

There was no objection.

**AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN THE EN-GROSSMENT OF H.R. 2031, TWENTY-FIRST AMENDMENT ENFORCEMENT ACT**

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 2031, the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections and conforming changes to the bill.

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

There was no objection.

**DISAPPROVAL OF NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS TREATMENT TO PRODUCTS OF VIETNAM**

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the previous order of the House, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 58) 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 in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of House Joint Resolution 58 is as follows:

H.J. RES. 58

*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 3, 1999, with respect to Vietnam.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 30, 1999, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) and a Member in support of the joint resolution each will control 30 minutes.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on House Joint Resolution 58.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield one-half of my time to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) in opposition to the joint resolution and that he be permitted 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.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 58 and in support of Vietnam's Jackson-Vanik waiver.

Over the past decade, the United States has taken gradual steps to normalize our bilateral regulations with Vietnam. This process has borne tangible results on the full range of issues in our bilateral agenda, including increased accounting of our missing in action, increased trade and investment opportunities for U.S. firms and workers, and substantial progress toward resolution of the remaining emigration cases.

Last week, the administration reached a bilateral trade agreement in principle with the Vietnamese that will serve as the basis for a reciprocal extension of normal trade relations once it is finalized and approved by Congress.

The agreement in principle contains provisions on market access in goods, trade, and services, intellectual property protection, and investment, which are necessary for U.S. firms to compete in the Vietnamese market, the 12th most populous in the world.

The Vietnamese pledge to lift import quotas and bans, reduce key tariffs, protect intellectual property rights, ensure transparency in rules and regulations, and ease restrictions on financial services, telecommunications, and distribution.

Because Vietnam and the United States have not yet finalized and approved a bilateral agreement, the effects of the Jackson-Vanik waiver at this time is quite limited.

The waiver enables U.S. exporters doing business with Vietnam to have access to U.S. trade financing programs, provided that Vietnam meets the relevant program criteria.

The significance of Vietnam's waiver is that it permits us to stay engaged with the Vietnamese and to pursue further reforms. Vietnam is not an easy place to do business; however, our engagement enables us to influence the pace and direction of Vietnamese reform.

I will insert in the RECORD a letter I received for more than 150 U.S. companies and trade associations supporting Vietnam's Jackson-Vanik waivers, an important step in the ability of the U.S. business community to compete in the Vietnamese market.

Terminating Vietnam's waiver will give Vietnam an excuse to halt further reforms.

Do not take away our ability to pressure the Vietnamese for progress on issues of importance to the United States.

I urge a "no" vote on H.J. Res. 58.

Mr. Speaker, the letter I referred to is as follows:

JULY 23, 1999.

Hon. PHILIP CRANE,  
House of Representatives,  
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 direction. We strongly oppose H.J. Res. 58, which would overturn the waiv-

er. Renewal of the Jackson-Vanik waiver will ensure that U.S. companies and farmers selling 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 credit programs.

Furthermore, overturning the Jackson-Vanik waiver could derail current bilateral trade negotiations at a critical time. The talks, which have been ongoing for three years, could be successfully completed in a matter of a few weeks. The U.S. Trade Representative is seeking commitments from Vietnam on market access for goods, agricultural products, services and investment, and the protection of intellectual property rights. The final agreement will thus bring Vietnamese law closer to international norms, thereby helping U.S. companies and farmers to tap the long-term potential of Vietnam, the second most populous country in Southeast Asia. The American business and agricultural community will work hard for congressional approval of a trade agreement that provides meaningful access to Vietnam's markets.

The American business and agricultural community believes that a policy of economic normalization with Vietnam is in our national interest. We urge you to support the renewal of the Jackson-Vanik waiver as an important step in this process. We also stand ready to work with Congress toward passage of a trade agreement that opens Vietnamese markets to U.S. goods, agricultural products, services and investment.

Sincerely,

ABB; Ablondi, Foster, Sobin, Davidow; ACE International; AEA International SOS; Aetna International, Inc.; AgriSource Co. Ltd.; American Apparel Manufacturers Association; American Chamber of Commerce in Australia; American Chamber of Commerce in Guangdong, China; American Chamber of Commerce in Hong Kong; American Chamber of Commerce in Korea; American Chamber of Commerce in the Philippines; American Chamber of Commerce Vietnam; American Council of Life Insurance; American Electronics Association; American Express Company; American Farm Bureau Federation; American International Group, Inc.; American-Vietnamese Management Consortium, Inc.; Amstan Sanitaryware, Inc., ARCO; Arthur Anderson Vietnam; Asia-Pacific Council of American Chamber of Commerce; Associated General Contractors of America; Association for Manufacturing Technology; ATKearney; Banker and McKenzie, Vietnam; BBDO Advertising Agency; Bechtel; Black and Veatch; Bridgecreek Group; Brown & Root; California Chamber of Commerce; Caltex; Camp Dresser & McKee International, Inc.

Cargill; Caterpillar, Inc., Centrifugal Casting Machine Co., Inc.; Chamber of Commerce of the Princeton Area; Checkpoint Systems, Asia Pacific; Chevron Corporation; Chillothe-Ross Chamber of Commerce Citigroup; Coalition for Employment through Exports, Inc.; Commerce Advisory Partners; Condor Consulting; Connell Brothers Company, Ltd.; Coudert Brothers, Vietnam; Craft Corporation; Crown Worldwide Ltd.; DAI-Asia; Deacons Graham & James; Delco Chamber of Commerce; Delta Equipment and Construction Company; Direct Selling Association; Eastman Kodak Co.; East-West Trade and Investment, Inc.; Electronic Industries Alliance; Eli Lilly (Asia) Inc.; Ellicott International; Emergency Committee for American Trade; Environmental Services Inc.; ERM Hong Kong Ltd.; Exact Software; Fashion Garments Ltd.; FDX Corporation; Fertilizer Institute; Firmenich Inc.; Foster Wheeler Corporation; Freehill

Hollingdale & Page; Freeport Area Chamber of Commerce; Freshfields Vietnam; General Electric Company; Habersham County Chamber of Commerce; Halliburton Company.

Hewlett-Packard Company; Hills and Co.; Humphrey International Healthcare Inc.; IAMBIC, Ltd.; IBC Corporation; IBM; Illinois State Chamber of Commerce; Indochina Asset Management Ltd.; Ingersoll-Rand Company; Interior Architects, Inc.; John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Company; Johnson & Johnson; Joseph Simon & Sons; Kansas Chamber of Commerce & Industry; KHM Inc.; Leo Burnett/M&T Vietnam; LiG Products Ltd.; Long Beach Area Chamber of Commerce; Louis Dreyfus Corp.; Luk, Inc.; McDermott Incorporated; Metro Atlanta Chamber of Commerce; Mobil Corporation; Motion Picture Association of America; Motorola; National Association of Manufacturers; National Foreign Trade Council; National Institute for World Trade;

National Oilseed Processors Association; National Retail Federation; Netrak Logistics & Consultants; New Jersey Chamber of Commerce; New York Life International; Nike; Norpac Food Sales; North American Export Grain Association, Inc.; Ohsman & Sons Company, Inc.; Oracle; Otis-Lilama Elevator Company, Ltd.; Pacific Architects and Engineers, Inc.; Pacific Ventures Inc.; Pacific View Partners, Inc.; Parsons Corporation; PASCO Scientific; PepsiCo Inc.; Pioneer Hi-Bred International; Polaris Co., Ltd. HCMC; Pricewaterhousecoopers Vietnam Ltd.; Procter and Gamble Company; Projects International, Inc.; Quaker Fabric Corporation; Raytheon; Rotex; RRC Schneider Electric; Rural Enterprises of Oklahoma, Inc.; Russin & Vecchi; S.C. Johnson & Son;

Samuels International Associates, Inc.; SciClone Pharmaceuticals International; Small Business Exporters Association; S-Tec Corporation; Telecommunications Industry Association; Telemobile Inc.; Texaco Inc.; The Boeing Company; The Chamber/Southwest Louisiana; Tileke & Gibbins Consultants Ltd.; U.S. Association of Importers of Textiles and Apparel; U.S. Chamber of Commerce; U.S. Committee Pacific Basin Economic Council-PBEC US; U.S. Council for International Business; U.S. Trading & Investment Company; U.S.-ASEAN Business Council; U.S.-Vietnam Trade Council; Unisys Corporation; United Parcel Service; United Technologies Corporation; Unocal; Valve Manufacturers Association; Vietnam Auditing Company; Vietnam Venture Group, Inc.; Vinifera Wine Growers Association; Warnaco Inc.; Wharton Chamber of Commerce and Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER), though we disagree perhaps at times.

□ 1545

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate the gentleman yielding me this time, as I am the author of the bill; and I wanted to have this opportunity to speak at this time.

It has been 1 year since President Clinton issued the first Jackson-Vanik waiver for Vietnam. Unfortunately,

there has been no progress concerning democracy and human rights in Vietnam. And more specifically, in violation of Jackson-Vanik, the U.S. Government reports systematic corruption in Vietnam's refugee program.

My joint resolution disapproving Jackson-Vanik waivers for the Vietnamese dictatorship does not intend to isolate Vietnam nor stop U.S. companies from doing business there. It simply prevents Communist Vietnam from enjoying a trade status that enables American businessmen to invest there with loan guarantees and subsidies provided by the U.S. taxpayer. If private banks or insurance companies will not back up or insure private business ventures in Vietnam, American taxpayers should not be asked to do so.

Rampant corruption and mismanagement are as valid a reason to oppose this waiver as repression in Vietnam. And during the last year, rather than open up its state-managed economy, the Vietnamese Communist regime has further tightened its grip. There has been no move whatsoever towards free elections. And yesterday's Reuters News Agency reported that the Vietnamese government announced that opposition parties will not be tolerated. This morning's Washington Times reports a new campaign in Vietnam to crush Christians.

