Reserving the right

to object, Mr. Speaker, this bill will

not bring relief to the millions of

North Koreans who are suffering every

day. It is estimated that 2 million people

have died of starvation in North

Korea. More than 13 million North Koreans

suffer from malnutrition, including

60 percent of all children, the worst

rate among 110 developing nations surveyed

by the World Health Organization

and UNICEF. North Korea had an

infant mortality rate of 2 percent in

2000. South Korea’s infant mortality

rate for the same year by contrast was

0.5 percent. There are chronic shortages

of food and fuel already. Heavy

military spending, estimated at between

one-quarter and one-third of

gross domestic product, has constrained

and skewed economic development.

North Korea has a per capita

GDP of $1,000. South Korea’s per capita

GDP by contrast is $18,000.

Despite significant inflows of international

assistance over the past decade,

harsh economic and political conditions

have caused tens of thousands

of persons to flee the country.

The better approach the U.S. should

be supporting is the approach adhered

to by the South Koreans. They have

taken the approach of unification as a

way to pull North Korea into the modern

world. It worked for East Germany,

and it can work for North Korea again.

The downside of this approach is that

missile defense advocates will have to

create another false reason to spend in

excess of $9 billion a year on the failed

system. I am confident they can conjure

up some new enemy and protect

defense industry profits.

Now, it is true, Mr. Speaker, that

North Korea has declared that it possesses

nuclear weapons, this according

to a report by Dr. Hans Blix that was

presented and remarked on in a congressional

subcommittee the other day.

He said this report says it has not provided

evidence of this claim. It has violated

the NPT and twice declared its

withdrawal from the treaty.

It operates a nuclear fuel cycle consisting

of a 5-megawatt research reactor,

which uses natural uranium; a reprocessing

facility which produces plutonium;

and various uranium processing

and fuel fabrication facilities.

The United States has claimed that the

country also has an enrichment capability.

In 2005 Pakistan’s President

Musharaff stated that the A.Q. Khan

network had provided centrifuge machines

and designs to North Korea, although

the scale of its enrichment capability

remains unknown. North

Korea has not signed the Comprehensive

Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

Now, under a section called ‘‘What

Must be Done’’ in the report that Dr.

Blix delivered, the Weapons of Mass

Destruction Commission makes many

specific and detailed recommendations.

The most important of them are summarized

as, number one, to agree on

general principles of action; number

two, to reduce the danger of present arsenals,

no use by states, no access by

terrorists; number three, to prevent

proliferation, no new weapons systems,

no new possessors; number four, work

towards outlawing all weapons of mass

destruction once and for all, including

preventing an arms race in space by

prohibiting any stationing or use of

weapons in outer space. I would recommend

this to the reading by Members

of this Congress who are concerned

about nuclear proliferation.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I think that it

is time that this Congress calls for the

abolition of all nuclear weapons. That,

in effect, is what the Nonproliferation

Treaty is all about. It is true that the

use of nuclear weapons threatens the

future of mass public, cities, nations,

civilization itself, and, indeed, all of

life on Earth. Nuclear weapons in the

arsenal of any country undermine the

security of all countries, including the

United States. Under the Treaty of

Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons,

the NPT, all nuclear weapon states are

committed to good-faith negotiations

to achieve nuclear disarmament.

On June 6, 2006, the Chair and Vice

Chair of the National Commission on

Terrorist Attacks Upon the United

States, commonly known as the 9/11

Commission, cited as their number one

concern for the security of the United

States the availability of nuclear

weapons materials for attack upon the

American people. The 2006 report of the

Weapons of Mass Destruction Commission

concludes: ‘‘So long as any state

has nuclear weapons, others will want

to use them. So long as any weapons

remain, there is a risk that they will

one day be used by design or accident.

Any such use will be catastrophic. The

model nuclear weapons convention circulated

by the United Nations demonstrates

the feasibility of achieving

the global elimination of nuclear weapons.’’

