

Rahall Shays Thornberry  
 Ramstad Sherman Thune  
 Rangel Sherwood Thurman  
 Regula Shimkus Tiahrt  
 Reyes Shows Toomey  
 Reynolds Shuster Towns  
 Riley Simpson Traficant  
 Rivers Sisisky Turner  
 Rodriguez Skeen Udall (CO)  
 Roemer Skelton Udall (NM)  
 Rogan Slaughter Upton  
 Rogers Smith (MI) Velazquez  
 Rohrabacher Smith (NJ) Vislosky  
 Ros-Lehtinen Smith (TX) Vitter  
 Rothman Snyder Walden  
 Roukema Souder Walsh  
 Roybal-Allard Spence Wamp  
 Royce Spratt Watkins  
 Rush Stabenow Watt (NC)  
 Ryan (WI) Stearns Watts (OK)  
 Ryan (KS) Stenholm Waxman  
 Sabo Strickland Weiner  
 Salmon Stump Weldon (FL)  
 Sanchez Stupak Weldon (PA)  
 Sanders Sununu Weller  
 Sandlin Sweeney Wexler  
 Sawyer Talent Weygand  
 Saxton Tancredo Whitfield  
 Scarborough Tanner Wicker  
 Schaffer Tauscher Wilson  
 Schakowsky Tauzin Wise  
 Scott Taylor (MS) Wolf  
 Sensenbrenner Taylor (NC) Woolsey  
 Serrano Terry Wu  
 Sessions Thomas Wynn  
 Shadegg Thompson (CA)  
 Shaw Thompson (MS)

NAYS—3

Blunt Paul Sanford

NOT VOTING—18

Abercrombie Gilman Stark  
 Baker Granger Tierney  
 Barton Jenkins Vento  
 Cubin McIntosh Waters  
 Engel Meek (FL) Young (AK)  
 Ewing Smith (WA) Young (FL)

b 1049

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

f

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device may be taken on this additional motion to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

f

ILLEGAL PORNOGRAPHY PROSECUTION ACT OF 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 4710.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4710, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 412, nays 4, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 440]  
 YEAS—412  
 Abercrombie DeMint Johnson, Sam  
 Ackerman Deutsch Jones (NC)  
 Aderholt Diaz-Balart Jones (OH)  
 Allen Dickey Kanjorski  
 Andrews Dicks Kaptur  
 Archer Dingell Kasich  
 Armeey Dixon Kelly  
 Baca Doggett Kennedy  
 Bachus Dooley Kildee  
 Baird Doolittle Kilpatrick  
 Baker Doyle Kind (WI)  
 Baldacci Dreier King (NY)  
 Baldwin Duncan Kingston  
 Ballenger Dunn Kleczka  
 Barcia Edwards Klink  
 Barr Ehlers Knollenberg  
 Barrett (NE) Ehrlich Kolbe  
 Barrett (WI) Emerson Kucinich  
 Bartlett Engel Kuykendall  
 Bass English LaFalce  
 Bateman Eshoo LaHood  
 Becerra Etheridge Lampson  
 Bentsen Evans Lantos  
 Bereuter Everett Largent  
 Berkley Farr Larson  
 Berman Fattah Latham  
 Berry Filner LaTourette  
 Biggert Fletcher Lazio  
 Bilbray Foley Leach  
 Bilirakis Forbes Lee  
 Bishop Ford Levin  
 Blagojevich Fossella Lewis (CA)  
 Bliley Fowler Lewis (GA)  
 Blumenauer Frank (MA) Lewis (KY)  
 Blunt Franks (NJ) Linder  
 Boehlert Frelinghuysen Lipinski  
 Boehner Frost LoBiondo  
 Bonilla Gallegly Lofgren  
 Bonior Ganske Lowey  
 Bono Gejdenson Lucas (KY)  
 Borski Gekas Lucas (OK)  
 Boswell Gephardt Luther  
 Boucher Gibbons Maloney (CT)  
 Boyd Gilchrest Maloney (NY)  
 Brady (PA) Gillmor Manzullo  
 Brady (TX) Gonzalez Markey  
 Brown (FL) Goode Martinec  
 Brown (OH) Goodlatte Mascara  
 Bryant Goodling Matsui  
 Burr Gordon McCarthy (MO)  
 Burton Goss McCarthy (NY)  
 Buyer Graham McCollum  
 Callahan Green (TX) McCrery  
 Calvert Green (WI) McDermott  
 Camp Greenwood McGovern  
 Campbell Gutierrez McGovern  
 Canady Gutknecht McIntyre  
 Cannon Hall (OH) McIntyre  
 Capps Hall (TX) McKeon  
 Capuano Hansen McKinney  
 Cardin Hastings (FL) McNulty  
 Carson Hastings (WA) Meehan  
 Castle Hayes Meeks (NY)  
 Chabot Hayworth Menendez  
 Chambliss Hefley Metcalf  
 Chenoweth-Hage Herger Mica  
 Clay Hill (IN) Millender  
 Clayton Hill (MT) McDonald  
 Clement Hilleary Miller (FL)  
 Clyburn Hilliard Miller, Gary  
 Coble Hinchey Miller, George  
 Coburn Hinojosa Minge  
 Collins Hobson Mink  
 Combest Hoefl Moakley  
 Condit Hoekstra Mollohan  
 Conyers Holden Moore  
 Cook Holt Moran (KS)  
 Cooksey Hooley Morella  
 Costello Horn Murtha  
 Cox Hostettler Myrick  
 Coyne Houghton Napolitano  
 Cramer Hoyer Nethercutt  
 Crane Hulshof Northrup  
 Crowley Hunter Norwood  
 Cummings Hutchinson Nussle  
 Cunningham Hyde Oberstar  
 Danner Inslee Obey  
 Davis (FL) Isakson Olver  
 Davis (IL) Istook Ortiz  
 Davis (VA) Jackson (IL) Qse  
 Deal Jackson-Lee Ose  
 DeFazio (TX) Owens  
 DeGette Jefferson Oxley  
 Delahunt John Packard  
 DeLauro Johnson (CT) Pallone  
 DeLay Johnson, E.B. Pascrell  
 Pastor

Payne Sanders Tauscher  
 Pease Sandlin Tauzin  
 Pelosi Sanford Taylor (MS)  
 Peterson (MN) Sawyer Taylor (NC)  
 Peterson (PA) Saxton Terry  
 Petri Scarborough Thomas  
 Phelps Schaffer Thompson (CA)  
 Pickering Schakowsky Thompson (MS)  
 Pickett Sensenbrenner Thornberry  
 Pitts Serrano Thune  
 Pombo Sessions Thurman  
 Pomeroy Shadegg Tiahrt  
 Porter Shaw Toomey  
 Portman Shays Towns  
 Price (NC) Sherman Traficant  
 Pryce (OH) Sherwood Turner  
 Quinn Shimkus Udall (CO)  
 Radanovich Shows Udall (NM)  
 Rahall Shuster Upton  
 Ramstad Simpson Velazquez  
 Rangel Sisisky Vislosky  
 Regula Skeen Vitter  
 Reyes Skelton Walden  
 Reynolds Slaughter Walsh  
 Riley Smith (MI) Wamp  
 Rivers Smith (NJ) Watkins  
 Rodriguez Smith (TX) Watt (NC)  
 Roemer Snyder Watts (OK)  
 Rogan Souder Waxman  
 Rogers Spence Weiner  
 Rohrabacher Spratt Weldon (FL)  
 Ros-Lehtinen Stabenow Weldon (PA)  
 Rothman Stearns Weller  
 Roukema Stenholm Wexler  
 Roybal-Allard Strickland Weygand  
 Royce Stump Whitfield  
 Rush Stupak Wicker  
 Ryan (WI) Sununu Wilson  
 Ryan (KS) Sweeney Wise  
 Sabo Talent Wolf  
 Salmon Tancredo Woolsey  
 Sanchez Tanner Wu

NAYS—4

Moran (VA) Paul  
 Nadler Scott

NOT VOTING—18

Barton McIntosh Tierney  
 Cubin Meek (FL) Vento  
 Ewing Neal Waters  
 Gilman Ney Wynn  
 Granger Smith (WA) Young (AK)  
 Jenkins Stark Young (FL)

b 1057

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 440, final passage on H.R. 4710, Illegal Pornography Prosecution Act, I was unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

f

DISAPPROVING EXTENSION OF MOST FAVORED NATION TRADING STATUS TO VIETNAM

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the previous order of the House, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 99) disapproving the extension of the waiver authority contained in section 402(c) of the Trade Act of 1974 with respect to Vietnam, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of House Joint Resolution 99 is as follows:

H.J. RES. 99

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress does not

approve the extension of the authority contained in section 402(c) of the Trade Act of 1974 recommended by the President to Congress on June 2, 2000, with respect to Vietnam.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Monday, July 24, 2000, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) and a Member in support of the joint resolution each will control 30 minutes.

Is there a Member in support of the joint resolution?

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in support of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. McNULTY) will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE).

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes of my time to my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), and I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to yield further blocks of time.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 99.

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

There was no objection.

b 1100

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 99 and in support of Vietnam's Jackson-Vanik waiver. Over the past decade, the United States has taken gradual steps to normalize our bilateral relations with Vietnam. This process has borne tangible results on the full range of issues on our bilateral agenda including increased accounting of our missing in action, MIAs; substantial progress on remaining immigration cases; and increased trade and investment opportunities for U.S. firms and workers.

The paramount issue in our bilateral relationship with Vietnam remains the fullest possible accounting of MIAs. Since 1993, 288 sets of remains of U.S. servicemen have been repatriated and fate has been determined for all but 41 of 196 persons associated with last known-alive cases.

