



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 147

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 2001

No. 115

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 6, 2001.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN SHIMKUS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Reverend Roy Mays, III, Southland Christian Church, Lexington, Kentucky, offered the following prayer:

Dear Gracious Father, for years we have sung "America, America, God shed his grace on thee," and in this prayer we affirm You have done it and we ask You to do it again.

As the Giver of grace, we need Your presence and assistance; Your good favor and great power. For whatever situation we face today, show us that Your strength is sufficient.

On the day following my diagnosis with myeloma cancer, You gave me an insight for experiencing grace in the metaphor of a railroad track, one rail represented healing and one rail symbolized dealing. I was invited to embrace Your grace and endure my race, keeping both rails parallel or I would wreck. Your part was to establish Your purpose and supply Your power. My part was to pray and persevere.

For all of the Members of this House and those they represent, we implore You to please touch us with Your healing grace, forgive us when we have forgotten You, lift us up when we have let You down, deliver help to those who are hurting, and provide peace for those who are in pain.

Also, we entreat You to please give us Your dealing grace: wisdom for our work, discernment for our decisions, resources for our responsibilities, and joy for our journey.

In all these requests, Heavenly Father, we pray that Your will be done, and we accept that Your grace is sufficient. For thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory, forever and ever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. FLETCHER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. FLETCHER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. FLETCHER) will be recognized for 1 minute. There will be only one 1-minute until after the joint meeting of the House and Senate.

WELCOMING THE REVEREND ROY H. MAYS III

(Mr. FLETCHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank a dear friend and classmate, Reverend Roy Mays, for his beautifully insightful prayer opening today's session of the United States House of Representatives.

Within the hallowed walls of this Chamber, my colleagues and I gather to attend to the business of this great Nation. Since the beginning of our democracy, we have begun each day's work petitioning our creator that we might know truth and have the wisdom and understanding to rightfully fulfill our duties. As Reverend Mays so eloquently stated in his prayer, our creator grants us grace and strength sufficient for our duties.

Reverend Mays continues to be a beacon for everyone who has crossed paths with him or who has made his acquaintance, including people in over 40 States where Roy ministered as an evangelist, also among the students, faculty and administration whose lives he has touched during 12 years of service at Cincinnati Bible College and Seminary. For the past 16 years, Reverend Mays has blessed thousands through the congregation at Lexington's Southland Christian Church as the senior executive associate minister.

Additionally, it is said that the character of a person is reflected in the countenance of one's spouse and children so it is with Roy and his lovely wife of 28 years, Beth, and his two children, Amanda and Ryan, who reflect the grace and peace engendered by mutual unconditional love.

Even after being diagnosed with multiple myeloma cancer in 1999, Reverend Mays continues to touch the lives of those around him, refusing to allow his testimony to fade and his countenance to dim, even when struggling to overcome persistently failing health. He stands humbly but firm with God, and

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H5409

with God's help of peace and perseverance during the most trying times of life. Through this example, countless others have received hope.

In this House, we pray alongside Reverend Roy Mays that we might be touched with both our Father's healing grace and dealing grace. We are inspired by Reverend Mays' unflinching faith and his steadfast confidence in God's plan for all.

Mr. Speaker, it is with deep appreciation that I recognize Roy Mays, not only for his service to us here today, but also to countless others across our Nation.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to make an announcement.

After consultation with the majority and minority leaders, and with their consent and approval, the Chair announces that during the joint meeting to hear an address by His Excellency Vicente Fox, only the doors immediately opposite the Speaker and those on his right and left will be open.

No one will be allowed on the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House.

Due to the large attendance which is anticipated, the Chair feels that the rule regarding the privilege of the floor must be strictly adhered to.

Children of Members will not be permitted on the floor, and the cooperation of all Members is requested.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 7 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

During the recess, beginning at about 10:48 a.m. the following proceedings were had:

□ 1048

JOINT MEETING OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY VICENTE FOX, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED MEXICAN STATES

The Speaker of the House presided.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms, Bill Sims, announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to escort His Excellency Vicente Fox, the President of the United Mexican States, into the Chamber:

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY);

The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS);

The gentleman from California (Mr. COX);

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE);

The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER);

The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE);

The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER);

The gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON);

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA);

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON);

The gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON);

The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT);

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR);

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST);

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ);

The gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO);

The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR);

The gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS);

The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY);

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES);

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD);

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ);

The gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO);

The gentleman from California (Mr. BACA);

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ORTIZ);

The gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO);

The gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA);

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ);

The gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD);

The gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ);

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA);

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ);

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ);

The gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ACEVEDO-VILÁ); and

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The President of the Senate, at the direction of that body, appoints the following Senators as a committee on the part of the Senate to escort His Excellency Vicente Fox, the President of the United Mexican States, into the House Chamber:

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE);

The Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID);

The Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY);

The Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER);

The Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY);

The Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN);

The Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER);

The Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY);

The Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS);

The Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN);

The Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY);

The Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT);

The Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. NICKLES);

The Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON);

The Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG);

The Senator from Tennessee (Mr. FRIST);

The Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI);

The Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS);

The Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR);

The Senator from Texas (Mr. GRAMM); and

The Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK).

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms announced the Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps, the Honorable Jesse Bibiano Marehalau, Ambassador of Micronesia.

The Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seat reserved for him.

□ 1100

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

□ 1115

At 11 o'clock and 15 minutes a.m., the Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms announced the President of the United Mexican States, His Excellency Vicente Fox.

The President of the United Mexican States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, and stood at the Clerk's desk.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, it is my great privilege and I deem it a high honor and a personal pleasure to present to you the President of the United Mexican States, His Excellency Vicente Fox.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY
VICENTE FOX, PRESIDENT OF
THE UNITED MEXICAN STATES

(Portions of the following address were delivered in Spanish, with a simultaneous translation in English.)

President FOX. Thank you. The applause in this room welcoming me has been heard by 100 million Mexicans which, in the name of them, I thank all of you for being so kind with us in Mexico.

Honorable Members of the Congress of the United States of America, it is a distinct honor for me to meet you here in the oldest legislative assembly on the American continent, a Congress whose deliberations have such a strong influence not only on the history of this country, but of the entire world.

This is an historic moment between our two nations in which the governments of Mexico and the United States have decided to begin a new era of friendship and cooperation to benefit both our peoples.

Mexico and the United States wish to bring together our principles and interests, as well as our traditions and hopes. The meeting of our two countries at the dawning of this new century may represent the beginning of the most promising chapters in our common history.

My presence in this Chamber bears witness to that will to bring our countries closer together. It is our very firm wish as Mexicans and Americans to establish a new relationship, a more mature, full and equitable relationship based on mutual trust.

Honorable Members of the United States Congress, I stand before you today with a simple message. Trust needs to be the key element of our new relationship. I am aware that for many Americans and for many Mexicans the idea of trusting their neighbor may seem risky and perhaps even unwise. I am sure that many on both sides of the border would rather stick to the old saying that good fences make good neighbors.

This perception has deep roots in history. In Mexico, they derive from a long-held sense of suspicion and apprehension about its powerful neighbor. And in the United States, they stem from previous experiences with a political regime governing Mexico which for the most part was regarded as undemocratic and untrustworthy.

Our countries, thus, cautiously distanced themselves from one other to pursue this frame of mind; but circumstances have changed. We are now bound closely together, whether in trade or tourism, economic or family ties. Our links are countless and ever growing. No two nations are more important to the immediate prosperity and well-being of one another than Mexico and the United States.

That is why our two great nations must go forward together to establish

wider and deeper forms of cooperation and understanding. In this task, trust will be essential to achieve our goals. We must, therefore, leave behind the suspicion and indifference that have so often in the past been the source of misunderstandings between our two peoples, for it is only by engaging more fully as neighbors and partners that we can make a difference to our societies, and we now have before us a historic opportunity to achieve this end which has proved so elusive in the past.

We intend to be forthright in our friendship and unwavering in our commitment. For as Corinthians states so simply and truly, it is required that those who have been given a trust must prove faithful. The relationship between Mexico and the United States has changed in one fundamental way. True democracy in Mexico, for decades an unfulfilled dream, is now a reality.

As a result of last year's vote, Mexico now has a legitimate and truly democratic leadership. This has meant a change in government, but it is also a reflection of a profound change in the values and aspirations of Mexican society. I am, therefore, determined to make democracy and tolerance the principles that guide all government actions, and to ensure that public institutions in Mexico become the guarantors of the rights and highest aspirations of citizens.

I have also pledged to address the most pressing problems now confronting Mexico, some of which are perhaps unintended, but nonetheless tangible legacies from our authoritarian past. Among them, the poverty and inequality that for so many decades have condemned millions of Mexicans to a life of disadvantage and insecurity; the crippling disease of corruption, which has had such an insidious effect on the life of our country; and the fragility and weakness of our judicial system, which itself must be reformed in order to bring an end to impunity and to consolidate the rule of law throughout the country.

I am convinced that it is time to bring Mexico up to date on all fronts, both within and beyond our borders. It is also time to bring Mexico up to date in its relations with the United States. Both of our nations now fully share, without qualification, the fundamental values of freedom and democracy. Thanks to those democratic changes inaugurated in Mexico last year on July 2, the time has come for Mexico and the United States to trust each other.

Simple trust, that is what has been sorely absent in our relationship in the past, and that is what is required for us to propel and strengthen our relationship in the days, weeks, and years to come. Let us foster trust between our societies. Let us build trust along our common borders. Let us take the road less-traveled-by and build confidence every step of the way. Only trust will allow us to constructively tackle the challenges our two nations face as we

undertake to build a new partnership in North America.

Take, for example, our common struggle against the scourge of drugs. It should be clear by now that no government, however powerful, will be able to defeat on its own the forces of transnational organized crime that lie behind drug trafficking. Intense cooperation is required to confront this threat, and trust is certainly a prerequisite of cooperation.

This is why since I took office last year, Mexico has enhanced its cooperation with U.S. authorities. We have arrested key drug kingpins and extradited drug traffickers wanted by the United States Justice Department.

However, much more needs to be done. Trust will be crucial to enhance intelligence and information sharing between both governments. We are committed to becoming a full partner with the United States in the fight against drugs. But trust requires that one partner not be judged unilaterally by the other.

Members of this honorable Congress, give trust a chance. Give both governments a chance. The bill to suspend drug certification for 3 years, S. 219, will allow us to move forward. In the fight against drugs, cooperation is not a nicety; it is a necessity.

We ask that you demonstrate your trust in us by passing this legislation as a gesture of your faith and confidence in this new country that we are working so hard to build.

We must also trust each other if we are to deal successfully with the issue of migration. In recent months, President George Bush and I have already shown our willingness to trust each other by agreeing to discuss this most complex matter.

As the history of this country shows, migration has always rendered more economic benefits to the United States than the costs it entails. Let us also not forget that migrants invariably enrich the cultural life of the land that receives them. Many among you have a parent or a grandparent who came into this country as an immigrant from another land.

