

for the Congress and the administration to work together to come up with a solution. Americans are sick of the politics. They want a solution that will protect U.S. soldiers and make what they are fighting and dying for, and what has taken untold numbers of Iraqi lives, worth the enormous sacrifice.

We need a new strategy in Iraq. We need a new plan. This one is not working. The more the administration denies it, the more time we waste and the more lives we lose because we do not do what we need to do. We do not need permanent bases in Iraq. Every day that goes by with the current war scenario, this country loses credibility around the world.

Every concrete block that we lay is sowing seeds of mistrust, anger, and resentment that will affect us for generations. Consider that we are still dealing with Vietnam 30 years later trying to establish relationships with them. It is time to involve the rest of the world in Iraq and stop anyone from calling this is the U.S.-Iraq war. Only the United Nations has the international imprimatur to lead an international coalition in Iraq. Only the United Nations can credibly install a peace-enforcing force in Iraq that is seen as such by the entire world.

We did a similar thing under UNTAC in Cambodia. We have done it before. I have never supported this war, but I would gratefully support a Republican resolution to get the U.N. into Iraq. This would be a positive development to safeguard U.S. ground forces and send a positive signal to a skeptical Arab world that America's intentions are not what the insurgents claim them to be.

We need a bold stroke in Iraq if we are to succeed in stopping the loss of lives and spread of terror. We cannot just fight insurgents in the streets day by day if there is any hope of peace in Iraq. The world has to believe we are only there to benefit Iraq. As long as the war is called and perceived as the U.S.-Iraq war, the insurgents have new ammunition to recruit, terrorize, maim, and kill.

We have an opportunity to work together as Americans, not Democrats and Republicans, but to create a plan that creates a new role for the U.S. in Iraq, contributing to the U.N. peace-enforcing force. We have an opportunity to safeguard American lives we are replacing, not withdrawing U.S. soldiers from Iraq.

Today, too many military experts in our country quietly say that the Iraq war could go on for the indefinite future. David Hackworth, the most decorated Vietnam veteran, said we are going to be there 30 years. We cannot afford the price in dollars, and more importantly, in loss or shattered lives for our soldiers.

The way to win the war in Iraq is to allow the world, not the United States, to lead the war in Iraq. Since the Republicans are the majority party in the

House, I willingly submit my proposal to the Republicans to call their own, get the President on board, turn it into legislation that we can pass by unanimous consent.

The best military option for the United States in Iraq is to act under the command and direction of the United Nations. U.N. leadership offers the best chance for a lasting peace and the fastest orderly way for American troops to return home.

Mr. Speaker, please put politics aside and let us act together. Yesterday, 82 members of the Iraq parliament submitted a letter to their speakers saying get the troops out of Baghdad. We ought to be working with them and make it happen, but it will take both Republicans and Democrats to do it.

#### THE NEED FOR THE RETURN OF FEDERALISM

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

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the 10th amendment states: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited to it by the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

These historic words, penned by our Founding Fathers, some of the most ingenious political minds the world has ever known, set forth an important principle: the Federal Government may exercise specific powers that are listed in the Constitution, and the States and the people may exercise all remaining powers.

Unfortunately, as the authors of the Constitution have long since passed, so too have many of their ideals for our system of government, from an ever-expanding Federal Government that for decades has crept into many facets of once locally controlled areas, to a Federal judiciary that in many instances completely ignores the intent of federalism, all resulting in a Federal Government that has become wildly inefficient and a hemorrhaging bureaucracy.

In an effort to draw attention to this nationally destructive trend, I have recently founded the Congressional States and Community Rights Caucus, which will be a forum to work to ensure that the Federal Government is operating under the intent of the 10th amendment of our Bill of Rights. I look forward to working with my like-minded colleagues who share the sentiment that the Federal Government has taken authority over too many areas from State governments and are operating them in an inefficient manner.

This is not a new concept. It goes back over some last 10 years and even back further than that. Our Founders were very clear when establishing our system of government. They intended to set up a Republic of sovereign States capable of self-governing with a small

central government with clearly defined, limited powers.

Our Constitution must be thought of as a social contract between people and the government. We must think of the most important document as a trade where our forefathers gave up certain specific rights in exchange for limited services specified, most notably, for defense of the people and the Nation.

□ 1815

When we refer to federalism, we refer to only powers specifically listed in the Constitution are to be administered by the Federal Government. All others are to be left to the States, local government, or to the people themselves. James Madison wrote this in Federal paper No. 45: The powers delegated to the Federal Government are few and defined, he said. The powers reserved to the several States will extend to all the objects which, in the ordinary course of affairs, concern the lives, liberties and properties of the people, and the internal order, improvement and prosperity of the State.

Of course, we know we have gone much further than this now. Throughout the last few generations especially, the intent of the 10th amendment of a limited government has been shredding away. Over the years in many areas, national crises and otherwise, many of the government's powers have grown on the Federal level, particularly in social service areas, through a centralized Federal Government.

Limited government was a gift to the American people. More accurately, it was got by blood, sweat, and tears that were shed by our forefathers who sought to break away from their mother country, Great Britain, and also by subsequent generations who worked for this great experiment of personal liberty.

There are those who support a big government, who have no faith in the people whatsoever to care for themselves, who feel a few should provide for the many. They believe that high taxes and high spending is the most efficient way to provide services. Of course, we know that history proves them not true. Those who support a big government might contend that those like myself are really antigovernment, but that is not true as well. Our Federal Government serves an important purpose, but our Nation is better off when that purpose is limited.

Mr. Speaker, those who support federalism as I do, those who strictly adhere to the 10th amendment, know that a large, burdensome, bureaucratic government is not the most efficient way to get the services to the American people. You see, State taxpayers and Federal taxpayers are not two separate groups of people but they are individuals who are taxed twice.