Future progress in terms of the ability of U.S. personnel to conduct excavations, interview eye witnesses and examine archival items is dependent upon continued cooperation by the Vietnamese.

On immigration, the central issue to the Jackson-Vanik waiver, more than 500,000 Vietnamese citizens have entered the United States under the or-

derly departure program in the past 10 to 15 years. As a result of steps taken by Vietnam to streamline its immigration process, more than 98 percent of cases in the resettlement opportunity for Vietnamese returnees have been cleared for interview.

Currently, Vietnam has agreed to help us reinstate a refugee program for former U.S. Government employees.

Earlier this month, the administration concluded a bilateral trade agreement with Vietnam that will serve as the basis for a reciprocal extension of normal trade relations once it is transmitted and approved by Congress. The trade agreement contains provisions on market access in goods, trade in services, intellectual property protection and investment which are necessary for U.S. firms to compete in the Vietnamese market, the 13th most populous in the world. Because Congress has not yet approved a bilateral agreement, the effect of the Jackson-Vanik waiver at this time is quite limited, enabling U.S. exporters doing business in Vietnam to have access to U.S. trade financing programs, provided that Vietnam meets the relevant program criteria.

At this time, I would insert into the RECORD a letter I received from over 40 trade associations supporting Vietnam's Jackson-Vanik waiver as an important step in the ability of the U.S. business community to compete in the Vietnamese market.

July 19, 2000.

Hon. PHILIP CRANE,  
U.S. Congress,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CRANE: As members of the American business and agricultural community, we strongly support action to normalize trade relations with Vietnam. Renewal of the Jackson-Vanik waiver is a key step in this process. We oppose H.J. Resolution 99, which would overturn the waiver, and urge you to vote against the resolution when it comes to the floor Wednesday, July 26, 2000. Renewal of the Jackson-Vanik waiver will ensure that U.S. companies and farmers exporting to Vietnam will maintain access to critical U.S. export promotion programs, such as those of the U.S. Export-Import Bank, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, and agricultural and maritime credit programs. Ultimately, the Jackson-Vanik waiver, plus the bilateral trade agreement, will lead the way for normal trade relations, enabling American companies and products to compete effectively with European and Asian companies and products in the Vietnamese market.

Important progress in the bilateral relationship has been made this year. The agreement on trade relations between the U.S. and Vietnam has just been successfully concluded, paving the way to full normalization of trade relations. The bilateral trade agreement, which addresses issues relating to trade in goods and farm products, trade in services, intellectual property rights and foreign investment, creates more open market access, greater transparency and lower tariffs for U.S. exporters and investors in Vietnam.

Also this year, the Ex-Im Bank framework agreements, which allow Ex-Im to open operations in Vietnam, were concluded and OPIC made its first loan to a U.S. company in Vietnam. In March Secretary of Defense Wil-

liam Cohen became the first U.S. Defense Secretary to visit Vietnam in 25 years.

The American business and agricultural community believes that a policy of economic normalization with Vietnam is in our national interest. Last year, the House defeated the resolution of disapproval on Jackson-Vanik by a vote of 297 to 130. We urge you to support the renewal of the Jackson-Vanik waiver this July as an important step in the normalization process.

We stand ready to work with Congress towards renewal of the Jackson-Vanik waiver for Vietnam, which will help American businesses and farmers reach this important market.

Sincerely,

American Apparel Manufacturers Association, American Chamber of Commerce in Hanoi, American Chamber of Commerce in Ho Chi Minh City, American Chamber of Commerce in Hong Kong, American Chamber of Commerce in Japan, American Chamber of Commerce in Singapore, American Chemistry Council, American Electronics Association, American Feed Industry Association, American Council of Life Insurers, American Meat Institute, American Potato Trade Alliance, AMT—The Association for Manufacturing Technology, Asia Pacific Council of American Chambers, Coalition for Employment Through Exports, Emergency Committee for American Trade, The Fertilizer Institute, Footwear Distributors and Retailers of America, The Grocery Manufacturers of America, and Information Technology Industry Council.

International Association of Drilling Contractors, International Mass Retail Association, National Association of Manufacturers, National Association of Wheat Growers, National Corn Growers Association, National Oilseed Processors Association, National Potato Council, National Retail Federation, New Orleans Regional Chamber of Commerce, National Foreign Trade Council, North American Export Grain Association, North American Millers' Association, Oregon Potato Commission, Pacific Basin Economic Council—U.S. Committee, Sporting Goods Manufacturers Association, Telecommunications Industry Association, U.S.-ASEAN Business Council, U.S. Association of Importers of Textiles and Apparel, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, U.S.-Vietnam Trade Council, Washington State Potato Commission, and Wheat Export Trade Education Commission.

Although the practical effect of Vietnam's Jackson-Vanik waiver is small at this time, its significance is that it permits us to stay engaged with Vietnam and to pursue further reforms on the full range of issues on the bilateral agenda.

Terminating Vietnam's waiver will give Vietnam an excuse to halt further reforms. I ask my colleagues not to take away our ability to pressure the Vietnamese for progress on issues of importance to the United States and I urge a no vote on H.J. Res. 99.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that half of my time be yielded to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) and that he be permitted to allocate that time as he sees fit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of joint resolution 99, which disapproves the President's determination to waive the Jackson-Vanik freedom of information requirement for Vietnam. Others will point out that this debate is not about extension of normal trade relations with Vietnam but rather about the more limited issue of whether Vietnam should be eligible to participate in U.S. credit and credit-guaranteed programs.

Technically, Mr. Speaker, that is correct. However, I think we all know that this debate is about something much more important. As I said last year, Mr. Speaker, I do not oppose the eventual normalization of relations with Vietnam, but I do oppose declaring business as usual while the remains of American servicemen are still being recovered.

According to the Department of Defense, we are receiving newly discovered remains on a fairly frequent basis. As recently as June 3, last month, Mr. Speaker, the possible remains of three American military personnel were recovered. Can we not wait until this process is completed?

Mr. Speaker, on August 9, 1970 my brother, HM3 William F. McNulty was killed in Vietnam. He was a Navy medical corpsman transferred to the Marines. He spent his time patching up his buddies, and one day he stepped on a land mine and lost his life. That was a tremendous loss for our family, and I can tell my colleagues from personal experience that while the pain may subside it never goes away.

There is a difference between what the McNulty family went through and what an MIA family goes through. Because Bill's body was returned to us, we had a wake and a funeral and a burial. What we had, Mr. Speaker, was closure. I can only imagine what the family of an MIA has gone through over these past several decades.

Mr. Speaker, until there is a more complete accounting of those missing in action, this waiver should not be granted.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JEFFERSON) be allowed to yield further time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 99. I support the President's decision to waive the Jackson-Vanik prohibitions with respect to Vietnam for an additional year.

This action takes place against a backdrop of bitter relationships in the past with Vietnam. Memories of those years remain, and appropriately so.

Over the past 5 years, the U.S. has gradually been reengaging with Viet-

nam. In 1994, we lifted the comprehensive embargo that had been in place since 1975. In 1995, we reopened the American Embassy in Hanoi. In 1998, the President decided to waive the Jackson-Vanik prohibitions. This body supported that decision with decisive margins. Each of these steps was a long time in evolving. Each responded to positive developments in Vietnam. Notably, the government of Vietnam has improved cooperation in the location of U.S. servicemen and women missing in Vietnam, and there has been improvement in the administration of programs to facilitate the resettlement of Vietnamese wishing to immigrate.

We must be clear concerning what today's vote is about, and what it is not about.

Today we simply vote on whether to approve or disapprove the Jackson-Vanik waiver for Vietnam for an additional year. Approving the waiver will continue the availability of export-related financing from OPIC, Ex-Im Bank, and the Department of Agriculture. Disapproving the waiver will cut off those sources of financing with an impact on U.S. exports, our businesspeople and our workers. Approving the waiver will not extend most favored nation status to goods and services from Vietnam. Imports from Vietnam will remain subject to restrictive tariffs until the Congress approves a bilateral trade agreement.

Two weeks ago, our country did, in fact, sign a trade agreement with Vietnam, negotiated over a period of 4 years. However, that agreement is not before the House today. When the President eventually submits it for approval, we will have to give careful consideration to a number of issues, including the extent of Vietnam's commitments, the extent to which it is implementing its commitments, our ability to monitor and enforce those commitments and Vietnam's compliance with international standards in areas including labor and the environment.

Fully normalizing relations with Vietnam is a long-term task. It requires us to work with Vietnam, including through the provision of technical assistance. For now, we must preserve the forward momentum that has developed over the past 6 years. To cut off programs now would be to pull out the rug from under U.S. producers of goods and services.

In short, let us keep intact the groundwork upon which a meaningful and enduring relationship hopefully could be built.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.J. Res. 99. The American people and our colleagues should listen carefully to this debate. What is it about? It is about trade subsidies. It is about a subsidy by the American people, the taxpayers of American businessmen

that want to invest in Vietnam. Investing in Vietnam? That does not mean selling American products in Vietnam. That means setting up manufacturing units in Vietnam to take advantage of the fact that that country is a brutal dictatorship that does not permit unions, that does not permit strikes, and thus there is virtual slave labor there at a cheap price.

Do we really want to give taxpayer subsidies and encourage American businessmen to close factories in the United States and open them up to take advantage of that type of market? That is immoral. It is immoral against the people of Vietnam and it is against the well-being of our own people. We are sinning against our own people by providing subsidies for our businessmen to close up operations here and open up there in a dictatorship.

It has been 2 years, Mr. Speaker, since President Clinton issued the first Jackson-Vanik waiver for Vietnam. Each year we have been assured by this administration and by our ambassador to Hanoi that this action would lead to greater political openness and prosperity for the Vietnamese people and a better economic climate for American investors so they would not need those subsidies. Unfortunately, the exact opposite has happened.

