

The budget resolution also cut Pell grants for colleges, cut safe and drug-free schools by \$200 million, improving teacher quality by \$105 million, education technology by \$134 million, and also eliminated 28 important educational efforts, such as dropout prevention, rural education, an area that is really hurting because of the disparate resources there, civics education, and numerous technology and training programs.

It is important that we live up to our commitment at this level. Because if we do not, even though the Federal Government only puts in, depending on the local jurisdiction, 6 to 7 percent, and in North Carolina it is probably no more than about 7 percent of the total budget because the bulk of it is State and local, that is an important piece of money because it sends a powerful signal. It says that this is a priority at the national level; we really do believe in what you are doing, and here is how we want to help those who have fallen behind.

Historically, Federal monies have been to help those who had needs in specific areas, by and large children with special needs, which we really are not meeting that obligation. We originally said we were going to pay a substantial amount more than we are now paying. We are paying 20 percent, and we should be paying more like 60 that we committed to. But these kinds of shortsighted cuts are wrong for our children, and they really are wrong for my home State and I think for the other States who are struggling to meet the needs and who really want to make a difference in children's lives.

I just hope that as this session moves on, and we are now getting into moving into the appropriations process of the budget, which will be coming up in the next several weeks, that we will correct some of these problems; that we will put the resources in that are needed so that teachers can teach and they will have the resources to meet their needs. Because if we do not put in the resources that we need and we put the mandates in for the things we want them to do, and then we threaten to hold back other monies if they do not live up to that obligation, what we do, the people we hurt the most are not the wealthy school systems in this country. They may be getting few of the resources on a percentage basis to the budget than a lot of others, but the ones who are really getting hurt are the children, in most cases, who are the most vulnerable, those in the poorest school systems, the children with special needs who get some of the money.

All those areas that are on the edge are the very youngsters that we are going to need to help. So I think sometimes we do not really understand when we pull the cord and not put the resources in place. Mr. Speaker, it has been my experience in the few years I have been here that we put together a lot of words, and talk is awful cheap.

But at a time when we spend a lot of time back and forth about appropriations and budgets and so on, a lot of stuff gets lost in the sound and fury of the debate. But at the end of the day it really is about budget and spending choices that we have to make that really defines the kinds of priorities that we ought to have, and they really express our values as a Congress and as a people.

I trust that in the next several weeks that we will show that we really do value education, because we know that lifetime learning is the key to the American dream for every family, middle class, wealthy, and those who are struggling to get into the middle class. As I said earlier, in today's global economy, America's international competitiveness is absolutely dependent on our people's ability to perform knowledge-based jobs that produce the best products and services in the world. And if we are going to continue to compete, we had better be about making sure the next generation of Americans in this new economy of this Information Age can be able to earn based on what they have learned.

And it is so true. It is as true today as it was last year; but it will be more so over the next 10, 20, 30, 40, 50 years. And so we have been trying to get Congress to give higher priority to strengthening our public schools, really our neighborhood schools; and by doing that they will demonstrate how much we value the education of our children and how much we care about the communities we live in. It is irresponsible, in my opinion, to talk about how much we value education and how much we care about the future and about our children when we come to this floor and squander the opportunity to make a difference and not put the resources in place to help our children be successful.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say that both our immediate and our long-term security needs depend on our investment in education. It is as critical today as it has ever been in the history of this country. You have heard others talk earlier about a number of things, but it is about looking at the future and how do we, as Members today, help those teachers in the classroom and the administrators teach our children to make decisions for tomorrow. We cannot allow children to be continually placed at risk by being condemned to less than quality facilities, and that same thing would be true for curriculum and instruction. That means we have to put the resources in where we can.

We cannot put them all in. We will never have enough, I realize that. But it has to be a partnership, and a true partnership with State, locals, and, yes, with the private sector to make sure that teachers get the skilled training they need and the ongoing training. Too many times we say to these professionals, you are professionals, we believe in you; and yet,

when they walk out of the classroom and they need to get their certificates renewed or upgraded, they have to take it out of their own meager salaries to pay for it. We do not do that in any other profession I am aware of that pays that kind of wage in this country, but we do it to teachers. And that is wrong. We can do better, and we ought to be doing better.

I think America is looking to Congress to provide leadership on these urgent national priorities, and I trust that not only my Democratic colleagues but my Republican colleagues will also join me. I certainly can say to you that I stand ready to help deliver on that because I think it is critical to the future of this country. We will not get many more opportunities. Even though these are challenging times and resources are tight, if we spend them wisely, we can have a very bright tomorrow. Our children will inherit a better country, and our democracy will be safe and secure. I really believe that an educated citizenry is important to maintaining a democracy. We have seen it around the world. When we do not have quality education, we are in trouble.

I will close with this, Mr. Speaker. If we want to look at Afghanistan as a place, the first thing they did was shut down the schools. Of course, the first thing they did was oppress the women and then they shut down the schools. But the truth is if you poison the minds of young people and do not give them an opportunity, your future is pretty grim. We are not going to let that happen in America. We are going to work together to make it better. We have the chance, we have limited resources, but we can target them, we can build better schools, we can help those teachers in the classrooms who are telling children about the better world they will have. Someone has said if you want a better world, tell a child, they will build it.

RECENT BIPARTISAN TRIP TO RUSSIA, CHINA, UZBEKISTAN AND NORTH KOREA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OTTER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I will perhaps not take the entire hour, but I want to take this opportunity to review a recent congressional delegation trip that I led over the Memorial Day recess.

Mr. Speaker, this was a historic trip, and one that has laid the groundwork for, I think, some future historic activities for this Nation in a number of areas. The trip was to basically countries involving Russia, a visit to Moscow and then on to Tashkent, Uzbekistan; on to Beijing, China; Seoul, Korea; visiting military sites along the way. And the only disappointment of our trip was that we

had planned to be the first large bipartisan delegation into Pyongyang, North Korea, to begin a dialogue with the leadership of that nation to lower the tension and the rhetoric and to see if we could not find some common ground in comparison to the recent negative feelings between the U.S. and the North Korean leadership.

□ 1900

Unfortunately, despite our best efforts to try throughout the entire trip, we were not successful, and I will talk about that effort over the next several minutes.

The bipartisan delegation consisted of 13 Members of the House. We had 7 Democrats and 6 Republicans. The delegation represented almost every one of our major committees in the Congress, but had a heavy emphasis of the Committee on Armed Services. The delegation was interested in a number of issues, but in particular cooperative threat reduction, ways that we could decrease the threat posed by nuclear weapons and stockpiles, ways that we could retrain, help retrain those individuals, especially in Russia, that were involved in nuclear and weapons activities, issues involving counterproliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and ways that we could work with former Soviet states and other nations to continue our counterproliferation efforts, dealing with the issue of nuclear waste and contamination and other environmental issues, energy production and distribution, cooperative efforts in the war on terrorism, Sino-American relations, and North and South Korean relations.

In addition to meetings that we had formally, we met with a number of our military troops and I will talk about some of the findings that we came away with as we visited troops throughout the region.

Mr. Speaker, we left Washington a week ago this past Friday on May 24, and traveled initially to Moscow. In Moscow, we were met by both our embassy officials and other Russia leaders that had been advised of our visit. On the first day, despite a very long trip, we spent some time with our embassy officials and got a briefing on an American company that is based in the district of the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN). The gentlewoman suggested that we visited with officials of the Atari Corporation, which we did, and got an overview of the kinds of activities that they are involved with, including the presence of that company here in America.

