

to winning this conflict than we were when President Bush declared an end to major combat operations under an arrogant banner declaring "Mission Accomplished."

Despite this lack of progress, the war has exacted a deeply troubling human and financial toll. In just over 2 years of war, almost 1,800 American soldiers and an estimated 25,000 innocent Iraqi bystanders have been killed. The Pentagon lists the number of Americans wounded as over 12,000; but that does not take into consideration the invisible wounds many of our soldiers have brought home, the painful mental trauma they have contracted from months and years of fighting, watching their friends being killed or wounded by the insurgents, and killing and wounding others themselves, a lot to live with when they finally come home.

□ 1800

When accounting for these psychological injuries, the number of wounded jumps to more than 40,000 soldiers. Given what is at stake here, do the American people not deserve a plan? Do our brave men and women who are selflessly sacrificing their time and energy, not to mention their arms, legs and lives for this war, not deserve a plan? And it would be helpful for their families to know what the plan is in Iraq.

We have asked the President to address Iraq's lack of security. We have asked him to come up with a plan for ending the war. He has not; so we will.

After we bring the troops home, we do have a plan. There is a plan. It is a plan that would secure America for the future, the SMART Security resolution, which I recently reintroduced with the support of 50 of my House colleagues. SMART is Sensible Multilateral American Response to Terrorism for the 21st Century, and it will help address the threats we face as a Nation. SMART Security will ensure America's security by reaching out and engaging the Iraqi people.

Instead of rushing off to war for the wrong reasons, SMART Security encourages the United States to work with other nations to address the most pressing global problems. Because not every international problem has a military answer, SMART Security will prevent terrorism by addressing the very conditions that give rise to terrorism in the very first place: poverty, despair, resource scarcity and lack of proper education, as an example.

SMART Security also encourages democracy building, human rights education, conflict resolution through nonmilitary means, educational opportunities, and strengthening civil programs in the developing world. These are the best ways to encourage democracy in countries like Iraq, not through wars that cost thousands of unnecessary deaths and cost billions of dollars. The SMART approach is the best way to reach out to Iraq. It is time we stopped putting all of our eggs in the

military basket and started getting smart about our national security.

STOP COUNTERFEIT POLLS

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

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, today I want to call attention to the June 25 Bulgarian and July 3 Albanian parliamentary elections. Voters in these developing economies deserve the opportunity to exercise the freedoms that were unavailable to them for so long.

As the world's greatest democracy, we should strive to foster the ideals of freedom in these developing democracies. Free and fair elections are the first essential step in this long and arduous process.

As a member of the International Anti-Piracy Caucus, I am a proud supporter of international intellectual property protection.

As Albania and Bulgaria move through the election process, they should understand that part of the process of becoming free is making sure that applicable laws are in force both locally and internationally. Failure to punish those that disregard laws will mean that these countries will not become accepted players on the world stage for some time to come.

Part of the process for providing free and fair elections is respecting and enforcing the intellectual property rights of American businesses assisting in these elections.

Therefore, I call upon the sitting governments of these two nations, including their justice ministries and central election commissions, to condemn the distribution of counterfeit Gallup polls that are being used to distort the democratic process during their parliamentary elections.

Promotion of democracy is one of the core pillars of our national security policy. Bulgaria and Albania are both important allies in the war on terror. It is essential that the elected leadership of these two great nations remain committed to defeating, preserving, and extending freedom and the rule of law. The citizens of these great countries have already made substantial progress in the fight for democracy. It is unfortunate, however, that a small segment of society has chosen to act nefariously in an attempt to distort the election process by misuse of the Gallup name.

George H. Gallup, the founder of the Gallup Poll, felt that providing a voice to all people around the world would strengthen societies to help ensure accountability of elected representatives. Unfortunately, Mr. Gallup's mission is being tainted by a group of counterfeiters in both Bulgaria and Albania.

These organizations are conducting electoral polling under the Gallup name without permission or license, while all the while receiving American

support through USAID. These actions constitute a clear violation of Gallup's intellectual property rights and, perhaps more importantly, taint the reputation that Gallup has rightfully earned during its 70 years of existence.

While it is true that Gallup is a major employer with its headquarters in my district, Gallup has been active across the country during their existence, providing polling in every Presidential election and several senatorial and congressional elections during that time period. Gallup might employ a number of my constituents, but it is a strong national company with a solid international reputation as well. To see this reputation tarnished with the aid of taxpayer dollars is not only a serious mismanagement of government funds but reprehensible conduct as well.

Mr. Speaker, USAID ought to provide better oversight of the work conducted under their name overseas, and I have called upon them to provide an explanation regarding this matter. Additionally, Congress should do all it can to help ensure that American companies and American intellectual property rights are protected overseas without the willful and wanton negligence of American governmental institutions.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that my colleagues will join me in this call for free and fair elections in Bulgaria and Albania, and support my request to stop the counterfeit polls from being distributed.

IRAQ SOLUTION LIES WITH UNITED NATIONS INVOLVEMENT

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to amplify on the Iraq proposal that I made last night in the House. I believe the solution in Iraq lies with the United Nations and that it is time for direct U.N. involvement to replace U.S. forces and to allow our troops to return home safely and in an orderly way.

The evidence is mounting that America's current approach in Iraq will not work. When was the last time anybody heard the word "coalition" to describe the military activity in Iraq? The world largely perceives the United States as going it alone in Iraq. Furthermore, large portions of the Arab world believe in the insurgency rhetoric that America is an occupier in Iraq for selfish oil reasons and not to serve the needs of the Iraqi people.

Administration claims about the insurgency do not square with the news coming out of Iraq every day or with the sober assessment by America's best military leaders. U.S. and Iraq civilian casualties are mounting. That is what Americans see every night on the news. What Americans want is a sober assessment of Iraq that reflects reality and

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