As the old saying goes, justice delayed is justice denied, and I will not stand by quietly as justice is denied to my congressional district by a foreign entity who should have no interest in this case. Today's editorial page in the Sarasota Herald-Tribune reads, ''Time's Up for Mexico.'' It begins, ''The reasons for Mexico to extradite murder suspect Jose Luis Del Toro Jr. will be the same tomorrow as they were a year ago. The only difference is that Mexico can no longer cite the need for time as its inexcusable refusal to send Del Toro to trial in the United States.'' I could not agree more. I am here today on the floor of the House to say, ''Mexico, your time is up. Send back Del Toro.''

DEBATE ON GUNS AFFECTS THE DISTRICT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, last week we had a heartbreaking debate on guns. Women Members of this body felt this debate with particular poignancy. If the truth be told, we regard ourselves as special guardians of issues that affect women and families, not because we are such, we are after all, self-anointed, but because we choose to be. However, I ask you to imagine a bill that came from outside, thrown in like a piece of dynamite to wipe out all your local gun laws, whether you are from the West and treasure your right to have a gun or whether you are from a crowded city and treasure your right to ban guns.

Two amendments came forward that would have invaded my district with law from this body. We defeated one handily, that that simply wiped out handgun laws in the District of Columbia. The other, we almost defeated. That is the one I want to talk about this afternoon, because it is one that is of special importance to women and children, and that is a bill that would have allowed people in the District of Columbia to have guns in their home.

Some Members came up to me and said, ''Well, that sounds reasonable to me to have a gun in your own home.'' So why should we not impose that on the District even though your city council has said otherwise and even though no Member here would impose anything on anybody else's district. Nevertheless, I can understand the surface appeal of a gun in your own home.

Ask the women in your own district why they do not want a gun in their own home. No woman in America wants a gun in the home and there is a very good reason why. The greatest cause of death of women is inflicted upon them not by rapists in the streets but by guns and knives in the hands of their own partners in their own homes as it is now. Most of them go to the hospital, the victim of beatings, often severe. Imagine if guns were freely available in homes, particularly in large cities which have rampant domestic violence rates.

Most of those who think about guns in the home are surely unaware of the most tragic statistics of all, and they are not the statistics from Columbine. They are the statistics that are awesomely larger. They are statistics that show accidental killings occur routinely from guns that are simply lying in the home, often out of the reach of children but found by children whose natural curiosity often makes them look for guns. Very few guns are used the way they are in the movies to counter somebody entering through the bedroom window and you shoot them dead. That is not what happens to guns in the home. Look at the statistics and you will know. But in big troubled cities there are other hazards in addition.

The lady who takes care of my handicapped daughter when I told her about how some people wanted guns in the homes gave me I think the best wakeup call of all. She said, ''Oh, my God, what will happen to these bad teenagers?'' The first she could think of is in her high crime neighborhood in southeast Washington, the troubled teens would be all over the place. She has a hard enough time with them now, but if they think that everybody is packing a gun in her neighborhood, she did not know what she would do. I know that because I represent this city. I do not expect Members to know that who do not. That is why I do not expect them to impose guns on me when my city council has not done so. In this town, particularly in high crime neighborhoods, the criminals and, yes, the teens would be breaking in not looking for computers but looking for guns because they hear the people are packing guns now because the Congress says, ''That is the thing to do if you live in a high crime city, pack your gun in.''

I do not need this body to send this message to a city that is one of the most violent cities in the United States and that our police chief is just getting under control. He was at the forefront of those who said he did not want our handgun laws wiped out and for God sakes do not send a message from the House that everybody ought to pack a gun.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, a grandmother named Helen Foster was shot in the back in southwest Washington as she gathered children after she heard gunshots, recognizing that they might be in danger. She died at D.C. General Hospital. What happens when there are guns in the home in a city like this? What happens when there are no handgun laws in a city like this? Grandmothers get shot in the back trying to defend their children.

Let the District be the District. Go home and be what you want to be. Let my District be what it is.