We continued our visit over the weekend with a trip to the American University in Moscow, an institution that was started over 10 years ago. Their director assembled a group of academics and leaders in the educational area, and briefed us on a whole new series of initiatives relative to the training and education of young Russian leaders with American institutions, and in this case the American University in Moscow.

We have a continuing dialogue with the American University, and in fact the exchange process has already started in terms of cooperation on academic programs with the American University.

Also on Sunday we met with the leadership of the Kurchatov Institute. Dr. Evgheny Velikhov is the head of Kurchatov. Kurchatov is the largest and most prestigious nuclear institute in Russia, named after its founder, who was the developer of the atomic weapon for the Soviet Union. Today Kurchatov, which is smaller than it was in the Soviet era, has a number of nuclear scientists that are in need of work. Part of the efforts of our government through the Department of Energy and the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program has been to find ways to have those nuclear scientists and weapons scientists work in a productive way for both Russian and American corporations, and take them away from the former work that they did, which was all military-related.

Our discussions with Kurchatov centered around a number of very specific projects and programs, programs that involve American corporations, American NGOs, and American governmental entities. They were very positive meetings, and we discussed everything from fusion energy, disposition of fissile materials, nuclear sites, clean fuel cycles, magnetic fusion, low-yield nuclear warheads, ballistic missile defense interceptors, and a number of other issues. We came away with a number of ideas of how we can further engage the folks at Kurchatov in a cooperative way to benefit both the United States and Russian people peacefully.

In addition to that meeting, we met with leaders of the petroleum industry and the oil and gas industry in Russia, and talked about the efforts of many of us to steer America away from our reliance on Middle Eastern crude, and to work with the Russians, who have huge deposits of energy, to allow us to help them develop that energy, thereby giving us a new source of fossil fuels and gas, reducing our dependency on Middle Eastern crude, and at the same time helping Russia grow its economy. Those meetings were very positive, and I think will be fruitful in the future.

In addition, at that meeting, I invited the North Korean commercial attache in Moscow, Mr. Ku Song Bok, to attend an evening event with us. I did that as a gesture of good faith toward the North Korean government, the DPRK government, to show them that this delegation was interested in starting a positive initiative to work to establish a framework for discussion between the leaders in DPRK and those of us in the Congress that want to pursue this new avenue of dialogue with North Korea's leaders, both their president or chairman, as well as the members of their high parliament.

Mr. Speaker, we also had meetings with the Moscow and the Russian

Duma. The Duma is the lower body of the Russian parliament, the Federation Council the other body. In our meetings, we had probably some 40 Duma deputies and Federation Council members interact with us. We had a number of discussions relating to a variety of issues. But the key issue was a document that many of us in this body produced last fall, a document that I have addressed on this floor in the past.

This document, 45 pages long with 108 specific recommendations, was prepared to provide President Bush and President Putin a new format for relations between our two nations, with 11 key areas involving energy, the environment, health care, local government, culture and education, science and technology, agriculture, and defense and security, among others; recommendations that we could undertake to bring the Russian people and the American people, Russian institutions and American institutions, closer together.

This document, as I have explained to my colleagues in the past, was given to both President Bush and President Putin over the signatures of over one-third of the House and the Senate, members of both political parties equally divided, signed on to say to our President before the most recent summit that we want to change the nature of our relationship with Russia.

Perhaps one of the highlights of our trip, Mr. Speaker, was during a lunch that we had on Monday afternoon, two of the top leaders of the Russian Duma both said publicly that the Russian approach to the most recent Bush-Putin summit was largely based on this document.

This was significant because this was the first time that Russia publicly acknowledged that the work of our Congress and our Senate in producing this document actually was the basis for the Russian lead-up to the summit between President Bush and President Putin. We knew that they had taken this document seriously because they had produced a document in Russian in response to what we had produced. This document is the Russian Academy of Sciences' response to our proposal for these new initiatives.

My understanding is that the Academy of Sciences is setting up 11 task forces to work on the specific areas that we identified as key areas for America and Russia to work together. So our meetings in Moscow were extremely fruitful. They were positive. They were building on the success of President Bush and President Putin for a new relationship that in fact is much broader and much more engaging than our past relationship, which was largely based on agreements of strategic weapons.

The contention here by many in this body is for us to have even greater success in strategic and defense issues, we have to work aggressively to build more confidence.

One other interesting offer made by the Russians at our final luncheon meeting in Moscow, Mr. Speaker, I bring forward to this body and ask for our consideration and help, and it shows the state and the change of our relationship. Ten years ago a meeting between Russian officials and American officials would probably have had some screaming and shouting and accusations against each other. Our meetings today are totally changed. Over the past 10 years we have established a major new positive dialogue so that the last discussion we had before we left Moscow and in the spirit of the goodwill games currently being held in Japan and South Korea was a challenge by our Russian Duma colleagues to have a series of athletic events between members of the Duma and Members of the House.

So, Mr. Speaker, I challenge our colleagues to work with me, having played in a number of congressional baseball games where our Democrat teams play our Republican teams and we raise money for charity, and being aware of our congressional basketball games and our golf matches where Republicans play Democrats and other events, we now have a new challenge. Members of the Russian Duma have challenged this body to a series of athletic contests in the spirit of goodwill both in Moscow and Washington, where we can get together and have some friendly fun and also agree to a series of what hopefully will become annual events between the leaders of two parliaments.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to establishing a task force on the American side, hopefully comprised equally of Democrats and Republicans. We will look at what types of competition we want to have because some that we would do would be favorable to America, some the Russians might want to do would be favorable to them. We want to find the middle ground. We will start a whole new era of cooperation in the same spirit that we have in this city in basketball and baseball and other competitions between our two parties. In the spirit of friendship and goodwill, we will now take the same atmosphere to our colleagues in the Russian Duma.

Mr. Speaker, we left Moscow on Monday afternoon and flew again on military transport to Tashkent, Uzbekistan. We wanted to visit Uzbekistan because it is a prominent former Soviet state, a Central Asian nation that has stepped up and played a critical role in our battle against terrorism. In that country, after having met with the officials of the Uzbeki embassy here in Washington, we were greeted with a meeting with President Karimov. It was an extremely positive, 2-hour meeting as we discussed a new level of cooperation with Uzbekistan, efforts to bring more focus on the Central Asian nations, and to thank the people of Uzbekistan for allowing America to use a base in their country

with the cooperation of their military to fight the war on terrorism.

In fact, when we met with President Karimov, as we did in our meeting with the foreign minister, Mr. Kamilov, our U.S. embassy country team, we also extended an invitation through members of their parliament to establish a bilateral parliamentary exchange, much like we started with the Russian Duma. We now challenged the Uzbekistan parliament to establish a formal relationship between the House and the parliament, the lower body, actually the only body in Uzbekistan. They accepted overwhelmingly, and very eagerly anticipate the first meetings of the delegation that will start an annual series of meetings both in Tashkent and Moscow to find ways to work closer together with the people of Uzbekistan.

Our ultimate goal is to produce a document similar to this document, outlining ways that we can bring the people and the institutions of Uzbekistan closer to the people and institutions of America.

In addition to our visit with the President and the foreign minister, which were separate meetings, we traveled to one of our primary military bases in Uzbekistan at Karshi-Khanabad, more commonly known as K-2. This military base is down fairly close to the Afghan border. We have right now approximately 3,000 troops at that site. They are doing a variety of work, and represented most of the services.

The purpose of our visit was to assess the spirit and morale of our troops, and to let them know how proud we are of their work. In fact, we carried with us almost 7,000 cards and letters from school children across America who are writing to individual members of our military to thank them for the services that they are providing to our country. We also took from my home State of Pennsylvania cases of TastyKakes and Hershey bars, and boxes of homemade cookies made by individuals and families and the spouses of Members of Congress to give to the troops to thank them from the people back home for the job that they are doing.

