

I believe that three points need to be implemented in order for students to receive this opportunity:

First, encouraging schools to build partnerships with the private sector in order to prepare trade school-oriented students for alternative career opportunities. The formation of school to job co-ops is beneficial because it will allow students to incorporate their technical training with real work experience.

Second, the name vocational should be replaced by a more positive name in order to dispel the negativity usually associated with vocational education (e.g., technological/trade education). Vocational education is technical/trade education which focuses on the development of specific hands-on skills.

Third, creating a positive awareness within the general public and among educators of technology and trade education. Our society needs to recognize trade education as a necessary component of our educational system.

In closing, I urge all of my colleagues to consider trade and technological education as a priority in our national education agenda. Our children need this choice, because only by giving them these opportunities will they be able to empower themselves.

UNITED STATES-CHINA RELATIONS IN THE PACIFIC CENTURY

HON. ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 1997

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honor to speak before you during this month celebrating the rich and diverse heritage of Asian-Pacific Americans.

I am very proud of the deep and enduring contributions of my fellow Americans—those whose roots extend from the soil of nations in Asia and the Pacific islands.

I have served on the House Committee dealing with Foreign Affairs for 8 years, and as a member of its Asia-Pacific Affairs Subcommittee have long argued that U.S. foreign policy has been overly preoccupied with Europe and the Middle East—to the neglect of the Asia-Pacific region. With two-thirds of the world's population and gross domestic product originating from the Asia-Pacific, America cannot afford to neglect its interests in this important part of the globe.

Looking at the Asia-Pacific region today, perhaps no country figures to have a greater impact on the United States than the People's Republic of China. The emergence of China as a major world power is one of the historic events of the late 20th century. As we enter the 21st century, the Pacific century, China is projected to become a true great power. Thus, it is fitting that we take this occasion to examine the very complex subject of Sino-American relations. I would like to share with you my thoughts on the major issues affecting our relationship.

While not so long ago Asia-Pacific issues were being given shortshrif, now, the region is buffeted by a whirlwind of attention from Washington. At the center of the vortex is China, where suddenly all roads seem to lead. Vice President Gore recently traveled to China, the first visit of an American President or Vice President since 1989. Last month, the

highest ranking official in the House of Representatives, Speaker NEWT GINGRICH, lead a congressional delegation to China. Preceding their visits was that of Secretary of State Albright. And President Clinton will also visit China, shortly after his summit meeting with Chinese President Jiang Zemin in Washington later this year.

All of this attention on China is well-founded. With 1.3 billion people, China is the most populous nation and the most promising market on the planet. With the world's third largest economy and dynamic growth over 10 percent for several years running, China's possesses foreign exchange reserves exceeding \$100 billion—second only to Japan. With the world's largest military, over 3.2 million strong, which is undergoing modernization and has nuclear arms, China is a force not to be taken lightly. All of these factors underscore why America's relationship with China is one of the most crucial in the world, and why it is growing in importance.

CHINA ENGAGEMENT

I have long been a supporter of maintaining broad and comprehensive ties with the People's Republic of China. This policy of China engagement has been upheld in a bipartisan fashion by five previous administrations and I support President Clinton in his efforts now for comprehensive engagement with China. We cannot allow America's board-ranging, multifaceted relationship with China to be held hostage to my particular issue or interest.

As for those that advocate a policy of China containment, I believe that this is dangerous and shortsighted. China is not what the former Soviet Union was—an ideological and military expansionist threat to democracies around the world, that was also closed to external trade. United States attempts to isolate China will not be supported by our allies and will only result in friction with our trading partners. Moreover, a containment policy would result in China responding with hostility and noncooperation directly targeted toward the United States. Our World War II ally, China, is not our enemy and we should not force China into responding like one to protect itself. The quickest way to transform China from friend to foe would be adoption of a containment policy.

It is in America's national interest to have a productive relationship with a China that is strong, stable, open, and prosperous—a China that is increasingly integrated into the international community and global marketplace as a responsible and accountable partner.

