

have seen more information from Vietnam's archives.

There are still more than 2,000 who are listed as unaccounted for, many because we have yet to locate or identify their remains. Because of the difficulties in doing that, the process of resolving these cases will take many more years. We cannot know for certain how much more information the Vietnamese have and to what extent they are truly being forthcoming. However, if we are to make any more progress in resolving these cases, we must have the continued close cooperation of the Vietnamese Government.

Lifting the trade embargo will not impede our progress in this area. In fact, lifting the trade embargo is an important step in ensuring that we have continued access to Vietnam and continued cooperation. Lifting the trade embargo will bring many more Americans into Vietnam, opening up that country even more and significantly contributing to our efforts there. After nearly two decades of no answers, we cannot risk losing our access to Vietnam again. If we lift the trade embargo, we are opening the doors to that country once and for all, in the hope that we are ensuring access for years to come.

As the amendments state, United States senior military commanders and United States personnel working in the field to account for U.S. POW/MIA's in Vietnam believe that lifting the United States trade embargo against Vietnam will facilitate and accelerate the accounting efforts. We must defer to their expertise on this matter.

Ultimately, the decision to lift the embargo is the President's decision. I know that he will consult not only with senior military commanders in the field, intimately involved in accounting for U.S. servicemen from the war, but he will also consult with the veterans and family members of POW/MIA's who feel so deeply about this issue.

Lifting the trade embargo is not a full normalization of relations with Vietnam, and we should move cautiously in this area, as we have on the issue of the trade embargo. We must also recognize that we can use our leverage with the Vietnamese to press them to improve their record on human rights.

Mr. President, this is an opportunity for us to do something positive to end this painful chapter in our history once and for all.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1263

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all time on this debate has expired. The question is on agreeing to the Kerry amendment No. 1263.

The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 62, nays 38, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 5 Leg.]

YEAS—62

- |           |            |             |
|-----------|------------|-------------|
| Akaka     | Glenn      | Mikulski    |
| Baucus    | Gorton     | Mitchell    |
| Bennett   | Graham     | Moylhan     |
| Biden     | Harkin     | Murkowski   |
| Bingaman  | Hatfield   | Murray      |
| Bond      | Hollings   | Nickles     |
| Boren     | Inouye     | Nunn        |
| Boxer     | Jeffords   | Packwood    |
| Bradley   | Johnston   | Pell        |
| Breaux    | Kassebaum  | Pressler    |
| Bryan     | Kennedy    | Pryor       |
| Bumpers   | Kerry      | Reid        |
| Chafee    | Kohl       | Robb        |
| Cochran   | Leahy      | Rockefeller |
| Cohen     | Levin      | Sarbanes    |
| Danforth  | Lieberman  | Simon       |
| Daschle   | Mathews    | Simpson     |
| Dodd      | McCain     | Stevens     |
| Eron      | McConnell  | Wallop      |
| Feinstein | Metzenbaum | Warner      |
| Ford      |            |             |

NAYS—38

- |           |             |               |
|-----------|-------------|---------------|
| Brown     | Durenberger | Lugar         |
| Burns     | Faircloth   | Mack          |
| Byrd      | Feingold    | Moseley-Braun |
| Campbell  | Gramm       | Riegle        |
| Coats     | Grassley    | Roth          |
| Conrad    | Gregg       | Sasser        |
| Coverdell | Hatch       | Shelby        |
| Craig     | Heflin      | Smith         |
| D'Amato   | Helms       | Specter       |
| DeConcini | Hutchison   | Thurmond      |
| Dole      | Kempthorne  | Wellstone     |
| Domenici  | Lautenberg  | Wofford       |
| Dorgan    | Lott        |               |

So the amendment (No. 1263) was agreed to.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROBB. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1266

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now vote on the Smith amendment No. 1266. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 58, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 6 Leg.]

YEAS—42

- |           |             |               |
|-----------|-------------|---------------|
| Brown     | Durenberger | Mack          |
| Bryan     | Faircloth   | Moseley-Braun |
| Burns     | Gramm       | Nickles       |
| Byrd      | Grassley    | Reid          |
| Campbell  | Gregg       | Riegle        |
| Coats     | Hatch       | Roth          |
| Cohen     | Heflin      | Sasser        |
| Conrad    | Helms       | Shelby        |
| Coverdell | Hutchison   | Smith         |
| Craig     | Jeffords    | Specter       |
| D'Amato   | Kempthorne  | Stevens       |
| Dole      | Lautenberg  | Thurmond      |
| Domenici  | Lott        | Wallop        |
| Dorgan    | Lugar       | Wellstone     |

NAYS—58

- |          |           |           |
|----------|-----------|-----------|
| Akaka    | Bradley   | Dodd      |
| Baucus   | Breaux    | Eron      |
| Bennett  | Bumpers   | Feingold  |
| Biden    | Chafee    | Feinstein |
| Bingaman | Cochran   | Ford      |
| Bond     | Danforth  | Glenn     |
| Boren    | Daschle   | Gorton    |
| Boxer    | DeConcini | Graham    |

- |           |            |             |
|-----------|------------|-------------|
| Harkin    | Lieberman  | Pell        |
| Hatfield  | Mathews    | Pressler    |
| Hollings  | McCain     | Pryor       |
| Inouye    | McConnell  | Robb        |
| Johnston  | Metzenbaum | Rockefeller |
| Kassebaum | Mikulski   | Sarbanes    |
| Kennedy   | Mitchell   | Simon       |
| Kerry     | Moylhan    | Simpson     |
| Kerry     | Murkowski  | Warner      |
| Kohl      | Murray     | Wofford     |
| Leahy     | Nunn       |             |
| Levin     | Packwood   |             |

So the amendment (No. 1266) was rejected.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. FORD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 1262, as amended.

The amendment (No. 1262), as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. PELL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. KERRY. Madam President, let me just say if I can very quickly, the majority leader has announced that we will work late tonight on the bill, and if we cannot finish the bill tonight we are absolutely going to be here tomorrow working with rollcall votes until 3 p.m.

So I urge colleagues to bring their amendments to the floor, and we will try to process them as rapidly as possible.

Mr. BUMPERS addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

AMENDMENT NO. 1267

(Purpose: To reduce the amount of appropriations authorized for the National Endowment for Democracy)

Mr. BUMPERS. Madam President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS], for himself; Mr. DORGAN, and Mr. BROWN, proposes an amendment numbered 1267.

Mr. BUMPERS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At page 103, strike lines 1 and 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"racy" \$35,000,000 for the fiscal year 1994 and \$35,000,000 for the fiscal year 1995."

Mr. BUMPERS. A moment ago, the Senator from Florida [Mr. GRAHAM], came up to me and said, "What is your amendment?" And I said, "It is to cut the authorization of the National Endowment for Democracy back to this year's appropriation level." He said, "Oh, BUMPERS, are you on that again? You remind me of that story about the inmates in the prison calling out a

# United States Senate

WASHINGTON, DC 20510

February 4, 1994

The President  
The White House  
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. President:

We are writing to urge that the Administration be more vigilant in its obligation to the free world to press for human rights improvements as it proceeds toward open trade and political normalization with the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

We cannot ignore that, in the words of the State Department report on human rights for 1993, Vietnam continues "to limit severely freedom of speech, press, assembly, and association". Numerous human rights observers report that nonviolent political and religious dissidents in Vietnam are routinely arrested, tried with minimal due process, and imprisoned for draconian terms. Once incarcerated, prisoners are often mistreated and international humanitarian organizations are barred from Vietnam's jails and labor camps.

In seeking human rights improvements globally, the United States cannot exempt Vietnam from scrutiny and criticism for not meeting internationally recognized human rights norms.

We are pleased by the announcement that the U.S. and Vietnam are about to begin a formal dialogue on human rights, and urge the Administration to place a high priority on seeking the release of all nonviolent political and religious dissidents, as well as reforms in Vietnam's legal procedures and practices to bring them into conformity with international standards. We believe it would be useful and appropriate for the State Department to issue a report to the Congress, by February 1, 1995, on the progress of the dialogue and ask you to formally order such a report.

We also believe the Administration should actively support a resolution at the United Nations Human Rights Commission, convening in Geneva this week, expressing concern about human rights violations in Vietnam and authorizing the UN Working Group on Arbitrary Detentions to visit Vietnam.

Finally, we encourage the Administration to consult actively with other governments, including Japan, Australia, Canada and the European Community, in order to coordinate appeals for

The President  
February 4, 1994  
Page 2

improvements in human rights in Vietnam, including efforts to urge the Vietnamese government to invite international humanitarian organizations such as the International Committee of the Red Cross to provide their services to Vietnamese prisoners.

We urge you to take these specific steps towards that goal, and we pledge our best efforts to assist you in this regard.

Sincerely,

Max Baucus  
Dennis DeConcini  
Tom Harkin  
Paul Wellstone  
Ben Nighthorse Campbell  
Edward Kennedy  
Mark Hatfield

Signed by Senators: Bob Kerrey, Dennis DeConcini, Russel Feingold, Bill Bradley, Max Baucus, Paul Wellstone, Ben Nighthorse Campbell, Edward Kennedy, Mark Hatfield, Tom Harkin

DDC/TC

STATEMENT OF  
SENATOR CHARLES S. ROBB  
CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE ON EAST ASIAN AND PACIFIC AFFAIRS  
HEARING ON THE POST-EMBARGO STATUS OF VIETNAM

WASHINGTON, D.C.  
FEBRUARY 9, 1994

We welcome representatives from the State, Defense, and Treasury Departments before the East Asia Subcommittee today to discuss future U.S.-Vietnam relations in light of President Clinton's decision to lift the trade embargo last Thursday.

For the past few years there has been little ambiguity over what stood in the way of improved relations between Vietnam and the United States. We have demanded accountability in the area of our POW/MIAs. The other condition precedent to lifting the embargo was the withdrawal of all Vietnamese combat forces from Cambodia and that was completed quite some time ago. But without full cooperation on the POW/MIA issue, there would be no economic or diplomatic fruits for Vietnam, and little dialogue between Washington and Hanoi.

The President's decision last Thursday to lift the trade embargo sets us on a new course. It acknowledges the significant cooperation the Vietnamese government has given recently in retrieving remains, resolving discrepancy cases, working with the Lao, and handing over historical documents. In exchange for their cooperation, President Clinton fulfilled our end of the agreement in the "roadmap" by bringing Vietnam out of a deep freeze and lifting the embargo -- but not taking any other steps toward a full normalization of relations.

In an unsuspecting way, the "roadmap" lent a sense of comfort and predictability to those of us involved in this issue. The Vietnamese had to do X before Y happened. Phase Three could not begin until phase two was complete. Even among those who strongly disagreed about whether the Vietnamese were meeting their obligations, from Bob Smith to John Kerry and John McCain to Chuck Grassley, we could at least agree on the "roadmap" as a point of reference.

Today, that is no longer the case. With the embargo lifted, the future becomes exceedingly more difficult to define. The President conditions normalization on further results in the POW/MIA area, but he has not been specific. The exact criteria for normalizing are simply unclear at this point.

I, for one, will not support full normalization unless there is continued cooperation on the POW/MIA issue and a marked improvement in Vietnam's human rights record. Many other Senators share that view. Some advocate normalizing right

away, and others oppose even the actions taken last week.

In any event, Vietnam's abysmal human rights record now comes to the forefront. I know Secretary Lord has spent considerable time working in this area, and today we would like to explore with him the State Department's strategy for achieving tangible progress.

Additionally, American commercial interests in Vietnam are becoming more prominent. While our priority remains the fullest possible accounting of our POW/MIAs, businesses big and small alike have urged the U.S. to permit U.S. firms to compete commercially with other nations on a more level playing field. Hundreds of millions, if not billions, of dollars are being lost to the Taiwanese, Japanese, and others.

Now, many U.S. companies are preparing to enter the Vietnamese market. A major U.S. oil company has been awarded a stake in the Blue Dragon oil field in the South China Sea. Pepsi is handing out free samples on the streets of Hanoi, Coke is not too far behind, and American Express is gearing up to shower 70 million Vietnamese citizens with plastic. In a few years Vietnamese consumers won't be talking just about the country's foreign debt.

So the task of sustaining our POW/MIA operations, promoting U.S. business interests, and pressuring the Vietnamese communists to ease restrictions on their people becomes increasingly complicated. I look forward to hearing from our distinguished panel how we intend to traverse this new terrain.

spite its regular safeguard and inspection activities. But lessons were learned from the Iraq experience, and the IAEA has developed a more activist approach to its safeguards responsibilities. It was the IAEA that uncovered evidence that North Korea had produced more plutonium than it had officially declared, giving it a potential nuclear weapons capability. The Agency deserves a great deal of credit for doggedly pursuing full access to all of North Korea's nuclear facilities, as the NPT requires. The Nuclear Proliferation Prevention Act establishes a broad agenda for strengthening the IAEA further. The Clinton administration should aggressively pursue these proposals.

Finally, the bill requires the administration to submit an annual report summarizing nuclear dual-use exports that have been approved. This will help improve oversight of U.S. nuclear export controls and will give an early warning if large numbers of nuclear exports are going to countries that are suspected of building nuclear weapons.

This legislation is an important milestone in U.S. efforts to prevent nuclear proliferation, strengthening policy in three key areas: Sanctions, export controls, and IAEA safeguards. As a next step, Congress and the President should build on each of these policy areas. We should expand the sanctions to include import sanctions. We should strengthen the nuclear export control licensing process to give the Department of Defense and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency a larger role in approving licenses. Finally, the IAEA should receive enough funding so that it can undertake the reforms H.R. 2333 recommends.

