia. So I think that this whole issue is something that we should not be discouraged as public policy makers from keeping a hands-off on exploring the legitimate role of government to regulate and make sure that we are properly protecting citizens. And so I'm not sure what the answer is to this but I don't subscribe to a necessarily hands-off policy that might be proposed.

Thank you. 1 2 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: 3 Representative Mantz? REPRESENTATIVE MANTZ: 4 5 Yes, Attorney Wainger, my name is Representative Carl Mantz. I represent portions of Lehigh and Berks County. By way of clarification or elucidation can you tell us were complete bodies or body parts, such as human organs, or a mix brought to 10 our shores and received by Premier Exhibitions from China already subjected to the plastinization process? 11 12 ATTORNEY WAINGER: 13 Yes, Representative Mantz. They were 14 shipped by the suppliers and received by Premier in

shipped by the suppliers and received by Premier in the United States. And of course they had already been subjected to the plastination process.

REPRESENTATIVE MANTZ:

So it's a mix, you're saying, both complete bodies and ---?

ATTORNEY WAINGER:

Oh, correct. It was complete bodies and organs and organ systems. Yes, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE MANTZ:

I see. Do you know what proportion?

ATTORNEY WAINGER:

15

16

17

20

21

22

23

24

25

I don't know the precise proportions.

There have been numerous shipments. But again, if you consider that the exhibition has between 10 and 20 --- approximately between say 9 and 20 full-body specimens and up to 150 or 200 organs and organ systems, that should give you the allocation or the breakdown pretty generally.

REPRESENTATIVE MANTZ:

Thank you very much.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:

Any other questions?

CHAIRMAN MARSICO:

Just a couple real quick ones. And if you know the answers, I'd appreciate it. How did this plastinization start and what country started this? Was it in the U.S.A.?

ATTORNEY WAINGER:

I am not a historian on the process. I would be speculating, and I'd rather not do that.

CHAIRMAN MARSICO:

Okay. I was just curious of the origin of this. And I think maybe somebody better up on it would be able to tell us. Thank you very, very much for your testimony. We appreciate it, sir.

ATTORNEY WAINGER:

Thank you, sir.

1

2

3

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

20

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:

Okay. We'll next hear from Ms. Georgina Gomez, director of development of Gunther von Hagens' Body Worlds, the original exhibition for the exhibit of human bodies. A representative of the Institute for Plastination. Maybe you can answer that question.

CHAIRMAN MARSICO:

I'm just curious as to its origin.

MS. GOMEZ:

Yes, I can certainly answer that

12 question. I believe ---.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:

Can you do it in this time period?

MS. GOMEZ:

Should I start with answering that first?

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:

18 Yes, if you could answer that question,

19 that would be ---.

MS. GOMEZ:

Okay. The plastination process was
invented in 1977 by Dr. Gunther von Hagens. He was a
researcher at Heidelberg University in Germany. And
he was looking for a way to teach his students about

25 the structure of the human body. And he was

determined to find a new way. And that's when he invented plastination.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:

And then that has taken place in other parts of the world, I assume?

MS. GOMEZ:

1

2

3

4

6

10

11

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Yes, actually there's universities all over the world that are doing their own plastination work with specimens they have in their labs. However, Dr. von Hagens' Institute --- plastination is based in Heidelberg, Germany still. Okay. So I'll start with 12 my testimony.

Good morning, or perhaps it's afternoon 14 now, Mr. Chairman, members of the House Judiciary Committee. My name is Georgina Gomez. I'm a body donor to the Institute for Plastination. And since 2004, when the U.S. based program was started, I've managed the North American body donation program for the Institute.

I make this testimony in my professional capacity as body donation manager representing the Institute for Plastination and on behalf of its scientific director, Dr. Gunther von Hagens, who is unable to appear before this committee at short 25 notice.

First of all, I want to clarify that the 1 2 Body Worlds exhibition is the exhibition which you 3 might've seen in Philadelphia at the Franklin Institute. It is the exhibition that since was hosted in the museum and he, you know, talked about that during his testimony. Anatomist Dr. Gunther von Hagens is the inventor of plastination and creator of the Body World exhibition. He is the scientific director for the Institute for Plastination based in 10 Heidelberg, Germany, and began the Institute's body donation program in Heidelberg in 1983. 11

On behalf of the Institute for Plastination, Dr. von Hagens and all of the body 14 donors registered in the Institute for Plastination's body donation program, I wish to commend Representative Mike Fleck for his efforts on behalf of 16 H.B. #2299 that would prohibit the commercial profit and public display of human bodies or remains without the documented informed consent of the deceased or next of kin.

