

the budget is not likely to be in surplus in the next 10 years. I do not want to say that Republicans do not care, but they seem to be really downplaying this as if it does not matter. The gentleman from Wisconsin is right, this is essentially an inheritance tax on our children. They are going to have to pay it back.

I wish we would hear something from the President about how he is going to deal with this deficit because from what I can understand, if we were able to implement his economic stimulus package, if we then made the tax cuts that were passed last year permanent, and then add the cost of the war in Iraq, which might be 2- to \$300 billion, if that happens, we could be talking about a couple-trillion-dollar deficit. I do not understand how, and again it goes back to the credibility gap. He makes commitments how we are going to keep the deficit under control, and then we find out it is very much the opposite.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I believe now is as good a time as any for the baby boom generation, this massive demographic bubble that is working its way through our society and aging ever so gracefully, to step into this political debate. I think the message is being delivered to them that they can have it all, that they can have massive tax cuts today and retirement security tomorrow, when it is really their generation and the challenge that their generation poses that we need to come to grips with.

I have to believe that the President is a good son, loyal and dutiful and listens to his mom and dad. I think it would be wise if the President were to listen to what his father said when it was proposed, this type of economic plan was proposed to him back in the early 1980s, where they would have huge increases in spending, coupled with large tax cuts, which would lead to large budget deficits, which did occur during the decade of the 1980s and the early 1990s. The first President Bush called it voodoo economics because he knew what would transpire.

It is like *deja vu* all over again, the economic policies coming out of this White House: Huge increases in spending, although they want to claim to be the party of fiscal constraint. We had a 10 percent growth in government spending last fiscal year alone. On the current track, we are going to be pretty close to that this fiscal year. Double that with the large tax cuts which have been enacted, with the increased spending and the reduction in revenue, we are going to have massive budget deficits forming. That is why the Office of Management and Budget, their own economic analysts are saying \$300 billion in projected deficits this year alone without even counting a military obligation in Iraq, which could blow the lid off everything else.

I feel there is time to recover. We have not slid too far down that road

yet where, without further budgetary discipline, we could not turn this ship of state around in the nick of time. Unlike the decade of the 1980s and the early 1990s when these huge deficits accumulated, we do not have the luxury of a decade of the 1990s to reduce the deficit and start running some surpluses again in time for this massive retirement that is about to begin with the baby boom generation.

We have a lot of work cut out for us this year, and hopefully some people are starting to pay attention to the looming economic crisis that budget deficits most assuredly will bring, and we will act accordingly.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. The whole goal of this Special Order is to say do not mislead us. If we have a State of the Union Address tonight, be honest where we are going, what we are going to accomplish and what it is going to cost. We are not going to be able to do it all, and the President basically has to confront that issue, and I hope he does.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PENCE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight on the eve of the historic State of the Union the President is going to provide to the American people to discuss the role that Congress has played in a very constructive way, in a very bipartisan way in assisting this President in some of the most difficult foreign policy decisions that have ever confronted this Nation.

We have heard a lot of rhetoric about the partisan politics of this President not doing what he said he would do and this President wanting to go into war and jump ahead of events and threaten the lives of the American people, and we all know that is just rhetoric. This President, to his core, does not want war. This Congress does not want war. This Congress and this President do not want conflict. So when Members on either side get up and spew out rhetoric that makes it appear that this President is bent on creating conflict with Iraq or North Korea, it is untrue.

I want to analyze some of the events that occurred over the recent recess, the role of Congress in a constructive way to assist this President on foreign policy. I want to lay the groundwork for what I think will be the President's comments tonight about some of the most difficult crises that we face today.

Much of the President's speech tonight will focus on domestic issues, and I look forward to that because we have to have a blueprint to restart this economy. He will talk about education, about health care and prescription drugs, and those are issues that we

have to continue to address, and this President has a plan for those issues. He has a national energy strategy that we passed in the House that got hung up in the Senate last year. We passed a prescription drug bill which could not get through the Senate. The President tonight will challenge us to complete the work domestically that he has outlined for us in the past, and he will outline a new vision in terms of jump-starting the economy.

But the real focus has to do with our national security, because as we all know, Article I, section 8 of our Constitution, which defines the role of the Congress, does not mention health care as a key priority. It does not mention the environment as a key priority. In fact, it does not mention education. But Article I, section 8 mentions the responsibility of the Congress. In five specific instances it mentions this: To provide for the common defense of the American people. That is our ultimate responsibility, because without a strong defense, we cannot have an education system, quality health care, or a decent environment. A national security provides that underpinning.

It is amazing to me when I hear the candidates who have announced they are running for the President 2 years down the road get up and spew out this rhetoric about how this President has caused all of these hostile relations with Saddam Hussein and other leaders around the world.

I would remind Members, it was over the past 10 years that when we as a Nation did not enforce the arms control agreements already on the books that technologies were transferred out of Russia and China 38 times. In fact, I had the Congressional Research Service document those 38 instances. Thirty-eight times during the 1990s we had solid evidence of technology being leaked, illegally sold and transferred out of Russia and China to five countries. Those five countries were Iran, Iraq, Syria, Libya and North Korea. What were those technologies? They were chemical and biological precursors that would allow Saddam Hussein to build chemical and biological weapons. They were missile components to allow Iraq and Iran to build their medium-range missile systems that they now have today. They were nuclear components to allow these countries to develop nuclear weapons capabilities.

Mr. Speaker, all that occurred during the 1990s, and the documentation showed it occurred 38 times. Of those 38 instances, we imposed the required sanctions of the treaties less than 10 times. The other 28 times we pretended we did not see it, partly because our policy towards Russia during the 1990s was to keep Yeltsin in power; and, therefore, we did not want to raise any concerns that might embarrass Yeltsin back to Moscow. So even though we knew this technology was flowing, we pretended we did not see it.

I remember very vividly a meeting in Moscow in May 1997 in the office of

General Alexander Lebed. He was a retired two-star general, and had just left Yeltsin's side as his defense adviser.

My bipartisan delegation said, "General, tell us about your military."

He said, "Congressman, our military is in total disarray. Our best warfighters, our best Soviet generals and admirals have left the service of the country because of a lack of pay, because of indecent housing, and because of morale problems beyond their control."

