

(which there is), it would still be morally wrong to kill these human embryos for experimentation.

From the Nuremberg Code to the Belmont Commission, this utilitarian justification for harmful or fatal research has been soundly rejected in order to protect patients and the practice of medicine.

Civilized cultures have protections in place to make sure we do not allow research on, or use organs from, death row prisoners who are "going to die anyway," and we do not do research on terminally ill patients unless such research has a chance to help the patient.

We take a great risk if we dehumanize human embryos and accept "they are going to die anyway" as how we judge what is acceptable treatment for our fellow human beings.

Examples of atrocities that would be justified by the statement that the victims are going to die anyway include: Harvesting organs from and experimenting on death row inmates (like China), harvesting organs from and experimenting on the terminally ill, and submerging 15 live human unborn children into salt solution to learn if they could absorb oxygen through their skin. One fetus survived for 22 hours in an actual U.S. case.

The second major myth is that the stem cells lines that could be derived from these frozen embryos have the potential to cure numerous diseases, but that such cures remain just around the corner and just out of reach because the administration refuses to fund research in which these embryos would be destroyed. This, too, is false.

Adult stem cells have treated over 58 diseases in human patients in published clinical studies. Embryonic stem cells have not treated even one patient, and have mixed results—at best—in animal trials.

Moreover, human embryonic stem cell research is completely legal. The debate is solely about federally funding research that requires the destruction of embryos, human beings in their earliest stages of life.

President Bush is the first president to federally fund human embryonic stem cell research. He determined that such research could be funded so long as the cells had been obtained from embryos destroyed on or before August 9, 2001.

Since then NIH determined that there are 78 derivations of embryonic stem cells that are eligible for Federal funding, and 22 cell lines are currently receiving Federal funds. According to the director of the National Institutes of Health, the Bush policy is sufficient for basic research.

There are 16 additional "eligible" embryonic stem cell lines in existence that have not been "contaminated" by mouse feeder cells.

NIH spent about \$25 million on embryonic stem cell research in 2003, funding 118 research projects.

HHS reports that as of February 2004, embryonic stem cell providers had shipped more than 400 lines to researchers, and there are 3,500 vials of embryonic stem cells that are waiting to be shipped to researchers.

The ultimate goal of researchers is free and unfettered access to Federal dollars to create and destroy embryos for research purposes, and to employ human cloning as the method of choice.

Embryonic stem cell research will not, no matter what the claims of its proponents, become the cure-all it is touted as.

Of the fewer than 275 potential viable stem cell lines genetical diversity will still be lacking,

since minorities are poorly represented among IVF clients.

Stem cells from IVF embryos will cause serious immune rejection problems if transplanted into patients. Researchers argue that to avoid immune rejection, we need to clone people to make stem cells that are genetically identical to the patient receiving the stem cell transplant.

Many of my colleagues, I'm sure, have been visited by members of disease organizations, desperate for cures for their loved ones. One of the myths promoted by some of these organizations—and I believe that the families, most of the time, do not know the falsity of their statements—is that somatic cell nuclear transfer is not cloning. This is absolutely false. Somatic cell nuclear transfer, or SCNT, is the process that created Dolly, the cloned Scottish sheep. This makes me irate, that some in the scientific community would mislead victims of disease and illness and their loved ones into fighting for research they would oppose were they told the truth, and making them believe that this sort of research will cure all that ails them if they were just provided the money.

Here are the facts: All medical advances (at least 58 therapies) from stem cells to date have been from "adult" stem cell research, which carries no ethical concerns. There have been none from embryonic cells, not even in animal studies.

The benefits of research that kills living human embryos is purely speculative and has been hyped by researchers who are after federal funding and by a media that doesn't understand or report the distinction between adult and embryonic stem cells.

Proponents continue to make the false claim that embryonic stem cells will cure Alzheimer's Disease. It almost certainly will not.

The Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation has irresponsibly refused to promote or fund ethical adult stem cell research, despite the fact that it shows far more promise in treating diabetes than does research on cells derived from human embryos.

