

toot around, a great way to get rid of the traffic jams on 395 in Washington, D.C. There is also a contraption that has already been built that if you think about it maybe like this, a lectern, the size of a phone booth, that you step in it and it flies. It is an individual spacecraft. It will go about 40 miles an hour and has a range of about 100 miles, right out of Johnny Quest which I know, Mr. Speaker, you have no idea who Johnny Quest was but I know the gentleman from Pennsylvania is an old man like me, he remembers Johnny Quest and Hadji his faithful assistant and Bandit the dog but they would fly around in these things. I am looking forward to that. It will get the kids out of the house. It will be fun.

There are so many things that the private sector is doing in the name of research right now. We are putting a lot of money in our energy bill, into more bold inventions and ways of stretching out that energy dollar. The final component of our energy bill is conservation. My dad was raised in Brooklyn during the Depression, and one of the things he taught us in Athens, Georgia, is you do not leave the room with the light left on. You do not brush your teeth with the water flowing out of the faucet. You take care of the stuff because it is all money. My dad was an early environmentalist, and he did not know it, because he made sure that we used as little energy as possible. And we recycled all kinds of things. But as I drive down Independence Avenue or Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington, D.C. and I see buildings, guess whose buildings have every single light left on? The Federal Government. You can drive by the Department of Energy, and I hate to say it, it does not matter who is in charge, Democrats or Republicans, the lights are left on. We have got to turn the lights off. We in the Federal Government need to lead the way in conservation. That is part of our energy bill, is credits for smart buildings, credits for energy-wise construction and all kinds of things like that. I hope that the other body will take this important piece of legislation up.

We also have other things that we have passed, such as the healthy forests initiative, very important. We have some endangered species relief for our military in a very good defense package. We have Medicare coming up, Medicare reform which will have a prescription drug package. We are going to have some post office reform coming up. A lot of things for veterans. The left does not like it but we did increase veterans health care spending by about 12 percent. I believe they all voted against that. The gentleman from Pennsylvania says yes. We are going to continue to stand up and do everything we can for the veterans. I am a supporter of the veterans history project which the Library of Congress is initiating and was passed under Republicans in the House. The great thing

about the veterans history project is if you are a veteran of any war and you have a story to tell, not necessarily a glorious story but we want to know about your experience in the war, contact the Library of Congress, contact your local Congressman and we can archive that forever so that your great great grandchildren can go back and see what you did in the war.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania on his work on the defense authorization bill. I think it is a great bill, and also for touching the sensitive area of training in the areas where there are endangered species, because I think you have got a good balance in there but many people do not understand that some of the training that our military does has greatly been hampered by the possibility that a species may be there and it is not even confirmed that they are. I represent Fort Stewart. They have a big problem with the red-cockaded woodpecker.

RESULTS OF TRIP TO NORTH KOREA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida). Under the Speaker's announced guidelines, the balance of the majority leader's hour is reallocated to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), and, without objection, his previous order for 5 minutes is vacated.

There was no objection. Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for allowing me to take the rest of this time. It is tough to follow the gentleman from Georgia. He is not only a nice human being but he is a real genuine person as you can tell by the way he handles issues, totally committed to his job and his family. I want to let the gentleman know he is someone for whom I have the highest admiration and always brings a few laughs to us while he use that kind of down-home southern humor to convey the real message of what the American people want us to be doing. I thank my friend and colleague for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, tonight I rise for the major purpose of outlining the results of a trip that I led to North Korea this past weekend, but I want to start out by responding to some of the concerns raised by my colleagues on the other side where they have continued to demagog and basically say that President Bush and the administration lied about the reasons for the Iraqi war. I heard one of our colleagues earlier say, show me the evidence of weapons of mass destruction. I could not help let that go by, Mr. Speaker. I am the vice chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services. I work issues involving proliferation of weapons of mass destruction technology, and for anyone to suggest that there just was not a case of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq is just plain wrong. In fact, all one has to do is go to the U.N. and look through

the records of the U.N. on abuses of human rights and look at the record of Saddam Hussein.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I will at this point in time insert in the RECORD two charts. One is the past Iraqi use of weapons of mass destruction and the second is the amount of weapons of mass destruction that Iraq admitted to having at the time of the war.