He went on to say that they feel betrayed by the motherland, and they are selling off the technology that we built to use against the United States during the Cold War, and they are selling it to your enemies. General Lebed went on to say to our bipartisan delegation, "Our problem today is your problem tomorrow." How right General Lebed was.

Mr. Speaker, that was in May 1997 at the height of the time when many of us in the Congress in both parties were screaming for enforcement of arms control regimes, because if we had taken steps back then, Saddam Hussein and bin Laden and the rest of these terrorist cells would not have this technology that we are now having to allocate billions of dollars to defend against because Iraq and Iran could not themselves build chemical and biological agents. They got that technology from Russia, a destabilized Russia. North Korea did not have the technology for long-range missiles. They got that technology from China and also from Russia.

So when I hear our colleagues, primarily on the other side of the aisle, taking shots at the President, saying he created all of this, it makes me sad because the facts do not support that conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, we are paying the price today for the inaction of all of us during the 1990s. Since I was a Member of this body at that time, I include myself. We could have and we should have done more to reinforce the transparency and the control mechanisms that were in place to prevent these kinds of technologies from being leaked into the hands of unstable players.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately we are where we are today, and the fact is that Iraq has chemical and biological and nuclear weapons. As a senior member of the Committee on Armed Services, I have sat through hundreds of briefings. I have gone to classified intelligence sessions. While I cannot talk about what I have seen publicly, there is no doubt in my mind, there is no doubt in the mind of anyone who follows these issues, that Saddam Hussein has the worst weapons imaginable.

Mr. Speaker, in Ken Pollack's recent book, talking about the ultimate activity that we are now in against Saddam Hussein, he quotes some U.N. special documents that compare the atrocities of Saddam Hussein's regime to those of Adolph Hitler before World War II.

What is amazing to me is those candidates running for the Presidency on the Democratic side who have criticized President Bush, I did not hear their rhetoric spewing out when President Clinton went to invade Yugoslavia. And as bad as Slobodan Milosevic was and is, and thank goodness he is being tried for war crimes today, even the actions of Slobodan Milosevic do not compare to what Saddam Hussein has committed on his own people.

□ 1545

We know that he has used chemical weapons on his own people. In fact, we had one instance where 15,000 people were killed by the actions of Saddam Hussein.

We know Saddam has a biological weapons program. In fact, in 1992 when Saddam Hussein was driven out of Kuwait, he signed a document pledging to the world community, not just the U.S., pledging to the world community that he would disarm, he would destroy all of his weapons of mass destruction. So the inspectors from the U.N. went into his country. We knew at the time he had chemical, biological weapons. We knew they were there. We saw them. We knew they could be accounted for, and we knew he was developing a nuclear capability.

And yet in the mid-1990's, Saddam kicked out those U.N. inspectors, and we did nothing about it. In 1998 everything was gone out of Iraq while Saddam continued to do exactly what the world community told him not to do and which he agreed not to do in 1992. When President Bush came in in 2000, he said in his very simple analysis we cannot allow this to continue. We are allowing a man who will use weapons of mass destruction against us to build additional capability, and that is why the actions that we are leading up to today through the U.N. and with the President are so essential to be supported by all of us.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I met with some of my Russian friends recently and they said, You know, the problem, Curt, in your country is you get out front and you have all these people taking shots at your President and Saddam Hussein reads that as weakness, he reads that as an inconsistent policy towards him and if he just holds out long enough, the antagonism in America will go away. So in effect those people in some cases crying most loudly for peace are the very ones that might lead us to war. If we as a Nation would get behind this President and show solid bipartisan support that Saddam Hussein has weapons of mass destruction that the world has acknowledged, that need to be destroyed, then Saddam Hussein would get the message that it does not matter how long he can prolong this effort and deny the U.N. inspectors; he must open up and let us see these weapons that we know he has.

Colin Powell yesterday said it best, Mr. Speaker. He asked some very fun-

damental questions: Where are the chemical weapons? Where are the mobile vans? Where are the biological agents that we know we had in the past that all of a sudden have disappeared? And my colleagues would do well in challenging this President to repeat the fact that all we want is Saddam to publicly acknowledge and then allow the destruction of those weapons to take place. Who can be against that, Mr. Speaker? No one. And if he does not do that, then we have to face the possibility of using force to accomplish the security that our Nation deserves.

And some would say the polls do not support the President. Mr. Speaker, no decent President in American history has governed by polls. We do not elect a President to put his finger in the air to read the way the winds are blowing. We elect a President to exert leadership, to be out front where others think perhaps he is going wrong. And this President has showed that leadership time and again. Mr. Speaker, it was this President who moved us out of the ABM treaty.

I would remind my colleagues on both sides, remember what we heard from the liberal left in this city. The world was going to end, a nuclear race would start, Russia and China would go off the deep end. We pulled out of the ABM treaty because of the President's desire to protect our own people, and there was a giant yawn around the world. Ironically today we are looking to do more missile defense cooperation with Russia than ever before. In fact, in a recent visit with the chairman of one of Russia's largest space institutes, Kurchatov, they showed me a document and asked me to support it; but I could not talk about it until the ABM treaty had expired because it would violate the terms of the treaty, allowing Russia and America to work together for the common defense of our people.

George Bush showed leadership. In spite of what the polls said, in spite of what our colleagues said in this body and the other body, George Bush stood up for what was right for America, and history has proven that he made the right decision.

The same thing is applicable now, Mr. Speaker. We have some extremely tough challenges. We have never had a more complicated foreign policy situation than we have today. Thank goodness we have a President who understands people who can lead. Thank goodness we have a President who put Colin Powell in the position of power, who has integrity, who has respect around the world perhaps unlike any other Secretary of State in the history of this Nation. Thank goodness we have a President who put Condoleezza Rice as the head of the National Security Council, his top advisor on security, someone who is not a politician but someone who understands geopolitical issues and is there at the side of the President advising him on policy direction and on procedures to deal

with other nations. And thank goodness we have Don Rumsfeld as the Secretary of Defense, someone who to his core will make sure that our military is the best prepared and the best equipped not to fight a war but to deter aggression. The reason we have a strong military is to deter aggression from those enemies and those adversaries who would want to take us down or who would want to harm our allies and our friends. And Don Rumsfeld plays that role extremely well.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am proud of this administration; and I am proud of this President, and I am also proud of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have worked together for bipartisan support of some very difficult issues.