Therefore, allow me to take this opportunity to pay homage to those brave men and women who in the past took on the challenge of building a new life for themselves and for their families in this country.

And let me also salute the Mexican migrants living in this country and say to them, Mexico needs you. We need your talent and your entrepreneurship. We need you to come home one day and play a part in building a strong Mexico.

When you return, when you retire, we need you to come back and help us convince other Mexicans that the future lies in a prosperous and democratic Mexico. My dear countrymen, Mexico will not forget you and will support you. We will not fail you.

There is one crucial fact that we must not lose sight of. Migration flows that respond to deep underlying economic incentives are all but impossible

to stop and must instead be regulated. Mexico is therefore seeking an agreement that will lend greater security and orderliness to the migration flows between our two countries.

That is why trust in dealing with migration entails reaching common ground to address the status of Mexican migrants already working and living in the United States, already contributing to enrich this Nation. Let me be clear about this: regularization does not mean rewarding those who break the law. Regularization means that we will provide them with the legal means to allow them to continue contributing to this great Nation.

The agreement that we seek would establish a higher ceiling for permanent visas awarded to Mexicans coming to this country, and it would also expand opportunities for Mexican workers to obtain temporary work visas so they can enter the United States safely and legally. Additionally, the agreement would require us to enhance our cooperative efforts to improve border safety, save lives and crack down on criminal smuggling gangs, or polleros. And, finally, it would demand that we promote economic growth in Mexico, and we know this is our responsibility, to promote specific opportunities for all those kids and young persons specifically in those regions that are the source of most migrants.

Progress regarding migration will not be easy. Yet it is essential that we maintain our commitment to an open and frank discussion, so that we may find a lasting solution that is acceptable to both our countries.

Such a discussion can only take place in a climate of trust. We have a fundamental decision to make. It is a decision that provides us with an opportunity to achieve the highest aspiration of any politician, leaving a lasting legacy of well-being to their people.

Mexico and the United States must also work constructively to promote our common values within our region. By adopting a clear and consistent stance, our governments may jointly address some of the most relevant and pressing issues of our hemisphere, such as the deepening of democracy and the promotion of human rights. This should be our most noble cause in the Americas and in the rest of the world.

On issues of common concern, such as the situation in Colombia, the promotion of economic development across Central America, the establishment of the Free Trade Area of the Americas, the negotiation of a democratic charter for the OAS, or the shared goal of fostering financial stability and disarming financial crises throughout our region, it is vital that Mexico and the United States work together, each one as a partner that we are, in building peace and stability throughout the Americas on the basis of our own principles and interests.

Evidently, we will not always see eye to eye. But both countries should convey to each other, in all sincerity and

candor, their respective perceptions about how best to tackle issues of common concern for the well-being of our peoples. Trust will allow us to do this.

Members of the Congress of the United States of America, we have before us today the opportunity to dramatically change the future of our relationship. This meeting between Mexico and the United States is today the meeting between two democracies willing to build a better future.

The relationship between Mexico and the United States is now in our hands. It is up to us to open wide the windows of opportunity before us. We are the architects of our common destiny.

This means that we must re-create the relationship between our two great nations in a conscious and deliberate manner, moving forward firmly without leaving anything to chance. We must fully share this commitment in order to later enjoy together the fruits of our common labors.

Obviously, we all know full well that there are no easy answers nor magical solutions to the challenges faced by Mexico and the United States, but there is a path along which we can make progress with firm steps towards their solution, the path of mutual trust, trust that our governments will always behave with integrity in their daily work, trust that the strength of our relationship as partners and friends is strong, trust in our future of shared prosperity.

□ 1145

Honorable Members of the U.S. Congress, the political change currently under way in Mexico is the most powerful reason why we are now able to establish new forms of friendship and cooperation with the United States. We are ready to turn this change into the seed of a better future for both of our countries.

I hope that the United States will embrace this historic opportunity to build a new era of prosperity and understanding between our peoples. It requires will, as well as vision, to take advantage of this favorable turn in history and forge a new friendship between Mexicans and Americans.

This legislative body, along with its peers in Mexico, can play a decisive role in bringing our two countries together. You are a key partner in fostering trust between our two peoples.

Years ago, the United States Congress faced a difficult decision and chose to vote in favor of a greater integration with Mexico through the North American Free Trade Agreement.

The partnership between Mexico and the United States is still incomplete. There remain many unresolved issues that must be dealt with in order to achieve our common goals as partners. One of these goals is an issue which this great body will soon consider and which entails an important obligation under NAFTA; it is the issue of access to the United States for Mexican trucks. For this, as in many other

items of our common agenda, we need your trust. Trust will allow both countries to comply responsibly and maturely with their obligations to one another.

The overarching question is not, then, whether we can afford to trust each other, but whether we can afford not to. The growing convergence of our nations can lead to shared responsibility and prosperity and to the strengthening of those values that we have in common.

Let us begin anew, as those who founded our modern nations once did, remembering on both sides that there can be no friendship without trust and no trust without true commitment.

When history comes knocking on our doors, as it has done now, bold decisions are required. Let us make one today. Let us decide to trust one another.

John F. Kennedy believed in new beginnings. In accepting his party's nomination as President he spoke of a New Frontier, "We stand today on the edge of a New Frontier . . . the New Frontier of which I speak is not a set of promises—it is a set of challenges." That was in 1960.

Today, at the dawn of a new century, our two great nations face new challenges. But we do so with new opportunities, unimaginable even a few years ago.

Our new frontier will be conquered not by confrontation, but through cooperation; not by threats, but by common aspirations; not by fear, but by trust.

My friends, let us pledge today to create a new special partnership between the United States and Mexico for the benefit of our two great peoples.

Senoras y senores:

Viva Mexico!

Viva Estados Unidos!

Viva nuestro futuro en comun!

[Applause, the Members rising.]

At 11 o'clock and 51 minutes a.m., the President of the United Mexican States, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The members of the President's Cabinet;

The Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps.

JOINT MEETING DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The purpose of the joint meeting having been completed, the Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly, at 11 o'clock and 52 minutes a.m., the joint meeting of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The House will continue in recess until 12:15 p.m.

□ 1215

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT) at 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that proceedings had during the recess be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

STATEMENT FROM FAMILY OF CHAPLAIN JAMES DAVID FORD

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, I have been asked to read a statement by the entire Ford family on the death of Chaplain Ford.

"The Ford family thanks everyone for their sympathy and concern about the death of Chaplain James David Ford.

"We wish to clarify that Chaplain Ford was very ill for an extended period of time. Many people did not realize this. This physical illness gave him no hope of regaining his zest for life.

"The family is at peace with his decision. We have supported him his entire life in everything he did and thought and we support him still. Most importantly, he is at peace now with his Creator. Of this we are certain."

This is signed by Marcy Ford and the entire Ford family.

PRESIDENT FOX'S VISIT AND IMMIGRATION REFORM

(Ms. SOLIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SOLIS. Madam Speaker, today I rise to reemphasize the need for immigration reform in the United States. In recent days, we have heard lengthy discussions from opponents and proponents on this issue. I want to make sure that the people, the hardworking immigrants and the many families that I represent, are not lost in that debate.

Millions of immigrants have lived here for an extended period of time. They go to work every single day. They pay taxes just like you and me. They own homes and many own businesses, and many have played by the rules. They also have children who are U.S. citizens. These people deserve respect. They deserve to be acknowledged for the many contributions that they have made to this great country.

Mexican President Vicente Fox has done a superb job of highlighting the

need for immigration reform. He recognizes the immense contributions all immigrants make to the U.S. economy and to foreign economies such as his own, and a majority of U.S. citizens recognize the important contributions that immigrants have made to this country. A recent bipartisan poll found that 62 percent of voters support legalization for immigrants who pay taxes, break no laws, and play by the rules.

I ask for this Congress to begin discussions, as President Fox stated yesterday at the White House, to begin discussions on immigration reform.

CONGRATULATIONS TO UNITED STATES LITTLE LEAGUE CHAMPIONS FROM APOPKA, FLORIDA

(Mr. KELLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KELLER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the United States Little League champions from Apopka, Florida. While I may represent the people of Apopka in the U.S. Congress, the Apopka Little Leaguers represented our entire country with class and dignity.

Led by Coaches Brewer and Tapley, these 11 young men put the little town of Apopka, Florida, front and center on the world stage. They entered the 16-team world series tournament as underdogs, but they fought their way to the top of the heap to become national champions. Their persistence and hard work will surely inspire thousands of future Little Leaguers.

On behalf of myself, Senator NELSON, and the entire U.S. Congress, we say to the Apopka Little Leaguers, congratulations on a job well done, and we thank them for inspiring us all.

U.S.-MEXICO RELATIONS

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, I join President Bush and my colleagues in welcoming His Excellency Vicente Fox to the U.S. Capitol today.

Listening to President Fox's words this morning confirms the special relationship that we enjoy between Mexico and the United States.

We all know, as my colleague and friend just mentioned, that immigration policy is crucial and should be the focus of discussions between the United States and Mexico. We should be an America that welcomes again, and I say that from the heart as the grandson of an Irish immigrant to this country.

But we must also look, Madam Speaker, beyond immigration. We have a historic opportunity to expand our relationship rooted in free trade, to which President Fox also alluded. President Fox accurately acknowledged that we share the most dynamic

border in the world. Let us show the world how neighbors can improve lives through mutual trust and mutual respect.

Today more than ever it is time for America and Mexico to prove that adage that we ought to love our neighbors as ourselves.

VIET NAM HUMAN RIGHTS ACT

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, pursuant to a previous order of the House, I call up the bill (H.R. 2833) to promote freedom and democracy in Viet Nam, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of H.R. 2833 is as follows:

H.R. 2833

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Viet Nam Human Rights Act".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 101. Findings.

Sec. 102. Purpose.

TITLE II—PROMOTION OF FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY IN VIET NAM

Subtitle A—Prohibition on Nonhumanitarian Assistance to the Government of Viet Nam

Sec. 201. Bilateral nonhumanitarian assistance.

Sec. 202. Multilateral nonhumanitarian assistance.

Subtitle B—Assistance to Support Democracy in Viet Nam

Sec. 211. Assistance.

Subtitle C—United States Public Diplomacy

Sec. 221. Radio Free Asia transmissions to Viet Nam.

Sec. 222. United States educational and cultural exchange programs with Viet Nam.

Subtitle D—United States Refugee Policy

Sec. 232. Refugee resettlement for nationals of Viet Nam.

Subtitle E—Annual Report on Progress Toward Freedom and Democracy in Viet Nam

Sec. 241. Annual report.

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Viet Nam is a one-party state, ruled and controlled by the Vietnamese Communist Party.

(2) The Government of Viet Nam denies the people of Viet Nam the right to change their government and prohibits independent political, social, and labor organizations.

(3)(A) The Government of Viet Nam consistently pursues a policy of harassment, discrimination, and intimidation, and sometimes of imprisonment and other forms of detention, against those who peacefully express dissent from government or party policy.

