technology or manufacturing companies locating or relocating to the United States.

FLEXIBILITY IN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT FUNDING OF PROJECTS

Revolving Loan Funds and Construction Projects

Provides EDA grant recipients with authority (pursuant to EDA approval) to redirect funds for new projects that meet EDA criteria.

BRAC- and Department of Defense-Impacted Communities

Authorizes EDA to consider ''mission growth'' of Defense Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC) or Department of Defense-impacted communities as a criterion for assistance, and allows EDA to consider economic opportunities and not simply economic injury as a basis for assistance to these communities.

Declining Tax Revenue Communities

Authorizes EDA to consider communities' declining tax revenues as the basis for increased Federal share of project costs or an eligibility determination, such as substantial home foreclosure rates creating economic conditions allowing grant assistance to particular communities or regions.

DEFINED ROLE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DISTRICTS AND INCENTIVES FOR REGIONAL PLANNING

Role of EDDs

Clearly defines the responsibilities of an EDD in statute to ensure that local communities have an established role in developing economic development projects.

Multi-Regional Planning and Incentives

Allows EDDs to consolidate without the current penalty of reduced EDD funding.

IN CELEBRATION OF FIFTEEN YEARS OF U.S.-VIETNAM DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS

HON. ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 28, 2010

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Madam Speaker, I rise today in celebration of 15 years of U.S.-Vietnam diplomatic relations. On July 14, 2010, I joined former President Bill Clinton, Senator JOHN KERRY and Senator JOHN MCCAIN in offering remarks at an event hosted by Ambassador of Vietnam Le Cong Phung and Assistant Secretary of State Kurt Campbell in honor of this occasion.

While time will not permit me to elaborate about the competing interests of ridding the world of colonialism versus communism and America's decision to eventually intervene in Vietnam, the majority of the American people did not know of the complexities facing the countries of the Asia region.

Why, for example, did Ho Chi Minh and so many other Asian leaders become followers of socialist, Marxist, and communist ideologies? One obvious reason is that the worst examples of those who advocated freedom and democracy were those European countries that came and colonized so many of these Asian nations, including Vietnam.

For some 100 years, Vietnam was colonized and exploited by the French and, during President Dwight Eisenhower's Administration, the French government requested American military assistance to fight the Vietnamese who, under the leadership of Ho Chi Minh, were struggling for independence from French colonial rule. President Eisenhower refused to help the French in Vietnam for the simple reason that French exploitation and colonial policies in the region went against the ideals upon which America was built.

Subsequently, in 1954, long before American intervention in Vietnam, Ho Chi Minh led his people to fight against French colonialism for which the famous battle of Dienbienphu was fought to liberate his country. While Ho Chi Minh's early intent was to get rid of 100 years of French colonialism and establish a better life for his own people, regrettably when the U.S. entered the fray in 1955 and by the time the Nixon administration withdrew U.S. troops forces in 1973, millions of U.S. troops had served in Vietnam, with more than 58,000 killed.

Three to four million Vietnamese were also killed, as were 1.5 to 2 million Laotians and Cambodians. For what, we ask? As a result of this horrific war, U.S.-Vietnam diplomatic and economic relations were virtually non-existent for more than 20 years following North Vietnam's victory in 1975—until President Bill Clinton announced the formal normalization of diplomatic relations with Vietnam on July 11, 1995.

Prior to this, President Clinton announced the end of the U.S. trade embargo in 1994 and, 2 months later, the U.S. Congress passed the Foreign Relations Authorization Act which contained a Sense of the Senate express the chamber's support for the normalization of relations with Vietnam.

In 1997, President Clinton appointed the first post-war ambassador to Vietnam and signed the landmark U.S.-Vietnam bilateral trade agreement, BTA, in 2000. Vietnam did its part, too, improving cooperation on POW/MIA and refugee issues and moving forward on its ongoing reform efforts.

In November 2000, President Clinton visited Vietnam, the first trip by a U.S. President since Richard Nixon went to Saigon in 1969. Tonight, we applaud former President Clinton for his visionary leadership which has led to this moment. I also commend Ambassador Le Cong Phung for the tremendous service he has rendered to his country.

Today, economic ties are the most mature aspect of our bilateral relationship with trade flows exceeding $15 billion in 2009, more than ten times the level in 2001. But we can do better, and one area that must be addressed is our forgotten responsibility to the victims of Agent Orange because part of normalizing relations means coming to terms with our past.

As Chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Asia, the Pacific and the Global Environment, I have held a series of hearing about Agent Orange and our need to clean up the mess we left behind.

From 1961 to 1971, the U.S. military sprayed more than 11 million gallons of Agent Orange in Vietnam. Agent Orange was manufactured under Department of Defense, DOD, contracts by several companies including Dow Chemical and Monsanto. Dioxin, a toxic contaminant known to be one of the deadliest chemicals made by man, was an unwanted byproduct and is thought to be responsible for most of the medical problems associated with exposure to Agent Orange.

According to Hatfield Consultants, the U.S. Department of Defense as well as Dow Chemical and Monsanto knew as early as 1967 of the potential long-term health risks, and sought to ''censor'' relevant news reports, ''fearing a negative backlash from government and the public.''

More than 30 years later, while research clearly shows that Agent Orange was much more hazardous than anyone would admit, U.S. and Vietnamese victims have not been adequately compensated, and Vietnam has not been cleaned-up. Ironically, Dow is now doing business in Vietnam but refuses to help the victims of Agent Orange, and this is not right.

In 2007, after 40 years, I, too, returned to Vietnam and, at a closing dinner hosted by the National Assembly of Ho Chi Minh City, I had long discussions with members of their Foreign Affairs Committee who had also served in the Vietnam War. Although we were once enemies, we embraced each other as friends who share the same hopes and dreams for our families and countries, and this is how it should be but full normalization will not be achieved until the Agent Orange issue is addressed. It is my sincere hope that we will come together and agree on a way to make this matter right.

Once more, I congratulate the government and people of Vietnam and applaud former President Bill Clinton, President George W. Bush, President George H.W. Bush, President Ronald Reagan, President Barack Obama and Secretary of State Hillary Clinton for all they have done to get us where we are today.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

SPEECH OF

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 27, 2010

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, I have grave concerns about the legislation before the House to provide $37.1 billion for ongoing military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. Our total war spending in Iraq and Afghanistan including the funding provided by this bill will exceed $1 trillion. Yet this spending comes without a viable exit strategy for the conflict in Afghanistan which is the longest war in our nation's history.

The recent publication of tens of thousands of leaked field reports on Afghanistan confirm what we already know: Our continued troop presence is alienating the local population, corruption is rampant in the Afghan government, the Taliban population is stronger than ever, and our Pakistani partners are unreliable at best.

Afghanistan is known as the graveyard of empires for a reason. No one since Ghengis Khan—not Alexander the Great, not the Persians, not the Ottomans, not the British, nor the Soviets—has been able to succeed in this troubled country. Some have said the definition of insanity is continuing to do the same thing over and over again and hoping for a different result. We should learn from those who came before us.

Madam Speaker, without an exit strategy, approving billions more of hard-earned taxpayer dollars for the war in Afghanistan is difficult enough to justify. But this cost pales in comparison to the loss of American lives. June