Since China opened her doors to the West in the 1970's with President Nixon's initiative, we have seen tremendous strides forward on several fronts. Business, social, and political ties with the west have blossomed, allowing a torrent of information, technology, and Western values to stream into China. This has resulted in a profound improvement of life for the Chinese people, giving them new-found freedoms in employment, travel, and housing, with expanded access to information and democratic participation in village elections. Over the past two decades, political and individual freedoms, along with an increased standard of living, have significantly changed for the better for the average Chinese.

While in our eyes much remains to be done for human rights, we should not forget that it was not so long ago—during Mao's rule and the cultural revolution—that hundreds of thousands of Chinese were murdered or impris-

oned from political persecution; while untold numbers fought starvation, sometimes through desperate acts of cannibalism.

The progress from the China of Mao Tse-tung, yesterday, to the China of President Jiang Zemin, today, is, indeed remarkable. China may be the first example of a Communist system that will succeed in meeting the long-term economic needs of her people. Feeding China's 1.3 billion hungry people—five times more than all the people in America—has by itself been a monumental accomplishment. In a nation of such huge size, which adds 12 million new mouths each year, I can understand why some say that providing food and shelter and stability may be preservation of the most basic yet important of human rights, particularly at this stage of China's development.

Clearly, America's engagement with China has played an invaluable role in this transition. It has been a long road from the 1950's and 1960's, when China opposed virtually all United States foreign policy goals. Then, China supported North Korea's attack on the south and ultimately entered the conflict to fight against us. It fired artillery at Taiwan on its islands of Quemoy and Matsu. China fought border wars with India and the Soviet Union. And it attempted to subvert nations friendly to us by sponsoring revolutionary movements in Africa, Thailand, Indonesia, Malaysia, and the Philippines.

Today, the picture is very different. In Korea, China has played a crucial role in providing stability on the Peninsula, including assistance to stop North Korea's nuclear weapons program and diplomatic efforts to prevent the outbreak of a war between the Koreans. Far from subverting its neighbors, China now seeks investment from their business leaders. Rather than oppose our foreign policy goals, it has acceded to the nuclear nonproliferation treaty, signed onto the comprehensive test ban treaty, taken part in the security dialogue at the ASEAN regional forum, worked toward international environmental protection accords and cooperated with us at the U.N. Security Council. With strong ties to the West, China is evolving into a more open society with a government that is increasingly sensitive to international opinion and willing to work with fellow nations and the United States.

HONG KONG

One of the most important issues to soon test United States-Sino relations is the transfer of Hong Kong from Britain to China this July 1.

America has substantial interests in Hong Kong, including \$14 billion in United States investment and two-way trade exceeding \$24 billion. Some 37,000 Americans reside in Hong Kong, with United States Navy ships making 60–80 port calls a year. The Government of Hong Kong works closely with the United States to combat narcotics trafficking, alien smuggling, and organized crime.

Under the joint declaration signed in 1984, Britain and China agreed for Hong Kong's reversion to China and the orderly transfer of power. The agreement holds that for 50 years China will extend Hong Kong a high degree of autonomy to control its own affairs, except in the areas of national defense and foreign relations. China's policy has been dubbed the "one country, two systems" approach. It is designed to preserve the unique economic environment that has made Hong Kong a capitalistic success story, and permits activities and

freedoms in Hong Kong that are not allowed in the rest of China.

While some in Washington bemoan the reversion of Hong Kong to Chinese control and predict Hong Kong's demise, I am not one of those. I view the return of Hong Kong to China as just, proper, and long overdue. It is the end to a long period of national humiliation for China.

For 157 years, the British have ruled over the Chinese People of Hong Kong as a colony of imperialism. It began in the 1840's, when China resisted Britain's efforts to sell China opium. Rebuffed, England started a war, called the opium war, which China lost and for which Britain took Hong Kong Island as a Prize. Twenty years later, England initiated another conflict, the arrow war, and defeated China again. Its prize this time was Kowloon, the mainland part of Hong Kong. In 1898, Britain gained another large amount of land by 99-year lease, the new territories, which is vital to Hong Kong's operations. With the expiration of that lease this July, the British had no choice legally but to return Hong Kong to its rightful owners, China.