The Nuclear Proliferation Prevention Act of 1994 will help stop the global spread of nuclear weapons. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] who is the distinguished chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and the gentlemen from California, Mr. BERMAN and Mr. LANTOS, who are both distinguished chairmen of Foreign Affairs Subcommittees, deserve great credit for their support and leadership on this important legislation, as do the gentleman from the other body, Senators GLENN, PELL, and HELMS. When President Clinton signs H.R. 2333, he will have further fulfilled his campaign promise to strengthen and improve U.S. nuclear non-proliferation policy.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

MOTION TO RECOMMEND OFFERED BY MS. SNOWE

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. SNOWE moves to recommit the conference report on the bill H.R. 2333 to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to disagree to section 521 (relating to relations with Vietnam) in the conference substitute recommended by the committee of conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule XV, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of the adoption of the conference report.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 195, nays 209, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 147]

YEAS—195

- |              |               |               |
|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| Allard       | Gilman        | Packard       |
| Applegate    | Gingrich      | Pallone       |
| Archer       | Glickman      | Paxon         |
| Armye        | Goodling      | Peterson (MN) |
| Bachus (AL)  | Goss          | Petri         |
| Baker (CA)   | Grams         | Pombo         |
| Baker (LA)   | Gunderson     | Pomeroy       |
| Balleger     | Gutierrez     | Porter        |
| Barca        | Hall (TX)     | Portman       |
| Barcia       | Hancock       | Poshard       |
| Barrett (NE) | Hansen        | Fryce (OH)    |
| Barlett      | Eastart       | Quillen       |
| Barton       | Hayes         | Rahall        |
| Bateman      | Hefley        | Ramstad       |
| Bentley      | Heger         | Ravenel       |
| Berenter     | Hobson        | Regula        |
| Bilbray      | Hochbrueckner | Roberts       |
| Billakis     | Hoekstra      | Rogers        |
| Billey       | Hoke          | Rohrabacher   |
| Blute        | Holden        | Roe-Lehtinen  |
| Boehert      | Horn          | Roth          |
| Boehner      | Hunter        | Roukema       |
| Bonilla      | Hutchinson    | Royce         |
| Browder      | Hyde          | Santorum      |
| Brown (OH)   | Inglis        | Saxton        |
| Bunning      | Johnson, Sam  | Schaefer      |
| Burton       | Kasich        | Schiff        |
| Buyer        | Kildee        | Sensenbrenner |
| Callahan     | Kim           | Shaw          |
| Camp         | King          | Shepherd      |
| Canady       | Kingston      | Shuster       |
| Castle       | Klug          | Skeen         |
| Chapman      | Knollenberg   | Skelton       |
| Clinger      | Lancaster     | Smith (MI)    |
| Coble        | Lazio         | Smith (NJ)    |
| Collins (GA) | Leach         | Smith (OR)    |
| Combest      | Lehman        | Smith (TX)    |
| Cooper       | Levy          | Snowe         |
| Costello     | Lewis (CA)    | Solomon       |
| Cox          | Lewis (FL)    | Spence        |
| Crabe        | Lightfoot     | Stearns       |
| Crapo        | Linder        | Stamp         |
| Cunningham   | Lipinski      | Stupak        |
| Deal         | Livingston    | Sundquist     |
| DeLay        | Machtley      | Talent        |
| Diaz-Balart  | Manzullo      | Tauzin        |
| Dickey       | McCandless    | Taylor (MS)   |
| Doolittle    | McCollum      | Taylor (NC)   |
| Dorman       | McCrery       | Tejeda        |
| Duncan       | McDade        | Thomas (CA)   |
| Dunn         | McHugh        | Thomas (WV)   |
| Ehlers       | McInnis       | Thurman       |
| Emerson      | McKeon        | Torkildsen    |
| Everett      | McMillan      | Trafficant    |
| Ewing        | McNulty       | Upton         |
| Fawell       | Meyers        | Walker        |
| Fields (TX)  | Mica          | Walsh         |
| Fish         | Michel        | Weldon        |
| Fowler       | Miller (FL)   | Williams      |
| Franks (CT)  | Molinari      | Wilson        |
| Franks (NJ)  | Moorhead      | Wolf          |
| Gallely      | Morella       | Young (AK)    |
| Gallo        | Myers         | Young (FL)    |
| Gekas        | Nussle        | Zelluff       |
| Gillmor      | Oxley         | Zimmer        |

NAYS—209

- |             |              |              |
|-------------|--------------|--------------|
| Abercrombie | Andrews (ME) | Andrews (TX) |
| Ackerman    | Andrews (NJ) | Bacchus (FL) |

- |              |                |               |
|--------------|----------------|---------------|
| Baesler      | Hastings       | Orton         |
| Barrett (WI) | Heiner         | Owens         |
| Becerra      | Hilliard       | Parker        |
| Bellenson    | Hinchey        | Pastor        |
| Berman       | Hoagland       | Payne (NJ)    |
| Bevill       | Houghton       | Payne (VA)    |
| Bishop       | Hoyer          | Pelosi        |
| Blackwell    | Hughes         | Penny         |
| Bonior       | Hutto          | Peterson (FL) |
| Boraki       | Inalae         | Pickle        |
| Boucher      | Jacobs         | Price (NC)    |
| Brewster     | Jefferson      | Rangel        |
| Brooks       | Johnson (CT)   | Reed          |
| Brown (CA)   | Johnson (GA)   | Reynolds      |
| Brown (FL)   | Johnson (SD)   | Richardson    |
| Byrne        | Johnson, E. R. | Ridge         |
| Cañtwell     | Johnston       | Roemer        |
| Cardin       | Kanjorski      | Rosa          |
| Carr         | Kaptur         | Rostenkowski  |
| Clayton      | Kennedy        | Rowland       |
| Clement      | Kennelly       | Roybal-Allard |
| Clyburn      | Kleczka        | Sabo          |
| Coleman      | Klein          | Sanders       |
| Collins (IL) | Klink          | Sangmeister   |
| Collins (MI) | Kolbe          | Sarpaluis     |
| Conyers      | Kopetski       | Sawyer        |
| Coppermith   | Kreidler       | Schenk        |
| Coyne        | LaFalce        | Schroeder     |
| Cramer       | Lambert        | Schumer       |
| Danner       | Lantos         | Scott         |
| Darden       | Lantos         | Serrano       |
| de la Garza  | Levin          | Sharp         |
| Dellums      | Lewis (GA)     | Shays         |
| Deutch       | Long           | Siskiy        |
| Dicks        | Lowey          | Skaggs        |
| Dingell      | Maloney        | Slaughter     |
| Dixon        | Mann           | Smith (IA)    |
| Dooley       | Manton         | Spratt        |
| Dreier       | Margolies-     | Stark         |
| Durbin       | Mezvinzsky     | Stenholm      |
| Edwards (CA) | Marky          | Stokes        |
| Edwards (TX) | Martinez       | Strickland    |
| Engel        | Matsui         | Studds        |
| Eshoo        | Mazoli         | Sweet         |
| Evans        | McCloskey      | Swift         |
| Farr         | McCurdy        | Synar         |
| Fazio        | McDermott      | Tanner        |
| Fields (LA)  | McHale         | Thompson      |
| Filner       | McKinney       | Thornton      |
| Fingerhut    | Meehan         | Torres        |
| Flake        | Meek           | Torricelli    |
| Foglietta    | Menendez       | Towns         |
| Foley        | Mifflin        | Tucker        |
| Ford (MI)    | Miller (CA)    | Unsoeld       |
| Ford (TN)    | Mineta         | Valentine     |
| Frank (MA)   | Minge          | Velazquez     |
| Furse        | Mink           | Vento         |
| Gejdenson    | Moakley        | Viselocky     |
| Gephardt     | Mollohan       | Washington    |
| Geren        | Montgomery     | Waters        |
| Gibbons      | Moran          | Watt          |
| Gilchrest    | Nadler         | Waxman        |
| Gonzalez     | Neal (MA)      | Whitten       |
| Gordon       | Neal (NC)      | Wise          |
| Hall (OH)    | Oberstar       | Woolsey       |
| Hamburg      | Obey           | Wyden         |
| Hamilton     | Olver          | Wynn          |
| Harman       | Ortiz          | Yates         |

NOT VOTING—29

- |         |            |            |
|---------|------------|------------|
| Barlow  | Goodlatte  | Murphy     |
| Bryant  | Grandy     | Murtha     |
| Calvert | Green      | Pickett    |
| Clay    | Greenwood  | Quinn      |
| Condit  | Huffington | Rush       |
| DeFazio | Inhofe     | Slattery   |
| DeLauro | Istook     | Volkmer    |
| Derrick | Kyl        | Vucanovich |
| English | Laughlin   | Wheat      |
| Frost   | Lloyd      |            |

□ 1707

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Quinn for, with Mr. DeFazio against.

Mr. HUTTO, and Mr. NADLER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. POSHARD, EMERSON, and LANCASTER changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

# H. R. 4343

To encourage liberty inside the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

---

## IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 4, 1994

Mr. DORNAN (for himself, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. PORTER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. WYNN, Mr. LEVY, Mr. KING, Mr. WILSON, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. COX, and Mrs. BENTLEY) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs

---

## A BILL

To encourage liberty inside the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3       **SECTION 1. STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES.**

4       (a) **PURPOSE.**—It is the purpose of this Act to create  
5       principles governing the conduct of commercial coopera-  
6       tion projects of United States nationals in the Socialist  
7       Republic of Vietnam.

8       (b) **PRINCIPLES.**—It is the sense of the Congress that  
9       any United States national conducting a commercial co-

1 operation project in the Socialist Republic of Vietnam  
2 should adhere to the following principles:

3 (1) Seek to ensure that political or religious  
4 views, sex, ethnic or national background, involve-  
5 ment in political activities or nonviolent demonstra-  
6 tions, or association with suspected or known dis-  
7 sidents will not prohibit hiring, lead to harassment,  
8 demotion, or dismissal, or in any way affect the sta-  
9 tus or terms of employment in the commercial co-  
10 operation project. The United States national should  
11 not discriminate in terms or conditions of employ-  
12 ment in the commercial cooperation project against  
13 former members of the armed forces of the Republic  
14 of Vietnam (South Vietnam), former government of-  
15 ficials of the Republic of Vietnam, former employees  
16 of the United States Government in the Republic of  
17 Vietnam, former employees of United States Govern-  
18 ment officials in the Republic of Vietnam, former  
19 employees of United States enterprises in the Re-  
20 public of Vietnam, and repatriated asylum-seekers  
21 (so-called "boat people").

22 (2) Ensure that methods of production used in  
23 the commercial cooperation project do not pose an  
24 unnecessary physical danger to workers and neigh-  
25 boring populations and property and that the com-

1        commercial cooperation project does not unnecessarily  
2        risk harm to the surrounding environment.

3            (3) Strive to use business enterprises that are  
4        not controlled by the Socialist Republic of Vietnam  
5        or its authorized agents and departments as poten-  
6        tial partners in the commercial cooperation project.

7            (4) Prohibit any military presence on the prem-  
8        ises of the commercial cooperation project.

9            (5) Undertake to promote freedom of associa-  
10       tion and assembly among the employees of the Unit-  
11       ed States national, including the right of employees  
12       to form collective bargaining units. The United  
13       States national should protest any infringement by  
14       the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam  
15       of these freedoms to the appropriate authorities of  
16       that government and to the International Labor  
17       Organization.

18           (6) Prohibit any compulsory political indoc-  
19       trination programs from taking place on the prem-  
20       ises of the operations of the commercial cooperation  
21       project.

22           (7) Promote freedom of expression, including  
23       the freedom to seek, receive, and impart information  
24       and ideas of all kinds, regardless of frontiers, either  
25       orally, in writing or in print, in the form of art, or

1 through any media. To this end, the United States  
2 national should raise with appropriate authorities of  
3 the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam  
4 concerns about restrictions on importation of foreign  
5 publications.

6 (8) Undertake to promote a full accounting of  
7 all Americans missing in action from the Vietnam  
8 conflict.

9 (c) PROMOTION OF PRINCIPLES BY OTHER NA-  
10 TIONS.—The Secretary of State shall forward a copy of  
11 the principles described in subsection (b) to the member  
12 nations of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and  
13 Development and encourage them to promote principles  
14 similar to these principles.

15 **SEC. 2. REGISTRATION REQUIREMENT.**

16 (a) IN GENERAL.—Each United States national con-  
17 ducting a commercial cooperation project in the Socialist  
18 Republic of Vietnam shall register with the Secretary of  
19 State and indicate whether the United States national  
20 agrees to implement the principles described in section  
21 1(b). No fee shall be required for registration under this  
22 subsection.

23 (b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The registration require-  
24 ment of subsection (a) shall take effect 6 months after  
25 the date of the enactment of this Act.

1 **SEC. 3. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.**

2 (a) **REPORT.**—Each United States national conduct-  
3 ing a commercial cooperation project in the Socialist Re-  
4 public of Vietnam shall report to the Department of State  
5 describing the United States national's adherence to the  
6 principles described in section 1(b). Such national shall  
7 submit a completed reporting form furnished by the De-  
8 partment of State. The first report shall be submitted not  
9 later than 1 year after the date on which the national reg-  
10 isters under section 2 and not later than the end of each  
11 1-year period occurring thereafter.

12 (b) **REVIEW OF REPORT.**—The Secretary of State  
13 shall review each report submitted under subsection (a)  
14 and determine whether the United States national submit-  
15 ting the report is adhering to the principles described in  
16 section 1(b). The Secretary may request additional infor-  
17 mation from the United States national and other sources  
18 to verify the information submitted.

19 (c) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—The Secretary of State shall  
20 submit a report to the Congress and to the Secretariat  
21 of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Devel-  
22 opment, describing the level of adherence to the principles  
23 described in section 1(b) by United States nationals sub-  
24 ject to the reporting requirement of subsection (a). This  
25 report shall be submitted not later than 2 years after the

1 date of the enactment of this Act and not later than the  
2 end of each 1-year period occurring thereafter.