12

13

15

17

18

19

20

21

25

Since his invention, more than 25 million 22 people worldwide have seen the Body World exhibition 23 that he created, making them the most effective public 24 health exhibitions in the world. From the early years of his invention, Dr. von Hagens' made a distinction

between clinical anatomy and public anatomy, between
the use of bodies without consent common in clinical
anatomy for the training of medical students and the
ethical, imperative or informed legal consent in the
case of plastination and eventually public anatomical
exhibitions.

The reason for this is very sound. In clinical anatomy, after students have dissected a body and used every part of the body for medical study, the body is eventually cremated and given some kind of finality, either through cremation or burial. In plastination, there is no such finality. The body is preserved permanently.

10

11

12

13

25

14 With the creation of the Body World 15 exhibition, there was a new element to be taken into consideration, that of public display and the charging 16 17 of admission to the public to view the plastinated 18 specimens. Dr. von Hagens consulted with philosophers, ethicist, religious and medical 19 20 professionals to refine his thinking on the importance 21 of informed legal consent. Very early on, it seemed 22 clear that there was a fundamental human right at 23 stake, that of an individual's right to choose his or 24 her own post-mortal state.

It was quite clear to him that it would

be ethically untenable to have a deceased person
undergo plastination, therefore preserving him or her
permanently and then putting the person on public
display in a museum setting without his or her
informed consent. In 1982, Dr. von Hagens was firmly
convinced that informed legal consent had to be the
ethical backbone of his science and the organizing
principle of plastination.

2.4

His convictions were so strong that he began the world's first, and still only, donation program for plastination. He wrote to more than 3,000 people who were registered donors in the University of Heidelberg's anatomy department donor program telling them about his new science and inviting them to become the first donors in his new body donation program for plastination. 1,500 of them were interested and became the first donors.

In 1993, the Institute for Plastination took over the management of the body donation program. As of July 31st, this program, the source of the bodies in the Body Worlds exhibition, has 8,757 living donors worldwide and 580 deceased donors worldwide. It has 7,366 living donors from Germany and 588 deceased German donors. It has 769 living American donors and 12 deceased American donors.

There's a cultural dimension to body 1 2 donation to the Institute's program. Most are Germans 3 because that's where the Institute is based. additionally, body donation for science is very much in keeping with our cultural history and traditions and sensibilities with Germans. This is not the case with Chinese nationals, as witnessed by a body donation program which Dr. von Hagens started in China, which has been phased out because he found that 10 the Chinese culture views anatomy, and certainly plastination, as desecration of the post-mortal body. 11

In the past four years, I have never spoken to a body donor who does not take his or her decision to be a body donor for plastination very seriously. Many donors have told me that they take months or even years to sign their consent forms because they want to be sure that they discuss their decisions with close family or friends. And they want to take the time to fully consider what it would mean to be a donor for plastination.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

There's no doubt that the decision is one that's not taken lightly and one that is very particular. For the majority of donors, myself included, the most stand-out part about donation is that it's a choice; one made for very specific

reasons. For any party to profit from individuals who have not made this very personal choice would be disrespectful and a complete violation of the rights of the deceased.

We support this legislation because plastination and public exhibition of plastinated human specimens, unlike clinical anatomy, has special responsibility to uphold the principle of informed legal consent. We support the bill for proposing that an experienced state sanctioned permitting authority be empowered with vetting powers to analyze documents, match death certificates with donor forms and bring to bear the weight of scrutiny and due diligence to ascertain that the deceased on display have given their informed and legal consent to be on display.

The Institute and Dr. Gunther von Hagen view Body Worlds as a scientific collaboration; one between donors, himself as an anatomist and visitors who come to the exhibitions. Without the important foundation of informed legal consent by individuals on display, Body Worlds would not be a collaboration but an ethically untenable exercise in commodification and exploitation of the deceased in our view.

