

Mr. Louis Flores Ruiz was born on October 30, 1918 in Chihuahua, Chihuahua, Mexico. At the age of five, he and his family immigrated to the United States and after successfully serving his country by joining the U.S. Army, he was granted United States Citizenship on December 17, 1944. During his time in the Army, he served as a Military Police escorting prisoners-of-war and civilians in combat areas as well as investigating theft. His stellar service to our country made Mr. Ruiz a recipient of the Philippine Liberation Ribbon, one Bronze Service Star, an Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal with Bronze Service Stars, and a Good Conduct Medal.

Upon his return from his service, Mr. Ruiz first worked as a grocery store owner, then as an insurance salesman. After that, he joined his brothers and brother-in-law in Tulare, California and co-founded a large tortilla factory where they pioneered the automation of tortilla production. An entrepreneur and innovator at heart, Mr. Ruiz went on to co-found what has become the largest frozen food Mexican manufacturing firm in the United States, the second largest Hispanic-owned manufacturing firm in the United States, and the largest manufacturing plant in the state of California. Ruiz Foods has also helped establish programs of charitable giving within the community to many organizations that enhance the quality of life for the people of the Central Valley.

In 1983 Mr. Ruiz had the distinctive honor of meeting with President Ronald Reagan and Vice President George Bush in the Rose Garden of the White House, as he accepted the U.S. Small Business Administration's Small Business Person's of the Year Award. In 2003, Mr. Ruiz had the pleasure of hosting President George W. Bush at Ruiz Foods in Dinuba, CA. Other major highlights in Mr. Ruiz's life include, placing a wreath at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier at Arlington Cemetery at the request of President Reagan and being named the 14th person to the Tortilla Industry Association Hall of Fame—a distinction reserved for those who have made positive contributions to the tortilla industry through technical or significant innovations in products, equipment or ingredients while attaining business success.

Mr. Ruiz is survived by JoAnn, his wife; their daughter and son-in law, Shannon and Eric Weller; brother and sister-in-law, Carlos and Olga Ruiz; brother and sister-in-law, Edward Sr. and Dolores Ruiz; brother and sister-in-law, Oscar and Alice Ruiz, sister, Margaret Tarasas; and daughter-in-law, Luisa Ruiz; the mother of his four children, Rose; and their daughter and son-in-law, Rose Margaret and Paul Doherty; son and daughter-in-law, Fred and Mitzie Ruiz; daughter and son-in-law, Anna and Dennis January; and daughter Carrie Ruiz. Louis was also blessed with numerous nieces, nephews, godchildren, grandchildren, great grandchildren, a wonderful care provider and many dear friends.

Although the passing of Mr. Louis Flores Ruiz brings sadness to his family, friends, and community, we believe his legacy of hard work and kindness will forever live on, through those whose lives he so graciously lived.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Madam Speaker, thank you for allowing me to be here at this time.

STEM CELL RESEARCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. CAS-TOR). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for the time remaining until midnight.

Mr. GINGREY. Madam Speaker, I am very happy to be before my colleagues on the House floor this evening to talk about a hugely important issue that we will be dealing with once again this week in all probability.

As you know, Madam Speaker and my colleagues, I am talking about the issue of stem cell research. Last week the Senate was in session, and once again the bill that passed on the House floor in the 109th Congress, the Castle-DeGette bill, which would require Federal funding, taxpayer funding for embryonic stem cell research that was obtained by the destruction of the so-called "throwaway embryos" from infertility assisted reproductive technology clinics that couples say they did not want, that these were extras. Well, that bill that passed last year on this House floor passed the Senate last week, and, Madam Speaker, we will be seeing that bill very soon once again.

So, I want to be present tonight to talk about this very, very important issue with my colleagues and anyone that has an opportunity within ear distance of what we are speaking about tonight to help bring an understanding to this issue and to try to convince my colleagues that we can do this; that is, we can do stem cell research as we have been doing over the last several years.

Since President Bush's first term in office way back in 2001, we have been spending Federal tax dollars on stem cell research. But what the President said in August of 2001 was that he would not allow Federal tax dollars, your tax dollars, my tax dollars, those of my family, my parents, my constituents, to be used to fund stem cell research that resulted in the destruction of a human life.