□ 1915

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, the morale of our troops at the K-2 base was unbelievably positive. The morale was so evident in everyone that we met with. Their needs are being met. They obviously would like to be home with their families, but they are there to do a mission, they understand that mission, and they are committed to follow through and complete the task assigned to them by our President and by our military command officers.

We did have a problem with one of the engines on our cargo plane that took us into the K-2 base. While I bring up this not to embarrass our military, I bring it up to show that we are having success because the starter would not work on one of our engines as we

prepared to leave. But because we have taken great efforts in this body to provide additional funds for spare parts and training, and that has been supported by both Democrats and Republicans, within 2 hours a spare part was made available and the men and women of the unit in K-2 were able to replace that so that we could take off in time to make our meeting with President Karimov back in Tashkent.

So our military, in fact, is doing a fantastic job. We are proud of them, and we were there to say thank you on behalf of not only Congress and the House but all America. Following our 1-day trip to Tashkent, having achieved our objectives to work with the President and a commitment to follow on with the parliament of that nation, we traveled and arrived late at night in Beijing, China, starting on May 29.

In the People's Republic of China, in Beijing, we met with President Jiang Zemin, a very historic opportunity for us to meet with the top leader of the People's Republic. The meeting was extremely interesting because President Jiang spoke to us not just in Chinese but also in English, which showed the level of comfort that he had with our delegation. He was very much interested in hearing our views. He put forth his commitment to work with America in trying to provide some stability in the current conflict between India and Pakistan, and he reiterated his commitment to work with us to provide peace for the world.

We discussed the issue of Taiwan. We heard his strong feelings toward that independent entity, and we again reaffirmed to President Jiang that we are committed to a one-China policy, and we are committed to the peaceful process of bringing China and Taiwan together. We also reiterated the fact that the Congress would not tolerate any armed hostilities in an attempt to bring Taiwan back in, and he assured us that that was not China's intent, that they were certainly totally committed to a peaceful resolution of the independent status of the two nations so they in fact could become one China again.

In addition to those meetings, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) had been in China for approximately 4 days. They were a part of the delegation but did not formally join us until we arrived and they had been there in advance. They were there for a very historic purpose and opportunity. Mr. Speaker, they went to a suburban city outside of Beijing. The purpose of their visit with a group of UPS officials was to help build a new school for a small Chinese community to bring the Internet and computers to that village and to that institution. As we all know, China's income level for their average person in that country is about \$300 per year. So when you get outside of Beijing and Shanghai, there is not much in the way of modern technology.

UPS, United Parcel Service, with 40 of their employees and two Members of Congress, set up a process to build a new school, which they did, and to equip that school with computers for the children that live in this community. It was an outstanding success and, in fact, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) on the day after that we met with President Jiang Zemin, along with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), the three of them were given an audience with Premier Zhu Rongji. President Zhu expressed his thanks to the people of America, to UPS and to our three Members of Congress for their outstanding work in helping to provide this new resource for the children of the community in China known as Zunhua.

Mr. Speaker, also in China we met with the Deputy Foreign Minister Zhou. It was a very positive meeting regarding economic reforms in China. He gave us an overview of the economic program that is in place. We talked about how America and China must work together to open new markets for American companies to allow that balance of trade to become more equal. He talked to us specifically about Taiwan, and we discussed again as we did with President Jiang Zemin the need for us to have a peaceful dialogue and a peaceful resolution of the Taiwan-China situation.

We were hosted on our visit to China by the Chinese People's Institute for Foreign Affairs. President Mei was our host. He had a luncheon arranged for us. In fact, the discussion there was broad ranging and discussed everything from economic cooperation to advancements in science and technology. It was very positive, and again they were the host that allowed us to arrange the meetings that took place in China.

Mr. Speaker, one of the highlights for me of our trip to China was the opportunity for me to speak for the second time at the National Defense University of the People's Liberation Army. It was a real eye opener. I had spoken at this university back 5 years ago. I believe I was the first elected official invited to speak at what is the premier military training institution for their mid- and senior-level officers. This invitation came before I went to Beijing to again address senior military officers in the PLA.

What was interesting about this trip was that it was not just me going to the National Defense University. In fact, eight of our colleagues who were with the delegation went with me. We drove for about 1 hour out of downtown Beijing until we arrived at the compound that is the major training site for China's mid- and senior-level officers. On the way, we talked to our defense attache who briefed us on what to expect. He told us to expect the Chinese officers to have canned questions, not to have any ability to go off the party line, and to be very stern and

strict in terms of the way that they asked questions of me once I had finished my presentation.

Mr. Speaker, I told our defense attache on the way in that I was going to do something different this time, that I was going to break this large group of officers into subgroups and have Members of Congress directly interact with them. Our defense attache said, "That will never happen. The Chinese will never go for that. They are not used to doing things in an ad hoc way."

Mr. Speaker, what a great surprise we had in store for us. When our bus arrived at the front door of the main building of the National Defense University, after having driven through the entranceway, there was a full Chinese PLA military band and orchestra. In fact, it was all female, all dressed up in their military uniforms, which were white in color; and there they were playing for us a series of military musical selections, welcoming us to the premier training center for the Chinese military. As we departed the bus and walked up the stairway, a number of generals and top leaders greeted us to welcome us to the National Defense University. It certainly was a good start to our meeting.

Inside, I was taken aside and allowed to meet with the general in charge of the National Defense University, where I explained to him that following my presentation, which would last about 40 minutes, instead of me answering questions, I wanted to divide the group up and allow Members of Congress to directly interact with the soldiers and leaders of the Chinese military. He looked at me in some bewilderment, but did not object.

So we went into the room, and there in the auditorium were some 300 senior military leaders of the Chinese People's Liberation Army. As they sat in the room and were extremely attentive, I was introduced, and I made my presentation which I did not have in writing but basically gave from my own feelings about the need to improve our relations with China, and I went through the entire context of why we were there. I discussed the meeting we had had with President Jiang Zemin, and I challenged them to help us find new areas of common concern where we could bring our military together with the Chinese military to reduce the potential for conflict and misunderstanding.

Mr. Speaker, following my presentation, I told the assembled group that I wanted to divide them up into four groups and have two Members of Congress each set aside with those individual groups and have a dialogue. Within 5 minutes, the group divided itself into four, the Members of Congress broke up into groups of two, we had interpreters at each group, and for the next 45 minutes, something happened that I would never have thought could occur. American Members of Congress were interacting not in a formal way but informally in answering

questions and asking questions of the next generation of Chinese military leaders.

Mr. Speaker, I must tell you, the comments were all positive. The tone was positive. And there were no canned questions or canned responses. It was an absolutely unbelievable opportunity to see American Members of Congress, our colleagues, interacting in an informal, sit-down way with Chinese military leaders around them in kind of a small-group setting asking questions and responding about American-China relations.

Mr. Speaker, this gave me a great deal of encouragement and leads me to believe that we must do more of this. We must continue to reach out, to tear down the barriers of misunderstanding and find ways to engage and be candid in the process where we have disagreements but also let these people know that we want to be friendly with them. We are not looking to have animosity or tension, but rather find ways that we can address common concerns together.

Mr. Speaker, leaving China, we had planned to go into North Korea. Unfortunately, all along the way, despite numerous attempts, we were getting nowhere with the DPRK leadership. In fact, I even at one point in time, one morning in Beijing had a call from Kofi Annan at the U.N., whom I had asked to assist us. Kofi Annan from the U.N., the Secretary-General, and five other groups were working aggressively with us to convince the DPRK leadership that it was in their best interest that this delegation be allowed in, not to criticize the North Korean leaders but to begin a dialogue, to talk, to try to break down the barriers and discuss common areas of concern and opportunity. Unfortunately, that was not to be.