1. PAST IRAQI USE OF WMDS

Date	Area used	Agent	Casualties	Target pop.
1983	Haji Umran ..	Mustard .....	<100 .....	Iranians/ Kurds.
1983	Panjwin .....	Mustard .....	3,000 .....	Iranians/ Kurds.
1984	Majnoon Is- land.	Mustard .....	2,500 .....	Iranians.
1984	al-Basrah .....	Tabun .....	50-100 .....	Iranians.
1985	Hawizah Marsh.	Mustard/ Tabun.	3,000 .....	Iranians.
1986	al-Faw .....	Mustard/ Tabun.	8-10,000 .....	Iranians.
1986	Umm ar Rasas.	Mustard .....	5,000 .....	Iranians.
1987	al-Basrah .....	Mustard/ Tabun.	5,000 .....	Iranians.
1987	Sumar/ Mehran.	Mustard/ Nerve.	3,000 .....	Iranians.
1988	Halabaj .....	Mustard/ Nerve.	800 .....	Kurds.

2. AMOUNT OF WMDS IRAQ ADMITS HAVING

Weapon	Effect	Quantity Iraq claimed
VX .....	Nerve Agent—Paralysis and Death	3.9 Tons.
Sarin .....	Nerve Agent—Paralysis and Death	812 Tons.
Mustard Gas .....	Blister Agent—Burns Skin, Eyes, and Lungs.	3,080 Tons.
Anthrax .....	Bio Agent—Lung Infection and Death.	2,200 Gallons.
Botulinum .....	Bio Agent—Death if inhaled or Di- gested.	5,300 Gallons.
Aflatoxin .....	Bio Agent—Causes Liver Cancer ...	520 Gallons.

Mr. Speaker, the facts cannot be refuted. Saddam Hussein was responsible for killing over 20,000 human beings by using weapons of mass destruction. What were they? Mustard gas, tabun, nerve gas. From 1983 to 1988, known facts in this chart which our colleagues can read tomorrow in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are the specific dates, the locations and who was killed. And who was killed? Iranians and Kurds. Innocent people. And what did Iraq admit when in 1991 they in fact were kicked out of Kuwait? What did they tell the U.N. they had? They told the U.N. they had VX, which is a nerve agent, causes paralysis and death. In fact, they publicly said we have 3.9 tons of VX. They said they had sarin gas, nerve agent, causes paralysis and death, 812 tons. They said they had mustard gas, a blister agent, burns the skin, eyes and lungs, 3,080 tons. They said they had anthrax, a biological agent, lung infection and death, 2,200 gallons. They said they had Botulinum, a biological agent, death if inhaled or digested, 5,300 gallons; and they said they had aflatoxin, another bioagent that causes liver cancer, 520 gallons.

Mr. Speaker, this was the leadership of Iraq publicly telling the U.N. what weapons of mass destruction they had. For my colleagues and friends to stand up here and say they do not have any weapons of mass destruction and therefore the administration lied is just wrong and it is really unfair. In fact, every major debate involving the

events leading up to the war in Iraq, both on the Democrat and the Republican side in this body and the other, they were not arguing over whether or not there were weapons of mass destruction, they were arguing over whether we should let the U.N. inspectors continue or in fact get more time or whether we should follow the President's lead because the time had run out. Because we have not found anything since the war ended, their rallying cry is, well, where are the weapons of mass destruction? First of all, you are talking about a country the size of California, which is an extremely large area to go through, to look in every school, every underground complex, every building. And we already have found two trailers that we know were used for the development of weapons of mass destruction. The fact is we are going to continue to look and I am convinced that we will find additional evidence of weapons of mass destruction. But to say that they had no weapons of mass destruction is ridiculous. I have put in the RECORD tonight the documentation of what we have in fact verified, what the U.N. has verified.