As The Washington Post stated on May 3, Vietnam remains a one-party state, rampant with corruption that retards foreign investment, and the Communist party fears more openness to the outside world could bring in more political heterodoxy for which the party shows zero tolerance, end of quote.

In a recent Human Rights Watch, reports link the ongoing persecution of dissidents and religious believers in Vietnam to the pervasive economic and political corruption in that country. There is no free press in Vietnam. All information is controlled by the state. Radio Free Asia broadcasts are jammed routinely.

The repeated promises by Hanoi of economic reform have been no more credible than their pledges in 1973 at the Paris Peace Agreement that the Communist violence against the people of South Vietnam would end and that there would be peaceful elections rather than bombs in resolving that war.

There is still not even the slightest hint of a free and fair election or opposition parties in Vietnam.

In that repressive government, it is hardly surprising that foreign investors and businessmen are bailing out. They are bailing out, but let us come by and save them. Let us use taxpayer subsidies and give them an encouragement to stay there in that corrupt and support that corrupt and undemocratic society, that tyrannical regime.

b 1115

As this panel is aware, the Jackson-Vanik provision primarily addresses the issue of freedom of immigration and migration for people who fear or

who have had the experience of persecution. The Vietnam Exit Permit system for immigration, including the longtime reeducation camp survivors, Amer-Asians, Americans, Montagnards and other people who have an interest in the United States of America, that state remains ripe for corruption. Many Vietnamese on the U.S. migration list have not been able to come to the United States because they could not afford to pay the bribes.

Contrary to the claims that we have just heard here today, there has been no progress in the MIA/POW issue. Hanoi has not even released the records. This Member has repeatedly, and last year, I might add, I made the same demand, but I have made this over and over again: if you want to prove good faith to us, simply release the records that you have of the prisons that you held Americans in during the war. Just give us those records. How about giving us the records of the facility that held our American ambassador, Pete Peterson. Just give us those records so we can examine it to see how many prisoners you really had. They have not given us those records after repeated demands. That is a sign of bad faith, and it is bad faith in the whole MIA/POW effort.

Mr. Speaker, my joint resolution disapproving the President's waiver for the corrupt Vietnamese dictatorship does not intend to isolate Vietnam or to stop U.S. companies from doing business there. It simply prevents the Communist Vietnam regime from enjoying a trade status that enables American businessmen, now listen to this, to make increasingly risky investments with loan guarantees and subsidies provided by the American taxpayer.

Why are we giving this perverse incentive for American companies to shut down their operations here or even refrain from opening up operations in countries that are struggling to be democratic and instead, to invest in dictatorships like Vietnam and China. If private banks and insurance companies will not back up these private ventures, why should the American taxpayer do that? American taxpayers should not be asked to do this.

Rampant corruption and mismanagement, as well as the abuse of the migration program, the lack of free trade unions, the suppression of freedom of expression, and the persecution of dissidents and religious believers, these are valid reasons to oppose the Jackson-Vanik waiver, and also it is not in our interests to make sure the American people are shortchanged by subsidizing investments in dictatorships.

Mr. Speaker, we do no favors for the Vietnamese people or American investors by again reflexively supporting the President's bogus Jackson-Vanik waiver. I propose that we get the Communists to give the Communist dictators in Vietnam to give a strong message from the United States Congress that corruption, mismanagement and

tyranny will no longer be tolerated, much less subsidized.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Our colleagues should have received a letter yesterday, in fact, and it was initiated by our distinguished colleague on the minority side, the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI), and the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) on ours; and in it it explains something, and there is one paragraph I would like to read to my colleagues: "At this time, Vietnam's waiver only allows that country to be reviewed for possible coverage by U.S. trade financing programs, such as those administered by the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, OPIC; the Export-Import Bank, Exim; and the U.S. Department of Agriculture, USDA. Vietnam is not automatically covered by these programs as a result of its Jackson-Vanik waiver."

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE), chairman of the Subcommittee on Trade, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to oppose the resolution disapproving the President's extension of the Jackson-Vanik waiver for Vietnam. Rejecting this resolution is especially important now that the United States and Vietnam have signed a bilateral trade agreement which will allow Vietnam in the future to gain Normal Trade Relations status renewable on an annual basis. But before that bilateral agreement is approved by Congress, we must continue the process of normalizing trade relations with Vietnam that began when we ended our trade embargo 6 years ago.

Over these few years, good progress has been made. From its accounting of U.S. POWs and MIAs, to its movement to open trade with the world, to its progress on human rights, Vietnam has taken the right steps. Vietnam is not there yet, but Vietnam is moving in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 99 is the wrong direction for us to take today. Who is hurt if we pass this resolution? We are. It is the wrong direction for U.S. farmers and manufacturers who do not have a level playing field when they compete with their European or Japanese counterparts in Vietnam. It is the wrong direction for our joint efforts with the Vietnamese to account for the last remains of our soldiers and to answer, finally, the questions of their loved ones here. It is the wrong direction for our efforts to influence the Vietnamese people, 65 percent who were not even born when the war was being waged.

Let us not turn back the clock on Vietnam. Let us continue to work with them and, in doing so, teach the youthful Vietnamese the values of democ-

racy, the principles of capitalism, and the merits of a free and open society.

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I support the McNulty resolution to disapprove the extension of trade waiver authority with Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, last year I supported the exact opposite position, in hopes that there would be signs in Vietnam that, in fact, that government would move toward a more open society. There are no signs of that, and political repression continues. Talk to people who live here in the United States who have relatives in Vietnam; many live in the Washington area.

What was even more troubling to me and the reason for this change in my own position, and I am not going to use the person's name, but one of the two most important Americans in charge of shaping U.S. policy toward Vietnam was speaking with me the other day; and I said, what are you going to do about the treatment of workers in Vietnam under this trade authority to give them dignity, whether they are working for a U.S.-based company or some other multinational working over there? And this American said to me, oh, that is not a trade issue, that is probably more cultural. That offended me so much.

Mr. Speaker, I think our government is on the wrong song sheet here. We ought to be for developing a civil society in Vietnam, beginning with humanitarian linkages, as our community is trying to do by helping build schools and clinics. We ought to be having educational exchanges to teach people something about democracy-building. We ought to have family reunification. We ought to have arts and cultural exchanges; but by golly, when top-ranking people from our own government fail to see that the basis of Jackson-Vanik is that political repression is wrong and this Nation ought to stand up for liberty at every cost, we ought to bring back those who are missing in action and call the government of Vietnam to task on that.

But we need to support the McNulty resolution and deny the additional extension, because it is in freedom's interests here and abroad.

Mr. JEFFERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge support of the Jackson-Vanik waiver by voting no on H.J. Res. 99, to encourage progress by Vietnam on a host of issues important to the United States.

It is undeniable that we have had a very troubled history with Vietnam, and we still have difficult issues. The scars of the past, as we have seen evidenced today, and this discussion run very deep; and we could never forget those who sacrificed their lives in the service of that country there.

But isolating Vietnam will not heal these scars. Perhaps no one can speak

more authoritatively on that issue than one of our former colleagues, Pete Peterson, who is here with us today. Pete Peterson was shot down flying his 67th mission during the Vietnam War and spent 6½ years as a prisoner of war. After serving 6 years with us in the U.S. House as a member of my class in 1991, Pete Peterson returned to Vietnam, this time as the first ambassador since the Communist takeover.

It is Ambassador Peterson's remarkable optimism about the changes going on in Vietnam, I believe, that sheds the greatest light on what our policy toward Vietnam should be. So while serious issues remain in our relationship with Vietnam, the dialogue with the Vietnamese on a full range of issues is the foundation on which those issues can be resolved.

For this reason, support for the Jackson-Vanik waiver for Vietnam and a no vote on this resolution is in our best interests, I believe.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard here that this really is not about taxpayer subsidy, because what we are doing today only makes possible that we will give taxpayer subsidies to American businessmen for closing factories here and opening up in this dictatorship in Southeast Asia, Vietnam.

The fact is, that is what this debate is all about, whether or not it should be permitted for American companies to receive these subsidies from the American taxpayer that are not in the interest of the American people so that they can go over and manufacture things in Vietnam and then to export them back to the United States. That is what this is about, the same way it is about this in China in our China debate, and what the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) read confirms that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise today in support of the Rohrabacher resolution.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that we have heard about the terrible human rights situation in Vietnam; and sadly, let me say it, in fact, is true. If we look at the rights abolished by the socialist republic of Vietnam, political freedoms are gone, all religious freedom is gone, economic freedom has been systematically abolished for the people there.

Now, the State Department tells us that the Vietnamese government quote, "maintains an autocratic one-party state that tolerates no opposition." Earlier this year, I visited Vietnam and I saw firsthand the Communist Party's harassment of those Vietnamese citizens who decide to peacefully set forth dissenting political and religious views. I visited several who were under house arrest.

Now, we can argue whether or not engagement best advocates freedom in

Vietnam. In fact, I believe engagement does. If done right, a two-track policy of engaging Vietnam on economic reform, while pressuring it on its political and religious repression with Radio Free Asia and other means, promises to promote the freedom the Vietnamese people have long sought.

Trade in investment terms with Vietnam, though, is not what this particular piece of legislation addresses. Denying this waiver would not make U.S. businesses any more or less free to do business in Vietnam. Approving this resolution would simply disallow taxpayer dollars from being used to continue subsidizing U.S. companies to do business in Vietnam. The reforms the Vietnamese government promises to make in its trade agreement with the U.S. generally are comprehensive. They are comprehensive because the business climate in Vietnam right now is so bad. The Communist Party runs the economy, making Vietnam abjectly poor, despite the talents and drive of the Vietnamese people. The economy is riddled with corruption, red tape, and cronyism.

