

So, Mr. Speaker, when we have this kind of rhetoric from the White House, choosing to use our military in a questionable war because the military has "nothing better to do," or that their use without a strategy is better than "not doing anything," is when events like Vietnam occur.

AMERICA'S EXPORT CONTROL POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss our Nation's export control policy. Obviously, economic growth is a key to a prosperous future in this country, but that fact points out how important exports are.

When we look at the world right now, we have a unique situation where, though the United States represents only 4 percent of the world's population, we currently consume 20 percent of the world's goods, services, and products.

In other words, if we are going to have economic growth in the country, we are going to have to open up foreign markets. We are going to have to export, and take advantage of that 96 percent of the world's population that does not reside in the United States.

When we look at it once again, the recent trade deficit figures just released today show another record trade deficit. There are a lot of issues that contribute to that. Today I would like to talk about just a couple that have to do with our export control policy, the policy of the United States in limiting the number of goods and products that can be exported from this country.

These are limited in a couple of ways. One of them is through what are called unilateral economic sanctions. That is basically where we as a country decide we disapprove of some action of another country, and then decide that we are not going to allow U.S. businesses to export to them.

I completely agree that we as a country need to stand up for things like democratic freedoms, religious freedoms, economic freedoms in the rest of the world, and do everything we can to encourage and promote those, but policies of unilateral economic sanctions do not get us there. Basically, all they do is force those countries to buy their goods from some other place.

The reason for this is the changing economy. As we have all heard, it has become a cliche now, we live in a global economy. What that means is if we attempt to impose our will on another country through unilateral economic sanctions, we will fail. It will not work, because that country can simply go to any one of the other members of this global economy and purchase what they want. All we accomplish in that

situation is restricting our own companies' abilities to export.

Multilateral economic sanctions make a certain amount of sense. If we can get enough of our global partners together, as was in the case in South Africa, as is the case in Iraq, to institute export control policies so that it is not just us alone, the United States, then the policies can work and can exercise some influence to make some changes, as they did in South Africa.

What I am opposed to is the proliferation of unilateral economic sanctions that do not succeed in their stated goal and harm our economy. There are several bills in Congress right now that will attempt to change that policy. I am proud to be a cosponsor of the House bill, and I think we need to move in that direction.

I have brought a chart with me to illustrate the point. This chart shows the number of countries in the world that currently have some export controls on them; in other words, the number of countries which U.S. businesses are somehow limited in their ability to export to. We can see that it is a large number of countries, as they are represented in red. They cover a substantial portion of the globe and a substantial number of people; in other words, possible markets that we are losing out on as a country.

If we could change that policy and open up those markets, it could be a boon to U.S. industry, and I must once again point out these policies have not had much effect on changing the policies of the other countries that we want to see changed.

So unilateral economic sanctions have reached the point where they do not work. All they are is bad for U.S. companies. If we want to expand and grow, we are going to need access to these markets. We need to make those changes to get there.

There are a couple of other aspects of our export controls policy right now that are particularly troubling because they focus on technology. In other words, they focus on the highest-growing segment of our economy, and indeed of the world's economy. They are controls on encryption software and on computers.

Basically, the U.S. has a policy right now that basically looks at technology and says, we need to develop the best technology here in this country, and then for national security reasons, we are going to put our arms around it and prevent the rest of the world from getting it, it will be protecting our national security.

There are a number of flaws with this theory, but the biggest one I want to point out is, once again, the global economy. There is access to this technology from other countries other than the U.S. We cannot stop that. By implementing these policies, all we are doing is restricting U.S. companies' ability to participate.

The biggest point I want to make on restrictions of technology, this is not,

and I repeat, not a choice between business and national security. If that was the case, absolutely, we would choose national security, end of story. The point is it does not help because these countries access the information elsewhere.

Take encryption as just one example, a simple software designed to protect programs. We restrict the exportation of top-of-the-line encryption technology, but top-of-the-line encryption technology is available from a number of other countries, and in fact we can download it off the Internet.

Our restrictions do not prevent these other countries from getting it, they only prevent our countries from being the ones that are able to sell it. In the long run this even harms national security by restricting our ability to develop the next best technology. We need to reexamine our policy of export controls for all of these reasons.

SUPPORT THE AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, it is crucial that the United States encourages economically reforming African countries. One of the ways to do that would be to pass the African Growth and Opportunity Act, a bill that will really put Africa on the course of joining the world economy.

Africa is the poorest continent today, largely because of the state-dominated development strategy that predominated for the first three decades of its era of independence. It was called African socialism, and it did not work for Africa. It did not work for Africa any better than it worked in Eastern Europe.

□ 1300

Those economic policies help explain the difference today between a country like Ghana in West Africa and South Korea. In the early 1960s these two countries had similar per capita incomes. Ghana and most of Africa took the route of socialism, and they paid a very heavy price as a result.

Now, fortunately, many African countries, including Ghana, have changed course ever since the Berlin Wall came down. Ever since the West and Third World countries began to look at what had actually happened in Eastern Europe and in the former Soviet Union, they began liberalizing their economies. They began permitting private ownership of assets and becoming more welcoming of foreign investment and implementing the rule of law.

These reforms, which were encouraged by the United States and were undertaken with considerable political difficulty, have produced desirable results in many African countries. Many countries are seeing consistent economic growth of higher than 5 percent.

In some, it is 10 percent, up to 17 percent growth rates per year.

These reforms advance America's many interests in Africa. It is very important when we think about this to realize that, realistically, the U.S. could not isolate itself from a 21st Century where Africa is suffering with increased war and social upheaval and environmental degradation or international terrorism and drug trafficking.

