

raising \$200,000 in cash, the group, Favor, made sure every family received overflowing gift baskets to mark Thanksgiving, Christmas, the depths of winter and the beginning of summer.

In June, the group decided it had done its job, and announced that it would disband. Several of the organizers, who set aside work and the demands of family, said it was time to return to their former lives. But Favor will not be fading away any time soon. The renewed flood of news media attention that began in recent weeks has sparked a fresh round of philanthropy, including that of a Texas millionaire who has offered scholarships to the 61 children who lost a parent last September.

At the very least, Allyson Gilbert, the group's executive director, said she and others have decided to put together one more gift basket, something small and simple, perhaps a tray of home-baked cookies crowned by a teddy bear. The baskets, she said, will probably arrive a week or two after Sept. 11, when the commemorative events and televised anniversary specials are through.

"They don't need us to deliver these huge food baskets or big checks anymore," she said. "I think they just need a reminder that we're thinking about them, that we have not forgotten, and that we're not going to go away."

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 464. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress on the anniversary of the terrorist attacks launched against the United States on September 11, 2001.

CONGRESS MUST CREATE SINGLE, UNIFIED AUTHORIZATION AND APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEES FOR NEW DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY TO BE SUCCESSFUL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLAKE). 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 take this time to reflect on the incidents of the past year and to discuss the next phase of our war against terrorism and our war for homeland security.

Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago on this day at 8:30 in the morning I was on the third floor of this building in the press gallery beginning a press conference with our colleagues from both sides of the aisle. We had assembled before the national media to call for support of a bill that I was introducing that day asking for an additional \$6 billion of defense spending. That defense spending was to go specifically for readiness for our troops, for homeland security, and for the war against terrorism.

The first plane hit; the second plane hit. The media had to stop the press conference, and by 9 o'clock we real-

ized that we were going to have to vacate the building. The Sergeant at Arms called for vacating the Capitol, and we began the orderly process of descending from the third floor of this building to the parking lot.

On the way out, I talked to our Sergeant at Arms. I said, What is happening? He said, There are at least two more planes in the air, and we feel one of them may be headed for the Capitol building. By the time we got to the parking lot and looked across Washington, off in the distance we could see the black smoke rising from the Pentagon.

There was total chaos on Capitol Hill that day, Mr. Speaker, because no one had anticipated that kind of action against us, in spite of the calls for America to be secure that had been made by many Members of this body on numerous occasions prior to 9-11.

We wandered on the Hill as they evacuated the office buildings, and moved down toward the Capitol Hill police station. Near the train station we would get our first briefing. About 120 of us got that briefing. I came back out and walked back toward the Capitol when my cell phone rang, and I got a call that was extremely disturbing and very emotional for me. I learned from my friends in the New York City Fire Department that one of my good friends was missing with the collapse of the two World Trade Center buildings.

See, what was so tragically emotional for me was that individual had taken me through the first World Trade Center bombing in 1993. As many of our colleagues know, Mr. Speaker, I would not be in this body were it not for my work in the fire service. Having grown up in a fire service family and becoming chief of my own local department, a fire instructor, and going back to school for a degree in that area, I have been identified with those brave individuals since I first came to this body 16 years ago.

So in my capacity as a Member of Congress and the founder of the Congressional Fire and Emergency Services Caucus for the past 16 years, I have made it my business to attend every disaster we have had, from the Murrah Building bombing in Oklahoma City to the wildlands fires in the West to Hurricane Andrew and Hugo in the South to the Mid Western floods to the Loma Prieta and Northridge earthquakes and the World Trade Center bombing in 1993.

It was in 1993 when I went up as a guest of Commissioner Howard Safir that I first met a brave young firefighter in New York who would later become the chief of all special forces and rescue in that department. He and members of the New York City Fire Department took me through the bombed-out parking garage in the Trade Center in 1993, where I saw the terrible, horrible devastation caused by bin Laden the first time he hit America.

He and I became friends. We traveled around the country and spoke at many events together on the need to prepare for homeland security and our common defense. In fact, it was the suggestion of a commission that came from some of the recommendations he gave me that resulted in legislation I introduced 4 years ago to create a commission chaired by former Governor Jim Gilmore of Virginia called the Gilmore Commission.