The lack of real progress to honestly resolve the MIA-POW cases and the continued persecution of America's former Vietnamese allies is why House Joint Resolution 58 is strongly supported by the American Legion, our country's largest veterans' organization, as well as other veterans' organizations and the National League of MIA-POW Families, and the National Alliance of POW-MIA Families.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). The gentleman from New York (Mr. McNULTY) is recognized for 30 minutes.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. McNULTY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 58 which disapproves the President's determination to waive the Jackson-Vanik Freedom of Information requirements for Vietnam.

Others have pointed out that this debate is not about extension of normal trade relations to Vietnam, but rather about the more limited issue of whether Vietnam should be eligible to participate in U.S. credit and credit guarantee programs. Technically, Mr. Speaker, that is correct. However, I think we all know that this debate is about something much more.

In granting this waiver, we send a message of support to the government of Vietnam. We are telling the government of Vietnam that despite their continued failure to assist us in finding lost servicemen, despite their refusal to allow Vietnamese, including Vietnamese who bravely fought alongside us, to leave Vietnam, despite their blatant disregard for human rights, that we support them. These are not the values for which 58,000 U.S. servicemen and women gave their lives.

The trade embargo with Vietnam was lifted in 1994. In the intervening years, what progress has Vietnam shown? There are still 2,063 Americans still unaccounted for in southeast Asia. While the remains of some of those Americans may not be recoverable, it strains belief that the Vietnamese have no information as to the fate or location of all of these men and women.

Much will be said today about increased cooperation between the United States and Vietnam. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, it is too little and it is coming too late. It has been 25 years since the communist takeover of the entire country, and in that time the Vietnamese have only cooperated with us when it would benefit them, and then only to the extent that they saw fit. This is not my definition of cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, I do not oppose the eventual, eventual, normalization of relations with the people of Vietnam. I do, however, oppose normalization of relations with this government under these circumstances.

Now, some may claim, Mr. Speaker, that I have an emotional attachment to this issue, and they are correct. On August the 9th, 1970, HM3 William F. McNulty was killed in Vietnam. He was a medical Navy 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 the pain may subside, but it never goes away. But 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 25 years and longer.

Mr. Speaker, until there is a more complete accounting for those missing in action, until there is progress on the immigration front, and until there is respect for human rights, this waiver should not be granted.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Resolution 58, which disapproves of the President's determination to waive the Jackson-Vanik Freedom of Immigration Requirements for Vietnam. This resolution, if passed, would preclude Vietnam from participating in United States trade financing programs, such as those sponsored by the Ex-Im Bank, OPIC, and agricultural credit programs under the United States Department of Agriculture.

At a broader level, passage of this resolution would seriously undermine the progress in United States-Vietnam relations made in the last 10 years. Since the late 1980s, Vietnam has shown an increasing commitment towards reengaging with the United States, evidenced by greater cooperation with the POW-MIA accounting and on immigration issues.

As a result of this progress, beginning in 1992, the United States has gradually normalized relations with Vietnam. This normalization process helped to keep Vietnam on track with its reforms and has resulted in greater cooperation on the POW-MIA accounting efforts, immigration, and economic reform.

Most recently, the administration announced that it reached a tentative bilateral commercial agreement with Vietnam. Clearly, our policy of engagement is helping to create a change in that society. Ending engagement at this juncture will end our ability to shape the pace and the direction of this change, including undercutting our ability to promote democratic reform.

In fact, as we have seen in our failed policy toward Cuba, a policy of isolation does little to promote the values which we care so much about. A policy of isolation, as we have seen in Cuba, only serves to separate people and prevents us from sharing our ideals and our beliefs.

I recognize that our history of Vietnam is a troubled one. The scars of the past run deep, and we can never forget

those who sacrificed their lives in service to their country. However, isolating Vietnam will not heal those scars.

Perhaps no one can speak more authoritatively on that issue than one of our former colleagues, Pete Peterson. 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 House of Representatives, Pete Peterson returned to Vietnam, this time as the first United States ambassador since the Communist takeover. It is Ambassador Peterson's remarkable optimism about the changes going on in Vietnam that I believe sheds the greatest light on what our policy toward Vietnam should be.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of my time be yielded to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and that he be permitted to allocate that time as he sees fit.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE), and that he be allowed to control that time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, opponents of this resolution say they are opposed to this resolution because they support a more free and open Vietnam. Well, I too support a more free and open Vietnam, but I support this resolution because by passing it we send a clear signal that business as usual is not acceptable.

No one is looking to take away the right of American corporations to do business in Vietnam. First, let us be clear. Since the U.S. trade embargo on Vietnam was lifted in 1994, businesses have had the ability to trade with and invest in Vietnam, and some have done so. The debate over Jackson-Vanik waiver for Vietnam is not about trade and investment. This is about government subsidies for companies operating in Vietnam.

This resolution is also about maintaining the focus on changes we would like to see in Vietnam. And I thought this was why we first normalized relations with Vietnam, with the expectation that the government would make a genuine reform, a genuine effort at progress. It is no secret that the Vietnamese government wants this waiver, but in granting the waiver once again

we are saying it is okay that religious freedom continues to be restricted, it is okay that there is minimal political freedom, it is okay to have repression and to have it intensified this past year.

If this waiver is upheld or rejected, American companies will be no more or less free to invest in Vietnam. It should be noted, however, that the investment climate in Vietnam is not good and that several American companies have pulled out and several others are considering pulling out. We should realize that one simply cannot do business, whether a foreigner or as a Vietnamese, in a place where the rule of law is disregarded.

For the U.S. to subsidize companies that do business in Vietnam through OPIC or Ex-Im would be for us to ignore this reality. As long as the Vietnamese government continues to jam Radio Free Asia, which is an attempt to deny the Vietnamese people access to objective news, and as long as it violates human rights and disrespects economic freedom, we should not waive Jackson-Vanik.

It is only through taking these steps that we can leverage and bring about the necessary changes concerning respect for individual rights, religious freedom and liberalized markets in one of the world's most politically and economically repressive countries.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER).

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

□ 1600

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, I rise in opposition to the resolution.

The Jackson-Vanik waiver does not constitute an endorsement of the communist regime in Hanoi. However, our experience has been that the isolation and disengagement does not promote progress in human rights.

New sanctions, including the symbolic disapproval of the Jackson-Vanik waiver, only strengthen 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, although we still remain disappointed at the limit scope and nature of those reforms.

Mr. Speaker, Americans must conclusively recognize that the war with Vietnam is over. With the restoration of diplomatic relationships in 1995, the U.S. and Vietnam embarked on a new relationship for the future. It will not be an easy or quick process.

The emotional scars of the Vietnam war remain with many Americans. In the mid-1960s, this Member was an intelligence officer with the First Infantry Division; less than a month after

the completion of my service, members of our tight-knit detachment of that division were in Vietnam taking casualties the very first night after arrival.

Like other Vietnam-era veterans, this Member has emotional baggage. A great many Americans have emotional baggage on Vietnam, but this Member would suggest it is time to get on with our bilateral relationship and not reverse course on Vietnam.

Distinguished Americans like JOHN MCCAIN, Pete Peterson, ROBERT KERREY, JOHN KERRY, CHUCK HAGEL, MAX CLELAND, CHUCK ROBB, and others support the effort to normalize our relationships with Vietnam. If they can do it, so can we.

Passing this resolution of disapproval on 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 integration into the international community.

A retrenchment on our part by this disapproval resolution is not in America's short- and long-term national interest.

Accordingly, this Member strongly urges the rejection of House Resolution 58.

By law, the underlying issue is about emigration. That is what Jackson-Vanik is all about and that is what we ought to be addressing. 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 3, 1999 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.

The Jackson-Vanik waiver also symbolizes our interest in further developing relations with Vietnam. Having lifted the trade embargo and established diplomatic relations four years ago, the United States has tried to work with Vietnam to normalize incrementally our bilateral political, economic and consular relationship. This policy 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. Over the past four years, Vietnam has increasingly cooperated on a wide range of issues. The most im-

portant 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.

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 negotiate a new bilateral commercial trade agreement in principle with Vietnam. Achieving such an 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. A new bilateral trade agreement will require Vietnam to make these reforms and will result in increased U.S. exports. When the final version of this agreement is complete, Congress will then have to decide whether to approve it or reject it and whether or not to grant NTR. As the Jackson-Vanik waiver is only a limited prerequisite for any future trade agreement, the renewal of the Jackson-Vanik waiver only keeps this negotiating and approval process going—nothing more. However, terminating Vietnam's waiver through passage of the resolution of disapproval before us would certainly derail this entire process as well as rejecting the modest trade opportunities currently available to American businesses.

Mr. Speaker, contrary to the claims of some, renewal of the Jackson-Vanik waiver does not automatically make Vietnam eligible for possible 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 Vietnam to be eligible for such coverage and that country must still face separate individual reviews against each program's relevant criteria.

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

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support House Joint Resolution 58, the resolution to disapprove the Jackson-Vanik waiver to Vietnam.

This provision was first waived in 1998 on the premise that it would promote free and open emigration with Vietnam. Sadly, things have not turned out that way.

My colleagues, let us consider the facts. An average immigrant now must pay about \$1,000 in bribes to have access to U.S. refugee programs, three times the average annual salary of a Vietnamese worker.

A recent report to Congress stated that over 15,000 former United States Government employees and their families have been denied exit visas, leaving them trapped in Vietnam.