(B) Recent victims of such mistreatment, which violates the rights to freedom of expression and association recognized in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, include Dr. Nguyen Dan Que, Dr. Nguyen Thanh Giang, General Tran Do, Most Venerable Thich Huyen Quang, Most Venerable

Thich Quang Do, Father Nguyen Van Ly, numerous leaders of the Hoa Hao Buddhist Church and of independent Protestant churches, and an undetermined number of members of the Montagnard ethnic minority groups who participated in peaceful demonstrations in the Central Highlands of Viet Nam during February 2001.

(4) The Government of Viet Nam systematically deprives its citizens of the fundamental right to freedom of religion. Although some freedom of worship is permitted, believers are forbidden to participate in religious activities except under circumstances rigidly defined and controlled by the government:

(A) In 1999 the Government issued a Decree Concerning Religious Activities, which declared in pertinent part that “[a]ll activities using religious belief in order to oppose the State of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, to prevent the believers from carrying out civic responsibilities, to sabotage the union of all the people, to against the healthy culture of our nation, as well as superstitious activities, will be punished in conformity with the law”.

(B) The Unified Buddhist Church of Viet Nam (UCBV), the largest religious denomination in the country, has been declared illegal by the Government, and over the last twenty-five years its clergy have often been imprisoned and subjected to other forms of persecution. The Patriarch of the Unified Buddhist Church, 83-year-old Most Venerable Thich Huyen Quang, has been detained for 21 years in a ruined temple in an isolated area of central Viet Nam. Most Venerable Thich Quang Do, the Executive President of the Unified Buddhist Church, has also been in various forms of detention for many years, and was recently rearrested and placed under house arrest after he had proposed to bring Most Venerable Thich Huyen Quang to Saigon for medical treatment.

(C) The Hoa Hao Buddhist Church was also declared to be illegal until 1999, when the Government established an organization which purports to govern the Hoa Hao. According to the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, “[t]his organization is made up almost entirely of Communist Party members and apparently is not recognized as legitimate by the vast majority of Hoa Haos . . . [n]evertheless, [this government-sponsored organization] has sought to control all Hoa Hao religious activity, particularly at the Hoa Hao village, which is the center of Hoa Hao religious life”. Hoa Hao believers who do not recognize the legitimacy of the government organization are denied the right to visit the Hoa Hao village, to conduct traditional religious celebrations, or to display Hoa Hao symbols. Many have been arrested and subjected to administrative detention, and several Hoa Hao have been sentenced to prison terms for protesting these denials of religious freedom.

(D) Independent Protestants, most of whom are members of ethnic minority groups, are subjected to particularly harsh treatment by the Government of Viet Nam. According to the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, such treatment includes “police raids on homes and house churches, detention, imprisonment, confiscation of religious and personal property, physical and psychological abuse, and fines for engaging in unapproved religious activities (such as collective worship, public religious expression and distribution of religious literature, and performing baptisms, marriages, or funeral services) . . . [i]n addition, it is reported that ethnic Hmong Protestants have been forced by local officials to agree to abandon their faith”.

(E) Other religious organizations, such as the Catholic Church, are formally recognized

by the Government but are subjected to pervasive regulation which violates the right to freedom of religion. For instance, the Catholic Church is forbidden to appoint its own bishops without Government consent, which is frequently denied, to accept seminarians without specific official permission, and to profess Catholic doctrines which are inconsistent with Government policy. A Catholic priest, Father Nguyen Van Ly, was arrested in March 2001 and remains in detention after submitting written testimony to the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom.

(F) The Government has also confiscated numerous churches, temples, and other properties belonging to religious organizations. The vast majority of these properties—even those belonging to religious organizations formally recognized by the Government—have never been returned.

(5) Since 1975 the Government of Viet Nam has persecuted veterans of the Army of the Republic of Viet Nam and other Vietnamese who had opposed the Viet Cong insurgency and the North Vietnamese invasion of South Viet Nam. Such persecution typically included substantial terms in “re-education camps”, where detainees were often subjected to torture and other forms of physical abuse, and in which many died. Re-education camp survivors and their families were often forced into internal exile in “New Economic Zones”. Many of these former allies of the United States, as well as members of their families, continue until the present day to suffer various forms of harassment and discrimination, including denial of basic social benefits and exclusion from higher education and employment.

(6)(A) The Government of Viet Nam has been particularly harsh in its treatment of members of the Montagnard ethnic minority groups of the Central Highlands of Viet Nam, who were the first line in the defense of South Viet Nam against invasion from the North and who fought courageously beside members of the Special Forces of the United States Army, suffering disproportionately heavy casualties, and saving the lives of many of their American and Vietnamese comrades-in-arms.

(B) Since 1975 the Montagnard peoples have been singled out for severe repression, in part because of their past association with the United States and in part because their strong commitment to their traditional way of life and to their Christian religion is regarded as inconsistent with the absolute loyalty and control demanded by the Communist system.

(C) In February 2001 several thousand Montagnards participated in a series of peaceful demonstrations throughout the Central Highlands, demanding religious freedom and restoration of their confiscated lands, and the Government responded by closing off the Central Highlands and sending in military forces, tanks, and helicopter gunships.

(D) Credible reports by refugees who have escaped to Cambodia indicate that the Government has executed some participants in the demonstrations and has subjected others to imprisonment, torture, and other forms of physical abuse.

(E) The Government of Viet Nam has also taken steps to prevent further Montagnards from escaping, and there are credible reports that Vietnamese security forces in Cambodia are offering bounties for the surrender of Montagnard asylum seekers.

(7) The Government of Viet Nam has also persecuted members of other ethnic minority groups, including the Khmer Krom from the Mekong Delta, many of whom fought alongside United States military personnel during the Viet Nam war and whose

Hinayana Buddhist religion is not among those recognized by the Government.

(8) The Government of Viet Nam also engages in or condones serious violations of the rights of workers. In August 1997, the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) reported that child labor exploitation is on the rise in Viet Nam with tens of thousands of children under 15 years of age being subjected to such exploitation. The government’s official labor export program also has subjected workers, many of whom are women, to involuntary servitude, debt bondage, and other forms of abuse, and the reaction of government officials to worker complaints of such abuse has been to threaten the workers with punishment if they do not desist in their complaints.

(9)(A) United States refugee resettlement programs for Vietnamese nationals, including the Orderly Departure Program (ODP), the Resettlement Opportunities for Returning Vietnamese (ROVR) program, and resettlement of boat people from refugee camps throughout Southeast Asia, were authorized by law in order to rescue Vietnamese nationals who have suffered persecution on account of their wartime associations with the United States, as well as those who currently have a well-founded fear of persecution on account of race, religion, nationality, political opinion, or membership in a particular social group.

(B) In general, these programs have served their purpose well. However, many refugees who were eligible for these programs were unfairly denied or excluded, in some cases by vindictive or corrupt Communist officials who controlled access to the programs, and in others by United States personnel who imposed unduly restrictive interpretations of program criteria. These unfairly excluded refugees include some of those with the most compelling cases, including many Montagnard combat veterans and their families.

(10) The Government of Viet Nam systematically jams broadcasts by Radio Free Asia, an independent broadcast service funded by the United States in order to provide news and entertainment to the people of countries in Asia whose governments deny the right to freedom of expression and of the press.

(11) In 1995 the Governments of the United States and Viet Nam announced the “normalization” of diplomatic relations. In 1998 then-President Clinton waived the application of section 402 of the Trade Act of 1974 (commonly known as the “Jackson-Vanik Amendment”), which restricts economic assistance to countries with non-market economies whose governments also restrict freedom of emigration. In 1999 the Governments of the United States and Viet Nam announced “agreement in principle” on a bilateral trade agreement. This agreement was signed in 2000 and has been presented to Congress for approval or disapproval.

(12) The Congress and the American people are united in their determination that the extension or expansion of trade relations with a country whose government engages in serious and systematic violations of fundamental human rights must not be construed as a statement of approval or complacency about such practices. The promotion of freedom and democracy around the world—and particularly for people who have suffered in large part because of their past associations with the United States and because they share our values—is and must continue to be a central objective of United States foreign policy.

SEC. 102. PURPOSE

The purpose of this Act is to promote the development of freedom and democracy in Viet Nam.

TITLE II—PROMOTION OF FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY IN VIET NAM

Subtitle A—Prohibition on Nonhumanitarian Assistance to the Government of Viet Nam

SEC. 201. BILATERAL NONHUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE.

(a) ASSISTANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), United States nonhumanitarian assistance may not be provided to the Government of Viet Nam—

(A) for fiscal year 2002 unless not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act the President determines and certifies to Congress that the requirements of subparagraphs (A) through (D) of paragraph (2) have been met during the 12-month period ending on the date of the certification; and

(B) for each subsequent fiscal year unless the President determines and certifies to Congress in the most recent annual report submitted pursuant to section 241 that the requirements of subparagraphs (A) through (D) of paragraph (2) have been met during the 12-month period covered by the report.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The requirements of this paragraph are that—

(A) the Government of Viet Nam has made substantial progress toward releasing all political and religious prisoners from imprisonment, house arrest, and other forms of detention;

(B) the Government of Viet Nam has made substantial progress toward respecting the right to freedom of religion, including the right to participate in religious activities and institutions without interference by or involvement of the Government;

(C) the Government of Viet Nam has made substantial progress toward respecting the human rights of members of ethnic minority groups in the Central Highlands or elsewhere in Viet Nam; and

(D)(i) neither any official of the Government of Viet Nam nor any agency or entity wholly or partly owned by the Government of Viet Nam was complicit in a severe form of trafficking in persons; or

(ii) the Government of Viet Nam took all appropriate steps to end any such complicity and hold such official, agency, or entity fully accountable for its conduct.

(b) EXCEPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) shall not apply for any fiscal year with respect to the provision of United States nonhumanitarian assistance for any program or activity for which such assistance was provided to the Government of Viet Nam for fiscal year 2001 in an amount not to exceed the amount so provided for fiscal year 2001.

(2) CONTINUATION OF ASSISTANCE IN THE NATIONAL INTEREST.—Notwithstanding the failure of the Government of Viet Nam to meet the requirements of subsection (a)(2), the President may waive the application of subsection (a) for any fiscal year if the President determines that the provision to the Government of Viet Nam of increased United States nonhumanitarian assistance would promote the purposes of this Act or is otherwise in the national interest of the United States.

(3) EXERCISE OF WAIVER AUTHORITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The President may exercise the authority under paragraph (2) with respect to—

(i) all United States nonhumanitarian assistance to Viet Nam; or

(ii) one or more programs, projects, or activities of such assistance.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) SEVERE FORM OF TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS.—The term “severe form of trafficking in persons” means any activity described in section 103(8) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-386 (114 Stat. 1470); 22 U.S.C. 7102(8)).

(2) UNITED STATES NONHUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE.—The term “United States nonhumanitarian assistance” means—

(A) any assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (including programs under title IV of chapter 2 of part I of that Act, relating to the Overseas Private Investment Corporation), other than—

(i) disaster relief assistance, including any assistance under chapter 9 of part I of that Act;

(ii) assistance which involves the provision of food (including monetization of food) or medicine; and

(iii) assistance for refugees; and

(B) sales, or financing on any terms, under the Arms Export Control Act.

