

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS WITH RESPECT TO THE RECONCILIATION OF NORTH AND SOUTH KOREA

**HON. SCOTT MCINNIS**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1995

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, the Administration has in recent months claimed several foreign policy victories. However, American taxpayers should recognize that one of these victories, the recent accord between the United States and Communist North Korea, may prove extremely costly.

The Administration has hailed the agreement as the beginning of the end of a perilous nuclear crisis. But, the nuclear crisis appears far from over since North Korea is not required to dismantle all its nuclear facilities for at least 10 years. The Administration has played down the concessions the United States must provide to North Korea within this "gentlemen's agreement". Additionally, the Administration appears to have slighted the traditionally close United States coordination with our democratic and reliable ally, South Korea.

Under the agreement, which was signed on October 21, the United States will organize a consortium including South Korea and Japan to supply North Korea with two light-water reactors. These reactors are less useful for bomb-making than the North's existing technology. In return, North Korea will freeze its nuclear program and promise to open its nuclear sites eventually to inspection.

A serious flaw is that the accord allows North Korea to postpone United Nation's "special inspections" of its nuclear sites until one of the light-water reactors is nearly in place, a process that will take at least 5 years—and probably longer.

These inspections are necessary to determine whether Pyongyang has extracted weapons-grade plutonium for its spent-fuel stock. We should take into account, though, that in the last two years, Pyongyang has concluded nuclear agreements with both the United Nations International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and Seoul that it has failed to fulfill. The Administration offered North Korea economic and political benefits and granted the North up to 10 years, or longer, to fulfill pledges it has already refused to honor.

While these light-water reactors are being assembled, a process that will take a decade or more, the United States-led consortium will provide North Korea with free crude oil as an alternative energy source, gradually reduce trade barriers, work toward exchanging diplomatic missions and provide a negative security assurance.

Both Tokyo and Seoul officially welcomed the agreement. However, the accord is drawing fire from South Korea's opposition Democratic party (DP) as well as from conservatives with the majority party, the Democratic Liberal Party (DLP). The DP is decrying the cost to Seoul of two light-water reactors, estimated as high as \$4 billion, and the requirement to pay for the crude oil that is supposed to serve as North Korea's alternative energy supply. Conservative members of the DLP similarly op-

pose the high price tag and the generous delays offered to the North. There is growing popular South Korean sentiment that North Korea has outmaneuvered Washington and marginalized the South's input into this issue. This agreement may jeopardize an alliance that has been very close and productive for many years. I believe we must move to reaffirm the importance of close United States coordination with the South Korean Government.

The Administration should take steps to guarantee that the implementation of the agreement is linked to substantive progress in the reconciliation of North and South Korea. To that end, the Administration should develop specific timetables for achieving measures which will reduce tensions between North and South Korea. For example, specific timetables should be developed for the prompt dismantlement of North Korea's nuclear processing facility. Timetables for the establishment of liaison offices between North and South Korea should be developed. Mutual nuclear facility inspections between North and South Korea should be initiated. Furthermore, the Administration should develop timetables for the establishment of a North-South joint military to discuss steps to reduce tensions between North and South Korea.

The Administration should immediately appoint a presidential envoy to deal directly with the real leadership in Pyongyang. This presidential envoy should be respected and experienced in negotiating with Koreans. One of the envoy's first actions should be to call on the North to resume substantive, high-level talks with Seoul immediately.

Today, I, along with my colleagues Representatives KIM (CA) and SOLOMON (NY), have introduced a concurrent resolution which outlines several steps I think the Administration should take to strengthen the United States-North Korea Agreed Framework. Likewise, Senators MURKOWSKI, SIMON, ROBB and HELMS have introduced identical legislation in the other body.

I urge my colleagues in the House to join me by cosponsoring this very important concurrent resolution. By taking these steps, the agreement between the United States and the heavily armed North Korean regime may ultimately be a success.

UNDERSTANDING CONGRESS

**HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1995

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, "Oh what gift to give us to see ourselves as others see us."—Robert Burns.

Following is an article from the Indianapolis Star.

PARTISAN SPATS HAVE LITTLE TO DO WITH REAL WORK OF THE HOUSE  
(By George Statuville)

WASHINGTON.—Republicans and Democrats in Congress had been handling each other with kid gloves until last week. Then they dragged out the old battle-scarred partisan boxing gloves left over from the last session, laced them up and started duking it out.

But a brawl had been brewing for a few days.

Since the start of the session, Democrats had been using their morning speeches on the floor to attack the Republicans' *Contract With America* or complain about Republicans cutting them out of legislation. It sounded like old times—except Democrats are the chief winners now.

Then on Wednesday, Rep. Carrie Meek, D-Fla., ignited the melee with an innocuous comment about House Speaker Newt Gingrich, R-Ga., and his potentially lucrative book deal. Said Meek: "Exactly who does this speaker really work for? Is it the American people or his New York publishing house?"

Wham! Rep. Bob Walker, R-Pa., one of the most incendiary House members when his party was in the minority, demanded that Meek's comment be stricken from the record. In Walker's corner, acting Speaker Cliff Stearns, R-Fla., ruled Meek was out of order.

In minutes, representatives of both stripes cleared out of their offices and committee meetings like baseball players emptying the dugouts for a donnybrook over an umpire's call. Then they put the issue to a vote and, on strict party lines, 217-178, the Republican majority prevailed.

It was a nasty moment. It got plenty of play in newspapers and on radio and TV.

But it wasn't indicative of what really happened in Congress.

To understand Congress, you must see the House chambers as political theater. Removed from political reality, the floor is where actor/politicians deliver ideological soliloquies; where actor/politicians engage in witty and well-planned dialogue; where actor/politicians play for hometown audiences with homespun stories; where actor/politicians put their egos on display.

The floor's voting consoles are its only practical use. Almost no work is done there.

WHERE BUSINESS IS DONE

To understand Congress, you must look at the subcommittee politics.

There weren't too many stories Wednesday about Rep. John Myers' first day as chairman of the House Appropriations subcommittee on energy and water.

Here, courtesy, congeniality and collegiality prevailed on a panel that controls about \$20 billion in federal spending. That's \$20 BILLION for water control and energy programs.

Instead of the contentiousness that spilled on the House floor, you saw Myers receive a gracious introduction from the former chairman, Rep. Tom Bevill, D-Ala.

Handing Myers the gavel, Bevill joked that he would have to get used to sitting in the smaller chair instead of the high-backed chairman's seat he had used for 18 years.

Myers jokingly replied that he had sold the chair, which got a laugh from Bevill.

The truth is that Myers, out of respect for Bevill, had the chair removed from the room altogether. Bevill had previously mentioned to Myers that he would miss the comfort of the big chair during interminable hearings.

So Myers got rid of it and took a small chair himself.

Myers' act carried deep symbolism, and it didn't go unnoticed by Bevill.

In subcommittees, members of Congress get to know each other. It's where most of the unglamorous legislative work gets done. Subcommittee politics are local, and a member's standing with his or her subcommittee is far more important than the bluster of the floor.

And in Myers' subcommittee, bipartisanship occupies the biggest chair.