In my hand I have copies of hundreds of unresolved constituent casework, unresolved because the emigration policy of the Vietnamese Government still

results in far too many people being prevented from leaving Vietnam due to unfair decisions. These are the parents, the siblings, and the offspring of families who have fought communism for two decades.

I will support H.J. Res. 58 because I believe the Government of Vietnam has not earned the right to improve trade privileges.

I urge my colleagues to put pressure on the Government of Vietnam to meet the conditions of emigration and to improve their political and human rights record by voting "yes."

Do not surrender our principal leverage with this regime. Vote "yes" for free immigration. Vote "yes" for family reunification. Vote "yes" to end religious persecution. Vote "yes" to promote free speech and democracy. Vote "yes" to honor the values which we are sworn to uphold.

The fact is the Vietnamese Government does not meet the conditions of good emigration. And by rewarding Vietnam regardless of its lack of cooperation, we are sending them the wrong message.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURR). The gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) has 11 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) has 10 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 12 minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York (Mr. McNULTY) has 9 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 58 and in support of the President's waiver of the Jackson-Vanik amendment with respect to Vietnam.

In considering this resolution, I ask my colleagues to bear a few matters in mind. First, today's vote is not a vote on whether to give normal trade relations, NTR, to Vietnam.

For that to happen, the United States first must enter into a bilateral commercial agreement with Vietnam and that agreement must be approved by Congress.

Second, if we reject this resolution, as we did last year, the result would be a continuation of Vietnam's eligibility to participate in financing programs, those administered by OPIC, the Export-Import Bank, and the Department of Agriculture.

Those programs support U.S. exports to and investments in Vietnam and thereby enable U.S. businesses and workers to compete in Vietnam with businesses and workers from other countries.

The programs have been available since the President first waived Jackson-Vanik for Vietnam in April of last year. To cut them off now would be to pull the rug from under U.S. producers of goods and services. It would be a setback in our effort to improve U.S. relations with Vietnam and to encourage the development of a market economy in that country.

By contrast, continuing those programs for another year represents a small but important step forward. Importantly, it should bolster our efforts to encourage the development of the bases of a free market and rule of law in Vietnam.

Third, our trade negotiators have been negotiating a trade agreement with Vietnam, which is a prerequisite to giving Vietnam NTR.

On July 25, the U.S. trade representative announced that an agreement in principle had been reached. She also stated that the administration "will now consult with Congress and others, and work toward completion of a formal Bilateral Commercial Agreement and a mutual grant of normal trade relations."

We look forward to those consultations which would give us an opportunity to review negotiations to date and other trade issues and any other additional issues relating to trade of concern to us in the Congress.

At the June 17 Subcommittee on Trade hearing on relations with Vietnam, I cited a number of important issues that have to be resolved before we can agree to full normalization. Of particular concern is the pace of economic reform in Vietnam. They are taking steps to reform the economy, including steps to root out corruption, enforcement of intellectual property rights, and improvement of the reliability of government-published data.

Another area of concern that I mentioned at that time is the potentially disturbing effects that Vietnam's labor market structure, including the exploitation of child labor, may have on competition. Labor market issues are trade issues.

Progress on each of the foregoing fronts is necessary to ensure that the benefits of U.S. businesses and workers from normalization with commercial relations with Vietnam are real.

Our ambassador to Vietnam and our former distinguished colleague, Pete Peterson, testified before the Subcommittee on Trade of the Committee on Ways and Means. He stated, based on his active work as ambassador, as follows. I urge all to listen to the conclusions or the findings, the experiences of our ambassador:

"Vietnam has eased restrictions on emigration," he said. "Over 500,000 people have left Vietnam for the U.S. under the Orderly Departure Program."

Next: "Vietnam continues to cooperate fully with the U.S. on locating Americans missing in action."

Next: "Last fall, the Government of Vietnam released several prisoners of conscience."

He also said: "Tolerance of religious worship," far, far from perfect, "is improving."

"In 1998," he also mentioned, "there were 60 independently organized worker strikes protesting unfair wages and working conditions."

"The Government is in the process of writing legislation to protect the freedom of association."

And lastly, that "the United States," he says, under his leadership, "continues to engage with Vietnam in a very frank dialogue on human rights. The most recent round in this dialogue took place at the assistant secretary level in mid-July."

Members of Congress will be watching for further progress closely. For now, let us support the accomplishments that have been made to date toward normalization of our relationship with Vietnam. Let us take a cautious step forward by continuing the Jackson-Vanik waiver for Vietnam.

In short, let us keep intact the groundwork on which a meaningful and enduring relationship can be built. Support the waiver. Vote against H.J. Res. 58.

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

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations, a veteran, and a great leader in international relations in this Congress.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 58 offered by the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) in disapproving the extension of the Jackson-Vanik waiver for the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

The issue before us is progress, progress on human rights, on freedom of religion, freedom of emigration, and obtaining the fullest possible accounting for our POW/MIAs from the war in Southeast Asia.

Simply stated, the Vietnamese Government has not demonstrated the progress on these issues to warrant an extension of the Jackson-Vanik waiver. Many of us have voiced our concerns with regard to the rapid pace of normalizing relations with Vietnam.

The President insists that extending the waiver of the Jackson-Vanik amendment and its ensuing privileges is in our best national interest and will encourage the Vietnamese Government to cooperate on many issues, including economic reforms, political liberalization, and respect for human rights.

OPIC guarantee and Export-Import Bank financing programs should be a reward for achievement and not offered as an incentive for future conduct.

Despite the opening of diplomatic relations 4 years ago, prisoners of conscience are still in prison in Vietnam. Many of our former comrades in arms are still unaccounted for in the Vietnam War.

The Vietnamese Government still arbitrarily arrests and detains its citizens, including those who peacefully express political and religious objections to government policies.

The hard-line communist government also denies its citizens the right to fair and expeditious trials and still hold a number of political prisoners.

Moreover, Radio Free Asia is continuously jammed, preventing the free flow of information which Congress has worked to promote.

Vietnam continues to "severely restrict those religious activities it defined as being at variance with State laws and policies," as stated in the State Department Report on Human Rights Practices.

Along with a number of Members of Congress, I recently wrote to President Clinton expressing our concern over the persecution of the Unified Buddhist Church, the Catholic Church, Protestant Christians, and the Montagnards in Vietnam.

In conclusion, a proposed extension of the waiver of Jackson-Vanik would essentially reward a lack of progress on human rights, political liberalization, economic reform, and the POW/MIA effort. This is illogical.

Accordingly, I call upon our colleagues to vote "yes" on this resolution of disapproval of the extension of the Jackson-Vanik waiver and send a strong message that our Nation still values principle over profits.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Joint Resolution 58.

As a Vietnam War veteran, I empathize with many of the arguments that are made by opponents to this waiver. I, too, am concerned about freedom of emigration. I, too, want a full accounting for our MIA and POWs. I, too, am concerned about religious freedom. But I strongly disagree with how this solution proposes to resolve these problems.

Denying the Jackson-Vanik waiver for Vietnam will do nothing to further progress in any of these areas. In fact, it will have the opposite effect.

I hope my colleagues will take a moment to consider the changes that have occurred and that are occurring to Vietnam.

Vietnam is not the same country it was 30 years ago when I was there. Over the past 15 years, 500,000 Vietnamese have emigrated to the United States. Over 96 percent of the resettlement opportunities for Vietnamese returnees cases have been cleared for interview by Vietnam. On emigration issues, we are clearly headed in the right direction.

On POW/MIA accounting, we have had and continue to have substantial cooperation from the Vietnamese Government in all areas. On religious freedom, progress is also being made.

Three weeks ago, a high-level U.S. delegation traveled to Vietnam to engage in the seventh session of our annual human rights dialogue with Vietnamese officials.

At each of these meetings, religious freedom has been a major topic of discussion; and each time U.S. officials

have been able to report that progress is being made.

□ 1615

In October of this year, five American Catholic bishops will be visiting Vietnam, the first visit by an American bishop since 1975. This will be a momentous event.

Let me be clear. While there is progress, the situation in Vietnam today is far from perfect. But it is important that we put this vote in its historical perspective. In 1991, 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 was to move incrementally toward normalized relations. We have moved in that direction.

I urge my colleagues not to abandon decades of progress. Only with engagement can we have commerce and only with commerce can we have change.

I urge a "no" vote on this resolution.

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding me this time.

I rise in strong support of H.J. Res. 58 and in support of trade agreements that put people before corporate profits, trade agreements that act as if human beings mattered.

Today we are debating whether to give the very same multinationals that last month succeed in gaining NAFTA for Africa and higher trade surpluses with China, whether to give those same multinationals more government-backed guarantees to protect their investments in another poor nation with a horrible human rights record, a nation with absolutely no worker rights or religious or political freedoms, the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

Think about that, because that is what the President's waiver does. It is a green light for businessmen and businesswomen to take advantage of another people's misfortune, of their inability to organize political change in the face of overwhelming government opposition. We are asking our constituents, the men and women who voted us into office, to back American corporations that want to do business with a Communist dictatorship that reviles the very form of government that lets us debate this measure.

This is a government that for the last 20 years has arrested, tortured and put hundreds of thousands of people into prisons and reeducation camps for crimes like forming independent trade unions, for worshipping in churches, for, quote, using freedom and democracy to injure national unity.

The Vietnamese people should have the opportunity to earn better wages, to live longer and healthier lives, to enter into better relationships with the United States and the rest of the

world. However, rubber-stamping the President's waiver makes a mockery of our Constitution and the provisions in the 1974 Trade Act that uphold human rights, that uphold worker rights, that uphold religious rights.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that my colleagues would join us in affirming that human rights and those principles that our country stands for do count for something. We should not just waive them. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and to support trade agreements that require nations to first enter the family of nations, agreements that support free trade between free people.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the very capable and distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS).