While China is undergoing accusations of undermining democracy in Hong Kong, I find it ironic that no one said anything during the 150 years of British Imperial rule when democracy never existed in Hong Kong. The Governor of Hong Kong, always British, was appointed by London, without an election nor the input of the citizens of Hong Kong. There was no democratically elected legislative council. All of the top civil servants were British. And the major companies in Hong Kong were kept in English hands. The British were the elite, and the native Chinese were second-class citizens in their own homeland.

It was not until recently in 1990, at the 11th hour before Hong Kong's return to China, that Britain took steps to turn Hong Kong into a democracy. After a century-and-a-half of colonial rule and imperialism, I find it hypocritical that Britain is preaching to China about preserving democracy. While some have argued that these late democratic reforms were in response to the Tiananmen Square tragedy, others in Hong Kong feel that they were undertaken solely to dress up Britain's legacy in Hong Kong; to make Britain look good in history after being forced to leave its colony—a practice repeated with its other former colonies.

The Western media have focused on the disbanding of the existing elected legislative council for a provisional legislature and the effort to retract the 1992 civil rights ordinances as signaling Hong Kong's looming problems. What is often not mentioned, however, is that Britain unilaterally undertook election reforms and legislative changes in violation of the 1984 joint declaration with China, which held Hong Kong's legal system in existence then was not to be changed. Britain's unilateral action was perceived as an arrogant insult to China, reopening wounds on an already sensitive matter. In rolling back these legal changes, China is merely holding Britain to its commitment to retain British laws followed for decades in Hong Kong.

While the media portrays dark storm clouds gathering over Hong Kong, I see rays of light. The appointment of C.H. Tung as chief executive of the new Hong Kong Government has been widely applauded, as he is a man of integrity that commands great respect not only

in Hong Kong and Beijing but in Washington and throughout the international community. Another very positive sign is that Mr. Tung has retained the senior leadership of the civil service and the Hong Kong Administration. He has also made clear that the provisional legislature's term shall be brief, as he will secure the election of a new legislative council soon after his government is in place.

Public confidence in Hong Kong about the transition is high, with recent polls showing that almost two-thirds of Hong Kong residents would voluntarily choose to join China if the decision were up to them. This confidence is reflected in the real estate market, where within the past year residential property prices have increased 20 to 40 percent and luxury homes have doubled in price. Hong Kong's stock exchange has also reflected this confidence, achieving several record highs in recent months and increasing in value by 34 percent over the year prior.

I believe that there is reason for optimism that the transition will go well. China, more than any other country, has the greatest stakes to lose if Hong Kong's autonomy is threatened and its economy strangled. First, Hong Kong is the central engine that drives 60 percent of foreign trade and investment in China, fueling China's economic reform process which is vital to its stability. Half of China's exports, over \$140 billion, go through Hong Kong, with Chinese investments there exceeding \$50 billion. Quite simply, undermining international confidence in Hong Kong will deal a fatal blow to China's own economic development. Second, China knows the world is watching and it needs Hong Kong to succeed to gain legitimacy as a responsible and mature nation in the eyes of the international community. A smooth transition will immeasurably enhance China's credibility and that of its Communist Government's ability to govern. Last, as Beijing is well aware, Hong Kong is a test case for Taiwan. The failure of the "one country, two systems" approach with Hong Kong would spell doom for peaceful reunification with Taiwan. Moreover, a crackdown on Hong Kong could result in international support for Taiwan's independence. China's highest priority has always been to reunite with Taiwan and I do not believe it will jeopardize reunification by a failure to handle Hong Kong properly. In short, I don't think we'll be seeing anytime soon Chinese PLA troops on the streets of Hong Kong beating demonstrators.

