

Secretary Clinton echoed the President's remarks and emphasized, as the President did in his April speech in Prague that—and I am quoting—“there are consequences to such actions.” The question is, it is unclear what consequences the administration has in mind. And Susan Rice, our Ambassador to the United Nations, has been reluctant to commit U.S. support for the inclusion of sanctions in the U.N. resolutions currently being drafted.

Despite North Korea's detonation of a nuclear device and test of long-range missiles designed to threaten us, the relationship between the United States and North Korea has not substantially changed. There are, however, several things that the United States could do to back up its condemnation of North Korea's reckless actions. Thankfully, we have a number of options available to us, and we are not faced with the “shoot first, ask questions later” approach that former Secretary of Defense William Perry advocated in a 2006 Washington Post editorial, when he argued that the United States had no other option than to destroy North Korea's missiles on their launching pads.

First, the United States could return North Korea to the state sponsor of terrorism list. North Korea was removed from this list when it agreed to a series of measures related to the disablement of its plutonium production at the Yongbyon reactor. Now that North Korea has renounced that agreement and restarted its nuclear program, there is no reason it should not return to that list.

President Obama indicated his support for this type of strategy on the campaign trail, saying:

If the North Koreans do not meet their obligations, we should move quickly to reimpose sanctions that have been waived, and consider new restrictions going forward.

Second, the United States could reimpose financial sanctions on high-level North Korean officials and banks affiliated with the North Korean Government. In March 2007, the U.S. Treasury ordered U.S. companies and financial institutions to terminate their relationships with Banco Delta Asia over alleged links between the bank and the Government of North Korea and froze certain funds of high-ranking North Korean officials.

Third, the United States could expand defense and nonproliferation initiatives. President Clinton's Secretary of Defense William Cohen recently argued in the Washington Times for reversing President Obama's deep cuts to missile defense programs. I agree with Secretary Cohen that the President's \$1.4 billion of cuts do not send the right signals to those who seek to threaten us, especially those who tout ballistic missiles as the chief element of their threats.

President Obama, in direct support of U.N. Security Council Resolutions 1695 and 1718, could also expand interdiction and intelligence cooperation under the Proliferation Security Initiative with our new partner, South Korea.

As the President said in Prague:

Rules must be binding. Violations must be punished. Words must mean something.

These commonsense steps would send a clear message to the North Koreans and their partners in proliferation that the United States is serious when it repeatedly refers to consequences and is willing to employ all measures and its full leverage in order to influence North Korea and avoid conflict.

Of course, the United States should work with the international community to enlist its support for increasing pressure on the North Koreans, and the administration has signaled its support for a multilateral approach through its focus on working through the United Nations. But this approach is already limited by North Korea's history of disregarding U.N. action and by continued Russian and Chinese waffling. I am not convinced new U.N. resolutions would be treated any differently by North Korea than the ones it has already ignored. Its record has led some to question whether a regime so willing to wreak famine and destruction on its own people is not beyond the traditional application of “carrot and stick” diplomacy.

Moreover, our effort to work with other nations does not excuse us from the responsibility to act ourselves. If Russia or China will not sanction North Korea, is that any argument that the United States should not? Of course not. We can offer nations attractive terms for their support, such as help in dealing with increased flow of North Korean refugees, trade incentives, or enhanced military-to-military cooperation, such as revoking the misguided Obey amendment and allowing Japan to purchase an export variant of the F-22 fighter. However, if other nations conclude that holding North Korea accountable is not in their interest, then we must not let that prevent us from doing what is best in our interest.

The gravity of events in North Korea is only increased by the similar disagreement between the international community and Iran on the subject of its nuclear program. If strong words are followed by weak and ineffective action toward North Korea, why should Iran expect different treatment? Conversely, if we display resolve and fortitude in confronting a belligerent North Korea that uses nuclear explosions and ballistic missiles as foreign policy tools, we send a powerful message to the rest of the world of our sincere commitment to nonproliferation and regional stability. This is doubly important considering the well-known cooperation between North Korea and Iran on a variety of illicit programs.