But throughout our trip in Moscow, again in Uzbekistan and throughout our stay in China, we sent faxes, e-mails, telephone calls, had meetings with representatives of groups that were working in North Korea but were not having success, so finally we decided to leave Beijing and travel directly to South Korea. In Seoul, South Korea, our first stop was at the Yongsan U.S. Army air base. There we spent time with the troops. They were having a picnic on Saturday afternoon. We visited with the family members. We thanked them for the work they are doing, and we spent time letting them know that we wanted to hear about the concerns that they had being stationed in that country.

Mr. Speaker, this is something that we heard throughout our stop in South Korea with all of our military: this body and the other body and the Pentagon has got to do more to increase the pay level, to provide more incentives and decrease the amount of time that our troops have to spend when they are assigned to South Korea. We learned from our military leaders, from our top generals, and from our CINC in

that region that South Korea is the least desirable stay that any member of the military has when they are given an assignment. In fact, in many cases, a young soldier would rather go to a theater where there is active hostility than they would to South Korea because the tour of duty is longer, usually a year, and the pay rates are significantly lower because of added incentives in going to Japan or other theaters. They are significantly lower when our military is assigned to South Korea.

Mr. Speaker, as you well know, we have 37,000 troops in South Korea. It is a major location for our troops overseas. This Congress has got to respond by changing the way that we are currently operating so that young people who are serving in Korea can bring their families with them, because today the bulk of them cannot get the pay level they should get when they serve in other parts of the world, and find ways to reduce the level of commitment in terms of the time they have to serve there. The commanding officers in that theater understand what steps they have to take.

And so our delegation came back to America convinced that we are going to work to commit to that military to change those requirements, to change those support mechanisms, so that our military when it is assigned to South Korea does so with pride, wants to go there, and does not feel that being assigned to South Korea is the least possible priority that they would have as a part of their military career and tenure.

Mr. Speaker, we spent time with Ambassador Hubbard. He gave us an overview of Korea. We had an in-team briefing with our leaders, both on South Korea, and they also gave us a briefing on the North.

□ 1930

We talked about the upcoming elections. We were scheduled to meet with the candidates for the presidency, but because they were off campaigning with elections coming up next week, we were not able to have those meetings. We did meet with Foreign Minister Choi. We met him at his home. We talked for over 1 hour about our relations between the South and America, and we talked about our interests in going to the DPRK, or North Korea.

He, along with the Japanese, along with the Chinese, along with the Russians and the Uzbekistanis, all said that our intent to go to North Korea is extremely important. President Jiang Zemin encouraged us to pursue entrance to North Korea, the leadership in Moscow encouraged us to pursue our entry into North Korea, and so did the South Koreans. That was articulated by the foreign minister of South Korea. We talked about programs that we have together between our two nations, and we talked about ways that we could work even closer together, assuming we can break down the barrier by gaining entrance into North Korea.

Mr. Speaker, we met with Members of the National Assembly of the Republic of Korea. We talked about the importance of our forces there. They are unequivocal in saying that they want America to maintain a presence. It is extremely important to deter conflict on the peninsula.

We talked about cooperation in the war on terrorism, political and military stability in the Korean peninsula, the strong desire for unification of the two Koreas, and we talked about e-government and the need to bring our government and their governments into the new digital divide and the way we can in fact bring information technology to all the people in South Korea.

We also met with the Senior Combatant Commander for United Nations Command Forces, General Leon LaPorte, to get a detailed assessment of the current operations of the United Nations' efforts in South Korea.

We had meetings with the American Chamber of Commerce in Seoul. They also told us that they had tried to take a delegation into North Korea. Mr. Speaker, they had had a group of American companies that are prepared to go to Pyong Yang and announced they were going to invest significant new dollars in North Korea. Despite being assured by the North Korean leadership that they would be given entrance, as they went to get their visas, they were told they were denied and they should come back later.

It is extremely frustrating, Mr. Speaker, to try to open doors in a positive way with a regime so closeted and isolated from the rest of the world. So I appeal today, Mr. Speaker, that those leaders in the Democratic Republic of Korea, the DPRK, that they understand that we want to go to their country not to cause problems, not to blame, not to cast negative statements against them, but, rather, to simply open a dialogue, because having a dialogue is a way to eventually ease tensions and find ways to deal with common concerns and common opportunities.

While also in South Korea, Mr. Speaker, the delegation was given an opportunity to travel to the DMZ, or Demilitarized Zone. Traveling up to Panmunjom, members were able to meet with our military once again, engage with the various military officials, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) took on a personal crusade to engage our military on the issue of the remains of Corporal Edward Gibson who has been missing in action since November 26, 1950.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) raised the issue that so many Americans continue to be concerned about, the lack of a full accounting of those who are missing in action from the Korean conflict, the Korean War.

As an indication of the support of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) and the honor that Corporal Gibson gave to his Nation by paying the ultimate

price, he had an American flag flown over the DMZ in honor of Corporal Gibson. In fact, every member of Congress had the same flown. Corporal Gibson's family will be given that flag by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) back in Ohio.

We discussed the issue with the leadership along the DMZ about that very hostile environment, perhaps the most tense environment today in the world, where American and North Korean forces and allied and North Korean forces stare each other down across this boundary line of barbed wire and concrete, that differentiates the North from the South. It really gives one a full perspective of the need, the absolute need, for us to find a way to begin a dialogue with the leadership of North Korea.

Mr. Speaker, the delegation's trip was exciting. It was almost without flaw. Unfortunately, the final part of our mission, the trip into North Korea and Pyong Yang, did not occur. But, Mr. Speaker, we are not giving up. We are renewing our efforts.

We have already started work on another visit. This visit will go into Pyong Yang, we will meet with their leaders and we will begin a positive dialogue, so we reduce the tensions and find ways that we can find common ground.

Hopefully President Bush's envoy, Ambassador Pritchard, will travel to Pyong Yang very shortly to open the door that the administration has in fact offered, and following that visit, I am extremely optimistic that a congressional delegation that I will be a part of will travel to Pyong Yang in an historic way so we can begin a process, much like we began 15 years ago in the Soviet Union. Look at where we are today with Russia's leaders. Today, we have just completed a major thrust of new initiatives. We are challenging each other to athletic contests and we are now considered good friends.

Hopefully that same process can occur and grow in China as we saw in our meetings at the National Defense University, and will also begin to grow in North Korea as we reach out to the people, as we reach out to show them that America wishes no harm, America only wants to find ways to understand, to have a dialogue, and to reduce the threats that come from the kind of actions that the North Korean leadership have taken over the past 20 years in building up a vast military complex, while denying many of their citizens the most basic human needs.

Mr. Speaker, I will insert the entire CODEL report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point, to make it available for the public to see all of the various actions I have described, the delegation members, the various contacts, the people that we interacted with, because I think it is important that we take these kinds of trips, and that we have total transparency in terms of our purpose, our actions, and the results that we achieved.

I want to thank all of my colleagues who went with me. It was an outstanding trip. We truly have an unbelievable institution. Thirteen members of Congress, seven Democrats and six Republicans, working together with a common agenda, working together to achieve peace and harmony, in those nations that in the past have been our adversaries, or in the future might become our adversaries.

So I thank my colleagues for their cooperation, I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and the staff for sticking around long enough for me to make this report to our colleagues and the American people on the congressional delegation trip that took place from May 24 to June 3, 2002.