This debate is purely about federal funding. Embryonic stem cell research is completely legal.

Americans do not support destructive embryonic stem cell research, especially when they are provided with the facts.

When respondents in a poll at the beginning of this month were told that scientists disagree on whether embryonic or adult stem cells will end up being most successful in treating diseases, 60 percent favored funding only the research avenues that raise no moral problem, while only 22 percent favored funding all stem cell research including the kind that involves destroying embryos.

Killing human embryos is morally wrong. A human embryo, a person in his or her earliest stages, must be destroyed to obtain embryonic stem cells. Destroying early human life shows a profound disrespect for human life.

The ends do not justify the means. Some pro-life members of Congress support funding of embryonic stem cell research on the basis that this research could save the lives of people with debilitating diseases. This obfuscation of the term "pro-life" is based on a utilitarian ethic. It is unethical to destroy some human lives for the betterment of the lives of others.

Even President Clinton's National Bioethics Advisory Commission concluded that embryos "deserve respect as a form of human life."

The Commission recommended funding of embryonic stem cell research, only if there were no alternatives. Adult stem cells are currently being used to successfully treat humans suffering from many diseases.

Taxpayers shouldn't spend their hard earned money on embryo destruction. Federal funding of the destruction of human embryos for research is unethical. The debate is over the use of taxpayers money, not whether it is legal. American taxpayers should not be forced to fund unethical research.

The fact is that patients and their loved ones need real hope, not hype. That hope resides in non-controversial, tried-and-true adult stem cell research. When this issue comes to the floor next week, please join me in returning our focus from destructive embryonic stem cell research to adult stem cell research, which has been proven to work, is not morally controversial, and holds true promise for disease victims.

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

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

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the Special Order time of the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER).

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

There was no objection.

CAFTA

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, last year President Bush signed the Central American Free Trade Agreement, a one-sided plan to benefit the largest corporations in the world at the expense of American workers and farmers, and the expense of Central American workers, farmers, and small businesses.

Every trade agreement negotiated by this administration has been ratified by Congress within 65 days of the President's signing it. CAFTA has languished in Congress for nearly 1 year without a vote because this wrong-headed trade agreement offends both Republicans and Democrats.

Just look at what has happened with our trade policy in the last decade. In 1992, the year I was elected to Congress, we in this country had a \$38 billion trade deficit. Today, 12 years later, our trade deficit is \$618 billion. From \$38 billion, a dozen years later to \$618 billion. It is clear our trade policy simply is not working.

Opponents to CAFTA know that simply it is an extension of the North

American Free Trade Agreement, which clearly did not work for our country. It is the same old story. With every trade agreement, the President promises more jobs for Americans, growth in manufacturing, more exports, raising the standard of living in the developing world, better wages for workers in the developing world. Every time it comes out differently.

The definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over and over again and then expecting a different outcome.

Why will this trade agreement not work? Look at the average wages in the CAFTA countries. In United States the average wage is \$38,000. El Salvador is \$4,800. Honduras is \$2,600. Nicaragua is \$2,300. The average Nicaraguan worker is not going to buy cars made in Ohio. The Guatemalan worker is not going to be able to buy steel from West Virginia. The Honduran worker is not going to be able to buy software from Seattle or prime cuts of beef from Nebraska or textiles or apparel from North Carolina or South Carolina or Georgia.

This trade agreement is about giving big business what it wants: access to cheap labor. They cannot buy our goods; but American business can move its production, its companies, outsource them to Central America, and it costs us jobs. That is why, Mr. Speaker, there is such strong bipartisan opposition to the Central American Free Trade Agreement.

The administration is pulling out all stops because they know they are going to lose this vote. The administration has attempted to link CAFTA with helping democracy in the developing world and fighting the war on terror. Ten years of NAFTA has done nothing to improve border security between Mexico and our country. So that argument does not sell. Then last week the U.S. Chamber of Commerce flew on a Chamber of Commerce junket the six presidents from the CAFTA countries around our Nation, hoping they might be able to sell Americans and the U.S. press and Members of Congress on the Central American Free Trade Agreement, but again they failed. In fact, the Costa Rican president, after traveling the United States, announced his country simply would not ratify CAFTA unless an independent commission could determine that agreement will not hurt the poor and working families in his country.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the most powerful Republican in the House, majority leader, said there would be a vote on CAFTA within a year of the President's signing, that is, by Memorial Day, coming next week. As we can see by this calendar, we are barely a week away from that deadline, but still no vote in sight because there is simply not enough support for CAFTA. It is dead on arrival in this House.