SEC. 202. MULTILATERAL NONHUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE.

The President shall ensure that section 701 of the International Financial Institutions Act (22 U.S.C. 262d), relating to human rights, is carried out with respect to Viet Nam.

Subtitle B—Assistance to Support Democracy in Viet Nam

SEC. 211. ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President is authorized to provide assistance, through appropriate nongovernmental organizations, for the support of individuals and organizations to promote human rights and nonviolent democratic change in Viet Nam.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the President to carry out subsection (a) \$2,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2002 and 2003.

Subtitle C—United States Public Diplomacy

SEC. 221. RADIO FREE ASIA TRANSMISSIONS TO VIET NAM.

(a) POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES.—It is the policy of the United States to take such measures as are necessary to overcome the jamming of Radio Free Asia by the Government of Viet Nam.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to such amounts as are otherwise authorized to be appropriated for the Broadcasting Board of Governors, there are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the policy under subsection (a) \$9,100,000 for the fiscal year 2002 and \$1,100,000 for the fiscal year 2003.

SEC. 222. UNITED STATES EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAMS WITH VIET NAM.

It is the policy of the United States that programs of educational and cultural exchange with Viet Nam should actively promote progress toward freedom and democracy in Viet Nam by providing opportunities to Vietnamese nationals from a wide range of occupations and perspectives to see freedom and democracy in action and, also, by ensuring that Vietnamese nationals who have already demonstrated a commitment to these values are included in such programs.

Subtitle D—United States Refugee Policy

SEC. 232. REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT FOR NATIONALS OF VIET NAM.

(a) POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES.—It is the policy of the United States to offer refugee resettlement to nationals of Viet Nam (including members of the Montagnard ethnic minority groups) who were eligible for the Orderly Departure Program or any other United States refugee program and who were deemed ineligible due to administrative error or who for reasons beyond the control of such individuals (including the inability to pay bribes demanded by officials of the Government of Viet Nam) were unable to apply for such programs in compliance with deadlines imposed by the Department of State.

(b) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITY.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State for Migration and Refugee Assistance for each of the fiscal years 2001, 2002, and 2003, such sums as may be necessary are authorized to be made available for the protection (including resettlement in appropriate cases) of Vietnamese refugees and asylum seekers, including Montagnards in Cambodia.

Subtitle E—Annual Report on Progress Toward Freedom and Democracy in Viet Nam

SEC. 241. ANNUAL REPORT.

Not later than May 31 of each year, the Secretary of State shall submit to Congress a report for the 12-month period ending on the date of submission of the report, on the following:

(1)(A) The determination and certification of the President that the requirements of subparagraphs (A) through (D) of section 201(a)(2) have been met, if applicable.

(B) The determination of the President under section 201(b)(2), if applicable.

(2) Efforts by the United States Government to secure transmission sites for Radio Free Asia in countries in close geographical proximity to Viet Nam in accordance with section 221(a).

(3) Efforts to ensure that programs with Viet Nam promote the policy set forth in section 222 and with section 102 of the Human Rights, Refugee, and Other Foreign Policy Provisions Act of 1996 regarding participation in programs of educational and cultural exchange.

(4) Steps taken to carry out the policy under section 232(a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, September 5, 2001, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2833.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, first of all, let me thank my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), and other cosponsors of this important human rights legislation for their strong support for this measure that is before the body today.

Madam Speaker, to hear some of our colleagues talk, we would think that Viet Nam was well on its way to being a human rights success story. Unfortunately, this is simply not the case. Just this week, a Buddhist monk in Danang committed suicide by self-immolation to protest the increasingly harsh repression of the Unified Buddhist Church of Viet Nam.

Just yesterday, the Hanoi security cadres arrested two prominent reform advocates, retired Colonel Phan Que Duong and writer Hoang Minh Chinh. Their only crime appears to have been

asking permission to start a non-governmental organization that would expose corruption and promote transparency in government.

Yet, these thoughtful and courageous men were dragged away from their homes and families on the very eve of the vote on the trade agreement whose supporters say is evidence that the Vietnamese Government is on the road to reform.

It is true that there have been some improvements since the dark days of the late 1970s and early 1980s, when hundreds of thousands of people were confined to so-called "reeducation camps;" and as we know, many died there, simply because they had taken the side of freedom. But in recent years, there has been no such progress. Indeed, in the last few months, the government of Viet Nam has substantially increased the frequency and the severity of its human rights violations.

Madam Speaker, the Government of Viet Nam systematically denies the fundamental right to freedom of religion. Although some freedom of worship is permitted, believers are forbidden to participate in religious activities except under circumstances rigidly defined and controlled by the government.

In 1999, the government issued a Decree Concerning Religious Activities which declared, in pertinent part, "All activities using religious belief in order to oppose the State of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, to prevent the believers from carrying out civic responsibilities, to sabotage the union of all the people, to go against the healthy culture of our Nation, as well as superstitious activities, will be punished in conformity with law."

The Unified Buddhist Church of Viet Nam, Madam Speaker, the largest religious denomination in Viet Nam, has been declared illegal by the government, and over the last 25 years its clergy have often been imprisoned and subjected to other forms of persecution.

□ 1230

The Patriarch of the Unified Buddhist Church, 83-year-old Most Venerable Thich Huyen Quang, has been detained for 21 years in a ruined temple in an isolated area of central Vietnam. Most Venerable Thich Quang Do, the Executive President of the Unified Baptist Church, has also been in various forms of detention for many years, and was recently rearrested and placed under house arrest after he had proposed to bring the most Venerable Thich Huyen Quang to Saigon for medical treatment. For that, he was punished.

The Hoa Hao Buddhist Church was also declared to be illegal until 1999, when the government established an organization which purports to govern the Hoa Hao, but is dominated by government and Communist cadres, which is not acceptable to the believers. Several Hoa Hao have been sentenced to

prison terms for protesting this denial of their religious freedom.

Independent Protestants, most of whom are members of ethnic minority groups, are subjected to particularly harsh treatment by the Government of Vietnam. According to the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, such treatment includes police raids on homes and house churches, detention, imprisonment, confiscation of religious and personal property, physical and psychological abuse, and fines for engaging in unapproved religious activities such as collective worship, public religious expression, the distribution of religious literature, and performing baptisms, marriages, and funeral services. In addition, the U.S. Commission's report goes on to say, it is reported that ethnic Hmong Protestants have been forced by local officials to agree to abandon their faith.

A Catholic priest, Madam Speaker, Father Nguyen Van Ly was arrested in March of 2001, just a few months ago, and remains in detention after submitting written testimony to the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom. For that, this great trading partner of the United States, this man, this priest, was arrested: submitting testimony to an official organ, a function of the United States Government that investigates religious persecution.

Madam Speaker, the other human rights violation in Vietnam right now is the recent intensification of the government's systematic repression of the Montagnards. Since 1975, the Montagnard people have been severely persecuted, in part because of their wartime association with the United States, and in part because of their strong commitment to their traditional way of life and to their Christian religion, and that is regarded as inconsistent with the absolute loyalty and control demanded by the Communist system.

In February 2001, several thousand Montagnards participated in a series of peaceful demonstrations throughout the Central Highlands, demanding religious freedom and restoration of their confiscated lands. The government responded by closing off the Central Highlands and sending in military forces, tanks and helicopters. Credible reports by refugees who have escaped to Cambodia indicate that at least one participant in the demonstration was killed and that the government has subjected others to imprisonment and torture and other forms of physical abuse. The Government of Vietnam has also taken steps to prevent further Montagnards from escaping, and the Vietnamese security forces in Cambodia are offering bounties for the surrender of Montagnard asylum seekers.

Madam Speaker, I want to also call attention to the active involvement of officials and entities of the Vietnamese Government in severe forms of trafficking in persons. There is evidence

that the government's official labor export program has subjected workers, many of whom are women, to involuntary servitude, debt bondage, and other forms of abuse. In the recent case of several hundreds of workers who were trafficked by Vietnamese-owned corporations to the Daewoosa factory in American Samoa, the reaction of government officials to worker complaints of severe mistreatment was to threaten the workers with "punishment under the laws of Vietnam" if they continued to complain.

Madam Speaker, as most Members know, these are not the only human rights violations committed by the Vietnamese Government. The Government of Vietnam also pursues a policy of harassment, discrimination, intimidation, and other types of detention against those who peacefully express dissent from the government or the party policy. The arrests of Mr. Chinh and Colonel Duong are just the latest episode in that awful story.

Madam Speaker, the Human Rights Act for Vietnam will ensure that putting an end to those egregious abuses remains central to U.S. foreign policy toward Vietnam. It will not restrict trade in any way, but it uses other forms of leverage to construct a human rights program that is comprehensive yet reasonable and flexible.

First, the act tells the truth about human rights and the situation of human rights in Vietnam. It describes the violations by the Government of Vietnam of the rights to freedom of expression, association, and religion, and the rights of workers, as well as the persecution of ethnic minorities, as I said, including the Montagnards and persons associated with the United States prior to 1975. The act concludes that Congress and the American people are united in their determination that expansion of trade relations should not be construed as approval or complacency or complicity about human rights violations, and that the promotion of freedom and democracy must be central to U.S. foreign policy.

Second, the act will link increases in foreign aid, other than humanitarian assistance to the Government of Vietnam, to a finding by the President that the government has made "substantial progress" toward meeting certain human rights benchmarks. These benchmarks are reasonable and easily attainable: substantial progress toward release of political and religious prisoners; substantial progress toward respect by the Government of Vietnam to the right of freedom of religion, including the right to participate in religious organizations not connected to the Government of Vietnam; substantial progress, Madam Speaker, toward respect for the rights of members of ethnic minority groups in the Central Highlands and elsewhere; and an end to the government complicity and severe forms of trafficking in human persons.

Madam Speaker, the Vietnam Human Rights Act does not require cuts in

current levels of assistance or impose any restrictions at all on assistance that goes to nongovernmental organizations or private sector enterprises. It affects only increases in nonhumanitarian aid that goes to the Government of Vietnam. It also has a waiver capability that the President can exercise in the national interest or if he feels that the purposes of the act would be better served by waiving its provisions.

Madam Speaker, finally, just let me say the act also authorizes assistance to NGOs committed to promoting freedom and democracy in Vietnam. It will support efforts by the United States to overcome Hanoi's systematic jamming of the profreedom broadcasts by Radio Free Asia. It is amazing to me that right now, as we are about to approve a bilateral trade agreement, they are jamming every day the broadcast coming out of Radio Free Asia.

The act would require the State Department to take steps to ensure that U.S. cultural and exchange programs are open to people who share our values not just of the Vietnamese Government and Communist Party officials and persons close to those officials.

