

applaud the efforts of all people who have worked to spread democracy throughout the earth including the contributions of the Vietnamese American people.

After the fall of Saigon, the Vietnam's government punished those Vietnamese who had allied with the U.S. North Vietnam forces placed hundreds of thousands of southerners in prisons, re-education camps and economic zones in efforts to remove subversion and to consolidate the country.

The Communists created a society of suspicion that hounded prisoners even after their release. The men were treated as second class citizens. Families were deprived of employment and their children could not attend college. Police interrogated families if ex-prisoners were not seen for more than a day.

Prisoners were considered expendable, worked to death and forced to walk in rows down old minefields to find out where they were. Daughters of South Vietnamese military men were sometimes forced by destitution to become prostitutes.

The re-education camps remained the predominant devise of social control in the late 1980s. Considered to be institutions where rehabilitation was accomplished through education and socially constructive labor, the camps were used to incarcerate members of certain social classes in order to coerce them to accept and conform to the new social norms.

Sources say that up to 200,000 South Vietnamese spent at least a year in the camps, which range from model institutions visited by foreigners to remote jungle shacks where inmates died of malnutrition and disease. As late as 1987, Vietnamese officials stated that about 7,000 people remained in re-education camps.

The first wave of refugees, in 1975, had no established Vietnamese American communities to rely upon for help. Assistance came from government programs, private individuals, nonprofit organizations and churches. Vietnamese men who held high positions in their homeland took whatever jobs they could get. Vietnamese woman became full-time wage earners, often for the first time.

Most refugees in the first wave were young, well-educated urban elites, professionals and people with technical training. Despite the fact that many first wave arrivals were from privileged backgrounds, few were well prepared to take up new life in America. The majority did not speak English and all found themselves in the midst of a strange culture.

The refugees who arrived in the US often suffered traumatic experiences while escaping Vietnam by sea. Those caught escaping after the fall of Saigon, including children, were jailed. Almost every Vietnamese American family has a member who arrived as a refugee or who died en route.

Many Vietnamese Americans still refuse to accept the current communist government of their former homeland. For many, the pain, anger and hatred felt toward the communist regime that forced them into exile remains fresh. Fiercely proud of their heritage, yet left without a homeland, many Vietnamese Americans have vowed never to acknowledge that Vietnam is now one communist country.

The story of Le Van Me and wife Sen is a typical one of many refugees. Me was a lieutenant colonel in the South Vietnamese Army when they came to the U.S. They spent time

in a refugee camp in Fort Chaffee, Arkansas, until the government found a church in Warsaw, Missouri, to sponsor them. In the small rural town, Me worked as a janitor for the church and all the parishioners helped the family in any way they could—giving them clothes, canned preserves, even working together to renovate a house where the family could live.

Me took classes at the community college. After 11 months, the family moved to California, drawn by the jobs rumored to be there. Me got a job as an electronic technician and started attending a neighborhood community college again. Sen was determined not to use food stamps for longer than two weeks. Within three years, they bought a three bedroom house in north San Jose. As Me explained "You really don't know what freedom is until you nearly die fighting for it."

Saigon fell 25 years ago, but the memories are still raw for many Vietnamese people. The exodus from Vietnam since 1975 has created a generation of exiles. The efforts of everyone, especially Vietnamese-Americans, to bring democracy must be recognized. We should hesitate no longer to make it known that the United States Congress proudly recognizes these efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I urge each of my colleagues to support this Resolution.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 322 expressing the sense of Congress regarding the sacrifices of individuals who served in the Armed Forces of the former Republic of Vietnam.

I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. DAVIS, for introducing this resolution and for his continuing commitment to human rights and democracy in Vietnam.

I want to thank the chairman of the Asia-Pacific Subcommittee, Mr. BEREUTER, for his work in crafting the final language in this measure.

Madam Speaker, it is unfortunate that 10 years after the end of the cold war, the Socialist Republic of Vietnam is still a one-party state ruled and controlled by a Communist Party which represses political and religious freedoms and commits numerous human rights abuses.

It is appropriate that we recognize those who fought to oppose this tyranny which has fallen across Vietnam and those who continue the vigil of struggling for freedom and democracy there today.

Accordingly, I urge Hanoi to cease its violations of human rights and to undertake the long-overdue liberalization of its moribund and stifling political and economic system. The people of Vietnam clearly deserve better.

Finally, I call upon the Vietnamese government to do all it can—unilaterally—to assist in bringing our POW/MIAs home to American soil.

I want to praise this resolution for pointing out the injustice that tragically exists in Vietnam today and those who have—and are—still opposing it.

Once again I want to commend Mr. DAVIS for introducing this resolution and his abiding dedication to improving the lives of the people of Vietnam.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this measure and I strongly urge my colleagues to support it and send a strong signal to Hanoi that it is time to free the minds and spirits of the Vietnamese people.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 322, which honors the wonderful contributions of our nation's Vietnamese-Americans in raising awareness of human rights abuses in Vietnam. I thank my colleagues Mr. DAVIS and Ms. SANCHEZ for their hard work on this issue. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this important resolution, and urge my colleagues' overwhelming support today.

I represent San Jose, California, a community greatly enriched by the presence of immigrants. Quite a few of my constituents came to San Jose as refugees, escaping the brutal and oppressive political regime in Hanoi. I worked with those refugees as a Santa Clara County Supervisor, and many of those people have become my friends throughout the years. I believe that they have a unique perspective on the state of our country's relationship with Vietnam that is of immense value.