But let me get to another point for those who criticize the President. What about Saddam's record of human rights violations? My colleagues on the other side were quick to support Bill Clinton 4 years ago when he decided we should go to war in Yugoslavia, an independent nation, because he decided the human rights record of Slobodan Milosevic was so bad that we should remove him with force. Incidentally and ironically coerced by both the French and Germans, we decided not to go to the U.N. but to bypass the U.N. because the Russians were going to issue a veto of any U.N. resolution and for the first and only time ever in the Clinton administration, we used NATO, which is a defensive body, for an offensive purpose, pushed by France, Germany and the U.S., we invaded a non-NATO country to remove the sitting head of state. Why? Because he had weapons of mass destruction? No. Because he was committing human rights violations.

In the case of Saddam Hussein, every organization on the face of the earth, from Amnesty International to the U.N., has clearly stated that Saddam Hussein's human rights record is far worse than anyone since Adolf Hitler. And so this argument being put forth by the left that somehow the Bush administration was not truthful with Congress and the American people leading up to the war is just plain wrong.

□ 2300

It is a case to try to be used by the candidates running for the nomination of the other party to try to get some kind of traction or leverage against President Bush.

The fact is, we did what we did because Saddam Hussein had a terrible human rights record, he used weapons

of mass destruction. We wanted to make sure he never had that chance to use them again, and that is exactly what we have accomplished.

Mr. Speaker, the real and primary purpose of my special order tonight was to focus on a trip that I just led, we got back yesterday, from North Korea, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

Mr. Speaker, no one from America in an elected capacity had been to Pyongyang, North Korea, for the past 6 years, and in fact the only contact we have had with the leadership of DPRK has been through our State Department diplomats. We had a team there almost a year ago, or last fall, actually, and we had our Assistant Secretary of State, Secretary Kelly, meet in Beijing to have further discussions with North Korea.

About a year ago, Mr. Speaker, I decided it was important that the Congress attempt to understand what was happening inside of DPRK, because of the tensions building between North and South Korea. I wanted to make sure we did not end up in another conflict. So I set out to take a delegation of 13 of our colleagues into Pyongyang last May.

We sat in Beijing and we sat in Seoul for 4 days waiting for the visas to be approved. They never came. The reason given by the North Korean government was that President Bush had referred to North Korea as a part of the axis of evil, and, therefore, they did not think it right we should be allowed admittance to their country.

But, Mr. Speaker, I persevered, and throughout the last 12 months traveled up to the UN on at least two occasions, met with the Ambassador for the DPRK mission at the UN, Ambassador Han, the only representative of North Korea allowed in America, and I talked to him about taking a delegation in.

Every time I met with him, as I have done in all of my contacts, I made sure I talked to the folks at the White House, the National Security Council and the State Department, so I kept them informed.

I used seven or eight individuals and groups that have contacts inside of North Korea to convey the message that it was more important for us to bring in a delegation of non-diplomats. There was an added sense of urgency because in the late summer-early fall our intelligence community gave the evidence to the State Department that in fact North Korea had an active nuclear weapons program under way, which was a clear violation of the 1994 agreed upon framework that was negotiated in the Clinton administration.

So, for all of those reasons I kept the pressure on to take a group into Pyongyang to meet with the officials of that country, not as diplomats, not as representatives of the President, not as representatives of the State Department, but as elected officials from our country, to put a face on the American people and to tell the people of North

Korea that none of us want war, none of us want conflict.

Approximately 10 days ago, Mr. Speaker, at the 11th hour, after I had planned a trip to go to Moscow and then on into North Korea, we were initially told the visas were not coming forward. Then the day after we canceled that trip I got a call from the New York embassy or New York office of the mission at the United Nations and Ambassador Han said Congressman WELDON, Pyongyang has invited you to bring your delegation into my country.

Very quickly we reassembled a team, three Democrats and three Republicans, and traveled to Pyongyang on a naval aircraft. The Navy did a fantastic job in providing support to us. We left on a Wednesday evening and flew all night. The trip took us about 30 hours, with the fuel stops that we had to make in the C-9 we were traveling in, and we arrived into Pyongyang, North Korea, from a stop in Japan, at approximately 9:30 a.m. last Friday.

For 3 days, we were hosted by the leadership of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the DPRK regime.