3 **SEC. 4. EXPORT MARKETING SUPPORT.**

4 (a) **SUPPORT.**—Departments and agencies of the  
5 United States may only intercede with a foreign govern-  
6 ment or foreign national regarding export marketing activ-  
7 ity in the Socialist Republic of Vietnam on behalf of a  
8 United States national subject to the reporting require-  
9 ments of section 3(a) if that United States national ad-  
10 heres to the principles.

11 (b) **TYPE OF CONTACT.**—The term “intercede with  
12 a foreign government or foreign national” includes any  
13 contact by an officer or employee of the United States with  
14 officials of any foreign government or foreign national in-  
15 volving or contemplating any effort to assist in selling a  
16 good, service, or technology in the Socialist Republic of  
17 Vietnam. Such term does not include multilateral or bilat-  
18 eral government-to-government trade negotiations in-  
19 tended to resolve trade issues which may affect United  
20 States nationals who do not adhere to the principles.

21 (c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—Subsection (a) shall take  
22 effect 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

23 **SEC. 5. DEFINITIONS.**

24 For purposes of this Act—

1 (1) the terms "adhere to the principles", "ad-  
2 hering to the principles" and "adherence to the prin-  
3 ciples" mean—

4 (A) agreeing to implement the principles  
5 described in section 1(b);

6 (B) implementing those principles by tak-  
7 ing good faith measures with respect to each  
8 such principle; and

9 (C) reporting accurately to the Department  
10 of State on the measures taken to implement  
11 those principles;

12 (2) the term "commercial cooperation project"  
13 refers to a for-profit activity the business operations  
14 of which employ more than 25 individuals or have  
15 assets greater than \$25,000; and

16 (3) the term "United States national" means—

17 (A) a citizen or national of the United  
18 States or a permanent resident of the United  
19 States; and

20 (B) a corporation, partnership, and other  
21 business association organized under the laws  
22 of the United States, any State or territory  
23 thereof, the District of Columbia, the Common-  
24 wealth of Puerto Rico, or the Commonwealth of  
25 the Northern Mariana Islands.

○

Mr. HEFLEY (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFLEY. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Chairman, at this point, since we worked this out in advance, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DEAL) having assumed the chair, Mr. TORRES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2442) to reauthorize appropriations under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended, to revise administrative provisions of the Act to improve the authority of the Secretary of Commerce to administer grant programs, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

**REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 302**

Mr. HUTTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my name as a cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 302.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

**REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 2000, HEAD START ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1994**

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103-502) on the resolution (H. Res. 421) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (S. 2000) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1995 through 1998 to carry out the Head Start Act and the Community Services Block Grant Act, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

**REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 518, THE CALIFORNIA DESERT PROTECTION ACT OF 1994**

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103-503) on the resolution (H. Res. 422) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 518) to designate certain

lands in the California Desert as wilderness, to establish the Death Valley and Joshua Tree National Parks and the Mojave National Monument, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

**REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2473, THE MONTANA WILDERNESS ACT**

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Report. No. 103-504) on the resolution (H. Res. 423) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2473) to designate certain National Forest lands in the State of Montana as wilderness, to release other National Forest lands in the State of Montana for multiple use management, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 1840

**PROCEDURE FOR SUBMISSION OF AMENDMENTS FOR PRINTING ON H.R. 518, THE CALIFORNIA DESERT PROTECTION ACT OF 1994**

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee has granted a rule for H.R. 518, the California Desert protection Act of 1994, that would require amendments to be printed in the amendment section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD prior to the bill's consideration.

That tentative schedule of the House would seem to indicate that the bill will be considered on Tuesday, May 17, 1994. To ensure Members rights to offer amendments under the rule, they should submit those amendments for preprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on or before Monday, May 16, 1994.

Amendments should be titled "Submitted for Printing Under Clause 6 of Rule XXIII" and submitted at the Speaker's table. Amendments do not need to be submitted to the Rules Committee.

**HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW**

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DEAL). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

**PERSONAL EXPLANATION**

Mr. BARLOW. Mr. Speaker, I was absent on Thursday, April 28 and missed roll call votes 146, 147, and 148. But had I been here, I would have voted in support of H.R. 3221, the Iraqi Claims Act; I would have voted against the motion to recommit H.R. 2333, State Depart-

ment authorization; and I would have voted in support of H.R. 4013, to exempt the Veterans' Administration work force from proposed reductions for 5 years.

**FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE**

Further a message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2000) "An Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1995 through 1998 to carry out the Head Start Act and the Community Services Block Grant Act, and for other purposes."

**VIETNAM HUMAN RIGHTS DAY**

Mrs. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 168) designating May 11, 1994, as "Vietnam Human Rights Day," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY], the distinguished Chair of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee and our good minority member, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS] for bringing this important initiative before us today and I rise in strong of House Joint Resolution 333, a resolution to commemorate May 11, 1994, as Vietnam Human Rights Day.

Vietnam remains one of the last communist countries in the world and maintains one of the most repressive political and social systems. Free expression is denied and most Vietnamese writers and poets have been denied the right to publish or compose since 1975. The Vietnamese constitution still designates the Communist party as the "Force Leading the State and Society". Vietnam's criminal law is used to punish nonviolent advocates of political pluralism, through charges such as attempting to overthrow the people's government or antisocialist propaganda. Even nonviolent political movements for democracy consisting of former national liberation front members such as the league of former revolutionaries have been repressed and its leaders remain under house arrest. Most prominent leaders from the Bud-

dhist, Catholic, Cao Dai, Hoa Hao, and protestant faiths are in prison or under house arrest for expressing their religious beliefs.

Mr. Chairman, there is more than enough reason to designate a day to educate the public and draw attention to the issue. Accordingly, I support House Joint Resolution 333 and urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I do so to yield to the gentlewoman from Virginia [Mrs. BYRNE]. the gentlewoman is the chief sponsor of House Joint Resolution 333, which would designate May 11, 1994, as "Vietnam Human Rights Day."

Mrs. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to thank my distinguished colleagues who have joined me as cosponsors of the resolution I introduced to designate May 11, 1994, as "Vietnam Human Rights Day."

This day commemorates the fourth anniversary of the Manifesto of the Non-Violent Movement for Human Rights in Vietnam, issued by Dr. Nguyen Dan Que, a human rights advocate and political prisoner being held in solitary confinement in Vietnam. He was the first member of Amnesty International in Vietnam and arrested by the Socialist government in 1978 for rebellion against the regime, even though his protests were solely non-violent.

With his case in mind, along with thousands of others, such as those of Buddhist monks and religious leaders, the resolution calls upon Hanoi to respect basic human rights, accept a multiparty system, and restore the right of the Vietnamese people to choose their own form of government through free and fair elections. While this resolution does not take binding action, it has become an issue of great importance to Vietnamese throughout our Nation and in Vietnam.

The passage of Vietnam Human Rights Day is a symbol of American resolve in the area of foreign policy. First, it confirms the necessity of placing human rights at the center of United States policy toward Vietnam and reminds us of what we stand for as a nation. Our Nation has always defined itself by the principles that are set forth in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. The values these great documents hold must continue to guide our actions and vision of our foreign policy.

Second, this resolution demonstrates that America will not ignore the plight of those Vietnamese citizens who suffer as prisoners of conscience under the Socialist regime. Those who are put in solitary confinement for their political views, Buddhist monks who are arrested and charged with traveling without permission, human rights advocates who are tortured for issuing non-violent statements, and hundreds of citizens who are imprisoned in dungeons without a fair trial will not be

forgotten by the United States and its citizens. Just as the world has welcomed South Africa into the community of nations after their recent elections, the people of Vietnam dream of such a day when they will be honored for their movement toward democracy.

Endorsed by veterans groups ranging from the American Legion to the American Ex-Prisoners Of War, I am optimistic that this will encourage Vietnam to go down the road of becoming a more open, democratic, and pluralistic society.

On behalf of the thousands of Vietnamese in my district and throughout the Nation, I want to thank my colleagues for cosponsoring this resolution and for bringing this issue to the forefront.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I wish to again thank the gentlewoman from Virginia [Mrs. BYRNE] for introducing this important resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA].

(Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my sincere appreciation to the gentlewoman from Virginia [Mrs. BYRNE] for bringing forward this initiative, and for her leadership in sponsoring House Joint Resolution 333, the companion legislation to Senate Joint Resolution 168.

I certainly commend the gentlewoman for this, as well as our good friend, the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA], for bringing this piece of legislation before the Members for consideration.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of a group of Members who has served in the Vietnam War, this is really a historic moment, at least in my humble opinion, for bringing again to the forefront a sense of recognition of this very important issue as it affects our relationship with the Republic of Vietnam. I certainly want to thank the gentlewoman from Virginia [Mrs. BYRNE] for doing this.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say also that I hope this legislation will be an initiative to make the leaders of the Republic of Vietnam cognizant of the civil rights of the citizens of Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentlewoman from Virginia [Mrs. BYRNE] for taking this initiative also to the effect that we are also not to forget some 2,300 POW's and MIA's that are still unaccounted for. I would certainly like to commend this administration for their sincere efforts in seeing that we settle this issue with the officials of the Vietnam Government.

Mr. Speaker, I want to also say that on the question of human rights, I realize this is one of the important issues that the administration has taken up, and it is certainly important with the Members of this body. More importantly, we should recognized human

rights, especially for the good citizens of Vietnam, I feel that this piece of legislation is most befitting.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] for yielding.

□ 1850

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation of objection, I just want to thank the gentleman for his very eloquent, sincere statement on behalf of this resolution. I reiterate my commendation to the gentlewoman from Virginia for introducing it and say I am proud to be one of the cosponsors.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DEAL). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S. J. RES 168

Whereas May 11, 1994, is the fourth anniversary of the issuance of the Manifesto of the Non-Violent Movement for Human Rights in Vietnam;

Whereas the Manifesto, which calls upon Hanoi to respect basic human rights, accept a multiparty system, and restore the right of the Vietnamese people to choose their own form of government through free and fair elections, reflects the will and aspirations of the people of Vietnam;

Whereas the author of the Manifesto, Dr. Nguyen Dan Que, and thousands of innocent Vietnamese, including religious leaders, are imprisoned by the Socialist Republic of Vietnam because of their nonviolent struggle for freedom and human rights;

Whereas the leaders of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam are seeking to expand diplomatic and trade relations with the rest of the world;

Whereas the United States, as the leader of the free world, has a special responsibility to safeguard freedom and promote the protection of human rights throughout the world; and

Whereas the Congress urges Hanoi to release immediately and unconditionally all political prisoners, including Dr. Nguyen Dan Que, with full restoration of their civil and human rights; guarantee equal protection under the law to all Vietnamese, regardless of religious belief, political philosophy, or previous associations; restore all basic human rights, such as freedom of speech, religion, movement, and association; abolish the single party system and permit the functioning of all political organizations without intimidation or harassment and announce a framework and timetable for free and fair election under the sponsorship of the United Nations that will allow the Vietnamese people to choose their own form of government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That May 11, 1994, is designated as "Vietnam Human Rights Day" in support of efforts by the Non-Violent Movement for Human Rights in Vietnam to achieve freedom and human rights for the people of Vietnam, and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to commemorate such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

# CRS Report for Congress

## Vietnam: Procedural and Jurisdictional Questions Regarding Possible Normalization of U.S. Diplomatic and Economic Relations

Vladimir N. Pregelj

Robert G. Sutter

Alan K. Yu

Larry Q. Nowels

August 4, 1994



# **VIETNAM: PROCEDURAL AND JURISDICTIONAL QUESTIONS REGARDING POSSIBLE NORMALIZATION OF DIPLOMATIC AND ECONOMIC RELATIONS**

## **SUMMARY**

The Clinton Administration has moved incrementally to begin establishing more normal U.S. economic, consular, diplomatic and other official relations with Vietnam. The U.S. economic embargo was lifted prospectively in February 1994, and it was announced in May 1994 that the two countries would establish consular level liaison offices in each other's capital later this year. In recent years, more senior level U.S. officials, including Members of Congress, have traveled to Vietnam than to any other Southeast Asian country.

The steps have come against the backdrop of a continuing debate in the United States over normalizing relations with Vietnam. Some favor greater U.S. flexibility and forward movement in relations with Vietnam; others oppose such changes until Vietnam meets U.S. conditions, especially accounting more fully for U.S. prisoners of war/missing in action (POW/MIAs) from the Vietnam War. ( For a review of the debate and of the general U.S. policy options for dealing with Vietnam, see Vietnam-U.S. Relations: The Debate Over Normalization, CRS Issue Brief 93081, updated regularly.)

Any significant forward movement in normalizing relations with Vietnam quickly runs into the complicated array of legal and regulatory restrictions currently governing U.S.-Vietnamese relations. These restrictions cover all areas of official relations including economic, consular, diplomatic and cultural interaction. They have often deep historical roots in American opposition to Communist regimes during the Cold War.

A review of the legal and regulatory restrictions and an examination of the American experience in normalizing relations with the Soviet Union and China show that the process of normalization with a Communist country and former military adversary like Vietnam could be protracted. Many of the current restrictions on U.S. relations with Vietnam are mandated by specific statutes referring to Vietnam or broader statutes affecting countries including Vietnam. Some statutes give an element of discretion to the President. Other restrictions on Vietnam have been imposed under general statutory authorities that have been applied to Vietnam by executive decision in response to specific situations or policy goals.