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, today's vote on the resolution of disapproval is really a vote on if we are truly dedicated to the hard work of getting a full accounting of the missing in action from the Vietnam War. As the Veterans of Foreign Wars has argued, passing this resolution of disapproval will only hurt our efforts at a time that they are receiving the access and cooperation we need from the Vietnamese to determine the fate of our POW/MIA's.

There is no more authoritative voice on this issue than our former colleague and now Ambassador to Vietnam, Pete Peterson, who supports the waiver. As a prisoner of war who underwent years of imprisonment in the notorious Hanoi Hilton, he should have every right to be skeptical and harbor bitterness against the Vietnamese. Yet he believes the best course of action is to develop better relations between our countries.

We have achieved progress on the POW/MIA issue because of our evolving relationship with the Vietnamese, not despite it. Without access to the jungles and rice paddies, to the archival information and documents, and to the witnesses of these tragic incidents, we cannot give the families of the missing the answers they deserve.

Our Nation is making progress in providing these answers. Much of this is due to the Joint Task Force-Full Accounting, our military presence in Vietnam who are looking into missing issues. I have visited these young men and women and they are among the finest and bravest and most gung ho soldiers I have ever met. Every day from the searches of battle sites in treacherous jungles or 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 men and women in action, some of whom were not even born when our missing served, perform a mission that they see as a sacred duty. They tell me time and time again one thing: "Allow us to remain here so we can do our job."

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

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON), a distinguished colleague who spent 6 years as a prisoner of war, a man who was a pilot, a man who fought for his country and a man who has a unique opinion on this issue that we are discussing today.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what the gentleman says, but even with the Ambassador over there, we still are not getting into some of the places that we need to get into. If you send our military to do a job, they are going to do it, regardless of where they are, and they are doing that job over there.

But I ask you, who better than our Vietnamese Americans to know what should happen in Vietnam? No waiver. They do not want a waiver. If you recall in 1995, I think it was, or 1993, rather, Clinton said that he would have a full and accurate accounting of all our POWs. That is our President. Again, in 1995, if you recall, he flipped and went back on his word and recognized them. And now we want to put another nose under the tent, or push the nose a little further and try to recognize them for trade. Even now, we still have over 2,000 unaccounted for servicemen in Vietnam. Our MIA, missing in action, families, deserve our full support and that means "yes" to no waiver.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

(Mrs. BIGGERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, H.J. Res. 58 is the wrong direction for us to take today. Who is hurt if we pass this resolution today? We are. It is the wrong direction for U.S. farmers and manufacturers who will 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. And it is the wrong direction for our efforts to influence the Vietnamese people, 65 percent of whom were not even born when the war was being waged.

Let us not turn the clock back on Vietnam. Let us continue to work with the Vietnamese, and in so doing teach the youthful Vietnamese the values of democracy, the principles of capitalism, and the merits of a free and open society. I urge a "no" vote.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, Vietnam should be able to trade with America, but only when Hanoi halts human rights abuses and establishes a fair, sound economic environment that embraces human rights.

It is clear that Vietnam is eager to have an economic relationship with the United States and is willing to take the steps necessary to do so. Unfortunately, they are not where they need to be and they will not get there unless we stand firm for democratic principles and for human rights for the people of Vietnam.

Vietnam embarked down the road to reform in 1986, achieving high economic growth of 8 percent per year with low inflation. As a result, the U.S. lifted economic sanctions in 1994 and normalized diplomatic relations in 1995.

It was all downhill from there. The economic growth did not produce democratic and market reforms. In addition to quashing the religious, political and social freedoms of its citizens and restricting their rights to emigrate, Hanoi has taken giant steps backward from fostering sound policies and stability to bolster its economy and attract foreign investors. Erratic decision making, government red tape and high overhead makes many businesses unviable.

The government's refusal to loosen its political domination and accelerate the transition to a market economy has brought the country to a critical juncture. We cannot abandon the Vietnamese people and American businesses at this critical juncture. In the case of Vietnam, trade sanctions can be an effective way of ensuring Hanoi chooses the path of reform. As we saw in South Africa, 5 years after the U.S. first imposed economic sanctions, the Pretoria government abolished apartheid. While some question the economic effectiveness of U.S. sanctions, economists agree that the psychological and political effects were of fundamental importance to eliminating apartheid.

Economic sanctions are not the right tool in every case. But when they are, they take time. They only are effective when we have the patience to wait for results. The people of Vietnam deserve the same patience.

Please support this resolution and join with the Vietnamese people in their struggle against communism and oppression.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I have a certain degree of irony being here on the floor having this resolution debated today, when earlier this week we had former Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara here on Capitol Hill meeting and admitting basically that the college students were right 30 years ago and that the government and Mr. McNamara were not telling the American people the truth.

I think it is amazing for us to look at the progress that has in fact occurred over the last third of a century. We have heard referenced on the floor the 500,000 people that have been able to legally emigrate. We had opportunities

today for Members of this assembly to meet with our former colleague Pete Peterson to talk about his experience with the progress in terms of religious freedom in Vietnam and the rebuilding of churches and pagodas, the progress on the MIAs where we have more accountability than any war in American history. Even in the area of democratic government, there were 61 people elected to the Vietnamese Assembly who were independents, who were not Communists. Consider this, given where they have been, that one even is a former South Vietnamese military officer.

Pete Peterson has made huge progress in his life's work of trying to bring 350 million people together between our two countries, the majority of whom in both countries were not even alive during the Vietnam War. I strongly urge a rejection of this resolution before us today. Reject the resolution in order to hasten the day when we can get beyond the tortured struggle that has, I think, divided our country unnecessarily and bring about a healing and an integration of the Vietnamese nation into the world economy and allow us to be able to deal honestly with the history that got us here in the first place.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) who represents thousands of Vietnamese Americans who know full well what repression their family members live under in Vietnam.

(Mr. DAVIS of Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 58, disapproving the extension of emigration waiver authority to Vietnam.

As Members know, last year the President granted Vietnam a waiver of the Jackson-Vanik's condition, but not much really I think has been cited or documented in that last year. Boat People SOS, an organization located in my district, has informed me that there is rampant corruption in Vietnam and the Vietnamese government and it continues to exclude thousands of former political prisoners and former U.S. Government employees from participating in the U.S. refugee programs. On average, an applicant has to pay \$1,000 in bribes to gain access to these programs. In a country where the average Vietnamese's salary is \$250, how can an impoverished former political prisoner or former U.S. Government employee who the government already discriminates against afford a \$1,000 bribe per person just to apply for these programs? Since last year's waiver, the Vietnamese government has not deemed a single case among this group of thousands to be eligible for the refugee program.

Corruption exists not only in the Vietnamese government but it also undermines U.S. exchange programs as well.

□ 1630

Our programs offer outstanding Vietnamese students the opportunity to participate and study in the U.S.; however, the Vietnamese Government excludes those students whose parents are not members of the Communist cadre.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this resolution.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO).

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, a small business exporter of wireless telecommunications equipment from Torrance, California, had never sold to Vietnam. Telemobile's Japanese, French, and Canadian competitors all had the support of their home government's export credit agencies. Telemobile had no hope of selling to Vietnam until the President and Congress approved the Jackson-Vanik waiver last year allowing the Export-Import Bank and other Federal export promotion programs to operate in Vietnam. Then Telemobile won a \$6 million contract with Vietnam to sell their product backed with the letter of interest from the Export-Import Bank.

The purpose of the vote today is to allow those types of partnerships so American companies can utilize our export credit agencies in order to have American jobs. With the already large U.S. trade deficit, we should not impose yet another sanction on our exports. We should vote against this resolution of disapproval.

Open letter to Congress from Telemobile is as follows:

TELEMOBILE, INC.,  
Torrance, CA, July 27, 1999.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
House of Representatives.

OPEN LETTER TO CONGRESS: I am President of a small electronics manufacturing company, employing about 100 people in the Los Angeles metropolitan area. I am writing to express my opposition to the resolution of disapproval regarding Vietnam's Jackson-Vanik's waiver (H.J. Res. 58) because it will have a serious impact on our business and our employees who live and work here.

Telemobile, Inc. is a manufacturer of wireless rural telecommunications equipment. We compete against Canadian, French, and Japanese manufacturers of similar equipment. They all have the support of their home governments in the area of trade promotion, including their government-supported export credit agencies. We had no hope of winning any business in Vietnam until the President and Congress supported a waiver of the Jackson-Vanik amendment last year. Since then, we received a Letter of Interest from the Export-Import Bank of the United States (Ex-Im) for a project we plan to do in Vietnam worth about \$6 million. We would have never won this contract if we did not have the backing of the Ex-Im Bank. Even still, all of our foreign competitors tell our Vietnamese customers to abandon their project with us because their governments do not go through this annual Jackson-Vanik waiver process. Fortunately, the Vietnamese want to buy American products.

But if Ex-Im is forced to leave Vietnam because of the passage of H.J. Res. 58, then our Vietnamese customers will have no choice but to go with one of our foreign competitors. Thus, if this bill passes, the real-life

practical effect upon Telemobile is that the work on this \$6 million contract will be transferred from the 100 employees here in Torrance, California to Canada, Japan or France. While a \$6 million sale may be insignificant in the eyes of Washington, it is significant to our small business, which is 95 percent export-oriented.

I firmly believe that renewal of the Jackson-Vanik waiver is a necessary step in the process of normalizing our relations with Vietnam and would be good for the American people, as well as the business activities of American workers engaged in exports. Please oppose H.J. Res. 58.