What President Bush did say back then was that embryonic stem cell research that was ongoing, that was a result of cell lines developed from human embryos that had already been destroyed could continue; and Federal tax dollars could be used through the NIH to give grants to these researchers as they applied to use these existing cell lines, which indeed did come from the destruction of human life, as I believe life begins at conception, in these embryos that were taken from fertility clinics.

In fact, Madam Speaker, I want to emphasize that point because it is so important that our colleagues understand that, especially new Members on both sides of the aisle that weren't here for the debate last year, that got the impression maybe they and their constituents felt that this administration and the former leadership of this Congress in the 109th was spending nothing, was refusing to fund stem cell

research whether it was adult or embryonic.

But the facts are really brought home by this first slide, Madam Speaker, that I want to present. And this is basically what it says: Our government invested in lifesaving research. The Federal Government has spent \$161 million since 2003 on human embryonic stem cell research. As I pointed out, Madam Speaker, the President was willing to allow that funding to continue on those embryonic stem cell lines that had already been created. And there was some 60 of those stem cell lines where researchers could get a grant from the Federal Government and begin that important research on these stem cells.

Before that, no administration, no President, at no time in the 40 years that the Democrats controlled the Congress, certainly not during President Clinton's 8 years, was one dime of Federal tax dollars spent on embryonic stem cell research. Some was spent on adult stem cell research. But when it was suggested by scientists that maybe the embryonic stem cells had more potential to develop into a lot of different tissues and ultimately organs that could possibly help people with diseases, and we have all seen those television spots with celebrities in some cases, Michael J. Fox, who is suffering severely from Parkinson's disease.

□ 2315

The life of Christopher Reeves, we all know about the tragic injury and the quadriplegic state that he suffered in for many years before his tragic death last year.

When you see those things, you know, you think, well, we are not doing anything. But the truth is, and it is very important for us to understand this, that under President Bush, indeed, since 2003, some \$608 million has been spent on stem cell research. And a lot of that, as I point out, because of those previous embryonic stem cell lines, a lot of it has been on embryonic stem cell research, and he is the only President that allowed that.

Now, we have great Members in both bodies and on both sides of the aisle. And I have a tremendous amount of respect, Madam Speaker, for the two Members in this body, in this House, that felt that because maybe these embryonic stem cell lines that were previously created that were being used for research would exhaust themselves, that we would use up all those stem cells. We certainly haven't, at this moment. I think there is still 20 of those stem cell lines in existence. Some were found to be contaminated. Originally, I think, back in 2001, we estimated that there were 60 of those lines, and now we are down to 20. So I can understand the concern that maybe we would exhaust that supply.

So Congressman CASTLE, a Republican Member, Congresswoman DEGETTE, a Democratic Member, along with the Senate colleagues, Senator

REID, Senator KENNEDY, Senator SPENCER, in a bipartisan way, felt the same thing. So these two bills came before the respective bodies in the 109th Congress. We did pass the Castle-DeGette bill, but the Senate failed to deal with that, until finally it was decided that they would go ahead and pass a companion bill, and then my colleagues, of course, know that the President, as he had said all along that he would veto that bill, and he did.

But what I want to make sure that the new Members understand is that people like myself, who are pro-life Members of this body, we support stem cell research, with only one exception. We don't support research that requires killing of a human life. And last year, I, along with Congressman Roscoe Bartlett, the gentleman from Maryland, a Ph.D. physiologist who knows more about this subject, I guess, than anybody in this body, and we worked together to develop an alternative bill that would allow us, we the Federal Government, to fund research programs that would use embryonic-like cells to get to the same point without destroying human life. And some of the things that were suggested in the Bartlett-Gingrey bill that we voted on, in this House, in the 109th Congress, were to obtain an embryonic cell from a stem cell from an embryo without destroying that embryo, to be able to, essentially, biopsy with a fine needle and obtain those embryonic cells without killing or even harming in any way that little embryo which had the potential, of course, for human life. We didn't want to destroy that life.

And this was part of the Roscoe Bartlett-Gingrey bill. And we felt that this was sort of a win/win situation, Madam Speaker and my colleagues, because we would be able to get to the same point without any collateral damage. And of course the collateral damage that I am talking about is the destruction of a human life.

And I want to go through a few of the posters that we have, and I want to point out, Madam Speaker, that a lot of our colleagues who are in support of destroying those human embryos, kind of indiscriminately, so that we can obtain the embryonic cells that hopefully can lead to cure of some of these diseases that I mentioned, would say in their argument, look, 75, 80 percent of the American people are in favor of this. How could we deny that overwhelming show of support when you ask the American people do they want us to do this, and therefore, we think we should, and we are going to pass this bill, over the President's objection.