There are a variety of paths that might be followed to normalize relations-- e.g. moving ahead first in economic and cultural areas while holding back diplomatic ties; establishing official political relations first and normalizing economic and cultural ties later; moving ahead in all areas concurrently; etc.. In general, the initiative to move ahead rests mainly with the President, but Congress plays an important role in many areas. Past practice suggests that the President is unlikely to move ahead without support from the legislative branch.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION .....	1
U.S.-VIETNAM RELATIONS SINCE 1975 .....	3
Policy Initiatives during the Carter Administration .....	3
Developments during the Reagan and Bush Administrations .....	4
Developments during the Clinton Administration .....	6
VIETNAM'S SITUATION .....	9
Economic Conditions .....	9
Foreign and Defense Policy .....	9
Political Trends .....	10
QUESTIONS INVOLVED IN NORMALIZING	
U.S.-VIETNAMESE DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS .....	11
What is the Current Status of U.S.-Vietnamese Political Relations? ..	11
Which Branch of the U.S. Government Has Responsibility for	
Normalizing Political Relations? .....	12
What Are the Different Processes Involved in Establishing	
Government-to-Government Relations? .....	12
What Are the Procedures to Establish an Interest Section?	
A Liaison Office? .....	12
If the United States Were to Normalize Diplomatic Relations	
with Vietnam, What Further Steps Might the United States	
Consider Undertaking? .....	13
Cultural and Educational Exchanges .....	13
Travel Restrictions .....	13
Refugee Resettlement Agreements .....	14
NORMALIZING U.S.COMMERCIAL RELATIONS WITH VIETNAM ...	15
Background .....	15
Blocked Assets .....	16
U.S. Imports .....	17
Most-Favored-Nation (MFN) Status .....	18
Generalized System of Preferences .....	20
U.S. Exports .....	21
Exports from Foreign Countries .....	23
Export Financing .....	23
Private Foreign Investment .....	24
Other International Aspects .....	24
WHAT STEPS COULD THE U.S. TAKE IF IT WERE	
TO IMPLEMENT OTHER U.S. ECONOMIC	
SUPPORT PROGRAMS FOR VIETNAM? .....	26
Bilateral Foreign Assistance .....	26
Other Assistance and Finance Programs .....	28
Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC) .....	29
Trade and Development Agency (TDA) .....	29
P.L. 480 Food Assistance .....	29
Multilateral Aid .....	30

WHAT PROCEDURES DID THE U.S. FOLLOW IN NORMALIZING RELATIONS WITH THE USSR AND THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA? .....	32
Soviet Union (USSR) .....	32
People's Republic of China (PRC) .....	33
APPENDIX: The U.S. Reported "Road Map" Proposal for Normalization with Vietnam .....	37
MAP OF SOUTHEAST ASIA .....	38

**NOTE:** This report was prepared at the request of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. With the Committee's permission, the report is made available for general congressional use.

# **VIETNAM: PROCEDURAL AND JURISDICTIONAL QUESTIONS REGARDING POSSIBLE NORMALIZATION OF U.S. DIPLOMATIC AND ECONOMIC RELATIONS**

## **INTRODUCTION**

The Clinton Administration has moved incrementally to establish more normal U.S. economic, consular, diplomatic and other official relations with Vietnam. The steps have come against the backdrop of a continuing debate in the United States over normalizing relations with Vietnam. Some favor greater U.S. flexibility and forward movement in relations with Vietnam; others oppose such changes until Vietnam meets longstanding U.S. conditions, especially accounting more fully for U.S. prisoners of war/missing in action (POW/MIA) from the Vietnam War.

Increased pressure to ease the American economic and political embargo against Vietnam included efforts in 1993 by France, Japan, and others to break ranks with the U.S. if necessary in order to renew international financial institution aid to Vietnam. American businesses have been attracted by Vietnam's oil potential and its economic reforms and restructuring in recent years.

Forces which have opposed easing the embargo until Vietnam cooperates more fully on POW/MIAs have remained strong. Other factors arguing for caution in any U.S. approach to normalizing relations with Vietnam include the poor state of human rights in Vietnam, the mixed views of Vietnamese-Americans, and the perception held by some that President Clinton has had difficulty addressing this issue because of his anti-war activities during the 1960s.

At its outset, the Clinton Administration endorsed the 4-phase "road map" plan for normalization that was created by the Bush Administration. That plan (see appendix) is premised on Vietnamese cooperation on Cambodia, which has been viewed by many as generally satisfactory in recent years, and on accounting for U.S. POW/MIAs--the area of greatest controversy.

President Clinton announced on July 2, 1993, that the U.S. would no longer oppose resumed international financial institution aid to Vietnam. (Such aid resumed in October 1993.) On September 13, 1993, President Clinton renewed his authority to maintain the U.S. trade embargo on Vietnam, but eased it in December 1993 by allowing U.S. companies to bid on development projects funded by international financial institutions.

On February 3, 1994, President Clinton ordered an end to the U.S. trade embargo on Vietnam. The action came after many months of high-level U.S. interaction with Vietnam, reportedly, achieving "tangible results" in resolving POW/MIA cases, and a January 27, 1994 vote in the Senate urging that the embargo be lifted. The Senate vote was controversial in the House, but the

legislation, part of the State Department authorization bill (H.R. 2333), passed Congress and became law (P.L. 103-236) in April 1994.

On May 26, 1994, Vietnam and the United States announced they would set up liaison offices in Washington and Hanoi, reportedly in two or three months. Secretary of State Warren Christopher was reported planning a visit to Vietnam in July. The United States said full diplomatic relations would require more progress on POW/MIA and human rights issues. Meanwhile, U.S. economic relations still face restrictions on account of frozen assets disputes and the fact that Vietnam remains ineligible for most-favored-nation (MFN) tariff treatment, generalized system of preferences (GSP), Overseas Private Investment Corporation guarantees, Export-Import Bank financing, and other measures.

This report reviews U.S. legal and regulatory restrictions on U.S. relations with Vietnam; addresses specific procedural and jurisdictional questions involved in normalizing U.S. diplomatic, consular, economic or other relations with Vietnam; and presents a range of possible actions the United States could take in key areas of diplomatic and economic policy, if it decided to move ahead to improve relations with Vietnam. This report does not address the pros and cons of possible progress in U.S. relations with Vietnam. Other CRS products address that issue.<sup>1</sup> And it does not cover some conceivable policy changes the United States could adopt in seeking improved relations with Vietnam.

Following this introduction, a background section reviews the development of U.S. relations with Vietnam since the fall of South Vietnam to the Communists in 1975. The next section examines procedural and jurisdictional questions related to the normalization of diplomatic relations. Specifically, this section addresses the following questions: What is the current status of U.S.-Vietnamese political relations? Which branch of the U.S. Government has responsibility for normalizing political relations? What are the different processes involved in establishing government-to-government relations? What are the procedures to establish an interest section or a liaison office? If the United States were to normalize diplomatic relations with Vietnam, what further steps might the United States consider taking?

The following section examines some of the procedural questions related to the possible expansion of economic and commercial relations between the United States and Vietnam. Specific questions addressed include: the current status of U.S.-Vietnamese economic relations; what would be required for the United States to lift restrictions on U.S.-Vietnamese commercial ties; what would be necessary for the United States to implement other U.S. economic programs for Vietnam; and how the U.S. position on multilateral assistance to Vietnam might change with normalized relations.

The final section presents case studies on the different procedures the United States undertook to normalize diplomatic and economic relations with the Soviet Union in 1933, and with the People's Republic of China from 1971 to 1979.

---

<sup>1</sup> See CRS Issue Brief 93081 for a discussion and listing of CRS products on this issue.

## U.S.-VIETNAM RELATIONS SINCE 1975

U.S.-Vietnam diplomatic and economic relations remained essentially frozen for over a decade beginning in 1975. After the communist victory in South Vietnam in April 1975, the United States ended diplomatic relations with Saigon and subjected all economic relations with South Vietnam to the same restrictions that already applied to North Vietnam. These restrictions consisted principally of a near total embargo on all commercial and financial transactions with Vietnam, and a blocking of all Vietnamese assets in the United States.

The Hanoi government in the 1970s called for talks with the United States on establishing diplomatic relations and demanded that the United States fulfill the provisions of the January 1973 Paris Peace Agreement, including a provision that pledged U.S. postwar aid for Vietnam's reconstruction. The Ford Administration rejected Vietnam's demand for aid and said that there could be no normalization of relations without a full accounting of American POW/MIAs and until Vietnam's longer range intentions in Southeast Asia became more clear. The United States vetoed Vietnam's application for membership in the United Nations on three occasions during 1975-1976.

### **Policy Initiatives during the Carter Administration**

The Carter Administration took several steps to improve relations with Vietnam in 1977, but these efforts were progressively frustrated by growing evidence in 1978 that the Vietnamese government was deliberately expelling hundreds of thousands of its citizens and was making military preparations to invade Cambodia. President Carter sent a commission, led by Leonard Woodcock, to Vietnam in March 1977 to discuss matters affecting mutual interests. Subsequently, the United States disclosed it would no longer veto Vietnam's application for U.N. membership. (On July 20, 1977, the U.N. Security Council recommended by consensus without formal vote that Vietnam be admitted to the United Nations.) The U.S. side proposed that diplomatic relations quickly be established between the United States and Vietnam, after which the United States would lift export and asset controls on Vietnam. But the Vietnamese responded that they would not agree to establish relations or to furnish information on U.S. POW/MIAs until the United States pledged to provide several billion dollars in postwar reconstruction aid. They later modified this position and provided some limited information on MIAs. Needless to say, U.S. aid was not forthcoming.

The U.S. Congress, for its part, responded unfavorably to the Carter Administration initiatives and the Vietnamese demands. Members were particularly opposed to Vietnam's insistence on receiving U.S. aid. In the latter part of 1977, both Houses of Congress went on record as strongly opposing U.S. aid to Vietnam.

Developments in 1978 had a long-term negative effect on U.S.-Vietnamese relations. Vietnam expelled hundreds of thousands of its citizens (many of

Chinese origin) who then became refugees throughout Southeast Asia; aligned itself economically and militarily with the USSR; and invaded Cambodia, deposing the pro-Chinese Khmer Rouge regime and imposing a puppet Cambodian government backed by 200,000 Vietnamese troops. The Carter Administration halted consideration of improved relations with Vietnam. It worked closely with the members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) to condemn and contain the Vietnamese expansion and to cope with the influx of refugees from Vietnam (see map).

### **Developments During the Reagan and Bush Administrations**

The Reagan Administration opposed normal relations with Hanoi until there was a verified withdrawal of Vietnamese forces from Cambodia, a position amended in 1985 to include a verified withdrawal in the context of a comprehensive settlement. Administration officials also noted that progress toward normal relations would remain difficult until Vietnam cooperated in obtaining the fullest possible accounting for U.S. personnel listed as prisoners of war/missing in action (POW/MIAs).

As Vietnam withdrew forces from Cambodia and sought a compromise peace settlement there, the Bush Administration decided on July 18, 1990, to seek contacts with Hanoi to reach a peace agreement in Cambodia and end U.S. support for the coalition government. That coalition, the so called Coalition Government of Democratic Kampuchia, was composed of three guerrilla forces, including the Khmer Rouge, and represented Cambodia in the United Nations. In September 1990, the Administration also began official contacts with the Vietnamese-backed government in Phnom Penh.

Regarding the issue of the POW/MIAs, since a visit to Hanoi by a U.S. Presidential delegation led by John Vessey in 1987, Vietnam has returned hundreds of sets of remains said to be those of U.S. MIAs.<sup>2</sup> Some, but not most, were confirmed as those of Americans. From 1974 to 1992, Vietnam returned the remains of over 300 Americans. There is a persistent belief in the United States that Hanoi holds more remains. A Vietnamese refugee testified before Congress in the late 1970s that the remains of several hundred Americans were stored in a Hanoi warehouse mortuary.

Belief that living Americans are still in Vietnamese captivity also has been prominent in recent years amid reports from former U.S. Government officials and others testifying to this possibility. Controversy about U.S. Government handling of POW/MIA issues prompted the Senate in August 1991 to set up a special committee to look into the matter. The committee completed its work and issued a lengthy report in January 1993. The findings clarified many matters but did not end the debate over U.S. and Vietnamese handling of this question and its implications for U.S.-Vietnamese normalization. Hanoi denies

---

<sup>2</sup> Department of Defense. See CRS Issue Brief 92101, POWs and MIAs. Status and Accounting Issues, by Robert L. Goldich

that it holds living Americans against their will, or the remains of U.S. MIAs. Americans who do not believe that live POWs are still in Vietnam dispute the veracity of the documents and other evidence used to support that issue. Others feel that some Americans may have been held after the Paris Peace Accord of 1973 but are now dead and/or may have voluntarily remained in Vietnam.

In April 1991, the United States laid out a detailed "road map" (see Appendix) for normalization with Vietnam, welcomed Vietnam's willingness to host a U.S. office in Hanoi to handle POW/MIA affairs, and pledged \$1 million for humanitarian aid (mainly prosthetics) to Vietnam. The U.S. office began operation in mid-1991, and the aid was transferred by the end of FY1991. Also in 1991, the United States eased travel restrictions on Vietnamese diplomats stationed at the United Nations in New York and on U.S. organized travel to Vietnam.

In 1992, Vietnamese cooperation on POW/MIA matters seemed to improve, especially in the area of allowing U.S. investigators access in pursuit of "live sightings" reports. The United States pledged and subsequently paid out \$3 million in humanitarian aid (mainly prosthetics and aid to abandoned children or orphans) for Vietnam; agreed to restore direct telecommunications with Vietnam; agreed to allow U.S. commercial sales to meet basic human needs in Vietnam; and lifted restrictions on projects in Vietnam by U.S. nongovernmental organizations.

This first phase in the "road map" was followed by a second phase, which called for the United States to partially lift its trade embargo once U.N. peacekeepers are well established in Cambodia. The third phase was to see a full lifting of the embargo and an exchange of diplomatic missions 6 months after the U.N. peacekeepers were set up in Cambodia and full diplomatic and economic relations were established. The fourth phase was to come after elections in Cambodia in May 1993.