Last month, two dozen Democrats and Republicans in Congress joined 150

business and labor groups saying no on CAFTA. Last week more than 400 union workers and Members of Congress gathered in front of the Capitol again saying no on the Central American Free Trade Agreement, because Republicans and Democrats, business and labor groups know what the administration refuses to admit, and that is that CAFTA is about one thing: it is about access to cheap labor and exploiting workers in the six CAFTA countries.

Congress must throw out this dysfunctional cousin of NAFTA and negotiate a trade agreement that will lift up workers in Central America while promoting prosperity here at home.

□ 2015

If we throw this agreement CAFTA out, and then negotiate a new central American Free Trade Agreement that really works for workers in both countries, we will know our trade policy is succeeding. Only when workers in the poor countries can afford to not just make American products, but also to buy American products, will we know that our trade policy has, in fact, succeeded.

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

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

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

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

THE EFFECTS OF SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM ON OUR YOUTH

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to talk before the House tonight, and I want to talk about an issue that has been discussed for a number of weeks and months, something that is of vital importance, I think, to all Americans, and that is the issue of Social Security and what do we do about it.

Now, the problem with Social Security, as everybody knows, is that it is a pay-as-you-go-system, which means that today's workers pay for today's retirees. It worked relatively well for a period of time. In 1950, there were 16 workers for every retiree, now there are 3.3 workers for every retiree, and in just a few short years there will be 2 workers for every retiree. So the demographics, the aging of our society dictate that we do something.

A lot of the talk has been about how does it affect seniors in our Nation. But I suggest to my colleagues that regardless of when you believe the problem or the situation or the crisis begins, or who you believe it affects, we cannot dispute this one fact, and that is that those most affected by it, regardless of when it happens or what happens, are the young people of this Nation. So I believe it is important for us to discuss and debate Social Security reform and how it will affect all sectors of our society, but we must, we must make certain that we talk about how it will affect young folks.

Now, in my district, what I did to try to listen to the young people of our Nation was to get together what is called a Youth Summit, and I set up a meeting with about 95 or 100 high school juniors and seniors in my district from all different schools, including Woodstock High School, Harrison, Kell, Lassiter, Etowah, Marietta High School, North Cobb, Pope, Sprayberry, Walton, Blessed Trinity, Centennial, Milton, North Spring, Riverwood, Roswell, and The Cottage School and Alpharetta High School, about 100 high school students, and sent them a bunch of material beforehand so they knew what we were talking about. The funny thing was a lot of them had great information about it before.

We gathered together for about 4 hours one morning and we talked about Social Security, and I challenged them to come up with some solutions and answer some questions. But when I started, I brought out this Social Security statement. This is a real Social Security statement, it came from the Social Security Administration, and this is what all of us get when we open up our mail from the Social Security Administration. It says, "Unless action is taken soon to strengthen Social Security, in just 14 years we will begin paying more in benefits than we collect in taxes." That was how we started as the premise.

I was extremely impressed by the knowledge and the intelligence of these young folks. We broke into different groups and assigned them questions. Now, they could take any question that they wanted, but we kind of prompted a few. We talked about discussing the benefits or the distractions or problems with personal accounts, and we asked them to answer the question: what is the best way to fix Social Security and, even the more fundamental question, do you believe that Social Security needs to be fixed, and asked them to talk about how personal retirement accounts, voluntary accounts have worked in other countries.

Then we got back together after they had worked for a period of time on those questions, and asked each of those groups to present their findings. It really was fascinating, but there was one common theme. There was a common theme to all of their conclusions, and that was that there is a major problem, every one of them believed