NORTH KOREA: EXPERIENCE DICTATES CAUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, despite a number of highly contentious foreign policy issues that have been debated in this body in recent months, this Member continues to believe that American interests are best served by a bipartisan foreign policy. When the executive and legislative branches, furthermore, speak with one voice, the Nation is more likely to enjoy success in preserving its vital interests.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific of the Committee on International Relations, this Member has had the opportunity to focus closely on the Clinton administration's policy toward this important region. Frankly, the administration deserves credit on several fronts in its overall policy there, including its active support for democracy in Indonesia and a peaceful resolution to the festering situation that is East Timor, the successful renegotiation of the U.S.-Japan Security Guidelines, its commitment with Congress to maintain 100,000 U.S. military personnel in the Asian region, and the judgment to elevate the import of the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation Forum.

Genuine bipartisanship in Congress complementary to formulating a foreign policy, however, requires that Members of the Congress speak out when serious foreign policy failings by this or any other administration are detected. It is in this context that this Member expresses deepening concerns over the Clinton administration's continued lack of a coherent, comprehensive strategy towards Pyongyang, toward North Korea. This situation presents a grave challenge to vital U.S. national security interests.

In recent weeks, two important U.S. missions have traveled to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, that is, North Korea. The first mission was that of former Secretary of Defense William Perry who has been tasked by the President to complete a congressionally mandated, comprehensive review of U.S. policy regarding the problems of the Korean Peninsula. Dr. Perry is an outstanding public servant, extraordinarily well qualified to undertake this important assignment. In large part because of his reputation, his qualifications and the high bipartisan respect he has here on Capitol Hill, expectations are very high that he will be successful in engaging Pyongyang and presenting them with a clear choice of another track for its relationship with the United States, the Republic of Korea—that is South Korea—and our allies in the region.

The second mission involved the inspection of the suspected underground nuclear facility at Kumchang-ni, North Korea. That country, my colleagues will remember, agreed to abandon its

nuclear aspirations in return for the construction of two light-water reactors for power generation through the U.S.-led international consortium called the Korean Energy Development Organization, or KEDO. If it is learned that the DPRK has a secret nuclear program, this, of course, would completely undermine the credibility of the Clinton administration's policy of constructive engagement and would end KEDO.

If these missions proved satisfactory in their results, it was hoped that the Clinton administration would begin to lay a solid foundation for eliminating or at least dramatically reducing hostilities and ultimately for wholly transforming the relationship between North Korea and the United States and our regional allies. Working towards this objective certainly is a laudable and desirable goal if North Korea truly does wish to break from its history of brinksmanship and blackmail. Regrettably, this Member does not find the results of the administration's missions to be wholly reassuring, particularly when viewed against the backdrop of North Korean provocations. Of course, despite the completion of the Kumchang-ni inspection to determine if Pyongyang is covertly continuing its nuclear development program at other locations in violation of the agreed framework, we really do not have evidence that they have stopped.

Certainly, former Secretary Perry effectively delivered a strong message to the upper echelons of North Korean leadership, and the American inspection team performed its mission very well. While applauding these efforts, this body nevertheless must urge careful scrutiny of both the results and the administration's impending policy proposal.

There is an old adage that says ''actions speak louder than words.'' With Pyongyang, actions shout louder than words. So, indeed, this Member is troubled by the provocative language and the actions of the North Korean leadership both during and after the Kumchang-ni inspection and Secretary Perry's visit. Not much time has passed since Dr. Perry's visit but Pyongyang's behavior thus far shows no real evidence of an interest in confidence-building measures or tension reduction. Rather, its behavior rings of persistent hostility, and appears to be inconsistent with defusing tensions, advancing regional security, and improving relations.

Here are just a few examples. First, the media has been reporting widely that Pyongyang will test fire the Taepo Dong II ballistic missile in July or August. If these reports are accurate, the growing capability of North Korea's missile development program, including an intercontinental ballistic missile capable of reaching the continental United States, cannot be overstated. North Korea, perhaps the most volatile and unstable regime on earth, is fast acquiring the ability to strike the continental United States with weapons of mass destruction.

Press reports indicate that talks between North Korean officials and Dr. Perry on halting the ballistic missile program and sales, a key requirement outlined by Dr. Perry as he prepared for his visit, apparently ended with the same North Korean attempts at extortion that the U.S. has received at earlier meetings. The North demanded a large direct cash payment to terminate the program. True to form, the DPRK behaves as the modern equivalent of the Barbary pirates, extorting tribute in return for barely tolerable behavior.