U.S. CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION (CODEL WELDON) TO RUSSIA, UZBEKISTAN, PEOPLES REPUBLIC OF CHINA AND REPUBLIC OF KOREA, MAY 24–JUNE 3, 2002

OVERVIEW

A bipartisan congressional delegation of 13 Members of the House of Representatives, led by Representative Curt Weldon, "CODEL WELDON," visited Moscow, Russia; Tashkent and Karshi-Khanabad, Uzbekistan; Beijing, China; Seoul, Yongsan (U.S. Army) Base, and the Demilitarized Zone, Republic of Korea, May 24 through June 3, 2002. The delegation also made considerable efforts prior to departure from Washington, D.C., to arrange meetings with the leadership of the Democratic Peoples Republic of Korea (DPRK). These efforts continued throughout the delegation's travel, to no avail. Given the major issues of mutual concern, the delegation was disappointed that the DPRK leadership did not accept the opportunity to open a dialogue and engage such a large delegation of the Congress.

Delegation members included Representatives Curt Weldon (R-PA), Solomon Ortiz (D-TX), Roscoe Bartlett (R-MD), Jim Turner (D-TX), Silvestre Reyes (D-TX), Joe Wilson (R-SC), Steve Horn (R-CA), Eni Faleomavaega (Del-American Samoa), Corrine Brown (D-FL), Alcee Hastings (D-FL), Carrie Meek (D-FL), Steve Chabot (R-OH), and Brian Kerns (R-IN).

In each of the countries visited, the delegation met with the senior executive branch and legislative branch officials; political leaders and organizations, educational groups and technical institute officials; U.S. and foreign military officers; and U.S. and foreign business leaders for the purpose of furthering greater communication; expanding inter-parliamentary exchanges and information sharing; and addressing common concerns on issues vital to international economic growth, human rights, peace and stability. Issues addressed included:

- Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR);
 - Securing nuclear stockpiles and materials in Russia.
 - Retraining human resources.
- Counterproliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction;
 - Protecting, reducing and/or Eliminating Weapons of Mass Destruction.
- Nuclear Waste and other environmental issues.
 - Energy Production and Distribution.
 - Cooperative Efforts in the War On Terrorism;
 - Furtherance of trade through better inspection methods at ports of debarkation and embarkation.
 - Sino-American Relations.
 - North and South Korean Relations.

The Members also took the opportunity to visit with U.S. military personnel based in

Karshi-Khanabad ("K-2"), Uzbekistan serving in the war on terrorism in Afghanistan; military personnel in Seoul and the DMZ; and their families in the Republic of Korea supporting peace and stability in Southeast Asia. Representatives Bartlett, Ortiz, Turner, Reyes, and Wilson visited Morale, Welfare, and Recreation sites and facilities in the Seoul area.

The delegation visits coincided with a number of international events and crises that reinforced the critical nature and timeliness of the purpose of its meetings and discussions. The delegation arrived in Moscow the day following the historic signing of the strategic arms reduction treaty and declaration of strategic partnership by Presidents George W. Bush and Vladimir V. Putin. Shortly thereafter the NATO nations met in Rome and agreed to Russian limited membership in NATO. India and Pakistan experienced increased tension and cross-border firings resulting in casualties on both sides. Pakistan completed several medium range ballistic missile tests. The war on terrorism continued in Afghanistan. And suicide bombings and reprisals continued the cycle of violence between the Israelis and Palestinians.

Moscow, Russia (May 25–27)

State Duma

In Moscow, the delegation had several opportunities to meet with their legislative counterparts, Members of the State Duma, in furtherance of the objectives of the Duma-Congress Study Group—the official inter-parliamentary exchange that engages U.S. and Russian lawmakers in meetings and discussions. The delegation also met with Russian business leaders, many of whom are involved in gas and oil exploration and energy production; Kurchatov Institute officials, to discuss energy and counterproliferation issues; and American University in Moscow officials.

Discussions with Members of the State Duma were in furtherance of the issues addressed in "U.S.-Russia Partnership," (see attachment 1), coauthored by Representative Weldon, supported by a bipartisan group of one-third of the U.S. Congress, and presented to the Duma in September of 2001, that provides over 100 recommendations in 11 subject areas for U.S.-Russian engagement. The delegation was advised by State Duma representatives that the recommendations made in this document had been used as the foundation for the Russian initiatives to President Bush during his visit. The State Duma Members indicated that the Speaker of the Duma had prepared a response to "U.S.-Russia Partnership." Representative Weldon stated his desire to establish U.S.-Russia co-chairs at the earliest opportunity in each of 11 subject areas addressed in the study.

International Republican & National Democratic Institutes

A meeting sponsored by the International Republican Institute, with National Democratic Institute participation, allowed Member-to-Member/House-Duma dialogue on a number of subjects, including the status of the repeal of Jackson-Vanik (Cold War legislation that conditions U.S. trade relations on Russian Jewish emigration); combating international terrorism; using academic research and science to address political problems; joint environmental efforts; WTO; steel and poultry imports/exports; the Bush-Putin statement on the U.S.-Russian strategic partnership; and engaging the youth of both countries in issues of mutual interest, including cultural and sports events. Members on both sides demonstrated their belief that there is a new basis for working together on issues of common interest and concern because for the first time there is mu-

tual agreement on goals and values and a sharing of vision on the security threats of the 21st Century.

Kurchatov Institute

The delegation also visited the Russian Research Center, the Kurchatov Institute. The Institute was established to design the Soviet Union's first nuclear weapons. Its current mission is research on safe and environmentally friendly nuclear fission and fusion power generation and fundamental physical research and development. The staff of the Institute is down to approximately 5,000 people from a Cold War high of 11,000. A goal of the Institute's Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) and counterproliferation programs has been to provide productive training and employment training and employment for many of the Institute's personnel. The Institute's President, Evgheny Velikhov, and his staff engaged the Members in briefings and discussions of counterproliferation; CTR; nuclear site physical security; disposition of fissile materials, fusion energy, nuclear medicine; safe, clean fuel cycles; magnetic fusion; electromagnetic pulse effects; low yield nuclear warhead, Russian-like, ballistic missile defense interceptors; a thorium-based nuclear fuel cycle (the Institute claims that the Department of Energy won't agree to consider programs that provide an alternative to Yucca Mountain); joint NAS-Institute programs for nuclear energy based space programs; software technologies for counter-terrorism; information technology training programs for former nuclear weapons scientists and engineers; and a visit to a nuclear power reactor being used for testing of thorium-based fuel.

American University in Moscow

The delegation also met with the staff and supporters of the American University in Moscow to demonstrate support for their program. Representative Weldon and the delegation were presented a copy of the "Russian response" to "U.S.-Russia Partnership." Other discussion topics included the transportation of nuclear waste and initiation of U.S.-Russia Exchange Centers (information exchange using the internet) between cities in the U.S. and Russia.

Moscow Petroleum Club

The delegation met with senior Russian government officials, Members of the Federation Assembly, and business leaders from the oil and gas industry. Victor Chernomerdrin, the former Prime Minister, led the Russian delegation. Also included, at the request of the U.S. delegation, were KU Song Bok, commercial attaché of the Democratic Peoples Republic of Korea, and his assistant, KIM Jong-Do.

