

from wells in the continental United States now.

But the sad fact is, we cannot rely simply on oil production as an only or major source of solving this problem. The reason is that while we consume 25 percent of the world's oil, there is only 3 percent of the world's oil reserves in the continental United States. We use 25 percent, but we only have 3 percent of the world's reserves.

The Creator did not put enough dead dinosaurs under America to solve this problem simply by oil production. That is why we cannot rely on the Arctic, which is only about somewhere between 6 months' and a year's worth of production, and which would not be on line for 10 to 12 years, in any event.

There are two pieces of this puzzle that my friends across the aisles left out. Number one, they talk about this, that they will only put a 10,000-acre imprint or footprint on this beautiful area. I have been to Prudhoe Bay, and I can tell the Members that it looks more like New Jersey than it does Yellowstone National Park. We do not need that in the Arctic wilderness refuge.

They say it is only 10,000 acres on this, what they call the imprint where the industrial sector would meet the tundra. The problem is, everything is built in Alaska on stilts, and the only thing they count in that 10,000 acres is where the stilts touch the ground. It is sort of like measuring how much your furniture in your office covers your office by where the little corner of your desk leg touches the tile. That is a gross distortion. This place is going to look like an industrial production plant if this wildlife refuge is destroyed by making it into an oil facility.

I realize that not a lot of Americans are going to see the Arctic wilderness, wildlife refuge. It is very remote. But I think a lot of people think of this sort of like the Mona Lisa. A lot of Americans will not see it, and maybe it is only like putting a little small mustache on the Mona Lisa to put this 10,000 acre industrial plant; but it is a mustache, nonetheless, and it would not look good on the Mona Lisa, and it is not going to look good on the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

The best argument I heard about that is from a young environmentalist constituent of mine from Bainbridge Island, Washington, his name is Sam Zuckerman. Mr. Zuckerman told me that in his view, we ought to leave it for the kids and our grandkids. I think Mr. Zuckerman is right, that we should do so. I think that is the American sentiment.

I also may note that the people who live in the area are divided on this issue. The native Americans who live in the Arctic village who depend on the caribou herds, which potentially could be threatened by this development, are adamantly opposed to this. But we ought to know this, this refuge belongs to all Americans, not to any one of us. All Americans should have something

to say on this. All Americans ought to have the opportunity to give this spectacular place to their children and to their grandchildren.

With that, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I just hope that in the next day or two while we are talking about energy in this Chamber that our effort to have this new Apollo energy project will be joined by some of our Republican colleagues.

We ask for their assistance in passing this, because America needs something more than half measures. We cannot break our addiction to oil with baby steps. We cannot solve the global warming problem with baby steps. We cannot grow the U.S. economy by these half measures that are now proposed in the Republican bill.

□ 2300

It is time to embrace and use the American talent for technological innovation. And it is time for the U.S. Congress to recognize both the challenge and the promise of what America can do when it comes to developing these new technologies.

There is a group in Lake Union, Washington called MagnaDrive, some former people from Boeing run it, and they have developed an electric motor coupling device which can increase the efficiency of an electric motor of about 30 percent. A fellow came up with this technology literally in his garage from Port Angeles, Washington, and now they are selling this to various building companies for their air conditioning systems to improve their electric efficiency.

We are going to solve this problem by 10,000 new inventions like that, by asking Americans in their garages, in their large corporate research and development facilities, to bring us into the next century. So I hope tomorrow or the next day we will indeed adopt this new Apollo energy project to give us, not an energy program for the last century, but one for the next century that is befitting the can-do talents of the American people.

UPDATING THE WAR WITH IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 60 minutes or until the hour of midnight, whichever comes first.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for recognizing me, and I will not take the full hour, but I rise this evening to discuss and put on the record some concerns about the current war and about where we are going and some problems that we will face in the future, and I hope to lay these comments on the record so that our colleagues can use them for the basis of discussion and perhaps action over the next several weeks and the rest of this session.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, what we saw today on our national television

around the world is a complete vindication of the efforts of our President, our Secretary of Defense, our Secretary of State, the National Security Advisor, and most importantly our military. We heard nothing but shrill rhetoric coming out of this city, and in some cases coming out of this body, from those who said that military action was not justified and that it would not be successful.

Now, granted we have not completed this action, Mr. Speaker, but here we are 3 weeks after the actual military conflict as begun and we now have secured a major portion of Iraq and the capital city of Bagdad. Saddam Hussein is on the run. He either has been killed or he is hiding like a coward and is looking for a way out, perhaps in the neighboring country of Syria.