Mr. Speaker, the State Department says, U.S. businesses find the Vietnamese market is a tough place to operate. That is an understatement. American and European companies, which eagerly entered Vietnam a few years ago, are in retreat. If they wish to stay the course, that is their decision; but we should not ask for a U.S. Government subsidy to do that.

Mr. Speaker, we all hope that freedom comes to Vietnam. Today we are debating whether the U.S. Government subsidies for American business is a constructive way to promote this freedom. I do not think that that case has been made for Vietnam, or from any other places, for that matter. I ask my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I would remind our colleagues that OPIC and Ex-Im Bank help businesses in a majority of countries around the globe; it is not confined to Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST).

b 1130

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution from the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) and support the Jackson-Vanik waiver.

In the 1870s, France colonized Vietnam. From 1940 to 1945, the Japanese and the French collaborated to oppress and colonize Vietnam. In 1945, President Roosevelt sent an agent, Archemedis Patti of the OSS, the forerunner of the CIA, to see what was going on in Vietnam and what should happen after World War II, which was fought for self-determination around the world.

Archemedis Patti suggested that Ho Chi Minh was fighting for independence against the French and the Japanese.

Roosevelt died. Archemedis Patti persisted with President Truman. Throughout the 1950s, the OSS, which turned into the CIA, recommended that the United States not become involved in the Vietnam conflict because it was a matter of a civil war and a matter of a fight for independence.

Now, I know the decisions were tough back then. In the 1940s and 1950s it was Communist expansion, China fell to the Communist, there was a Korean War and so on. But the United States got involved in the conflict. I served in Vietnam. I lost close friends in Vietnam. I knew men who are still to this day MIAs. I was proud to fight for the democratic process in the 1950s in Vietnam.

It is now 25 years later. The war virtually ended in 1975. The United States does have business interests around the globe and in Vietnam. The United States does have humanitarian interest around the world and in Vietnam. We will not lose sight of those humanitarian interests regardless of what anybody says about cultural interests.

So I highly recommend to my colleagues that we vote against the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), we stand firm in favor of the Jackson-Vanik waiver; and while we do that, we salute Pete Peterson, the Ambassador to Vietnam from the United States.

Mr. MCNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

(Mr. GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 99 and oppose the granting of the waiver for Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe Vietnam has made significant improvements in allowing political express or religious freedom.

I intend to support today's resolution opposing the waiver of the Jackson-Vanik provisions of the 1974 Trade Act. The Communist government in Hanoi still clings to the belief that any form of individualism is a threat to their grip on power.

Every year the House is asked to make exceptions to the countries who consistently oppress political dissent and religious freedom. When is the United States going to say enough is enough?

I understand that we are here today because of the tremendous economic opportunities that are available in Vietnam. I understand that Vietnam has the cheap labor and lax environmental regulations that we seem to favor to produce our clothes and our shoes.

What would we get in return for waiving the Jackson-Vanik provisions of the 1947 Trade Act? Are we going to get more help in locating our missing servicemen? The legacy of the Vietnam War will remain open and festering without a higher level cooperation from the government in Hanoi.

I hope that next year, if we repeat this process, the United States is not running a huge trade deficit with Vietnam. Injecting large amounts of foreign investment in Vietnam to bring about social change is a flawed theory. We have been doing that with China for years, and it still suppresses religious expression, and it still sells weapons to some of the most unstable nations in the world.

It is interesting that the companies and businesses who are successful in our country because of the freedom of individualism and initiative want to take advantage of a society that suppresses it to the point, and that is the very reason that our society and our government is successful because, individually, we have the right to succeed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. JEFFERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution and in support of the continuation of the Jackson-Vanik waiver for Vietnam.

Last year, 297 Members of the House voted against a disapproval waiver. Since that time, major steps have been taken in many areas of greatest concern to the Congress and the American people with respect to issues between the United States and Vietnam.

The number of Vietnamese who have been able to leave the country to resettle in the United States has reached merely 16,000 in the first 6 months of this year compared to 3,800 2 years ago.

Ambassador Pete Peterson, our former colleague, has declared that "Vietnam's cooperation on emigration policy, the test issue for the Jackson-Vanik waiver, is exemplary." Close cooperation between our governments is also continuing in the location, identification, and the return of remains, and in resolving the remaining MIA questions has been considerable.

I had an opportunity to visit with our teams in the country that are seeking these remains and going through this intensive, arduous process. They will tell us the cooperation that they are getting from the government now that they did not get before. The program is working, not as fast as we would like, but the cooperation is in fact there.

In reaching an accord with the United States on a comprehensive trade agreement, which is not an issue before this Congress today, the government of Vietnam has also demonstrated that it is prepared to move in the direction of transparency, fair trade, and a more open economy that will ultimately serve the people of that nation well.

Our continued waiver of Jackson-Vanik, which is strongly supported by a number of veterans organizations,

has encouraged Vietnam to implement reforms that are needed to establish the basic labor and political rights we believe are critical. There is still much room for improvement, to be sure, on all of these fronts, on freedom of expression, on religious freedom, on labor rights, on political rights; but the fact of the matter is progress is being made because of this engagement.

We should continue to encourage these reforms in Vietnam through expanded trade, labor, and educational exchanges, again which are taking place already; cooperation, environmental and scientific initiatives which, again, are already taking place. But we need more of them. We need these efforts to build a stronger relationship between the two countries to promote the kind of open and democratic societies we believe they have a right to enjoy.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, will the Chair please let me know what the time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). The gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) has 6 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JEFFERSON) has 8 minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York (Mr. MCNULTY) has 8½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, first and foremost, let us look again at the central issue. No matter how much people are trying to deny it, the central issue is whether or not the American taxpayer should be subsidizing the investment by American businesses, not to sell American products in Vietnam but to set up factories in Vietnam, to take advantage of their, basically, slave labor, people who have no right to form a union, people who have no legal protections. Should we subsidize with our taxpayers' dollars American businessmen that want to go over there and exploit that market, closing factories in the United States, and then exporting their produce that they produced with this slave labor back to the United States, again, competing with our own goods made by our own people? That is immoral.

Let us just say, yes, I agree with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE). OPIC and Exim Bank, these are the vehicles that we use taxpayers' dollars to subsidize this investment overseas. They do it with a lot of countries. But we should put our foot down here today and say dictatorships should not receive this kind of subsidy, especially the dictatorship in Vietnam that has not cooperated in finding our missing in action and POWS.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, Ambassador Pete Peterson, was

here a moment ago. He is over here on the floor. I would like to recognize him. He spent 6 years with us here in the House. He spent 6½ years in the Hanoi Hilton, and he is doing an outstanding job as our Ambassador in Vietnam. He assures me that he has the records from the prison in which he was held for 6½ years. These records are now publicly available.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE).

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this House Joint Resolution 99. As a Vietnam veteran, I empathize with many of the arguments that I have heard by some of the opponents to this waiver. I am concerned about the issue of emigration of Vietnamese from that country. I also, of course, want a full accounting of our MIAs and POWs, and our ambassador has been working very hard on achieving that.

Of course I am concerned about religious freedom and its state in a country like Vietnam. But I disagree with the proposed solutions that the other side suggested as denying the Jackson-Vanik waiver for Vietnam does nothing to further the progress in any of these areas. In fact, I believe it has just the opposite effect.

Let us put this vote today in its historical perspective. It was 1991 that President Bush proposed a road map for improving our relations with Vietnam. To follow the road map, Vietnam had to take steps to help us account for our missing servicemen. In return for this cooperation, the United States agreed to move towards normalizing relations in an incremental fashion.

Progress has been made through the years in that. In 1994, a second step was taken when President Clinton lifted the trade embargo against Vietnam. In 1995, in response to further reforms by the Vietnamese, formal diplomatic relations were established between the United States and Vietnam. In 1998, President Clinton issued the first waiver for Vietnam under the Jackson-Vanik procedures. This waiver, which was approved by this House by a very substantial margin, made American products eligible for trade investment programs such as Ex-Im and OPIC.

This year, an even more historic step was reached when the United States and Vietnam signed a bilateral trade agreement which contained significant concessions for the U.S. industry in Vietnam.

Now, this vote today is not going to provide us with all the benefits of the agreement, nor will it mean that we will have normal trade relations with Vietnam. That will require an additional vote by Congress. But today's vote does send a message that Congress supports the policy of continued engagement with Vietnam. I believe that has helped us.

I urge a no vote on this resolution.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair wishes to remind all Members that references to the presence on the floor of non-Members during debate is not appropriate.

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ).

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. McNULTY) for yielding me this time.

As the Congresswoman who represents the largest Vietnamese-American population in the United States in Orange County, California, this Jackson-Vanik is about the immigration issue and the reunification of the families, the Vietnamese-American families that we have here in our country.

We have gone through the process. Our State Department has allowed that these members of families come to the United States, and then they run into a problem. The problem is that the corrupt government of Vietnam charges bribes of about \$2,000 to try to get an exit for each person who is trying to come here to the United States to be with their family members.

Well, when one considers that the household income in Vietnam is \$300 a year, \$2,000 is not an easy amount to get one's hands on to get one's exit visa so that one can come here and be with one's family after our State Department says, in fact, one should and can be here in the United States.

So on the issue of immigration, the government of Vietnam has not held up its end. But in addition to that, why should we, the United States, help a government that is so against human rights?

The government continues to repress basic political and religious freedoms and does not tolerate most types of public dissent. This is what the United States State Department reported in its 1999 review of the human rights situation in Vietnam.