Congress passed the Hong Kong Policy Act in 1992 and the Hong Kong Reversion Act just months ago. They send the message to China that the United States is concerned about Hong Kong's freedoms, that we are monitoring the transition, and will take steps to terminate our relationship with Hong Kong if it is no longer autonomous. While I supported these bills, we must be careful not to intervene too much in Hong Kong, a matter that is totally within China's sovereign right. Micromanagement of the transition process may prove to be counterproductive.

At this point, I think we need to step back and give China and the new Hong Kong Government of Chief Executive Tung room to breathe. Certainly, Mr. Tung deserves the opportunity to show that he can effectively lead Hong Kong and China must be given the chance to demonstrate that it will keep its promises.

IN HONOR OF ASIAN-PACIFIC AMERICANS

While China may be the magnet in the Asia-Pacific region attracting much of United States foreign policy attention today, China along with the other nations of the Asia-Pacific have played another role by contributing offspring to the rich ethnic diversity of the United States.

Americans of Asian-Pacific descent, almost 10 million strong, are the fastest growing demographic group in the United States today. Over the last decade, the Asian-Pacific American community has more than doubled and this rapid growth is expected to continue well into the next century.

As many of you are aware, immigrants from the Asia-Pacific region are amongst the newest wave to arrive in the United States in recent years. However, they are merely the latest chapter in the long history of Asian-Pacific Americans in our Nation.

During this month for celebration, it is only fitting that we honor our fellow citizens of Asian-Pacific descent—both from the past and the present—that have blessed and enriched our Nation. I submit that Asian-Pacific Americans have certainly been an asset to our country's development, and it is most appropriate that our President and Congress have proclaimed May as Asian-Pacific heritage month.

The people of the Asia-Pacific have contributed much to America's development in the sciences and medicine. Nothing exemplifies this more than Time magazine's selection of a Chinese-American, Dr. David Ho, head of the prestigious Aaron Diamond AIDS Research Center, as its "1996 Man of the Year." Dr. Ho's journey from being a 12-year-old immigrant to being honored as "Man of the Year" for giving hope to millions of people affected with the HIV virus is a testament to the significant contributions that Asian-Pacific American immigrants have made in America.

Dr. David Ho, scientific director and chief executive officer of the Aaron Diamond AIDS Research Center at New York University Medical School, is one of the foremost aids scientists in the world. While unraveling how the aids virus causes death after infection, Dr. Ho pioneered a treatment for HIV infection that has shown promise in beating back the deadly disease. In focusing treatment research on the early stages of infection, using cocktails of antiviral drugs to combat the aids-causing virus, HIV, Dr. Ho has fundamentally changed the approach to combating aids, stated Time magazine. Dr. Ho's accomplishments are a credit to the Asian-Pacific American community and more importantly give renewed hope to millions of patients around the world suffering from the HIV virus.

Dr. Ho's scientific advances continue a long record of service by Asian-Pacific Americans. In 1899, a Japanese immigrant arrived on the shores of this Nation. After years of study and work, this man, Dr. Hideyo Noguchi, isolated the syphilis germ, leading to a cure for the deadly, wide-spread disease. For decades, Dr. Makio Murayama conducted vital research in the United States that laid the groundwork for combating sickle-cell anemia. In 1973, Dr. Leo Esaki, an Asian immigrant to our country, was awarded the Nobel Prize in physics for his electron tunneling theories. and, in engineering, few have matched the architectural masterpieces created by the genius of Chinese-American, I.M. Pei.

Major contributions to U.S. business and industry have also been made by Asian-Pacific

Americans. Wang laboratories, the innovative business enterprise in computer research and development, was founded in 1955 by Chinese-American, An Wang. This Nation's largest tungsten refinery was built in 1953 by industrialist K.C. Li and his company, the Wah Chang Corp. And, in 1964, an immigrant from Shanghai, China, Gerald Tsai, started from scratch an investment firm, the Manhattan Fund, which today has well over \$270 million in assets.

In the entertainment and sports fields, American Martial Arts Expert Bruce Lee entertained the movie audiences of this Nation, while destroying the stereotype of the passive, quiet Asian male. World-class Conductor Seiji Ozawa has lead the San Francisco Symphony through brilliant performances over the years.