Very truly,

W.I. THOMAS,  
President.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

(Mr. MORAN of Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution and in favor of the Jackson-Vanik waiver.

I rise in opposition to this resolution and urge my colleagues to uphold the current waiver from the Jackson-Vanik provision.

Mr. Speaker, 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 U.S. and Israel.

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

The co-author of this provision, Senator Scoop Jackson was a staunch anti-communist.

Yet, he was willing to consider incentives to encourage the Soviet Union to relax its emigration policy.

Vietnam is experiencing a new era, driven by a population where 65% of its citizens were born after the war. Vietnam today is thirsty for U.S. trade and economic investment.

Last year, 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.

Ironically, the economic incentives provided in Jackson-Vanik are all one sided favoring U.S. firms doing business in Vietnam.

A waiver of Jackson-Vanik does not establish normal trading relations with Vietnam.

The Vietnamese Government has made tremendous progress in meeting the emigration criteria in the Jackson-Vanik amendment.

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 less isolated and to follow the rule of law.

Through a policy of engagement and U.S. business investment, Vietnam has improved its emigration policies.

As of June 1 of this year, the Vietnamese Government had cleared nearly 20,000 individuals, or 96% of applicants, for interviews under the Resettlement Opportunity for Vietnamese Returnees (ROVR).

The Immigration and Naturalization Service has approved 15,833 ROVR applicants for admission to the United States as refugees—14,715 of which have left Vietnam for the U.S.

According to the State Department, we are also obtaining "the fullest possible accounting" of our missing in action from the Vietnam War.

Just last week, the U.S. and Vietnam finalized the terms of a bilateral trade agreement to address issues ranging from import quotas, import bans, and high tariffs to financial services, telecommunications, and other issues that are critical to opening Vietnam to U.S. products and services.

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. products and services in the 12th most populous country in the world.

Disapproval of this waiver will have several negative outcomes. It will 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.

I can see nothing gained by overturning the waiver and urge my colleagues to defeat this resolution.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute, and I understand that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) will also yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CRANE. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute as well to our good colleague and friend from San Diego, California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURR of North Carolina). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) for 2 minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, for some of us this issue is very, very difficult, when heart, economics, pain are all tied up into one. I understand the version of the gentleman from New York (Mr. McNULTY) of this, and I understand the gentleman's, and what I would do is point out a couple things on each side because I still do not know how I am going to vote on this issue.

When one lives through Private Ryan, it is very difficult for something like this, and one side we see economics, like the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO) talked about for his constituents, and on the other side, Mr. Speaker, I went with the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) to Vietnam. He asked me to go four times, and I said no, it is too hard, and then he said, Well, Pete Peterson asked you to come and help raise the American flag for the first time in 25 years.

I saw American children there, Eurasians, that can not be helped by this on one side, but yet I saw very strong Communism. As a matter of fact, the Communist premier told me, he said, Duke, we don't engage in free trade. I can't do this quickly. He is very open, he said, because it will put us out of a job, which meant Communism.

To me on one side that says, Hey, American involvement is good because it hammers away at Communism; but yet on the other side I see where not even Pete Peterson can be there when an American citizen is tried in their courts, and it is difficult, Mr. Speaker.

I had a young lady in my district named Foo Lee, had to work a year. Her whole family escaped in a boat, lives in my district, and the mom had to stay behind because they knew that if they were caught, they would be put into a reeducation camp, and not many people survive; and it took a year to get her back into the United States and rejoined with the family.

And on that side it is very hard for this. I look at that we cannot go in with intellectual property rights, but on the other side we have the same problem with China, and I voted for trade with China, so why not for this? And it is one of the more difficult. For most of my colleagues it is not, but for us, and Sam, and I understand both sides of this issue. I see my friend Pete Peterson spent 6 years as a POW there, and it is very difficult to look at heart, to look at logic, to look at economics.

Mr. Speaker, I will not chastise anybody for either side of this vote.

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

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me, and what I would like to do is address my remarks to all of my colleagues, but especially to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

As a young soldier in Vietnam, I like to speak to my colleagues through the eyes of many young soldiers in Vietnam where we would every once in a while help corps men deliver babies, some alive and some dead. We as very young men saw leprosy for the first time. We saw the eyes of the dying Viet Cong. We saw the eyes and looked into the eyes of dying young Americans and said good bye. We laughed and cried with the Vietnamese people, the very old and the very young.

One incident, we moved into a small little village, pulled an old man out of a grass hut with one leg, and the old woman in the grass hut began to cry because we thought he was shooting at us and we were going to take him away. And a little girl about 10 screamed and cried and grabbed at our clothes as we were walking this old man away from the village, and then suddenly we young soldiers just stopped. We looked into the eyes of the old man. The old woman froze in fear as to what might happen next, and the little girl just stopped crying, and then the old man looked at us, and we looked back at him, and we suddenly realized something. We were just all people together caught in a horrible struggle, none of which we created.

There was an Israeli soldier in 1967 that said, We need to learn to love our

children more than we hate our enemies. We can never forget the pain of the past. But in this vote I think it is time that we start a new future for us, for the Vietnamese children.

We remember the quote from President Kennedy at the Berlin Wall where he said:

"We all cherish our children's future, we all breathe the same air, and we are all mortal."

Let us vote for America and Vietnam.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, on August 3 in 1492 Christopher Columbus set sail on a new journey across the Atlantic, and he set sail with new maritime instruments, a quadrant, an astrolabe, a cross staff, that helped him find the shores of the Bahamas. Today the new instruments to help us navigate to help our workers, to help our businesses, navigate the complicated world of international trade are access to OPIC, agricultural loans and Ex-Im Bank loans. That is why we should reject this resolution and allow us the opportunity for Boeing to compete against Airbus and sell our planes to Vietnam.

Now Pete Peterson, a good friend of mine, has been mentioned as our ambassador who spent 6 years as a POW. Pete Peterson will never forget, nor will Congress forget the MIAs, and we are ripping up highways and searching in mountains for every clue to find those MIAs, and we will never forget the 58,000 soldiers that were lost in that war.

But it is also time for us to move in a positive way to bring Vietnam into the community of nations.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) one of the most distinguished and ferocious champions of human rights in this body.

(Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago the U.S. sent a representative to Vietnam to conduct a human rights dialog with the government there. At the conclusion of the dialogue the Vietnamese government issued a statement essentially denying that the U.S. had any right whatsoever to concern itself with human rights outside of its borders. However, less than 2 weeks later, with the obligatory dialogue out of the way, the U.S. sent another representative to Vietnam, and this time we signed an agreement in principle to give MFN, or normal trading status to Vietnam, sending a clear message to the Hanoi dictatorship that they can safely ignore everything else we say about human rights and still get what they want from our government.

Mr. Speaker, let us be very clear on one thing. There is no freedom of im-

migration from Vietnam. If there were, there would be no need for this waiver. The administration could simply certify that Vietnam complies with the Jackson-Vanik freedom of immigration requirement. Instead, by waiving the requirement, the administration has conceded that there is no such freedom.

Mr. Speaker, the only significant human rights concession the Vietnamese Government has made in order to get the waiver was to finally begin letting us interview people under the rover program. Now I happen to be a very enthusiastic supporter of this program, and for the RECORD Members will recall that I was the prime sponsor of the amendment on this floor that stopped us from doing what I think would have been very, very cruel, and that would be to end the CPA, the Comprehensive Plan of Action, to just send the people back without giving them any opportunity to get re-interviewed after some bogus reviews were done, or interviews.

The refugee program, the rover program, works when there was a real push, and the ambassador, Pete Peterson, did do a good job in pushing when he had the effort of ourselves holding up the waiver. 13,000 people were cleared, but as soon as the waiver was granted, the clearances slowed right back to a trickle.

Mr. Speaker, let us not forget the prisoners of conscience; let us not forget the Catholic priests and the Buddhist monks. The religious persecution situation has gotten worse since last April when additional restrictions on exercise of religion was put on those people.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the gentleman from California's (Mr. ROHRBACHER) resolution.

Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago the United States sent a representative to Vietnam to conduct a "human rights dialogue" with the government there. At the conclusion of the dialogue, the Vietnamese Government issued a statement essentially denying that the United States had any right at all to concern itself with human rights outside its own borders. Less than two weeks later with the obligatory dialogue out of the way, the United States sent another representative to Vietnam. This one signed an "agreement in principle" to give Most Favored Nation status to Vietnam—sending a clear message that the Hanoi dictatorship can safely ignore everything we say about human rights, and still get what it wants from our government. Because the waiver of the Jackson-Vanik freedom of emigration provisions is a prerequisite to MFN, the communist regime—and its victims—are watching today's vote very closely.

Let us be clear, Mr. Speaker, on what this vote is about. It is about U.S. taxpayer subsidies for one of the worst dictatorships in the world.

And let's be clear on one other thing: there is no freedom of emigration from Vietnam. If there were, there would be no need for a waiver. The Administration could simply certify that Viet Nam complies with the Jackson-Vanik freedom-of-emigration requirement. Instead, by waving the requirement, the Admin-

istration has conceded that there is no such freedom. Yes, the government allows some people to leave, when it is good and ready. But for many thousands who have been persecuted because they were on our side during the war, Vietnam is still a prison.

Finally, I hope my colleagues understand that this is not a vote about free trade. It is about subsidies—corporate welfare for Communists. Since the President gave the waiver in March of 1998, the U.S. taxpayers have been paying for Eximbank and OPIC subsidies of trade and investment in Vietnam. Many of these taxpayer dollars subsidize ventures owned in large part by the government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

Overregulation and widespread corruption make Vietnam a terrible place to do business. Starting this year, foreign businesses in Vietnam are no longer allowed to hire Vietnamese employees directly, but must go through the government. No only does this practice encourage corruption, it also excludes victims of persecution from what for many is the only potential source of employment available to them. In addition, according to a recent Ministry of finance audit, 5.8 billion dollars—one third of Vietnam's total civil service assets—are unaccounted for. Most of the money reportedly was spend on luxury items for high-ranking communist officials. So U.S. taxpayers are now forced to compensate businesses for the greed and inefficiency of their partners in Hanoi.