What they are doing now in Vietnam is that, instead of holding prisoners in prisons, they put them in house arrest so that the rest of the nations will not criticize them internationally. In fact, the last time I was in Vietnam, while I was talking to a dissident under house arrest in his home, the government figured out I was there. They sent their police knocking on the door trying to get through. I do not know, if I had not had a couple of Marines there with me, what would have happened.

b 1145

But the situation is that dissidents do not have an ability to speak their mind under this government. So I ask again, why should we reward that government with a Jackson-Vanik waiver?

It was just 2 months ago when the Vietnamese police placed Ha Si Phu under house arrest and threatened to charge him with treason. The Vietnamese authorities apparently believe that Mr. Ha is connected to an open appeal for democracy issued by intellec-

tual dissidents. If convicted, he could face the death penalty.

Sadly, this is not the first time that Ha Si Phu has been harassed by authorities for peacefully expressing his views. In recent years, he has become well known at home and abroad for his political discourses and for focusing international attention on Vietnam's terrible human rights record. For his efforts, he was imprisoned in December 1995 for a year; and he continues to be under House arrest, like the rest of the people who speak up in Vietnam and say that what they are doing is wrong.

How do we reward this country when it punishes its citizens for exercising basic human rights; a country where a citizen is punished for speaking out against what he or she believes is wrong?

Unfortunately, Mr. Ha's situation is not the only example of what we see over and over and over in this country. Our ambassador, Mr. Pete Peterson, says that human rights conditions are getting better. They are not. We have only to ask the relatives who live here in the United States.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this resolution.

Mr. JEFFERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS).

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, this vote today is a vote on whether we are truly dedicated to the hard work of getting full accounting of our missing from the Vietnam War.

As the Veterans of Foreign Wars have stated, passing this resolution of disapproval will only hurt our efforts at a time in which we are receiving the access and cooperation we need from the Vietnamese to determine the fate of our POW-MIAs. There is no more authoritative force and voice on this issue than our former colleague and now ambassador to Vietnam, Mr. Pete Peterson, who supports this waiver. As a prisoner of war who underwent years of imprisonment in the notorious Hanoi Hilton, he should have every reason to be skeptical and harbor bitterness against the Vietnamese. Yet he believes the best course is to develop better relations between our two nations.

We have achieved progress on this POW-MIA issue because of our evolving relationship with the Vietnamese, not despite it. Without access to the jungles and the rice paddies, to the information and documents, and to the witnesses of these tragic incidents, it would be impossible to give the families of the missing the answers our country owes them.

We are making progress and providing these answers. Much of this is due to the Joint Task Force—Full Accounting, our military presence in Vietnam tasked with looking for our missing. I have visited with these young men and women, and they are among the most brave and motivated troops I have ever met. Every day, from the searches of jungle battle sites

to the excavation of crash sites on precarious mountain summits, they put themselves in harm's way to perform a mission they truly believe in.

It is moving to see these young men and women, some who were not even born when our presence was so involved in Vietnam. They have told me time and time again one thing; allow us to remain on this job.

The resolution before us today puts this at risk. I urge my colleagues to please vote against this resolution.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER).

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, this Member rises in opposition to the resolution.

It is important for us, I think, to recognize what the Jackson-Vanik waiver does and what it does not do. By law, the underlying issue here is about immigration. Based on Vietnam's record of progress on immigration and its continued cooperation on U.S. refugee programs over the past year, renewal of the Jackson-Vanik waiver will continue to promote freedom of immigration. Disapproval would undoubtedly result in the opposite.

The Jackson-Vanik waiver also symbolizes our interest in further developing relations with Vietnam. Having lifted the trade embargo and established diplomatic relations 5 years ago, the United States has tried to work with Vietnam to normalize incrementally our bilateral, political, economic, and consular relationships. This is in America's own short-term and long-term national interests. It builds on Vietnam's own policy of political and economic reintegration into the world.

This will be a lengthy and challenging process. However, now is not the time to reverse course on Vietnam. Vietnam continues to cooperate fully with our priority efforts to achieve the fullest possible accounting of American POW-MIAs. The Jackson-Vanik waiver supports this process.

The Jackson-Vanik waiver certainly does not constitute an endorsement of the Communist regime in Hanoi. We cannot approve of a regime that places restrictions on basic freedoms, including the right to organize political parties, freedom of speech, and freedom of religion. On May 4, however, this body passed a resolution condemning just such violations of human rights.

The Jackson-Vanik waiver does not provide Vietnam with new trade benefits, including Normal Trade Relations, NTR, status. With the Jackson-Vanik waiver, the United States has been able to successfully negotiate and sign a new bilateral commercial trades agreement with Vietnam. Congress will have an opportunity in the future whether to approve it or not, and whether to

grant NTR or not, but that is a separate process. The renewal of the Jackson-Vanik waiver only keeps this process going, nothing more.

Renewal of the Jackson-Vanik waiver does not automatically make American exports to Vietnam eligible for possible coverage by U.S. trade financing programs. The waiver only allows American exports to Vietnam to be eligible for such coverage.

Mr. Speaker, the war with Vietnam is over, and we have embarked upon a new, although cautious, expanded relationship with Vietnam. Now is not the time to reverse this constructive course. Accordingly, this Member urges a "no" vote on the resolution.

Having summarized the key reasons to oppose the resolution, this Member would like to expand on a few of these points. First, the issue of emigration, which indeed, is what the Jackson-Vanik provision is all about. Since March of 1998, the United States has granted Vietnam a waiver of the Jackson-Vanik emigration provisions of the Trade Act of 1974. As this is only an annual waiver, the President decided on June 2, 2000, to renew this extension because he determined that doing so would substantially promote greater freedom of emigration from that country in the future. This determination was based on Vietnam's record of progress on emigration and on Vietnam's continued cooperation on U.S. refugee programs over the past year. As a result, we are approaching the completion of many refugee admissions categories under the Orderly Departure Program (ODP), including the Resettlement Opportunity for Vietnamese Returnees, Former Re-education Camp Detainees, "McCain Amendment" sub-programs and Montagnards. The Vietnamese Government has also agreed to help implement our decision to resume the ODP program for former U.S. Government employees, which was suspended in 1996. The renewal of the Jackson-Vanik waiver is an acknowledgment of that progress. Disapproval of the waiver would, undoubtedly, result in Vietnam's immediate cessation of cooperation.

Second, the Jackson-Vanik waiver also symbolizes our interest in further developing relations with Vietnam. Having lifted the trade embargo and established diplomatic relations five years ago, the United States has tried to work with Vietnam to normalize incrementally our bilateral political, economic and consular relationship. This policy is in America's own short- and long-term national interest. It builds on Vietnam's own policy of political and economic reintegration into the world. In the judgment of this Member, this will be a lengthy and challenging process. However, he suggests that now is not the time to reverse course on Vietnam.

Third, over the past five years, Vietnam has increasingly cooperated on a wide range of issues. The most important of these is the progress and cooperation in obtaining the fullest possible accounting of Americans missing from the Vietnam War. Those members who attended the briefing by the distinguished Ambassador to Vietnam, a former Prisoner of War and former Member of this body, the Honorable "Pete" Peterson, learned of the significant efforts to which Vietnam is now extending to address our concerns regarding the POW/MIA issue, including their participation in

remains recovery efforts which are physically very dangerous.

Fourth, the Jackson-Vanik waiver does not constitute an endorsement of the Communist regime in Hanoi. We cannot approve of a regime that places restrictions on basic freedoms, including the right to organize political parties, freedom of speech, and freedom of religion. However, our experience has been that isolation and disengagement does not promote progress on human rights. New sanctions, including the symbolic disapproval of the Jackson-Vanik waiver, only strengthens the position of the Communist hard-liners at the expense of those in Vietnam's leadership who are inclined to support more openness. Engagement with Vietnam has resulted in some improvements in Vietnam's human rights practices, though we still remain disappointed at the very limited pace and scope of such reforms. As this Member mentioned, on May 4, 2000, this body adopted a resolution condemning Vietnam's human rights record. Given the strong reaction to our resolution by Hanoi, it is evident that our actions and concerns did not go unnoticed.

Fifth, the Jackson-Vanik waiver does not provide Vietnam with any new trade benefits, including Normal Trade Relations (NTR) status. However, with the Jackson-Vanik waiver, the United States has been able to successfully negotiate a new bilateral commercial trade agreement with Vietnam. This agreement was signed two weeks ago in Washington. In the opinion of this Member, this agreement is in our own short and long term national interest. Vietnam remains a very difficult place for American firms to do business. Vietnam needs to undertake additional fundamental economic reforms. This new bilateral trade agreement will require Vietnam to make these reforms and will result in increased American exports supporting jobs here at home.

In a separate process with a separate vote Congress will have to decide whether to approve or reject this new trade agreement and to grant NTR status to Vietnam. Given that the agreement has yet to even be transmitted to Congress and there are only a limited number of legislative days before the body's scheduled adjournment, this Member believes that these decisions will not be made until the 107th Congress meets next year. Thus, the Jackson-Vanik waiver simply ensures that the modest trade opportunities currently available to American businesses will continue until Congress considers the agreement.

Sixth, contrary to the claims of some opponents of the Jackson-Vanik waiver, renewal of the Jackson-Vanik waiver does not automatically make American investment in and exports to Vietnam eligible for coverage by U.S. trade financing programs such as those administered by the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, the Export-Import Bank, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The waiver only allows American exports and investments to be eligible for such coverage. Each must still face separate individual reviews against each program's relevant criteria.