But, Mr. Speaker, through all of this our military has performed in an absolutely astounding manner. The brave men and women of America who went over to serve have done an absolutely fantastic job. Our hearts and our sympathies go out to those family members of those brave Americans and British troops who paid the ultimate price and to those hundreds who have been injured and have received casualties because of this conflict.

But in the end, Mr. Speaker, the plan established by our Pentagon leaders was a valid plan, is a valid plan, and, in fact, has accomplished not only what we could have in our wildest dreams imagined and expected, but it has even surpassed our expectations in the success, in the efforts to secure the oil fields, to open the port facilities, to prevent missiles from being lobbed into Israel and Jordan and Kuwait which we knew the Iraqis wanted to do, to show the people of Iraq in all the cities that we are there not to dominate or take over their country but rather to liberate them and eventually turn the country back to them so they can elect their own leaders in free and fair elections.

Mr. Speaker, as well as things are going we must also look to where we are going to the future. And I mention that because we need to continue to pursue several other issues. The first of which is the request to convene a war crimes tribunal, not just to hold Saddam Hussein accountable but to hold the leaders of his regime accountable.

Several weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, I introduced legislation which has received scores of Members who have co-sponsored it to create such a war crimes tribunal. Yesterday, Senators SPECTER and BAYH and I announced the reintroduction of a concurrent resolution between the House and the Senate that calls for this war crimes tribunal. We hope to have this legislation passed both bodies within a matter of weeks. And the legislation specifically focuses not just on the well-documented war crimes of Saddam Hussein himself, but also of those leaders in his entourage and those military leaders and those military police and thug leaders who

have increased the amount of atrocities they have committed on the innocent Iraqi people, our POW's and our troops over the past 3 weeks.

Mr. Speaker, I am talking of people like Tariq Aziz. Tariq Aziz has been invisible over the past several days. I met the man over a decade ago when we had the attack on the USS *Stark*. I know him. And I want our colleagues to go on record as saying that, Tariq Aziz, you will be held accountable. You will not be able to walk away from this conflict because you publicly on international TV supported the types of activities that were used in direct violation of the Geneva Convention that resulted in the deaths of Americans POW's. And, Tariq Aziz, wherever you are, you will pay the ultimate price if it takes us the rest of our lifetime to track you down and put you in the proper attitude of a criminal court, much like we are trying Milosovic right now in the Hague.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that this war crimes resolution be brought up on the floor of this body and the other body to send a clear and unequivocal signal to the leadership of what is left of Saddam's regime that they will be held accountable for what they have done and for what they continue to do. The best thing these leaders of a former regime in Iraq can do is to lay down their arms, turn over our POW's, blend into society and admit, in fact, that Saddam's regime was oppressive and out of control. And if they do that and if they do not commit war crimes, then, in fact, they will not be held accountable under this action. But we will pursue those people who have, in fact, committed war crimes. And, in fact, we have asked our military and our allies to document, along with the Iraqi people, to document dates, times, places, so that in the end justice will prevail for the years and years of human rights abuses that Saddam Hussein and his regime have perpetrated on innocent people. And especially in recent times on our POW's and our soldiers who were sucked into situations where people were pretending to be coming forward in a gesture of surrendering, hiding behind the garb of civilians only to inflict serious wounds and killings on our troops. All of which is unacceptable under the international rules of conflict. So, Mr. Speaker, this is an item that I would hope all of our colleagues would support.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to address the cost of this conflict. As the vice chairman of our Committee on Armed Services and the chairman the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces which oversees the bulk of our procurement dollars for the military, we are facing a crisis. We have used significant amounts of ammunition in this conflict. We have tested the machines and equipment from helicopters, to tactical aviation units, to our ships, to our ground combat vehicles. There is need for repair, upgrades, improvements and replacements of this equipment.

Now, granted, Mr. Speaker, the emergency supplemental that President Bush asked for that has passed this institution will go a long way to meet those immediate shortfalls that have to be taken care of; but, Mr. Speaker, we are beginning, when we return from this two week period, to mark up our defense authorization bill for fiscal year 2004. And, Mr. Speaker, we have serious problems. We are going to have an extremely difficult time in meeting the kinds of resources challenges that will allow us to motivate an increase in our ship building program, to continue to purchase those unmanned aerial vehicles, to move forward in our tactical fighter programs, the FA-18, the joint strike fighter and the F-22, as well as continue to pursue missile defenses like the PAC-3 that was so successful in this conflict, or THAD or our international missile defense capabilities.

To do all of those things is going to require us to be extremely prudent in how we spend the Defense Department dollar. And I want to send out a signal to our colleagues that many have come forward and ask for specific add-ons in our defense bill this year. In fact, within the jurisdiction of my subcommittee alone, Mr. Speaker, I have received requests from our colleagues on both sides of the aisle that total \$14 billion above what the President has asked for. Now, in the past we have been able to meet the needs of many of our colleagues as long as, in fact, their priorities have been requested and are supported by the military services.