My friend, Ray Downey, was a member of that commission. The Gilmore Commission's purpose was to make recommendations to the Congress and the White House about how we could better prepare for what none of us wanted to think about: the ultimate tragedy against our country. Four years ago, no one was thinking that could be a reality, but the Gilmore Commission in fact three times issued reports before 9-11 with specific recommendations that we in the Congress and the White House should follow.

Ray Downey was a member of that commission. Ray Downey was the incident command officer on the scene in New York at Ground Zero directing the bulk of those 343 firefighters who were killed as they went up into the stairwells of those buildings to bring people down. In fact, when I went to the Trade Center Ground Zero site 2 days later, not as a Member of Congress but as a member of the fire service, I spent the day with the New York City firefighters.

The day that I arrived, unfortunately, the tragedy was that Ray Downey's two sons, who were both New York City firefighters, one a captain and one a lieutenant, were looking for the remains of their dad. How terribly tragic it was to be asked by the firefighters union in the city to go back to the Javits Center to greet the families of those that were going to visit with President Bush that night, the families of those that were missing.

I did that, and I saw our President for 2½ hours meet privately with the families of those victims who were tragically taken in the course of the rescue, in the course of the firefighting, in response to the World Trade Center disaster.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor for two specific reasons. One is to first of all talk about the next phase of where we have to go. It is extremely important that this body understand that even though we passed the Homeland Security Act creating a new Federal department, and we did a good job in that process, and the gentleman from Texas (Speaker ARMEY) and our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are deserving of credit for the outstanding piece of legislation that we finished very early in the morning hours of August, the other body will shortly complete their version of that bill; and by the end of this month we will send to the President a piece of legislation that creates a brand-new large agency in fact consolidating 22

existing agencies with over 170,000 employees and a budget of nearly \$40 billion.

This new agency is needed, and this new agency is absolutely essential if we are going to win the war on terrorism and if we are going to properly protect our homeland.

The four departments of this agency are critically vital to our Nation's security: the Border and Transportation Security Division, the Emergency Preparedness and Response Division, the Chemical, Biological, Radiological, and Nuclear Countermeasures Division, and the Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection Division.

This new cabinet agency I think is the right solution that the administration has proposed for America to be secure. But, Mr. Speaker, I come tonight to tell my colleagues that in my opinion the passage of this legislation and the signing of it into law by President Bush will only accomplish 40 percent of the solution.

Now, Members of Congress in both parties will pat themselves on the back; the President will sign the bill into law with a Rose Garden ceremony; and everyone will say, America should feel safe because we have created a new agency. This new agency will, for the first time, consolidate the efforts of 22 existing departments.

I come before my colleagues tonight to tell them that this agency cannot and will not succeed unless the Congress does its job. Mr. Speaker, I just mentioned that Congress completed their legislative work in the House and the other body is about to complete it, so what in fact am I talking about?

Mr. Speaker, as it currently stands, this new agency, with its new cabinet member director, will oversee 170,000 employees with a budget of nearly \$40 billion. But here is the dilemma, Mr. Speaker: this agency will have to report to 88 separate committees and subcommittees of the House and the Senate. When we add in the intelligence committees and the other select committees, this new agency will have to answer to 90 separate committees and subcommittees of this body and the other body.

Mr. Speaker, this agency is doomed to failure unless this Congress does something that the leadership does not want to talk about. The reason I raise this tonight, Mr. Speaker, is to begin a process that I will continue for the rest of this year to call for the creation of one single authorization committee in the House, one single authorization committee in the Senate, one single Committee on Appropriations in the House, and one single Committee on Appropriations in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, if the Congress does not rise to the occasion and put aside our petty differences, put aside our jurisdictional concerns, and realize that this agency cannot succeed having to answer to 90 separate committees and subcommittees, then this Congress will not have done its job.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this will not be done by legislation because the committee structure is a part of the rules of the House, so I am asking our colleagues on both sides of the aisle to communicate with the leadership of both parties so that whoever wins control of the Congress in November understands that our new rules in January must create single, unified authorization and appropriation committees to give the proper support to this new agency that we will have just created.