Mr. Speaker, in December I led a delegation that started out in the former Soviet Republic of Georgia. We went to Georgia for several reasons. First of all, to meet with President Shevardnadze to assure him that we are a key ally that he could count on to help Georgia in rebuilding their Nation, their economy, and this new democracy. We went up and got the briefings on the Pankisi Gorge when we went to Moscow, we could reassure the Russians that the Georgians were doing everything possible along with American assistance to drive out the terrorist cells that had been in the Pankisi Gorge in the past that posed such a threat to the people of Russia.

But perhaps the most important reason we went to Georgia, Mr. Speaker, was our concern that last winter the gas supplies for the Georgian people to heat their homes was cut off. In the middle of the winter they had no heat, and so I invited to meet us in Georgia the president of the primary gas supplier for that Nation. President Igor Makarov of the Itera Corporation met us in Georgia at my request, and I asked him to make a public statement, which he did; and that public statement at our suggestion was to guarantee the people of Georgia that no gas supplies would be shut off this winter so they in fact could not be dangled by anyone using energy, using heat as a source of manipulation. The Congress played an extremely constructive role in that visit, and I thank my colleagues for their support in that effort.

We then moved on to Belarus. Belarus has not been a friend to the United States in recent years. President Lukashenko has drifted aside. He has unfortunately manipulated the Parliament and has caused problems in our relationship. In fact, just before we arrived in Minsk, the capital of that country, he kicked out the OSCE inspectors that were there to monitor human rights, free and fair elections, and the oversight of the OSCE responsibilities that all 55 member nations agree upon.

When I arrived in Minsk, our ambassador, who is a very capable man, said, "Congressman, President Lukashenko is not going to meet with you. He

meets with no one from the West nor from America." I said, "Ambassador, I would not be here if I had not received a personal invitation from President Lukashenko." At five o'clock on the afternoon of the evening we arrived, the foreign ministry from Belarus contacted us at the hotel and said that we were in fact invited to President Lukashenko's home for a private dinner meeting, which I attended along with my colleague from the Senate, Senator CONRAD BURNS, and our colleague from the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT).

We spent 5 hours, 5 hours in the home of President Lukashenko, with the President and two other individuals, one of whom was a good friend of mine. We sat around a table and for the first hour we talked about ice hockey because that is a passion of the President, and Belarus was the Cinderella team in the Olympics in America just a few years ago. And then we turned to more serious issues, and I conveyed to President Lukashenko that we wish his people no ill will, that President Bush does not want to have sour relations with Belarus, but there were certain parameters that Belarus had to get back to so that we in the Congress could support an agenda to assist the people of Belarus in dealing with their economic problems, their health care problems. And those issues deal with free and fair elections, a legitimate Parliament. Those issues deal with the concerns that we have over proliferation coming out of Belarus, and those issues deal with restoring the OSCE representatives back into Minsk.

After 5 hours of discussion, President Lukashenko agreed with our assessment. We shook hands and we thought we had reached an agreement that would last and change a direction of our relationship with this nation that some have called one of the most untrustworthy in all of Europe. Unfortunately, the next day the foreign ministry of Belarus misinterpreted what we had said, and we had to come back publicly and make some very strong statements against the President of Belarus.

A week later, I was contacted by my friend who is a personal friend of Lukashenko, and he said, "Congressman WELDON, President Lukashenko understands that perhaps things were not conducted the way they should have been, the way it was discussed with you and your colleagues." The bottom line is, Mr. Speaker, that 1 month later President Lukashenko in Vienna announced that all six OSCE reps would be restored to their positions in Minsk. Congress again played a constructive role in supporting our President in moving toward a stable relationship with this nation.

We moved on to Moscow, Mr. Speaker, and there we signed a historic document. Members of the United States House, the United States Senate, the Russian Duma, and the Russian Federation Council met together in one

room to agree to a document that we all signed, supported by almost 100 members of our Congress, House and Senate, and the Russian Parliament, Duma and Federation Council. These identical pieces of legislation that we drafted back in the fall call for a new energy strategy that the U.S. should rely on Russian energy sources and move away from the troubled resources of the Middle East. The documents that we signed, which I will present to Speaker HASTERT and President Bush this week, signify a new time in our relationship where the four parliaments understand a new strategic opportunity to move together, to help America move away from Middle Eastern crude, to help Russia realize the financial resources they need to help their economy by selling America her energy capabilities. While in Moscow we also met with the senior leaders of the Russian Government and the Duma and the Federation Council. We talked about arms control and proliferation, and we talked about our strategy for a new relationship, a document that one third of this Congress signed on to a year and a half ago before the first summit.

Mr. Speaker, I am so proud of our colleagues in this body because prior to the first presidential summits, a group of our colleagues who have traveled to Russia, Democrats and Republicans together united, working with those think tanks to focus on Russian-American relations, we produced a 40-some page document with 108 recommendations in 11 key areas to say to our two Presidents that it was time that America and Russia moved together as they had announced publicly in speeches they had given. These 11 areas included agriculture, health care, education, science and technology, energy, the environment, local government, judicial systems, and defense and security. These 108 recommendations, Mr. Speaker, were endorsed by one third of this body and in the other body by our colleagues, Senator JOE BIDEN, Senator CARL LEVIN, and Senator DICK LUGAR, so that when President Bush and President Putin were hand delivered these documents, they both knew that Congress was ready to move our relationship into a new direction.

□ 1600

That was a year and a half ago, Mr. Speaker. In May of last year, when I led a delegation of 13 colleagues to Moscow on the last day of the Moscow summit, we had a luncheon in the Presidential Hotel in downtown Moscow with Members of our Senate, our House, the Russian Duma and Federation Council. One of the former candidates for the Presidency of Russia, Gregor Lavinsky, stood up to give a speech. Mr. Speaker, he held up this document and he said this was the basis of the Russian approach to both summits.

Again, Mr. Speaker, when the Congress unites and takes away the partisan rhetoric, we can accomplish great

things, and we can do it together, with our President, to move us in a new direction, as we have done with Russia.