Think about that for a moment. Americans from all around the country send their money to Washington only for Washington to lose some of it, waste some of it, and spend some of it on

areas and ways that you and I might not agree with. In fact, you have taxpayers from one State who are subsidizing services for taxpayers in another State. For instance, in my State of New Jersey, I know that for every dollar that we send to Washington, we only receive back 54 cents from the Federal Government. That does not make sense to me and I know that is not fair.

Our recent leaders have tried to right this position of our Federal Government back to where our Founding Fathers had it. In his first inaugural address in 1981, President Reagan said, "It is my intention to curb the size and influence of the Federal establishment and to demand recognition of the distinction between the powers granted to the Federal Government and those reserved to the States or to the people. All of us need to be reminded that the Federal Government did not create the States; the States created the Federal Government."

In light of the looming fiscal crisis of our Federal budget and the domestic programs that are simply not reaching their intended goals, I believe it is imperative to highlight the need to return to a system intended under the reserve clause of the Constitution. I invite and encourage my colleagues to join the caucus and help us return control to those who know what is best, to the people. All of our constituents deserve the most efficient and effective government, a government in accord with our Constitution.

---

#### PRISONER ABUSE INVESTIGATIONS

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the call for an independent commission to review accusations of abuse of prisoners at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba and other places continues to grow. This is not a partisan issue. Members from both sides of the aisle, citizens who consider themselves progressives and citizens who consider themselves conservatives, have joined the call for such a commission. Opinion polls reflect the American people's deep concern about prisoner abuse. The security of our Nation is profoundly impacted by our reputation, by how we are viewed by the rest of the world.

Our response to terrorism is based on contrasting our values to theirs. We are conducting an ideological war in parallel with police and military operations. The outcome of both the ideological struggle and the armed struggle hinge to a significant extent on this great test of values.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is great shame that attention has been diverted in recent days from the fundamental issues to the words used by one Senator, a Senator whom I much admire and greatly respect, who has admitted

that the words he used were too strong and who has apologized to those whom he may have offended. The issue raised by the Senator was timely, on target, and central to our Nation's best interests, despite the fact that his specific words failed to properly frame his message.

It is imperative that we remain focused on the issue that the Senator called to our attention and not allow ourselves to be dissuaded, deterred, or discouraged from pursuing a thorough public inquiry into prisoner abuse in much the same manner as the commission we created to examine September 11.

Do some of the policies of our government endanger our troops by disparaging the image of America? Are our own troops endangered by our strained and unique interpretation of the Geneva Conventions? Has our approach to human intelligence distorted and limited our ability to understand and respond to the insurgency in Iraq and the terrorist threat in general? Do the incidents of abuse flow from decisions taken at the highest levels with regard to the conduct of American intelligence?

These are urgent and critical questions that cannot be answered adequately in the inquiries launched to date. We owe a great debt to those who have spoken out, calling for an independent commission, sometimes at great personal cost. I thank them for their leadership.

We owe a great debt to Senator RICHARD DURBIN for helping cause Americans to look seriously at this issue of prisoner abuse by our intelligence agencies and our military. I thank the Senator.

---

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

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

---

#### EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to use the time of the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE).

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

There was no objection.

---

#### SOMATIC CELL NUCLEAR TRANSFER IS HUMAN CLONING

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

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the bioethical issues that we have been debating for the past several years, and particularly over the last

couple of months, deal with fundamental questions about the value of human life and the meaning of human dignity. Every poll conducted on the subject of human embryo cloning for research indicates that 70 to 80 percent of the American people oppose human embryo cloning for research purposes. Cloning advocates know that the American public is adamantly opposed to their goals, so they have crafted new speech in an attempt to deliberately mislead Members of Congress, the media, grassroots advocates and the American public.

One of the leading patient advocacy groups for human cloning research is the Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation, and they have been sanitizing the language and playing semantic games with a willing media and an unaware American public.

Let me give you a few examples. Last year when representatives of the JDRF stopped by my office, they shared with my staff that they endorsed stem cell research involving somatic cell nuclear transfer. When my staff replied that somatic cell nuclear transfer, or SCNT, was the cloning of human embryos, the JDRF advocates in my office responded that they had been told by those training them for their Hill visit that SCNT did not create a human embryo because sperm was not used. Indeed, the literature in their own hands stated the following: "When scientists use SCNT to create stem cells, no sperm is used and the resulting cell has no chance of developing into a human being because it is never placed in a uterus. This is a fundamentally different procedure from reproductive cloning, as was used by scientists in 1996 to create Dolly the sheep."

This statement is misleading on several counts. JDRF is flat-out wrong when they state that SCNT is a "fundamentally different procedure from reproductive cloning, as was used by scientists in 1996 to create Dolly the sheep." Dr. Ian Wilmut, Dolly's own creator, does not agree with the JDRF statement. Dr. Wilmut stated clearly in a peer-reviewed article, "the unique feature of Dolly was that she was the first mammal to be cloned from an adult somatic body cell." Then he goes on to say, "The success of somatic cell nuclear transfer was used in creating Dolly."

Cloning supporter and then-NIH Director Harold Varmus testified in 1998 stating, "in the Dolly experiment, a lamb was produced using the technology of somatic cell nuclear transfer."

JDRF implies that sperm is necessary to develop an embryo capable of growing into a human. This notion is completely inaccurate, as hundreds of animals have been created through SCNT using no sperm. Was Dolly not a sheep because sperm was not involved? JDRF characterizes the resulting product of SCNT as merely a cell with no chance of developing into a "human." But President Clinton's own Bioethics