Well, Madam Speaker, as we all know, in regard to a response, it really sort of depends on how you ask the question. If you ask the question, and maybe a person sitting at home gets a telephone call of a pollster, and they have been watching television, and they have just seen a clip of Michael J.

Fox and the ravages of Parkinson's disease, or Christopher Reeves, as he sits there with the breathing machine, struggling to talk to the American people about his struggles, and then they get that call, and it is a pollster and they say, would you be in favor of using embryonic stem cells in research to help cure these diseases? And of course that individual may also just happen to have a family member who is in the nursing home suffering from something like Alzheimer's is an example.

And sure, I mean, Madam Speaker, if I were one of those individuals that got that call, I would say, absolutely. Absolutely. So I am surprised the number was only 75 percent. I would think it would be 95 percent, if you phrase the question in that way.

Now, on the other hand, if you said, and you prefaced that with, would you be in favor of your tax dollars going to fund this research on embryonic stem cells that might help cure one of these devastating diseases, then no doubt that number would go down a little bit. I don't know how much, but no doubt. When you start saying, well, now, it is your money. It is not somebody else's money, in the abstract. It is your money. Now, do you want to spend your money, the numbers would not be as high.

But in this, the point I am getting to, Madam Speaker, in this next slide, if you ask the question this way, and this is the only fair way to ask this scientific question, say to the individual, stem cells are the basic cells from which all of a person's tissues and organs develop. Congress is considering the question of Federal funding for experiments using stem cells from human embryos. The live embryos would be destroyed in their first week of development to obtain these cells. Do you support or oppose using your Federal tax dollars for such experiments? That is the question that should be asked. And when it was asked, in a poll conducted by the International Communications Research in May of 2006, this is what the survey said. Those who support that, 38 percent. Those who oppose it, 47.8 percent. So, Madam Speaker, that really is the crux of what we are talking about in regard to, do the American people support research using embryonic stem cells that result in the wanton, indiscriminate destruction of a human embryo, the so-called extra, and I will get into that point later in the discussion, extra, throw-away, nobody wants them, little babies.

And if you believe as I do that life begins at conception, these embryos are several days to a week, maybe even 10 days old, long past the moment of conception.

We are blessed tonight, my colleagues, to have one of our colleagues join me in this discussion. And she just happens to represent a wonderful district in North Carolina that includes the Wake Forest Baptist University

and Medical Center. And I want her to share with us some of the research that is going on there at Wake Forest and the Wake Forest School of Medicine.

I had an opportunity, Madam Speaker, as I was returning to Washington yesterday, to stop at Wake Forest and to visit with Dr. Anthony Atala, who is the president of the Institute for Regenerative Medicine at Wake Forest University, and to spend about 3 hours with Dr. Atala, to have an opportunity to meet with Dr. Hatch, the president of Wake Forest University, and Dr. Richard Dean who is the dean of the medical school. And with the 150, they weren't all there, but quite a few were, Ph.D. and M.D. scientists that are working there at that great university, and some of the things that they are doing to give us an opportunity to obtain pluripotent, almost embryonic-like stem cells that will help us do this kind of research that our colleagues want us to continue, and the President wants to fund, with no collateral damage.

So at this point I want to yield to my colleague, VIRGINIA FOXX from North Carolina, to tell us a little bit more about that program and take as much time as she wants. And we will continue our dialogue. And I yield now to my good friend, VIRGINIA FOXX.

Ms. FOXX. Thank you, Dr. GINGREY, Congressman GINGREY. I appreciate your starting off this hour this evening on this important issue. I also appreciate your having gone to Wake Forest to visit the Institute for Regenerative Medicine. Some of the most important research that is happening in the area of stem cell research is occurring at the Institute for Regenerative Medicine at Wake Forest University. And I am very proud to represent them here in the Congress.

