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. Nicaraguas \$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.

\square 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. Kuhl 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

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

that. There was not a single soul who said that we ought not to anything, and that that problem ought to be addressed, and that it is the responsibility, obviously, of Congress to get it done. There were a couple of tongue in cheek suggestions about what we ought to do with folks over 65, but those were purely for humorous effect at the meeting.

There was the common theme that we needed to fix it, and all of their suggestions had merit, but some of them I would like to point out. They talked extensively about personal retirement accounts, talking about putting more money in personal retirement accounts when they are younger because they would have a greater opportunity to increase; some of them thought we ought to increase the age of retirement but, when they get closer to that, I suspect they will not believe that. They spoke about not increasing the 12.4 percent tax. There was an interesting conclusion or recommendation that education on retirement plans ought to be mandatory in high school. Education on retirement plans ought to be mandatory in order to graduate from high school, they said. I thought that was an interesting item; probably something that we ought to take up. Then one final point that they made, and that was that people ought not rely on just Social Security for their main source of income in their retirement years.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we tend to get distracted here. We talk about different ages, we talk about those over 55, and I think it is important for everybody to appreciate that those over 55 will not be affected at all. Those youngest individuals in our society will be those most affected.

I challenge our colleagues to follow the lead of the high school students in my district who said, get down to business, put politics aside, and do not wait. That is good advice from those individuals who are most affected by whatever changes we bring about.

STEM CELL RESEARCH: EMBRYONIC VERSUS ADULT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORTENBERRY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. Foxx) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening because I fear that a number of good people will make a bad decision in the coming weeks. What is worse is I fear they will be making this decision based on a plethora of false information, and that is why I am here this evening.

There is an abundance of misinformation, exaggeration, and blatant lies being spread by interest groups regarding the prospects for embryonic stem cell research. The first misconception is that embryonic stem cell research is not legal. The fact is, embryonic stem cell research is completely legal. Re-

search on embryonic stem cells has taken place for years.

But what has this research produced? Nothing. While adult stem cells have treated over 58 diseases in human patients, embryonic stem cells have not treated even one patient. Adult stem cells have had success in treating debilitating and fatal illnesses without compromising ethical standards. Embryonic stem cells have treated nothing while, at the same time, destroying human life.

So why in the world would anyone support the unethical, failed use of embryonic stem cells instead of the ethical, successful use of adult stem cells? Because they do not know the difference. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I want to share some very important information tonight. If and when the American public learns the scientific facts, and I want to stress "scientific facts" regarding stem cell research, the ethical questions will not matter as much.

Now, I had the good fortune today to hear a talk by Dr. Robert P. George, who is the McCormick Professor of Jurisprudence in the Department of Politics at Princeton University in Princeton, New Jersey. Not all of the information that I am sharing with you tonight came from Dr. George, but he gave an outstanding talk sponsored by the Wilberforce Forum as a part of the Majority Leader's lecture series, 2005. The title of his talk was "Embryonic Stem Cells: Ethical Boundaries, and Possible Ways Forward."

I want to use some material that I have also received related to the definition of stem cells, and some of the research that has been produced in this area by Dr. Tadeusz Pachotczyk who has done post doctoral work at Massachusetts General Hospital at Harvard Medical School after he earned his PhD in neuroscience from Yale University. What is a stem cell? I used to teach, and I always believed that you start with the basics when you are teaching. So let us start with the definition. What is a stem cell?

A stem cell is essentially a blank cell capable of becoming another, more differentiated cell-type in the body, such as a skin cell, a muscle cell or a nerve cell. Why are stem cells important? Stem cells can be used to replace or heal damaged tissues in cells in the body. There are two broad classes of stem cells. The two basic types of stem cells are embryonic type and adult type. Embryonic stem cells and embryonic germ cells make up the embryonic type. Umbilical cord stem cells, placental stem cells, and adult stem cells make up the adult type.

Now, where do embryonic-type stem cells come from? They come from embryos. Embryonic stem cells are obtained by harvesting living embryos which are generally five to seven days old. The removal of embryonic stem cells invariably results in the destruction of the embryo. Another type of stem cell called an embryonic germ

cell can be obtained from either miscarriages or aborted fetuses.

Now, where do adult type stem cells come from? They come from umbilical chords, placentas, and amniotic fluid. Adult-type stem cells can be derived from various pregnancy-related tissues, or they come from adult tissues. In adults, stem cells are present within various tissues and organ systems. These include the bone marrow, liver. epidermis, retina, skeletal muscle, intestine, brain, dental pulp, and elsewhere. Even fat obtained from liposuction has been shown to contain significant numbers of adult-type stem cells, and I am going to refrain from making any jokes about that tonight. Cadavers. Neural stem cells have been removed from specific areas in postmortem, human brains as late as 20 hours following death.

Now, there are people who believe that embryonic stem cells have a great deal more to offer than adult stem cells. Let me say a little bit about what embryonic stem cells bring that adult stem cells do not. They do seem to be very flexible and to have the potential to make any cell. And, there is a lot of availability, so we are told, with embryonic stem cells from in vitro fertilization clinics, although there is some debate about exactly how many there are.

What are some of the disadvantages of embryonic stem cells? They are very difficult to differentiate uniformly and homogeneously into a target tissue. It is extremely difficult to get them to do exactly what we want them to do. Immunogenic. Embryonic stem cells from a random embryo donor are likely to be rejected after transplantation. They just do not work as well. They are capable of forming tumors or promoting tumor formation. This is one of the major drawbacks of embryonic stem cells.

□ 2030

And, of course, the most important disadvantage of embryonic stem cells is that they result in the destruction of human life.

Now, let us talk a little bit about the advantages of adult stem cells. Special adult-type stem cells from bone marrow and from umbilical cords have been isolated recently which appear to be as flexible as the embryonic type. They are already somewhat specialized, so inducing them to go into a certain area may be much simpler.

They are not immunogenic; recipients who receive the products of their own stem cells will not experience immune reaction. This is extremely important. Relative ease of procurement. Some adult stem cells are easy to harvest: the skin, muscle, marrow, fat, while others may be more difficult to obtain, brain stem cells.

Umbilical and placental stem cells are likely to be readily available. More and more people are being encouraged now, when they have babies, to save the umbilical and placental cells and store them for possible later use.