Given general Vietnamese cooperation on Cambodia and the successful conclusion of elections there in May 1993, the slow and narrow "pace and scope" of U.S. normalization with Vietnam has been contingent mainly on eliciting greater Vietnamese cooperation on POW/MIA issues. U.S. attention to that issue remained strong with, among other things, widespread press coverage of the Presidential campaign of Ross Perot, who had definite views on this subject; the disclosure by Russian President Yeltsin in 1992 that American POWs may have been sent to the U.S.S.R.; an incident in late July 1992 when President Bush was heckled during a speech to POW/MIA relatives; and lengthy hearings by the Senate Committee on POW/MIA Affairs in August and September 1992, where some former Administration officials agreed with the Committee Chairman, Senator Kerry, that Americans were probably left behind in 1973.

Important developments in October 1992 saw U.S. officials, armed with evidence including photographs of extensive Vietnamese archival information on U.S. POW/MIAs, pressing for greater access to such data. Vietnamese representatives agreed. The U.S. pledged and subsequently provided a disaster

assistance grant to Vietnamese flood victims and promised and provided aid to help Vietnam with malaria problems. In April 1992, the U.S. lifted restrictions that barred direct U.S. telephone service to Vietnam. In December, the United States eased some restrictions on U.S. companies with the prospects of doing business in Vietnam.

A third cluster of issues, apart from Cambodia and POW/MIAs, also occupied the Reagan and Bush Administrations. These involved negotiations with Vietnam concerning other humanitarian issues dividing the two countries. Major progress was made. In particular, arrangements were made to:

- facilitate emigration from Vietnam of relatives of Vietnamese-Americans or permanent Vietnamese residents of the United States (the caseload of people in this category was 40,000 in mid-1993);
- regularize the flow of Vietnamese immigrants to the United States and other countries under the so-called Orderly Departure Program managed by the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees (over 300,000 people had come to the U.S. through this channel as of mid-1993);
- resolve the issue of the estimated several thousand Amerasians (whose fathers are Americans and whose mothers are Vietnamese) who reportedly wish to emigrate from Vietnam to the United States (as of mid-1993, 80,000 people -- Amerasians and relatives -- had come to the U.S. through this channel); and
- obtain release from Vietnamese prison camps and the opportunity to immigrate to the United States of thousands of Vietnamese who worked for the United States in South Vietnam or were otherwise associated with the U.S. war effort there. (As of mid-1993, 72,000 such internees had come to the U.S. through this channel.)

Meanwhile, U.S. policymakers in Congress and the Administration expressed repeatedly their concern about the large numbers of prisoners of conscience said to be in Vietnam, warning that human rights is a central feature of U.S. foreign policy and cannot but affect U.S. policy toward Vietnam.

### **Developments During the Clinton Administration**

In 1993, Clinton Administration spokespersons generally endorsed the road map of the Bush Administration. Press speculation held that the U.S. might feel compelled to ease the U.S. embargo against Vietnam in light of anticipated French and Japanese initiatives at the late April 1993 International Monetary Fund/World Bank consultations in Washington. The U.S. press disclosure in April 1993 of a Soviet document stating that Vietnam held many more U.S. POWs than previously thought occupied an April 18-19, 1993 visit to Hanoi of Presidential Envoy Vessey. In late April, President Clinton and other Administration figures reaffirmed their commitment to a full accounting and to

conditioning U.S. relations with Vietnam on Hanoi's cooperation in resolving this issue. Press reports disclosed that the Administration had succeeded in obtaining a delay, until late June 1993, of international donor consideration of renewed international financial aid to Vietnam.

A high-level U.S. congressional delegation led by Senator Kerry traveled to Vietnam on Memorial Day 1993 and returned with several Members urging forward movement in U.S.-Vietnamese relations. Delegation members met with President Clinton on June 11, 1993.

President Clinton announced on July 2, 1993, that the United States would no longer oppose arrangements supported by France, Japan, and others allowing for resumed international financial institution aid to Vietnam. The U.S. economic embargo on Vietnam would remain in effect. Some veterans groups and their backers in Congress were critical, while some business supporters claimed that the new situation meant that U.S. business would gain nothing from new international lending to Vietnam. Some in Congress supported the move as an appropriate step.

A high-level Clinton Administration delegation visited Hanoi in mid-July 1993 to press for progress on POW/MIAs. It gave Vietnamese leaders U.S. documentary evidence that would help in resolving Vietnamese MIA cases. The delegation also disclosed that U.S. consular officials would now be stationed in Hanoi. The delegation told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on July 21 that the Clinton Administration did not intend to normalize trade relations with Vietnam until significant progress was made on POW/MIAs. Several Members of Congress visited Vietnam in August.

On September 13, 1993, President Clinton renewed his authority to maintain trade embargoes, including the one on Vietnam, but eased the latter in December by allowing U.S. companies to bid on development projects funded by international financial institutions in Vietnam. Senator Dole on September 15 criticized Clinton's action, while Representative Gibbons and five other members of a House trade subcommittee on September 16, 1993, called for the embargo to be lifted. Also in September, the Administration approved \$3.5 million in U.S. aid to extend two humanitarian programs (prostheses and orphans) in Vietnam; the Senate Foreign Relations Committee rejected an amendment to S. 1467 urging easing the embargo; and the Senate adopted a general resolution on Vietnam normalization while considering H.R. 2295. Subsequent controversy surrounding an investigation into alleged Vietnamese payments to Commerce Secretary Brown caused some Members to call for a halt in moves toward normalization.

On February 3, 1994, President Clinton ordered an end to the U.S. trade embargo on Vietnam. The action came after many months of high-level U.S. interaction with Vietnam, reportedly achieving "tangible results" in resolving POW/MIA cases, and a January 27, 1994 vote in the Senate urging that the embargo be lifted. On February 1, 1994, Commerce Secretary Brown reportedly was notified that he was cleared of charges that he accepted \$700,000 to ease

U.S. sanctions against Vietnam. This allayed some of the concerns in Congress that moves toward normalization with Vietnam should be halted until the charges against Brown were satisfactorily resolved.

The Senate language urging lifting the embargo was attached to authorizing legislation (H.R. 2333). The language was controversial in House deliberations in April 1994, but H.R. 2333 passed Congress; it was signed into law (P.L. 103-236) on April 30, 1994.

The Treasury and Commerce Department regulations implementing the President's February 3 decision were issued on February 7 and 10, 1994, respectively.<sup>3</sup> U.S. economic relations face restrictions on account of frozen assets disputes and the fact that Vietnam remains ineligible for most-favored-nation tariff treatment, the generalized system of preferences, Overseas Private Investment Corporation guarantees, Export-Import Bank financing, and other measures. Talks to resolve the frozen assets issue began in Hanoi on February 28 and are continuing.

On May 26, 1994, Vietnam and the United States announced that official liaison offices would be established reportedly in two or three months.

---

<sup>3</sup> Journal of Commerce, February 11, 1994.

## VIETNAM'S SITUATION

American decisionmakers have given top priority attention to Vietnam's handling of the POW/MIA issue in determining the pace and scope of U.S. normalization of relations with Vietnam. At the same time, U.S. incentives for normalization have been influenced by Vietnam's economic reforms, foreign policies and internal political controls. In general, Vietnam's economic and foreign policies have encouraged the U.S. to improve relations, while Hanoi's continued strict political controls have served as a drag on improved relations.

### Economic Conditions

Economic reforms continue to make meaningful progress toward greater openness. Market-oriented reforms and greater interaction with the international economy are seen as essential if Vietnam is to avoid the stagnant production, shortages, and limited famine that characterized past, more orthodox communist economic policies. (The most graphic illustration of Vietnam's backwardness remains its \$230 per capita gross national product -- among the lowest levels in the world.) The government has given farmers greater control over what they produce, abandoned central state planning, cut subsidies to state enterprises, reformed the price system, and introduced a liberal foreign investment code. Positive results in economic growth have developed. The economy is expected to grow by 8% in 1994, and by 10% in subsequent years.<sup>4</sup> A big problem remains foreign aid, which used to come from the Soviet bloc. Hanoi was particularly pleased with Japan's November 1992 announcement of resumed aid (\$370 million) after a hiatus of 14 years. World Bank, International Monetary Fund and Asian Development Bank aid resumed in 1993. Due to political and administrative obstacles, it remains unclear whether Vietnam will become an emerging "Asian Tiger" or remain a risky location for foreign investors.

### Foreign and Defense Policy

For many years, a major impediment to Vietnam's development was the strong international opposition to Vietnam's invasion and occupation of Cambodia. Faced with a cutoff of much aid from the Soviet bloc, the Vietnamese in the 1990s increased their flexibility on a Cambodian settlement, moved to accommodate China on sensitive issues, and stepped up progress on the POW/MIA and other humanitarian issues with the United States. Vietnamese officials have voiced their frustration that the United States and others are "slow" in ending economic restrictions that limit Vietnam's ability to obtain international financial assistance, investment and trading opportunities needed for economic modernization.

---

<sup>4</sup> World Bank, Country Briefing Note, Vietnam.

## Political Trends

Vietnam's experiment with political reform in the late 1980s lagged far behind economic changes and has largely been superseded by an orthodox drive to maintain tight political control. Reform-minded leaders came to the fore following the Vietnamese landmark Sixth Communist Party Congress in December 1986. "Old Guard" leaders were retired and the new General Secretary set about to revitalize the ossified political structure and stagnant economy through reforms and experiments, reductions in central control, and curbs on the party's power over aspects of state and society.

The reformers' standing remained uncertain as many senior-level leaders harbored concerns about the diminution of their control. The political crisis in China after the June 1989 Tiananmen massacre and the collapse of communism in Europe caused these leaders to reassert their views against the reformers. The Seventh Party Congress, held in Hanoi in June 1991, saw a leadership emerge that was dominated by relatively younger political hard-liners anxious to reassert party prerogatives and avoid political changes incompatible with Communist Party control. A new constitution, which went into effect on April 18, 1992, confirmed the political monopoly of the Communist party. Restrictive procedures for a National Assembly election in July 1992 effectively eliminated candidates not approved by the government. Complaints about human rights abuses (such as arbitrary arrest and torture) remain a feature of international commentary on Vietnam.

## QUESTIONS INVOLVED IN NORMALIZING U.S.-VIETNAMESE DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS

### **What is the Current Status of U.S.-Vietnamese Political Relations?**

The United States does not have normal diplomatic relations with the Socialist Republic of Vietnam (SRV). The United States had not recognized the predecessor to the Socialist Republic of Vietnam -- the Democratic Republic of Vietnam (the Communist government in North Vietnam). The United States did have full relations with the noncommunist South Vietnamese government until it fell to the Communists in 1975.

The United States does recognize the Socialist Republic of Vietnam as a state in the international law sense. Moreover, the United States has acknowledged that the government of the SRV exercises effective control within Vietnam, and U.S. officials have dealt routinely with SRV authorities on a wide range of issues of mutual interest.

In July 1989, President Bush stated as U.S. policy that the United States would not normalize diplomatic relations with the Socialist Republic of Vietnam until a comprehensive settlement has been achieved in Cambodia that would include genuine power sharing with the noncommunist Cambodians led by Prince Sihanouk, as well as an internationally verified withdrawal of Vietnamese troops. He added that as a "practical matter," the pace and scope of U.S. normalization would be directly affected by the degree of Hanoi's cooperation on POW/MIA and other humanitarian issues. The Clinton Administration generally has followed these broad guidelines. As Vietnamese cooperation on Cambodia has been widely viewed as satisfactory in recent years and other humanitarian issues have been largely settled, the pace and scope of U.S. normalization with Vietnam has been determined mainly by U.S. assessment of Vietnamese cooperation on the POW/MIA issue.

The absence of formal diplomatic relations has not prevented a range of extensive bilateral official contacts in Vietnam, the U.S. and elsewhere over POW/MIA and other issues. In recent years, more senior level U.S. administration and congressional officials have traveled to Vietnam than to any other Southeast Asian country. Since 1991, a U.S. office to handle POW/MIA matters has been operating in Hanoi; American officials in recent years have worked actively throughout the country investigating crash sites and other areas where information about POW/MIA cases might be found. The U.S. and Vietnam reportedly plan to establish liaison offices in Hanoi and Washington later this year.

### **Which Branch of the U.S. Government Has Responsibility for Normalizing Political Relations?**

The Constitution divides the foreign relations powers between the executive and legislative branches of the government. For example, the Constitution gives the President the power to send and receive ambassadors, while Congress has the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, to define offenses against the law of nations, and to declare war. The President and the Senate share the power to make treaties and appoint ambassadors.

Although the Constitution does not ascribe the powers of recognizing states and governments to any particular branch of the Government, the President traditionally exercises such authority. The legislative branch of the Government exercises little direct influence over the normalization of relations. Congress, however, controls appropriations that are necessary to implement the President's plan to establish relations.

### **What Are the Different Processes Involved in Establishing Government-to-Government Relations?**

There are general aspects to the process of establishing relations between governments including: 1) recognition of a sovereign state, and 2) establishment of diplomatic relations. Governments can choose to recognize a state -- such recognition is accorded to an entity having a defined area and population under the control of a government that has the capacity to engage in foreign relations. Recognition of a state, however, does not necessarily mean that a government may recognize the government of that state. Oftentimes, political considerations influence a government's willingness to establish or reestablish diplomatic relations with the foreign state.

### **What Are the Procedures to Establish an Interest Section? A Liaison Office?**

In certain cases, the United States has maintained interest sections or liaison offices in countries with which it has no diplomatic relations. In the case of Cuba, for instance, the United States conducts business with Cuba through the U.S. Interests Section in Havana. The Interests Section is officially part of the Swiss Embassy, but is located in the former U.S. Embassy building. The Cuban Interests Section in Washington operates through the Swiss Embassy, although it is located in the former Cuban Embassy building. The State Department was responsible for negotiating the agreement with the Government of Cuba that led to the creation of the respective interests sections.