I am going to talk a little bit about what they are doing, but I want to reiterate some of the things that you have been saying. I got out my file today on this and looked back at my notes, and it was almost 2 years ago that I stood on this floor one evening, a little earlier than this, and spoke for about 40 minutes about the issue of stem cell research. And I have told this story many, many times to people, because many may wonder why we are here speaking sometimes to very few of our colleagues who are here in the Chamber. But I tell this story because it was about 9 o'clock at night, and as I said, I spoke for about 40 minutes. And when I got back to my office, the staffer said to me, you just had a call from a gentleman from Maryland who had never watched C-SPAN before, was channel surfing and saw this woman standing on the floor of the House and wondered how in the world did she get to be on the floor of the House when he thought only Members of Congress could speak on the floor of the House. And I didn't look like I was a Member of Congress, so he stopped the channel surfing and watched and listened to me talk about the issue of stem cell research and

called my office and said that he was so grateful for that because he had not understood the issue like I had explained it.

□ 2330

And he wanted to just call and thank me for that. And that has been one of the things that has kept me going and doing these Special Orders at night, thinking that even if we only reach a few people who are watching, it is important to do that, and it is particularly important on this issue.

And I think how you described, Dr. GINGREY, the way the survey question should be asked, explaining to people exactly what is going to happen as a result of the research, is very, very important because we all know you get about whatever results you want to from a survey depending on how you ask the question. But I think describing what stem cell research is, is extremely important, and talking about what is being done. You have presented some facts and figures there already, and I want to do it again. I just think that every time we talk about it, we need to talk about it.

People who are pro-life support stem cell research. I support stem cell research. You do. Every other person here who considers himself or herself a pro-lifer supports stem cell research. But what we want is research that does not require the killing of human life. That is what is important to us. We also know, as you have pointed out, that a lot of money is being spent on embryonic stem cell research. A lot of Federal dollars are being spent on that. And I think, frankly, that we are paying more than our fair share for research that many people find to be morally repugnant.

You gave some statistics. Mine are not long-term statistics. I have the 2006 numbers.

In 2006 NIH spent \$38 million on embryonic stem cell research, compared to \$200 million on human nonembryonic stem cell research, adult and cord blood research. That is very important research. That is the research that has given us some results in terms of curing disease. We have gotten no positive results from embryonic stem cell research, and that is the point I think that needs to be made over and over again.

And one of the reasons I am very excited about the research that Dr. Atala and his team are doing is because they are doing research that doesn't require the destruction of human life. Dr. Atala, who came to Wake Forest from Harvard and brought a large team, as you said, with him, is a tissue engineering specialist, and he has found that amniotic fluid stem cells have those pluripotent properties that you pointed out earlier and grow as fast as embryonic stem cells. And I know that he talked to you about the research, particularly in growing bladders, that has occurred there and the tremendously positive response that he has gotten.

Mr. GINGREY. Reclaiming my time, on that point for just a second, Dr. Atala's research in regard to amniotic fluid cells, which that study was published just this January of 2007 in the journal *Nature Biotechnology*, was an amazing accomplishment in what Dr. Atala says. And I know this, as an OBGYN physician from the great State of Georgia in my prior life where I practiced for 26 years, delivering 5,200 babies. What Dr. Atala is doing, you can obtain this amniotic fluid from a pregnant mom, pregnant woman, in the process of trying to make sure that she is not carrying a baby that has a genetic defect. A lot of times this is done if a woman is a little older. She is not old at age 35 but is considered a little older for childbearing and the increased risk of genetic defects. So a lot of women do have this amniocentesis done. And if not an amniocentesis, a biopsy actually can be taken of a part of the placenta through the cervix as early as 9 weeks of the pregnancy or obtain the amniotic fluid with a very fine needle as early as 10 or 11 weeks of the pregnancy.

So I just wanted to point that out to my colleague that we are just talking about a few weeks more mature in getting those cells, which are almost embryonic because they are so early.

Ms. FOXX. Right. Well, thank you again for pointing out more of the scientific evidence that we have. And I think it is very important that a person with your background as an OBGYN physician can understand this issue so well and explain it. I think that all the physicians on our side of the aisle are very strong pro-lifers and are working very hard to get the information out about this issue.

As you point out, those stem cells, those coming from the umbilical cord and those coming from the placenta and the amniotic fluid, have shown tremendous results.

The other thing that the media does not point out and that people who are proposing that we go to embryonic stem cell research with government funding, they don't point out the fact that over 70 diseases have been treated by adult stem cells and zero treatments have come out of embryonic stem cell research, even though embryonic stem cell research just passed the 25-year mark. For over 25 years, scientists have been looking into using embryonic stem cells, and we have really gotten nothing but negative results from that, and we have gotten tremendously positive results from adult stem cell research.