Finally, Madam Speaker, the act declares it to be the policy of the U.S. to offer refugee resettlement to pro-American combat veterans and other residents of Vietnam who meet the statutory criteria for U.S. refugee programs, who have been wrongfully denied access to these programs for reasons beyond their control, including but not limited to their inability to pay bribes that have been demanded by the Vietnamese Government officials.

The act does not change existing refugee law and does not mandate the admission of any person or group. The act does insist, however, that discretion under current law should be exercised to promote fairness for people who have been persecuted for 25 years because of their wartime associations with the U.S. or simply because they share our values.

Madam Speaker, I urge a positive vote on this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in support of H.R. 2833.

First, I would like to commend my good friend and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), for introducing this very important legislation and for doggedly pursuing the Vietnam human rights issue, as indeed he has been pursuing so many human rights issues during his entire course of great service to this Nation. I would also like to express my appreciation to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), for moving this legislation so expeditiously.

Madam Speaker, yesterday afternoon I returned from the Durban Conference in South Africa on Racism and Discrimination, as the American delegation was withdrawn by Secretary of State Colin Powell, a decision I fully support.

It is ironic to listen to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), outlining in great detail the discrimination and persecution unfolding in Vietnam against religious and ethnic minorities, because Vietnam was not on the agenda at Durban. The Sudan was not on the agenda at Durban, although as we speak, slave trade is taking place in the Sudan.

Afghanistan and the Taliban were not on the agenda in Durban, although we know what happens to individuals who attempt to introduce Christianity into that country. There are few things Afghanistan needs more than some Christian values.

Saudi Arabia was not on the agenda, although the persecution of women continues unabated, discrimination against women continues unabated.

The only country singled out for criticism at the farce which was Durban was the democratic state and our ally in the Middle East, the State of Israel. So the timing of this legislation, as it comes before us, could not be more opportune.

I would like to identify myself with the statements made by the gentleman from New Jersey with respect to all the specific acts of religious and ethnic persecution which unfold in Vietnam. None of us here should be under any illusion about the nature of the Vietnamese Government. According to the State Department's Human Rights Report, the Vietnamese Government is an unrepentant authoritarian regime. True political opposition in that country is not allowed. Freedom of expression does not exist, and Vietnamese are put in prison for good for simply expressing political opinions the government does not approve of.

The Vietnamese Government places the most severe restrictions on the expression of religious beliefs, particularly beliefs in Buddhism, as my good friend and colleague so eloquently outlined.

Madam Speaker, today the House will approve the U.S.-Vietnam bilateral trade agreement. I support that agreement, but it is critical that we send a signal to Hanoi that the U.S. continues to care about the human rights and the religious freedom situation in Vietnam, not just trade. Passage of the Smith legislation will indicate to the administration and to the Vietnamese Government that the Congress expects to see true progress on the human rights front, and we have not forgotten those Vietnamese who are being persecuted for their religious beliefs or their political views.

The legislation that we are considering will ensure that there is not a rollback in our trade and aid relationship with Vietnam, only a cap on the level of our aid to Vietnam unless decent human rights conditions are created.

□ 1245

It is ironic that this legislation is before us today, because if it were not

and if it would be merely a discussion of trade with Vietnam, we ourselves would be engaging in hypocrisy as are the delegates in Durban as we speak. It is important to promote trade. But it is important to stand up for human rights as well.

I commend and congratulate the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) for introducing this legislation. I urge all of my colleagues to support its passage.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds.

Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend for his outstanding statement and for pointing out the hypocrisy of the Durban conference, especially in leaving out some of these egregious violators and, as he pointed out, focusing on the state of Israel. I want to thank him for that statement and for his support for that bill.

Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS).

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

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2833, the Viet Nam Human Rights Act of 2001.

As an original co-sponsor of this landmark legislation, I believe passage of the Viet Nam Human Rights Act will send a strong message to the Hanoi regime and to its victims that expansion of trade relations does not imply approval of or complacency about the continuing pattern of severe human rights violations in Vietnam.

As an ardent supporter of human rights and a strong proponent of free trade, I want to stress that the Viet Nam Human Rights Act is about aid, not trade. This legislation sends a clear message to Hanoi, and also to other interested observers including the Vietnamese-American community, that the U.S. is serious about our commitment to the principles of free speech, freedom of expression, and the freedom of religious exercise.

As a founding member of the Congressional Dialogue on Viet Nam and a member of the Congressional Human Rights Caucus, I am acutely aware of the Vietnamese government's human rights violations, including religious persecution and indefinite criminal sentences for political prisoners.

On May 12 of this year, I attended a hearing which addressed the issue of religious suppression and persecution in Vietnam. My colleagues and I heard testimony from many religious Vietnamese-American leaders who shared their perspectives on this important issue. Many of them had suffered personally at the hands of the Vietnamese government. In July, I sent a letter to Secretary of State Colin Powell before he went to Vietnam, asking him to raise these very issues with the government.

This legislation sets a framework for an honest and detailed assessment of the human rights situation in Vietnam. It accurately identifies violations by the Vietnamese government against the rights of the Vietnamese people to exercise their freedom of expression, association, and religion, and the rights of workers, as well as persecution of religious figures and ethnic minorities including the Montagnards and other people associated with the U.S. prior to 1975.

In addition, H.R. 2833 summarizes the history of U.S. policy towards Vietnamese refugees and of normalization of U.S.-Vietnam diplomatic and trade relations. This legislation concludes that Congress and the American people are united in their belief that expansion of trade relations should not and must not be construed as approval of or ignorance about the Vietnamese government's human rights violations. Furthermore, we, the government and the American people, seriously believe that the promotion of freedom and democracy must be central to U.S. foreign policy.

This legislation makes conditional any increases in foreign assistance, other than humanitarian assistance, to the Vietnamese government on a finding by the President that they have made substantial progress toward meeting certain human rights benchmarks, which include the release of all political and religious prisoners from all forms of detention including imprisonment and house arrest; respect by the Vietnamese government towards the right to freedom of religion, including the right to participate in religious organizations not connected to the Vietnamese government; respect for the rights of members of ethnic minority groups in the Central Highlands and elsewhere; and an end to government complicity in severe forms of trafficking in human beings, in particular, women and children.

This bill will also require an enforcement of a provision of a current law designed to withhold non-humanitarian loans and other extensions of funds from international financial institutions to governments that consistently commit gross violations of fundamental human rights.

This legislation will help to actively promote freedom and democracy in Vietnam by authorizing assistance to nongovernmental organizations committed to encouraging and advancing these principles in Vietnam.

Additionally, this legislation declares it to be the policy of the United States to take such measures as are necessary to overcome the jamming of Radio Free Asia by the Vietnamese government. It requires periodic reports on efforts by the U.S. government to secure transmission sites for Radio Free Asia in countries near Vietnam. It also authorizes additional funding to enhance transmission facilities in order to overcome jamming.

This bill seeks to ensure that U.S. educational and cultural exchange pro-

grams promote American values. It requires the U.S. State Department to take steps to make sure that U.S. cultural and exchange programs are open to people who share our values, not just Vietnamese government and Communist Party officials and persons close to them.

Finally, this bill would declare it to be the policy of the United States to offer refugee resettlement to residents of Vietnam who met the statutory criteria for the Orderly Departure Program and other refugee programs, but who were incorrectly deemed ineligible for such programs or who, for reasons beyond their own control including but not limited to inability to pay bribes demanded by Vietnamese government officials, were denied access to U.S. programs in time for deadlines imposed by State Department officials. This legislation also requires the State Department to report on what steps it has taken to provide such persons with access to U.S. refugee resettlement.

This bill does not affect any form of humanitarian assistance, nor does it limit assistance that is provided through nongovernmental organizations. Essentially, the Viet Nam Human Rights Act will require the Vietnamese government to make substantial progress towards the release of political and religious prisoners, and an end to religious persecution, respect for the rights of ethnic minorities, and elimination of trafficking in human beings before receiving any further increases in government-to-government U.S. aid. It is my strong belief that this is the least we can do for all those being oppressed by the Communist Government.

For these reasons, I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 2833 so that we can hold the Vietnamese government accountable for the human rights abuses committed by their regimes and hopefully bring justice to the Vietnamese people.

I commend the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and his staff for their hard work and commitment in bringing attention to this important issue.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) who has been a persistent and outspoken champion of human rights.

(Ms. LOFGREN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of 2833, the Viet Nam Human Rights Act, a resolution to promote democracy and freedom in Vietnam.

Madam Speaker, last weekend many of us were celebrating Labor Day with our constituents and families honoring our country's proud traditions of democracy and freedom. But last weekend in Da Nang, Vietnam, a 61-year-old monk set himself on fire in protest of the communist authorities' repression of religious freedoms.

Before his death, Ank wrote letters to the U.N. Human Rights Commission, the Human Rights Commission of the European Union and other international groups, stating simply, "I have decided that the only way I can protest is by setting my body on fire to denounce repression against the UBCV and all other religions."

I have with me the Declaration of Vietnamese Priests Abroad, an open letter to the international community condemning the vicious repression of religious and other basic human rights in Vietnam. This letter, dated August 15, was signed by 144 Catholic priests worldwide and calls upon "freedom-loving governments to defend the values of human rights which are being trampled on in Vietnam."

Madam Speaker, I include the letter for the RECORD.

DECLARATION OF VIETNAMESE PRIESTS ABROAD

We, the undersigned Vietnamese priests abroad, want to express our great concern about the present urgent situation of Vietnam's religious life in general, and the life of the Vietnamese Catholic Church in particular.

Though living and serving away from the Fatherland, we as Vietnamese and as priests remain attached to our people and country. We always pray for our people to be truly free and for our country to be prosperous, in which every Vietnamese is loved and respected in accordance with his or her human dignity.

As for religious life in Vietnam, we are convinced that religious freedom is absolutely a basic and spiritual need for man and society. For the future of Vietnam, religious freedom is not only a legitimate demand but also a matter of human rights that needs to be urgently solved. Vietnam will lose an opportunity to create a bright future if the Vietnamese people do not have true religious freedom. The history of Vietnam has proved that religious life is strongly tied with the destiny of the people. Once religion is free, society will be peaceful and healthy and a human development will be secured for the country.

It is unfortunate for the Vietnamese people that what is happening in our country increasingly proves that religion is at risk of being used as an instrument by the Vietnamese Communist Government and enslaved by it to the point of dying away in the end. Using this as its strategy involves agonizing policies of the legal system (especially the procedure of begging the government permission and policies of discrimination), unreasonable administrative system, "divide and conquer" causing division among leaders of the same religion, etc. All of these aim to deprive religious belief of sacred values and to render it meaningless and finally useless. Religious freedom in Vietnam is being distorted and trampled brutally and shamelessly by the Vietnamese Communist Government. The present conditions of society are unstable and only conducive to bribery and power abuse at all levels. In the face of these great social problems, religious organizations do not have a right to truly speak out. If they say anything, they must espouse the policies of the government.

