

compassionate Americans. It hits all the political hot buttons and it makes it seem as though human cloning is a great discovery in our day and age that will cure cancer, diabetes, Parkinson's disease and even keep our country safe from the terrorists by identifying the origins of germ and biological weapons.

However, creating cloned human embryos raises the real possibility that one day they will be implanted into a woman's uterus to create a human cloned baby. Over 95 percent of all animal clonings attempted end in failure; and, like Dolly the sheep, cloned animals have genetic abnormalities.

Most scientists agree that human cloning poses a serious risk of producing babies that are stillborn, unhealthy, and have severe malformations.

Let us not forget the ethical problems associated with human cloning. Cloning is entirely unsafe to practice on human beings because it poses serious risks to the developing cloned baby and to pregnant women due to genetic abnormalities. The attempts to perfect human cloning despite the high risk of injury would constitute a violation of the fundamental principles of all medical research to do no harm.

Research cloning will not only make reproductive cloning more likely, it is unethical. Regardless of what you think about the moral status of human embryos, human beings should not be created solely for research. Human cloning for research involves the creation of a human cloned embryo to be bought, sold and stripped, and exploited for its many parts.

□ 1745

Such proponents have crossed the ethical line universally adopted even by supporters of embryo stem cell research.

As always, in simplicity we find the truth. Human cloning, whether for research or reproduction, involves the creation of a new human life. We have reached a point in our Nation's history where arrogant scientists and medical researchers have become so emboldened with the race to become the first to genetically manipulate human life that they have set aside all standards of human decency, morality, and ethics. They rush to usher in a new era in which genetic alteration of human life is common place; and, therefore, they become the creators of human life. They become the idols of their peers.

I urge my colleagues to not allow such a gross violation of human dignity.

CONFIRMATION OF MIGUEL ESTRADA

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, as of today there has not been a vote on the nomi-

nation of Miguel Estrada to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. Article II, section 2 of the U.S. Constitution states that the President has the power to appoint judges with the advice and consent of the Senate, advice and consent. Those two little words represent the difference between an organized process of judicial nomination and sheer chaos.

President Bush first nominated Miguel Estrada on May 9, 2001, 18 months ago. For 18 long months, we have waited for the confirmation of Mr. Estrada. Time is running out. For the sake of the integrity of the nomination process, for the sake of decency and simple fairness, the process must move forward.

The American people sent us to Washington to get a job done, not to waste time. It is time to vote on Miguel Estrada. The American people do not want obstructionism.

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

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

CONSERVATIVES AGAINST A WAR WITH IRAQ

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, most people do not realize how many conservatives are against going to war in Iraq.

A strong majority of nationally syndicated conservative columnists have come out against this war. Just three of the many, many examples I could give include the following:

Charlie Reese, a staunch conservative, who was elected a couple of years ago as the favorite columnist of C-SPAN viewers, wrote that a U.S. attack on Iraq "is a prescription for the decline and fall of the American empire."

Paul Craig Roberts, who was one of the highest-ranking Treasury Department officials under President Reagan and now a nationally syndicated conservative columnist, wrote: "An invasion of Iraq is likely the most thoughtless action in modern history."

James Webb, a hero of Vietnam and President Reagan's Secretary of the Navy, wrote: "The issue before us is not whether the United States should end the regime of Saddam Hussein, but whether we as a Nation are prepared to occupy territory in the Middle East for the next 30 to 50 years."

It is a traditional conservative position, Mr. Speaker, to be against huge deficit spending.

The Congressional Budget Office estimated that a very short war, followed by a 5-year occupation of Iraq, would

cost the U.S. \$272 billion, this on top of an estimated \$350 billion deficit for the coming fiscal year.

It is a traditional conservative position to be against the U.S. being the policeman of the world. That is exactly what we will be doing if we go to war in Iraq.

It is a traditional conservative position to be against world government, because conservatives believe that government is less wasteful and arrogant when it is small and closer to the people.

It is a traditional conservative position to be critical of, skeptical about, or even opposed to the very wasteful, corrupt United Nations; yet the primary justification for this war, what we hear over and over again, is that Iraq has violated 16 U.N. resolutions. Well, other nations have violated U.N. resolutions; yet we have not threatened war against them.

It is a traditional conservative position to believe it is unfair to U.S. taxpayers and our military to put almost the entire burden of enforcing U.N. resolutions on the U.S.; yet that is exactly what will happen in a war against Iraq. In fact, it is already happening, because even if Hussein backs down now, it will have cost us billions of dollars in war preparations and moving so many of our troops, planes, ships and equipment to the Middle East.

It is a traditional conservative position to be against huge foreign aid, which has been almost a complete failure for many years now. Talk about huge foreign aid, Turkey, according to reports, is demanding 26 to \$32 billion; Israel wants 12 to \$15 billion; Egypt, Jordan, Saudi Arabia want additional aid in unspecified amounts.

Almost every country that is supporting the U.S. in this war wants something in return. The cost of all these requests have not been added in to most of the war costs calculations. All this to fight a bad man who has a total military budget of about \$1.4 billion, less than three-tenths of 1 percent of ours.

The White House said Hussein has less than 40 percent of the weaponry and manpower that he had at the time of the first Gulf War. One analyst estimated only about 20 percent.

His troops surrendered then to camera crews or even in one case to an empty tank. Hussein has been weakened further by years of bombing and economic sanctions and embargoes. He is an evil man, but he is no threat to us; and if this war comes about, it will probably be one of the shortest and certainly one of the most lopsided wars in history.

Our own CIA put out a report just a few days before our war resolution vote saying that Hussein was so weak economically and militarily he was really not capable of attacking anyone unless forced into it. He really controls very little outside the city of Baghdad.

The Washington Post 2 days ago had a column which said, "The war in Iraq,