The Institute for Plastination welcomes
Representative Mike Fleck's proposed legislation of

1 H.B. #2299 prohibiting the commercial profit and public display of human bodies or remains without the 3 documented informed consent of the deceased or next of kin. The proposed legislation is in alignment with the Institute for Plastination's rigid ethical standards for public anatomical display and in accordance with the Institute for Plastination's fundamental principles about body donation and informed legal consent.

The Institute for Plastination has always honored the last will and testament of donors for 11 anonymity and wishes to continue to do so, but 13 understands the need for regulations to protect the 14 rights of the deceased in public anatomical displays. The Institute for Plastination is therefore prepared to show informed consent by donors for specimens on 16 17 display in Gunther von Hagens' Body Worlds exhibition to a permitting authority legally authorized and empowered by the State of Pennsylvania to enact H.B. #2299 after it become law. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:

Kathy?

10

12

15

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO:

2.4 Thank you. Thank you very much, Ms.

25 Gomez, for your testimony. You heard me ask the prior testifier about the issue of consented versus
unclaimed specimens; the distinction that he had made.

And I take it from your testimony that you would
disagree and think that --- well, let me say it this
way. I take it from your testimony that going back
not to the common terms but to the language of the
legislation, which is valid written authorization,
that you would believe that all of the bodies and body
parts that you use in your display would be able to
meet this definition?

MS. GOMEZ:

That is correct.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO:

Okay.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. GOMEZ:

I will specify, though, that there are fetuses on display in the Body Worlds exhibition which stem from historical anatomical collections which predate the 1920s, and those specimens which were a part of museums in Europe, hospital anatomy programs. So they're not consent forms or anything that the Institute for Plastination has obtained. But we do have records of where the specimens did come from.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO:

Okay. Why do you --- how do I want to

ask this. If I listen to --- it was actually the coroner, Dr. Hoffman, from Montgomery County --- talk about unclaimed bodies in the United States and I listened to that in context with your testimony, I would be correct in concluding that you would not have any bodies within your plastination program that would have come from unclaimed bodies in the United States?

MS. GOMEZ:

No, since the program has started in the U.S. in 2004 --- it actually started in 1983 in Europe --- there's been 12 deceased American donors. And those are the only Americans that were ---.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO:

Respond to the --- I'm sure you're prepared to because it seems to be the crux of it.

Respond to the criticism that we've heard that to try to make a distinction between consented versus unclaimed specimens is buying into a --- this is my characterization but he said I hit the nail on the head so I'm just --- is buying into a business debate between competitors in a for-profit entity.

MS. GOMEZ:

The Institute for Plastination and the Body Worlds exhibition would not have a problem with any exhibitor who exhibits human remains with proper

consent. I think because of so many questions that
were brought up --- Dr. Harry Wu brought up some
points about those human rights violations that exist
in China. And I think it's something that we all need
to be concerned with. Dr. von Hagens is a medical
doctor.

His wife, Dr. Angelina Whalley, who works with him to promote the Body Worlds exhibition at the Institute for Plastination, is also a doctor. I mean, our mission is education. It's not entertainment.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO:

Your institute obviously sees an ongoing growing role of the use of plastination for all different kind of purposes, thus your active pursuit of donors going forward to the future. Whereas the distinction made by the prior presenter was kind of like been there, done that, got all we need; it's stagnant. It's a stagnant process the way it was presented by Mr. Wainger. It's an active process the way it's presented by you.

So going forward, what are the additional uses of plastination in things that we might not even be considering and talking about here?

MS. GOMEZ:

Well, for example --- well, first and

foremost, Dr. von Hagens eventually plans to have a 1 plastination museum open to the public. However, Dr. 3 von Hagens is also a visiting professor at New York University at the School of Dentistry. And he is helping to create the first anatomy curriculum in the U.S. that uses completely plastinated specimens in lieu of fresh cadavers for dissection.

8

11

15

18

19

20

21

22

23

It's been found that medical students, when they are using plastinated specimens, are much 10 less timid about the way that they're approaching the human body. They're able to work with plastinated specimens in a way that they can't with fresh 12 cadavers. So definitely, there's medical schools all 13 14 over the country, all over the world, that are using this plastination technology. The Institute for Plastination additionally plastinates specimens for 16 17 medical institutes.