Mr. Speaker, on our trip to Moscow in early December, I was overwhelmed with what occurred when we went to the Russian Academy of Sciences. In the former Soviet States their Academy of Sciences are the ultimate, the elite, those who really are the most respected people in those Soviet societies.

In Russia, its Academy of Sciences is the ultimate body. It is even a part of the government. Irregardless of who the President is, the Academy is part of the government as advisors.

I had been asked to speak to the Academy of Sciences, so we scheduled a visit. I walked in the room, and there before me were 300 academicians from all over the country. At the head table up front was former Presidential candidate and Communist Party leader Zyuganov, the former Foreign Minister and a whole host of former Russian leaders from all factions.

The Chairman of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Mr. Osipov, was seated at the center of the head table. He brought me to the front and sat me down and said, Congressman, we are asking you to speak about this document for this new relationship which your Congress produced. I said, I will be happy to. He said, following your speech, we will open it up for questions.

I spoke for 25 minutes with our colleagues in the audience before 300 academicians. When I finished, Chairman Osipov asked them to ask us questions, which they did. Some were tough; most were positive.

But, Mr. Speaker, something then very strange happened. Chairman Osipov asked me to stand up and brought out a black cap and black gown, and they asked me to put it on. And then probably the most rewarding event that I have had in all of my years in public office, the Russian Academy of Sciences, the social science network, made me the first American member of their Academy. What an honor was bestowed upon me and all of my colleagues, because it was a process that involved members of both parties.

Following that ceremony, something extremely unusual happened that I wish I could share with every colleague in this body and the other Chamber. The Russian Academy of Sciences voted unanimously to make this document their document; to make our document, *A New Time, A New Beginning*, the official document of the Russian Academy of Social Sciences and to distribute it to every member of the Russian Duma and Federation Council.

Mr. Speaker, when members of both parties come together on foreign policy, we can achieve unbelievable results. We can shape the system, we can open new doors, and our colleagues from both parties deserve the praise that should be lavished on everyone for this new relationship that we have achieved with Russia.

Mr. Speaker, following our trip to Moscow in December, I went back to Moscow a second time in January for another very special purpose. Igor Kurchatov is the founder of the Soviet nuclear bomb. Much like those in America that were nuclear scientists who did not want their careers to focus on killing people, but rather wanted peaceful use of atomic energy, Igor Kurchatov was told by Stalin to build a nuclear bomb to respond to the American program for nuclear weapons following World War II. Igor Kurchatov built the Soviet nuclear weapons program. During the Cold War, it was Kurchatov's work and the work being done at our labs that allowed the two nations to build all of these nuclear weapons.

January 8, 2003, was the 100th anniversary of Igor Kurchatov's birth, the celebration at the institute named after him that day. It is the largest nuclear institute in Russia, with thousands of scientists.

Mr. Speaker, I was given the honor of speaking as a keynote speaker, along with the Japanese Prime Minister and the former Foreign Minister of Russia, to talk about this new relationship and about this laboratory that was built and designed for production of nuclear weapons, but now was being transformed for peaceful purposes.

The director of that lab, Dr. Evgeny Velikhov, is one of my best friends. He is a real scholar and a real leader for all of humanity. He has taken an agency in Russia that was designed to develop nuclear weapons and has transformed it into peaceful projects with our nuclear agencies and labs in America.

I would include at the end of the speech, Mr. Speaker, my speech at Kurchatov entitled *A New Millennium*. That speech outlines a new relationship between the U.S. and Russia to take apart our nuclear weapons, to dismantle our chemical and biological weapons, to follow through on the recommendations in our document to allow the U.S. and Russia to work together.

That speech, Mr. Speaker, was extremely well received on the Russian side, and I challenged them to build a new network of interaction between our labs and the Russian labs.

Following that speech we cut the ribbon on a brand new training facility that is retraining 600 Russian nuclear physicists who used to work on bombs to do software engineering for Russian IT companies working with American IT companies.

Mr. Speaker, we have come a long way. The new relationship with Russia just did not happen. It happened because the Congress, Democrats and Republicans, worked together, following the leadership of Presidents Bush and Putin, who set the vision for our nations, who talked about a new time and a new era of cooperation and support. Amazing things can happen, Mr. Speaker, when this Congress comes to-

gether and realizes that foreign policy challenges require us to act as a common body.

Yes, we can disagree in the process, but not to the point where we undermine our strategic leadership needs as best put forth by Colin Powell and President George Bush.

Mr. Speaker, we want to expand those programs, those nuclear non-proliferation programs, those cooperative threat reduction programs. But let me issue a word of caution to some of my colleagues in both bodies, because some have put out some misinformation that perhaps we in the House do not want these programs to move forward.

Nothing could be further from the truth. To those who have said publicly that the House is trying to handicap cooperation with Russia and dismantling chemical and biological and nuclear weapons, I say hogwash. What we did do last year, Mr. Speaker, as the stewards of the American taxpayer dollars, is to say that every dollar we spend in Russia, we must hold them accountable for how those dollars are ultimately given out.

Why is transparency and integrity and fiscal responsibility so critical here, Mr. Speaker? Well, for one reason, last year there was an audit done by the Department of Defense inspector general, who found \$95 million misused by some unscrupulous people inside of Russia. Mr. Speaker, that is unacceptable. As much as I want to take apart chemical and biological weapons and reduce Russia's nuclear stockpile, I do not want \$95 million siphoned off for some other purpose, and neither does any other taxpayer in this Nation.

For my colleagues in both bodies to stand up and to say in op-eds and public speeches that somehow this body wants to stop those programs is absolutely false and is an outrageous misstatement. All we want in expanding these programs is transparency. All we want are some basic conditions that show the Russian side and the American contractors doing this work in Russia that we want accountability for every dollar spent. We should seek no less for the taxpayers, because it is their money that we are spending.

As the chairman of the subcommittee that oversees much of our defense procurement, I can imagine the outrage if one of our defense contractors could not account for \$95 million of taxpayer money. It would be a national scandal. But there are those in this body and the other body who want to pretend that is not a problem.

This year we in the House will continue to support expansion of programs for nuclear nonproliferation, for cooperative threat reduction. In fact, I am preparing a new package of legislation at this very moment. But in the end we will also guarantee that every dime of money that we spend is accounted for and is not being abused by anyone.

