

threats of the global economy and the perceived threats of the global economy. What do we mean by that? For all the very real dangers, the global economy directly affects just one-fourth of all the jobs in America today. Beth Shulman's article in last December's *American Prospect* points out that 77 percent of the jobs in America are out of reach of global competition.

There are more people today working in dental offices than are working in the auto industry.

There are more people working in Laundromats than are working in steel-mills.

Columbia Hospital system employs more people than Chrysler.

McDonald's employs more people than General Motors.

Yet, the model we have based our image on is the same manufacturing model we focused on 50 years ago. By doing so, not only are we skewing the reality of the global economy, we are playing into the fears that the threat of the global economy is greater than it really is. That, in turn, creates a sense of powerlessness across the entire economy.

Not long ago I heard a story about a company in Ohio that announced it was moving to Mexico. As a result, both hospital workers and McDonald's employees were all worried about losing their jobs. But the hospital and the restaurant were not going anywhere, but the very fear of moving convinced those workers not to push for salary increases.

While we need to address the very real problems about jobs going overseas, we need to be realistic about its scope. There are enough barriers to organizing unions today. The power of corporations, legal barriers, technology, a shrinking job base, are all tremendous hurdles to overcome. Labor needs new tactics to meet these challenges.

Labor needs to reach beyond its traditional constituencies, it needs to put more resources into organizing, it needs to reach out to younger people, like the thousands of college students who participated in union summer last year.

If a majority of workers are fed up and decide they want a union and they sign a union card, they should have a union. They should not be forced to jump through hoops for 8 years to carry out their constitutional rights. In Canada, they have what is called a card check. It works this way. If a majority of workers sign a card for a union, that is it; they get a union. For too long the National Labor Relations Board has been used to making it as difficult as possible to organize new members. But that cannot stop us.

Labor needs to enlist the whole community; the churches and religious leaders, community activists, responsible local businesses. Everyone needs to involve themselves and understand the link between workplace issues and community issues.

I believe labor needs to take on more struggles that help it create and recapture this moral authority that I am talking about. That is why I believe this weekend's march with the strawberry workers in California is so important.

The strawberry industry is a \$650 million industry. It is run by some of the largest corporations in America, including Monsanto, where senior executives get paid million-dollar salaries. Yet, the people that are working in the fields get paid \$8,000 a year, often working 12 hours a day with no job security, no pension, no health care, often no clean drinking water, no decent bathroom facilities, working every day with dangerous pesticides and dangerous toxins, and most of them have not seen a raise in 10 years.

Last year they had elections across strawberry country. Workers voted overwhelmingly to be represented by the United Farm Workers. But instead of giving workers a raise, do you know how the corporations responded? Some of them fired people, some of them skipped town, some of them even plowed under their own fields. Of course, most of them immediately brought in consultants.

But the strawberry workers of the United Farm Workers have not given up. This weekend, tens of thousands of men and women from all over the country will be traveling to California. I will be joining them. We are going to March arm in arm with the United Farm Workers, and we are not going to give up until strawberry workers have the right and dignity they deserve.

So, the more that labor can regain moral authority in places like the strawberry fields of California, the more it will help them in the steel-mills of Pennsylvania and the hospital wards of Texas.

We may be living in a profound time, a time of profound insecurity, and we may be living in an age when multinational corporations are running amuck, when the gap between the rich and the poor is growing and people seem to be more disconnected every single day. But I do not think for a second that it means they are disinterested. People do not want to see hard work go unrewarded. They do not want to be treated like garbage.

They do not want to read stories about layoffs and downsizing. They do not want to see a \$776 million payoff. They do not want to read stories about Asian sweatshops. They do not want to be left alone to face 5 billion other people in the world economy.

They want to believe again. They want to believe that things can get better. They want to have control over their lives. They want to be part of a community. They want to believe we have larger purposes as a nation. That is what the union movement in this country is all about.

It is not unions who have rigged the game, Mr. Speaker. It is unions who have fought for decency for working

families and a greater vision of democracy. They have fought against the billions of dollars of corporate special interests that is arrayed against them every single day. They have fought against the multinational corporations that know no allegiance to any country and move jobs overseas at the drop of a hat. They have fought against runaway corporate greed and its destructive effects on our communities and our values. Always they have fought against the odds. They have organized when guns and nightsticks have tried to beat them down. They have pooled their resources to get out the truth, even as corporations have outspent them by hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Unions have shown average Americans that they have real power, that they can have a larger voice, and that working together, people can make a difference. If we have the courage to try new things, to believe in old values, and to work together to make it happen, I believe unions can lead America into the 21st century. More than that, we will reconnect people to this democracy. We will make them feel a part of something larger than themselves, and we will give them a reason to believe again. That was worth fighting for 50 years ago, and it is worth fighting for again today.

So in conclusion, I say that I look forward to engaging in this debate about unions and people coming together, banding together for decent profits, decent wages, and decent working conditions; because it was the working men and women who stood up and fought those who would perpetrate greed, who got us the 8-hour day, the 40-hour work week, wage increases, Medicare, Social Security, educational benefits, protection at the work site. That movement helped create the most powerful middle class in the history of this planet. It is that movement, again, that will be needed to counter the forces that are trying to drive peoples' wages and drive peoples' benefits and drive peoples' dignity and respect into the ground.

So let us have this debate. I am ready. My colleagues are ready. We are willing to debate the Speaker and his colleagues on the issue of working men and women and their right to collective bargaining. It is a right that was put together, culminating 30 years of prosperity unknown in the history of this planet. We believe, again, that the movement that brought us these rights is ready to take its appointed place in American society.

#### REPORT ON TRIP TO ASIA LED BY SPEAKER NEWT GINGRICH

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. HASTINGS of Washington]. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the special order I have taken out today is to relate to the House and to the American people the details about a trip to Asia led by the Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], and 11 other Members of the House during the period of March 23 through April 2 of this year.

Accompanying Speaker GINGRICH was the senior Democrat in the House of Representatives and the senior Member of the House, the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. JOHN DINGELL, the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. ROBERT LIVINGSTON, the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. JOHN BOEHNER, the gentleman from California, Mr. CHRIS COX, the gentlewoman from Washington, Ms. JENNIFER DUNN, the gentleman from Florida, Mr. ALCEE HASTINGS, the gentleman from California, Mr. JAY KIM, the gentleman from California, Mr. ED ROYCE, the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. WILLIAM "JEFF" JEFFERSON, the gentleman from Florida, Mr. MARK FOLEY, and this Member. Also accompanying us on part of the trip, that part relating to China, Japan, and Taiwan, was the junior Senator from the State of Florida, CONNIE MACK.

Mr. Speaker, in this trip we visited the following cities, in this order: first to Seoul, Korea; then to Hong Kong; to Beijing; to Shanghai; to Tokyo; and to Taipei, Taiwan.

As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific of the Committee on International Relations, some 2 years ago when I took control and chairmanship of the subcommittee, I set out three guiding objectives. The first of those objectives is to maintain our military and naval strength in the Pacific region, because it is in our national interest, and because our military and naval forces there are a source of security for the entire region. I think it makes it much less likely that we will have extraordinary arms races in East or Southeast Asia, as long as a military presence is there from the United States.

Indeed, it is rather remarkable that every nation in the region, with the possible exception of North Korea, wants the United States to be there in that significant role. Constantly we are asked whether or not the United States is there and will retain its forces there in the foreseeable future.

The second guiding objective is to maintain and in fact enhance our economic presence in the region, our business presence, our export presence, our American business activity, including investments.