While some debate the proper U.S. response, I believe one thing is certain: Past negotiations have not been successful. North Korea has not been an honest negotiator, preferring to use, instead, “missile diplomacy” to spark international panic and extract a concession—typically fuel or grain ship-

ments—from a worried international community. This process, in various permutations, happened in 1993, 1994, 1998, 2006, 2007, and it may repeat itself in 2009.

For those who would not repeat the blunders of the past, North Korea's actions have forced an unwelcome choice on the world: either North Korea is a threat and we must take actions across all fronts to isolate the regime and defend our Nation and our allies against its considerable capabilities or these actions are the benign outbursts of a misunderstood regime.

The President has clearly said that North Korea poses a threat to world peace and security. It is now a question of matching action to rhetoric.

Mr. President, I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized for up to 15 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. I thank the Chair.

REMEMBERING TIANANMEN SQUARE

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, 20 years ago this week, on June 3 and 4 in 1989, the world watched the Communist Government of China violently crack down on peaceful demonstrators in Tiananmen Square. We all remember that. It is hard for me to believe it has been 20 years ago.

One picture that is forever imprinted on our minds and our memories is that of a lone Chinese student who stood before a line of army tanks following days of violence that had resulted in hundreds killed and thousands more wounded. We never did find out what happened to that young student. I assume he was taken away, tortured, and killed, but we don't know that. He displayed tremendous courage in the face of tyranny and injustice. For weeks, students had raised their voices demanding greater democracy, basic freedoms of speech and assembly, and an end to corruption. While the photo of this student became infamous to the world as a picture of the Chinese people and their desire for true and lasting freedom and democracy, it remained virtually unknown to the people of China due to the Chinese Government's continued censorship and oppression.

On March 25, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Nancy Pelosi, while on a trip to China, remained silent regarding the ongoing human rights abuses there. Instead, she talked about the government on

global warming and issues such as that. This week in Beijing, U.S. Treasury Secretary Tim Geithner followed the Pelosi model, remaining mute on human rights abuses that are going on today, and spoke only of environmental issues.

In 2005, I gave a series of speeches on the threat China poses to our Nation. Now, 4 years later, we are in a position where they are the largest holder of our national debt, and my concerns regarding China remain the same.

I have spent many years in activity in Africa, primarily Sub-Saharan Africa, and right now we are competing with China for the energy that is there. China is doing a better job than we are. They are competitors of ours not just militarily but economically. It is of great concern to me that as we continue to grow in our relationship and our dependence on China, our U.S. Government officials seem to place more value on the Chinese Government's treatment of the environment than the treatment of their own people and the threat they pose to our Nation.

On the 20th anniversary of the Tiananmen Square massacre, Pelosi and Geithner's omission is a disgrace to the memory of those who stood and many who died as they pleaded with the government to allow them basic freedoms that we as Americans possess and enjoy.

Sadly, ignoring these issues is exactly what the Government of Beijing wants. They would like nothing more than to erase the memory of the Tiananmen Square massacre from our minds and from the minds of all people around the world. The Chinese Government would like us to forget that in June of 1989, they used lethal force of 300,000 troops strong to crush peaceful protestors who were seeking greater freedoms. The Chinese Government would like the image of that courageous man standing before the line of tanks to fade from our memory. However, we can't forget the hundreds who were murdered, the thousands who were injured, and the more than 20,000 people who were arrested and detained without trial due to the suspected involvement in the protests, specifically in Tiananmen Square.

We don't know today where those people are. Most likely, they are still incarcerated someplace or they have been killed. The Communist government is so bent on wanting us to forget these issues that they have shut down blogs, blocking access to individual news sources such as Twitter, and denied access to popular sites such as YouTube.

Since Tiananmen Square, China has continued to increase severe cultural suppression of ethnic minorities such as the Tibetans, the Uighurs; increase persecution of Chinese Christians, the Falun Gong, and other religious groups and other minorities; increase detention and harassment of dissidents and journalists; and has maintained tight controls on freedom of speech and ac-

cess to the Internet. We know journalists who right now are still incarcerated over there, but there is no trace of exactly where they are.