Mr. Speaker, I would say at the outset that we let it be known going in we were not going in to represent the President of the United States, nor the State Department. We were not going in to do any negotiations. We were simply going in to put a face on America so that the leadership of DPRK that has been so outrageously nasty within their country toward America and the American people should see who we are, not as diplomats, but as ordinary people.

The three Democrats and the three Republicans who went to Pyongyang made it be known that we were not going to negotiate because that is not our position, and in fact we were going in supporting the position of President Bush and Secretary Powell; that a multilateral approach to dealing with North Korea in the end had to be the vehicle, the way to get this issue of this nuclear threat under control.

Our goal was to put the human face on, and we did. In fact, during the 3 days that we were in Pyongyang, North Korea, it was an unbelievable experience. I had asked in advance, Mr. Speaker, to visit 10 sites so that we would not just be taken where they wanted us to go, but rather we would pick the type of sites that we would like to see. In fact, half of those sites they agreed to and we visited.

One was a school, a school with 1,800 children from the age of 3 years to 18 years. It was an impressive sight, a model school for the country. But it gave us an understanding of the support of the DPRK government to educate their children.

The second was the Pyongyang Computer Center, one of three buildings in the downtown city area that are used to develop North Korea's technology and information and the use of computers.

We had to visit a film studio because the leader of North Korea, Kim Chong-Il, has a major interest in producing video productions, actually movies. He does not import any from the West for his people because society in North Korea is totally closed. So I thought it would be relevant to visit what I had heard to be one of the largest studio complexes outside of Hollywood and Orlando, Florida. We visited that site where there are 1,500 employees.

Mr. Speaker, to say the least, it was unbelievable. We were driven through the back lot. I have been through the back lot of Universal Studios, and I can tell you, that this rivaled that back lot. There were scenes for movies that could be shot about Japan, about China, about Korea, about Europe, about the West. All of these sets were established so that North Korea each year can produce between 20 and 25 feature lengths films that are shown in the movie houses of North Korea, which are all oriented toward the propaganda message and the message of the North Korean leadership. So we visited that facility.

We had a shopping visit to interact with the ordinary people that were in the city. We visited restaurants.

Mr. Speaker, on the last day we were there, we were scheduled to meet with the Minister of Trade, but I asked the delegation the night before if they wanted to do that meeting, and they said not really. So I told the representative who handles U.S. issues for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs that we did not want to go to the meeting with the Minister of Trade, but instead on Sunday morning we wanted to go to church.

They agreed. They picked us up at our hotel at 9:45 in the morning, and six Members of Congress went to church in a Protestant church on a hill in North Korea, in the middle of this closed society, where there were no pictures of Kim Chong-Il or Kim Il-Song, his father, but rather were crosses, and with 300 people we worshipped in a Protestant church, much like churches all over America do every Sunday morning. So we had a good glimpse of this closed society.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, I have visited the Soviet Union when it was communist many times and I visited China under its communist system. North Korea makes those two societies in their worst days of communism look like an open society. It is an absolutely closed society to the outside world, no access to outside media, no access to newspapers, totally closed. In fact, limitation on people traveling in is also closed.

But, Mr. Speaker, we are in a tense situation right now, because North Korea has admitted publicly in our meetings that we held that they have nuclear weapons today. They admitted that they are reprocessing the 8,000 nuclear rods from their nuclear power plants and they admitted that that reprocessed nuclear weapons grade fuel

will be used to build more nuclear weapons.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that if North Korea uses the fuel from those 8,000 rods, they will have the ability within a year to build four to six additional nuclear weapons. That is unacceptable, Mr. Speaker, and that is why we have to aggressively at this point in time move in to find a common way to solve the nuclear crisis that exists between North Korea and the rest of the world.

The thing I wanted to mention to our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, is after meeting with the leadership, after meeting with the foreign minister, the speaker of their parliament called the Supreme People's Assembly and the vice foreign minister, I came away convinced that we in fact can find a way to get the North Koreans to give up their nuclear capability.

□ 2310

Tomorrow morning I will talk to Secretary Powell on the phone, and I will relay to him the exact details of what I think could become the basis for his experts and professionals to conduct negotiations within the context that the President and the Secretary of State have defined to allow us to move away from the brink of nuclear war.