Third, rather than check them at the door, the guiding principle will be to take American objectives and principles to Asia and continue to push for their introduction and sustenance. They would include, of course, the rule of law, a democracy, free and fair elections, and human rights, as well as taking economic freedom to the region.

Those are the objectives that were pursued by the Speaker's CODEL to

Asia. I am very pleased that so many of my colleagues, in a bipartisan effort, made this trip. I would like to begin very briefly, until I am joined by the Speaker and other Members.

First of all, I would mention as an overview a few things about the countries that we visited.

□ 1345

First, the Republic of Korea, which we know, of course, is South Korea, this is our fifth largest trading partner. Our exports to the Republic of Korea exceed \$30 billion with a trade surplus of about \$3.9 billion during 1996.

Our meetings in Seoul, South Korea, oriented Members regarding the problems of instability and deep economic and food problems in North Korea and the nature of North Korea's military threat to South Korea. We had top level access to South Korean Government officials, including an hour with President Kim Yong-sam, who took all of our questions and then honored our visit with a subsequent luncheon in the Blue House.

We visited the demilitarized zone, a very unusual place, I must say, on this planet and participated in military briefings by the commander of all United States forces in Korea. The Speaker also had an opportunity to visit the officers and troops of the U.S. Army 2d Division in their forward sector on the DMZ. We have about 37,000 American military personnel in Korea, most of them forward based along the DMZ. And that, of course, does not include military dependents and civilian members of the U.S. Government.

I will also briefly mention our trip to Japan before we proceed to discussion of China, even though it is out of order. In Japan we also had access to top leadership, including a breakfast and question and answer period with Prime Minister Hashimoto. He assured us that in the next few days, at that time, he would lead an effort to proceed with the extension of leases for the reconfigured United States bases in Okinawa, even if it jeopardized his government.

The trip reemphasized the fact for all of us that Japan is our most crucial military ally in East Asia. The fact that it has the second largest economy in the world by a wide margin and the fact that the state of our military and political relationship with Japan is excellent. However, we continue to have major trade difficulties with Japan, and several of us raised trade issues with the Ministry of International Trade and Industry.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH].

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific and was a tremendously important part of our trip.

It was a very important, I think, congressional delegation to Asia. We had a very strong membership of that delegation and representing both key Demo-

crats and key Republicans here in the U.S. Congress. Overseas we had no partisanship. It was entirely one team functioning as Americans. In fact, on issues such as market widening, giving Americans more access to sales in other countries, we would have both a Democrat and a Republican making the case to make sure that people understood that we were united as one country in insisting on economic opportunity for Americans.

Let me just say for my part that I thought there were a number of lessons to be learned. First, we visited South Korea and visited the fine young men and women of the 2d Division who are protecting South Korea and who are risking their lives on the North Korean border and who are spending a year away from their families in order to defend their country and our allies.

It was very clear to me, first of all, that Seoul is now a capital of 13 million very increasingly prosperous people in an increasingly democratic society with a free press, free elections and all of the turmoil and challenges of freedom, and that that is true in large part because it stands behind the shield of American defense.

So one of the lessons I took out of this trip was that we need to make sure that our young men and women in uniform have the finest weapons that science and engineering can develop so that those weapons and that training gives those young men and women the best possible chance to survive in combat and that we who are here at home owe it to those who risk their lives and spend their courage to invest in the kinds of defense which will make it effective and save their lives.

Second, that it is very clear that we need missile defense systems, both ballistic missile defenses and cruise missile defenses, because the greatest threat to the lives of our young people and the lives of our allies come from missiles that could be launched from North Korea or elsewhere. And unless we have systems to defend against those missiles, I think we have a problem.

I will say, in terms of my recent commitments on economic growth and my discussions of eliminating the death taxes and eliminating taxes on savings and job creation, one of the things which impressed me when we were in Korea was that they were worried about growth declining to 5.8 percent a year. That was a drop to 5.8 percent a year. We went to Hong Kong, where we saw 6.5 million people, possibly the highest per-capita income in the world, an island, some peninsulas, no natural resources, no automatic reason to be successful, but the courage, the hard work, the entrepreneurship, the intelligence of the people of Hong Kong had given them a tremendously vibrant system.

And part of the reason was because they were in a situation where their tax code and their structure of government gave them the best of both low

interest rates and low taxes. People in Hong Kong pay a top rate of 15 percent. Only 40 percent of the people pay that top rate of 15 percent. They have had a balanced budget for about 30 years. They have a \$19 billion surplus, their rainy day fund, which is actually paying interest.

They insist that their public services be lean and effective and that they have civil servants rather than bureaucrats. And they insist, for example, that their mass transit actually pay for itself. And it is in that kind of a framework that it was very impressive to see the commitment that they had made to an economically vital future.

We saw similar vitality in China where we were in Shanghai and saw 17 percent of the world's construction cranes, according to the World Bank, literally 1 out of every 5 construction cranes in the entire world is in Shanghai and its major economic development in an area called Pudong. Interestingly, the Pudong region, which is right across the Huangpu River in Shanghai from the original city, was farmland 8 years ago.

We were able to look out. We went up a tower and looked out and saw 150 highrise buildings simultaneously under construction. The reason is simple, they have very low taxes, tremendous incentives for investment. They are committed in the Shanghai area to the world market. And this is the great dilemma I think the entire delegation found in dealing with Hong Kong and in dealing with the People's Republic of China.

On the one side there was great economic growth, increasing economic freedom, increasing commitment to the world market. On the other side there was a dictatorship in Beijing which still has many of the unfortunate repressive police-state characteristics of a classic dictatorship. And so we were faced with a challenge of encouraging the Chinese Government in Beijing to understand that Hong Kong works because of freedom. The freedom is indivisible. Economic freedom, religious freedom, and political freedom are connected together.

And when you start breaking down one of those freedoms, the other two are not far behind. And I must say that I am very disappointed today, and I understand my colleague from Florida is going to spend more time on this, but the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FOLEY] and I were just discussing the article on page 1 of the New York Times, quote, right to protest in Hong Kong to be cut back, close quote, is exactly wrong. It is exactly what this delegation urged the Chinese Government not to do. It is exactly what this delegation urged Mr. Tung not to do.

And I must say, I am very disappointed by this initial proposal and regard it as a step away from freedom and a step away from what they called two systems in one country. They did not talk about 1½ systems. They

talked about two systems. The system of Beijing and the system of Hong Kong. And we kept trying to tell them, for Hong Kong to truly be a unique system, it must have freedom of speech. It must have a free news media. It must have free elections. It must have an honest, independent judiciary. It must have the rule of law. And it must have a law abiding and incorrupt Civil Service.

This is, I think, a very sad day for us to be looking at this report from Hong Kong. I hope it is wrong. I hope that Mr. Tung will withdraw these proposals, because I think they are destructive of our understanding of where Hong Kong should go.

We were quite candid about that. We hope that the reversion will work. We understand why the Chinese Government is excited. It is legitimate for China to want Hong Kong back. It is their national territory. But if they, in the process of reversion, destroy freedom, they should not be surprised to see the West react negatively. And they should not be surprised to see difficulties in Hong Kong. So I hope they will reconsider what we learned today.

Let me say also that in Japan we were very impressed with the Japanese Government and the Prime Minister. Their commitment to a continued Japanese-American military relationship I thought was very, very important. And I think that all of us left Japan with a feeling that we have a very good friendship and that that is truly the base of our policies in Asia and that the Japanese-American alliance is strong and sound and both sides understand its importance.