The United States maintained a liaison office in Beijing from 1973 until it established diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China (PRC) in

1979.<sup>5</sup> Until 1979, the United States officially had relations with the government of the Republic of China -- located in Taiwan. Upon establishing diplomatic relations with the PRC in 1979, the United States broke official relations with Taiwan.

Currently, American commercial and cultural interaction with the people of Taiwan is facilitated through the American Institute in Taiwan (AIT) -- a nongovernmental entity staffed largely by U.S. State Department and other officials who are temporarily separated from the U.S. Government. The AIT was established under the authority of the Taiwan Relations Act (P.L. 96-8, 22 U.S.C. 3301-3316). Section 7(a) of the Act authorizes personnel at the AIT to perform notarial, conservator, and consular services. Section 10(c) of the Act provides the means to grant diplomatic status to the Coordination Council for North American Affairs (the Taiwanese liaison office in Washington), and to its personnel.

### **If the United States Were to Normalize Diplomatic Relations with Vietnam, What Further Steps Might the United States Consider Taking?**

#### **Cultural and Educational Exchanges**

The United States has no official cultural, scientific, or educational exchange programs with Vietnam and has only very limited unofficial exchanges. Some Vietnamese scholars work in the United States courtesy of a Fulbright Program which is managed by the American Council of Learned Societies. If the United States were interested in pursuing such programs with Vietnam it might look to the U.S.-Chinese experience as a model.

In January 1979, the United States and China signed a Cultural Agreement that has established a basis for long-term official exchange. According to the agreement, the U.S. Information Agency is charged with managing the U.S.-China cultural exchange program. The agreement, however, governs only official, government-to-government contacts, and neither precludes nor covers other U.S.-China cultural exchanges that may be privately sponsored. As has occurred under many official U.S.-China agreements, costs of the official cultural exchange programs have been reciprocal, with each country covering the costs of its own involvement.

#### **Travel Restrictions**

The United States has no restrictions against U.S. citizens travelling to Vietnam. Because the United States has no consular establishment in Vietnam

---

<sup>5</sup>The U.S. passed legislation to allow for the establishing of liaison offices with China. Such legislation is said not to be needed in the case of liaison offices with Vietnam as both Vietnam and the U.S. are parties to multilateral conventions governing diplomatic and consular relations.

at this time, the State Department is able to provide only limited assistance to U.S. citizens travelling there.

### **Refugee Resettlement Agreements**

The United States and Vietnam have had talks and reached agreements relating to the Orderly Departure Program (ODP) -- a program that facilitates the emigration of people from Vietnam with family or other contacts in the United States. In July 1989, the United States and Vietnam initialed an ad referendum agreement concerning the ODP, which dealt with a resettlement program for released reeducation center detainees. The agreement has been formally agreed to and implemented.

In June 1989, the United States was also a participant in the International Conference on Indo-Chinese Refugees, held in Geneva. The countries participating in the conference endorsed a Comprehensive Plan of Action to curb the flow of people from Vietnam. The United States and Vietnam were parties to a series of meetings and agreements on implementing the Comprehensive Plan of Action.

## NORMALIZING U.S. COMMERCIAL RELATIONS WITH VIETNAM

### Background

For almost three decades, Vietnam — or, at least, a large part of it — was one of the few countries whose economic relations with the United States have recently been subject to a regime of U.S. sanctions of the most comprehensive and restrictive kind. In addition to an embargo on U.S. commercial and financial transactions with Vietnam and blocking of Vietnamese assets in the United States, numerous other types of transactions (various other aspects of merchandise trade, export credits, private investments) were prohibited, limited, or subject to discriminatory practices by specific provisions of law and/or regulation. Most of these sanctions were originally imposed against North Vietnam in the context of the Vietnam conflict and expanded to include South Vietnam after its takeover by North Vietnam in late April 1975; the earliest have been in force since 1951.

After some marginal moves toward normalization of relations, beginning in 1991, the most comprehensive and restrictive part of these sanctions — the embargo and the blocking of assets — was lifted prospectively in February 1994, while other, more selective sanctions remain in force.

Apart from the remaining sanctions, U.S. economic relations with Vietnam are adversely affected by Vietnam's situation in general international relations as well as by other bilateral problems with the United States. Among the former are Vietnam's nonparticipation in certain international entities (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, Multifiber Arrangement), which to some extent also directly affect bilateral U.S.-Vietnam economic relations; the latter include lack of diplomatic relations with the United States, the as yet uncompensated nationalization of U.S. property in Vietnam, and the remaining unresolved questions of American prisoners of war and missing in action (POW/MIAs) in the Vietnam conflict.

The measures whereby the existing restrictions on U.S.-Vietnamese economic relations can be removed or mitigated depend primarily on the type of authority under which they have been imposed. Some are mandated by specific statute applying only to Vietnam, others by broader statutes affecting a group of countries (e.g. "Communist," or other similarly described countries) which include Vietnam either specifically or by implication. These may, however, contain an element of executive discretion, generally subject to statutory conditions for its use. Finally, restrictions have been imposed under general statutory authorities that have been applied to Vietnam by executive decision in response to specific situations or policy goals.

Consequently, certain sanctions can be lifted only by the enactment of measures repealing or modifying the applicable statutory mandate, others can be revoked by executive action as authorized by and subject to the conditions,

if any, imposed by the relevant statute, and others still might be repealed solely at executive discretion. All sanctions, of course, can be removed by specific legislation.

This section of the report discusses restrictions at present in force on U.S. commercial relations with Vietnam, their brief history, and means for their removal or modification.

### **Blocked Assets**

The blocking of Vietnamese assets<sup>6</sup> in the United States is the remnant of the comprehensive embargo on commercial and financial transactions imposed on North Vietnam on May 5, 1964 (29 F.R. 6010) during the escalation of the Vietnam conflict, by adding that country to the list of countries subject to the already existing Foreign Assets Control Regulations (31 C.F.R. Part 500) and expanding them with provisions specifically affecting North Vietnam. The embargo was extended in the same way to South Vietnam on April 30, 1975 (40 F.R. 19202), after the takeover of South Vietnam by North Vietnam.

These regulations were put into effect — and subsequently occasionally modified in minor ways — by the Department of the Treasury or its Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) first under the "national emergency" provision of section 5(b) of the Trading With the Enemy Act (TWEA), which was replaced in late 1977 by the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA) (50 U.S.C. 1701 - 1706). The exercise of the authorities applied under the TWEA and continued under the IEEPA (among them the Vietnamese embargo and blocking of assets) has been continued in effect by means of annual Presidential determinations that such extensions are in the national interest of the United States. The latest such determination extended Vietnamese sanctions through September 14, 1994 (Presidential Determination No. 93-38, September 13, 1993, 58 F.R. 51209). (Of course, President Clinton decided to lift the embargo on Vietnam on February 3, 1994.)

At the time of its latest extension, the Vietnamese embargo consisted — with marginal exemptions — of a virtually total ban on merchandise trade and financial transactions between the two countries, and blocking of Vietnamese assets in the United States. Several exemptions were added following the announcement, in April 1991, by the Bush Administration of a "road map" for the normalization of U.S.-Vietnam relations. Thus, American travel service providers were permitted, with some restrictions, to arrange tourist and business travel to Vietnam (56 F.R. 65992; December 20, 1991); telecommunications transactions of U.S. common carriers involving Vietnam were authorized (57 F.R. 17855; April 28, 1992); nongovernmental organizations were authorized to conduct humanitarian projects in Vietnam, and provision of goods and services

---

<sup>6</sup>The value of blocked Vietnamese assets in the United States, consisting mostly of bank accounts but including also the value of the Vietnamese embassy building in Washington, is estimated at \$325 to \$330 million.

to Vietnam to meet basic human needs became possible by case-by-case specific licenses (57 F.R. 20765; May 15, 1992); American businesses were permitted to enter into executory contracts with Vietnamese firms, the performance of which was contingent on the eventual lifting of the embargo (57 F.R. 62230; December 30, 1992); specific licenses authorizing on a case-by-basis the provision of training and orientation services to Vietnamese nationals were made available (58 F.R. 63083); and U.S. persons were authorized to participate in development projects of international institutions in Vietnam (58 F.R. 68529; December 28, 1993).

On February 3, 1994, President Clinton announced the lifting of the embargo itself because "tangible, significant progress has been made in all ... areas" related to the POW/MIA question and as "the best way to ensure cooperation from Vietnam and to continue getting the information Americans want on POW's and MIA's."<sup>7</sup> While no Presidential document (Proclamation, or Executive Order) was issued the embargo was lifted with effect at 5:05 p.m. EST on February 3, 1994 (the time of the President's announcement), by a notice of the Office of Foreign Assets Control (59 F.R. 5696; February 7, 1994). The lifting was only prospective, applying to future transactions, and did not affect assets already blocked. Subsequently (as of May 18, 1994), the unblocking action was extended somewhat retroactively to apply also to Vietnamese funds received through wire transfers or checks after December 31, 1989 (59 F.R. 26601; May 23, 1994).

The regulatory mechanics of the still existing restrictions (blocked assets) are administered by the Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) and consist principally of a requirement that transactions which are not authorized by a regulation or general license (a blanket permit) must be subject to review and specific licensing on a case-by-case basis.

The still remaining restrictions can be further relaxed or revoked — as was the embargo — by executive action.

### **U.S. Imports**

After the lifting of the trade embargo, two sanctions, of lesser impact but nonetheless important, still remain in force with respect to U.S. imports from Vietnam: the denial of the nondiscriminatory (most-favored-nation; MFN) status to Vietnam in its trade with the United States, and Vietnam's ineligibility for the U.S. generalized system of preference.

---

<sup>7</sup>*Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents*, v. 30, no. 5, February 7, 1994, p. 205, 206.

### Most-Favored-Nation (MFN) Status

Lack of Vietnam's MFN status in its trade with the United States means, mainly, that the United States assesses customs duties on imports from Vietnam essentially at the high rates enacted by the protectionist Tariff Act of 1930 rather than at the substantially lower rates resulting from concessions granted by the United States in subsequent negotiations with other countries. Because of long-standing U.S. statutory policy, dating back to 1934 and at present stated in section 126 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2136), and, in most cases, also obligations under various international trade agreements, concessionary rates granted in negotiations to any country are applied as a matter of general policy to imports from all U.S. trading partners.

This policy was changed by section 5 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951 (65 Stat. 73), which required the President to suspend MFN status of most communist countries as a sanction against their support of North Korea and in its armed conflict with the United States. The suspension was implemented generally by Presidential Proclamation 2935 of August 1, 1951 (16 F.R. 7635) and specifically for "any part of ... Vietnam, which may be under Communist domination or control" by Trade Agreement Letter of the same date with effect on September 1, 1951 (16 F.R. 7637). This language remained in the form of a regulation until it was incorporated into the Tariff Schedules of the United States, a completely revised and restructured form of the United States basic tariff document, enacted in 1962, which in General Headnote 3(e) contained a list of "Communist countries" denied MFN status.

Two events, relevant for Vietnam's MFN status, took place in early 1975. First, on January 3, 1975, the Trade Act of 1974 was enacted, which, in section 401<sup>8</sup> (19 U.S.C. 2431), mandated continued denial of MFN status to any country denied such status at the time of its enactment, except as otherwise provided in Title IV of the Act. The other, based on the — still original — language of the MFN denial provision in General Headnote 3(e) and without any specific implementing document, automatically extended the suspension of MFN status to South Vietnam after its takeover by North Vietnam in late April 1975. The original language was not modified until a new thorough revision of the tariff document (Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States - HTS; 19 U.S.C. 1202; not codified) was enacted by section 1204 of the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988 (19 U.S.C. 3004) and entered into force on January 1, 1989. In its General Headnote 3(b), no longer referring to "Communist countries," the HTS listed Vietnam as such as an entity subject to the denial of MFN status.

This development of Vietnam's MFN situation may have created a problem for the restoration of Vietnam's MFN status, and may result in the need for specific legislation for this purpose. The mandatory continuation in force of the denial of MFN status to certain countries in section 401 applies to those

---

<sup>8</sup>Unless otherwise stated, further references to titles or sections of statutes in this part of the report are those to the Trade Act of 1974.

countries which did not have such status on the day of its enactment. With respect to Vietnam this would mean "any part ... which may be under Communist domination or control" on that date, in effect, North Vietnam. Section 401 also provides as the sole means for the restoration of MFN status to such countries the mechanism provided for in several other provisions of Title IV. Hence, although all Vietnam is denied MFN status by HTS General Headnote 3(b), its restoration under the existing legislation, technically, can be implemented only with respect to former North Vietnam.

Restoration of MFN status to all of Vietnam would appear to require the enactment of legislation of one of two types: either (1) specifically making the restoration provisions of Title IV applicable to all Vietnam, or, (2) less likely, granting outright to Vietnam regular (unconditional and unlimited) MFN status.<sup>9</sup> Either measure would have to be considered under regular legislative procedure.

In the event that the restoration takes place under Title IV, the procedure, applicable by law to nonmarket economy (NME) countries (of which Vietnam is one), requires compliance with the provisions of the freedom-of-emigration (usually referred to as Jackson-Vanik) amendment (sec. 402; 19 U.S.C. 2432), and the conclusion of a bilateral trade agreement and its implementation by enactment (sec. 405; 19 U.S.C. 2435). The requirements of the Jackson-Vanik amendment can be fulfilled by either: (1) a Presidential determination that Vietnam is in full compliance with the freedom-of-emigration requirements of the amendment, or (2) a waiver of such compliance by the President if he has determined that such waiver will substantially promote the objectives of the amendment. The determination of full compliance must be renewed semiannually and is subject, at year-end, to disapproval by a joint resolution, enacted under a special fast-track procedure (sec. 152; 19 U.S.C. 2192). Waivers of full compliance are issued under the waiver authority originally granted in 1975, and are automatically renewable, under specified conditions, every mid-year; annual renewals of the waiver authority also are subject to joint resolutions of disapproval (which may target individual countries), enacted by a fast-track procedure applicable only to such disapprovals (sec. 153; 19 U.S.C. 2193). The initial issuance of a waiver does not require congressional approval nor is it subject to congressional disapproval.