The only significant human rights concession the Vietnamese Government made in order to get the waiver was to finally begin letting us interview people under the "ROVER" program (Resettlement Opportunities for Vietnamese Refugees). Now I happen to be an enthusiastic supporter of this program was prime sponsor of the amendment to ensure that the Boat People refugees weren't sent back. ROVR was the compromise, it provide a new interview for people who managed to escape Vietnam but were forced back—although many were refugees. They were promised that as soon as they got back, the U.S. would interview them and resettle them if they were eligible for our protection. But of course the Vietnamese government broke its promise. For over a year and a half they hardly let us interview nobody. Finally, when we really held their feet to the fire, they cleared 13,000 people. But as soon as the waiver was granted, the clearances slowed back to a trickle.

In fact, the emigration situation has become worse since the waiver. In the last year, communist officials reportedly have been demanding much larger bribes in exchange for access to U.S. refugee programs. An average emigrant must pay about one thousand dollars in bribes—more than three times the average annual salary of Vietnamese workers. In some cases, government officials have demanded tens of thousands of dollars from eligible refugees.

Finally, we must not forget the prisoners of conscience. Hanoi imprisons Catholic priests, Buddhist monks, pro-democracy activists, scholars, and poets. Last April, the regime placed additional restrictions on religious exercise and permanently appropriated properties that it had confiscated from different churches. When we complain to the Vietnamese Government, they just respond that "we have a different system." They need to be persuaded

that a system like this is not one that Americans will subsidize.

The lesson is obvious: the Vietnamese Government has no trouble clearing refugees for interview when it really wants to. But once they get what they want from us, they have no interest in allowing people to leave. So we should disapprove the Jackson-Vanik waiver at least until the government allows all the refugees to leave: not only the returnees who are eligible for the ROVR Program, but also those who never left Vietnam and are still trapped there, including longterm re-education camp survivors and former U.S. Government employees. Many of these people are members of the Montagnard ethnic minority who fought valiantly for the U.S. and have suffered greatly ever since.

The list of human rights violations goes on and on. Vietnam enforces a "two-child per couple" policy by depriving the parents of "unauthorized" children of employment and other government benefits. It denies workers the right to organize independent trade unions, and has subjected many to forced labor. The government not only denies freedom of the press, but also systematically jams Radio Free Asia, which tries to bring them the kind of broadcasting they would provide for themselves if their government would allow freedom of expression.

Mr. Chairman, the Vietnamese Government and its victims will both be watching this vote. We must send the message that economic benefits from the United States absolutely depend on decent treatment of Vietnam's own people. We may not be able to insist on perfection, but we must insist on minimal decency.

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ) who represents the largest number of Vietnamese Americans in the country.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my colleagues to explain to Dr. Giang why the Communist government of Vietnam should be rewarded and granted the Jackson-Vanik waiver. On March 4 of this year, Dr. Giang was a respected geophysicist and writer and was arrested in Hanoi for allegedly possessing anti-Communist documents. Unfortunately, this was not the first time that he had been harassed by the authorities for peacefully expressing his viewpoints.

In January of 1997, he wrote an essay and argued the universality of human rights and concluded that the world needs to unite its actions for human rights.

□ 1645

In March of 1997, Dr. Giang was also summoned to appear before the Communist Party for a session of public accusation. After a storm of international protest of governments and human rights organizations, Dr. Giang was finally released. In fact, I went to Vietnam in April to try and find him. Officials in communist-ruled Vietnam never explained to Giang why he was arrested on March 4 or formally charged.

In my hand, I have a copy of a letter that he sent to my office detailing his

current situation. I would like to share his thoughts with you today.

It says,

Dear Ms. Sanchez: I am still being restricted by a police writ which bans me to go elsewhere outside my residence. This oppression causes me to suffer in my home detention status. Even so, I am not dejected in this indignant circumstance. I will always aspire for better conditions and freedom and democracy for our people. Thank you again. I pray that global allegiance for democracy and human rights will spread far and wide as we build greater victories for all people.

This is one of the many examples of human rights abuses which occurs in Vietnam. The United States must take a stand on human rights, and we must say enough is enough. We have an opportunity to send a signal to Vietnam, that human rights cannot be ignored.

Vote "yes" on House Joint Resolution 58.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. BOUCHER.

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

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the President's decision to extend the Jackson-Vanik waiver for Vietnam and in strong opposition to the resolution of disapproval. The Jackson-Vanik waiver process is designed to promote immigration from countries that do not have market economies. In the case of Vietnam, the waiver is working as intended.

Since the waiver was granted, Vietnam has made steady progress under both the ROVR and the orderly departure programs. If the waiver is rescinded through the passage of this resolution, that progress, which depends entirely upon the cooperation of the Vietnamese government, will almost certainly be reversed.

We have now negotiated a bilateral trade agreement with Vietnam and progress is being made on human rights and on religious freedom matters.

I urge the Members to reject this resolution and, in doing so, to give a vote of confidence to the very fine work of our former colleague, the Ambassador to Vietnam, Pete Peterson, and his excellent staff, under whose guidance this outstanding progress is being made.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute 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, earlier this year I had an opportunity to travel to Vietnam and to talk to members of the business community, to the international environmental community, to workers, to representatives of labor organizations, and to U.S. manufacturers and had an opportunity to travel throughout the country. I think that my conclusion is that the waiver can continue to be justified because of the progress that is being made.

I think it is also clear that the waiver helps to empower our ambassador, Pete Peterson, who may be the greatest catalyst for change inside this country, so that he can continue his work to get Vietnam to improve its human rights conditions, to improve its labor conditions, to improve its environmental conditions and so many of the other issues that are of concern to all of us here.

This is not about not being concerned about human rights, labor conditions, or any of the rest of it. It is about whether or not we can have a process where we can continue to make progress. Unlike the vote last week on China, where I voted against extending the relationship with China because, in fact, there we have gone backwards, here we have an opportunity to continue the progress forward.

We will have much debate on the trade agreement and whether or not that can be justified or not be justified, but the fact of the matter is, in this particular case, the continued waiver for another year so that we can continue to monitor, continue to work with the government of Vietnam on all of these issues, is a positive step that we should and can take today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 58 so that we might continue the existing waiver of the Jackson-Vanik restrictions as they apply to Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to travel to Vietnam earlier this year on official business to attend an international environmental conference, to inspect labor conditions at factories that subcontract for United States manufacturers, and to meet with our Embassy officials on a broad range of United States-Vietnam issues.

Vietnam today is a country struggling to become a player in the global economic market. It is once again a major agricultural power and is the world's second largest exporter of rice. Hundreds of foreign companies are investing in this nation of 80 million people, the 12th largest population in the world, because of its key role in Asia and its educated and diligent work force. Most of the representatives of American businesses with whom I spoke in Vietnam praise the local business opportunities and actively promote the normalization of economic relations so that trade between the United States and Vietnam, now less than \$300 million a year, can expand and investment can flourish.

The conditions for waiving Jackson-Vanik are quite specific, and in my view, Vietnam has met those tests and should again be granted the waiver as it was last year by nearly 100 vote margin in the House. Jackson-Vanik was developed to use our economic leverage to force political and immigration reforms, and it has had the desired effect in Vietnam where we have seen significant and steady movement towards expanded emigration.

Our Ambassador, who is our former colleague and a distinguished Vietnam veteran, Pete Peterson, has documented broad cooperation by the Vietnamese government with the emigration program and has even noted that in some cases, it has been impossible to fill the slots allocated for some categories of

applicants. Ambassador Peterson has also noted expanding religious activity and I was able to observe the expanded construction of churches in northern Vietnam. Lastly, the Vietnamese and United States governments now operate a Joint Task Force that conducts interviews, archaeological digs, genetic testing, and other efforts to locate the remains of United States soldiers and pilots. Nearly 400 remains have been repatriated since the end of the war, several just this past month.

Vietnam has a considerable way to go to fully open its economy and bring it into conformity with international standards on transparency. Moreover, I remain concerned by the continued denial of labor rights by the government, including the fundamental right to join an independent labor union. Some of these issues will be addressed when we have the opportunity later this year to debate the United States-Vietnam Trade Agreement.

Last week, this House voted on granting normal trade relations to China, and many members took the floor to denounce, rightly I believe, that nation's continued repressive government and its unacceptable human rights record. It is terribly important that, during this current debate, we distinguish what is different in Vietnam from the Chinese example. For Vietnam has made and continues to make major steps forward on economic reform, is cooperating on emigration and MIA issues, and is showing promising signs of political liberalization. If we see retrenchment in Hanoi, then I believe many of those who today are prepared to vote for this waiver and for expanded trade between our countries will reconsider their decision.

We vote to waive Jackson-Vanik in recognition of Vietnam's changing political system and to encourage further liberalization. But understand that the Congress and the American people are serious about assuring that open trade is also fair trade: that working men and women in America are assured that their counterparts in Vietnam labor under reasonable conditions and with the enjoyment of basic human and labor rights recognized by international law.

The continued waiver of the Jackson-Vanik restrictions should be voted by the House tonight to recognize Vietnam's steady steps towards reform. Similarly, the Congress should expect that the waiver of Jackson-Vanik will promote a continuation of democracy in Vietnam, unlike the China case where despite expanded trade relations, political reform has worsened.