I must say that on the economic front, we were probably as aggressive with the Japanese as with any government we met with, in saying that now that they are the second largest economy in the world, that they have an obligation to open up their society, to have the kind of open markets that are legitimate, that for many, many years the United States has been generous to the world, for many years we have been the most open market in the world, but there is some reciprocity that is required. And I must commend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] in particular, who made a very impassioned and very aggressive speech in favor of Japan being more open in its markets.

We had a very good meeting in Taiwan. Taiwan is an illustration of the changes we are trying to encourage. We met with the first democratically-elected President in the history of China. We met with the speakers of the yuan and the upper house in a democratically-elected free legislative body. There is free news coverage, and we had a press conference that certainly indicated they had a free press in Taipei. That is the situation that we faced, where we saw that freedom is possible and that we hope that the mainland Chinese will decide that Taiwan and Hong Kong are the wave of the future, not repression and dictatorship.

We indicated clearly, both in Beijing and in Taiwan, that we favor a continuation of the bipartisan one China policy.

I did say, on behalf of the House, which had voted 369 to 14 last year that we would defend Taiwan against unprovoked aggression, that the People's Republic of China has an absolute obligation to pursue the dialogue about one China with the people of Taiwan in a peaceful manner and that the United States would not accept an attempt to conquer Taiwan. We were also candid in Taiwan in emphasizing our commitment to a one China policy and that no one should engage in unilateral activity.

I want to thank my colleagues for working with us on this tremendous trip and say to the House that in three speeches, one in Hong Kong, one in Beijing and one in Tokyo, I tried to speak for the House about the centrality of freedom in understanding America, that we truly believe our Declaration of Independence, that we truly believe that these are truths that are self-evident, not propositions, not debating points, but truths that are self-evident, that we truly believe that we are endowed by our Creator with certain inalienable rights, and that means frankly that the rights Americans have and the rights that all human beings have across the planet are rights that come from God, not from politicians, not from lawyers, not from bureaucrats, not from the military or the police but from God, and that those rights, among which are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, mean at their heart that the right of free speech, the right of religion, the right of assembly, the right of a free news media, the right of free election, the right to the rule of law, the right to expect your government Civil Service to be honest and uncorruptible, that these are at the core of what we believe in.

We tried to say to the Chinese, yes, we understand how excited you are at getting Hong Kong back, but you have to understand that we have the same emotional excitement about freedom, that to discuss freedom is to define being an American. And to ask an American to come to China and not talk about freedom is to ask an American to not be talking about America and to not talk about the values that make us the country we are.

We also felt that while that discussion should be respectful, should be positive, should be pleasant, that plain truth, spoken honestly, was a legitimate goal of friendship, that we had an obligation to talk openly and candidly about exactly what we thought was going on and to represent the values and the beliefs that we share.

Let me close my part of this by saying two things about dedication. First, as an Army brat whose father served in the Korean war and served later in Korea during his military career, to me it was very meaningful, whether it was at airbases or with the infantry of the

2nd Division, to see these young men and women who are prepared to train every day to be on the demilitarized zone with the special units and, again, today is the day when we have heard there has been an incident involving the North Koreans, to recognize that just north of them is a country that we frankly do not know very much about. I think it is very important for my colleagues to understand this.

□ 1400

Despite 44 years of studying North Korea, despite the fact that 37,000 of our young men and women and their families are at risk, the simple truth is that we do not know very much about this dictatorship, and it should remind us why it is important to be militarily prepared for capabilities and not simply diplomatically prepared for intentions, because the truth is, we do not know what Kim Chong-il's intentions are, we do not know what makes his government work, we do not know what their values or their plans are, and so we must be prepared for worst-case situations.

So I want to praise those who risk their lives and serve their country, because that dedication at the demilitarized zone and across not just South Korea but we met with young men and women also in Japan serving at air bases at Misawa and Yokota, a tremendous sense of commitment; the young men at Elmendorf living here at home in Alaska but nonetheless part of the same team; the young men and women of the Air Force team who went with us and who carried us across the region.

I also want to say a word on behalf of the Members and staff who went on this visit. This was a long, hard-working delegation. We had many, many meetings. In one day in Beijing, we had six major negotiating sessions, just in one day.

We sought to represent America. We had coordinated with the Clinton administration. We had talked with the National Security Council. I had talked with the Vice President and the President and the Secretary of State, and we saw it as one unified team to represent America. And I was very proud of my colleagues and the work they did and the way they stood up for our values, they stood up for our economic opportunities, and they made clear our commitment to peace and freedom and security in the region.

And now under the unanimous consent, as was previously agreed to, I am going to yield back control of this, if I might, to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], and ask him to recognize various Members.

Mr. BEREUTER. I thank the Speaker for that excellent summary and inspirational discussion of really what he, as leader of this delegation, and what this delegation attempted to achieve while we were on our Asia visit.

With the indulgence of my colleagues, I am going to go back to take another 4 or 5 minutes to try to set the stage as I did with respect to Korea and Japan, and then I will call on Members. I think we have sufficient time. In fact, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], has a special order hour as necessary.

But let me now go briefly to Hong Kong, the PRC, and Taiwan, and discuss them as a whole. The economists refer to this today as a greater economic China.

Certainly a major focus of our trip was a cluster of issues related to Hong Kong, China, and Taiwan. We intentionally visited Hong Kong first among these elements of greater economic China because of the imminent reversion of Hong Kong from British rule on July 1, 1997, to China, where it will become a special administrative region within the People's Republic of China.

American interests in Hong Kong are huge. With more than 1,100 American businesses located there, 450 of them are regional headquarters. In fact, it is the largest American Chamber of Commerce abroad in the world. With more than \$14 billion of American investments there and about \$14 billion in American exports to Hong Kong last year, we actually had a surplus with Hong Kong of \$4.1 billion. Therefore, the United States Government and the American people are very concerned about the Chinese keeping their promises under the Sino-British accord of 1984, which assured Hong Kong's autonomy from the PRC in all matters but defense and foreign affairs.

In short of Deng Xiaoping's policy, China has had a two-systems-in-one-country arrangement. This will be an important but very challenging task for the Chinese even though they understand the importance of Hong Kong to their economy, and especially with their trade to the outside world.

We discussed these and other important issues with Hong Kong Chief Executive Tung Chee-hwa, American and Hong Kong business interests, human rights activists, representatives of the news media, a diverse panel of religious leaders, and the critics of China on the existing legislative council. We also met with British Governor Chris Patton at considerable length and had a very candid and informative discussion.

We made it clear to all interested parties in Hong Kong and to Chinese leaders in Beijing that we want the Chinese to keep their promises of a high degree of autonomy for Hong Kong and that we wish them every success in implementing their two systems/one country concept. This will be an important precedent for the eventual peaceful, noncoercive unification of Taiwan with mainland China, an outcome that is consistent with our long-standing bipartisan, one-China policy.

In Beijing, we expressed the same interest and concerns about the Hong

Kong autonomy issue. We made it clear that we would be observing their progress in keeping their promises and that the Congress of the United States in the 1992 Hong Kong Policy Act authorized the President to modify United States law with respect to Hong Kong if these promises were broken.

We indicated our willingness to assist the Chinese in understanding the importance of ensuring that second system within China for Hong Kong which preserves the rule of law, freedom of press, civil liberties, free and fair elections for the legislature, and what is thought to be the most advanced state of economic freedom in the world.

Also in Beijing, Speaker GINGRICH spoke for the entire delegation in reconfirming our support for a one-China policy. He stressed that unification with Taiwan must be by peaceful means and reiterated the formal United States House position and congressional viewpoint that the United States would defend Taiwan against an attack and that unification would only take place by peaceful means. This direct statement was delivered in a non-hostile manner by Speaker GINGRICH and actually was surprisingly well received by the Chinese leadership, including President Jiang Zemin. Rather than the usual anti-Taiwan tirade, the key leaders said only that they had no intention of attacking Taiwan, and we went on to other productive items of discussion.