Mr. Speaker, the alternative is unacceptable. The alternative would be for North Korea to continue to develop nuclear weapons. If we try an economic embargo, they would likely offer to sell their nuclear weapons to other nations, rogue groups, terrorist organizations. That is unacceptable.

Regime change by means of war I think is unacceptable, at least until we make every possible effort to find a way to convince the North Koreans, as President Putin and Chinese President Hu Jintao have said, to have them remove nuclear weapons from the Korean Peninsula.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include the trip report, and I would like to thank our congressional delegation Members, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ORTIZ), who was my co-chair; the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES); the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL); the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON); the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER). They were a dynamic team, and together we have now brought back to our colleagues the knowledge and a fuller understanding of this nation that has been so secretive.

But more importantly, we bring back to America the possibility that we can resolve this nuclear crisis on the Korean Peninsula through peaceful discussions and through peaceful resolution. Hopefully, Mr. Speaker, under the leadership of our great President and our Secretary of State and Condoleezza Rice, our security adviser, we will in fact this year be able to solve this very difficult challenge in a peaceful way.

The material referred to earlier is as follows:

U.S. CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION (CODEL) WELDON VISIT TO NORTH AND SOUTH KOREA—DEMOCRATIC PEOPLES' REPUBLIC OF KOREA (DPRK) AND REPUBLIC OF KOREA (ROK), MAY 30–JUNE 2, 2003

OVERVIEW

*North Korea DPRK*

The delegation was the largest congressional delegation to visit the DPRK and the first CODEL to visit the DPRK in five years. The visit occurred during a period of escalating tensions between the DPRK, the United States, and nations of the region resulting from the DPRK October, 2002, admission of its nuclear weapons-related uranium enrichment program. Subsequent DPRK withdrawal from the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT); confirmation of its possession of nuclear weapons; expelling of IAEA inspectors; declared intentions to reprocess its spent fuel; continued sales of missiles and technology to terrorist nations; and allegations of nation-sponsored drug trafficking all served to further raise tensions between the DPRK and the international community.

The delegation visit was the culmination of over a year-long effort by Representative Weldon to gain entry into the DPRK for the purpose of engaging senior DPRK officials in informal discussions, free of the formality of traditional posturing and imposed pressures of negotiation objectives, to share mutual perspectives on the major political, military, and economic issues.

The resulting visit achieved its purpose by providing the Members an opportunity to engage senior DPRK officials (attachment 2) in lengthy, candid, unstructured, and often pointed, yet respectful, discussions, in several venues covering the complete range of outstanding issues. While discussions with senior DPRK officials included the predictable hard line rhetoric associated with recent DPRK public statements, balanced discussion took place in the formal as well as more personal informal sessions. The demonstrated goodwill and willingness to go beyond first level posturing gave the delegation reason to believe that there are options that should be considered to avoid conflict and resolve critical outstanding issues in a way satisfactory to both sides. There is unanimous agreement within the delegation that a way must be found to initiate discussions in an agreed framework at the earliest possible opportunity. Concern exists that failure to address these critical issues in a timely manner could result in the proliferation of nuclear weapons and/or technology to terrorist organizations and States.

Repeated statements were made by the DPRK leadership that their brief is that the Bush Administration seeks regime change in North Korea. "The Bush Administration finds regime change in different nations very attractive . . . and is trying to have regime change, one by one. This kind of conduct damages the U.S. image in the world and weakens the leadership role of the U.S. This is the heart of the question. If the U.S. would sign a non-aggression pact, we would give up nuclear programs and weapons." The DPRK seeks normalization of relations and non-interference with its economic relations with South Korea and Japan. Chairman Weldon indicated he did not believe regime change to be the goal of the U.S.—and stated his position of not advocating regime change. The issue of regime change is seen as the determining factor in whether a peaceful resolution to the current standoff is possible.

Chairman Weldon also stated his concern that the establishment of a DPRK nuclear weapons program would lead to similar programs in surrounding nations. He cited Hu-

Putin statements calling for a nuclear free Korean Peninsula. The DPRK, Vice Minister Kim, acknowledged this as a valid point, but indicated that the other nations can rely on the U.S. "nuclear umbrella," while the DPRK has no such option.