Mr. Speaker, following our trip to Moscow, we went on to Belgrade. We

met with the Prime Minister of Serbia, the leadership of the Parliament there, and we got an update on the progress that Yugoslavia is making following the war of just a few short years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I have to tell you, I was disappointed. We bombed Belgrade, we bombed Yugoslavia, and we promised after the bombing as a Nation and as a group of nations that we would help them rebuild if they followed certain conditions. Mr. Speaker, they have followed those conditions. Our embassy in Belgrade certified to us that they are making progress, yet we, Mr. Speaker, and our allies have not taken the steps to properly support the rebuilding of Yugoslavia, and that is an outrage.

So I come back tonight and I plead to our colleagues in both bodies to work to live up to the promises that we made to the people of Yugoslavia, that they, in fact, can rebuild their country which we bombed just a few short years ago to rid them of the scourge of Milosevic.

Our last stop on that trip, Mr. Speaker, was in Vienna. The trip to Vienna had two purposes, to receive at the IAEA the most recent briefing on nuclear weapons in both North Korea and Iraq. For 2 hours we sat at their headquarters, and they walked us through this Agency's assessment of the nuclear capability and potential of Iraq and the nuclear capability and potential of North Korea.

I would tell my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, it was not a pretty briefing. In fact, I invited the IAEA to come to Washington, which they accepted, where they will allow for every Member of Congress to receive the same briefing, the briefing as to the capabilities of both North Korea and Iraq with nuclear weapons and nuclear facilities such as the reactors that are being built in North Korea, the reactor being built in Iraq, and the potential for that material to be used illegally by either or both nations.

Mr. Speaker, we also in Vienna visited the OSCE, hosted by our very capable Ambassador Steve Minikes. At the OSCE headquarters I had the privilege to speak to 10 of the major nations' ambassadors, including Russia, about America and our policies relative to the OSCE. Ambassador Minikes and the OSCE team is doing a fantastic job. Again, it is because of the bipartisan support of people like the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and those people who involve themselves in the inter-parliamentary dialogue that is a part of the OSCE process.

So, Mr. Speaker, I come full circle, and I come full circle because tonight in a few short hours the President will stand behind us and give a speech, and a major part of his speech will focus on foreign policy. I say to my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, we have proven time and again that we can take on any challenge the Nation has and win if we stick together, if we take apart the

partisan rhetoric and get down to the substance of what America needs to do.

□ 1615

None of us want war. None of us want conflict. None of us want to see Americans go overseas and shed any blood. Now is the time for us to stand together, at the most difficult point in the recent history of this Nation. We face the scourge of terrorism. We face uncertainty in the Middle East. We face China and Taiwan, North and South Korea, India and Pakistan, all of which require us as a Nation to act together; to disagree on the way we approach these solutions, but to do it in a civil way, to show these countries that, in the end, we are united. I would just caution our colleagues in both bodies in both parties to understand the importance of that approach to these very difficult foreign policy challenges.

Mr. Speaker, one final word. Over the recess, as it was for the past year, we have tried to take a bipartisan delegation into North Korea, to DPRK. In May of last year, 13 of our colleagues were together. We went to Moscow, we went to Beijing and Seoul, being promised all along we would get visas to go into North Korea to open some dialogue with Kim Jong-il and the North Korean Supreme People's Congress. We were denied that ability; even though we had been promised, we were not given the ability to travel in there to open doors.

In August we received an e-mail from the North Korean Government to try again. I went back up to the U.N. two more times and met with the DPRK ambassador, Ambassador Han, and pleaded with him to allow us to bring a delegation in. In January of this year, with his support, I reissued a letter asking for support for our delegation to visit, equal Members of Democrat and Republican from this body. With the support of President Jiang Zemin in China, which we received in May of last year personally, and with the support of Kofi Annan who called me at home a week ago and said Congressman, we are behind your effort; with the support of his chief interlocutor who has been working the DPRK issue for the U.N., Maurice Strand; with the support, quietly, of our own government, aware of what we were doing and not telling us to oppose it, the North Korean Government again has consistently opposed an effort, an honest effort by Democrats and Republicans, to open a new dialogue.

So, Mr. Speaker, I thank our colleagues in both parties who have stood together and said, we will go back to Pyongyang, we will take a delegation in, we will have a discussion, we will tell Kim Jong-il and the North Korean people that we wish them no ill will, we do not want a war with them, we want to encourage the south in its effort to establish a peaceful relationship, but there are certain things that the DPRK must do, as outlined by our

President and Secretary of State. They must return to their commitment to a safe policy of relationships with our neighbors. They must end their program of developing highly enriched uranium which will lead to nuclear weapons; and if they take those steps, then we can peacefully cooperate with them. We can become a trading partner, and we in this body can open new doors and new opportunities as we have done with Russia, as we have done with other nations around the world.

So in closing, Mr. Speaker, I encourage our colleagues tonight who have done so much, so much good with so much foreign policy challenge existing around the world, Democrats and Republicans have consistently united; and I encourage my colleagues to look for that opportunity again, so that following the State of the Union tonight we can come out with one voice, with one Nation and say that we all want to avoid war. But we must continue to exert the pressure that was required by the U.N. resolutions in 1992, that was required by the arms control agreements that North Korea has now opted out of, and if they come back to the normalcy that they were once a part of, that, in fact, we can have peaceful coexistence without conflict.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for their cooperation. I will insert the speech, "A New Millennium," that I presented to the institute as a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time.

A NEW MILLENNIUM

To stand before you today—as an American, as a member of the United States House of Representatives—and deliver the keynote address in celebration of the 100th birthday of Igor Kurchatov, is an astonishing privilege. An invitation to attend this important occasion would have been honor enough. That I stand here as a principal speaker is so much more than I could have ever imagined. It is truly a humbling experience.

How far we—the United States and Russia—have come! From adversaries to friends, from competitors to partners—we have moved huge distances from the world of our youth. The cold war is over, finished forever. Today, Russians and Americans are called to be the instruments of a new and, hopefully, more peaceful, prosperous, and democratic world in which each and every human being on this globe will live in peace and dignity.