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

Mr. Speaker, Jackson-Vanik, this waiver we are talking about, yes, it deals with immigration. For the record, I have a statement issued by the United States embassy in Bangkok on July 14 of this year stating that the orderly departure program has some severe problems. So much for all the progress we have made for Jackson-Vanik just in terms of the immigration issue.

We are also told that there has been so much progress in other areas, especially in the area of democratization, which is not directly to Jackson-Vanik. But the fact is today all of us understand that we are sending a mes-

sage to Vietnam, and that by moving forward in the area of Jackson-Vanik, we are giving them the idea that they can get away with the type of repression that they have been getting away with and still have better trading relations and make more money off their relations with the United States.

I have something here, a report just yesterday, August 2, talking about in Hanoi where the government in Hanoi has declared they will not tolerate any other political parties except the Communist Party of Vietnam. I will submit both of those for the record.

Let us get right down to brass tacks. Over this last year since we came here and went along with the Jackson-Vanik waiver that this administration has decided to give to the communist government of Vietnam, there has been no human rights progress. There has been no political parties that have been able to be formed. There has been no more free speech. There has been no examples whatsoever of more freedom of the press. There have been many examples also of repression of religious individuals. So we have no progress on that front whatsoever.

I would hope that my colleagues, maybe they can enlighten me to the parties that are springing up in opposition to the Communist Party or these other examples of freedom of speech or freedom of press or freedom of religion that are nonexistent. Please, tell us about that.

No, that does not exist in Vietnam. That is why we will not hear about that and have not heard about it in this debate.

A constituent of mine, Mr. Ku Noc Dong, went back to Vietnam. He is an American of Vietnamese descent. He went back, and within 1 day he was thrown in jail. For what? For passing out leaflets talking about liberty and justice. He is imprisoned as we speak.

Do not tell me there has been human rights progress in Vietnam. There has been none, and by moving on this legislation, we are giving the stamp of approval of this Congress on that type of behavior by this regime.

Let me just suggest something else. We have heard about the progress in MIA/POWs. I totally reject that contention. I am afraid that some of our other Members, including our former distinguished Member, Mr. Peterson, are sadly misinformed about what is going on in this effort.

I have two pictures that were taken that I would submit for the record of MIA/POWs who were incarcerated in Vietnam. Their remains were never returned. Plus, none of the records of the prisons that held our POWs has ever been made available to us after requests for those records of 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that this body vote against the Jackson-Vanik waiver, and send the Vietnamese communists a message that we stand for freedom.

#### VIETNAM COMMUNISTS SAY TO KEEP SINGLE-PARTY SYSTEM

HANOI, Aug. 2, 1999 (Reuters).—A top ideology from Vietnam's ruling Community

Party said on Monday that Hanoi would not tolerate a multi-party system.

"The Communist Party of Vietnam is the leader of Vietnam's entire society, we will not accept any other parties or a multi-party system," said Dao Duy Quat, deputy head of the party's powerful Ideology and Culture Commission. He was speaking at a rare news conference held for foreign media and diplomats that discussed party-building and a two-year criticism and self-criticism campaign.

But one veteran diplomat in Hanoi was unconvinced, questioning how legitimacy could be gauged when Vietnam's vast internal security machine went to such lengths to isolate or silence contradictory voices. "They want power, on that there is no compromise," he said. "They stamped out all opposition in the past—even those groups that supported the same aims—and see absolutely no reason to liberalise."

Some foreign governments and international human rights groups say Vietnam imprisons people for the peaceful expression of political or religious beliefs—a charge that Hanoi denies. Quat said the party would not repress minority views unless people violated the law. Anti-socialist activities in Vietnam are treated as a crime.

#### MEMORANDUM

JOINT VOLUNTARY AGENCY ORDERLY DEPARTURE PROGRAM, AMERICAN EMBASSY, BANGKOK, JULY 14, 1999

Re request for refugee statistics and assessment of ODP cases.

ODP Cases: The Socialist Republic of Vietnam has frequently determined applicants did not meet ODP criteria, despite our confirmation that they did; many applicants are still awaiting interview authorization. . . . As of July 9th, there are 3,432 ODP refugee applicants and 747 ROVR applicants awaiting Vietnamese Government authorization for interview. . . . ODP has continually received requests from applicants for assistance in dealing with local officials; many applicants originally applied to ODP as long ago as 1988 but have yet to be given authorization by the Vietnamese Government to attend an interview.

Impact of Jackson-Vanik Waiver: It would not appear that Jackson-Vanik had a telling impact on ODP activities. . . . Staff are of the opinion that there has been little, if any, indication of improvement in the Vietnamese Government's efforts to deal with remaining ODP cases.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH).

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I, along with I think probably 30 of my colleagues last week, had an interesting dinner meeting with Bob McNamara. If there is any lesson that he has learned in looking back on Vietnam, it is really hearing and receiving, giving the wrong messages and not talking to each other. We really have an opportunity right now to heed some of the lessons that he talked about.

Vietnam is making progress, contrary to the previous speaker. There is a great deal of evidence which our former colleague, the Ambassador, has articulated to us, and the press has as well. It is a relationship that can continue to be good for the United States as we are moving a young nation towards moving into the community of nations, of living within international standards. It is a region in the world

that for 4,000 years has faced uncertainty and conflict.

What we are talking about is normal trading relationships. That is really what the issue is about. Obviously people can see it differently, but I urge the defeat of the resolution.

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

Mr. Speaker, as I grow older, 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 every morning, the first two things that I do are to thank God for my life and veterans for my way of life, because had it not been for my brother Bill and all those who gave their lives in service to this country through the years, had it not been for people like SAM JOHNSON and Pete Peterson and JOHN MCCAIN, who endured the 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 week in our new Veterans National Cemetery in Saratoga, if it had not been for them and all of the men and women who wore the uniform of the United States military through the years, I would not have the privilege of going around bragging about how I live in the freest and most open democracy on the face of the Earth. Freedom is not free. We paid a tremendous price for it.

So today, Mr. Speaker, based upon the comments that I made earlier and on behalf of all 2,063 Americans who are still missing in Southeast Asia, I ask my colleagues to join 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 my time.

Mr. Speaker, there have been arguments raised here, ones that I think are worth listening to by all of us, regardless of our position on the issues, and I respect the disagreements that I have with some of my colleagues, but I think personally that if you examine the evidence, you will realize that the hope for mankind in the future lies in moving down this path of expanding our relationships with one another and especially expanding our economic relationships.

□ 1700

Keep in mind, too, that as Ambassador Peterson told a group of us this morning, 65 percent of the population over there has been born since the end of the Vietnam War. The overwhelming majority of these people know nothing about it except what they have heard from those who preceded them.

In that regard, I think it is important to note, too, that we have a recent report that just came out from the U.S. Ambassador for International Reli-

gious Freedom, this was in July, last month, mentioning that three-fourths of the population are nominally Buddhist now, an estimated 6 to 7 million are Roman Catholics, and there are a variety of other religious affiliations, including Mormons in Vietnam. In addition to that, they are growing in population.

I think further that it is important for us to recognize that in the last national election there, and that was last year, this was not an absolute Communist dictatorship in place. There were almost two candidates running in every race for their national assembly, 800, and 450 seats. The result was the election of 61 National Assembly members who are not members of the Communist party, and as indicated earlier, one of those 61 was a major in the South Vietnamese army, a former major.

We have also something else, I think, to keep in mind. That is a point that the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) brought up, the response he got from a Communist he spoke to while he was there who said that they cannot advance free trade because that would put him out of a job. Think about that for a moment, Mr. Chairman, a Communist cannot participate in the advancement of free trade because that will put him, a Communist, out of a job; to which I say, amen. That is a fringe benefit.

The immediate benefit is the material benefits to the people of Vietnam, and the material benefits here as we advance down that path creating expanded free trade worldwide.

I would remind Members also, this is not a vote on normal trade relations. This simply provides an expanded opportunity for increased business contact in Vietnam. I would urge all of my colleagues to vote no on H.R. 58. I think it is in the best interests of our country and the best interests of the people of Vietnam.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.J. Res. 58. I do so because I am deeply concerned about the human rights situation in Vietnam which has not improved despite normalization of relations between the U.S. and Vietnam.

Religious persecution has continued to intensify. I submit for the RECORD a recent Reuters story about The Venerable Thich Quang Do, head of the Unified Buddhist Church of Vietnam (UBCV). This 80-year-old Buddhist leader has been in prison for over twenty years. Before we rush down the path of providing U.S. taxpayer dollars to businesses wanting to get into Vietnam, we must consider people like Thich Quang Do.

Earlier this year, the Religious Liberty Commission of the World Evangelical Fellowship issued a report describing the intense persecution of Christians in the Hmong minority group in Vietnam's Northwest province and as well as members of the Hre and Bahnar minority groups. It has pages and pages of testimony from persecuted believers and edicts from the Vietnamese government regarding its anti-religion policies.

The U.S. should be keeping the pressure on Vietnam to improve its human rights record, not rewarding them.

MONK URGES HANOI TO FREE BUDDHIST LEADER

(By Andy Solomon)

HO CHI MINH CITY, Vietnam, Aug. 3 (Reuters)—A dissident Buddhist monk in Vietnam has demanded the country's communist rulers immediately release from detention the aged patriarch of the banned Unified Buddhist Church of Vietnam (UBCV).

Thich Quang Do, head of the UBCV's Institute for the Propagation of the Dharma and a former long-term political prisoner, said 80-year-old Thich Huyen Quang should either be tried or unconditionally released.

The patriarch is detained at Quang Phuoc pagoda in central Quang Ngai province. The United Nations and international human groups say he has been held without trial since 1981.