We also made it clear to both sides, including the Taiwanese, that they should avoid provocative actions. In Taipei, these comments were reiterated, and in fact it was specifically mentioned that Taiwanese or Taiwanese American campaigns for United Nations membership for Taiwan are provocative and serve no useful purpose since China would veto such an initiative in the Security Council. I found it particularly interesting that President Li said to us that his government would not push for independence, they had no intention of doing so.

Speaking personally, I would say that I believe it is clear to the Chinese and to the world community that making the two systems/one country policy work in Hong Kong can be an important precedent in the reunification of Taiwan with China.

Also, I would note that this Member encouraged President Li of Taiwan to proceed energetically to make the changes necessary to come into the World Trade Organization, the WTO, as soon as possible, changes that would include reductions in tariff and market access changes. I specifically urged them to reduce the tariffs on processed foods so that American exporters can exploit this Taiwanese market, and Taiwanese consumers will benefit from lower food prices and a greater selection of goods.

Additionally, I stressed my own view that Taiwan should be allowed WTO membership before the PRC if the

changes it makes satisfy WTO membership. That possibility also gives us increased leverage to succeed and to successfully demand changes from the PRC for WTO membership.

In summary then, and in conclusion of my comments, in my view, our meetings with the Chinese officials on the mainland in Beijing and Shanghai were amazingly positive and productive, particularly in view of the fact that Speaker GINGRICH and the bipartisan congressional delegation would subsequently visit Taiwan, and they knew we intended to, and thus he would be the highest-ranking official and we would be the highest-ranking delegation ever to visit Taiwan since the Taiwan Relations Act was enacted in 1978.

The Chinese Government gave us top-level access and gracious, nonbelligerent meetings, even expressing their interest in initiation of an interparliamentary exchange between the United States House and the National People's Congress.

I would now be very pleased to yield on a seniority basis to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and I yield such time as he may consume.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding and apologize to my colleagues for intruding, but since the Speaker has asked me to be at another meeting right now, I appreciate your courtesy for letting me proceed briefly at this point.

I also want to identify myself with the gentleman's comments and with the comments of Speaker GINGRICH. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that this delegation was the highest-ranking delegation ever to appear not only in Taiwan, but it is the highest ranking one that I have ever been engaged in where the Speaker of the House, the dean of the House, Mr. DINGELL, and various committee chairmen, ranking subcommittee chairmen, and ranking members all gathered together to go to these five sovereign areas, South Korea, Hong Kong, China, Japan, and Taiwan.

It was an extraordinary sequence of events. In each country we met with the very top leaders, and in many instances we had several separate meetings with top leaders, and in each country, under the leadership of the Speaker of the House, I think our delegation presented a cohesive, coherent, and articulate view of American policy.

I was extraordinarily proud of the way that Speaker GINGRICH and the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. DINGELL, and all the other Members conducted themselves throughout this entire process. It was exhausting. We worked all day long every day throughout the trip. No sooner had we recovered from several days of jet lag than we were engaged in more meetings. Then it was time to come home, picking up jet lag on the way home as well.

But the delegation, under the leadership of Speaker GINGRICH, spoke out on

behalf of free speech, freedom of religion, the right to assemble, and a free press. We stood up for the real democratic values now embodied in Hong Kong and did everything possible in all of those countries to assert the American viewpoint that democracy should be maintained in Hong Kong after the transfer to mainland China.

We held steady with that message all the way through the trip, not only in Hong Kong but through Beijing and Shanghai and beyond. We stood fast for American presence in the Pacific, the prerogatives of America, the remaining superpower, to maintain its policy as a strong Pacific-oriented nation.

We stood strong concerning the relationship between Taiwan and mainland China, saying that if there was provocation, we are going to be there; we are going to defend our friend, Taiwan; so there should be no provocation, and that should not be misunderstood. The messages were not blurred and they were very clearly reported by the press. Regardless of whether the press was friendly, antagonistic, or cynical, invariably the reports from the trip came out positive.

And I just want to say that as a Member of this Congress for almost 20 years, I have never seen as productive a congressional delegation as this one was, nor have I seen as cohesive a delegation, between Republicans and Democrats alike, majority and minority, working together steadfastly, going to meetings and expressing what, in my view, was a united viewpoint of American policy in the Pacific.

It was a privilege to have been on the trip and a special privilege for me to watch the Speaker of the House in action. This man is tireless. He never slept for more than 5 hours a day, and yet he was constantly reading, absorbing, thinking, meeting, speaking, strategizing, synergizing, and synthesizing. He was a whirlwind of activity, and in every instance he represented our delegation and our country with remarkable agility in an articulate fashion.

So I am pleased to associate myself with the remarks of my friends and colleagues who will speak after me on the positive results of this trip. It was a significant opportunity to have been in this delegation and on this trip to these Pacific countries, and I really, really do think that it did a lot of good.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his great comments, and I know that I speak for all of my colleagues in thanking him for his role in this delegation. And the gentleman did not mention, but the Speaker called meeting after meeting after meeting, including at 9 o'clock at night or later.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FOLEY] for any remarks he may wish to make.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and would say, of course, that the gentleman from Louisiana

[Mr. LIVINGSTON], spoke eloquently about the Speaker's great presentation on behalf of the United States of America, our ideals, our goals, our vision for this world we live in, but it did not hurt to have the chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] along; the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] the ranking Democratic Member of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS]; and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYCE].

□ 1415

What I noticed was that the leadership of all the countries took extremely seriously this visit because of the fact that the leadership of Congress had taken time out to visit them and discuss the issues that face us. One issue we raised on behalf of the environment was Taiwan has contemplated sending its nuclear waste to North Korea. North Korea is in desperate need of financial assistance, if you will, to prop up their rogue regime. Seventy million is the number that is banded about that they will receive in order to accept nuclear waste.

What assurances do we have that that nuclear waste, once brought to North Korea, will be properly disposed of? None. President Lee, upon the notification from the Speaker that we were deeply concerned with the environmental consequences to South Korea and to our entire planet, took due note and suggested he would revisit that issue and carefully consider it, because he did not want it to be a geopolitical problem, he did not want it to be a stress on relations with the United States.

Again, I want to enter into the RECORD the fact that we raised the issue, we will continue to pursue the issue, we do not want to see Taiwan send its nuclear waste to North Korea under any circumstance.

We also had an opportunity to raise issues of trade. We were fortunate in being joined by Congressman JEFFERSON and Congresswoman DUNN, both on Ways and Means, to talk about issues that are important to Congressman HASTINGS and myself from Florida: The introduction of citrus from our State to the People's Republic of China which has currently been banned; the protection of our intellectual property rights; our copyrights; our enforcement of the things that we hold dear, the movies, the CD's, the technology, software that is being pirated and sold on the streets for 1/1,000 of its value, depriving both the owners and creators of their due payment for those rights.

So we raised those issues. But I think, more than ever, we raised the consciousness of the people that we visited. We found a people in China wanting to be free, that will propel what I believe is their own democracy, with

some nudging by us, to seek free elections as they have had in Taiwan.

But I will again go back to what the Speaker urged caution on and I will obviously suggest, as many newspaper articles have suggested recently, that MFN, most-favored-nation status, is not guaranteed, is not guaranteed business-as-usual in this Congress; and that when you read in the *New York Times*, in a severe blow to civil liberties, the man appointed by China to run Hong Kong announced plans today to impose more stringent controls on the right of public protest and free associations, certainly is not a reflection of the meeting we attended, where he stressed it would be an open affair country, that things would be smooth, that the process of coming back into the fold in China would be orderly and observing the rule of law.