□ 2310

Our policy has been and will be in this new markup process in May that we will not be able to even consider requests for add-ons where the military services have not, in fact, indicated their support. To plus up that kind of funding would, in fact, be a gross disservice to the men and women serving our country.

To our colleagues I say, during the next several weeks and months, we are going to have to make some difficult decisions about which priorities we, in fact, can fund.

It is also going to provide, Mr. Speaker, a unique opportunity for us. I think there are some ways that we can, to some extent, revolutionize some aspects of our defense spending and free up some money that can help us meet the shortfalls caused by the war.

Within a period of several weeks, Mr. Speaker, I will be coming out with a new initiative that I have discussed with my colleagues in this body on a number of occasions, but I hope it receives strong bipartisan support that will unleash the power of the private sector to privatize much of our military base housing around the country.

Currently, and what has been the practice in the past, Mr. Speaker, is that we use taxpayer dollars to fund the construction of new family housing and barracks units for our troops. These construction projects are ex-

tremely expensive, very inefficient and oftentimes, because we do not have the funding to maintain them, within a matter of a few short years, these housing units become extremely costly to operate and, in fact, have serious problems.

The private sector, which for years has been developing university housing for our university campuses and other types of private sector funding, have come forward and told us as they have shown to both the Army, the Marine Corps and the other services, that they can take the needs that we have in housing, and using private funding that they secure from private sector lending institutions, they can finance the actual construction of brand new family housing units and barracks units on any base throughout this Nation.

In taking this approach, it negates the need for the Federal Government and our Defense Department to put the funding up front to build these homes. In fact, the private sector will come in, design the homes, family housing, barracks units, to the specifications of our military, will abide by contracts such as those that have been developed especially by the United States Army and allow us to build state-of-the-art housing units with all of the amenities that are even much more improved over what exists today, as well as providing infrastructure in the form of water piping, sewer system, playgrounds, swimming pools and community centers, and do it all within the cost of what we are currently spending in terms of housing allowance for our troops.

By taking a bold initiative, Mr. Speaker, as I will present and offer over the next several weeks, we can, in fact, put into place a multibillion dollar 5-year housing renewal program for our troops. This multibillion dollar program, which could see as much as \$20- to \$50 billion of new housing, is a real shot in the arm for our local economies, provides brand new state-of-the-art housing for military bases around the country, totally funded with private dollars.

By doing that, giving the upgraded housing to our troops so that we can maintain and increase the quality of life for their families and for these troops that will be coming home from Iraq, by taking those actions, we can then reduce the military construction budget where we spend between \$2.5 to \$3 billion every year. That money then, Mr. Speaker, can be channelled into those program shortfalls that we are going to have to meet this year because of the Iraqi war.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, we are going to have to be prepared in this body to support the President in aggressively asking our allies, those that especially did not provide troops in that 50-Nation coalition, to put money on the table to help us defray some of the costs of this conflict.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the revenues realized from the sale of Iraqi oil also should be used, especially to help

in the beginning of the rebuilding of Iraq and the stabilization of Iraq's infrastructure and their economy, and that should begin immediately by using the frozen assets that President Bush and the administration have frozen over the past several years.

Mr. Speaker, we talk about reconstruction of Iraq. We need to understand the activities in rebuilding Iraq, while led by the U.S. and Great Britain, and I fully support that process, must also involve the Nations of the world. I think it would be extremely shortsighted for us, as much as many of us have very serious reservations about allowing those Nations that were not a part of our coalition benefit, I think it would be a serious mistake for us if we did not allow the U.N. to play a constructive role.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, Nations of the world, along with the U.S., have frozen over \$6 billion of Iraqi funds that are currently being held in banks around the world. That money cannot be accessed unless all the Nations of the world are a part of a coalition with us. So I encourage the administration, as Secretary Powell and as the President has stated, to work together with the U.N.

Make no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker, I think the U.S. and Great Britain and Australia should play the lead role, and I think our companies and our consulting contractors should have an edge over those other contractors and Nations that did not see fit to support the liberation of the Iraqi people.

Let me talk about the three most prominent Nations that did not support us in this effort, Mr. Speaker, the first being Germany. Some would say that we should not allow Germany, France and Russia to play any type of role in a post-Iraqi renewal. I think we have to look at this very carefully Mr. Speaker.