For example, university hospitals that are using anatomical specimens for teaching, they come to the Institute for Plastination and request certain specimens that they might need. And those are also provided.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO:

24 You may not know this off the top of your 25 head. But if you have this information, because of

the other countries in which the doctor's Institute
works, I would be interested in knowing how other
countries, if they have addressed this issue --- and
I'm asking the question --- and we can look again if
it's easy to point the finger and say it's some other
country's human rights abuses.

But this committee debated just this session the whole issue of informed consent in terms of medical procedures, experimentations or trial vaccines, and the role that our own country's had in terms of human rights violations on testing on prisoners in the '40s and '50s without proper education and informed consent. So it's certainly an issue that governments struggle with as science, technology, et cetera, advances.

So I am interested in whether other countries that you work in, whether Germany, the United States or some of the other countries you mentioned, have done similar regulatory or legislative plans. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:

Reply?

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MS. GOMEZ:

To my knowledge, there's not been another country that has any standards in place for

plastinated specimens. However, I do know that with regard to body donation, European countries are much more open to body donation. For example, I know that most of our donors are German. And there's two reasons; the Institute is based in Germany, but also it's just part of the culture that people donate their bodies to science.

I think following that, the U.S. --- you know, many people are organ donors. And body donation for plastination is something that is definitely considered. With regard to any other country, I'm not exactly sure. But I do know that in China people are fairly shy about donating their bodies to science and it's not something that is common.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:

Thank you for your presentation.

Plastination is an incredible process. It's just really very intriguing. It says in the book that you passed by, I'd like to get a copy, that 1,500 hours to do a specimen?

MS. GOMEZ:

Yes.

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:

And now, do you take each part, each 25 muscle, each organ, and work on it individually?

MS. GOMEZ:

Some specimens are dissected so that each and every organ is plastinated separately. And then in some cases there are whole-body plastinates that are dissected together for a presentation of say the whole muscular system and how it works and how it interacts with the organs from within.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:

Now, it takes two different processes.

It sounds like you have a silicon process which would be soft, and then you have an epoxy process which would be very rigid.

MS. GOMEZ:

Yes, there is. Dr. von Hagens, like I said, has been researching and developing plastination since 1977. And he developed a few ways where plastics and polymer can be used to preserve a human body permanently. There's a silicon process, which I don't know if any of you have seen the exhibition, but this is our catalogue, which has specimens of the exhibition; I can pass around for you.

This is something that the silicon process --- where you can actually see the muscles and everything preserved. It's an epoxy resin process which is like plastination. It's similar to

radiology, so that when medical professionals or anyone who's examining the human body can actually see 3 a slice of a certain cavity of a body and be able to identify what's happening within. You can see evidence of cancer, you can see evidence of tumors, brain strokes, all that is able to be viewed through slice plastination.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:

Now, with the process with the soft tissue, it appears that there's nothing left of the original body; that you've replaced it all with either the epoxy or the silicon.

MS. GOMEZ:

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

The bodily fluids have all been removed and that is what's been replaced with plastic.

However, the structure of the human tissue remains. 16

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:

Yeah, but that tissue, would there be cells from the original body still there? Would there be D.N.A. of the original cells still ---?

MS. GOMEZ:

I believe that there would be a way to do D.N.A. testing. However, I'm not a doctor and I can't 23 completely answer that question.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:

Now, the hard tissue, the bone structure, 1 2 is probably still intact. You don't do any 3 replacement of that? 4 MS. GOMEZ: Some plastination work is done on the 5 bones just to conserve it permanently. However, it's 6 not as much as you would need for human tissue. CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: 8 9 So there would be a substitution of the 10 calcium with an epoxy? 11 MS. GOMEZ: 12 In some cases. 13 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: 14 Thank you. 15 MS. GOMEZ: Thank you. 16 17 CHAIRMAN MARSICO: 18 Thank you for being here today. Just some real quick questions. For Body World, everyone 19 20 who's exhibited in Body World gave consent? 21 MS. GOMEZ: 22 Correct. 23 CHAIRMAN MARSICO: 2.4 And the doctor doesn't have any unclaimed 25 bodies or anything like that in his ---