I have had a lifelong interest in Russia. I have studied Russian language, history and culture. Over time, I have been blessed with many opportunities to travel to this great country. I have learned that the Russians are a proud people, historically aware, and mindful of Russia's unique global role.

I also have a passion for science and the good things it can accomplish. My home city of Philadelphia was the home of a famous American, Benjamin Franklin. As a child I was told of the wonderful discoveries and practical application of science by Mr. Franklin, who is one of the founders of our nation. I have since been interested in what science can do for mankind. Russia and science make such a wonderful combination, a combination that could springboard to a wonderful and prosperous future.

One hundred years ago—on January 8, 1903—Igor Kurchatov, son of a nobleman who was himself the grandson of a serf, was born

to a life of great destiny. Igor Kurchatov was one of those central persons of 20th century Russia, who helped to define Russia's role in the modern world. He was a remarkable man who left his mark and legacy on Russia forever.

We gather here today more than 40 years after his death to pay tribute not only to him, but the institute that bears his name. Indeed, the occasion of Igor Kurchatov's 100th birthday provides us with an opportunity to salute the entire Russian scientific community, especially the nuclear science community. For it is my firm belief that the emerging future of a prosperous, democratic Russia will rely on the hard work and talent of Russia's scientific and engineering community—a community that Igor Kurchatov was instrumental in establishing.

As I briefly trace some of Igor Kurchatov's accomplishments, I want to begin at the end of his life—in 1958, more than 40 years ago. In his last public address, Kurchatov said, "I'm glad that I have dedicated my life to Soviet nuclear science. I believe that our people and government will use science only for the good of mankind."

Today, on the 100th anniversary of his birth, I believe Kurchatov's final wish is coming true. From my position in the United States, I have had the opportunity over the past decade of seeing the Russian scientific community emerge from the shadows of the cold war and turn their formidable talents toward peaceful contributions to Russia and to the world. Even as I speak here today, the men and women in the institute that bears his name are hard at work, beating their swords into plowshares. And they are not alone in this great task—as scientists and engineers at other Russian institutes also turn to science to serve—rather than destroy—humanity.

Igor Kurchatov was both a world-class scientist and a loyal citizen of the Soviet Union. He was the father of the Soviet Union's atomic bomb. His country depended on him to create and provide its nuclear deterrent during the cold war. He succeeded in this demanding task under very difficult circumstances, despite the tyranny of his bosses: Joseph Stalin and Lavrenti Beria. He succeeded very well. The Soviet nuclear arsenal became and remained a serious worry of the United States throughout the cold war.

In retrospect, I can say that the nuclear deterrence of the United States and the Soviet Union provided the basis for stability during dangerous times of enmity and opposition. These weapons kept us from ever firing a shot in war or anger against one another. However we might think about that 50-year era and whether nuclear weapons and the threat of mutual assured destruction through their use was moral or wise, deterrence worked. Both countries—indeed the entire world—escaped the devastation of nuclear weapons because both countries had them and both recognized the consequences of their use.

The scientific infrastructure that Igor Kurchatov created to bring this about is, and will remain his enduring legacy, long after the days of the nuclear deterrence created by the capability of mutually assured destruction fades from our collective memory. What Kurchatov created goes well beyond nuclear weapons and encompasses the entire range of peaceful uses of the atom. No one can dispute the world-class capabilities of Russia's present nuclear science network. It is your inheritance from him.

The later part of Kurchatov's career was spent increasingly on peaceful uses of nuclear strategy. He oversaw the construction of particle accelerators and research in fusion. This new focus occupied him as his

health gradually deteriorated. Like his fellow scientist Sakharov, he called for an end to nuclear testing.

Kurchatov died in February 1960 of a blood clot in the brain. His last public appearance was to attend a performance of Mozart's Requiem. The haunting refrain of *dona eis requiem* (grant them peace) must have rung in his ears as he returned home from the concert hall moments before he died. I repeat that refrain now: *dona eis requiem*, grant the world peace, grant him—Igor Kurchatov—the peace that belongs to a man of peace.

You—the scientists and citizens of Russia—carry his torch into tomorrow. You are carrying it into an uncertain future. The future is always uncertain, no matter how hard we try to prepare for it. Your work will delineate the tomorrows for your children and grandchildren. It will define the future and improve it for Russia and the world. You—the scientists and engineers of Russia—have already begun the next phase of scientific endeavors for your country, and you have done it in the most difficult and troubling of times, and in the face of grave uncertainty.

I stand here today and tell you that you are not alone in this quest. The United States of America will stand with you as you build a new prosperous and democratic Russia. I am proud that the United States has been a partner with Russia and its scientists in so many ways since the end of the Soviet Union. I, as a member of the U.S. House of Representatives, have supported all of the efforts of our U.S.-Russian partnership—whether through the International Science and Technology Center, the Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention, or the Nuclear Cities Initiative. I have supported the joint U.S.-Russian work on nuclear materials—the conversion of Weapons-grade highly-enriched uranium (HEU) into Low-enriched uranium (LEU) for use in peaceful power reactors, the transformation of Weapons Plutonium into MOX fuel, also for peaceful use in reactors, and the safeguarding of nuclear material through the joint Materials Protection Control and Accounting (MPC&A) program.

The list of our partner projects goes on and on. I expect that we shall walk hand-in-hand in the scientific community's efforts against terrorism. These programs are also a key to Russia's and the United States' joint efforts to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

I am particularly interested in how you, the scientists and engineers of Russia, can transform your nation through the commercialization of Russian science, often in cooperation with U.S. companies. I see such commercialization as a key to future Russian prosperity.

Last month, I attended and addressed the annual meeting of the United States Industry Coalition, a group of more than 140 companies working with Russia and other former Soviet republics in cooperative scientific commercial ventures. These private companies have put aside all vestiges of cold war thinking. They are committed to and see the importance of creating jobs and viable business in Russia as their contribution to peace. I believe that such cooperation with the U.S. will help create, if not become, the locomotive of a new and prosperous Russian economy that takes full advantage of your greatest strengths—the thousands of excellent scientists, engineers, and technicians.