In the case of Germany, she has been a long-time ally of ours, and if we look and listen to the leaders of the German military, if we listen to much of the mainstream political leadership coming out of that Nation, it is very supportive of the U.S. and our position. My own feeling is that our problem with Germany resulted from a regime that today is very unpopular in that Nation, and I think the feeling towards Germany should be focused on the leadership of that Nation as opposed to the German people. They continue to house significant amounts of our troops and our military bases in Germany, and their military continues to play a very close working relationship with our troops.

Hopefully, Germany will deal with its own leadership problems internally, and hopefully, the German government will, in fact, take action separate from the words and actions of Mr. Schroeder that will allow Germany to again become a solid partner of ours.

In the case of France, Mr. Speaker, I would say perhaps it is a different

story. France has also been a long-term ally of ours, and I have been a long-term friend of both the Germans and the French. In fact, I was to have received the highest award that France offers for homeland security in traveling over there in March which I refused to do because of my concerns for the comments of both their foreign minister and President Jacques Chirac.

My concern with France is much deeper than it is with Germany, Mr. Speaker, because it is not just one person. It is, in fact, a pervasive attitude among the leadership of France that the U.S. was inherently wrong in our effort and that we should be condemned really by the Nations of the world for the actions that we took in regard to Iraq.

As I wrote to President Chirac and President Schroeder one month ago or several weeks ago when this conflict started, I cannot understand how they could be more hypocritical.

Mr. Speaker, I would remind our colleagues that it was only 4 years ago that Jacques Chirac was pounding on America's door, begging and imploring us to send our troops into harm's way in Yugoslavia. It was the same Jacques Chirac who recently said that America should be condemned for taking military action without U.N. support. It was the same Jacques Chirac who 4 years ago convinced our President at that time, along with the German leadership, that we should use America's sons and daughters, through NATO, the first time NATO had ever been used since NATO is a defensive organization, a collective organization of countries that pledge to defend each other, the first time in the history of NATO that it was used in an offensive mode to attack a sovereign non-NATO Nation. Because of Jacques Chirac and because of the German leadership and our own President, in fact, we sent more troops than either Germany or France. We invaded a sovereign country to remove a leader because of his human rights violations.

Mr. Speaker, all of us, including myself, acknowledge that Milosevic is a war criminal, and he is justifiably being tried in The Hague for his crimes, but Mr. Speaker, as we all know, when that conflict started, we did not want Russia involved. In fact, the only way we ended that conflict after our aerial bombing campaign did not dislodge Milosevic was to convince the Russians to come back in and as a part of the G-8 process help us negotiate a framework to get Milosevic out of power.

In the end, Russia was a key ally, but if we remember just 4 years ago, it was the same Jacques Chirac who was telling America we cannot go to the U.N. to get Security Council support for the action against Milosevic because Russia will veto any Security Council resolution. So the same Jacques Chirac, who was today condemning America for not getting a U.N. resolution of support, is the same man who 4 years

ago convinced America not to go to the U.N. but to invade Yugoslavia in a NATO-led mission to remove a leader of another Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I really have a problem with France. I think France has made some very fundamental blunders in its relationship with the U.S. that are not going to be easily healed. I do not want to create rifts between Europe and America, but Mr. Speaker, the continued arrogance of Jacques Chirac and the French, as we now look to rebuild Iraq, is mind boggling to me, and I think the French people have to understand this is not some parting feeling that we have that will go away quickly.

□ 2320

The feelings of the comments, of the actions taken by the leadership of the French Government, to me, are despicable, and France is going to have to eventually answer for the actions and the lack of support they have taken. And, most importantly, for the absolute hypocrisy of the French Government 4 years ago in sucking us into a conflict with our troops without going to the U.N. and then now saying that we should not have used our military to remove the worst human rights abuser on the face of the earth since Adolf Hitler and Joseph Stalin.

And, Mr. Speaker, that is not my assessment. That is the assessment of Max Vanderstahl, the U.N. Special Rapporteur For Human Rights, who just a few short years ago documented, in an official U.N. publication, that there has been no regime since Adolf Hitler that has committed the kinds of human rights abuses that Saddam Hussein has been documented as having committed, including Milosevic.

So, Mr. Speaker, France is a different story. And my own feeling is that we should look very closely at any involvement of those companies and entities in France, especially those funded with government subsidies because, as we all know, significant parts of the French economy are directly tied to the French Government. And I for one, Mr. Speaker, will have an extremely tough time justifying any governmental entity that is a "business entity" benefiting in the reconstruction of Iraq.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me talk about Russia. Now, I am not here to make apologies for Russia. I was extremely disappointed that Vladimir Putin did not come out and support the United States in our effort. I was convinced, as someone who chairs the interparliamentary dialogue with the Russian Duma, as someone who has traveled to that country many times and knows all of their leaders, I was convinced that Russia would in fact support us. And I am still convinced to this day that if it had come down to a U.N. vote in the Security Council that Russia would have abstained as opposed to vetoing or opposing a resolution. That would be my best guess.

