Mr. Chairman, sorry I am late. We have got

Greenspan in the Committee on Financial Services, almost as illustrious

as the panel before us here.

Obviously a nuclear North Korea is very dangerous. The Administration

appears to be immobilized between those who have a messianic

view that we must concur, or a regime change in North

Korea, because it is a bad government and I wish that it was that

easy.

There is another group that believes in real politic, that believes

that the safety of the people of America ought to be our highest priority

and that eliminating North Korea’s nuclear weapons program

verifiably, permanently, with total inspection would make America

much safer.

I clearly want to identify with the second camp, in that destabilizing

North Korea is not sure to be possible, but if it were possible,

you might end up with Yugoslavia with nukes.

What we have is an Administration, though, that time and time

again is willing to put corporate interests first. In order to deal

with the weapons of mass destruction threat posed by Saddam

Hussein, we have lost 1,200 of our finest, but the weapons of mass

destruction program of Iraq was tiny and of almost no significance

compared to the nuclear and missile programs of North Korea.

In order to deal with North Korea, we have to inconvenience

American corporations and international corporations. We have to

tell China that they must play with us, work with us and even act

in a way that is not in their immediate short-term interests, in

order to compel North Korea to abandon its nuclear program.

That means we would have to say that maybe the next load of

tennis shoes isn’t coming into the United States. That would inconvenience

the corporation, and inconveniencing corporations is something

this Administration is not willing to do simply to protect

Americans from a nuclear weapons program.

This is shameful, in light of their willingness to send 1,200 of our

finest in order to stop a much smaller threat.

We can bring enormous pressure on North Korea if we are willing

to pressure China. We can also offer North Korea the carrot

they have been asking for and that is a nonaggressive pact.

That would, of course, offend the messianic wing of this Administration.

We have to do that as well. Maximum carrots, maximum

sticks and vicarious sticks if necessary. That is to say, pressuring

China to pressure North Korea.

The other approach is what we followed for the last 4 years: Immobilization

and unwillingness to do anything and an announcement

of great success every time there is a hint, usually false, that

the North Korean’s are willing to lie to us around a six-sided table,

instead of a two-sided table.

I am tired of telling my constituents that nuclear weapons are

available to be smuggled across the border inside a bale of marijuana

and destroy our city and that we are not doing anything

about it, except some day we may get them back to a six-sided

table and they should go to sleep soundly knowing that that possibility

exists.

The unwillingness of this Administration to inconvenience perhaps

the corporate sector and psychologically inconvenience its

messianic wing has led to this possibility of a nuclear weapon being

smuggled into your city or into mine and it is particularly shameful

in light of the losses that we have suffered to deal with a much

smaller threat.

I yield back.