The institute that bears Igor Kurchatov's name plays a major role in all of these efforts. Its leaders, Academicians Evgeny Velikhov and Nicholai Nicholaiovich Ponomarev-Stepnoi, have shown an aggressiveness and entrepreneurial spirit that should be emulated by all the science institutes of Russia. They see the future of Rus-

sia in high tech industries. One of the most foresighted efforts in this area is their participation with the United States Industry Coalition to create a sister organization, the National Industry Coalition here in Moscow, to encourage Russian companies to take advantage of Russia's technical expertise in new business ventures.

The Kurchatov Institute is not just standing still, waiting for tomorrow, but it creating the future. I urge all the scientific institutions of Russia to emulate the endeavors of those who are creating a new high tech commercial community in Russia. This need not just be an effort on behalf of weapons scientists.

We have the opportunity to accomplish so many things in our new U.S.-Russian partnership. We are already doing so against the horrors of terrorism and will do much more in that critical area. In fact, there are few areas where the United States and Russia cannot work together.

Last year I put together a blueprint for a U.S.-Russian partnership. This document was endorsed by one-third of the United States Congress. I called it *A New Time, A New Beginning*. In this document I present a new vision for U.S.-Russian relations. I wrote it because I believed then, and even more so today, that now is the time, with Vladimir Putin and George Bush as presidents of our two countries, to improve our relationship for the long-term. It is time to stop the roller coaster ride of the past decade and settle down into a steady forward path. Our route must continue to take full account of defense and security issues, even when they collide. However, it is now time to move beyond these issues as we step into the new millennium. It is time to take a holistic approach to cooperation—one that takes into account Russia's myriad concerns and needs as well as those of the United States.

I would like to describe the series of initiatives that I have proposed. These initiatives take a comprehensive view of what might be accomplished if we—the United States of America and the Russian Federation—set our minds and hearts on them. They deal with initiatives in environment, energy, economic development, and health care—as well as defense and security. Let me describe what I believe can be accomplished if we have the will and perseverance to stay the course.

It is time for greater cooperation on agricultural development. This means not only improving production, but expanding private-sector investment.

We must facilitate Russia's accession to the World Trade Organization (WTO) and its acceptance of all WTO agreements. In addition, we should increase funding for OPIC and the U.S. Export-Import Bank projects here in Russia. Also essential for economic development is improvement of intellectual property rights so that companies will invest here.

Energy and natural resources are one of the great strengths of Russia. We should cooperate in oil and gas exploration, for example in Timan Pechora. Success in joint cooperation on energy will hinge on eliminating bureaucratic obstacles on both sides of the oceans. Our collaboration should investigate the energy security implications in this new environment of sub-national terrorism and the efforts of both our nations to snuff out such terrorism.

Of course, I consider cooperation in science and technology to be a linchpin of our future relationship. Our future economies will rest most assuredly on the ability to capitalize on new science and technology and create new businesses that meets the world's needs.

This cooperation includes cooperation in the area of nuclear fuel cycles. We must put

to rest public concern about the safety, environmental, and proliferation concerns associated with nuclear power. Over the long-term fusion may be the key to the world's energy needs. Therefore, we must cooperate more on fusion research.

We should also cooperate in the embryonic nanotechnology industry.

We have the opportunity to perform joint cutting-edge research in medical technology and treatments. The Department of Energy and Institutes such as MINATOM can collaborate on breakthrough technologies such as radiopharmaceuticals and advanced medical diagnostic and treatment equipment. We can also encourage research on devastating chronic illnesses such as cardiovascular disease and diabetes between the U.S. National Institutes of Health and appropriate Russian Research institutes. Our cooperation would include a more extensive exchange of physicians and scientists.

Scientists would also cooperate in Space and Aeronautics on projects like space solar power, propulsion technology and weather satellites. They would also expand cooperation on marine science research and on developing Russian technologies for environmental protection and remediation.

I would like to see creation of a fund from Russian foreign debt transferal that would be the economic engine for many of these initiatives. For example, commercial success in technology could lead to repayment of loans or grants from the fund. Such repayments could then be the basis for new investments in these programs.

Of course there are many other ways in which we should become partners. I propose to also include cultural and educational development, improvement of the Russian judicial and legal systems in order to firmly establish the "rule of law," as well as assistance to local Russian governments so that they can provide necessary services to the public and also encourage democracy at the grass roots level.

This is a very ambitious agenda that I propose. I put it forward because I happen to believe that there is no limit to what we can achieve in our partnership. After all, it is a new time. And new times call for new beginnings.

Much has happened in the one hundred years since the birth of Igor Kurchatov. The vast scientific and technical complex that is his legacy has done much to advance knowledge and technology. It will do much more if we set our minds to it.

Before leaving Washington to travel to Russia and Kurchatov, I sought the personal feelings and thoughts of another great leader in the world of nuclear physics—a man who met Igor Kurchatov and professionally respected the work of this great man. Born in the same decade as Igor Kurchatov, Edward Teller was a key architect of the early nuclear work of the United States. Now in his 90's, living in California, Edward Teller wanted me to relay his personal feeling on this great occasion.

He said, "like Igor Kurchatov, I long for peace far more than I oppose war." He went on to say that "cooperation between scientists is the most important aspect of the United States and Russia working together—it is a splendid foundation for future progress when former adversaries work together."

One hundred years after the birth of two men who devoted their lives to nuclear research and whose lives and thoughts were focused on peace while their countries used their work for security—it is appropriate that we look to move to a new level of cooperation in nuclear science that forges a 21st century U.S./Russian alliance that builds on and rededicates our two great na-

tions to the peaceful use of nuclear energy for the improvement of the quality of life for all human beings on the face of the Earth.

I propose that we create the Kurchatov-Teller Alliance for Peace that brings together in a formal way Kurchatov Institute and the labs of the Ministry of Atomic Energy with Lawrence Livermore Laboratory (Teller's base of operation today) with Oak Ridge, Argonne, Los Alamos and the labs of our Department of Energy for the specific purpose of enhancing the use of nuclear power worldwide while controlling proliferation. Projects like Thorium Power (that offer so much promise in stopping weapons production and eliminating environmental problems) and cutting edge research by scientists in both nations can be brought together within one new bi-lateral entity that truly moves us into a "New Time and New Beginning."