Growing economic means for Africa is an antidote for this scenario, translating into improved educational and health services, better environmental protections and greater social stability.

President Museveni said that to meet all of the health and education needs of Uganda, they would have to build the tax base through economic reforms and introduce free enterprise. That is exactly what they have done, with very positive results.

So recovering African economies already offer the U.S. significant commercial opportunities. While African countries are still in the early stages of economic reform, America's growing exports, exports to Africa already total \$6 billion per year. That supports 100,000 American jobs. American investment on the continent is increasing. American corporations, looking beyond the headlines of civil strife, are clearly recognizing opportunities in Africa.

The African Growth and Opportunity Act would strengthen these positive trends by putting Africa more firmly on the trade and investment map. This legislation would encourage qualifying African countries in annual, high-level trade forums, modeled after forums the U.S. holds with other regions of the world, to continue along this route of reducing tariffs and reforming the economy. These forums would have symbolic value, demonstrating that the world's most powerful economy takes Africa's economic development seriously.

American exporters and investors stand to benefit by the African Growth and Opportunity Act. Qualifying African countries would be reducing barriers to American goods and investment, including reducing tariffs and regulatory burdens and protecting private property. In other words, this legislation treats trade and investment as a two-way street.

The African Growth and Opportunity Act has received strong support from American businesses, particularly those already engaged in Africa and aware of the opportunities. There should be a sense of urgency about the African Growth and Opportunity Act. There should be a sense of urgency about Africa itself.

While several African countries are making encouraging economic progress, others are not. Africa's share of world trade and developing world foreign direct investment is small. Unless these trends are reversed, Africa

runs a real risk of becoming economically irrelevant. I urge passage of the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

AGOA promises to make Africa more relevant to the world economy. That is why it enjoys the support of virtually every African country.

The African Growth and Opportunity Act is not a panacea for Africa's many challenges. But it would help.

While modest from an American perspective, AGOA promises tangible benefits and a psychological boost to those African countries wishing to become economic partners with the U.S.

This is the least we can do for countries fighting their best against the continent's economic marginalization, and worse.

Having encouraged difficult market-opening reforms, denying greater market access for a modest amount of African goods disrespects our many interests in Africa.

It is also indefensible policy toward the world's poorest continent just as it is developing some momentum.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this Act when it reaches the House floor.

CHINESE ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday, I came to the floor to speak about the escalating rush of illegal immigrants coming from the People's Republic of China directly into Guam. Just within the past week, another 257 more illegal immigrants coming from the People's Republic were apprehended at sea and brought to shore.

Last Thursday, on April 15, 152 Chinese nationals suspected of trying to enter Guam were interdicted by the U.S. Coast Guard. Fortunately, as a result of the efforts of my office, the governor's office, and I think a sensible policy pursued by the White House, and the cooperation of the government of the Northern Marianas, this vessel, instead of being taken to Guam, was taken to the Northern Marianas, where it was assumed because of the differing laws which are applicable to the Commonwealth, these nationals of the People's Republic of China will be more easily repatriated back to China.

Immediately after that vessel was detained, another vessel carrying 105 nationals from the People's Republic of China docked at Apra Harbor on Guam. This was yet the largest single apprehension on Guam, with 34 women and at least 6 juveniles.

According to the INS, the number of apprehended illegal immigrants from the People's Republic caught on Guam since January this year is now up to 585. As I have informed the House before and people of this country, these immigrants are coming directly from Fukien Province, are paying crime syndicates anywhere from \$10,000 to \$30,000 to ship them to the United States.

Guam being the closest American territory, these criminal organizations then funnel them right into our island, and we are now experiencing boat landings nearly every 2 to 4 days.

Upon arrival, these people who are being sent to Guam by criminal organizations are eventually apprehended by primarily local officials, turned over to Federal officials, and they are expected to apply for some form of asylum.

Mr. Speaker, what we see here is a clear exploitation of INA, the Immigration and Naturalization Act, as it is applicable to Guam, by Chinese crime syndicates. Chinese nationals who succeed in finding employment inside the United States, who have come to this dream, are actually turned into indentured servants with no legal papers and immense debts to pay. They continue to pay off these Chinese crime syndicates, even after they are in the United States, for well over a decade. This is a criminal activity which must end.

Now we have this humanitarian crisis on the high seas. It takes approximately anywhere from 10 to 15 days on these decrepit vessels, which are expected to simply take a one-way trip from Fukien Province in China.

This has created a number of crises on Guam. It has created a resource crisis. The INS does not have any funds to attend to these, so it has been left up to the government of Guam to feed them, house them, and clothe them. Now over 400 Chinese nationals are currently being housed in a Guam facility with a capacity of 150 at a cost of approximately \$97 per immigrant per day.

The government of Guam estimates that the total expense for apprehending, staffing, housing, and detaining these illegal immigrants from the People's Republic has cost the people of Guam nearly \$2.5 million. This is a Federal responsibility. No State in the Union would put up with this.

There is also a potential environmental crisis as these boats deliberately run aground on our reefs. There is also a potential health crisis. In one shipment of these illegal immigrants, well over half of the illegal immigrants were tested positive for TB.

Over the past few days, I have had several meetings, including officials at the Department of Justice, officials in the National Security Council and the White House, and I am happy to report that they have taken some action on this. But the Federal Government needs to take clearly more responsibility over this.

It is very interesting to note that, as widely reported in the news about 2½ weeks ago, Guam was considered a possible destination point for Kosovar refugees. It was estimated that Guam may have to house as many as 5,000 to 10,000 Kosovar refugees.

Everyone willingly acknowledged that the Federal Government would be responsible for such an eventuality on Guam. Yet, in this particular instance where we are talking about 400 illegal