Now, I realize there are committee chairs and subcommittee chairs that do not want to give up jurisdiction. In my case, Mr. Speaker, I am the chairman of one of the largest subcommittees on the Armed Forces in the House, the Subcommittee on Military Procurement.

My subcommittee, with its membership from both sides of the aisle, oversees approximately \$100 billion a year of our defense budget. But, Mr. Speaker, I understand the need for us to have a quantified oversight function if the homeland security agency is going to succeed. I am willing to give up the jurisdiction that my subcommittee has and am willing to support giving up the jurisdiction of the full Committee on Armed Services to a new committee structure that will have the ability to coordinate the work of this new committee.

Now, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, we all know there are committee chairs, ranking members, subcommittee chairs and ranking members in both bodies that are not going to be willing to give up their committee jurisdiction.

□ 1830

And if they prevail, I contend this agency will not be able to be successful. We cannot expect a new agency of this complexity with the challenges of information dominance, information assessment, transportation security, homeland response, first responders, research and testing for weapons of mass destruction and all the other activities that this agency will oversee, we cannot expect this agency to be successful if the Secretary of this agency, if the leaders of this agency have to come up to the Hill for the individual hearings and briefings that will be required by 90 committees and subcommittees of this body and the other body.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot overemphasize enough on this day 1 year after the attack on our country, the need for us to follow in the second phase of the battle for homeland security. As someone who has been involved on the Committee on Armed Services for 16 years, as someone who has been involved in homeland security ensuring the Congressional Fire and EMS Caucus and having founded it, the largest caucus in the Congress with 340 House and Senate members, with someone who has worked the issues of intelligence and data fusion and issues involving weap-

ons of mass destruction, I am absolutely convinced, Mr. Speaker, the only way this new agency can succeed is if we rise above petty politics and if we rise above the parochial concerns each of us have with our own committees and subcommittees to give this new agency a chance to succeed.

The first few months of the existence of this agency, in fact, the first few years of the existence of this agency, are going to require organization, are going to require new structures, new budgets, new techniques, reaching out to deal with new challenges. The last thing this agency needs is to have 90 committees of this Congress calling them up to the Hill, getting them to come in and brief them on various aspects of what they are doing.

By setting up two new committees in the House, one authorization and one appropriations, two new committees in the Senate, one authorization and one appropriations, we will give our colleagues, and our steering committees will determine who those members are, we will give our colleagues the kind of jurisdictional control that will allow this new agency to succeed.

So, Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to challenge our colleagues, to do something that I know is not inherently and logically what Members would want to do. And that is to take the jurisdiction away from existing committees, both appropriations and authorization, and consolidate all of those efforts into the new committee structures that would oversee a coordinated agency.

Mr. Speaker, I will be sending a dear colleague letter to all of my colleagues. I have talked to our colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) who will be working the other side of the aisle. I invite other Members of this body who feel as I do to join with us in calling on the leadership in both parties to begin the process to prepare for the makeup of the rules of the 108th Congress, for those that return, to make sure that in the new committee structures of this House and the Senate, the other body, is that this new committee structure be put into place.

If we take these steps now, if we lay the groundwork, then I am convinced this new agency has an absolutely outstanding opportunity to succeed. I would also encourage, Mr. Speaker, our colleagues and their constituents from around the country to weigh in with their representatives and let them know that the homeland security battle is only 40 percent complete when we established the new homeland security agency. The other 60 percent of that battle is in a consolidated committee structure that gives the jurisdictional control to a group of our colleagues in both bodies to coordinate, to have aggressive communication and to help provide the proper oversight of this new agency that we will, in fact, create by the end of this month.

Mr. Speaker, the second follow-on to homeland security involves the President's decision to move forward in an

aggressive way against the weapons of mass destruction that Saddam Hussein has acquired in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I have been here 16 years. The toughest votes I have had to make are those votes we have taken that commit our sons and daughters, our brothers and sisters, our uncles and aunts to go into harm's way on behalf of this Nation. Because every time we do that we have casualties, we have injuries and we have loss of life. And all of our colleagues, as you know, Mr. Speaker, take this responsibility extremely seriously because they understand these are America's sons and daughters that we place in harm's way.