So that is why it is so important that we always distinguish between adult stem cell research and embryonic stem cell research. We must do that when we talk about it. Again, it is like what you have said, pointing out the questionnaires and the surveys, making sure that people get asked the right question and that we describe the issue very, very well. We need very much to educate the American public on this

issue so that they won't think that the President is being very arbitrary when he vetoes the bill and that we are not being arbitrary when we uphold that veto, which I hope that we will do. And we need to explain to people the ethical questions that we are dealing with.

As I pointed out in my comments a couple of years ago, and I want to say it again, never in this country have we sanctioned research that would harm other human beings. There was the research done in the 1930s that was wrong. We have condemned it. Since that time we have had very, very strong and ethical programs to protect adults from diseases that would cause them harm and from diseases that would cause them death. And yet people don't see the same problem when they are dealing with embryos, and we have to do that. We must do that. We are crossing an ethical Rubicon when we sanction using embryos for research or creating embryos for this research. I think that it is really going over the line, and we must tell people that, and we must have them understand the long-term implications of that for our society and for the human race. We don't believe in doing that in this country.

□ 2340

I think that we have to be very careful again that we explain we can get better results from doing things ethically than we are going to get from doing things unethically, and we don't start down a slippery slope of treating human beings in the wrong way.

I want to thank you again for coming tonight and starting this discussion on this very, very important issue. I hope there is at least one gentleman out there or one person out there, whether they are in Maryland or some other State, who is watching this for the first time and understanding the issue and the distinction that we are making between doing ethical research on adult stem cells and what most of us consider is unethical research on embryos, which will destroy them; and that we can continue to use funds to support programs like Dr. Tony Atala's research at Wake Forest University and other places where they are seeing excellent results. And if we take that money away, we may be denying the kinds of cures that many people say they want to get; but by ignoring the adult stem cell research victories, we may be slowing up the great results that we could get. And I yield back to you.

Mr. GINGREY. I thank the gentelady from North Carolina who I said represents Wake Forest University and Dr. Atala and his team there.

And her closing comments, Madam Speaker, segue really into my next slide in this poster that I've got. What Ms. FOXX said is we have to not go down that slippery slope. We have to consider the collateral damage of what we do. We have to be very, very careful that we are not playing God. And I say

that with all honest, sincerity, that we have an opportunity to do ethical stem cell research; and by that I simply mean balancing life and science.

Ms. FOXX talked about a number of the techniques. She talked about obtaining stem cells from umbilical cord blood. She talked about obtaining adult stem cells from bone marrow or from blood. And she talked about the many successes utilizing research with adult stem cell research. And the cures, I think she mentioned 70 different diseases, including Type I diabetes. There was just a study from Brazil where 13 of 15 Type I juvenile, we call it, it is not always in children, but a lot of children get juvenile diabetes, the severe kind of diabetes that almost always requires insulin therapy, and even with good control, leads to devastating complications, such as blindness, kidney failure, the need for a kidney transplant. Thirteen out of 15 of these Type I diabetics in Brazil who were treated with adult stem cells were found to be months later developing insulin on their own. These stem cells went to the pancreas and became the so-called islet cells, and now 13 out of 15 of those patients are not having to use insulin at all to control their diabetes.

So some of the ethical ways. And then of course we talked about Dr. Atala, who happens also to be chairman of the Department of Urology and operates every day on what you might call routine things, but at the same time is spending a lot of his effort running the Institute for Regenerative Medicine, where they are studying ways to obtain, through amniotic fluid, cells that are neither completely embryonic nor completely adult, but they have qualities that are very similar to both, in being similar to embryonic cells, those that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle mostly, although some Republicans supported the Castle-DeGette as well, the need to use these cells. Well, if you can get the amniotic cells, they can double every 36 hours just like the embryonic cells that we are talking about in destroying a human embryo. But also, similar to an adult cell, they do not form tumors. And that is one of the huge problems that the research on embryonic cells has resulted in.

How do you solve that problem? Well, with Dr. Atala's research, we wouldn't have that problem. These cells would double every 36 hours, and they don't form tumors. The best of both worlds.

I see my colleague from Texas has joined us. He is a fellow insomniac, although it is a little earlier out in Texas and maybe his constituents are still up, certainly some are in California; but it is great to have him with me tonight.

At this point I would like to yield to the gentleman from east Texas and let him join in on this very, very important topic.

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, I appreciate my good friend from Georgia, the good doctor, yielding.