Tashkent & Karshi-Khanabad, Uzbekistan (May 27–28)

In Tashkent, the delegation met with President Karimov; Foreign Minister Kamilov; the U.S. Embassy country team; and visited U.S. military personnel at Karshi-Khanabad. The delegation expressed to the President, U.S. appreciation for Uzbekistan's support for the war on terrorism. For his part, the President acknowledged his nation's shortcomings in human rights and economic reforms, but indicated he is taking actions in these areas in making reforms. The President provided an assessment of the regional geo-political environment and his views on the campaign in Afghanistan. He emphasized a desire for a long-term U.S. presence in Central Asia and Afghanistan and expressed a concern over the long-term intentions of Russia, Iran and particularly China. He was supportive of Representative Weldon's proposal to establish a joint U.S. Congress-Uzbek parliamentary working group. President Karimov sees the

U.S. as a political, legal, and economic model he would like to replicate.

American Embassy officials noted their concerns about the long term economic health of the country, citing the 50 percent inflation rate over the past year and the unwillingness of most foreign companies to invest in Uzbekistan because of the lack of convertibility of the currency.

The delegation was transported via an Air Force C-130 cargo aircraft to Karshi-Khanabad in southeastern Uzbekistan, near the Afghanistan border, to visit with U.S. forces personnel deployed in support of Operation Enduring Freedom. All Members had an opportunity to meet with constituents and took the opportunity to make the military members fully aware of the total support of the American people for the job that they are all doing.

The President, acknowledging fully "what wars can cause on the main continent, briefly digressed, citing China's experience with a number of wars—"Japan against China"—and mentioned his personal participation in Japan's war against China. "China and the U.S. were on the same side against Japan in Japan's War of Aggression." He further mentioned his visit to Hawaii and the Arizona War Memorial—"I shared the same feeling as your Commander of the Pacific Fleet. If you look at history and major events, you see history evolves in cycles. People unify then fall apart. Now Japan and the U.S. get along well . . . Maintenance of the imperial system in Japan had a lot to do with General MacArthur."

"My advice to the U.S. is that not every place in the world can follow the U.S. model. In the world, each place has its own model, but that should not stop contacts and communication . . . The first principle should be to seek common ground while putting aside differences . . . Do not let differences interfere with communication . . . We have more in common than divergences."

Premier Zhu Rongji

Representative Turner, accompanied by Representative Spencer Bachus (R-AL) and Arnie Welman, Vice President of Commercial Affairs for the UPS Corporation, met with Premier Zhu at the Purple Light Pavilion for over an hour.

Representatives Turner and Bachus, along with Representative Pete Sessions (R-TX) had participated in the construction of a computer laboratory with 40 UPS government affairs employees in the City of Zunhua, located northeast of Beijing in Hebei Province.

Premier Zhu expressed his appreciation to the representatives' and the UPS employees' for their tangible contribution to the children of Zunhua and was pleased that the group had experienced rural China.

Premier Zhu stated the importance of the "one China" policy and stated that the PRC does not desire to use force against Taiwan to achieve reunification. He cited Hong Kong as a successful example of reunification and said reunification with Taiwan would not require a change in Taiwan's economic system. Representative Turner expressed his support for the "one China" policy and indicated that his support for permanent normal trade relations and the PRC's admission to the WTO was based on his belief that the ability of the U.S. and the PRC to build a strong bond of friendship and cooperation is critical to world peace and prosperity over the next 25 years.

Assistant Foreign minister Zhou

In a later meeting, Assistant Foreign minister Zhou outlined China's plan to "intensify" its economic reform program. "With 25 million people entering the work force each year, if we are to avoid problems, we need to speed up reform." He stated

Beijing, China (May 29–June 1)

In the Peoples Republic of China (PRC), the delegation met with President Jiang and senior foreign ministry officials; met officials of the Chinese Peoples Institute of Foreign Affairs; engaged the U.S. Country team in discussions; and visited the National Defense University, where Representative Weldon addressed the student body and delegation members met in breakout sessions with the PLA students attending the University. There was also a side-group meeting by Representatives Turner and Bachus with Premier Ju.

President Jiang

In the delegation meeting with President Jiang, Representative Weldon expressed the desire of the majority of the American people for a productive long-term relationship with the PRC.

President Jiang indicated that China and the U.S. have more interests in common than differences and encouraged mutual respect and moderation. He urged that the U.S. should accept that there are other acceptable models than that of the U.S. for political and economic development. President Jiang stated that the most important and sensitive issue in Sino-American relations is Taiwan. He cited the importance of continuing the "one China" policy. "The Chinese relationship boils down to one question: Taiwan . . . The question is a very simple one . . . We have already agreed (citing normalization, the three joint communiqués, and "three no's") . . . we don't understand why the U.S. is sending weapons to Taiwan . . . We place much hope in you as representatives that we can get much done."

Representative Weldon indicated he supported the "one China" policy. "Arms sales take place when there is a perception, right or wrong, that a threat exists to the people of Taiwan . . . I am the Chairman responsible for authorizing the procurement of all our military systems. But I am a teacher by profession. I would like to spend money on education, not weapons . . . We do not want conflict with China in any form."

Representative Hastings, citing the importance to both China and the U.S. of engaging the DPRK, asked President Jiang if he would consider having his officials contact the DPRK on the delegation's behalf to arrange a visit. He also asked the President what China is doing to ease tensions between India and Pakistan. The President encouraged the delegation visit to the DPRK, but "whether they allow the visit must be totally up to them . . . We cannot take decisions in their place. North Korea will have to decide. China is China. North Korea is North Korea." On India and Pakistan, the President indicated that both countries are "China's neighbors" and said he hoped the Kashmir problem can be solved peacefully. "Although people are of a view that we are closer to Pakistan, we are trying to get each side to work together. Our relationship with India has fluctuated, but more recently we have had a constantly improving relationship with India." He also said that because of the U.S. need to fight terrorism, he believed that "the U.S. attitude toward Pakistan has changed." the purpose of their foreign policy is world peace and common development. "China is not a threat to anyone and should not be perceived as a threat . . . perception is important . . . China is an important force in the region for peace . . . In our relationship, we have accomplished a lot . . . the only problem is Taiwan . . . The issue of Taiwan should be left to the Chinese to work out. The U.S. should not become involved . . . Our policy goal of peaceful reunification remains. If they (Taiwanese) accept one China, we can be very patient. I hope you will not send signals that can be misinterpreted."

Representatives Bartlett suggested that Taiwan is a "tiny island" with relatively small population and that China and the U.S. should focus on the 90 percent of what we have in common. Representative Horn indicated that "it would be the biggest mistake ever made for China to invade Taiwan." Mr. Horn also expressed his concern over a quote attributed to a Chinese admiral citing "missiles over LA" as a Chinese option. Minister Zhou indicated that such a quote was incorrect.

In response to Representative Brown, Minister Zhou agreed there are both obligations and benefits to entry into the World Trade Organization (WTO). "We will honor our words." He indicated there would be challenges for China as a WTO member, but also opportunities. In acknowledging the \$100 billion annual trade imbalance between the U.S. and China, Minister Zhou said that "China wishes to buy more, but that there are too many restrictions." Also in response to Representative Brown, he cited the need for the Three Gorges Dam project as primarily for flood control, acknowledged the importance of environmental protection, and said that electricity production is secondary.

In response to a question from Representative Hastings on India and Pakistan, Minister Zhou indicated that the Foreign Ministers involved had talked and cited the need "to be cautious and avoid escalation . . . The President of Pakistan said he would not use force. We have encouraged them to talk together."

Minister Zhou concluded that "China will not commit to not use force in the case of Taiwan because we don't want to use force . . . If we make such a commitment (Taiwan) separatists will push for a proclamation of independence, which would be a disaster for everyone." Representative Hastings indicated that the issue of Taiwan would likely take care of itself over time because of the large and increasing investment by Taiwan interests in mainland China.