I am also concerned because in the last 10 years we have used our troops at a level that we have not seen in the past 100 years. From 1991 to 2000 our troops were deployed to 39 major involvements around the world from Haiti and Bosnia, from Kosovo and Macedonia, from Somalia and East Timor to Colombia and to numerous other destinations at home and abroad. Our troops are stretched. Our troops have been overworked, but this President has told us and will tell the world tomorrow at the U.N. that America has to continue this war against terrorism, and that includes dealing with Saddam Hussein in Iraq and the terrible capabilities that he, in fact, has acquired.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in spite of the President's request and call, I have questions and I have asked the administration and I am hopefully going to get all of the answers. Those questions are simple and they are: The absolute factual information about what technology Saddam Hussein has today in the area of weapons of mass destruction and how soon he will require more aggressive technology.

The second is what ties are there between Saddam Hussein's actions and his leadership and the al Qaeda, bin Laden network.

The third question relates to what kind of military action might we see. A surgical strike taking out Saddam and his upper guard or an all-out war as we saw in 1991 requiring massive commitments of our troops.

The fourth question involves the support of our allies. Not the public rhetoric that we hear, but the behind-the-scenes commitments, the behind-the-scenes private conversations between our President and our State Department and those nations that when we commit will have to support us.

The last question is what will be our exit strategy? What will happen when Saddam Hussein leaves? And I have no doubt that when we undertake such a mission we will be successful. But the key question for us to answer is who will follow Saddam Hussein? What organizational structure will be put into place? What role will the U.N. play, and what will be the response of our allies and the neighbors to Iraq?

The President is answering those five questions as we assemble today. In fact, yesterday before the Committee

on Armed Services we had classified briefings with arms control inspectors from the U.N. who came before us and in private gave us a very candid assessment along with our intelligence community as to what capabilities Saddam Hussein has.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that every Member of this body and the other body ask the CIA, the Defense Intelligence Agency and the FBI and our other intelligence apparatus to come in and brief the member privately and confidentially on what we know about Saddam Hussein's capabilities.

Now, we know he has chemical weapons capabilities because he has used chemical weapons against his own citizens, the Kurds, in the past. We know he has been working on biological weapons capabilities and, in fact, we now know and this has been verified publicly, that he has this capability as well. In fact, he has strains of anthrax, small pox, botulism and other illness or other diseases of that type and organisms that can promote those types of diseases easy.

We know that Saddam has been working on nuclear capability, but it is not yet unclassified as to whether or not bin Laden has the capability to deliver a nuclear weapon. We are certainly aware he has missile technology because it was Saddam in 1991 who fired that low complexity scud missile into our barracks in Saudi Arabia that sent 28 young Americans home in body bags, half of them from my State, because we could not defend against that missile.

Mr. Speaker, the leadership in the White House is now offering Members of Congress the answers to the questions that I have posed. But, Mr. Speaker, we must not be satisfied until we have taken every step possible to use every means possible to avert war.

Several of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle approached me this past week, colleagues who had traveled with me to Vienna when the war in Yugoslavia started several years ago. They came to me because at that time we were, with the support of our State Department, took a bipartisan delegation with 11 members of this body to Vienna to meet for two days with the leadership of the political factions in Russia. We were joined by a representative of Milosovic.

For two days we met with the State Department representative in the room with us. At the end of those two days, we hammered out the frame work which would 2 weeks later become the basis of the G-8 agreement which would end the war in Yugoslavia with Russian involvement.

So my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who went with us on that trip, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) who chairs the Progressive Caucus and others approached me and said, Perhaps we can do something similar again. I said, What are you talking about? He said, Perhaps we should join with our Russian friends

and see what influence they can provide with us to convince Hussein that his time is up, that he can no longer run aware from the requirements that were placed upon him by the nations of the world in six U.N. resolutions that were passed in 1991. Those U.N. resolutions were not adopted in this body, by America alone. Those U.N. resolutions were hammered out by the nations of the worlds with the support of the U.N. Security Council which means that Russian and China and the other nations in the Security Council were in agreement with those resolutions.