And I, like our friend Ms. FOXX, appreciate so much the time you spent in explaining this, Dr. GINGREY.

You know, when you and I discussed this, and if we could exchange in a colloquy here for a moment, but you and I discussed this back at the time when we were having a vote on this matter.

I came to the floor very excited because this amniotic fluid stem cell information was just exciting because it didn't grow tumors. It wouldn't require throwing away embryos. That was exciting news. And I just felt in my heart, you know, we just get this information to the floor and let those folks, most of them on the other side of the aisle, but all the people who are saying we have got to dispose of embryos, we have got to kill these unborn children in order to get the stem cells that are embryonic stem cells. Here is this great research, the great information that shows these are better than embryonic, these amniotic stem cells. And that is exciting. Nobody has to die to provide stem cells for anybody else to live. We got to the floor, and my heart was broken. They didn't care. They didn't care.

Mr. GINGREY. If the gentleman would yield, and I really so much appreciate him pointing that out.

I think what the gentleman is saying is, no tumor formation, no collateral damage, no destruction of life, lives that could be adopted and become a "snowflake" baby, we have a slide later on to show. But I wanted to mention to my colleague, and I like his comments on this. In addition to the work that Dr. Atala is doing at Wake Forest, and I didn't know this, this is the last year, I say to the gentleman from Texas, but in my great State of Georgia, at the University of Georgia, a Ph.D. researcher, Dr. Steve Stice, has a project whereby embryonic stem cells from embryos can be obtained if it is an embryo that once it is rethawed and there is maybe an attempt to place that in a mother's womb, but if you look at it under the microscope, he can tell if that embryo has the potential for further generation. It is not dead, but you might equate it to, say, a person who has no brainwave activity, the other extreme of life, and has no chance of recovery. Well, Dr. Stice, his research would be to obtain those embryonic stem cells from those embryos so you wouldn't be destroying human life.

And I yield back to my colleague because I wanted to make him aware of that. Our Senator, our junior Senator, who is so prescient and has a way of solving problems when you've got a divide like this, Senator JOHNNY ISAKSON, along with Senator NORM COLEMAN from Minnesota, introduced a bill in the Senate last week and it passed overwhelmingly. I think it got 75 votes. And I hope that we will have an opportunity to vote on that bill in this House if, Madam Speaker, Ms. PELOSI, will allow that to come to voice for a vote; because I can't see why any Member, Republican or Demo-

crat, pro-life, pro-choice, would not want to support that, where it is a win-win situation. I yield back.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you. I appreciate the gentleman from Georgia yielding.

And I know we both share that hope that springs eternal in the human breast, that this is beginning to soak in. In fact, you know, you wonder who is listening, who is paying attention. Are other people getting it? I was talking to seven friends that are here from Smith County with Sky Ranch, a Christian camp, and every one of them get it. They understand.

□ 2350

They know the value of human life, and they are passing that on. And those with whom they deal, they are getting it. So the message is getting out here. And I really believe with the optimism that my dear friend from Georgia has and that we have, that there are so many good people in this body, and I was so pleased to learn that when I got here, that I believe in the end they will get it. They will understand we don't have to make that terribly difficult, unethical decision to end some life in order to take something from that one because we have made the philosophical decision that we think that this person means more to us than this other person, so we take this organ, we take those stem cells and kill them to allow this one to live, and we shouldn't have to go there. And the amniotic fluid stem cells I think provide that kind of excitement.

I thank the gentleman from Georgia and appreciate your interest and care and love for life, all life, even life on both sides of the aisle and for what you are doing here.

Mr. GINGREY. Judge Gohmert, I thank you for your kind remarks; and of course you are here not to praise me but to praise God and life and the sanctity of life at the extremes, the embryo and the senior citizens as well.

My colleagues, Madam Speaker, I cannot over-emphasize the point as I look at this and reference you to this next slide. No lives, no lives are thrown away.

We have heard, all of our colleagues have heard people speak on this floor and say there are 400,000 of these extra throw-away embryos available for this research, and they are going to be and I have even heard people say, thrown down the toilet, that they are garbage. I have heard the expression, and I know this is appalling, Madam Speaker, but to hear the expression that it is nothing but medical waste and they are going to be thrown away anyway, I know that gives many of us and you and me and many of my colleagues chill bumps to think about that.