Chinese Peoples Institute for Foreign Affairs (CPIFA)

President Mei indicated that the CPIFA had worked for 50 years doing exchanges, sponsoring research on international affairs, and hosting high level delegations to promote mutual understanding and bilateral relationships. He cited the importance of economic development and discussed the wide variance within China of economic well-being, with per capita GDP in cities like Shanghai being \$4,000, while in many regions it is \$300/person. He stated that last year began a policy of developing China's west (12 provinces, two-thirds of China's land area) and cited the need for a stable international environment for economic development. He also discussed the Taiwan issue, citing all of the same factors mentioned by President Jiang and Assistant Foreign Minister Zhou.

In response to a question from Representative Horn, President Mei said China had three domestic goals: develop the west economically, achieve sustained growth throughout the country, and advance education in science and technology. "The quality of human resources is key to China's development."

National Defense University

Representative Weldon addressed the military students at the National Defense University for the Peoples Liberation Army on Sino-American relations; America's policy toward Taiwan; the need for increased dialogue and cooperative programs between the PLA and U.S. military; the common threat to China and the U.S. posed by the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and drug trafficking; and the role the Congress plays in the U.S. system of government. After Representative Weldon's address, Members of

the delegation had the opportunity to participate in small group discussions with the military students. Taiwan was again a topic of discussion. Also of interest to the students, was the Members' views on international terrorism and the Falun Gong.

Seoul, Yongsan U.A. Army Base, and the DMZ, Korea (June 1-3)

In Korea the delegation met with the foreign minister; the U.S. Ambassador, Thomas C. Hubbard; Members of the National Assembly; senior U.S. and Korean military officials; Korean business leaders; and family members of U.S. military personnel.

Ambassador Hubbard

Ambassador Hubbard provided the delegation an overview of the Republic of Korea (ROK) political and economic situation, indicating that the South Korean economy continues its recovery from the 1997 economic crisis, currently growing at five-to-six percent a year, making its growth second only in the region, to China. He also advised the delegation of the significant and prompt support provided by the ROK to the events of 9/11. The ROK "stepped up quickly to our war against the Taliban and al-Queda in Afghanistan, and provided shipping, aircraft, and a field hospital to support U.S. operations . . . In addition they have provided \$40 million in aid to Afghanistan." The Ambassador further highlighted the critical importance of local and provincial elections taking place in June and the national election in December 2002. He indicated that the South Koreans continue to make major strides in political and democratic reforms.

Foreign Minister Choi

In the delegation meeting with Foreign Minister Choi, Representative Weldon expressed his appreciation for all that the ROK had done and continues to do in support of the international war on terrorism. He also reaffirmed our total commitment to the defense of the ROK. Foreign Minister Choi indicated that his country's prompt support for the U.S. led war on terrorism was an expression of the importance of the effort as well as its appreciation for all the U.S. has done on the Korean Peninsula.

Foreign Minister Choi highlighted the rather significant contribution to ROK-Japanese relations made by the joint sponsorship of the on-going World Cup. He commented that the opening ceremonies were the first time that the Japanese national anthem had been played at an official event in the ROK. He also noted that at the opening ceremonies, in a spontaneous sign of friendship, the two Presidents stood and raised clasped hands, signaling the friendship between their two countries. Foreign Minister Choi described the event as a "spectacular moment" for the two countries—the "first time this has happened in a thousand years."

Representative Weldon also expressed to the Foreign Minister, the delegation's consternation with the North Korean, DPRK, failure to approve the delegation's visit request. The delegation had hoped to visit the DPRK to open a dialogue with the North, to express the interest of the legislative branch of the U.S. Government in addressing food aid, agriculture, health, education and other humanitarian assistance. The delegation had hoped to deliver a "totally positive" message to the North—that as a coequal branch of the U.S. government, Congress could work with the DPRK to further peace and stability on the Peninsula and help the people of North Korea.

Foreign Minister Choi indicated that the ROK continues its efforts to maintain the dialogue with the North, but the pace of discussions is much slower than what had been hoped for. He expressed considerable concern

over the state of the DPRK economy and the well-being of its people. "Our interest is to try and engage, help them improve their situation, to try and increase cooperation." The foreign minister indicated the North is in desperate need of food, health care, and electrical power. He also indicated that the next year will be a critical period because of ROK elections, potential instability in the North due to its dysfunctional economic system, the issue of the DPRK nuclear power reactor and related required inspections by the international community.

National Assembly

The delegation later met with Members of the ROK National Assembly. Discussions related to trade; the importance to the ROK of U.S. Forces in Korea for deterrence purposes; the war on terrorism; political and military stability on the Korean Peninsula; the strong desire for eventual reunification of the DPRK and ROK; internet voting in the ROK; "e" government; and the "digital divide."

United Nations/Combined Forces Command

The Members of the delegation also met with the senior combatant commander, General Leon LaPorte, and his staff to get a detailed assessment of the military balance, force readiness, personnel morale, and classified issues.

American Chamber of Commerce

Regarding the difficulty and frustration the Delegation experienced in attempting to arrange a visit with DPRK leadership, American Chamber of Commerce officials the delegation met with indicated a similar frustration with the "on again, off again" nature of visits they had attempted to arrange.

Demilitarized Zone (DMZ)

Delegation Members were provided the opportunity to visit the DMZ. Representative Chabot was able to engage military officials on behalf of the relatives of Corporal Edward Gibson, who has been missing in action since November 26, 1950. Representative Chabot acquired an American flag which had been flown at the DMZ in honor of Corporal Gibson and will present the flag to the Gibson family. During the course of the CODEL, Representative Chabot also stressed to Foreign Minister Choi, Ambassador Hubbard, and other U.S. Embassy personnel the importance of making every effort to recover the remains of Corporal Gibson and other U.S. servicemen missing in action.

U.S.-RUSSIA PARTNERSHIP—A NEW TIME, A NEW BEGINNING

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Agricultural development

Assist in agricultural production.

Expand private-sector investment.

Enhance capacity to purchase essential agricultural inputs, commodities and equipment.

Cultural/educational development

Expand cultural ties outside the major cities.

Assist regional museums in generating tourism.

Provide for more Russian language and cultural studies in U.S. schools.

Defense and security

Initiate new bilateral talks similar to the Ross-Mamedov talks on a Global Protection System.

Move forward with joint talks on a new nonproliferation regime.

Encourage progress on the RAMOS program and restructure the Nuclear Cities Initiative.

Economic development

Help facilitate Russia's accession to the WTO and its acceptance of all WTO agreements.

Increase funding for OPIC and EX-IM Bank projects in Russia.

Work with Russia to improve intellectual property rights.

Energy/natural resources

Foster cooperative pilot projects, starting with oil and gas exploration in Timan Pechora.

Convene bilateral task force to discuss the energy ramifications of the war on terrorism.

Eliminate bureaucratic obstacles to joint cooperation on energy.

Environmental cooperation

Develop a revolving fund to assure development of promising Russian technologies.

Expand debt for nature swaps.

Dramatically expand cooperation on marine science research.

Health care

Increase emphasis on chronic diseases like cardiovascular disease and diabetes.

Develop more extensive physician exchange programs.

Augment existing cooperation between NIH and appropriate Russian research institutes.

Judicial/legal systems

Support expansion of jury trials into all Russian regions.

Expand Environmental Public Advocacy Centers into Russia.

Encourage a doubling of the number of legal clinics.

Local governments

Propose ways to expand the tax base available to local governments.

Encourage political participation by increasing local partisan affiliations.

Encourage the gradual devolution of services to the local level.

Science and technology

Increase cooperation in the area of nuclear fuel cycles.

Expand cooperative fusion research on nonpolluting energy solutions.

Involve Russian industry in embryonic U.S. nanotechnology efforts.