Those resolutions at that time call for Hussein to abide by certain conditions after the U.S. removed his military from the independent nation of Kuwait. One of the primary requirements of those resolutions was that Iraq had to open up its doors for independent U.N. inspectors to verify whether or not weapons of mass destruction were in fact being produced.

Initially there was some limited success. But as we heard yesterday in a public hearing with two of our leading arms control inspectors from the U.N., the cooperation by Iraq quickly ended. In their estimation there is no doubt in their minds that Saddam Hussein today has developed sophisticated chemical and biological weapon technology. And within a few short months if he is able to acquire the fissile material he needs, the weapons grade material he needs, he could have a nuclear bomb at his disposal.

Now, contrary to what another inspector has said who traveled to Iraq, these inspectors were emphatic. They provided evidence. And they have provided their firsthand experiences.

Mr. Speaker, we have to take action. Now, I am convinced that we have to at this time go to our friends in Russia who have reached out so aggressively to us and we have to ask and in fact in a polite way demand that they come with us as partners as they did with us back during the Yugoslavian or Kosovo war. We responded when the Russians came to us and asked me in particular as the co-chairman of the Duma Congress group with the Russian Duma and Federation Council to join them in finding a way to end that war and we did. And now I have challenged them after a response from our colleagues on the other side to work with us to make a case in Moscow and to President Putin that Saddam Hussein must comply with the orders of the world community or he will be dealt with by the U.S. led coalition.

Now, I have been in communication for the past several days with the leadership of the Russian Duma. I have told them that we would like to bring a delegation to Moscow as soon as they will agree to the terms that we have established. The bipartisan delegation that we will take to Moscow on a military aircraft would have discussions with the Russians about a joint statement, a joint statement of Russian and American legislatures demanding that Saddam Hussein do what is right in terms

of the leadership of the world's communities established in 1991 through the U.N. resolutions.

□ 1845

In fact, it is my hope that when we arrive in Moscow at the invitation of our Duma friends we would also have a chance to meet face to face with President Putin, as I have done in the past, to deliver our feelings directly to him.

Why this focus on Russia? It is rather simple. Russia has become a new ally of ours. As our colleagues in this body know, I focus on Russia. It is of primary interest to me. I have traveled to that country 29 times, and I have a great many friends throughout Russian society, both elected and nonelected.

Russia has reached out to America, unlike many other countries in the world. It was President Putin who was the first foreign leader on September 11, 1 year ago, who telephoned President Bush and offered the support of the Russian people. It was President Putin and the Russian Government that opened the doors of their intelligence agency to share what intelligence they had on al Qaeda. It was President Putin and the Russian military that opened former Soviet military bases in Uzbekistan, which I took a delegation to visit in May, where our troops are today stationed, fighting the war against terrorism.

Russia has made a fundamental decision to join with America and the West in the 21st century, but Russia also maintains significant ties to Iraq. Iraq has relied on Russia in the past for technology, for the sale of legitimate military technology that can be sold in the marketplace. Russia also has just signed a \$40 billion long-term energy deal with the Iraqi oil industry. Mr. Speaker, it does not take a rocket scientist to figure out Russia has ties with Iraq that are deep, that are both political and economic.

We have new ties with Russia. We have become Russia's friend, and we spend approximately \$1 billion a year of the U.S. taxpayer dollars on programs to stabilize Russia, the cooperative threat reduction program, programs through the Department of Commerce, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of State, environmental programs, education programs, initiatives involving all aspects of Russian society.

In fact, it was this Congress that 2 years ago created a brand-new program called Open World, funded through the Librarian of Congress, Jim Billington and his office. Each year we bring over thousands of Russian leaders to spend up to 10 days in our local towns and cities understanding the strength of the American system.

Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity here in this next phase of the war on terrorism. That opportunity I think requires us to call in our chips with Russia.