The trade agreement required by law must contain a reciprocal grant of the MFN status as well as several safeguard provisions. Its implementation must be approved by the enactment of a joint resolution (sec. 407(c)(1); 19 U.S.C. 2437(c)(1)), considered under the same fast-track procedure (but without being subject to the same detailed procedural conditions) as other trade agreements (e.g., the Uruguay Round agreements). By its own terms, such trade agreement remains in force for three-year periods but may be renewed virtually

---

<sup>9</sup>Both legislative approaches have been initiated to resolve a similar problem involving Cambodia: H.R. 4530 would extend to Cambodia regular MFN status, while H.R. 4656 and S. 2103 would make restoration of MFN status to Cambodia subject to Title IV procedure.

automatically. Such renewals are not subject to congressional approval or disapproval. It is doubtful, however, that a trade agreement would be concluded with Vietnam, unless diplomatic relations have first been established between the two countries.

Closely tied in with the provisions of section 401 are those of section 409 (19 U.S.C. 2439), which bar the extension of MFN status to an NME country which denies or places serious obstacles to a citizen's right to emigrate to join a close relative in the United States. Affecting the same countries as section 402, this provision does not apply to any country with respect to which a Jackson-Vanik waiver is in effect.

A related provision, contained in section 403 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2433) and potentially affecting Vietnam, denies the MFN status to any NME country which the President determines is not cooperating with the United States in accounting for, repatriating, or returning the remains of U.S. personnel missing in action in Southeast Asia, as long as such determination remains in force. Such determination, however, has not been made with respect to Vietnam.

The United States also accords MFN status as a reciprocal obligation under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade to the parties to the Agreement. In the event that Vietnam, which is not now a party to the GATT, were to accede to the GATT -- or to its institutional successor, the World Trade Organization (WTO), if it is established sometime in 1995 -- the United States could avoid its MFN obligation under the GATT or the WTO toward Vietnam by invoking, respectively, GATT Article XXXV or WTO Article XIII. Either provision, of which the latter is somewhat less restrictive than the former, allows reciprocal nonapplication of the GATT or, respectively, the Uruguay Round agreements between a current and a newly acceding party to the GATT or the WTO if either does not consent to it.<sup>10</sup>

### **Generalized System of Preferences**

Vietnam also is denied the status of "beneficiary developing country" (BDC) under the U.S. generalized system of preferences (GSP) (secs. 501 - 505; 19 U.S.C. 2641 - 2645), which permits a substantial array of products of countries designated as BDCs to be imported into the United States under certain conditions free of duty. Although South Vietnam had been so designated before the GSP went into effect, it was omitted from the list of designated BDCs contained in Executive Order 11888 (40 F.R. 55276), which initially implemented the GSP effective January 1, 1976. North Vietnam has never been designated a BDC. Hence, imports from Vietnam do not qualify for duty-free treatment under the GSP. The denial of the BDC status to Vietnam is evident

---

<sup>10</sup>For additional information on Vietnam's status with respect to the GATT, see section on Other international aspects, below.

from Vietnam's absence from the list of designated BDCs contained in General Note 3(c)(ii)(A) of the HTS.

Designation of a country as a BDC is subject to several conditions of which at least three would clearly appear to be relevant with respect to Vietnam (sec. 502(b); 19 U.S.C. 2462(b)). Designation is denied, generally, to a country that has not settled or is not in the process of settling expropriation or nationalization claims against it made by U.S. citizens; does not afford internationally recognized worker rights to its workers; or, in the case of a communist country, does not have MFN status with the United States, is not a party to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) and member of the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and is controlled by international communism. While compliance with the claims settlement, and worker rights conditions may be waived by the President if he determines that the designation of a country as a BDC is in the national economic interest of the United States, the communist-country restriction may not. The claims settlement provision, in any event, does not appear to present a serious obstacle to Vietnam's designation as a BDC, because relevant discussions have already taken place with Vietnam.<sup>11</sup>

As to the conditions applicable solely to communist countries, Vietnam is a member of the IMF and, arguably, could be considered as not being controlled by international communism, an aspect to be definitively determined at the time of the eventual designation. Vietnam has not acceded to the GATT nor has yet applied for accession; it has the status of an observer in the sessions of the Contracting Parties, and is applying for such status in the General Council.

### **U.S. Exports**

The United States controls commercial exports to foreign countries, primarily for national security and/or foreign policy reasons, under the authority of the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2401-2420). Regulations to control U.S. exports of general merchandise and technology (Export Administration Regulations; 15 C.F.R. 769-799.2) are promulgated and administered under statutory policies and guidelines by the Bureau of Export Administration of the Department of Commerce. The scope of controls applicable to exports to any country depends on the country group to which a country is assigned, where the degree of restrictiveness is reflected in the range of articles that require an individual "validated" license for each shipment (or group of related shipments) to a certain destination. Validated licenses are not required for exports that may take place under a general license, that is, a regulation which, in effect, gives an advance blanket permission for a specific type of export. The assignment of countries to their groups and the application of specific licensing requirements is done by the Bureau of Export Administration.

---

<sup>11</sup>For more detail on U.S. claims against Vietnam, see section on Other International Aspects.

President finds that the furnishing of such articles or services to a country or international organization would strengthen the security of the United States and promote world peace.

### **Exports from Foreign Countries**

Exports from foreign countries to Vietnam are to some extent affected by Transaction Control Regulations (31 C.F.R. 505), which, with some exceptions, prohibit a U.S. person to engage in any transaction in connection with the sale or purchase in any foreign country, and shipment to any country of the former Sino-Soviet bloc (or its successors), including Vietnam, of any merchandise included in the list of articles at one time subject to international controls of the now defunct Coordinating Committee for Multilateral Export Controls (COCOM), or prohibited by U.S. munitions or nuclear control provisions. This prohibition, originally promulgated in August 1954 and now maintained in force under the same authority and administered in the same way as Foreign Assets Control Regulations (see section on Blocked Assets), was applied to North Vietnam on February 6, 1965 (30 F.R. 1284) and to South Vietnam on April 20, 1976 (41 F.R. 16556). While shipments originating in 23 Western countries have been excepted from this prohibition, this exception does not apply to shipments to Vietnam (and North Korea). These provisions are administered and can be modified by the Office of Foreign Assets Control.

### **Export Financing**

Financing of exports to Vietnam through export credits is restricted or affected in several ways. Participation in any U.S. Government program that extends export credits or export credit guarantees or insurance is prohibited to any nonmarket economy country — hence also to Vietnam — unless the freedom-of-emigration requirements of the Jackson-Vanik amendment are fulfilled. The principal programs affected by this restriction are export credits and credit guarantees or insurance of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and export credits of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Moreover, the Export-Import Bank of the United States is specifically prohibited by its own organic law (sec. 2(b)(2), Export-Import Bank Act of 1945; 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(2)) from engaging in any type of credit transaction (credit, credit guarantee or insurance) for the benefit of any "Marxist-Leninist" country, among them the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, unless the President determines that such transactions are in the national interest. A separate determination is needed for any Eximbank loan of \$50 million or more. No determination has been made with respect to Vietnam.

The prohibition of Vietnam's access to U.S. Government export credits and export credit guarantees or insurance contained in the Jackson-Vanik amendment can be removed by the President in either of the two ways provided for in that amendment for compliance with its requirements (Presidential

determination of full compliance, or a waiver) for the restoration of the MFN status (see p. 5). Although functionally related, restoration of a country's access to U.S. Government financial facilities is not contingent on the country's having been granted MFN status,<sup>13</sup> nor is it subject to congressional approval. The removal of this prohibition, however, would not affect the specific prohibition of such transactions contained in the Export-Import Bank Act itself. Extension of Export-Import Bank credits and credit guarantees and insurance to Vietnam, now unavailable to Vietnam as one of the Marxist-Leninist countries under 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(2), could be authorized if the President determined (1) that Vietnam has ceased to be a Marxist-Leninist country, or (2) that such transactions are in the national interest.

### **Private Foreign Investment**

While there are, after the lifting of the embargo, no restrictions on U.S. private investment in Vietnam, such investment is, nevertheless, somewhat discouraged by two provisions affecting the investors' ability to use the facilities of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC), a U.S. Government agency insuring or guaranteeing American private investments in developing countries. One is the prohibition, contained in the Jackson-Vanik amendment, of investment guarantees for investments in nonmarket economy countries that do not comply with the requirements of that amendment<sup>14</sup> (see the preceding paragraph for the implications of the Jackson-Vanik amendment); the other consists of restrictions placed on OPIC operations in communist countries by virtue of OPIC legislation being part of foreign assistance legislation (see the Foreign Assistance section for a discussion of OPIC activities).

### **Other International Aspects**

Apart from its implications for the Hickenlooper amendment (see section on Foreign Assistance, below) and GSP eligibility (see section on the generalized system of preferences, above), the issue of unsettled claims by U.S. citizens and firms against Vietnam for their property located in Vietnam that was expropriated by the Vietnamese government may pose a practical obstacle to normal economic relations. The situation, however, is in the process of being resolved. Under an amendment to the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, added as its Title VII (22 U.S.C. 1645-1645o) by P.L. 96-606 (December 28, 1980), the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission received and adjudicated the

---

<sup>13</sup>As a past example: a Jackson-Vanik waiver was issued on December 29, 1990 (E.O. 12740, 56 F.R. 355) for the then still existing Soviet Union, to a substantial extent in order to allow Soviet Union access to U.S. export credit facilities, but the Soviet Union was dissolved (in December 1991) before the procedure for extending the MFN status to it could be completed.

<sup>14</sup>The implications of the Jackson-Vanik amendment for OPIC operations are the same as for Eximbank's operations, mentioned in the preceding paragraph.

validity of claims by U.S. nationals against Vietnam arising from losses due to nationalization or other expropriations of properties in Vietnam on or after April 29, 1975. Of the claims against Vietnam filed with the U.S. Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, 342 have been denied, while awards have been adjudicated in 192 cases with an aggregate value of the principal of about \$99.5 million. While the law sets out the procedure for the payment of claim awards, it authorizes no appropriation of funds for this purpose. The awards would be paid from the sums realized under the claims settlement agreement that would need to be concluded between the United States and Vietnam and is at present the subject of bilateral exploration.

Lack of diplomatic relations between the United States and Vietnam also prevents or hampers the negotiation and conclusion of any bilateral economic agreements (e.g., trade, investment guaranty) between the two countries. Vietnam's nonparticipation in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and the Multifiber Arrangement prevents Vietnam from enjoying the benefits that participants in those compacts are obligated to extend (with exceptions) to each other.

Vietnam's accession to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) (if and when the Uruguay Round agreements enter into force, the accession would presumably have to be to the World Trade Organization) would have to be approved by the GATT Council (or WTO Ministerial Conference) after Vietnam's application (which thus far has not been made) and a detailed examination of Vietnam's trade regime and recommendation by a working party, a procedure usually taking several years. If Vietnam acceded to the GATT or the WTO, the United States could avoid its obligations under the respective agreement (e.g., the granting of the MFN treatment) toward Vietnam by taking recourse to GATT Article XXXV (or Article XIII of the WTO Agreement), which allows nonapplication of the Agreement between two parties if at the time one of them accedes to the Agreement either party does not consent to such application.

While Vietnam is not a party to the Multifiber Arrangement (MFA), which provides ground rules for the international trade in textiles, it could become one on terms to be agreed between it and the countries participating in the MFA. But even if it did not, the United States could conclude with it a bilateral textile trade agreement under the provisions of section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1854), assuming that there are no other obstacles to the conclusion of such agreement.

**WHAT STEPS COULD THE UNITED STATES TAKE  
IF IT WERE TO IMPLEMENT OTHER  
U.S. ECONOMIC SUPPORT PROGRAMS FOR VIETNAM?**

The U.S. Government administers such economic support programs as foreign assistance -- both economic and military -- the Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC), the Trade and Development Agency (TDA), and P.L. 480 food assistance, as well as contributes to international financial institutions and other multilateral aid agencies. Over the past few years, the United States has taken limited steps to extend aid to Vietnam, but most restrictions prohibiting such assistance remain in place.<sup>15</sup> Congress, however, is nearing completion of legislation (H.R. 4426, Foreign Operations Appropriations, 1995) that would remove two legal impediments to extending bilateral assistance to Vietnam. If enacted and signed into law, as expected, the President would gain substantial discretionary authority to initiate direct aid to Hanoi, although U.S. assistance would still be subject to general foreign aid conditions that apply to all countries. If the United States were to fully normalize relations with Hanoi, it could establish some, all, or none of the these economic support programs with the Vietnamese Government. The normalization of relations with Vietnam does not require the U.S. Government to implement any of these programs. The United States has diplomatic relations with many countries that do not receive any assistance through these programs.

**Bilateral Foreign Assistance**

Several impediments have stood in the way of a U.S. bilateral foreign aid program in Vietnam. Prohibitions on foreign economic and military assistance to Vietnam exist in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (P.L. 87-195), the Department of State Appropriations Authorization Act of 1973 (P.L. 93-126), the Arms Export Control Act (P.L. 90-629), and in the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act, 1994 (P.L. 103-87).<sup>16</sup> The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961,

---

<sup>15</sup> The U.S. Agency for International Development has provided assistance, channelled through non-governmental organizations operating in Vietnam, under two humanitarian programs: the War Victims Fund and the Displaced Children and Orphans Fund. Legal authorities for both programs allow such assistance "notwithstanding" other legislative prohibitions that might exist.