A major issue often voiced by DPRK officials remains a requirement on their part to achieve a satisfactory framework for bilateral discussions because of their belief that certain issues "are too serious" to be dealt with in a multilateral framework. The delegation believes flexibility exists within a multilateral framework to satisfy the DPRK officials desires for bilateral discussions.

Requested visits by the delegation to the Pyongyang Information (Computer) Center, a school for gifted students, Kim Il Sung's birth place, the North Korean movie studio production facilities, and a Christian church as well as casual evening social events permitted the delegation to interact with a wide variety of North Koreans and to travel to several sections of the city.

Prior to departure, Ministry of Foreign Affairs officials extended an open invitation to the delegation for a return visit and further indicated a willingness to consider visits to the Yong Byon nuclear facility.

#### *Seoul, ROK*

In Seoul, the delegation was hosted by President Roh for a breakfast meeting, met with Foreign Minister Yoon, Members of the National Assembly, Ambassador Hubbard, General LaPorte, and other officials to discuss the meetings in the DPRK. The ROK officials expressed their appreciation for the efforts of the delegation and reinforced the need for dialogue with the North.

#### *Observations*

Each of the senior DPRK officials with whom the delegation met cited the importance of the visit, given the current tense relationship between the DPRK and the U.S. They also noted their understanding of the role of Congress and that the delegation was not visiting to negotiate issues for the United States, but to enhance mutual understanding between the two nations.

In each of the meetings, Chairman Weldon cited the past and continued importance of inter-parliamentary exchanges in improving relationships with nations and improving the well-being of the peoples once considered to be enemies of the United States, including the People's Republic of China and the U.S.S.R., and expressed his belief that this could be the case with the DPRK once normalized relations could be established. He also expressed his belief that no one in the Congress wishes ill-will toward the North Korean people and that no one wants another war.

Each of the senior DPRK officials noted the tense international situation and sought to place the blame on the U.S. "because the U.S. seeks to make us give up our military forces which safeguard our political system." Each of the leaders also cited their preference for the "Clinton approach" in the bilateral relationship and took strong exception to President Bush's inclusion of the DPRK as part of the "Axis of Evil." They stated their belief that such a characterization demonstrates that the U.S. is unwilling to "accommodate with our country" and the U.S. seeks regime change. "Further, the U.S. is enlisting other nations to prepare a nuclear first strike—seeking to blackmail and intimidate us . . . The U.S. does not want to coexist with us . . . And not only does the Bush Administration not want to coexist, but wishes to get rid of my nation with its nuclear strength . . . We see the U.S. preparing for a military strike . . . The U.S. must change its hostile policy." Without necessarily supporting the Bush Administra-

tion policies toward the DPRK, all members of the delegation agreed with Representative Engel's point to DPRK officials, that violations of the 1994 Agreed Framework by the DPRK were the reason for the current tensions, not Bush Administration policies.

The DPRK officials stated their belief that the situation can only be resolved by acceptance of the current leadership—coexistence—and dialogue. And in the meantime it intends to continue to develop its "restraint capability" (nuclear deterrent). "We have tried dialogue and have been patient . . . Our willingness to meet in Beijing in April shows our flexibility to allow the U.S. to save face, showing our flexibility and sincerity to resolve the issues at any cost . . . We have not had concrete results. The Bush Administration has not responded to our request for bilateral talks—they are more focused on our first giving up our nuclear program . . . This causes us to believe that the Bush Administration has not changed its policy about disarming my nation . . . We want to conclude a non-aggression treaty between the two countries and avoid a military strike on my country."

DPRK officials explicitly reconfirmed their nation's possession of nuclear weapons and repeated previous public statements regarding the reprocessing of the 8,000 spent fuel rods from the Yong Byon facility. They also indicated they will use the reprocessed materials for making weapons. They further indicated that the only option open to them, given their inclusion in the "Axis of Evil" and U.S. refusal to engage in bilateral discussions, "is to strengthen and possess restraint (deterrent) capability and we are putting that into action . . . I know some say we possess dirty weapons. We want to deny they are dirty ones . . . I apologize for being so frank, but I believe you have good intentions and I want to be frank. We are not blackmailing or intimidating the U.S. side. We are not in a position to blackmail the U.S.—the only super power. Our purpose in having a restraint (deterrent) is related to the war in Iraq. This is also related to statements by the hawks within the the U.S. Administration. Our lesson learned is that if we don't have nuclear restraint (deterrent), we cannot defend ourselves."