So again I would send that caution as well, that we made some valuable points. We hope that the lessons and the things that we tried to share with the Chinese Government and others is not lost, and we would sincerely urge Mr. Tung to evaluate his recent comments and ensure the democracy of this country.

I was proud, as an American, to be on the trip. As was mentioned, the Speaker, I do not think he got 5 hours of sleep. I think it was 3. One of the things that I think most impressed our hosts was his tremendous grasp of the historical occurrences that happened in Japan, in China, Taiwan, Korea. He was able without note to speak extemporaneously about events that had occurred in their country, not just in the last 10 or 20 years but the last 1,000, 2,000 years, and was able to bring that reflected history forward in analogies and examples.

I think when I watched the faces of the Presidents of those countries, saying, this man has not just come here with a printed text to give us; he understands our culture, he understands the dynamics in which we have operated, he knows that it is stressful when you change governmental policies or governmental operations; but he came with such authority and such strong presence that the mission was that much more successful because of his being there, obviously as Speaker of the House, third in line to the Presidency, but more importantly, that he was so phenomenally prepared to debate with leaders of other countries the urgent things that we feel important.

I thank the gentleman for allowing me time under the special order.

Mr. BEREUTER. I thank the gentleman from Florida especially for his mentioning the fact that we did bring up the low-level nuclear waste issue on Taiwan aggressively, firmly, clearly, and conveyed our concerns and those of the Republic of Korea.

The Speaker has asked if I would yield next to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, and I will return then to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYCE].

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], the dean of the House, the senior Democrat on the Speaker's codel, and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank my good friend for yielding. I want to commend him for having this special order. I think the product of the work of not only the delegation but also this particular special order is going to be valuable to the country. I want to commend the gentleman. I want to commend the Speaker for the work which was done. It was done in a thoroughly bipartisan fashion, and it focused on a number of issues of enormous moment to the United States and to the people of this country. More importantly, it addressed the issues of security and trade in Korea, Hong Kong, the People's Republic of China, and in Taiwan as well as in Japan.

Our interest in Hong Kong was, of course, the question of reversion to Chinese sovereignty which will take place shortly. We met with Governor Chris Patten, with Mr. Tung who will serve as Hong Kong's chief executive officer after the reversion, the financial secretary of the colony, senior legislators, human rights activists, leadership of the Hong Kong Christian Council, members of the United States and Hong Kong business communities, ordinary citizens and large numbers of others.

In China the delegation reviewed a whole broad range of issues with the entire top leadership of the People's Republic. I must say in these two, and in all of the other activities in which the delegation functioned, it functioned in a thoroughly and completely bipartisan and proper fashion.

The delegation's focus in Japan was economic, again, and security issues. We met with the Prime Minister, the Foreign and Defense Ministers, the Minister of International Trade and Industry, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, as well as Japan's most wealthy and successful business leaders and the Chamber of Commerce there. Our discussion related to trade, unfair trading practices, opening the markets with regard to all kinds of American exports and the need for achieving a fair and more evenhanded trading relationship with that country. Similar discussions were held, of course, in Korea, which is an area of major concern, as we also discussed these matters in the People's Republic of China.

As a result of the trip, I have come home more firmly convinced than ever that the United States has enormous political, economic, and security interests in east Asia, interests which we are safeguarding and on which we are pledging our interest and determination for the maintenance of peace by having some 37,000 of our fine young men and women standing watch along the most dangerous and heavily fortified border in the world. We spent

considerable time inquiring, I would observe to the gentleman as he has already observed, into not only the relationship between the United States and the countries there, but very specifically the situation with regard to North Korea, a curious closed nation which is witnessing with great distress the economic collapse of its economy, with a continued annual decline in economic activity of about 7 percent.

Again, we discussed not only the question of our security but the situation with regard to the North Korean country and what is happening in that unfortunate place and what its meanings are. Does it mean implosion, does it mean explosion, does it mean invasion to the south, does it mean democratic change or some kind of soft landing? The answer is no one knows the answers to these questions.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend, the gentleman who has gotten this special order, for the outstanding work that he is doing and does do and for his leadership in this particular matter.

I have recently returned from a 10-day trip to Asia led by Speaker of the House NEWT GINGRICH. The bipartisan delegation, on which I served as ranking Democrat, visited South Korea, Hong Kong, China, Japan, and Taiwan.

In South Korea the delegation focused on security and trade issues. We met with President Kim Young Sam, Gen. John Tilielli, who commands United States Forces Korea, Foreign Minister Yoo Chong-Ha, Korean trade officials and senior legislators, and representatives of the United States business community in Korea.

In Hong Kong our primary interest was in Hong Kong's reversion to Chinese sovereignty, due to take place on July 1, 1997. We met with Gov. Chris Patten, C.H. Tung, who will serve as Hong Kong's chief executive after the July 1 reversion, the Hong Kong financial secretary, senior legislators, human rights activists, leaders of the Hong Kong Christian Council, and members of the U.S. and Hong Kong business communities.

In China the delegation reviewed a range of issues on the United States-China bilateral agenda, with particular emphasis on Hong Kong, Taiwan, human rights, and trade. While in Beijing we had meetings with President Jiang Zemin, Premier Li Peng, Vice-Premier Zhu Rongji, Foreign Minister Qian Qichen, and other senior Chinese officials. The delegation also spent 1 day in Shanghai, where we attended Easter morning services and met with Shanghai's mayor, the chairman of China's Association for Relations Across the Taiwan Strait, and the American Chamber of Commerce.

The delegation's focus in Japan was on economic and security issues. We met with Prime Minister Hashimoto, the Japanese foreign and defense ministers, the Minister of International Trade and Industry, the speaker of the Japanese House of Representatives, and some of Japan's wealthiest and most successful business leaders, as well as the American Chamber of Commerce in Tokyo.

The delegation's final stop was in Taiwan, where we met with President Lee Teng-hui, Vice President and Premier Lien Chan, and Foreign Minister John Chang. Relations between Taiwan and the People's Republic of

China, Hong Kong's reversion, the proposed sale of Taiwanese nuclear waste to North Korea, and the WTO dominated the discussions.

As a result of this trip, I have returned to the United States more firmly convinced than ever that the United States has substantial political, economic, and security interests in East Asia, including the maintenance of peace on the Korean Peninsula, where 37,000 American troops stand watch along the most dangerous and heavily fortified border in the world. These interests can be protected only by an active American engagement in the region. The United States is a Pacific power today, and should remain so for the foreseeable future. This will require active and imaginative diplomacy, backed by the presence of approximately 100,000 American troops in the region. I had the privilege of visiting with many of these men and women who represent the United States armed services in East Asia, and I am pleased to report to you that they are an impressive lot—dedicated, serious, committed professionals whom the Nation owes a great debt of gratitude.

China and the difficult United States-Chinese relationship figured prominently in our discussions at each of our stops. We found widespread agreement among the Asian leaders with whom we met that the Clinton administration's policy of constructive engagement toward China offers the best means of safeguarding our interests and pursuing our political, security, and economic objectives in East Asia. Our relationship with China will inevitably be a rocky one for many years, for we are divided by profound differences. But we also share important interests in common—a desire for peace and stability throughout the region, a prosperous, open global economy, a non-nuclear North Korea that does not threaten its neighbors or disrupt the strategic status quo, a successful Hong Kong reversion process—and it is very much in our interests to remain engaged with this prickly but important country.

