Mr. Chairman, I am seeking recognition.

I yield to the gentleman from New York, Mr. Ackerman.

Reclaiming my time, I yield to the Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let me just review

some of the ground that Mr. Pomeroy covered. Let me put it in

maybe more stock terms. When he posed a question relative to a

containment only policy, is it a fair statement to say that if we

adopted a containment only policy, that the expenditure of tax dollars

would far exceed, the path that we are presently pursuing?

So it is a fair statement, if this policy should

eventually prove to be successful, that we will have saved billions

of American taxpayer dollars?

I concur with your priority in terms of the threat

issue and the risk. But I think it is important for those who are

here and those that are watching these proceedings to understand

in terms that most of us can understand that it is in times when

we can’t seem to agree on budgets and spending priorities, that it

would be an extremely expensive route to go, if there were to be

a containment only policy. I just wanted to make that point.

Fundamentally, the policy we are pursuing now, in simple terms,

is to retard and then prevent the development and the ability to

deliver weapons, nuclear arms, weapons of mass destruction, by

North Korea. That is the purpose of this policy.

Did I hear you say, Dr. Perry, that it would have appeared by

information that was available to you back in 1994, or was it 1995,

that they were prepared, or very close to having that particular

ability? Is that an accurate statement on my part?

Let me review, because I just want to try to really

grasp this: This is approximately 5 years later, and there has

been no progress presumably on the part of the North Koreans in

terms of the development in the ability to deliver a nuclear device?

I would suggest that we have for a relatively

small investment yielded a good return in terms of this particular

policy. Some have stated that we have conferred benefits. It sounds

as if we are implicit in that term as somehow coddling, giving them

something that they don’t deserve. Maybe they don’t deserve it. But

the reality is that we have received something in return. We have

secured 4 to 5 years of development, and, as you indicate, Dr.

Perry, this is a process. This is a process that is ongoing with fits

and starts and hopefully, if it is pursued to a conclusion, as there

appears to be at least some room for optimism, may preclude North

Korea from full membership in the nuclear club.