Mr. Speaker, Americans must conclusively recognize that the war with Vietnam is over. With the restoration of diplomatic relations in 1995, the United States and Vietnam embarked on a new relationship for the future. It will not be an easy or quick process. Vietnam today remains a Communist country with very

limited freedoms for its citizens. Significant reforms must occur before relations can be truly normal. The emotional scars of the Vietnam war remain with many Americans. In the mid-1960's, this Member was an infantry officer and intelligence officer with the First Infantry Division. Within a month of completing my service, members of my tight-knit detachment of that division were in Vietnam and taking casualties the first night after arrival. Like other Vietnam-era veterans, this Member has emotional baggage about Vietnam, but this Member would suggest that it is time to get on with our bilateral relationship and not reverse course on Vietnam.

Passing this resolution of disapproval of the Jackson-Vanik waiver would represent yet another reflection of animosities of the past at a time when Vietnam is finally looking ahead and making changes towards its integration into the international community. A retrenchment on our part by this disapproval resolution is not in America's short and long term national interests. Accordingly, this Member strongly urges the rejection of House Joint Resolution 99.

Mr. MCNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the Chair about the procedure for closing statements?

It is my understanding that the order would be the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER), followed by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JEFFERSON), followed by myself, and then followed by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE); is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). The gentleman's understanding is correct.

Mr. MCNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JEFFERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JEFFERSON) for yielding me this time, and I strongly associate myself with the comments of my colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BE-REUTER).

I too rise in opposition to this resolution and support President Clinton's decision to waive Jackson-Vanik requirements for the next year. This would absolutely be the worst thing we could do at this point, undercutting the outstanding work that Ambassador Peterson and our team has done in terms of continued progress in immigration, in terms of continued accounting and cooperation in dealing with prisoners of war and missing in action. It would also undercut the progress that has been represented by the successful conclusion of the bilateral trade agreement, a critical, critical milepost.

This debate is absolutely not about some hypothetical huge potential trade deficit with Vietnam. The amount of trade involved is minuscule at this point and is not going to be, under the wildest circumstances, anything significant in the foreseeable future.

It is absolutely not about closing United States' factories and shipping

this process overseas. The goods that have been identified here as the primary products for Vietnam are not things that the United States is specializing in right now. Most of those products are already manufactured overseas and simply shifting suppliers.

And it is categorically not about slave labor. That is absolute nonsense and referenced by someone who clearly has never seen the activity that is going on now in Vietnam factories. I am informed by our embassy in Vietnam that there have been dozens of strikes already this year. And if we talk to the men and women who have done work in Vietnam, we see that even in this area progress is being achieved.

Mr. Speaker, this House is poised to make some very significant accomplishments in foreign policy; a historic realignment of our policy with China. Last week's vote sent signals about being real about our relationship with Cuba and reversing some absolutely ineffectual activities in the past. We are now on the verge of doing the same with Vietnam. I strongly urge rejection of this resolution and keeping us moving in this direction.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, again, we should take a look at what is being said here today and what the central issues are. We have heard that if we vote today for this resolution that these subsidies for businessmen who go over there, who close factories in the United States and open up factories to produce goods with the slave labor in Vietnam and export them to the United States, will not "automatically" be granted; will not "automatically" have these subsidies available.

We keep getting these words that should make it very clear that is what this debate is about. The debate is about whether or not U.S. taxpayers are going to subsidize American companies to close their doors in the United States, go over there and take advantage of, yes, slave labor.

I am not impressed when I hear that there have been strikes in Vietnam. The question is what happened to the strikers after the strike. The question is whether those strikers had a right to form a union and to try to peacefully advocate their own position, which is the right of every person in a free society.

There has been no progress reported in labor relations in Vietnam. There is no progress in terms of a free press, no progress in terms of religious freedom, no progress in terms of an opposition party. So where is this progress? We are rewarding the Communist government of Vietnam for continuing its repression.

As far as Mr. Peterson's report, this is the first time any of us have ever heard of a report that there are records from a prison available. Let me note this, and I have just spoken to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER),

chairman of the committee, that it has never been reported to him; it has never been reported to me, a senior member of the Committee on International Relations and the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, that those records are available.

Now, how limited are they? How long have they been available? We are being told this right now, during this debate, that records that have been denied us for 10 years of our demanding are now available to us. Let me just say if that is the case, and those records have been available and it has not been reported to the oversight committee of the United States Congress, there is something wrong with our State Department or something wrong with the process.

And I would put on the record today that I expect to see those prison records. I would put this on the record for our ambassador to Vietnam that I expect to see those prison records forthwith and immediately so that they can be examined in relationship to the MIA-POW issue. Those records have not been made available to us. We have not had a good faith effort, and it is wrong to spring this in the middle of a debate on the floor on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JEFFERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES).

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise this morning in support of maintaining the President's waiver of Jackson-Vanik for Vietnam and in opposition of this resolution.

Our policy of engagement with Vietnam is our most effective tool for influencing Vietnamese society and achieving positive relationships with that country. With engagement, we are able to insert American ideals of freedom and liberty to the Vietnamese people. Furthermore, as a global leader in economic enterprise, American companies are poised to develop even broader commercial ties and influential relationships throughout Vietnam.

I can tell my colleagues that our presence in Vietnam impacts their society in all areas, from commercial relations to worker rights.

b 1200

Moreover, as a Vietnam veteran, I believe that the coordination and cooperation of the Vietnamese government in the recovery of remains of our servicemen is essential and has been extremely successful and possible through our policy of engagement.

Clearly, additional progress must be made in Vietnam on a whole range of issues including trade, human rights, religious freedom, and freedom of expression. However, we can only do that through a policy of engagement. We all agree that there must be greater political and democratic reforms as well as more open access to Vietnamese markets in order to address the large and growing trade imbalance.

In my view, the most effective way to bring about improvements in trade, human rights, and political and religious freedoms and to maintain our progress in successful joint searches for veterans' remains is through continued engagement with the Vietnamese government and increased contacts with the Vietnamese people so that they can learn and appreciate the values of democracy and the values of freedom.

If we do not support the President's waiver of Jackson-Vanik for Vietnam, the result will be that it will cause us to disengage and withdraw. This will harm and not improve our situation with Vietnam.

Removal of Vietnam's status would likely result in the withdrawal of American goods and, therefore, American values.

I strongly urge everyone in this House to support the waiver of Jackson-Vanik for a status for Vietnam and vote against this resolution.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JEFFERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Ms. MCCARTHY).

(Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the resolution and thank my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JEFFERSON), for giving me this opportunity to speak.

There is no question that the Vietnam War strained the very fiber of our nation, however, the time has come to reconcile the discord of the past. Including trade in our new diplomatic relationship with Vietnam will allow us to create a positive partnership for the future.

In January, I traveled to Vietnam and was struck by the evolution of their economy and the progress which has occurred to provide opportunities for both our countries.

Mr. Speaker, in our increasingly global economy, shutting Vietnam out would be detrimental not only for the people of Vietnam and southeast Asia but for American citizens and businesses, as well.

In the shadow of the historic market-opening agreement made only this month thanks to the efforts of U.S. Ambassador Pete Peterson, it would be a disaster for Congress to approve legislation to deny Vietnam eligibility for U.S. trade credits.

Opening the Vietnamese markets will not only provide an economic boon for both Vietnam and the U.S. but will improve trade between the two countries, and that will go a long way toward healing the wounds both nations have been nursing for decades.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution.

I rise in strong opposition to the resolution and thank my friend and colleague from Louisiana Mr. JEFFERSON, for giving me the opportunity to speak.

The Vietnam war is the war of my generation and I will always have strong feelings regarding the longest war in our country's history and the conflict which strained the fiber of our nation.

In January, I traveled to Vietnam and was struck by the evolution of their economy and the progress which has occurred to provide opportunities for both our countries.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, could I get the time that is left for all of us and what sequence that we will be making our closing arguments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). The order of close shall be the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) first, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JEFFERSON) second, the gentleman from New York (Mr. McNULTY) third, and finally the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) will have the final word.

The amount of time remaining for the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is 2½ minutes, for the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JEFFERSON) 1 minute, for the gentleman from New York (Mr. McNULTY) 4½ minutes, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) 2 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in support of this resolution. Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleagues to support this resolution. Let us today make a stand for principle. Let us send the message to the world and to the American people about what America stands for.

Today we are really a government that simply can be manipulated by large financial interests, billionaires who want to invest in various parts of the world under a guise of globalism.

Is that what we are all about? No. We have Mr. Lafayette who watches us today. We have George Washington who watches us today. Is that the America that they fought for? Is that the globalism they had in mind?

The globalism our forefathers had in mind were universal rights where the concept of the United States stands as a hope of liberty and justice for the world, not just that we are a place where people can come and do business together. Yes, we believe in that and that our businessmen have a right to do businesses overseas. Yes, they have a right to do that. But there is some higher value involved with our country.

We can reaffirm that today, and not only reaffirming that principle that human rights and democracy means something, but at the same time, watch out for the interests of the American people.

We see this American flag behind us. What does that flag stand for? It stands for, number one, we believe in liberty and justice and independence and freedom. We believe in those things our Founding Fathers talked about 225 years ago. But, number two, it also stands for that we are going to represent the interests of those American people who have come here to this

country and become citizens of our country.

It is not in their interest, and it is not in the interest of human freedom that we subsidize American businesses to go over and do business in dictatorships, dictatorships where they throw the leaders of strikes in jail 2 days after the strike is over, dictatorships where they do not allow any opposition parties or freedom of religion.

There has been no progress in terms of human rights in Vietnam. And now we are thinking about offering a perverse incentive again today. That is what this debate is about, to our businessmen to close their doors here, not watching out for the interests of the American people, but instead making sure that these business men can go over and use that slave labor.

Those people in Vietnam have a \$300 a year per capita income, and they are going to be exploited by American businessmen.