Space and aeronautics

Utilize commercial joint ventures to enable Russia to meet its Space Station obligations.

Increase joint projects on space solar power, propulsion technology, and weather satellites.

Cooperate on mutually-beneficial planetary defense tracking technologies.

DELEGATION

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Rep. Curt Weldon (R-PA), Rep. Solomon Ortiz (D-TX), Rep. Roscoe Bartlett (R-MD), Rep. Jim Turner (D-TX), Rep. Silvestre Reyes (D-TX), Rep. Joe Wilson (R-SC), Rep. Steve Horn (R-CA), Delegate Eni Faleomavaega (D-American Samoa), Rep. Corrine Brown (D-FL), Rep. Alcee Hastings (D-FL), Rep. Carrie Meek (D-FL), Rep. Steve Chabot (R-OH), and Rep. Brian Kerns (R-IN).

COMMITTEE STAFF

Mr. Pete Steffes, Mr. Carl Commenator, Mr. Ryan Vaart, and Mr. Doug Roach.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Mr. John Merrill and Mr. Mark Cameron.

DREXEL UNIVERSITY

Dr. Roy Kim.

MEDICAL STAFF

Dr. Michael Keith.

U.S. AIR FORCE ESCORTS

Colonel Pete Bunce, Lt. Colonel Laura Shoaf, Senior Master Sergeant JJ Cook, and Staff Sergeant Dave Scieszka.

KEY CONTACTS
MOSCOW, RUSSIA

Victor Chernomerdrin, Former Prime Minister.

Andrey Kokoshin, Member, Chairman of the Committee on Industry, Construction Industries, and High Technologies, State Duma, and former National Security Advisor to President Yeltsin.

Vladimir Lukhin, Member, State Federation Council.

Grigory Vavilinsky, Vice Speaker, State Duma.

Andrey V. Skoch, Member, State Duma, Metallurgy and Mining Caucus.

Valdimir Rushkov, State Duma.

Svetlana Gvozdeva, Member, State Duma.

Boris Nadezhdin, Member, State Duma, Union of Right Forces.

Alexander Burataeva, Member, State Duma.

Evgheny Velikhov, President, Kurchatov Institute.

Nikolai Ponomarev-Stepnoi, Vice President, Kurchatov Institute.

Ku Song Bok, Commercial Attache, DPRK. Seth Grae, Thorium Corporation (USA).

Dr. Edward Lozansky, President, American University, Moscow.

Karen Aguilar, U.S. Embassy.

U.S.-Russia Business Council.

International Republican Institute.

National Democracy Institute.

American Chamber of Commerce.

Moscow Petroleum Club.

TASHKENT, UZBEKISTAN

Islam Karimov, President.

Abdulaziz Kamilov, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

John E. Herbst, U.S. Ambassador, Uzbekistan.

Larry Memmott, Chief Political-Military Section, U.S. Embassy.

KARSHI-KHANABAD, UZBEKISTAN ("K-2")

Colonel Lovelad.

BEIJING, CHINA

Jiang Zemin, President, PRC.

Ju Ryang Zi, Premier, PRC.

Zhou Wenzhong, Assistant Foreign Minister.

Mei, Zhaorong, President, Chinese People's Institute of Foreign Affairs.

Clark T. Randt, U.S. Ambassador, PRC.

Brigadier General Gratton Sealock, Defense Attache, U.S. Embassy.

James Wayman, U.S. Embassy.

National Defense University.

SEOUL, KOREA

Sung Hong, Choi, Foreign Minister.

Jay Kun Yoo, Member of National Assembly, ROK, Chairman of U.S.-Korea Interparliamentary Exchange Council.

Dai-Chul Chyung, Member of the National Assembly, PhD.

Unna Huh, Member of National Assembly, ROK, Information Technology Committee.

Joo Hong Nam, Professor of Unification and National Security, Kyounggi University.

Un Yong Kim, Executive Board, International Olympic Committee.

Kyung Soon Chang, Chairman, Senior Council, The Parliamentarians Society.

Thomas C. Hubbard, U.S. Ambassador, South Korea.

General Leon LaPorte, Commander in Chief, United National Command (UNC), Combined Forces Command (CFC), and U.S. Forces Command (USFC).

Lt General Dan Zanini, Chief of Staff, USFC.

Brigadier General John Defreintas, J-2 (Intelligence), USFC.

Colonel Bud Redmond, J-5 (Plans), USFC.

H. CON. RES. 36

Whereas over one million Americans suffer from juvenile (Type 1) diabetes, a chronic,

genetically determined, debilitating disease affecting every organ system;

Whereas 13,000 children a year 35 each day are diagnosed with juvenile diabetes;

Whereas 17,000 adults a year 46 each day are diagnosed with juvenile diabetes;

Whereas juvenile diabetes is one of the most costly chronic diseases of childhood;

Whereas insulin treats but does not cure this potentially deadly disease and does not prevent the complications of diabetes, which include blindness, heart attack, kidney failure, stroke, nerve damage, and amputations;

Whereas the Diabetes Research Working Group, a non-partisan advisory board established to advise Congress, has called for an accelerated and expanded diabetes research program at the National Institutes of Health and has recommended a \$4.1 billion increase in Federal funding for diabetes research at the National Institutes of Health over the next five years; and

Whereas a strong public private partnership to fund juvenile diabetes exists between the Federal Government and the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation, a foundation which has awarded more than \$326 million for diabetes research since 1970 and will give \$100 million in fiscal year 2001: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Federal funding for diabetes research should be increased in accordance with the recommendations of the Diabetes Research Working Group so that a cure for juvenile diabetes can be found.

CORRECTION TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF JUNE 4, 2002, AT PAGE H3102.

The following version of H. Con. Res. 36 and the amendment in the nature of a substitute was inadvertently printed in the RECORD incorrectly. The correct versions are as follows:

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OFFERED BY MR. TAUZIN

Mr. TAUZIN. Madam Speaker, I offer an amendment to the text.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. TAUZIN: strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That Federal funding for diabetes research should be increased annually as recommended by the Diabetes Research Working Group so that a cure for juvenile diabetes can be found.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DUNCAN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GUTKNECHT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, for 5 minutes, June 6.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. Trandahl, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1366. An act to designate the United States Post Office building located at 3101 West Sunflower Avenue in Santa Ana, California, as the "Hector G. Godinez Post Office Building".

H.R. 1374. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 600 Calumet Street in Lake Linden, Michigan, as the "Philip E. Ruppe Post Office Building".

H.R. 3448. An act to improve the ability of the United States to prevent, prepare for, and respond to bioterrorism and other public health emergencies.

H.R. 3789. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2829 Commercial Way in Rock Springs, Wyoming, as the "Teno Roncalio Post Office Building".

H.R. 3960. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3719 Highway 4 in Jay, Florida, as the "Joseph W. Westmoreland Post Office Building".

H.R. 4486. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1590 East Joyce Boulevard in Fayetteville, Arkansas, as the "Clarence B. Craft Post Office Building".

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 6, 2002, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

7188. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification of the intention to reallocate funds previously transferred from the Emergency Response Fund; (H. Doc. No. 107-225); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

7189. A letter from the Directors of Congressional Budget Office and Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a joint report on the National Defense Function (050) outlays for Fiscal Year 2003, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 226(a); to the Committee on Armed Services.

7190. A letter from the Deputy Commissioner for Education Statistics, Department of Education, transmitting the annual statistical report of the National Center for Education Statistics entitled, "The Condition of Education 2002," pursuant to 30 U.S.C. 9005; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

7191. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Land Disposal Restrictions: Granting of Two Site-Specific Treatment