But, Mr. Speaker, let me talk about Russia for a moment. What Russia did in not supporting us was wrong, and I have conveyed that message very strongly to my friends in Russia in the Duma, the federation council, and to the Russian leadership. Likewise, I have expressed in very strong terms, as I have done for the past 10 years, my outrage that technology has continued to flow out of Russia into the hands of Iraq and other unstable nations. And that is an issue that we have to deal with that I will talk about in a moment.

But I want to look at the Russian perspective for just one moment, Mr. Speaker, and I want us to try to put ourselves in the minds of the Russians. Because since Putin has decided to fundamentally put his country in the camp of the U.S. and the west, there has not been much that we have done to give him political victories back home. After all, Mr. Speaker, it was the U.S. that pulled out of the ABM Treaty.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, I have been a leader in saying that that treaty had outlived its usefulness. But we all know that the ABM Treaty was an extremely important political statement in Russia in terms of bilateral security with the U.S. The fault with the ABM Treaty was not that we pulled out of it, as President Bush did, with my support, it was how we handled the pulling out of the ABM Treaty. We did not give Putin any degree of cover politically back home in his country.

And the same thing occurred with the expansion of NATO. Again, I supported the expansion of NATO and all of those countries that are currently NATO members, including the Baltic States; the former Soviet states of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania; the former eastern block nations, all of which are a part of NATO. I absolutely supported the membership of those countries into the family of nations in NATO. But, again, from the Russian perspective, we move NATO up to Russia's doorstep. Again, we did not take the appropriate steps to give Putin the political cover to his people that this was not some kind of an overt move or some kind of overt effort to try to threaten Russia and its stability and security.

The third thing was, Mr. Speaker, the war in Kosovo, which I just described a moment ago, 4 years ago, where we bombed Milosevic and deliberately kept Russia out of the equation. In fact, Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago I led a delegation of 11 of our colleagues to Vienna, five from the Democrat side and five from the Republican side. I let each of those 11 Members read on the airplane ride to Vienna an internal memo that was written by Strobe Talbott to Vice President Gore and Sandy Berger that outlined the fact that we did not want Russia involved in helping to find a solution to get Milosevic out of power. So, again, we sent the wrong signal to Russia.

And, finally, Mr. Speaker, the one priority that Russia has consistently asked for, that President Bush promised he would deliver to President Putin over 1 year ago, was the elevation of Russia out of Jackson-Vanik restraints. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is strong overwhelming bipartisan support in this body to elevate Russia out of Jackson-Vanik, and many of my colleagues have cosponsored that legislation. President Bush promised President Putin over 1 year ago that we would elevate Russia out of Jackson-Vanik. Because of actions by Members in the other body over issues like poultry imports and steel imports, action was never taken on elevating Russia out of Jackson-Vanik. So another commitment that we made to Russia never materialized.

So if you look at it from Putin and Russia's standpoint, it really has been a one-way effort in terms of trying to convince the Russians that we want to be their equal partner. That does not justify Russia's action in not supporting us. In my opinion, Russia should have been with us because they have the same problems with terrorism that we have. And, in fact, I might add, Mr. Speaker, Russia has been very cooperative in working with us in sharing intelligence and allowing us to use airspace and allowing us to use former Soviet military bases for our troops in fighting the war against terrorism.

But my disappointment in Russia and its position is also partly modified by the reality of what happened over the past several years that I think caused Russia not to be as supportive as perhaps they should have and could have been.

□ 2330

Mr. Speaker, in Russia today we still have a major problem. One of the points that I have made to my colleagues repeatedly over the past 10 years is that much of our problem with homeland security today has come about because we did not enforce the requirements of arms control regimes in the mid to late 1990s that allowed technology to flow out of Russia into the hands of five nations, Iran, Iraq, Syria, Libya and North Korea.

As a student of Russia and someone who has spent much time working with the Russian leaders, during the late 1990s I saw instance after instance where we had solid evidence that technology, including chemical precursors, biological technology, technology associated with missile systems, and conventional weapons was being sold out of Russia into the hands of people in those five unstable nations. In fact, in 1998 I did a floor speech where I laid out in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD documentation prepared by the Congressional Research Service outlining 38 times that we caught Russian and Chinese entities illegally transferring technology to five nations, Iran, Iraq, Syria, Libya and North Korea. In all 38 of those cases, we did not take the ap-

propriate steps. In fact of the 38 cases, we imposed the required sanctions 8 times.