A native-Hawaiian named Duke Kahanamoku shocked the world by winning the Olympic Gold Medal in swimming seven decades ago; followed by Dr. Sammy Lee, a Korean-American who won the Olympic Gold Medal in high diving. Then there was Tommy Kono of Hawaii, also an Olympic Gold medalist in weightlifting. And, yes, perhaps the greatest Olympic diver ever known to the world, a Samoan-American by the name of Greg Louganis—whose record in gold medals and national championships will be in the books for a long time. Japanese-American Kristi Yamaguchi's enthralling gold medal ice-skating performance at the Winter Olympics continues the legacy of milestone achievements by Asian-Pacific Americans.

In professional sports, of course, we have Michael Chang blazing new paths in tennis, Pacific-Islanders Brian Williams and Michael Jones of world rugby, and the tens of dozens of Polynesian-Americans—like All-Pro Samoan Linebacker, Junior Seau, and Jesse Sapolu of the San Francisco Forty-Niners—who have made their mark as players in the National Football league.

We also have Asian-Pacific Americans who are making their mark on history, not in our country, but in the Far East. Samoan-American Salevaa Atisanoe is a 578-pound Sumo wrestler in Japan who goes by the name of Konishiki. Salevaa, or Konishiki, incidentally, also happens to be a relative of mine. Konishiki was the first foreigner in Japan's centuries-old sport to break through to the rarified air of Sumo's second-highest rank. Another Somoan/Tongan-American, Leitani Peitani—known in Japan as Musashimaru—has also gained prominence as a Sumo wrestler.

Native-Hawaiian Chad Rowen, or Akebono as he is known in Japan, has scaled even greater heights by attaining the exalted status of Yokozuna or grand champion. Until this Polynesian-American arrived on the scene, no foreigner had ever been permitted to fill this sacred position, as the Japanese associate the Yokozuna with the essence of Shinto's guardian spirits. The ascendancy to grand champion status goes to the heart of the Japanese religion and culture.

In honoring Asian-Pacific Americans that have served to enrich our country, I would be remiss, as a Vietnam veteran, if I did not

honor the contributions of the Japanese-Americans who served in the United States Army's 100th Battalion and 442d Infantry Combat Group. History speaks for itself in documenting that none have shed their blood more valiantly for America than the Japanese-American that served in these units while fighting enemy forces in Europe during World War II.

The records of the 100th Battalion and 442d Infantry are without equal. These Japanese-American units suffered an unprecedented casualty rate of 314 percent, and received over 18,000 individual decorations, many posthumously awarded, for valor in battle.

With the tremendous sacrifice of lives, a high number of medals were given the unit. I find it unusual, however, that only one medal of honor was awarded, while 52 Distinguished Service Crosses, 560 Silver Stars, and 9,480 Purple Hearts were given. The great number of Japanese-American lives lost should have resulted in more of these ultimate symbols of sacrifice being awarded. Nonetheless, the 442d Combat Group emerged as the most decorated combat unit of its size in the history of the U.S. Army. President Truman was so moved by their bravery in the field of battle, as well as that of black American soldiers During World War II, that he issued an executive order to desegregate the armed services.

I am proud to say that we can count the honorable DANIEL K. INOUE and the late, highly-respected Senator, Spark Matsunaga, both from Hawaii, as Members from Congress that distinguished themselves in battle as soldiers with the 100th Battalion and 442d Infantry. It was while fighting in Europe that Senator INOUE lost his arm and was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross, the second highest medal for bravery.

These Japanese-Americans paid their dues in blood to protect our Nation from its enemies. It is a shameful black mark on the history of our country that when the patriotic survivors of the 100th Battalion and 442d Infantry returned to the United States, many were reunited with families that were locked up behind barbed-wire fences, living in concentration camps. You might be interested to know, my colleagues on the Hill, Congressman ROBERT MATSUI and former Representative Norman Mineta, were children of the concentration camps.