I am prepared, Mr. Speaker, to take time off from this body with our col-

leagues to go to Moscow to meet with our Russian colleagues from all factions, the Communist, Udinstyo, Yabloko, even Zhironovsky's faction, to come together on a common agenda as civilized human beings as new partners and friends to tell President Putin that we need him to make the personal case to Saddam that the world will not tolerate the kind of buildup of weapons of mass destruction technology that he has built up over the past 10 years.

If Saddam refuses our request for unconditional visits, unconditional visits, not where Saddam can know 24 hours in advance where our inspectors are going, not where Saddam can predetermine what sites we are going to visit, unconditional visits, not by the U.S. but by U.N. and world-sanctioned inspectors, hundreds of inspectors, then Saddam has to understand that America will take the action required and requested by our President.

I have my doubts, Mr. Speaker, that Saddam will accept such a request; but as a Member of Congress responsible for the lives of my constituents who wear the uniform, I will not be happy unless I use every possible opportunity that I have to try to find a way to avoid the ultimate conflict. I think joining together, Democrats and Republicans, liberals and conservatives, joining with members of the Udinstyo, Yabloko, Union of Right Forces and all the other factions in the Russian political sphere, that we can find a common agenda that follows on and expands the U.N. resolutions passed in 1991.

What a dramatic statement it will be if Russian leaders and American leaders, George Bush supported by President Putin joined together, and tell Saddam Hussein the game's up, you have been doing for 10 years what you agreed not to do in 1992, not because the U.S. demanded it, but because the U.N. passed resolutions demanding that you adhere to the requirements of the civilized nations of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that in following through on this request we would give the President the kind of support that he needs during this difficult time. All of us will be listening intently tomorrow as the President makes a key address before the United Nations, as he lays out factually the evidence that we have as to Saddam's efforts and the potential use of that technology against our Nation, our people, our friends and other nations with weapons of mass destruction.

This is a key and fundamental part of the war against terrorism. If we allow Saddam Hussein and Iraq to go unchecked, it is only a matter of time before we will face the threat that would be caused by the weapons that he has produced.

Mr. Speaker, in our hearing yesterday, we questioned the inspectors from the U.N. about the possible effects on American and other lives if smallpox were used as a weapon of mass destruction. At our hearing yesterday, in a public format, they admitted that Sad-

dam Hussein today has smallpox capability. The question asked by our colleagues on the committee was, What would be the potential impact on America if smallpox were used here or at one of our installations? They really could not give a solid answer.

When it came time for my questioning, I made reference to a war game, a simulation that our military funded in May of 2001 at Andrews Air Force Base. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, war games are held to simulate the worst possible conditions that could face our country. This war game was conducted by the Army and by CSIS, the Centers for Strategic and International Studies, headed by Dr. John Hammer, former deputy Secretary of Defense.

What was the war game? The war game was called Dark Winter. What was the simulation? The simulation was a deliberate outbreak of smallpox in three cities in just three States of America. It was a very credible exercise. Former Senator Sam Nunn played the role of the President. Former CIA Director Jim Woolsey played the role of the CIA director and former top officials from both administrations of both parties played the role of our leadership.

What was the outcome? A single case of anthrax was given and put forward quietly in Pennsylvania, Alabama, and Arkansas, one case in each State. Within 2 weeks, Mr. Speaker, 2 million Americans were afflicted with smallpox, 2 million Americans. As my colleagues know, we have no smallpox vaccine. It is one of the reasons why the Secretary of Health and Human Services, Tommy Thompson, asked for the money we gave him to purchase 350 million vaccines.

The point is, Mr. Speaker, as bad as the World Trade incident was a year ago, as bad as the attack on the Pentagon was a year ago, as bad as the plane going down in Pennsylvania was a year ago, the next incident could be much worse. Saddam Hussein has continued to build these terrible weapons of mass destruction that both the U.S. and Russia are now destroying.

We must come together as an institution and find ways to support the next phase of our battle for homeland security. That means we have to pass in the next rules for the next session of Congress a unified oversight structure for authorization and appropriation of dollars in the House and the Senate for this new agency, and it means that we must hold accountable our new Russian friends to help put maximum pressure on Hussein; and if that fails, then we must be prepared to support our President in his effort to rid the world of the kind of sources of terrorism that can destroy mankind.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Chair and the staff for staying.