During each of our stops, I raised difficult trade issues and preached the need to break down barriers to American products and services. In South Korea I focused on Korean restrictions that block the import of United States automobiles—the government's frugality campaign, tariffs and taxes on automobile imports, vehicle certification procedures, matters relating to financing, and politically motivated tax audits and other forms of harassment—and arranged for meetings outside the delegation's official program with South Korean trade officials and representatives from the Big Three United States automakers. If Korea persists in refusing to open its trading system, I warned, the United States would be forced to reconsider its options, which might include placing Korea on the watch list or initiating a complaint before the World Trade Organization.

In China I emphasized the need for China to accept more United States goods and to take other steps to reduce Beijing's sizable trade surplus with the United States. American support for a policy of engagement, I cautioned, will evaporate unless China treats American business fairly. Opening up China's vast markets, I told economic czar Zhu Rongji, will set up a win-win situation. Not only will such actions strengthen the bilateral relationship; they will also help both countries address their domestic economic problems.

While in Tokyo, I spent considerable time looking into why the import of U.S. autos, while slightly higher in 1996 than 1995, was still so sluggish. I was told that in addition to Japan's well-known trade barriers, the weak yen was now making foreign autos more expensive for Japanese consumers. Tokyo, I warned, must avoid the temptation to deal with its current economic difficulties by aggressively promoting exports that create an even larger trade imbalance with the United States. Japan, we repeated at every opportunity, must do more to open its markets to American goods. While we do not seek special treatment, we have a right to expect the same treatment from Japan that we afford Japanese companies doing business in the United States.

As a result of this trip I have a renewed understanding of how the prosperity and well-being of Americans, including the people of the 16th District of Michigan, is inextricably linked to an active and enlightened American presence in East Asia. Equally important, our delegation was able to spread the word that if the peoples of East Asia desire the fruits of American engagement, they will have to help us shoulder the burdens as well—politically, militarily, and not least in importance, economically.

Mr. BEREUTER. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Michigan for his comments. As my colleagues well know, when the gentleman made his contributions on our trip, it was always speaking from authority and speaking with a complete knowledge of the issue, and it will not surprise his constituents in Michigan to know that among other important economic issues and trade issues he brought up, autos and auto parts in Korea and especially before the Minister of International Trade and Industry were high on the agenda and were articulately addressed by the gentleman from Michigan, in which I joined him.

Mr. DINGELL. If my good friend would yield, with his full support, cooperation, and also with that of the Speaker and the rest of the delegation, for which I thank the gentleman, the Speaker and the other members of the delegation.

Mr. BEREUTER. I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL]. Indeed he did have the full support of the delegation in that respect and in all others.

Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYCE], my colleague from the Committee on International Relations, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa. As Speaker GINGRICH reminded everyone on the trip, he is also the Republican who has the district which contains more Asian-Americans than any other Republican member.

Mr. ROYCE. I thank my good friend for yielding. I want to thank Speaker GINGRICH for putting together this delegation. The Congress plays a key role in making our country's foreign policy and a trip like this gives us a much better understanding of the important issues we decide each year. We worked hard, it was grueling and we made the

most of our time, and the Speaker of the House deserves our thanks.

It is important to me that this was a bipartisan delegation. America stands tallest when its foreign policy is widely supported. One of the things all of the members of the delegation agree on is the importance of Asia. There is no question the security and the prosperity of the United States is on the line. We saw this in North Korea when we visited some of the 37,000 American service men and women in Korea. These are Americans who believe passionately in their mission. Their mission is maintaining peace and helping to run out the clock on one of the last vestiges of the cold war, the last Stalinist regime there in North Korea. As we talked to the young men and women of the Second Division, many of them from California, from my home State, doing the job that they do in this most difficult of conditions, it was a great honor. It was a great honor for us. We owe these Americans our strongest support, including, in my view, the best missile defense system that we can give them.

We saw the importance of Asia when we visited the American business men and women in Hong Kong who are the center of Asia's pounding economic heart there in Hong Kong. They are bringing America's economic prowess and our exports to this booming region. We saw it when we visited Taiwan, which has moved now to democracy. Asia in general has made strides toward economic prosperity and political freedom, and America is stronger and safer because of this. But I think the stakes are high. We would suffer great damage if we decided that the world's greatest Nation should disengage in the Pacific. That is no course for us to take.

Some of the lessons learned on this trip. We learned that America is viewed as the world's greatest nation. Our Government is respected the world over. Our economy has produced amazing prosperity. But there are lessons to be learned from the countries we visited, and the Speaker stated, I think yesterday, he said, "I believe our economy can do better."

Well, our economy runs at a rate of less than 3 percent growth. That is what we are stuck with a year. And here we are viewing these Asian economies, South Korea where the growth rate was 9 percent last year. Taiwan at 7 percent. These are growth rates 2 and 3 times the rate of growth in the United States.

Our delegation visited Hong Kong. Many consider Hong Kong the freest economy in the world. Hong Kong has a far lower tax rate than the United States. Fifteen percent is their top tax rate. Hong Kong is free of the excessive regulation that shackles our economy. And in many ways, Hong Kong is much more encouraging of the entrepreneurial spirit our country celebrates. I think the United States needs to take notice and lower our taxes and cut our redtape.

□ 1430

I think we need to heed the words of Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan when he said that we should at the very least index capital gains for inflation taking the inflationary bite out of investments. I have a bill to do this, and having seen Hong Kong's miracle, I am more committed than ever to give American taxpayers this relief.

Other trade issues that we should discuss: You know, many of our allies in Asia need to look at Hong Kong also because Hong Kong has become an economic powerhouse because of trade, and that means they have no trade barriers. The people of Hong Kong are free to purchase goods and services from whenever they want to. They buy the best goods at the best price. It is no secret that the U.S. economy is the most competitive in the world. We are the world's biggest exporter. We are selling more and more goods to Asia. These exports support over a million jobs in my State of California alone. But we should be selling more in Asia, and the problem is that too many Asian countries are shutting out too many U.S. goods and U.S. services.

So our delegation pressed and pressed every government that we met with to open their markets to American goods and services. I serve on the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, and in China American insurance companies are shut out, they simply cannot operate, and we raised that issue with China. The message was that we on this delegation gave, we said trade, including trade in the ever more important service sector, is a two-way street. We talked with South Korea who is shutting out California agricultural products, and we said, well, if South Korea wants to sell autos and electronics in the United States, then American companies should be allowed to sell grapes and oranges and autos and electronics in South Korea. This is right for the American worker, it is right for the Korean consumer who should, after all, have a chance to buy the best goods at the cheapest possible price. And right now in South Korea the government hassles Koreans who buy American cars. It actually sends the tax auditor after Koreans who buy American cars. That practice has to go, and we told that to the South Korean Government.

But it is more than trade. Trade is important, but it is not all the United States is about. Our delegation has focused on democracy. On this trip we focused on human rights, too. Our country has always taken its values seriously and our foreign policy. It matters to us how other governments treat their citizens. This meant confronting the Chinese leadership about its terrible treatment of its citizens. I presented the Chinese Government a list of 75 political prisoners, and locking up people because of their beliefs is intolerable.

And I hope that the White House begins to understand that when it comes

to China, yes, trade matters, but so do human rights and nuclear proliferation and Taiwan. The administration would like to treat trade as being above these issues.

My view is America is a superpower, not a salesman. The administration's willingness to stand up for American values will be tested as Hong Kong falls under Beijing's control in the next 2 months. Already there are signs that China may not honor its one country, two-systems pledge. Just yesterday, as we heard, it announced that it would severely restrict fundamental political rights to publicly meet. Beijing's future ruler for Hong Kong, Mr. Teng-hui, who we met with, is touting Asian values. This is shorthand for the idea that universal democratic and civil rights norms are inappropriate for Asia, as if Taiwan and even Hong Kong itself, where these values are honored, are not in Asia.