<sup>16</sup> The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 authorizes such programs as development assistance, the Economic Support Fund (ESF), the grant Military Assistance Program (MAP), the International Military Education and Training (IMET) program, international narcotics control assistance, disaster assistance, and anti-terrorism training. The Arms Export Control Act authorizes programs to provide grants and credits for military sales to foreign countries under the Foreign Military Sales Financing (FMS) program. Annual or biennial State Department authorization acts do not normally authorize foreign aid programs. They can, however, as in the case of the 1973 statute, include limitations and prohibitions on U.S. assistance. The Foreign Operations Appropriations Act

the 1973 State Department Act, and the Arms Export Control Act are permanent laws. The Foreign Operations Appropriations Act, however, is a temporary statute and applies only to programs in FY1994. In the case of provisions cited below that affect Vietnam, most have been continued for a number of years in the annual appropriation measures. Although some of these are likely to be reenacted for FY1995, removal of two prohibitions regarding aid to Vietnam are expected to be approved by Congress.

Listed below are the general provisions that prohibit bilateral U.S. foreign assistance to Vietnam.

- Section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 prohibits the United States from providing assistance to any communist country, unless the President determines that: (A) such assistance is vital to the security of the United States; (B) the recipient country is not controlled by the international communist conspiracy; and (C) such assistance will further promote the independence of the recipient country from international communism. Alternatively, the President may exempt a country from this restriction if he determines and reports to Congress that such an exemption would be important to the national interest of the United States. Vietnam is on the list of communist countries. Under this provision, assistance to Vietnam could occur with Presidential certification.
- The Hickenlooper Amendment -- section 620(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 -- requires the President to suspend assistance to the government of any country that has nationalized or expropriated or seized ownership or control of property owned by any U.S. citizen or by any corporation, partnership, or association not less than 50 percent beneficially owned by U.S. citizens. Such suspension shall continue until the President is satisfied that appropriate steps are being taken to resolve the situation. The provisions of this subsection shall not be waived with respect to any country unless the President determines and certifies to Congress that such a waiver is important to the national interests of the United States. Although Vietnam is among those countries that have expropriated U.S.-owned property, the executive branch has not chosen to invoke the Hickenlooper Amendment against Vietnam. Reportedly, the U.S. and Vietnam have discussed and agreed in principle on the approximate \$230 million in private American claims against Hanoi.
- The Brooke Amendment -- section 512 of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act, 1994 -- prohibits the United States from expending funds appropriated by that Act to provide assistance to any country that is in default during a period in excess of one calendar year in payment to the United States of principal or interest on any U.S. foreign assistance loan. Since May 29, 1976, Vietnam has been in violation of the Brooke

---

provides annual funding for foreign aid programs authorized by these and other acts.

Amendment. Pursuant to this provision, if Vietnam does not repay its debt, assistance to Vietnam could occur only through legislative action.

- Section 620(q) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 includes a provision similar to the Brooke Amendment. Section 620(q) prohibits any assistance to a country that is in default during a period of six months in payment to the United States of principal or interest on any U.S. foreign assistance loan, unless the President determines that assistance to such country is in the national interest and notifies Congress of such determination. Vietnam has been held in violation of this provision since November 29, 1975. Under Section 620(q), assistance to Vietnam could occur with presidential certification.
- Section 507 of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act, 1994 prohibits the United States from expending funds appropriated by this Act to provide any direct assistance or reparations to a series of countries. Vietnam is among those countries. For FY1995, however, a House and Senate conference committee has recommended removing Vietnam from this list of countries. Congress is expected to pass the bill (H.R. 4426) in early August.
- Section 13 of the Department of State Appropriation Authorization Act of 1973 prohibits the use of any appropriated funds, notwithstanding any other law, for providing direct or indirect assistance to North Vietnam, unless specifically authorized by Congress. The Administration has interpreted the reference to North Vietnam to apply to all of Vietnam. Initiation of aid to Vietnam could come only after repeal of section 13. The Executive branch has requested its repeal on several occasions -- and Congress is in the final stages of enacting legislation (H.R. 4426) that would delete section 13.

Beyond the options noted above to remove these prohibitions through legislative action or specific waivers, the President could use his special authority under section 614 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2364). The section 614 authority permits the broad waiver of most statutory prohibitions on foreign assistance and allows the President to provide assistance -- up to certain limits -- to a country, notwithstanding any other provision of the Act and other foreign policy acts, when the President determines that to do so is important to the security interest of the United States, and so notifies Congress in writing. The section 614 authority effectively gives the President the power to override prohibitions in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, the Arms Export Control Act, and a range of laws authorizing and appropriating funds for U.S. foreign policy.

Because of the far-reaching nature of the section 614 authority, the President consults with, and provides a written policy justification to, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and the House and Senate Appropriations Subcommittees on Foreign Operations prior to exercising his authority. In practice, past Presidents have used the authority sparingly and with close consultation with Congress.

## Other Assistance and Financial Programs

Beyond these general prohibitions, listed below are prohibitions related to specific U.S. foreign assistance and financial programs.

***Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC):*** The purpose of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC) is to provide political risk insurance for U.S. private capital investment in economic development activities in developing countries.

The authorizing legislation for OPIC is within the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. In most cases, the general prohibitions discussed above in the bilateral foreign assistance section would also apply to assistance provided through OPIC. Section 239(f) of the Act, however, might provide a model for enabling OPIC activities in Vietnam. Section 239(f) states that: "Except for the provisions of this title (Part I, Chapter 2, Title IV), no other provision of this or any other law shall be construed to prohibit the operation in Yugoslavia, Poland, Hungary, or any other East European country, or the People's Republic of China of the programs authorized by this title, if the President determines that the operation of such program in such country is important to the national interest." Establishing a similar provision for Vietnam could occur only through legislative action.

The President would also have to remove, with appropriate waivers or determinations, the prohibitions on U.S. Government investment guarantees contained in the Jackson-Vanik amendment (removable by the same procedure that applies to the restoration of the access to export credit facilities under the same amendment).

***Trade and Development Agency (TDA):*** The purpose of the Trade and Development Agency (TDA) is to promote U.S. business involvement in infrastructure and industrial projects in developing countries. TDA funds feasibility studies, consultancies, and training activities carried out by American firms that both enhance U.S. export opportunities and contribute to economic growth in the developing world.

The authorizing legislation for TDA is also within the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. The Secretary of State has the authority to determine which countries are "friendly," for purposes of this program. If the Secretary chose to he could make such a determination for Vietnam.

***P.L. 480 Food Assistance:*** The Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 ("PL 480") (P.L. 83-480) authorizes the transfer, on both a grant and loan basis, of U.S. surplus agricultural commodities to developing and least developed countries facing foreign exchange shortages, difficulties in purchasing food needs through commercial channels, food deficits and high levels of malnutrition, and emergency food requirements. Emergency aid needs may be extended notwithstanding any other limitation or prohibition. So long as Vietnam meets these requirements, presumably it could be declared eligible

for U.S. food assistance, although no programs are planned at the present time. Congress repealed in 1990 an explicit prohibition on P.L. 480 assistance to Vietnam, as well as general exclusions for communist countries.

### **Multilateral Aid**

Normalization of diplomatic relations would not necessarily directly affect the U.S. position on multilateral aid to Vietnam. In other words, there is no statutory mandate that requires the United States to vote against multilateral loans to, or contribute to organizations assisting, countries with which we have no diplomatic relations; nor is the United States required to support multilateral assistance to countries with which we have reestablished relations. However, by virtue of its membership in and contributions to various international institutions for economic assistance and stabilization, the United States is faced with the situation of providing assistance indirectly to communist countries and other nations with which problems exist that also are members.

During the past year, the United States has taken steps that have helped remove obstacles to renewed multilateral lending to Vietnam. Nevertheless, some legal and policy restrictions remain that limit full U.S. support of international institution loans to Hanoi. Since the late 1970s until mid-1973, the United States worked to oppose lending to Vietnam by multilateral development banks (MDBs) and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). Following termination of lending by 1978 of these international financial institutions, Vietnam fell into arrears in its loan repayments to the Asian Development Bank (ADB) and the IMF, making it ineligible for further loans. In early 1993, France and Japan proposed to loan Vietnam sufficient funds to clear the ADB and IMF arrears and pave the way for renewed multilateral lending. On July 2, 1993, President Clinton announced that the United States would not oppose other countries from assisting Vietnam clear its arrears.

This action by the President, however, did not on its own result in subsequent U.S. support for new lending by international institutions. In the case of the International Monetary Fund (IMF),<sup>17</sup> section 43 of the Bretton Woods Agreement Act (22 U.S.C. 286aa) -- commonly referred to as the "Gramm Amendment" -- requires the Secretary of the Treasury to instruct the U.S. Executive Director of the IMF to "actively oppose" the use of any IMF credit facility by a "Communist dictatorship" (not further defined, but presumably including Vietnam) unless the Secretary of the Treasury, upon request, at least 21 days before the IMF vote on approving such use, certifies that the loan:

- 1) provides the basis for correcting the balance of payments difficulties and restoring a sustainable balance of payments position;

---

<sup>17</sup> The IMF Board of Governors replaced the Republic of Vietnam (South Vietnam) with the Socialist Republic of Vietnam effective September 15, 1976.

2) would reduce the severe constraints on labor and capital mobility or other highly inefficient labor and capital supply rigidities and advances market-oriented forces in that country; and

3) is in the best economic interest of the majority of people in that country.

The Administration has not considered utilizing this certification procedure. In October 1993, the United States did not support (by abstaining) two IMF loans to Vietnam. Should the U.S. wish to support future IMF lending to Vietnam, Congress would have to repeal the Gramm amendment or the Administration would have to issue the required certification.

In the case of the MDBs, current U.S. policy calls on the U.S. Executive Director to each of the multilateral lending institutions to abstain on loans to Vietnam, except for projects supporting basic human needs (BHN) of the Vietnamese people. Of the 10 loans issued since October 1993 by the World Bank's International Development Association (IDA) and the Asian Development Bank, the United States has supported five that maintained a BHN-character, including projects for primary education, agricultural rehabilitation, irrigation and flood projection, and water supply rehabilitation. The Administration states that U.S. votes on future MDB loans to Vietnam will be governed by the economic and technical merits of the proposed project.

In order to take these limited steps in support of MDB lending to Vietnam, the Administration has had to waive a prohibition on "indirect" U.S. aid to selected countries, including Vietnam. Section 523 of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act, 1994 (P.L. 103-87) prohibits any indirect U.S. assistance or reparations to a series of countries, including Vietnam, unless the President certifies that withholding these funds would be contrary to the national interest. The President most recently made this certification through Presidential Determination No. 94-4 of November 19, 1993, 58 F.R. 63519. The prohibition on "indirect assistance" refers to multilateral aid to these countries and effectively prohibits U.S. contributions to any banks or organizations providing funds to these countries, absent a Presidential determination. For FY 1995, however, a House and Senate conference committee has recommended removing Vietnam from this list of countries. Congress is expected to pass the bill (H.R. 4425) in early August.

Current U.S. law can also potentially impact U.S. contributions to international organizations that assist Vietnam. Section 516 of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act, 1994, states that at the discretion of the President, the U.S. may withhold a share of its voluntary contribution to various U.N. and other international organizations in proportion to the amount of aid such organizations might have provided to communist countries listed under Section 620(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. See the discussion on section 620(f) above for details on how the President could remove Vietnam from the section 620(f) list.

## WHAT PROCEDURES DID THE U.S. FOLLOW IN NORMALIZING RELATIONS WITH THE USSR AND THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA?

There have been two major instances in which the U.S. Government normalized relations with foreign governments several years after their actual ascendancy to power. In 1933 -- 16 years after the Bolshevik Revolution -- the United States normalized relations with the Soviet Union. In 1979, the United States normalized relations with the People's Republic of China -- 30 years after the Communist victory over the Nationalist forces in 1949. These cases provide some background on how the United States has proceeded in normalizing relations with other countries and may highlight possible implications if the United States were to follow the same path with the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

### **Soviet Union (USSR)<sup>18</sup>**

In 1917, President Woodrow Wilson responded to the Bolshevik Revolution by refusing to recognize the new Soviet government. Although the Soviet Union expressed interest in normalizing relations with the United States in the years following the Bolshevik Revolution, U.S. hostility towards communism, in general, and the Soviet government, in particular, precluded the United States from recognizing the Soviet government.

In the early 1930s, however, the United States found it increasingly difficult to ignore the permanence of the Soviet regime as well as the potential economic and diplomatic benefits of recognition. Despite the lack of formal relations between the governments, commercial ties between the countries increased somewhat in the early 1930s. In addition, U.S. concerns over the growing power of Japan in Asia and of Nazi Germany in Europe caused the United States to reconsider its stand on recognition of the Soviet Union -- especially since some officials felt that the Soviets might offer a strategic counterbalance to Japanese and German expansionism.

President Franklin Roosevelt was the key U.S. actor in the normalization process with the Soviet Union. As a first step, in May 1933, President Roosevelt included Soviet President Mikhail Kalinin among the European leaders he called upon to attend the London Economic Conference. In the spring and summer of 1933, the President also sent U.S. envoys to speak unofficially with Soviet officials on the issue of normalization. At the same time that he was taking these actions, the President worked to build public and congressional support for recognition. There was a growing consensus within the executive branch and Congress that normalization should be contingent upon prior Soviet

---

<sup>18</sup> The primary source for the following information is: Maddux, Thomas R. *Years of Estrangement: American Relations with the Soviet Union, 1933-1941*. (Tallahassee, FL: University Presses of Florida, 1980).