Let us vote for this resolution. Let us not give them this waiver. Let us put them on notice that they have a year to clean up their act, and then we can grant them some concessions if they have progressed in those areas.

I ask for support of the resolution.

Mr. JEFFERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to keep in mind what this legislation is all about. It is not to cure all these difficulties that exist between the United States and Vietnam, nor between the debate over democracy versus communism. It is strictly about providing greater access for immigration and our review of whether or not that is taking place in that country in sufficient capacity to permit us to continue with the waiver.

Since the 1980s, over 500,000 Vietnamese people have emigrated as refugees of that country to the United States. Ambassador Peterson reports that while there are bribes and corruption, these are isolated incidents and this is not a form of government policy in Vietnam.

And so Vietnam is meeting the requirement for us to continue the waiver, and that is all that is important here. While incident to this there will be permission of OPEC and Ex-Im Bank to engage and support U.S. business there, that is not the overriding purpose of what we are doing here. And so Vietnam has met its obligation.

It is time for our country to step up and meet its obligation as well and to permit the Jackson-Vanik waiver to continue and to permit people to continue to enjoy free immigration to this country.

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Ron Cima and Chuck Henley of the Office of the Secretary of Defense for the briefing that they gave me last week on the search for our MIAs. I am grateful to them, to Pete Peterson, and to all of those who are working to bring our MIAs home.

As I grow older, Mr. Speaker, I try to keep my priorities in proper order. I am not always successful at that, but I work at it. That is why when I get up in the morning the first two things I do are to thank God for my life and veterans for my way of life.

Had it not been for my brother Bill and all of those who gave their lives in service to this country through the years, had it not been for people like the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) and Pete Peterson and JOHN MCCAIN, who endured torture as prisoners of war, had it not been for people like Pete Dalessandro, a World War II Congressional Medal of Honor winner from my district who was just laid to rest last year in our new veterans' cemetery in Saratoga, had it not been for them and all of the men and women who wore the uniform of the United States military through the years and put their lives on the line for us, we would not have the privilege of going around bragging about how we live in the freest and most open democracy on Earth.

Freedom is not free. We paid a tremendous price for it. And we should always remember those who paid the price.

So today, Mr. Speaker, based upon the comments that I made earlier on behalf of all 2,014 Americans who are still missing in southeast Asia, on behalf of their families, I ask my colleagues to join with me, the American Legion, the National League of POW/MIA Families, the National Alliance of POW/MIA Families, the National Vietnam Veterans Coalition, the Veterans of the Vietnam War, and the Disabled American Veterans in supporting this resolution of disapproval.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to just make one brief concluding remark, and it has to do with the events in Vietnam that all of us have recollections of.

My two kid brothers served over there. I know that we all had a concern not just for the welfare of our friends, neighbors and relatives, but we had a concern about the Vietnamese people, too.

I think it is important for us to recognize that since the Vietnam War ended that there is a whole new Vietnam that has come into existence. Sixty-five percent of the people in Vietnam were not alive at the end of the Vietnam War. As this new population has taken over the country, I think it is important for us to lend our efforts in advancing the Vietnamese country and people toward those civilized values that we cherish.

For that reason, I think the Jackson-Vanik waiver is a very tiny but incremental and important step in that direction. And for that reason, with all due respect to my colleagues who are supporting H.J. Res. 99, I would urge my colleagues to vote no on H.J. Res. 99 and keep us moving in the right direction.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I am surprised to hear for the first time today that the Vietnamese communists have made available the records of one of the prisons where Ambassador Peterson was held. In response, I just asked Ambassador Peterson which records he was referring to. Unfortunately, the records he is speaking of are not from the prisons in which he was held early during his captivity, for which I am most concerned that some Americans may not have returned from. I do not doubt that Ambassador Peterson is being honest that commanders from those prisons told him that they do not know where the records are after so many years. However, they as individuals were not the record keepers. The Vietnamese communist government kept many overlapping records on prisoners they held in Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia or transferred from Indochina to other communist countries. It is those meticulous records that I am concerned about and to which my request to communist officials in Hanoi has not been addressed.

Former American POWs such as Mike Bengé and Colonel Ted Guy have told my staff and I how they were repeatedly interviewed and had written records made by overlapping Vietnamese communist intelligence and military organizations while they were transferred between Laos and a number of prison camps in Vietnam. U.S. officials have to this day, not had those records made available to them by the Vietnamese regime.

In addition, there are some 400 Americans who U.S. intelligence agencies have identified as having been alive or who perished under Vietnamese communist control. The Vietnamese regime could easily account for these men, but to this day, refuse to do so. Finally, the CIA and DIA have verified the validity of the testimony before Congress by a Vietnamese mortician who testified to processing hundreds of deceased American prisoners' remains in Hanoi during the war. He testified that the organization he worked for kept meticulous records of the deceased Americans, processed the remains for storage, and carefully packaged and labeled personal belongings of the deceased Americans. To this day, none of the records of that organization—which could resolve the fates of scores of missing American servicemen—have been made available by the Vietnamese regime.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution and urge my colleagues to uphold the current Jackson-Vanik waiver.

The Jackson-Vanik provision of the 1974 Trade Act was intended to encourage communist countries to relax their restrictive emigration policies. At the time, the Soviet Union was prohibiting Soviet Jewry from emigrating to the United States and Israel.

The Jackson-Vanik waiver specifically granted the President the power to waive the restrictions on U.S. government credits or investment guarantees to communist countries if the waiver would help promote significant progress toward relaxing emigration controls.

To avoid confusion among some of my colleagues, this waiver does not provide Vietnam with normal trade relations. Ironically, the economic incentives provided in the Jackson-Vanik are all one-sided favoring U.S. firms doing business in Vietnam.

Mr. Chairman, Senator Scoop Jackson was a staunch anti-communist. Yet, he was willing

to consider to incentives to encourage the Soviet Union to relax its emigration policy.

In 1998, Charles Vanik, former Member and co-author of the Jackson-Vanik provision, sent me a letter expressing his strong opposition to the motion to disapprove trade credits for Vietnam and upholding the current waiver.

Vietnam is experiencing a new era, driving by a population where 65 percent of its citizens were born after the war. Vietnam today welcomes U.S. trade and economic investment.

The Vietnamese Government has made significant progress in meeting the emigration criteria in the Jackson-Vanik amendment. Through a policy of engagement and U.S. business investment, Vietnam has improved its emigration policies, cooperated on U.S. refugee programs, and worked with the United States on achieving the fullest possible accounting of POW/MIAs from the Vietnam War.

Despite problems of corruption and government repression, there is reason to believe that our presence in Vietnam can improve the situation and encourage its government to become more open, respect human rights and follow the rule of law.

U.S. Ambassador to Vietnam, Pete Peterson, our esteemed former colleague and former POW, has been one of our nation's strongest advocates for expanding trade with Vietnam. Renewing the Jackson-Vanik waiver will increase market access for U.S. goods and services in the 12th most populous country in the world.

Disapproval of this waiver will only discourage U.S. businesses from operating in Vietnam, arm Soviet-style hardliners with the pretext to clamp down on what economic and social freedoms the Vietnamese people now experience, and eliminate what opportunity we have to influence Vietnam in the future.

Mr. Speaker, last year we debated and soundly rejected a similar disapproval resolution. I urge my colleagues to do the same today and uphold the presidential waiver of the Jackson-Vanik requirements.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.J. Res. 99.

I represent San Jose California, a community greatly enhanced by the presence of immigrants. Many years ago, as a Supervisor on the Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors I worked with refugees escaping a brutal and oppressive political regime.

As an immigration lawyer, I did my best to help these courageous individuals adjust to their new life. During that time, I met families torn apart by a government that would not let them leave unless they escaped. All of these families sacrificed—so that some of them could see freedom.

Over the past two decades these brave people have become my friends and my neighbors. I have learned lessons about freedom and liberty from them. These same people tell me that we must not waive the Jackson-Vanik amendment.

I am a strong supporter of fair trade. I believe that an economic search for open markets often results in a more open society. I believe that an economic dialogue often results in an enhanced political one. I also believe that a trusted economic partner can evolve into a trusted political ally.

However, not every nation travels the same path to a more open society. In the case of Vietnam, I believe we can achieve more by

making Vietnam live up to the free emigration requirements of the Jackson-Vanik amendment to the Trade Act of 1974.

Why? Because Vietnam is so eager for a trade relationship with America that they would improve their human rights policies in order to get it—but only if we insist.

One cornerstone of our trade policy with nonmarket economies has been the Jackson-Vanik Amendment. This amendment requires that a country make progress in allowing free emigration in order to achieve normal trade status. More than two decades after the end of the Vietnam War, my congressional staff in San Jose continues to receive letters from Vietnamese American families seeking reunification with a brother or sister, a mother or a father, a son or a daughter.

Think of what this resolution says to them. More than two decades after the end of the Vietnam War, they are still waiting for a loved one. And in the face of their wait, we are exploring the extension of normal trade relations to a nation that still holds those captive who would leave if only they could.

I understand my colleagues when they say Vietnam has changed. It has changed, but not enough. In a 1999 review of Vietnam's human rights record, the State Department reached the conclusion that Vietnam's overall human rights record remained poor. The report pointed out that "the government continued to repress basic political and some religious freedoms and to commit numerous abuses." The report pointed out that the government was "not tolerating most types of public dissent."

Additionally, reports from human rights organizations indicate that the Vietnamese government has tried to clamp down on political and religious dissidents through isolation and intimidation. Dissidents are confined through house arrest and subject to constant surveillance. During her trip to Vietnam Secretary Albright said that the bilateral relationship between Vietnam and the United States "can never be totally normal until we feel that the human rights situation has been dealt with." I agree.

