

Dunlap. Deputy Chief Dunlap recalls, "Mike had an amazing wealth of knowledge about aircraft. He literally ate, drank, and slept airplanes."

When the Army gave the Beaumont Police Department two helicopters, it was only natural that Lane would be heavily involved in the helicopter operations that would come up. Any time there was a mission or training, Lane was the first in line to take part in it.

On the evening of September 15, 2004, the neighboring Port Arthur Police Department reported a boat fire on Sabine Lake. Lane was one of two pilots who was called to duty for the search and rescue mission that took place that moonless night, a night that Deputy Chief Dunlap recalled was extra dark. During the flight, Lane was tasked with shining the spotlight on the large, murky, marshy Sabine Lake near the Texas-Louisiana border while the other officer maneuvered the helicopter through the intense, immense darkness that surrounded them.

Flying a mere 6 feet above the lake in an effort to get closer and look for people or debris in the water, Sergeant Lane was once again fulfilling his oath to protect and serve the people.

Sergeant Lane and crew made last contact shortly after 10:30 p.m. and after that, there was only silence, silence in the stillness of the damp, dark, dreary night. A helicopter search team spotted the wreckage almost 4 hours later at 2 o'clock in the morning. Jefferson County Sheriff's Deputy Jeremy Battenfield, who was piloting the helicopter, survived the crash with minor injuries; but in the line of duty, doing what he loved and what he did best at the age of 54, Sergeant Mike Lane lost his life in the stillness of that September night.

Hundreds of law enforcement members from across Texas and Louisiana traveled to South Park Baptist Church in Beaumont to pay their respects to a unique and talented officer and pilot that will never be replaced. He was laid to rest in the same church where he served as a deacon and a mentor to kids.

Mr. Speaker, this past weekend, I had the opportunity to participate in the Fraternal Order of Police's 24th annual National Peace Officers Memorial Service here on the Capitol grounds to remember those police officers killed last year. I was honored to join the multitude of officers and surviving family members who traveled to Washington to assure their comrades that they never walk alone. I spent time with Sergeant Lane's wife, Renee; his son Ben; and his two sisters; and I was moved by the memories they had of their husband, their father, and their brother.

Mr. Speaker, there are more than 800,000 members of the law enforcement community in this Nation. They wear the badge, and with that badge they become a cut above the rest of us. They do what most of us would not do. They watch out for our country, our kids, our family and our great land.

In 2004, 156 officers were killed in the line of duty. Last year, our military lost nearly 900 of its band of brothers during operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. And while we often pay daily tribute to our fallen military who have been combating outlaws across the sea, these warriors against domestic outlaws, our police officers, often remain nameless, statistical heroes.

When President Bush spoke this last weekend, he stated that every generation of Americans has produced men and women willing to stand in watch over the rest of us. They are peace officers. When Sergeant Lane lost his life on the Sabine Lake that night, he did not die alone. His conviction, courage, and character live on and his spirit watches over his friends and family and the citizens of Jefferson County, Texas, that he devoted his life in protecting.

Thank you, Sergeant Mike Lane.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ALLEN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CHICAGO LIGHTHOUSE INDUSTRIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about an industry in my congressional district that is being frustrated, squeezed, uncertain about its future as a result of our trade policy, globalization and the general tenor of the times. I rise to talk about the Chicago Lighthouse Industries, which has made clocks for the Federal Government for the last 28 years. They have been consistent and diligent in their performance. Since 1977, the Chicago Lighthouse has made 3.3 million clocks. In fact, last year they made 104,000 clocks for all branches of the military, Energy Department, the Postal Service, and the Justice Department.

The unique thing about the Chicago Lighthouse is that they employ more than 40 people who are blind or are visually impaired.

□ 2000

They employ their workers at a salary of \$8.50 an hour and provide health benefits. On a recent visit to the Chicago Lighthouse, I was amazed at the level of detail and speed at which the workers developed the clocks. They have an assembly line that produces in packages 1,000 wall clocks daily.

In fact, Rita McCabe can assemble a 12-inch clock in less than 1 minute. Ms. McCabe, who is blind, found her job through the Chicago Lighthouse. When asked how she felt about her job, she stated the following: "It gives me a

chance to be with people, to make a living on my own, and to prove that I am competent enough to do this kind of work."