I was in Moscow in January 1996 a month after the Washington Post ran a front page documenting the story of accelerometers and gyroscopes for Iraq's missiles. I went to see our ambassador, Tom Pickering, in Moscow in January. I asked, What was the Russian response? That is a violation. They are not allowed to transfer that kind of technology to Iraq. His answer was, You have to ask Washington, I do not make that call.

I wrote to the President and he wrote me back in March, Dear Congressman WELDON, I share your concerns. We are investigating the allegations that are in the Washington Post, and if it did occur, it would be a violation of the missile technology control regime, but we have no evidence.

Since I work closely with the intelligence community, several of my friends in one of our agencies brought in a package and showed me two devices which I have used in speeches around the country probably 500 times, a Soviet-made accelerometer and a Soviet-made gyroscope that we caught being transferred out of Russia to Iraq 3 times.

During the year that our President told me he was investigating the transfer of illegal technology to Iraq, we caught Russian entities illegally transferring technology 3 times. Over 100 sets of those devices were in the hands of our intelligence agency. What were they used for, to improve the accuracy of the missiles that Saddam Hussein fired against our troops in 1991 and tried to fire against our troops just over the past several weeks.

Mr. Speaker, the problem of our homeland security today is because we did not take the appropriate steps in the 1990s to secure the weapons of mass destruction within Russia's borders. We made some success, the Nunn-Lugar program, the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program, and the Nuclear Nonproliferation Program did make good strides. They allowed us to take apart nuclear weapons and dismantle offensive arms. They allowed us to begin to control the amount of chemical and biological agents and understand them. But even that program did not go far enough. In fact, that program did not have enough in the way of accountability to make sure the funds that we were expending were being used for the proper purpose for which they were intended.

Just this past month, we held a hearing in the Committee on Armed Services where over \$100 million of U.S. money was paid to a U.S. contractor to build a plant in Russia that was supposed to destroy fuel that Russia had which we felt was a potential threat.

After \$95 million of that money was spent and the plant was completed, we realized that Russia no longer had the fuel. They in fact used the fuel for their space program leaving us with a

\$95 million empty plant and an absolutely red face.

Mr. Speaker, in our programs to help Russia control and monitor these weapons of mass destruction, it is essential that we have accountability. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to my colleagues, now is not the time for us to back away from engaging Russia in helping her control these technologies that are the reason why we went to war in Iraq in the first place, these chemical and biological agents, these weapons of mass destruction, these potential nuclear programs.

In fact, it was retired Soviet General Alexander Levitt who entertained a delegation that I took to Moscow in May of 1997 who responded to a question I asked him about the status of the Russian military in this way. I said General Levitt, you have just left President Yeltsin's side as his top defense adviser. You have been in a position of overseeing all of Russia's military on behalf of your country's President. Would you tell me the status of your military?

He looked at our bipartisan delegation and he said it is in total disarray. He said our best Soviet war fighters, our most competent Soviet generals and admirals have left the service of their country because they have not been paid. They do not have decent housing, and morale among our troops has never been worse. So Congressman, all of those technologies and weapons that we built during the Cold War to use against you are being sold by those generals and admirals, and they are being sold to your enemies.

How right he was in 1997 to tell us what would happen in the future. Those Soviet generals and admirals, not the Russian government, those Soviet generals and admirals who felt betrayed by the motherland resorted to selling off technology to unstable leaders like Saddam Hussein. So today in Iran, Iraq, Syria, Libya and North Korea, we have technologies that flowed out of Russia into the hands of evil people and are now being considered for transfer to unstable terrorist organizations.

Now Russia still contains vast amounts of weapons of mass destruction. When I had Dr. Alexa Yobakov come to Congress in the fall of 1998 to testify before my subcommittee, and he is perhaps the most respected environmentalist in all of Russia, he said this about Russia's chemical weapons stockpile. He said publicly we have claimed that we produce and have 40,000 metric tons of chemical weapons. But he said my hunch is that our actual inventory is probably closer to double that amount, 80,000 to 100,000 metric tons of chemical weapons.

These are the same chemical agents that we have been so concerned about Iraq using. We cannot now move away and not help Russia stabilize the security of those weapons and destroy them because if we do, they will ultimately get again in the hands of the wrong people.

Likewise, Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union before it became Russia and a nation that divided itself, produced significant amounts of biological weapons. In fact, a good friend of mine, Dr. Ken Alibek, who at one time was the number two leader of the Soviet agency that produced the biological weapons for the Soviet Union and is now a professor at George Mason University here in the States, in testimony again before my subcommittee in 1998 and in his book "Biohazard" that he has produced nationwide, Ken Alibek talks about the significant amount of biological weapons that the Soviet Union produced again to use against America. In his book he documents 60 strains of anthrax, smallpox, botulism, VX gas, mustard gas, all of which the Soviets produced and stockpiled so that one day they might have to use them against us. Well, those stockpiles are still there, Mr. Speaker. Those biological agents are still stored throughout the former Soviet Union.