The world will be watching Hong Kong, and the world will be watching Washington's response. Acting on human rights concerns is just; it is not idealism, it is justice. The reality is that the United States will never be fully at peace with a government that is not at peace with its own people, and to the extent that the United States encourages change by raising these concerns, especially with the Chinese people, through efforts like Radio Free Asia, we strengthen our security while honoring our values.

Again thank you, Mr. Speaker, for making this so very important trip.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much, and I am now very pleased to yield to another of my colleagues on the House Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS], who is a particularly valuable Member for this trip because of his knowledge as a lawyer and a jurist, and I am pleased to yield to him.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Nebraska for yielding, and I thank him for perpetuating this particular special order. We are all indebted to the extraordinary work that was done by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and, as one Member of the House of Representatives, I was honored and privileged to have the opportunity to travel with this delegation to the areas of Asia that we traveled. A lot has been made about this particular trip, and I was asked when we were in China why it was that I had visited China twice in three months. I had the good fortune of going to China in January with Congressman KOLBE from Arizona and the delegation that he led of 22 Members of the House of Representatives, and in each instance we had a variable type program that allowed for further information. I am going to come back to that, but I would like to answer the media by saying what I said, and that is that China is a happening.

Now that could be construed as China is a party. That is not the happening

that I was speaking of. The happening that I was talking about is the fact that China is the vortex of the dynamism that is going on in economic development in that area of the world, and assuredly what our trip did was underscore the principles and values of this great country, and as I look about this gallery and I see children that are here on this day as this special order is being held, I cannot help but think that many of us will long have since passed, and yet we laid the groundwork for their future in the various delegations and those that have preceded us in this rather extraordinary work that Congress does in international relations.

The vortex of dynamism does not mean that China is old. We visited Korea, we visited Taiwan, we visited Japan, and of course Hong Kong and Shanghai inside China as well as Beijing. In each instance in a bipartisan fashion those things that have been said by my colleagues can be underscored with the fact that all of us supported the values and principles that are enunciated in our great democracy.

And you know the Speaker made the comment often that America is a Pacific nation, and some folks would quarrel with that, but I ask anyone that wishes to quarrel with that, ask the citizens of California or Oregon or Washington or Hawaii or Alaska, ask them where they live. And speaking of Alaska, let us just compliment the extraordinary military people that handle all of our security matters as it pertains to that area of the world in a more than admirable fashion.

Travel further into the demilitarized zone where speakers before me, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] and others, have pointed out the 37,000-plus troops that are in that demilitarized zone, many of whom we had an opportunity to see, all of whom are extremely sharp, well commanded, young individuals, and they have a slogan that says in front of them all it means simply that in the deteriorating posture of North Korea, if some insanity prevails and war occurs, they will be the first ones to see it. We need to support those individuals.

And what I came home with, as we get ready to talk about foreign aid authorization, and you lead us in that effort as you so ably do, and the Chair of the Africa subcommittee, my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYCE], does so with Africa, is I came home with legislation. People say these trips sometimes are useless and we are criticized for taking them.

I now know about the need for 4-way talks in Korea in a meaningful way. I know now more about nuclear proliferation in a meaningful way, in the dumping that was about to take place or still may contractually with Taiwan and North Korea, and the potential dangers not only to the environment but to the security of that area of the

world. I know now about the reversion of Hong Kong in a meaningful way that I think I can stand with any American with the same background and argue forcefully why it is that we have to insist that there be no sedition provision in China's law, that they do not revoke the civil liberties and civil rights of those that for 99 years now have had that opportunity.

I know more about Taiwan, its democracy, how it has managed its economy. I know about the interrelated areas of economic and political and human rights, and all of that will lead me to three pieces of legislation that I plan to offer during the authorization process in addition to legislation that will support our military in a meaningful way, since many of them pointed out the horrors that they have visited.

And I want to say one final thing and thank you again for the time. The staff that accompanied us are unrivaled on either the Republican or the Democratic side, and they are effusively to be complimented by those of us that had the opportunity to work with them.

In addition thereto, I think it is abominable that the foreign services of the United States of America are in the critical posture that many of them are. In spite of the fact that we have these enormous financial constraints that all of us know about, it is pitiable to leave our children and our adults who work in the foreign services in circumstances where they do not have electricity, they do not have water, the embassies are run down, such as the one in Beijing, and I am not here to apologize for anybody in that regard. I take full responsibility for my remarks and say that this is an observation that I think is a mistake for us.

Those children in this gallery need to learn languages, and they will be very wise to learn the languages of Asia since Asia is going to be a coming.

As regard freedom and my final remarks, Mr. Speaker, as you well know we had an opportunity to go to church in Shanghai. That was a moving experience. Some of us went to Catholic services, others of us went to Protestant services. But the fact is that we went to services and symbolically it let China know that we are going to stand for religion as we said and were told by those persons that are in Hong Kong with whom we met that are the religious leaders of that area.

I want to say to the world, I want to say to China, I want to say to America and say to all of my colleagues that freedom marches to a steady beat. China cannot stop freedom. Freedom once tasted is sweet enough to cause individuals to rise above oppression.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The Chair would remind Members to refrain from referring to occupants of the gallery in their remarks.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Florida

[Mr. HASTINGS] for his moving and accurate summary of what he saw there and particularly for his compliment to the staff which we had not mentioned previously.

I now have one Member and perhaps another one who may come back in time, but I am pleased now to yield to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. KIM], and his hometown, his former hometown where he was born, is the first place we visited. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, I was a little concerned about this article this morning, and I had a good feeling when I come back from the trip from Hong Kong and China. I thought that they understood clearly where we stand on the Hong Kong issue. This morning's article says that they are going to be curtailed, certain rights, public assembly rights and public gathering rights, and that is a guarantee by the first amendment in our Constitution.

Now that is not the impression I got from the trip. Very, very concerned. Is that the signal we are getting, the more to come?

I remember, Mr. Speaker, I have to have a colloquy with you. Remember that they said that it is two system one country will succeed and not to worry about it? But very disappointed. I hope this is not the true story, this morning's article. But if it is, we should watch closely, very closely because I am deeply concerned of what is happening in Hong Kong versus what they told us. Do you not agree with that?

Mr. BEREUTER. I do agree, and as the Speaker said, it is not one system and one and a half. It is two systems, and this agreement of autonomy to Hong Kong carries with it the need to have free assembly and an opportunity to peacefully demonstrate. So I hope they reverse their actions if in fact this is their proposal.

□ 1445

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about the North Korean situation. Remember I mentioned this particular issue several times in China.

I was concerned about China's vague position in North Korea. Remember, I asked the question. Even this morning I understand that shots have been fired, shots have been exchanged, and remember when we went to the DMZ in Korea, we were scheduled to stop on the bridge, we were scheduled to get out of the bus and walk halfway.

Mr. BEREUTER. The Bridge of No Return.

Mr. KIM. The Bridge of No Return, and we had to abruptly change our schedule because they had assembled AK-47's, all of the weapons assembled together, so we had to change at the last minute and we did not get out of the bus, we just simply made a U-turn and came back. That is disgusting, that is totally unwarranted, and I feel very offended by this hostile action.

Yet, in China, of course North Korea is totally unknown to us, and all of

this hostile action. Let me give my colleague an example, that every country denounced and condemned the hostile action, except China. China has kept silent; they did not say anything. So we asked the question, why is it? Why is it that China has not said anything about this hostile action, and what is China's official position? What is the policy toward North Korea?