Ms. McCabe has worked for the Chicago Lighthouse for 25 years. Rita McCabe's job is in jeopardy due to competition from foreign sources. In the past 4 years, U.S. imports of wall clocks, most of them from China, have increased by 24 percent, totaling \$123 million in 2003.

The Chicago Lighthouse does not mind competition. They have suggested that they can compete with anyone as long as the rules are the same. Unfortunately, the playing field is not level when it comes to competing with China and other countries that do not have a minimum-wage requirement or pay health benefits to their workers. The Chicago Lighthouse pays its workers an average of \$8.50 per hour plus health benefits. In China, it is not uncommon for workers to make \$2 an hour and have no benefits. China is able to undercut clock manufacturers like the Chicago Lighthouse for the Blind because they do not play by the same rules. They are able to dump their products into the United States for a cheaper price. This adds to the trade deficit that currently exists.

More importantly, to allow foreign governments who do not pay minimum wage or a livable wage nor provide benefits to continue to undercut U.S. companies like the Chicago Lighthouse erodes the faith that citizens have in government and puts many jobs here at home at risk. The Chicago Lighthouse is not asking for preferential treatment. They are seeking fundamental fairness. The Lighthouse has been in existence now for 99 years, and they have done something right to be able to survive for so long.

The Federal Government, as a result of the Javitz-Wagner-O'Day Act, is required to show favor towards the Chicago Lighthouse and other organizations like it when purchasing clocks through the General Services Administration. However, this law has been eroded and many Federal purchases are going for the lower-priced clocks. Obviously, these are the clocks that are being produced through cheaper labor costs. The Federal Government must set the example and ensure that taxpayer money is not going to support foreign governments that do not have minimum wage or benefit standards comparable to those in the United States.

Everything comes at a price. The workers at Chicago Lighthouse are able to be productive tax-paying citizens because of their jobs. These jobs help to support them, their families, and the local economy. For example, Mr. Albert Harris has been with the Chicago Lighthouse since 1971, able to work, though blind.

Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Lighthouse and other entities that employ our people must be able to continue to do so. Let us make sure that our trade policies are fair and equitable and that

they can compete on an even keel, on an even playing field.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUHLE of New York). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my Special Order at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

STEM CELL RESEARCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak to this Chamber and address the Speaker and the House.

I would like to speak about the embryonic stem cell research that is a matter of discussion around this Congress intensively in the last weeks and months as we have been here. I would like to join some of my colleagues in explaining the progress and promise of adult stem cell research, and I would like to also dispel many of the myths promoted by those urging more Federal funding for the destruction of human embryos required for embryonic stem cell research. I am for stem cell research, adult stem cell research. I am not for ending human life in the process of trying to find a cure for the lives of others.

Among the favorite myths of proponents of embryonic stem cell research is the legend that there are 400,000 embryos stored at IVF clinics that are simply going to be discarded. So we should derive some benefit from them, my opponents say. This figure has become so fixed in their rhetoric that it now seems to be a fact. Members of both Houses, in a letter to President Bush, even cited the number, the 400,000 number, in an effort to get President Bush to change his current policy on the funding of embryonic stem cell research. These proponents then use that number to create the assumption that an equally large number of therapeutic stem cells can be derived from them.

Here is why this argument is wrong, Mr. Speaker: IVF embryos will not just die anyway. Most IVF embryos are designated for implantation, and the rest can be adopted. In 1995 about 500,000 women were seeking to adopt a child. That would be 500,000 families, most of them husbands and wives. Seventy-five

children are alive and well today who started life as frozen embryos.

All of the frozen embryos have the potential to become an independent, well-adjusted human being. Only a small fraction, 2.2 percent, are slated to be discarded. Only another 2.8 percent of embryos in IVF clinics, that is, roughly 11,000, have been designated by their parents for research. That is a total of 6 percent of all the embryos presently in IVF storage that are intended for disposal or research. Only 6 percent. Ninety percent are designated for a future.