So, Mr. Speaker, I am once again

asking this House to call for the abolition

of all nuclear weapons and to ask

that the House call upon the President

to initiate multilateral negotiations

for the abolition of nuclear weapons.

We can start by opening up direct negotiations

with North Korea for the

purpose of getting their participation,

and I think that is a much better approach

than the legislation that we are

about to send over to the President.

And for that purpose, I withdraw my

reservation of objection.

I want to say that

the gentleman from Oregon’s point is

well taken. As someone who engaged in

the debate over India, I am familiar

with the concerns that he has raised.

And there are concerns about the ability

of the United States Congress,

which is being asked to on one hand ascent

to the proliferation of one group,

and deny the proliferation of another,

for this Congress to be in a position of

trying to help this country have a consistent

program of nuclear nonproliferation,

which I know is exactly

the point that the gentleman relates to.

In addition to that, the Weapons of

Mass Destruction Commission has said

that North Korea ought to be given the

same kinds of guarantees that is in the

agreed framework of 1994 that they are

not going to be attacked. This is the

same thing that has been recommended

that is done with Iran as well. So we do

not need to get into these nuclear crises

and say that people are threats if

we engage them in talks that work towards nonproliferation.

This group made recommendations, Mr. WU,

that I am sure you are familiar

with. They said that a negotiation

with North Korea should aim at a

verifiable agreement, including as a

principle element, North Korea’s manifestation

of its adherence to the MPT

and accepting the 1997 additional protocol,

as well as the revival and a legal

confirmation of the commitments

made in the 1992 joint declaration on

the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula.

And notably saying that neither

North nor South Korea shall have nuclear

weapons nor nuclear reprocessing

and uranium enrichment facilities, and

fuel cycle services should be assured

through international agreements. The

agreements should also cover biological

and chemical weapons as well as

the comprehensive nuclear test ban

treaty, thus making the Korean Peninsula

a zone free of weapons of mass destruction.

So what Mr. WU is asking about, and

which I certainly support, is some consistency

in policy. And it beings with

Congress since we are being called

upon, as Mr. WU stated, to either agree

or disagree with these policies.

I want to thank the gentleman for

raising that, because this is the appropriate

time to raise that.

This is a discussion

that should have been happening a long

time ago in this Congress. Because no

one really talked that deeply about the

implication of our decision granting

India the ability to gain access to

fissile materials, in terms of the potential

dialectic of conflict which develops

between the proliferator, Pakistan, and

India gaining the fissile materials.

Mr. WU has raised the point that is

really central to the discussion about

how do we protect world peace. How do

we stop some kind of a conflagration

from breaking out on the subcontinent

if we do not have a consistent policy?

I mean, we know as was pointed out

in the WMDC report here, that in February

of 1999, India and Pakistan

signed a memorandum of understanding

on a variety of nuclear confidence

building measures.

Both countries, however, this report

says: ‘‘Are continuing their efforts to

develop and produce nuclear weapons

and their delivery vehicles.’’ So, Mr.

WU is right on in raising this. And this

is the exact time this has to be raised,

even though it is almost one in the

morning on Saturday. I yield.

Mr. Speaker, if I

could make just one last comment in

support of what the gentleman is saying,

I am sure many are familiar that

in the Hindu religion Brahma, the Creator;

and Vishnu, the Preserver; and

Shiva, the Destroyer exist simultaneously

and represent the multiplicity of God.

We here are called upon to determine

which of the principles, Creator, Preserver

or Destroyer, shall work

through each of us. As the gentleman

from Oregon says, if we continue to

pursue nuclear proliferation as embodied

in the nuclear agreement with

India, we will be open to the principles

of destruction. At this moment when

world tensions are rising and violence

is cycling higher, we need to take the

direction of preserving the peace and

creating a new opening through the

abolition of all nuclear weapons.

Again, I want to thank my friend

from Oregon for raising this point at

this propitious moment.