The answer I got was, look, I think they are trying to walk a fine line. If everybody pushed North Korea against the wall, then we are afraid they might do some irrational action. Therefore, we have to show some friendship, something like that. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleague, is that not the answer we got, some kind of vague answer?

Mr. BEREUTER. I think so, absolutely.

Mr. KIM. We are still not sure of China's policies in terms of North Korea. I think our country should demand what their policy is. Are they with us or against us? I am very disappointed at such a timid answer.

Then when we went to Taiwan, remember I asked the question about nuclear waste dumping that is generated by the Taiwanese power company. We are talking about 270 drums of nuclear waste, dumping it into North Korea because they are going to buy it, pay \$100 million or \$120 million, I do not remember, buy this nuclear waste.

I remember the gentleman's summation that we are setting up a dangerous precedent, that I think countries should keep their own waste in their own country, whether they are shipping overseas, which I totally agree.

My concern is, my God, pretty soon we are going to stop buying and selling this nuclear waste all over the country and bidding on it, I mean this is really ridiculous. We have to stop this from happening.

Also, my concern is, it is not the Taiwanese, it is North Korea. North Korea has no ability to manage its nuclear waste. Besides, they refuse to invite any IAA member team to inspect the nuclear waste dumping procedure, so God knows what they are going to do with it. I do not know what they are going to do with it. Perhaps they might contaminate our groundwater system. Then what is going to happen? It is only 24 miles from Seoul.

We have 37,000 young troops out there in Korea, plus their families, plus civilians, all 120,000. They are only 24 miles away from the DMZ. I am just afraid for not only the Koreans' lives in danger, but our own troops, our own families' lives could be in danger. So we have to stop this.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I would ask of my colleague to reclaim my time and to compliment the gentleman for all of his contributions throughout this trip. Frequently the Speaker pointed out the gentleman as an example to our Asian friends of an immigrant who succeeded remarkably in this country as so many have from various parts of the world.

I wonder if the gentleman would indulge me in yielding the remaining 5 minutes to our colleague who has not had a chance to speak. If the gentleman will stand by, we may have a chance for a concluding colloquy.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington [Ms. DUNN], a member of the Committee on Ways and Means who made invaluable contributions on this trip.

Ms. DUNN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I must say it has been with great interest that I have listened to my colleagues' discussion about our very important trip to Asia and how proud I am to have traveled with them on this trip and to have watched in action some very powerful Members of the U.S. Congress who care a lot about our relationships with those nations over there, but who are not willing to make a trip such as this, with the rights of our constituents in our hearts, without being very, very candid in all of our conversations about some of the problems that we must deal with over in that part of the world.

My responsibility as a member of the Subcommittee on Trade of the Committee on Ways and Means dealt with trade issues in the Asian nations, and I would say that thanks to the Speaker and to other members of the delegation, I was able to inquire about specific policies that deal with our relationship with Asia. Certainly I come from a State, the State of Washington, that is very, very export-oriented.

One out of four jobs in my State are related to trade. As constituents in my State and as you know, Mr. Speaker, Boeing, the aircraft company that is the largest exporter in this Nation that does great business now with the nation of China, and we will see that nation as probably 20 percent of its future market.

There were questions about market access that we brought up over and over again. For example, in Japan, what about access, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] was interested in, in American autos? How about apples that come from our orchard, Mr. Speaker, in your part of our great State of Washington, that we are not allowed to export to Japan, the apples they want to eat, not just the Red and Golden Delicious, but the Fuji and the Gala apples, and why not provide to them the items that will be useful to the people that live in their country and also will help our export industry.

So we did not get good answers on some of those issues, Mr. Speaker, but we continued to try. In China we have serious problems having to do with intellectual property piracy, a rate that someone said is as high as 98 percent, market access to wheat for one thing in the State of Washington. We have terrible human rights violations. We have very serious problems there, but we were given a very warm welcome by the people in Beijing and Shanghai, because they want to do business with us and they want to work with us.

I believe that there is an openness there to a great degree that will allow us to expand on our trade relationships, that will allow the debate to begin on whether they should be able to accede to the WTO if they follow the road map that has already been laid out by our very effective ambassador-to-be of the USTR.

Taiwan, we had candid conversations in that nation as we did in all of the nations. It was a very effective trip. We were treated with great welcome, and I think that we were able to contribute a great deal to the work of the U.S. foreign policy, certainly reflected that, and I am very grateful, Mr. Speaker, to have been a colleague of yours on this important trip.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her excellent contributions on the trip and her comments, and I thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] for allowing us this time.

#### TIME TO PUT PAY EQUITY FOR WOMEN BACK ON THE AMERICAN AGENDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] is recognized for 50 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, all over the country today, women are preparing for tomorrow, for they have been alerted by women's organizations and others that tomorrow is a day for commemoration, it can hardly be for celebration, because it is pay inequity day, the day on which women earn what a man earned during the previous year.

I want to devote my time this afternoon to discussing some issues which I think will astonish many. I want to acknowledge that the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACTION-LEE] wished to participate in this Special Order and was unable to do so.

Interestingly, pay equity was one of the great issues of the 1960's and 1970's. What has happened to the issue? Why do we not hear it discussed as much? Have we in fact finally remedied pay inequality between men and women?

One of the things that happened, Mr. Speaker, I think, is that women represent such a broad and diversified group that women have in fact balkanized and diversified their agenda so that in a very real sense it is very difficult to indicate what matters most to women.

This afternoon I want to bring us back to basics, because what we are certain of is that a most dramatic structural change has occurred in the United States and in the American family. The housewife has virtually disappeared from the American landscape, and I am going to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that is not because there are not millions of women who would prefer to stay at home with their children, and I think frankly would be better off staying at home with their chil-

dren, as would their children be better off, but during the past couple of decades, the fact is that the American standard of living has been going down, wages have stagnated and in fact decreased, so women are out there because they have to be out there, and this quite apart from the millions of women who want to be out there in order to reach their full potential in the workplace.

It is time that we put pay equity back on the American agenda if we mean what we say about the American family. The very reason that these women have gone to work in the first place is the American family and the pressures to keep the American standard of living where it was. Even so the average tow-parent family is not where that family was in the 1950's and 1960's, even with two people working. We have not been able to keep family income at the level we experienced in the post-World War II period.

I have a special interest in this issue because I am a former chair of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, where I raised the issue of pay equity for the first time during the Carter administration. But, Mr. Speaker, this is not an issue for government officials and expert lawyers; it has now become a grassroots issue as American women struggle out to work every day and, working year-round, have only been able to bring themselves to the point where they are worth 72 cents for every dollar earned by a man.

In case we think that this concern of working women is confined to a small group, let me offer these figures: 40 percent of all working women have children under 18. In two-parent families, 66 percent of women work. The number of female-headed households has doubled since 1970. We are dealing with a structural change in American society. We cannot run from it, but we certainly have hidden from it.

Today I introduced a bill that begins to deal with that part of the problem that may come from discrimination.

□ 1500

I have done so because of my concern about the gap, which is closing, ironically enough. I am very pleased that the gap appears to have gradually closed. We are 72 cents on the man's dollar, but more than a decade before that we were 62 cents on the man's dollar.

But when I looked behind these figures, Mr. Speaker, I found that while there had been some progress, most of it had nothing to do with the average woman. The gap has, indeed, not closed at all for many women because the figures we are using measure women against the decline in men's wages. Therefore, we have been able to catch up to men in large part, in very significant part, because men's wages have declined so dramatically over the last couple of decades.

That is not what we had in mind when we indicated we wanted to close