Concerning the Vietnamese Catholic Church, we are in one accord with the pastoral approach of the Vietnamese Episcopal Conference as stated in the Joint Letter May 1, 1980: "To live the Gospel in the midst of the people." It is also for the sake of living

the Gospel in the midst of the people that we cannot fail to share the common concern of our people as stated in the above observations.

In the spirit of those observations, we, the undersigned Vietnamese priests abroad, want to declare our position regarding several urgent issues of the present situation of religions in Vietnam as follows:

1. We fervently support the spirit of self-engagement of Reverend Thaddeus Ngyeân-Vaên-Lyù, a Catholic priest of the Archdiocese of Hueá, and his demands regarding true religious freedom. At the same time, we also support other religious leaders' legitimate demands regarding religious freedom. We demand that the Vietnamese Communist Government guarantee religious leaders' safety and security and their right to freely exercise religious duties.

2. We demand the Vietnamese Communist Government, for the sake of the future of our people and country, bring to an end religious persecution and insidious and malicious strategy, which is ordered to use religions in Vietnam as instruments leading to their destruction.

3. We call freedom loving governments and international human rights organizations to defend the values of human rights, which are being trampled on in Vietnam, especially the right to religious freedom according to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Declared in Washington, D.C.

On the Fifteenth of August, 2001.

Solemnity of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Body and Soul, into Heaven.

Signed by the following Vietnamese priests abroad:

Rev. Msgr. Dominic Mai-Thanh-Lõông, Archdiocese of New Orleans, USA
 Rev. Joseph Ninh-Coâng-Huyõnh, Archdiocese of Philadelphia, USA
 Rev. Peter Ngyeân-Thanh-Long, Archdiocese of Washington, USA
 Rev. Joachim Traân-Quyù-Thieân, Diocese of Arlington, USA
 Rev. Andrew Ngyeân-Hõõu-Leá, Diocese of Auckland, New Zealand
 Rev. Paul Traân-Xuaân-Taám, Archdiocese of Washington, USA
 Rev. Joseph Traân-Kim-Thieân, Archdiocese of Philadelphia, USA
 Rev. Vincent Ngyeân-Hõõu-Duĩ, O.P. Canada
 Rev. John Ninh-Xuaân-Minh, Diocese of Mainz, Germany
 Rev. Joseph Phaím-Xuaân-Thaéng, Diocese of Richmond, Virginia, USA
 Rev. Joseph Ngyeân-Phuù-An, Diocese of Camden, New Jersey, USA
 Rev. Joseph Toáng-Thieân-Lieân, Diocese of Dallas, Texas, USA
 Rev. Joseph Phaím-Thanh-Lõông, Diocese of Camden, New Jersey, USA
 Rev. Joseph Traân-Vaên-Huaân, Archdiocese of San Antonio, Texas, USA
 Rev. Vincent Kim-Vaên-Toan, Diocese of Hamilton, Ontario, Canada
 Rev. Anthony Ngoá-Kim-Traing, Diocese of Richmond, Virginia, USA
 Rev. Dominic Vuõ-Ngoic-An, Archdiocese of Washington, USA
 Rev. Peter Phaím-Vaên-Chính, Diocese of St. Petersburg, Florida, USA
 Rev. Joseph Phaím-Vaên-Tueá, Archdiocese of New Orleans, Louisiana, USA
 Rev. John Baptist Ngyeân-Huõng-Laân, O.F.M., Diocese of Bruxelles, Belgium
 Rev. Matthias Vuõ-Ngoic-Naung, Diocese of San Jose, California, USA
 Rev. Peter Ninh-Ngoic-Queá, C.Ss.R., Archdiocese of Los Angeles, USA
 Rev. Alphonsus Ngyeân-Hoá-Naenh, Diocese of Pontoise, France
 Rev. Vincent Phan-Hõõu-Toá, Archdiocese of Mobile, Alabama, USA

Rev. John Vuõ-Haân, Archdiocese of New Orleans, Louisiana, USA
 Rev. Peter Phan-Phaüt-Huoaân, C.Ss.R., Archdiocese of Los Angeles, USA
 Rev. John Ngyeân-Thaõnh-Chung, Archdiocese of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA
 Rev. Joseph Phaím-Mainh-Cõõõng, Diocese of Camden, New Jersey, USA
 Rev. Joachim Ngyeân-Dao-Kim, Diocese of Galveston-Houston, Texas, USA
 Rev. Joseph Hoaõng-Minh-Thaéng, Archdiocese of Rome, Italy
 Rev. Vincent Ngyeân-Vaên-Kieân, Diocese of Honolulu, USA
 Rev. Peter Ngyeân-Vaên-Huõng, S.S.C., Taiwan
 Rev. Alexis Nõaõn-Quang-Trõõõng, Diocese of Hsinchu, Taiwan
 Rev. Peter Ngyeân-Huõng-Cõõõng, M.M., New York, USA
 Rev. Joachim Vuõ-Ninh-Thoân, Diocese of Chiayi, Taiwan
 Rev. Joseph Ngyeân-Minh-Chính, Archdiocese of Taipei, Taiwan
 Rev. Andrew Traân-Cao-Tõõõng, Archdiocese of New Orleans, Louisiana, USA
 Rev. Joseph Ngyeân-Theá-Quang, Archdiocese of Birmingham, London, England
 Rev. Anthony Traân-Hõõu-Laân, Archdiocese of Seattle, Washington, USA
 Rev. Joseph Ngoá-Quang-Nõnh, Archdiocese of Tokyo, Japan
 Rev. Christopher Leá-Huy-Baung, C.Ss.R., Houston, Texas, USA
 Rev. Joseph Mai-Thaõnh-Haân, Archdiocese of Brisbane, Queensland, Australia
 Rev. John Traân-Ngoic-Bich, C.Ss.R., Diocese of Tucson, Arizona, USA
 Rev. Joseph Noaõn-Huy-Chõõng, Diocese of Galveston-Houston, Texas, USA
 Rev. Paul Chu-Vaên-Chi, Archdiocese of Sydney, Australia
 Rev. Dominic Ngyeân-Vaên-Nõai, Archdiocese of Sydney, Australia
 Rev. Canut Ngyeân-Thaùi-Hoáich, Archdiocese of Sydney, Australia
 Rev. Joachim Noaõn-Só-Thuic, Archdiocese of Sydney, Veritas Radio, Philippines
 Rev. Joseph Vuõ-Minh-Ngyeân, Archdiocese of Sydney, Australia
 Rev. Dominic Mai-Minh-Luaân, Diocese of Springfield Cape Girardeau, USA
 Rev. Joseph Chu-Coâng, O.Cist., Diocese of Worcester, Massachusetts, USA
 Rev. Joachim Ngyeân-Ninh-Naõm, Diocese of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, USA
 Rev. Joseph Vuõ-Xuaân-Trõõõng, Diocese of Brooklyn, New York, USA
 Rev. Joseph Leá-Phuic, C.Ss.R., Diocese of Galveston-Houston, Texas, USA
 Rev. Paul Leá-Anh-Võõng, S.V.D., Diocese of San Bernardino, California, USA
 Rev. Anthony Traân-Tri-Tueá, Diocese of Hsinchu, Taiwan
 Rev. Thomas Nõ-Minh-Taám, Diocese of St. Paul-Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA
 Rev. Mark Noaõn-Quang-Baùu, C.M.C., Archdiocese of Boston, Massachusetts, USA
 Rev. Peter Vuõ, Diocese of Grand Rapids, Michigan, USA
 Rev. Michael Ngyeân-Linh-Ghi, Diocese of Chiayi, Taiwan
 Rev. Joseph Trõõõng-Vaên-Phuic, Diocese of Hsinchu, Taiwan
 Rev. Peter Leá-Vaên-Quaung, Diocese of Hsinchu, Taiwan
 Rev. Dominic Ninh-Duy-Khieám, Diocese of Tulsa, Oklahoma, USA
 Rev. Joseph Naõ-Vaên-Nhõõõng, Archdiocese of Saõi Goõn, Retired, Louisiana, USA
 Rev. Peter Leá-Thanh-Quang, Diocese of Little Rock, Arkansas, USA
 Rev. Peter Ngyeân-Thanh-Baèng, Incarnational Consecration (Hereafter: I.C.), Archdiocese of New Orleans, USA

Rev. Francis Ngyeân-Vaên-Hoá, Archdiocese of Oklahoma, USA
 Rev. Vincent Traân Ninh-Phuic-Quyù, Archdiocese of New Orleans, Louisiana, USA
 Rev. Louis Ngyeân-Haáu, C.Ss.R., Archdiocese of Paris, France
 Rev. John Ngyeân-Kim-Ngoân, Diocese of Meaux, Paris, France
 Rev. Joseph Vuõ-Ngoic-Chaáu, Archdiocese of Taipei, Taiwan
 Rev. Peter Dõõng-Baù-Hoaít, Diocese of Chiaya, Taiwan
 Rev. Vincent Traân-Quang-Nieám, Diocese of Orange, California, USA
 Rev. Joseph Chaáu-Xuaân-Baùu, C.Ss.R., Diocese of Dallas, Texas, USA
 Rev. Joseph Ngyeân-Vaên-Thaùi, Archdiocese of Chicago, Illinois, USA
 Rev. Peter Ngyeân-Ninh-Neá, Diocese of San Jose, California, USA
 Rev. Paul Phaím-Vaên-Hoái, Diocese of Orange, California, USA
 Rev. Joseph Ngyeân-Coâng-Hoàn, Diocese of Fresno, California, USA
 Rev. Philip Ngyeân-Vaên-Hieáu, Diocese of Sioux City, Iowa, USA
 Rev. Peter Nõá-Quang-Chaáu, Diocese of Nashville, Tennessee, USA
 Rev. Philip Ninh-Vaên-Thieáp, Diocese of Green Bay, Wisconsin, USA
 Rev. Joseph Ngyeân-Duy-Huõng, Diocese of Stockton, California, USA
 Rev. Joseph Phaím-Minh-Vaên, Chaplain for Vietnamese Catholics in Switzerland
 Rev. Joseph Ngyeân-Vaên-Soñ, Diocese of Dallas, Texas, USA
 Rev. Leo Vuõ-Huyeân, C.M.C., Diocese of San Bernardino, California, USA
 Rev. Peter Traân-Vaên-Trõi, S.J., Australia
 Rev. Augustine Ngyeân-Nõic-Thuĩ, S.J. Australia
 Rev. Joseph Vuõ-Moáng-Thõ, Diocese of Tours, France
 Rev. Maurice Ngyeân-Vaên-Danh, O.S.B., Monastery of Buckfast, England
 Rev. Stephen Ngyeân-Maím-Taân, O.F.M., Archdiocese of San Francisco, USA
 Rev. Peter Mary Ngyeân-Hõõu-Hieân, Archdiocese of Tokyo, Japan
 Rev. Andrew Duõng-Laic Cao-Duy-Linh, O.F.M., Diocese of Nayoga, Japan
 Rev. John Baptist Ngyeân-Vieát-Huy, S.J. Australia
 Rev. Vincent Traân-Vaên-Baèng, Diocese of Bamberg, Germany
 Rev. Peter Hoaõng-Kim-Huy, O.S.B., Archdiocese of Hobart, Tasmania, Australia
 Rev. Paul Tai-Thanh-Binh, C.Ss.R., Archdiocese of New Orleans, Louisiana, USA
 Rev. Joseph Phan-Nõõng, C.Ss.R., Diocese of Oakland, California, USA
 Rev. Joseph Vuõ-Ngoic-Thaân, Diocese of Baton Rouge, Louisiana, USA
 Rev. Peter Ngyeân-Huõng-Nõic, Diocese of Sioux City, Iowa, USA
 Rev. Paul Ngyeân-Huõng-Cõõõng, S.V.D., Iowa, USA
 Rev. Joseph Vuõ-Thaõnh, Diocese of Galveston-Houston, Texas, USA
 Rev. Louis Vuõ-Laám, Diocese of Lafayette, Louisiana, USA
 Rev. Francis Xavier Ngyeân-Trung-Duõng, Diocese of Nagasaki, Japan
 Rev. Joseph Cao-Phõõng-Kyù, Diocese of Honolulu, Hawaii, USA
 Rev. Dominic Ngyeân-Vaên-Haùu, Diocese of St. Jean Longueuil, Canada
 Rev. Peter Ngoá-Ninh-Thoúa, C.Ss.R., Archdiocese of Los Angeles, USA
 Rev. Joseph Noáng-Vaên-Vinh, Archdiocese of Perth, Australia
 Rev. Andrew Phaím-Quang-Phong, Diocese of Grand Rapids, Michigan, USA
 Rev. Joseph Traân-Minh-Nhaát, Archdiocese of Perth, Australia
 Rev. Stephen Buõi-Thõõõng-Lõu, Diocese of Rottenburg-Stuttgart, Germany