The wholesale and arbitrary abolishment of the constitutional rights of these loyal Japanese-Americans will forever serve as a reminder and testament that this must never be allowed to occur again. When the miscarriage of justice unfolded during World War II, Americans of German and Italian ancestry were not similarly jailed en masse. Some declare the incident as an example of outright racism and bigotry in its ugliest form. After viewing the Holocaust Museum in Washington, I understand better why the genocide of 6 million Jews has prompted the cry, "never again." Likewise, I sincerely hope that mass internments on the basis of race will never again darken the history of our great Nation.

To those that say, well that occurred decades ago, I say we must continue to be vigilant in guarding against such evil today.

Not long ago we had the case of Bruce Yamashita, a Japanese-American from Hawaii who was discharged from the Marine Corps in an ugly display of racial discrimination. Marine Corps superiors taunted Yamashita with ethnic slurs and told him, "We don't want your kind around here. Go back to your own country." After years of perseverance and appeals, Mr. Yamashita was vindicated after proving he was the target of vicious racial harassment during his officer training program. The Secretary of the Navy's investigation into whether minorities were deliberately being discouraged from becoming officers resulted in Bruce Yamashita receiving his commission as a captain in the Marine Corps.

I am also greatly disturbed by recent events involving campaign funding, where the integrity of the Asian-Pacific American community has been unfairly tarnished by the transgressions of a few. With the intensity of a witchhunt, the national media have obsessively fixated on political contributions from Americans of Asian-Pacific descent. This singling out of one ethnic group has led to the unfair characterization that all Asian-Pacific American political contributors are "Asian foreigners buying up America."

I find this racial scapegoating to be repugnant and morally objectionable. Playing up fears of the "Asian connection" serves to alienate Asian-Pacific Americans from participating in our political process. Moreover, this negative reporting acts to marginalize Asian-Pacific Americans political empowerment at a time when we are coming of age in American politics. Lost in the barrage of hysteria has been the fact that our community has 75,000 newly registered voters, greater numbers of immigrants becoming citizens, and more Asian-Pacific Americans candidates running for political office than ever before—culminating with the first Asian-American Governor elected in the continental United States, Gary Locke of Washington State.

Perhaps these attacks are a convenient way to ostracize a growing American political force. When Caucasians raise money from Caucasians, it is called gaining political power, but when Asian-Pacific Americans begin to participate, we are accused of being foreigners trying to infiltrate U.S. policymaking. Now that Asian-Pacific Americans are finally at the table and our opinions heard, we are once again being cast as outsiders and not as true Americans.

This is nothing new. One need only look at the history of this country to see that the scapegoating of Asian-Pacific Americans as foreigners has been used as an excuse to burn down our communities in the 1880's, deny us the right to own land, marry our own kind and practice many professions in the early 1900's, and put us in concentration camps in 1942. To protect America's greatness, we should all be sensitive to the fact that democratic participation by people of all races and backgrounds, including Asian-Pacific Americans, is crucial to our Nation's health and vitality.

In concluding, I think Bruce Yamashita's case and the hysteria surrounding Asian-Pacific Americans political contributions bear implications not just for the military and the media but for our society as a whole. It asks the question, how long do we have to endure the attitude of those who consider Asian-Pacific Americans and other minorities as lesser Americans?

I applaud Captain Yamashita and others like him who have spoken out to ensure that racial

discrimination is not tolerated. During this month as we recognize the diverse experiences and contributions of the Asian-Pacific Americans community to our great Nation, I would hope that we all take inspiration from his example.

With that in mind, I would like to close my remarks by asking what is America all about? I think it could not have been said better than on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial when Martin Luther King said, "I have a dream. My

dream is that one day my children will be judged not by the color of their skin but by the content of their character."

That is what America is all about, and Asian-Pacific Americans wish to find a just and equitable place in our society that will allow them—like all Americans—to grow, succeed achieve, and contribute to the advancement of this great Nation as we enter the "Pacific century."