It is also important to note that during Dr. Perry's visit, the North Korean press condemned the U.S. with the most contemptuous invective—and also vitriolically denounced South Korea and Japan—on issues ranging from a supposed U.S. master attack plan, an alleged U.S. dress rehearsal for an attack on the DPRK being staged in the Balkans, and a condemnation of Western economic policies that must be prevented from so-called poisoning their society. Pyongyang further lambasted Seoul's ''sunshine policy''—South Korean President Kim Dae Jung's policy of engagement with the North—as a blatant attempt to absorb North Korea.

Mr. Speaker, this Member also would note that the mid-June, North Korea-South Korea naval stand-off in the Yellow Sea escalated to an armed confrontation, reportedly provoked by North Korean ships that violated the demarcation line. Pyongyang subsequently threatened to cancel long-postponed talks with the South, and agreed to sit down only after a final shipment of humanitarian aid arrived in North Korea. This was the last shipment of $50 million in fertilizer aid that Seoul had agreed to provide in exchange for these talks.

The potential challenges for the U.S. and the Asia-Pacific region posed by recent North Korean activities highlight the need to remain very wary of the North's intentions and actions, despite the initial results of the Kumchang-ni expeditious withdraw and its Perry missions. In some ways, the results of these missions raise more questions and concerns than they answered. For example, it is no real surprise that the inspection team found no evidence linking the underground site at Kumchang-ni to North Korea's nuclear weapons program. If this evidence had existed, it is obvious that the United States never would have been permitted to inspect that facility.

In addition, this Member's concern about the possibility of a covert North Korean nuclear development program are exacerbated by press reports that the North is not cooperating sufficiently with the IAEA regarding reactor parts that are missing from Yongbyon, a subject which is covered by the Framework Agreement. More worrisome, however, are reports that Pyongyang has been trying to obtain items related to uranium enrichment. This material would help North Korea develop nuclear weapons without violating the Framework Agreement. Lastly, accentuating this list of concerns is the genuine difficulty we have in monitoring North Korean activities in that, the most closed society on earth.

Mr. Speaker, North Korea's continuing provocations demonstrate how important it is for the administration to clearly and, I emphasize, expeditiously lay out for Congress its policy proposal for North Korea. North Korea's behavior certainly seems to reflect a leadership that still has little intention of working constructively with the U.S. and our regional allies. North Korea's leadership appears to remain committed to its policy of orchestrating crises as a means of extorting financial and humanitarian assistance. If this is the case, forthcoming Clinton administration policy proposals that derive principally from the perceptions of the inspection team and Dr. Perry in may leave unanswered the particularly thorny policy question of how to deal with a truculent, mercurial, and menacing North Korea—one that continues to use posturing and threats to extract resources and other concessions while offering nothing meaningful in return.

Mr. Speaker, relations with North Korea are highly problematic and precarious. A policy failure on our part for the Korean Peninsula would put tens of thousands of American troops and the South Korean people at risk. Misjudging our adversary could result in virtually any Americans on the continent being vulnerable to North Korean ballistic missile attack. The administration has a responsibility to extensively and routinely consult with Congress, particularly on a threat of this magnitude, and this body has both the responsibility and right to act as a partner in the formulation of North Korean policy. This body should have further dialog with, and a road map from, the Clinton administration that clearly outlines the benefits that would be extended to Pyongyang for working in earnest with the United States, the conditions that the North must meet to obtain these benefits, and the potential consequences of remaining intractable. We also should work to ensure that any administration plan is backed by both United States willingness and capability to undertake the tough measures to bolster our national security that North Korea appears to understand.

☐ 1830

Pyongyang subsequently threatened to cancel the long postponed talks with the south. That is not a good start to a more constructive path.

I urge my colleagues to watch this issue very carefully and to work with the administration, demanding a full report on progress on the Dr. Perry mission.

TRIBUTE TO DR. MIDDLETON H. LAMBRIGHT, JR., OF CLEVELAND, OHIO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 14, 1999, the Eleventh Congressional District and the Nation lost a medical pioneer and giant, Dr. Middleton H. Lambright, Jr., who was born in 1908, at the dawn of the 20th century, in Kansas City, Missouri. His father, Middleton Sr., was not only a medical doctor, but was a man of vision and hope for his children. Seeking greater opportunities for his son and daughter, Dr. Lambright moved to