Rev. Joseph Vuõ-Nõuc, Archdiocese for the Military Services, USA
 Rev. Michael Joseph Ngyeân-Ngoic-Vinh, Archdiocese of New Orleans, USA
 Rev. Joseph Vuõ-Naũo, S.V.D., Indiana, USA
 Rev. Joseph Traân-Theá-Maãn, Archdiocese of New Orleans, USA
 Rev. Joseph Ngyeân-Chinh, Archdiocese of Boston, Massachusetts, USA
 Rev. Francis Buõi-Quyeát, Diocese of Houma-Thibodaux, Louisiana, USA
 Rev. John Baptist Ngyeân-Vaên-Hieãn, Diocese of Long Island, New York, USA
 Rev. Peter Mary Buõi-Coâng-Minh, Diocese of Orange, California, USA
 Rev. Joseph Ninh-Xuaãn-Long, Diocese of Charlotte, North Carolina, USA
 Rev. Peter Traân-Nieãn, Retired, Carthage, Missouri, USA
 Rev. Joseph Ngyeân-Nõuc-Duong, Archdiocese of Hartford, Connecticut, USA
 Rev. Joseph Noã-Baũ-Aũi, Wyoming, Michigan, USA
 Rev. Jerome Ngyeân-Thanh-Laãm, O.S.B., Carthage, Missouri, USA
 Rev. Peter Ngyeân-Vaên-Phong, (Society of the House of the Lord), Diocese of Dallas, Texas, USA
 Rev. Dominic Noã-Duy-Nho, Diocese of Little Rock, Arkansas, USA
 Rev. Peter Traân-Vieát-Huong, Archdiocese of Newark, New Jersey, USA
 Rev. John Baptist Traân-Vaên-Taãn, Diocese of Des Moines, Iowa, USA
 Rev. Anthony Ngyeân-Vaên-Noã, Archdiocese of Oklahoma, Oklahoma, USA
 Rev. Peter Traân-Ninh-Thaũo, Diocese of Hoalien, Taiwan
 Rev. Joseph Vuõ-Xuaãn-Minh, Archdiocese of St. Paul and Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA
 Rev. John Bosco Phaĩm-Trung-Thõic, C.M.C., Archdiocese of Boston, USA
 Rev. Martin Ngyeân-Thanh, I.C., Diocese of Baton Rouge, Louisiana, USA
 Rev. Thomas Thieãn-Nonh, I.C., Diocese of Baton Rouge, Louisiana, USA
 Rev. Peter Ngyeân-Vieát-Taãn, I.C., Diocese of Baton Rouge, Louisiana, USA
 Rev. Msgr. Philip Traân-Vaên-Hoaõi, Vatican, Rome, Italy
 Rev. Thomas Ngyeân-Vaên-Chaũnh, Archdiocese of New Orleans, Louisiana, USA
 Rev. Joseph Ngyeân-Huong-Cõõng, Diocese of Wichita, Kansas, USA
 Rev. Thomas Noã-Thanh-Haõ, Diocese of Orange, California, USA
 Rev. Thomas Ngyeân-Xuaãn-Toaõn, Archdiocese of San Francisco, California, USA
 Rev. Peter Ngoã-Coâng-Thaéng, Archdiocese of Los Angeles, California, USA
 Rev. Dominic Ninh-Minh-Haũi, C.Ss.R., Diocese of Dallas, Texas, USA
 Rev. Joseph Phaĩm-Nõuc-Khõui, Diocese of Stockton, California, USA
 Rev. Vincent Phaĩm-Minh-Chaũu, S.V.D., Archdiocese of St. Louis, Missouri, USA
 Rev. Joseph Traân Ninh Huynh, S.V.D., Archdiocese of Taipei, Taiwan/R.O.C.

Madam Speaker, a few months ago the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Tom DAVIS) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ) and I held a hearing on human rights in Vietnam. Several of our invited guests, prominent religious leaders in Vietnam, were unable to leave Vietnam to give their testimony. As a result of this hearing, the congressional dialogue on Vietnam relaunched its Adopt a Voice of Conscience campaign. My colleagues and I have been in constant contact with the Vietnamese American community and the Department of State about the safety of Father Nguyen Van Ly, Ven-

erable Thich Quang Do, and other leaders we know are being harassed or detained.

I invite my colleagues to again join this bipartisan campaign and make the release of these prisoners of conscience a prominent issue in U.S. policy towards Vietnam.

The Vietnamese people deserve to live in full freedom. Countless brave Vietnamese are currently in prison, under house arrest, or suffering other kinds of persecution.

These "voices of conscience" are both our inspiration and our responsibility. It is our duty to ensure that those who are courageous enough to speak out against injustice have our support and our protection.

Our offices have received hundreds of letters from our Vietnamese American constituents, calling upon Congress to pass the Vietnam Human Rights Act.

This bill tells the truth. It does not restrict trade in any way. It does not limit humanitarian aid to Vietnam. It remembers by name those who have been persecuted because of their beliefs. It is important human rights legislation that I am proud to support, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHR-ABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2833. Let me commend the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for the strong leadership they have provided. It has been my honor to stand with these two gentlemen on numerous occasions on issues dealing with human rights.

I only wish our other colleagues had the commitment to freedom and democracy and human rights that the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) have because America truly could save the world if we had that type of commitment. It is up to us to try to reach out to our colleagues, and that is what we are doing today.

The Vietnam Human Rights Act stresses the importance of human rights in American policy towards Southeast Asia. During the last 24 hours, let us take a look at what has happened. The Vietnamese communists understand what is going on with the debate here. In fact, some people in Hanoi may understand this debate more than some of our colleagues who are not paying attention to this debate right now. They prepared for this debate by what? What happened in Vietnam?

Well, two prominent elderly dissidents were arrested, one simply after he applied to set up an anti-corruption body in Vietnam to try to deter corruption in Vietnam. Think about that.

The Vietnamese government, the regime, the dictators in Vietnam, have sent us their message. We talk about

human rights in Vietnam. They start arresting dissidents. The British Broadcasting Corporation reports that dozens of other dissidents have been called and questioned by police, called into the police departments and been given the message. These incidents exemplify the reality of what we are voting on today. They have verified themselves by their own arrogance the need for us to pass a bill concerning human rights in Vietnam.

During the past 6 years, the United States has normalized relations and extended trade subsidies through waivers in the Jackson-Vanik Act, and we have a bilateral trade agreement with Communist Vietnam. These initiatives by our government have made absolutely no impact on promoting democracy and human rights in Vietnam. To paraphrase a song I heard as a kid, when will we ever learn. Trying to cozy up and ignore the pitfalls and the bad parts of a dictatorial regime, trying to ignore the violence and the crimes of gangsters will not make this a better world.

Right now the Hanoi regime is proving that they are as stubborn and as brutal as ever in their campaign against Buddhists, Catholics, and others. They are proving their very nature by continuing these attacks on anyone who believes in religion in Vietnam who has not succumbed to the temptation of simply trying to register their church and run their church affairs in the way that the government would have them run.

Finally, we know now of a brutal suppression of the Montagnard hill tribes people. These people fought valiantly alongside Americans during the war and since then have faced brutal repression; and now that the war is long over when these chapters should be closed, the Vietnamese Communist Government is reopening this type of repression against the Montagnards. I feel a personal obligation for the Montagnards. I was in a Montagnard village in 1967, and I believe that my life was a lot safer with those Montagnards because they were on the side of the United States. It is up to us to be on their side now, and on the side of all religious believers throughout the world, especially in Vietnam, who are persecuted, and to be on the side of those people who believe in democracy throughout the world, especially Vietnam. That is what this legislation does.

Madam Speaker, I would ask my colleagues to join us in supporting it.

□ 1300

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I am delighted to yield as much time as she might consume to my good friend and distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ).

Ms. SANCHEZ. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), my colleague, for being such a defender and proponent of human rights, not just in this debate

today, but in his recent work also when he was in South Africa.

Madam Speaker, I rise today as a co-sponsor and a strong supporter of H.R. 2833, which promotes the development of freedom and democracy in Vietnam. While the United States should move toward promoting economic relations with Vietnam, we must first address the current human rights violations, religious persecution, and the social injustice that is faced by so many in that country.

In our support for the economic revitalization of Vietnam, we cannot ignore these basic human rights. We cannot ignore that they go unresolved in that country. Although diplomatic and trade relations between the United States and Vietnam have improved in recent years, very little headway has been made with respect to the rights of people in that country.

Madam Speaker, I have the privilege of representing the largest Vietnamese community outside of the country of Vietnam. They are the parents, siblings, the children of families who fought communism for 2 decades.

The majority of the people that I represent feel that the economic relations with Vietnam should not be established until specific immigration, political and human rights are addressed; and in this debate, I am their voice.

On their behalf, I support H.R. 2833, which links bilateral, non-humanitarian aid to Vietnam's progress on human rights. While encouraging economic revitalization of Vietnam, it will require a climate of freedom and democracy.

At this point, the Vietnamese Government has not made sufficient progress. In fact, in the 4 years, now 5 years that I have been in Congress, very little progress has been made.

When we held a human rights hearing recently on Vietnam with my other colleagues, we reviewed the United States State Department records, and they reported that the Vietnamese Government has made some change, but their human rights record remains poor.