We are still at the beginning of the 21st Century. Much as Kurchatov set out to do in the last century, we have the opportunity to solve the problems and challenges of the next 100 years. The scientists and engineers of our countries—together with the businessmen and entrepreneurs in both countries—could solve nagging problems of safe, environmentally friendly, and plentiful energy sources. They can solve difficult and complicated medical issues and use science to increase agricultural production. We have an almost limitless horizon before us.

Our task ahead is daunting—some might say impossible. But I am the eternal optimist—perhaps born out of being the youngest of nine children in a poor family. My parents never completed high school, yet they were the smartest people that I have ever met—they had common sense and moral decency.

My father, who only went to the 8th grade, gave me some advice as a youngster that is just as fitting to our challenge. He said in life you can accomplish almost anything that you can dream. He used to say "Your only limitations in life will be those that you self-impose." And that applies to us today.

Together, following in the footsteps of the great scientific leaders of our past, like Igor Kurchatov, our two great nations can solve any problem, overcome any challenge and rise to any occasion for the good of mankind—if we work together as one.

And so, I shall end where I began, by expressing my profound gratitude for the honor you have bestowed on me by inviting me to make this address. I am your friend and I will continue to work for our joint U.S.-Russian interests. Let us work together. Let us clear out the underbrush, let us do away with petty bureaucratic obstacles on both sides of the Atlantic. Both governments have to commit themselves to making cooperation easier, and not filled with time-consuming procedures. You can be assured that this U.S. Congressman will work tirelessly toward this goal.

Again, I thank you for inviting me. I wish you all well. God bless the United States and Russia.

ELECTION OF MINORITY MEMBERS, DELEGATES, AND RESIDENT COMMISSIONERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 35) electing Members, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners to standing

committees of the House of Representatives, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 35

Resolved, That the following named Members, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners be and are hereby elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE: Mr. Peterson of Minnesota, Mr. Dooley of California, Mr. Holden, Mr. Thompson of Mississippi, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Etheridge, Mr. Boswell, Mr. Lucas of Kentucky, Mr. Hill, Mr. Baca, Mr. Larsen of Washington, Mr. Ross, Mr. Acevedo-Vila.

(2) COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS: Mr. Murtha, Mr. Dicks, Mr. Sabo, Mr. Hoyer, Mr. Mollohan, Ms. Kaptur, Mr. Visclosky, Mrs. Lowey, Mr. Serrano, Ms. DeLauro, Mr. Moran of Virginia, Mr. Oliver, Mr. Pastor, Mr. Price of North Carolina, Mr. Edwards, Mr. Cramer, Mr. Kennedy of Rhode Island, Mr. Clyburn, Mr. Hinchey, Ms. Roybal-Alford, Mr. Farr, Mr. Jackson of Illinois, Ms. Kilpatrick, Mr. Boyd, Mr. Fattah, Mr. Rothman, Mr. Bishop of Georgia, Mr. Berry.

(3) COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES: Mr. Spratt, Mr. Ortiz, Mr. Evans, Mr. Taylor of Mississippi, Mr. Abercrombie, Mr. Meehan, Mr. Reyes, Mr. Snyder, Mr. Turner of Texas, Mr. Smith of Washington, Ms. Loretta Sanchez, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Rodriguez, Mrs. Tauscher, Mr. Brady of Pennsylvania, Mr. Andrews, Mr. Hill, Mr. Larson of Connecticut, Mrs. Davis of California, Mr. Langevin.

(4) COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET: Mr. Moran of Virginia, Ms. Hooley of Oregon, Ms. Baldwin, Mr. Moore, Mr. Lewis of Georgia, Mr. Neal of Massachusetts, Ms. DeLauro, Mr. Edwards, Mr. Scott of Virginia, Mr. Ford, Mrs. Capps, Mr. Thompson of California, Mr. Baird, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Meek of Florida, Mr. Emanuel, Mr. Davis of Alabama.

(5) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE: Mr. Kildee, Mr. Owens, Mr. Payne, Mr. Andrews, Ms. Woolsey, Mr. Hinojosa, Mrs. McCarthy of New York, Mr. Tierney, Mr. Kind, Ms. Loretta Sanchez, Mr. Kucinich, Mr. Wu, Mr. Holt, Mrs. Davis of California, Ms. McCollum.

(6) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE: Mr. Waxman, Mr. Markey, Mr. Hall, Mr. Boucher, Mr. Towns, Mr. Pallone, Mr. Brown of Ohio, Mr. Gordon, Mr. Deutsch, Mr. Rush, Ms. Eshoo, Mr. Stupak, Mr. Engel, Mr. Wynn, Mr. Green of Texas, Ms. McCarthy of Missouri, Mr. Strickland, Ms. DeGette, Mrs. Capps, Mr. Doyle, Mr. John, Mr. Allen, Mr. Davis of Florida, Ms. Schakowsky, Ms. Solis.

(7) COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES: Mr. Kanjorski, Ms. Waters, Mrs. Maloney, Mr. Gutierrez, Ms. Velázquez, Mr. Watt, Mr. Ackerman, Ms. Hooley of Oregon, Ms. Carson of Indiana, Mr. Sherman, Mr. Meeks of New York, Ms. Lee, Mr. Inslee, Mr. Moore, Mr. Gonzalez, Mr. Capuano, Mr. Ford, Mr. Hinojosa, Mr. Lucas of Kentucky, Mr. Crowley, Mr. Clay, Mr. Israel, Mr. Ross, Mrs. McCarthy of New York, Mr. Baca, Mr. Matheson, Mr. Lynch, Mr. Davis of Tennessee, Mr. Emanuel, Mr. Miller of North Carolina, Mr. Scott of Georgia.

(8) COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM: Mr. Lantos, Mr. Owens, Mr. Towns, Mr. Kanjorski, Mrs. Maloney, Ms. Norton, Mr. Cummings, Mr. Kucinich, Mr. Davis of Illinois, Mr. Tierney, Mr. Turner of Texas, Mr. Clay, Ms. Watson, Mr. Lynch.

(9) COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS: Mr. Berman, Mr. Ackerman, Mr. Faleomavaega, Mr. Payne, Mr. Menendez, Mr. Brown of Ohio, Mr. Sherman, Mr. Wexler, Mr. Engel, Mr. Delahunt, Mr. Meeks