A quarter century after the fall of Saigon, the Communist government continues to oppress its citizens and violate their basic human rights. Stories of political repression, religious persecutions and extra-judicial detentions are all too common. Many Vietnamese-Americans have worked tirelessly to bring these violations to light, here in the United States and to the international community. As a result of their extraordinary dedication, awareness of the abuses of the Vietnamese government is growing exponentially.

I applaud their continued effort to bring democratic ideals and practices to Vietnam. This resolution is a small token of our gratitude for the hard work of the 1 million Vietnamese-Americans living in our country. I am proud to support it.

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 322, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The title of the concurrent resolution was amended so as to read: "Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the sacrifices of individuals who served in the Armed Forces of the former Republic of Vietnam."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4 p.m.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 4 p.m.

1600

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro

tempore (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) at 4 o'clock and one minute p.m.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks during further consideration of H.R. 4461, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 538 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4461.

1602

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4461) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, with Mr. NUSSLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole House rose on Thursday, June 29, 2000, the bill was open for amendment from page 57, line 12, to page 58, line 8.

Are there further amendments to that portion of the bill?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage in a series of discussions with the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN).

Mr. Chairman, as we know, the Senate bill provides direct payments to dairy farmers estimated at \$443 million to offset the record low prices we have seen for much of the past year.

I would simply ask the chairman if he would be willing to work with me to ensure that direct payments for dairy farmers are included in the bill when it emerges from conference.

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

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I would be pleased to work with the gentleman from Wisconsin. I find that we agree more often than not on the specifics of dairy policy, and would point to the last 2 years of economic assistance payments we have jointly inserted into

the agriculture appropriations conference report as proof.

Accordingly, I will be pleased to carry out our tradition of working together on dairy producer assistance, when and if we ever get to conference.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Let me turn to another subject, that of ultrafiltered milk. It seems there is always some new issue popping up in the dairy area. There are growing fears about the damaging impact on domestic dairy producers from imports of dry ultrafiltered or UF milk.

Ultrafiltration is an important technology widely used in cheese plants for about 15 years to remove water, lactose, and minerals and allow manufacturers to manipulate the ingredients in cheese to arrive at the desired finished product.

The use of liquid UF milk from another location has been approved by FDA on a case-by-case basis, but there is another problem. The problem is the threat of unlimited imports of dry UF milk from places like New Zealand following a petition to FDA earlier this year by the National Cheese Institute to change the standards of identity for cheese.

I understand that there are no quotas or tariffs on this product, which is currently used in bakery mixes, ice cream, and other products that do not have the strict standards of identity that cheese has. There have also been newspaper reports suggesting that dry UF milk is already being imported for use in American cheese plants, in violation of FDA regulations.

We need to know what the facts are so we can develop an appropriate response. At a minimum, we need to understand first how much UF milk is coming into the country and what it is used for. I would ask the chairman of the subcommittee if he would be willing to work with us to get answers to those questions through the GAO and other sources.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I, too, have an interest in ultrafiltered milk. I believe it is prudent to have empirical facts in order to understand the specifics of a somewhat muddled portion of the dairy production and cheese-making process.

I would offer to the gentleman that we will jointly direct either the GAO or the committee S&I staff to conduct a factual investigation into how much UF milk is produced in this country and how much is being imported and what it is used for. At that time, and with the facts on our side, I am confident that we will be able to address the issue in an intelligent and productive manner.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman.

Now I would like to turn to another subject, Mr. Chairman. That is the Dairy Export Incentive Program.

I am concerned that the USDA is not being aggressive enough in encouraging dairy exports through the Dairy Export Incentive Program, or DEIP, which al-

lows us to compete in world markets with highly subsidized exports in the European Union.

About 10 percent of DEIP contracts are apparently canceled, I understand due mainly to price undercutting by our competitors. For whatever the reason, we apparently have about 40,000 metric tons of canceled nonfat dry milk contracts dating back to June of 1995. This canceled tonnage can be reprogrammed for export by allowing exporters to rebid for them, but the Foreign Agricultural Service appears reluctant to do that, perhaps fearing that it may be taken to the WTO court by the European Union.

Mr. Chairman, as we know, DEIP saves money. It is cheaper to export surplus nonfat dry milk than it is for USDA to buy it and store it. Removing this product from the domestic market would have a beneficial impact on dairy prices. As such, again, I would ask the chair of the subcommittee to help me convince USDA to propose a solution to resolve the problem by the time we have reached conference on this bill, one that might include establishing a procedure for automatic rebidding of canceled tonnage.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, again, I would be pleased to work with the gentleman to address his concerns, as they are shared by myself and many others. It seems the administration has been entirely too willing to roll over to our competitors without looking to the interests of America's farmers and ranchers first, and anything we can do to reverse the trend will be a step forward.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to raise the question of cranberries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. OBEY was allowed to proceed for 4 additional minutes.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, with respect to that product, cranberry growers, as we know, like all farmers today, it seems they are in dire straits due to overproduction, massive overproduction and lower prices. It costs about \$35 per barrel to produce cranberries. Some growers in my district are getting as little as \$9 or \$10 a barrel for their crop.

The USDA recently announced its support for industry-proposed volume controls that are desperately needed to get a handle on overproduction. That is part of the solution, but will add to the farm income problems those cranberry growers are facing, so it seems to me we have to look for more things that can be done.

Another part of the solution might be for USDA to purchase surplus products. USDA has been very responsive so far looking for opportunities to purchase surplus product, but much more needs to be done if we are to restore balance to supply and demand.