More than 90 percent stored in clinics are saved for later use by parents or donated to other infertile couples for implantation. That means of the original 400,000 frozen embryos, only 11,000 are actually available to be destroyed for their stem cells. Of those available embryos, less than 275 stem cell lines would be created. That can be with private sector dollars. It does not have to be dollars extracted from the taxpayer.

When we are asking the taxpayer to contribute money to the Federal Government and diverting those dollars, Mr. Speaker, to go towards embryonic stem cell research, which of necessity must end a human life, and a human life like those 75 children that have come from frozen embryos to childhood and on their way to adulthood, that is an immoral choice, a choice that we are imposing upon tens of millions of people that understand in this country that life begins at the instance of conception; and we cannot declare an embryo, a fertilized egg, that has all of the chromosomes and all the components of an individual little blessing, we cannot declare them to be something of science to be discarded.

And if we roll ourselves back into history, back to the time of the Second World War, the Nazi regime, Dr. Josef Mengele, he did research on people, people who saw more than half of their world population extinguished by the Nazi regime. He did research on people because they were Jewish and put them in chambers and froze them to death and put them in heat chambers to see how much heat they could stand and put them through a whole series of scientific experiments to find out the limitations of the human body, how much suffering could they take, how much weather could they take, how much deprivation of food and water, how much torture could they take, and documented that. And civil societies have refused to use the information and the data that came from the Nazi regime because it resulted in the death of human beings.

This embryonic stem cell research also results in the death of human beings, Mr. Speaker. It is the same kind of philosophy done in the name of science. We can find and have found better and other ways to produce similar and better science. We need to follow that path. There is no legal prohibition against embryonic stem cell research in this country. The debate in

this Congress is about will we impose a tax upon Americans and compel them to dig into their pockets and contribute to this diabolical science that ends the life of an innocent human being for the potential of improving the life of others when we have other alternatives.

Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to join my colleagues in explaining the progress and promise of adult stem cell research and to dispel many of the myths promoted by those urging more federal funding for the destruction of human embryos, required for embryonic stem cell research.

Among the favorite myths of proponents of embryonic stem cell research is the legend that there are 400,000 embryos stored at IVF clinics that are simply going to be discarded, so we should derive some benefit from them. This figure has become so fixed in their rhetoric that it now seems to be a fact. Members of both Houses, in a letter to President Bush, even cited the number in an effort to get President Bush to change his current policy on the funding of embryonic stem cell research. These proponents then use that number to create the assumption that an equally large number of therapeutic stem cells can be derived from them.

Here is why this argument is wrong: IVF embryos will not just "die anyway." Most IVF embryos are designated for implantation, and the rest can be adopted. In 1995, about 50,000 women were seeking to adopt a child. 75 children are alive and well today who started life as "frozen embryos."

Only a small fraction—2.2 percent—are slated to be discarded.

Only another 2.8 percent of embryos in IVF clinics, roughly 11,000, have been designated by their parents for research.

That is a total of 6 percent of all the embryos presently in IVF storage that are intended for disposal or research. More than 90 percent of embryos stored in IVF clinics are saved for later use by parents or donated to other infertile couples for implantation.

That means of the original 400,000 frozen embryos, only 11,000 are actually available to be destroyed for their stem cells.

Of those available embryos, less than 275 stem cell lines would be created. So, behind the seemingly impressive number of 400,000 frozen embryos, the reality is that the actual number of stem cell lines likely to be produced from them is so small as to be clinically useless.

In order to treat diseases—which is, as I will explain, still a very distant prospect using human embryonic stem cells—hundreds of thousands more embryos beyond those currently frozen and available for research would be needed. This could only be achieved by a deliberate effort to create new embryos for the sole purpose of destroying them—an outcome that the use of the frozen embryos is supposed to avoid, but would most likely cause. Federal funding of this destructive embryonic stem cell research would, therefore, create an incentive to create and kill more human embryos for stem cells, which would lead to a US human embryo farm industry.

There is an ethical alternative to killing these embryos: Adult and cord blood stem cells are treating patients of over 58 diseases.

Even if these frozen embryos were going to be discarded anyway (which they are not), and even if there was no ethical alternative