Hanoi rarely makes mention of Quang, but routinely denies it detains or jails people for the peaceful expression of religious or political views.

"On what grounds have they detained him for nearly 20 years?" Do said in a recent interview at the Buddhist monastery where he lives in the former Saigon.

"If he is guilty of a crime he should be put on trial, but they can find no (legitimate) reasons."

Quang and Do were prominent Buddhists who led protests in the former South Vietnam against the U.S.-backed Saigon regime during the Vietnam War.

"During the night there is nobody, he is alone. We are very worried about his health during the night. If anything happened to him there would be nobody to help," Do said.

He added that Quang has no official documents or identity papers and is therefore unable to travel.

"All his visitors are checked and questioned. We ask for international help to put pressure and use influence to press the government to release him as soon as possible," Do said.

Following World War Two, Quang led Buddhists against French colonial forces, but he also opposed the communist Viet Minh, who jailed him from 1952-54.

In the years following the end of the Vietnam War in 1975, the victorious communists banned the UBCV and replaced it with the state-sponsored Vietnam Buddhist Church.

Quang, Do and other UBCV activists remained a constant thorn in the side of the Hanoi authorities.

In March, 72-year-old Do secretly travelled for his first meeting with Quang in 18 years, but he was detained by police and questioned for hours before being escorted back to Ho Chi Minh City.

Abdelfattah Amor, the U.N. Special Rapporteur for Religious Intolerance, in a visit to Vietnam last October, said he was prevented from travelling to meet the patriarch and was physically barred by security personnel from meeting Do.

In a report, Amor slammed Vietnam for failing to allow basic religious freedoms—a charge Hanoi rejected.

Do, who has spent much of the last 20 years under detention or in prison, was freed under an amnesty last September after serving three-and-a-half years of a five-year sentence for offenses connected with attempts to send relief supplies to flood victims in 1994.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURR of North Carolina). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 30, 1999, the joint resolution is considered as read for amendment, and the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the 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. MCNULTY. 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 130, nays 297, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 365]

YEAS—130

Aderholt	Green (WI)	Regula
Andrews	Gutknecht	Riley
Baker	Hall (TX)	Rivers
Barcia	Hansen	Rogan
Barr	Hayes	Rohrabacher
Bartlett	Hayworth	Ros-Lehtinen
Barton	Hefley	Rothman
Bilirakis	Hill (MT)	Royce
Bonilla	Hilleary	Ryun (KS)
Bonior	Hoekstra	Sanchez
Bono	Holden	Sanders
Brown (OH)	Hostettler	Saxton
Bryant	Hunter	Scarborough
Burton	Hutchinson	Schaffer
Buyer	Hyde	Serrano
Canady	Jackson-Lee	Shadegg
Carson	(TX)	Shuster
Chabot	Jenkins	Slaughter
Chenoweth	Johnson, Sam	Smith (NJ)
Coble	Jones (NC)	Smith (TX)
Coburn	Kasich	Souder
Collins	Kelly	Spence
Cook	Kennedy	Stearns
Costello	King (NY)	Strickland
Cox	Kingston	Stump
Cunningham	LaHood	Stupak
Davis (VA)	Lazio	Sweeney
Deal	LoBiondo	Talent
Diaz-Balart	Lofgren	Taylor (NC)
Doolittle	Martinez	Thornberry
Duncan	McColum	Thune
Ehrlich	McIntyre	Towns
Emerson	McKinney	Trafficant
English	McNulty	Turner
Everett	Menendez	Velazquez
Forbes	Mica	Vento
Frelinghuysen	Miller (FL)	Visclosky
Gibbons	Miller, Gary	Wamp
Gillmor	Norwood	Weldon (FL)
Gilman	Paul	Weldon (PA)
Goode	Pelosi	Wolf
Goodling	Pombo	Wu
Graham	Porter	Young (AK)
Green (TX)	Radanovich	

NAYS—297

Abercrombie	Berry	Camp
Ackerman	Biggart	Campbell
Allen	Bishop	Cannon
Archer	Blagojevich	Capps
Armey	Bliley	Capuano
Bachus	Blumenauer	Cardin
Baird	Blunt	Castle
Baldacci	Boehlert	Chambliss
Baldwin	Boehner	Clay
Ballenger	Borski	Clayton
Barrett (NE)	Boswell	Clement
Barrett (WI)	Boucher	Clyburn
Bass	Boyd	Combust
Bateman	Brady (PA)	Condit
Becerra	Brady (TX)	Conyers
Bentsen	Brown (FL)	Cooksey
Bereuter	Burr	Coyne
Berkley	Callahan	Cramer
Berman	Calvert	Crane

Crowley	Kilpatrick	Pomeroy
Cubin	Kind (WI)	Portman
Cummings	Kleccka	Price (NC)
Danner	Klink	Pryce (OH)
Davis (FL)	Knollenberg	Quinn
Davis (IL)	Kolbe	Rahall
DeFazio	Kucinich	Ramstad
DeGette	Kuykendall	Rangel
Delahunt	LaFalce	Reyes
DeLauro	Lampson	Reynolds
DeLay	Largent	Rodriguez
DeMint	Larson	Roemer
Deutsch	Latham	Rogers
Dickey	LaTourette	Roukema
Dicks	Leach	Roybal-Allard
Dingell	Lee	Rush
Dixon	Levin	Ryan (WI)
Doggett	Lewis (CA)	Sabo
Dooley	Lewis (GA)	Salmon
Doyle	Lewis (KY)	Sandlin
Dreier	Linder	Sanford
Dunn	Lipinski	Sawyer
Edwards	Lowe	Schakowsky
Ehlers	Lucas (KY)	Scott
Engel	Lucas (OK)	Sensenbrenner
Eshoo	Luther	Sessions
Etheridge	Maloney (CT)	Shaw
Evans	Maloney (NY)	Shays
Ewing	Manzullo	Sherman
Farr	Markey	Sherwood
Fattah	Mascara	Shimkus
Filner	Matsui	Shows
Fletcher	McCarthy (MO)	Simpson
Foley	McCarthy (NY)	Sisisky
Ford	McCrery	Skeen
Fossella	McGovern	Skelton
Fowler	McHugh	Smith (MI)
Frank (MA)	McInnis	Smith (WA)
Franks (NJ)	McIntosh	Snyder
Frost	McKeon	Spratt
Gallegly	Meehan	Stabenow
Ganske	Meeke (FL)	Stark
Gejdenson	Meeks (NY)	Stenholm
Gekas	Millender	Sununu
Gephardt	McDonald	Tancredo
Gilchrist	Miller, George	Tanner
Gonzalez	Minge	Tauscher
Goodlatte	Mink	Tauzin
Gordon	Moakley	Taylor (MS)
Goss	Moore	Terry
Granger	Moran (KS)	Thomas
Greenwood	Moran (VA)	Thompson (CA)
Gutierrez	Morella	Thompson (MS)
Hall (OH)	Murtha	Thurman
Hastings (FL)	Myrick	Tiahrt
Hastings (WA)	Nadler	Tierney
Herger	Napolitano	Toomey
Hill (IN)	Neal	Udall (CO)
Hilliard	Nethercutt	Udall (NM)
Hinchey	Ney	Upton
Hinojosa	Northup	Vitter
Hobson	Nussle	Walden
Hoefel	Oberstar	Walsh
Holt	Obey	Waters
Hooley	Olver	Watkins
Horn	Ortiz	Watt (NC)
Houghton	Ose	Watts (OK)
Hoyer	Owens	Waxman
Hulshof	Oxley	Weiner
Inslee	Packard	Weller
Isakson	Pallone	Wexler
Istook	Pascrell	Weygand
Jackson (IL)	Pastor	Whitfield
Jefferson	Payne	Wicker
John	Pease	Wilson
Johnson (CT)	Peterson (MN)	Wise
Johnson, E. B.	Petri	Woolsey
Jones (OH)	Phelps	Wynn
Radanovich	Pickering	Young (FL)
Kaptur	Pickett	
Kildee	Pitts	

NOT VOTING—6

Bilbray	McDermott	Mollohan
Lantos	Metcalf	Peterson (PA)

□ 1722

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. POMEROY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. HAYWORTH, KINGSTON, STRICKLAND, GIBBONS, ROTHMAN, BUYER, SMITH of Texas, and WELDON of Florida changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the joint resolution was not passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall no. 365, it has been brought to my attention that I was recorded as voting AYE. I seem to recall pressing the red button for a NAY vote. So that there is no misunderstanding of my position, I wish for the record to indicate that I should be recorded as a NO vote.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2587, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2587) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURR of North Carolina). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, we have no objection to this motion. We do want to use this opportunity, though, to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Chairman ISTOOK) and congratulate him for the 333 to 92 vote on final passage of the D.C. appropriations bill.

I do not know that anybody in this body is aware of this, but over the past 20 years, no D.C. appropriations bill has ever passed the House of Representatives with a higher margin of votes. This strong bipartisan support reflects a vote of confidence on a number of positive developments in the district. It is important to understand that that was unprecedented, virtually unprecedented to get that kind of margin of support for a D.C. appropriations bill.

It is really for three reasons, a strong fiscal picture that includes a budget surplus that will make it possible for the first time in a decade to cut any taxes for D.C. businesses and residents. We have got a new mayor and city council who are committed to revitalizing the district, its businesses, its infrastructure and schools, and its public services.

Thirdly, we have a new chairman who has made every effort to familiarize himself with the affairs of the District and played a fair and an even hand with District officials, with the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), and with myself.

I believe the strong bipartisan support, however, also reflects confidence that at least two of the riders that both the administration and many in Congress have objected to can be modified in conference.