DPRK officials maintained that their nuclear program is only for deterrence and not being pursued to seek economic aid—that "we only wish to be left alone. The nuclear issue is directly linked to the security of our nation . . . We need frank exchange on nuclear policies." DPRK officials indicated that economic sanctions would be viewed as a proclamation of war.

#### *Attachment 1*

CODEL WELFON—Members of Congress: Curt Weldon (R-PA); Solomon Ortiz (D-TX); Silvestre Reyes (D-TX); Joe Wilson (R-SC); Jeff Miller (R-FL); Eliot Engel (D-NY).

Professional Staff: Doug Roach; Bob Lautrup.

State Department Interpreter: Tong Kim.  
Navy Escorts: Commander Lorin Selby; Lt Commander/Dr. Erik Sawyers; Lt Frank Cristinzio; Lt Tamara Mills.

#### *Attachment 2*

DPRK—PAEK, Nam Sun, Foreign Minister; KIM Gye Gwan, Vice Minister, Ministry of Foreign Affairs; CHAI Tae Bok, Chairman, Supreme People's Assembly (SPA); CHO, Seung Ju, Director General, Bureau of U.S. Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs; RHEE Sang No, Director of External Affairs, Presidium of SPA; PAK Myong Guk, Director of U.S. Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

ROK—ROH, Moo-Hyun, President; YOON, Foreign Minister; YOO, Jay-Kun, Member, National Assembly; KIM Un-yong, Member, National Assembly; LEE, Jae-joung, Mem-

ber, National Assembly; SONG, Young-gil, Member, National Assembly; LEE By-ang, Member, National Assembly; PARK, Jin, Member, National Assembly; KIM, Suh-woo, Chief of Staff to the Speaker, National Assembly; SOHN, Jang-nai, former Ambassador to Indonesia; Thomas C. Hubbard, U.S. Ambassador to ROK; General Leon LaPorte, Commander, USFK.

#### HEALTH DISPARITIES AMONG MINORITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for the remaining time before midnight as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I had planned to talk about health care as a result of the Congressional Black Caucus' chairman, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), coming to Chicago on Sunday to participate in a forum dealing with health care issues that is going to be held at the Illinois Institute of Technology.

But listening to much of the discussion this evening as special order speeches have been made talking about tax cuts and tax breaks and which groups got them and which groups did not, I could not help but be reminded of the fact that President Bush has been in office now for about 2 years after being selected by the Supreme Court, and has actually presided over one of the worst downturns in our Nation's history. We have lost 2.7 million jobs, as many as 500,000 in the last 2 months alone. The only answers that I have heard the Republicans give is, tax cuts, tax cuts, and more tax cuts as we have gone from a surplus to a \$350 billion deficit, the largest deficit in the history of this country.

As I listen to all of the information about tax cuts and the inability to give certain groups a break, the top 1 percent of the tax cuts that we have made will receive on an average of \$24,100 in 2003, this year. Those with incomes of more than \$1 million will receive an average of \$93,500.

I hear people talk about what will happen for small businesses, and 52 percent of small business owners will only get between zero and \$500. Seventy-nine percent of the benefits will go to individuals who have incomes of over \$100,000. Twenty-nine percent of the population will go or 29 percent of the breaks will go to individuals who make more than \$1 million.

More than two-thirds of the tax cuts will go to the top 10 percent of the population, and over 50 percent of the tax cuts will go to the top 5 percent of the population. The bottom 60 percent of the taxpayers will only get 8.6 percent, averaging less than \$100 a year for the next 4 years. The average reduction for the richest 1 percent will be \$103,899 for 4 years. Thirty-nine percent will go to this tiny group. The best off 1 percent of the population will get 52 percent of the benefit.

I am not one that always pays a great deal of attention, but oftentimes