□ 2340

It is not enough for us to pull away and think that somehow Russia is going to have the money and the will to take apart and destroy all of those chemical and biological agents.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, in the transition of Russia from a communist society to a free market democracy, many of their most competent nuclear scientists are out of work. They used to produce nuclear weapons, nuclear warheads. Today they have no work. They are driving taxicabs. So it is equally essential that we not allow those scientists to end up working in Iran or Iraq or North Korea or Syria or Libya or China or India or Pakistan, helping them develop a new generation of nuclear weapons.

For all of those reasons, Mr. Speaker, it is essential that we renew our effort to help Russia, in spite of our concerns with their position on the Iraqi conflict, to stabilize, secure and destroy those weapons of mass destruction.

Because of that, Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, joined by my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, with our lead minority sponsor the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), I will introduce the most comprehensive nuclear nonproliferation cooperative threat reduction program with Russia and the former Soviet States in the history of our relationship.

This 35 page bill will be introduced tomorrow. I would encourage our colleagues on both sides of the aisle to sign on as original cosponsors. At this point in time we have approximately 10 Members of the Republican Party and 10 Members of the Democrat Party. I have not yet introduced the bill, nor have I sent it out for consideration.

Tomorrow this comprehensive legislation will be filed, which builds and expands upon our successes in the Nunn-Lugar program and the nuclear nonproliferation and weapons of mass destruction programs and creates new

possibilities to go into Russia and to help them identify, secure and destroy these nasty weapons that we do not want to get in the hands of other leaders that might one day do what Saddam Hussein did in Iraq.

It is absolutely essential, Mr. Speaker, now at this critical juncture, that we redouble our effort with Russia to help her stabilize and destroy these most nasty weapons that are the most significant threats to our homeland security.

This legislation, Mr. Speaker, is creative. It creates a number of new initiatives, all of which are involved to have a closer working relationship.

Mr. Speaker, in my initial discussions with the Russians, they have told me if America passes this kind of comprehensive legislation, they will work with us to open up all of those other secret sites that up until now Russia has been unwilling to allow our scientists to visit.

If we truly want to secure the homeland, Mr. Speaker, then we have to go to where the threats are, and the threats to our security and our homeland, the threats of chemical, biological, nuclear strategic missile systems, are contained within the confines of the former Soviet States.

This legislation gives us new initiatives to address those threats cooperatively with Russia, and, in doing so, convinces the Russians that they have got to stop keeping some of their facilities closed and off limits, but rather allow us to work collectively together.

It also provides something new, Mr. Speaker. It provides for an accountability process that will prevent future expenditures of U.S. money from being misspent the way we have seen dollars misspent in past programs, where the projects were not in fact doing what was intended to be done and did not accomplish the objectives that we laid out initially.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleagues to join on this legislation tomorrow morning. Our press conference at 9:30 in the Capitol will be attended by support groups that I think represent the broad cross-section of ideology in America. The Carnegie Center for International Peace, the Heritage Foundation, the Organization of Vietnam Veterans and the Nuclear Threat Reduction Campaign will all join with us in a bipartisan announcement to put forward a new initiative, a bold initiative that allows us to deal with the underlying threats to our homeland security, the reasons why we had to go to war in Iraq, because Saddam had obtained these terrible technologies from a destabilized Russia.

Mr. Speaker, the minister of atomic energy from Russia, Rumyantsev, is in our city tonight. I will be meeting with him tomorrow morning at 9 a.m. I know the minister well. He wants to work with us in a constructive way to reduce threats. We must seize the opportunity and the initiative. We must not allow ourselves to be clouded, to

think that somehow pulling away from Russia is the answer. It is the worst solution. It is the worst alternative in terms of dealing with the concerns of our homeland and its security.

So I would encourage our colleagues to look at this legislation, to cosponsor it and to work to get it brought up on the House and Senate floors as quickly as possible.

Finally, in closing, Mr. Speaker, let me just speak a word or two about a man who I think will go down in history as the 21st century Winston Churchill. I was not a big fan of Tony Blair's up until this year, Mr. Speaker, but let me tell you, I have changed my mind.

You know, Britain went through a very difficult time when Adolf Hitler was in power in Germany, and I remember from my history lesson the position of Winston Churchill as a minority voice in Great Britain, calling out for the people to be wary of this man Hitler and what he might do to dominate people around him and to eventually inflict pain on Britain.