136 1 MS. GOMEZ: 2 No. 3 CHAIRMAN MARSICO: --- school or labs? 4 5 MS. GOMEZ: No, well, the Institute for Plastination 6 does plastination work, or used to do plastination work, for other schools or universities that said we have these specimens, we'd like you to plastinate 10 them. But for the Body Worlds exhibition, it's all the donors from the donation program. 11 12 CHAIRMAN MARSICO: 13 And they're of multiple ethnic 14 backgrounds, primarily German? 15 MS. GOMEZ: 16 Well, primarily Germany. And as you 17 know, followed by Americans now, various European countries. The exhibit has been shown in the U.K. so 18 there are some U.K. donors. Still, primarily German. 19 20 I mean, we have a number of donors from Mexico that 21 may have seen the exhibit in the U.S., abroad. 22 CHAIRMAN MARSICO: 23 Have you seen the Premier exhibition? 24 MS. GOMEZ: 25 Yes, I have.

CHAIRMAN MARSICO:

Would you happen to know where they had their plastination of their bodies done? Would you happen to know that?

MS. GOMEZ:

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

From what I understand, it's done in China.

CHAIRMAN MARSICO:

Oh, it's actually done in China? okay. Thank you. Thank you very much. I appreciate your answers.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:

Representative Dally?

REPRESENTATIVE DALLY:

Thank you, Mr. Caltagirone. And thank 16 you, Ms. Gomez, for your testimony. I'm kind of curious because the previous testifier when asked didn't know how many bodies they actually had in their exhibits. Do you know how many bodies that are utilized in your exhibits?

MS. GOMEZ:

Yes, we actually have four exhibits that are travelling. And in each exhibit, there are approximately 200 body parts, organs and full-body plastinates. Since they're all different exhibitions,

it's between 200 to 225. 1 2 REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: 3 And does your organization, do you do business under the exhibit name Body Worlds? Is that the name of the ---? 6 MS. GOMEZ: Body Worlds is the name of the exhibition. But it's the Institute for Plastination 8 in Heildelberg, Germany. 10 REPRESENTATIVE DALLY: 11 And is that a not-for-profit institute or 12 a for-profit institute?

MS. GOMEZ:

No, it's a private education and teaching

15 institute.

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

REPRESENTATIVE DALLY:

But is it for-profit?

MS. GOMEZ:

Correct.

REPRESENTATIVE DALLY:

Now, from the information that you provided to the committee in your testimony, it appears that there's no shortage of donors that are willing to donate after being informed properly of donating their bodies for this purpose; is that

139

correct?

1

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2 MS. GOMEZ:

Correct.

REPRESENTATIVE DALLY:

So if this bill were passed and we would require informed consent or proven informed consent of the donors or their family, that doesn't put an end to these types of exhibits?

MS. GOMEZ:

No, the Body Worlds exhibition would still be able to operate because there's consent for the donors on display.

REPRESENTATIVE DALLY:

And if other vendors in this area would be pushed to do the same, they can certainly go out and get donors just like you're doing?

MS. GOMEZ:

Correct.

REPRESENTATIVE DALLY:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:

Just one question.

REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you.

25 I just have one question if you know. And if you

don't know, I'll let the lawyers do the research on

it. But obviously there's a conclusion of ex post

facto, which would be backwards application, that if

this legislation were to move and pass and go, it

would be heretofore forward. With that, do you know

if that would have any bearing on the existing

offerings that you have relevant to shows and

opportunities to display? Because I'm assuming that

the law would be, in the future, all of your displays

now would be old and maybe exempt. Or don't you know

or could you comment on that?

MS. GOMEZ:

Well, the body donation program started in 1983. So it's safe to say that the first body donor or the first plastinated specimen in the exhibition originated after 1983. So it would have taken whatever amount of time from the time that donor signed his consent form to the time that they passed away to actually be plastinated and be part of the exhibition. The legislation is that we wouldn't put it --- it says that if the information is there and it's proven that these people donated their bodies that they would be allowed to be on display.

So that wouldn't have an effect on the

Institute for Plastination. The fetal development

1 section, like I mentioned, does include specimens that 2 predate the 1920s or are about from the 1920s. 3 obviously we do not have consent forms for each of these fetuses on display. 5 REPRESENTATIVE PALLONE: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 6 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: 8 Are there any other questions? Thank you very much and we'll adjourn the hearing. 10 MS. GOMEZ: 11 Thank you so much. 12 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: 13 Thank you. 14 15 16 MEETING CONCLUDED AT 1:07 P.M. 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25