Despite the promises to the contrary, China didn't provide greater access to the international media during the 2008 Olympic Games. Unlike the previous hosts of the past games, the Government in Beijing blocked access to certain Internet sites and media outlets in an attempt to censor free speech.

As China grows economically and continues to exert its influence globally and thus considers itself a significant player on the world stage, I believe China should be held to a standard of political, religious, and ethical responsibility.

Our country was founded by those who were seeking basic freedoms, and we have to stand for those who are doing the same in other countries. When basic freedoms can be practiced, countries thrive and prosper because people are allowed to choose a better way of life for themselves. We must also recognize the danger we place ourselves in by becoming closer and more dependent upon nations that continue to silence their people, deny them access to information and the ability to practice their cultures and beliefs. That is what is happening today.

On the occasion of the 20th anniversary of Tiananmen Square, my colleague Senator BROWN and I have introduced S. Res. 167 to remember the families and the victims who were killed in the June 1989 protest and to call on the Government of China to put an end to its continuing human rights violations. Our country must not remain silent, and many of my fellow colleagues in the Senate who are cosponsors of this resolution agree.

This resolution calls on the Chinese Government to release all prisoners still in captivity as a result of their suspected involvement in Tiananmen Square protests and to release all others who are currently being imprisoned without cause. This resolution puts the Senate on record, encouraging the Chinese Government to allow freedom of speech and to access information, while ending the harassment, intimidation, and imprisonment practices the government has carried out against those who are minorities and who seek religious freedom. We also call on our government to uphold human rights in China. Our silence only dishonors those who lost their lives and freedoms in Tiananmen Square.

We have this resolution right now. So far, we have cosponsors who have just found out about it and called in, including, in addition to Senator BROWN and myself, Senators GRAHAM, LIEBERMAN, KYL, COBURN, VITTER, MENENDEZ, WEBB, and BROWNBACK. I encourage others to join in this message that I believe is a very clear message that should be sent by the United States.

Today—this very day, this moment—there are 150,000 people who are pro-

testing in Hong Kong right now because of the problems we are addressing with this resolution. So I encourage my colleagues to join in this resolution and get this message out loud and clear.

GUANTANAMO BAY

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, one of our colleagues from Illinois was talking about their desire to have these detainees from Guantanamo Bay come into the United States for trial. Let me just suggest—I am not a lawyer, but I do know this: I have spent a lot of time down there. I know the situation. I know it is a resource that we have to have, that we have to keep. There is no justification at all for closing Guantanamo Bay. No justification. All we hear is: Well, this came at a time when there was suspected terrorism or torture of prisoners in other areas. But never at Gitmo. There hasn't been a documented case of torture that went on there. This is a resource we need.

My friend from Illinois suggests bringing them to this country. The rules of evidence are different. These are not criminals, these are detainees. The proper place for them to be adjudicated is in the tribunals. The only place available right now is the tribunal that is set up in Gitmo.

If we bring them to this country, under our laws, quite a few of those would actually be released. When they are released, they could be released into society. For those who say we need to use some 17 areas for incarceration in the United States, as opposed to using Gitmo, to incarcerate these people, that would become 17 magnets for terrorist activity in the United States.

We have to get over this thing of everybody lining up and saying we have to close it. Guantanamo Bay is something we need, and we have to have it. There is not a pleasant alternative. It would cause the release of terrorists in the United States. If that is what the Senator from Illinois and the Democrats and the President want, they are going to find that virtually all Americans disagree with them.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

NUCLEAR ENERGY

Mr. VOINOVICH. As my colleagues know, supporting the development and expansion of the nuclear industry is something that has been one of my top priorities since I came to the Senate. I have been working to shape nuclear policy in this country for the past 8 years as chairman or ranking member of the Clean Air and Nuclear Safety Subcommittee. I wish to recognize my colleague, Senator INHOFE, for the leadership he provided before I became chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission committee.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, first, I compliment the Senator from Ohio.