The essence of this debate is freedom—how we can best achieve greater freedom for the Vietnamese people and how we as a nation can more greatly influence the government to create a more open society. I believe that course is to pass this resolution. After all, leverage is no longer leverage once it is given away. I urge my colleagues to support H.J. Res. 99.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 99, Disapproving the Extension of Emigration Waiver Authority to Vietnam.

While the United States and Vietnam signed a trade agreement last week which requires Vietnam to overhaul its economy, by reducing tariffs on a range of goods and allowing foreign firms to participate in businesses in Vietnam; the resolution on the House floor today is whether Vietnam allows free and open emigration for its citizens. In 1999, President Clinton granted Vietnam a waiver of the Jackson-Vanik Amendment's on this condition. Unfortunately, not much improvement can be cited nor documented. *Boat People*, SOS an organization in my district, informed me that there is significant corruption in Vietnam and the Vietnamese government continues to exclude thousands of former political prisoners and

former U.S. government employees from participating in U.S. refugee programs. On average, an applicant must pay \$1,000 in bribes to gain access to these programs. In a country where the average Vietnamese's annual salary is \$250—impoverished former political prisoners and former U.S. government employees simply cannot afford these outrageous bribes to apply for these programs.

Corruption exists not only in the Vietnamese government but also undermines U.S. exchange programs as well. Our programs offer outstanding Vietnamese students the opportunity to study in the U.S. However, the Vietnamese government excludes those students whose parents are not members of the Communist cadre. Thus, many qualified Vietnamese students are denied the opportunity to study in U.S. exchange programs simply because their parents are not card-carrying members of the Communist party. This discrepancy is only one example of the apartheid system that the Vietnamese government has implemented to punish those who do not agree with their ideology.

On the issue of human rights, while Vietnam has released some political prisoners, many more remain imprisoned while the Communist government continues to arrest others for speaking out against the government. While the Vietnamese government may claim to make strides, I would like to share with you 2 prominent cases: Dr. Nguyen Dan Que, a prominent prisoner of conscience who was released in late 1998, remains under house arrest in Saigon; while Professor Doan Viet Hoat, a former prisoner of conscience who had been imprisoned for over 20 years for promoting democratic ideals, was forced to leave Vietnam as a condition of his release. The government of Vietnam does not tolerate liberties, such as the right to free speech, the right to freely practice one's religion, and the right to peacefully assemble. Reports reveal that the Vietnamese police have forced many religious groups to renounce their beliefs or face the threat of imprisonment. Furthermore, when I visited Vietnam in 1998, a Catholic priest told me that the Communist government did not allow him to wear vestments in public.

Even more egregious is the persecution of the Hmong, approximately 10,000 of them have had to flee their ancestral lands in the north, traveling 800 miles to the south central highlands in Dak Lak Province. Many have been arrested as "illegal migrants" or on charges of "illegal religion" as part of a government crackdown on Hmong Christians.

Mr. Speaker, in light of these offenses, I believe H.J. Res. 99 is an important bill that deserves the support of every Member, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Monday, July 24, 2000, the joint resolution is considered read for amendment and the previous question is ordered.

The question is on engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. ROHRBACHER. 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.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 91, nays 332, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 441]

YEAS—91

Aderholt	Green (WI)	Metcalfe
Andrews	Gutknecht	Paul
Baca	Hall (TX)	Pitts
Bachus	Hayes	Pombo
Barr	Hayworth	Riley
Bartlett	Hefley	Rivers
Bonilla	Hill (MT)	Rogan
Bonior	Hilleary	Rohrabacher
Brown (OH)	Holden	Ros-Lehtinen
Burton	Hunter	Royce
Buyer	Hyde	Sanchez
Canady	Jackson-Lee	Sanders
Chabot	(TX)	Saxton
Chenoweth-Hage	Johnson, Sam	Scarborough
Coble	Jones (NC)	Schaffer
Collins	Kaptur	Shadegg
Cook	Kasich	Sherwood
Cox	Kelly	Smith (NJ)
Davis (VA)	Kennedy	Souder
Deal	Kildee	Strickland
Diaz-Balart	King (NY)	Stump
Doolittle	Kucinich	Sweeney
Duncan	LaHood	Taylor (MS)
Ehrlich	Lazio	Taylor (NC)
Everett	Lewis (GA)	Walsh
Forbes	LoBiondo	Wamp
Fossella	Lofgren	Weldon (FL)
Goode	McIntyre	Weldon (PA)
Goodling	McKinney	Wolf
Graham	McNulty	Young (FL)
Green (TX)	Menendez	

NAYS—332

Abercrombie	Campbell	Emerson
Ackerman	Cannon	Engel
Allen	Capps	English
Archer	Capuano	Eshoo
Armey	Cardin	Etheridge
Baird	Carson	Evans
Baker	Castle	Farr
Baldacci	Chambliss	Fattah
Baldwin	Clayton	Filner
Ballenger	Clement	Fletcher
Barcia	Clyburn	Foley
Barrett (NE)	Coburn	Ford
Barrett (WI)	Combest	Fowler
Bass	Condit	Frank (MA)
Bateman	Conyers	Franks (NJ)
Becerra	Cooksey	Frelinghuysen
Bentsen	Costello	Frost
Bereuter	Coyne	Galleghy
Berkley	Cramer	Ganske
Berman	Crane	Gejdenson
Berry	Crowley	Gekas
Biggart	Cummings	Gephardt
Bilbray	Cunningham	Gibbons
Bilirakis	Danner	Gilchrest
Bishop	Davis (FL)	Gillmor
Blagojevich	Davis (IL)	Gonzalez
Bliley	DeFazio	Goodlatte
Blumenauer	DeGette	Gordon
Blunt	Delahunt	Goss
Boehlert	DeLauro	Greenwood
Boehner	DeLay	Gutierrez
Bono	DeMint	Hall (OH)
Borski	Deutsch	Hansen
Boswell	Dickey	Hastings (FL)
Boucher	Dicks	Hastings (WA)
Boyd	Dingell	Herger
Brady (PA)	Dixon	Hill (IN)
Brady (TX)	Doggett	Hilliard
Brown (FL)	Dooley	Hinchey
Bryant	Doyle	Hinojosa
Burr	Dreier	Hobson
Callahan	Dunn	Hoefel
Calvert	Edwards	Hoekstra
Camp	Ehlers	Holt

Hooley	Miller, George	Sensenbrenner
Horn	Minge	Serrano
Hostettler	Mink	Sessions
Houghton	Moakley	Shaw
Hoyer	Mollohan	Shays
Hulshof	Moore	Sherman
Hutchinson	Moran (KS)	Shimkus
Inslee	Moran (VA)	Shows
Isakson	Morella	Shuster
Istook	Murtha	Simpson
Jackson (IL)	Myrick	Sisisky
Jefferson	Nadler	Skeen
John	Napolitano	Skelton
Johnson (CT)	Neal	Slaughter
Johnson, E.B.	Nethercutt	Smith (MI)
Jones (OH)	Ney	Smith (TX)
Kanjorski	Northup	Snyder
Kilpatrick	Norwood	Spence
Kind (WI)	Nussle	Spratt
Kingston	Oberstar	Stabenow
Kleczka	Obey	Stark
Klink	Olver	Stearns
Knollenberg	Ortiz	Stenholm
Kolbe	Ose	Stupak
Kuykendall	Owens	Sununu
LaFalce	Oxley	Talent
Lampson	Packard	Tancredo
Lantos	Pallone	Tanner
Largent	Pascarell	Tauscher
Larson	Pastor	Tauzin
Latham	Payne	Terry
LaTourette	Pease	Thomas
Leach	Pelosi	Thompson (CA)
Lee	Peterson (MN)	Thompson (MS)
Levin	Peterson (PA)	Thornberry
Lewis (CA)	Petri	Thune
Lewis (KY)	Phelps	Thurman
Linder	Pickering	Tiahrt
Lipinski	Pickett	Tierney
Lowe	Pomeroy	Toomey
Lucas (KY)	Porter	Towns
Lucas (OK)	Portman	Trafficant
Luther	Price (NC)	Turner
Maloney (CT)	Pryce (OH)	Udall (CO)
Maloney (NY)	Quinn	Udall (NM)
Manzullo	Rahall	Upton
Markey	Ramstad	Velazquez
Martinez	Rangel	Vislosky
Mascara	Regula	Vitter
Matsui	Reyes	Walden
McCarthy (MO)	Reynolds	Waters
McCarthy (NY)	Rodriguez	Watkins
McCollum	Roemer	Watt (NC)
McCrery	Rogers	Watts (OK)
McDermott	Rothman	Waxman
McGovern	Roukema	Weiner
McHugh	Roybal-Allard	Weller
McInnis	Rush	Wexler
McKeon	Ryan (WI)	Weygand
Meehan	Ryun (KS)	Whitfield
Meek (FL)	Sabo	Wicker
Meeks (NY)	Salmon	Wilson
Mica	Sandin	Wise
Millender-	Sanford	Woolsey
McDonald	Sawyer	Wu
Miller (FL)	Schakowsky	Wynn
Miller, Gary	Scott	Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—11

Barton	Gilman	Radanovich
Clay	Granger	Smith (WA)
Cubin	Jenkins	Vento
Ewing	McIntosh	

b 1235

Messrs. EHLERS, DEMINT, CROWLEY and Ms. BERKLEY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. DUNCAN, SOUDER, WAMP, SHERWOOD, BACHUS, FOSSELLA, BONILLA, BARTLETT of Maryland, and JONES of North Carolina changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the joint resolution was not passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

f

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Evans, one of his secretaries.