The people of Britain laughed at him. They said Churchill was an alarmist. Instead, they listened to Neville Chamberlain. Neville Chamberlain had a very famous meeting with Adolf Hitler. At that meeting he supposedly received assurances from Adolf Hitler that Hitler had no intention of harming Great Britain, that Hitler had no intention of harming Europe.

So Neville Chamberlain went back to Britain and gave a famous speech. In that famous speech he pronounced those famous words: "Don't worry, Britain. Peace is at hand." Within a matter of a few short weeks, Britain was being bombarded with missiles launched by Germany, Adolf Hitler.

It was Winston Churchill who then rose to prominence. It was Winston Churchill, who had been mocked by the people of Britain, who stood up and provided leadership, and perhaps Britain, Europe and the world's worst hour. It was Winston Churchill who had the courage to do the right thing, in spite of the animosity generated by the people of his Nation and by those who said, "We can negotiate with Hitler. He will listen to us. He has agreed not to attack us and agreed not to harm Europe."

Thank goodness for Winston Churchill, that he was there, to call to arms Great Britain, Europe and eventually America.

I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, Tony Blair is the Winston Churchill of the 21st century. Under absolutely outrageous odds, from his own party, internal bickering and sniping at him, to the British people, to world opinion, to the European leaders, his neighbors, Tony Blair stood up, and he stood for his convictions, and he did the right thing.

So, Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight in final summary of my discussion about the war to pay tribute to someone who I think will go down in history as an

equivalent to Winston Churchill in the 21st century, a man who stood up and did the right thing under impossible conditions.

Now, that is not to minimize the leadership of our great President. George Bush provided the vision, but it would have been far easier for Tony Blair to blend in with the European crowd, with the Jacques Chiracs, the Gerhard Schroeders, and said that is not our battle, that is not our worry. Tony Blair did not do that.

This Nation, this body and the world owes Tony Blair on this evening of the celebration of the stabilization of Iraq and Baghdad a tremendous vote of thanks.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURGESS). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1724. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, Department of Defense, transmitting notification of the decision to order up to 150,000 additional workstations under the Navy Marine Corps Intranet (NMCI) contract; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1725. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report required pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 12302(d), relating to those units of the Ready Reserve of the Armed Forces that remained on active duty under the provisions of section 12302 as of January 1, 2003; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1726. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report entitled, "Devolution of Research, Development, Test and Evaluation Programs and Activities Beginning in FY 2004"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1727. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting notification regarding the Department's study required by the Senate Armed Services Committee report accompanying the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2003; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1728. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the annual report of the Armed Forces Retirement Home for Fiscal Year 2001; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1729. A letter from the Director, Corporate Policy and Research Department, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits — received April 3, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1730. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's annual financial report to Congress required by the Prescription Drug User Fee Act of 1992 (PDUFA) for

fiscal year 2002, pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 379g note; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1731. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medical Devices; Reclassification of the Knee Joint Patellofemoral Metal/Polymer Porous-Coated Uncemented Prosthesis and the Knee Joint Femorotibial (Uni-compartmental) Metal/Polymer Porous-Coated Uncemented Prosthesis [Docket No. 00N-0018] received April 3, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1732. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Labeling Requirements for Systemic Antibacterial Drug Products Intended for Human Use; Correction [Docket No. 00N-1463] (RIN: 0910-AB78) received April 3, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1733. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — New Animal Drugs; Phenylbutazone; Extralabel Animal Drug Use; Order of Prohibition; Correction [Docket No. 03N-0024] received April 3, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1734. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report entitled, "Policy on terminating the Arab League Boycott of Israel and expanding the process of normalization between the Arab League countries and Israel," pursuant to Public Law 108-7, section 535; to the Committee on International Relations.

1735. A letter from the Administrator and Chief Executive Officer, Department of Energy, transmitting the 2002 Annual Report of the Bonneville Power Administration, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 839(h)(12)(B); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1736. A letter from the Chief Operating Officer, Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board, transmitting the Board's annual inventory of activities; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1737. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Financial Report of the United States Government for Fiscal Year 2002 (Financial Report); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1738. A letter from the Director, Holocaust Memorial Museum, transmitting the Annual Performance Report for Fiscal Year 2002; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1739. A letter from the Executive Director for Operations, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting a report on Year 2002 Inventory of Commercial Activities and Inherently Governmental Functions; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1740. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting a report on the Federal Activities Inventory Report Act Inventory as of June 30, 2002; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1741. A letter from the Chief Judge, Superior Court of the District of Columbia, transmitting the Superior Court's Family Court Transition Plan; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1742. A letter from the Architect of the Capitol, transmitting a report discussing the AOC's activities to improve worker safety during the first quarter of FY03; to the Committee on House Administration.

1743. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting a biennial report on Atlantic Bluefin