But the point is of these 400,000, those are not all extra and scheduled for the trash can and available for the harvesting of embryonic stem cells. The fact is in April 2002, there were a total of 396,000 embryos that had been placed

in storage, frozen for possible later use. Of those, and that is what this slide points out, 88 percent of these frozen embryos, in fact close to 350,000, are being held for future family building by the donors. They have not completed their family. Maybe they have not gotten pregnant yet. They have not conceived. So 88 percent are going to remain preserved in a frozen state so that hopefully these infertile couples will hopefully at some point in the future become parents.

And only 2.8 percent, about 8,700 of the frozen embryos, are designated for destruction. Couples a lot of times are asked the question: Well, would you like to give this baby up for destruction so that we can get these embryonic stem cells, or would you rather just throw them away? Well, half of the people that own those embryos would say for whatever reason, maybe the same reason that folks sometimes say no, I don't want an autopsy on my loved one; or no, I don't want to donate an organ when I am in a massive automobile accident and I am brain dead. A lot of people will say, look, I don't want my embryo, my child, to be put in a blender for the sake of obtaining those embryonic stem cells. I would rather it be thrown away.

So this business of 400,000 available, it is nothing near that amount. It is very important for people and our colleagues to understand and to put that in perspective.

Madam Speaker, I know our time is running short. We are rapidly approaching the time that this body will be adjourning for the day, a busy day. And I have one poster in particular that I want my colleagues to take a close look at. This is the one that I am presenting now with these precious children.

These were frozen embryos. These were part of the so-called medical waste that was going to be thrown away; or, indeed, put in a blender and churned up, destroying these little lives. Thank God the ones on this poster were adopted by infertile couples, with the permission from the couples who owned those embryos. These are what we refer to as the snowflake babies.

Last year when we were debating this issue, many of them, the parents went out of their way to take time off work, to buy an airline ticket and fly up here with these toddlers, some months old, and some a few years old. And I saw at the White House, as President Bush vetoed this bill last year, he was holding a set of snowflake baby twins. Indeed, throw away medical waste. I think not.

These little children on this poster look a lot like my six grandchildren. I have three precious granddaughters and three precious grandsons, and I think how precious life is.

We need to think about this very, very closely. I want to ask my colleagues this question, just like the survey, the polling done and you ask the question in the right way: some of us

are pro-life. Some of us are pro-choice. Some of us are Democrats, some of us are Republicans. But if we have an opportunity to obtain embryonic stem cells, maybe they do have more potential than the adult stem cells. I don't know. I do know they have this problem with tumor formation. But if the argument is our hands have been tied, although we have funded embryonic stem cell research on those existing cell lines, but if the opportunity is there and we considered that tonight and talked about Dr. Atala's work on obtaining nearly embryonic, nearly totipotential cells, we also can do things like biopsy an embryo, that is called pregenetic diagnosis, and we do that all the time now.

If an embryo is from a family that has a congenital defect like hemophilia or muscular dystrophy, you can biopsy that embryo to make sure that condition does not exist. If you can do that without harming the embryo, and it has been done thousands of times, we ought to be able to do the same technique and get embryonic stem cells. It takes some research.

If we can continue to fund scientists like Dr. Stice at the University of Georgia in regard to using those essentially brain dead embryos that don't have any potential for further life and get those embryonic stem cells, we don't have to get into this argument, Madam Speaker, between the pro-life and pro-choice community.

Isn't that, my colleagues, the way to go? I hope there is an opportunity this year in the 110th Congress to vote on that bill and give the President something that he can sign and get back to us and make it law.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HIGGINS (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and the balance of the week.

Mr. HILL (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of official business in the district.

Mr. WALSH of New York (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and the balance of the week on account of family reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. KILPATRICK, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WYNN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. LEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PAYNE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KUCINICH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOLT, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, April 18.

Ms. FOXX, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, April 23 and 24.

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GINGREY. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at midnight), the House adjourned until today, Wednesday, April 18, 2007, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1076. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a 6-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism that was declared in Executive Order 13224 of September 23, 2001, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1077. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the semiannual report detailing payments made to Cuba as a result of the provision of telecommunications services pursuant to Department of the Treasury specific licenses, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 6032; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1078. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1079. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1080. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report entitled "Supporting Democracy and Human Rights: The U.S. Record 2006-2007," pursuant to Public Law 107-228, section 665; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1081. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification regarding the proposed license for the export of defense articles and services to the Government of Russia (Transmittal No. DDTC 036-07); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.