Moreover, human rights groups report that over the past year the Vietnamese Government, in order to avoid international criticism, has cracked down on political and religious dissidents by isolating and intimidating them through such practices as house arrest and constant surveillance rather than imprisoning them.

In fact, I myself saw some of this while I was in Vietnam this past year. I was supposed to meet with six of the leading dissidents on human rights in Vietnam. Unfortunately, two were unable to make it because of that constant watch and the ability to stop them.

The four that I did meet with, Professor Nguyen Thanh Giang, General Tran Do, Mr. Pham Que Duong and Mr. Hoang Minh Chinh, discussed the restrictions. They talked about the rising fear that they have because of this

government oppressing them in particular as they continue to speak out on human rights.

The Government of Vietnam systematically deprives its citizens of the fundamental right to freedom of religion. Numerous respected religious leaders, including the Most Venerable Thich Huyen Quang and the Most Venerable Thich Quang Do, Father Ly, all of these have been under house arrest in the last few years. The Venerable Thich Quang Do, 28 of our colleagues in this House and I signed a letter to the Nobel peace prize people because of the work he has done on behalf of trying to stop this religious persecution.

The Patriarch of the Unified Buddhist Church, Thich Huyen Quang, has been detained for 21 years, 21 years, in a ruined temple, and Thich Quang Do has recently been put under house arrest once again simply because he wanted to get his colleague to Saigon for medical treatment.

Contrary to the pretense of the Vietnamese Government that it has no political or religious prisoners, many Vietnamese continue to languish in prisons because of their beliefs. All they simply do is say they broke the law. Well, if the law is to ask for the right to assemble, if the law would be the right to free speech, if the law would be the right to religious freedom, if it was a right to collective bargaining, if it was a right to own the press or speak up in the press, then the laws of that country would be correct; but currently all of that is deprived these people in Vietnam.

Madam Speaker, today I will support H.R. 2833 because I believe we must keep the pressure on the Government of Vietnam to improve its record on religious and human rights.

It is the United States' responsibility, the world's beacon of democracy, to make certain that the Vietnamese Government is making sufficient progress with the human rights of their own people before we give them concessions with respect to trade normalization.

I urge my colleagues to join me in keeping the spotlight on the Government of Vietnam so that it may improve its political and human rights record.

Vote yes to end that religious persecution. Vote yes to promote free speech and democracy. Vote yes on H.R. 2833.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. ROYCE. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Viet Nam Human Rights Act.

Last year I led a delegation to Vietnam to survey the political, social and economic situation there in the country. During my trip, I paid a visit to the Venerable Thich Quang Do, who was imprisoned there under house arrest. He is the leader of the banned

Unified Buddhist Church of Vietnam. Because of his years of peaceful protest in support of religious and political freedom, he has suffered constant harassment, constant imprisonment; and even though he was under house arrest and under surveillance, Thich Quang Do nevertheless welcomed my visit.

Because of my private visits with this brave dissident and Le Quang Liem, another courageous fighter for freedom, I came to the conclusion that we needed frankly to speak out. What was surprising was how quickly I was denounced by the government, by the Communist government of Vietnam. That told me something. That told me that the Vietnamese Government is sensitive to international criticism. And I think this obliges the United States to speak out constantly against Vietnam's human rights violations. We may not always realize it, but protests by the American Government and the American people do help the cause of freedom in Vietnam and elsewhere. Silence I think for us, Madam Speaker, is not an option.

However, I am afraid that we as a Nation have been tepid when it comes to challenging human rights abuses in Vietnam. Our last ambassador to Vietnam even went so far as to say, "I don't hear anyone reporting problems here. Vietnam by any standard has been rated a success." That is what he said. By no standard is Vietnam a success. Just ask those who were forced to flee their country. Just ask those who want freedom of speech. Just ask, as I did, Thich Quang Do or Le Quang Liem.

Today is our chance to correct the mistakes of the previous administration and to act against human rights abuses in Vietnam. The bill before us today is a good one. The legislation links human rights as a condition to nonhumanitarian aid to Vietnam, it authorizes assistance to democratic forces in Vietnam, and it provides additional funding of Radio Free Asia to overcome jamming efforts by the Communist government of Vietnam.

I am particularly supportive of the Radio Free Asia provisions in this act, because it should now be more able to bring objective news, the truth, to the Vietnamese people. The spread of democratic values in Asia is critical to U.S. security interests. Radio Free Asia is a step in the right direction. The Vietnamese service airs important programs on issues like democracy and press freedoms, and it tells the Vietnamese people what the world is saying, what this Congress is saying, about their repressive government. It gives critical moral support to Thich Quang Do and Le Quang Liem. We know that these broadcasts are effective. Why do we know that? Because the Vietnamese Government spends so much time trying to block them. With this bill, that will be a harder task.

I urge its passage.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I am delighted to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY).

Mr. CLAY. Madam Speaker, let me thank the distinguished gentleman from California for yielding the time.

Today, as we consider improving our relations with the country of Vietnam, we must not overlook our longstanding commitment to human rights in our global relationships. In recent months, the Government of Vietnam has significantly increased its suppression of religious and personal freedoms within its borders. The regime has imprisoned scores of religious leaders, mostly Christians, who have courageously spoken out against their government's repressive actions, and it has caused hundreds more to flee into Cambodia to avoid imprisonment. Still other Vietnamese religious leaders are currently under government-ordered house arrest, effectively cutting off contact with their parishioners and congregations.

In addition to its actions against free expression and religious activities, the Vietnamese Government has also confiscated church properties, where in some cases they have turned church sanctuaries into state-run nightclubs.

In light of these continued crackdowns on religion, dissidents and minorities, Congress must make it clear to the Vietnamese Government that in order for the U.S. and Vietnam to have a closer relationship, they must do more to improve their human rights record.

The Viet Nam Human Rights Act, H.R. 2833, seeks to establish such human rights safeguards. H.R. 2833 would prohibit any increase in non-humanitarian assistance to the Vietnamese Government unless there is clear progress on human rights on their part. It would also authorize \$2 million to help promote human rights and democratic change within Vietnam and support additional Vietnamese refugee resettlement.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2833.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that debate time be extended by 10 minutes, equally divided between the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations, who has been a forceful advocate for human rights worldwide, including Vietnam, and is one of the cosponsors of this legislation.

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

□ 1315

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

I strongly support H.R. 2833, the Viet Nam Human Rights Act. I want to congratulate the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the vice chairman of the House Committee on International Relations, and other cosponsors of this comprehensive human rights legislation.

Later this afternoon, the House will consider a resolution to approve the U.S.-Vietnam Bilateral Trade Agreement. We are all hopeful that free trade will improve the lives of the Vietnamese people and that it will eventually create irresistible domestic pressure for human rights and democracy in Vietnam. In the meantime, however, the Vietnamese Government remains one of the most repressive regimes on Earth. Religious persecution, especially of Buddhists and of Evangelical Protestants, has taken a turn for the worse during the last year. Since February, the government has engaged in a brutal crackdown against members of the Montagnard ethnic minority groups who participated in peaceful demonstrations seeking the return of their traditional lands.

I think it is important, therefore, that in expanding trade relations we avoid sending a message of approval or complacency about Hanoi's human rights record.

This bill makes clear that progress towards freedom and democracy will continue to be a central theme of U.S. foreign policy toward Vietnam. It uses forms of leverage other than trade sanctions to promote this objective, such as conditions on nonhumanitarian foreign assistance, guarantees that U.S. educational and cultural exchange programs will be open to people who share our values, and serious efforts to overcome the jamming of Radio Free Asia.

I urge a unanimous vote in favor of this important human rights legislation.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I am delighted to yield such time as she may consume to my good friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), who has been an eloquent champion of human rights across the globe.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from California for his leadership and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) for his leadership on this legislation.

Clearly, I believe it is important that those of us who may go in the face of adversity on issues that may provide a certain degree of contention and tension, that we continue to be united around the question of human rights and the right kind of human rights.

Let me thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH). The gentleman helped me out. Although my constituent is still incarcerated in

Vietnam, we spoke a couple of months ago about the gentleman who simply walked across the border because he had a sense of concern. A Vietnamese citizen out of Houston walked across the border in Vietnam trying to express the desire for political freedom.

I thank the gentleman for assisting his family, though we know that he is still incarcerated and his family, of course, is suffering greatly in my community.

I come here today because I support H.R. 2833 because it is important for America to know that Vietnam is our friend. The Vietnamese stood alongside of us in the Vietnam War, and those same Vietnamese are now here in our country. They are our friends and neighbors. They have simply asked us to allow the freedom that they experience in this country to be the same kind of freedom that their friends and relatives could achieve in Vietnam.

We are friends of Vietnam. There are many of us who lost good relatives and friends in that country. But now, today, this legislation is needed, because it simply ties to the funding process a very strong statement: no increase in appropriations from the United States of America until you address the human rights abuse.

What do I mean by that? The incarceration of a Catholic priest, who simply wanted to include testimony in the U.S. Commission's hearing on International Religious Freedom; also the incarceration of the cofounder of the Inter-Religious Council, a leader of the banned Buddhist church, incarcerated; since 1992, the detaining of the Patriarch 82 year old Mr. Nguyen of the Unified Buddhist Church. These people are ailing. They are seeking justice, and they are seeking freedom.

Madam Speaker, these individuals are simply an example of those who we have lost contact with, who because of their particular views or their desire to practice their religion without intimidation, have been lost in the prison system of the Vietnamese Government, the present Vietnamese Government.

So I would simply say that the United States has its responsibility to ensure that the message of freedom, the opportunity of equality, most importantly, human rights and religious freedom, is promoted to our friends. And the Vietnamese community here has exhibited for us a true partnership. I stand with them in supporting H.R. 2833, thanking the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for his leadership and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

I am hoping and praying that my neighbor, who is still incarcerated, leaving his family in financial destitution, can raise his head again in dignity and come back home. But if I do not stand for him on the floor of the House with this legislation, then I would say to my friends and colleagues in this Congress, we do a disservice to those who lost their lives and stood alongside of us as brothers as we

fought for justice and peace in the Vietnam War. That, I consider to be a war that was for a just cause, and I will never, never, I will never cease thanking those brothers and sisters who served in the Vietnam War from the United States of America.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Vietnam Human Rights Act, HR 2368.

Madam Speaker, last year the United States signed a sweeping bilateral trade agreement with Vietnam. The World Bank estimates that this world increase U.S. imports from Vietnam by \$800 million from last year—a gain of 60 percent.

Madam Speaker, the U.S. State Department's year 2000 review of human rights in Vietnam noted that Vietnam has made improvements in its human rights record. Despite these improvements, the State Department still rated Vietnam as "proof" overall on human rights. The State Department noted that the Vietnam Government continues to repress basic political freedoms, is intolerant of dissenting viewpoints, and selectively represses the religious rights of its citizens.

In protest of these practices, I voted to disapprove normal trading relations with Vietnam prior to the recess. By doing so, I did not seek to disparage the gains Vietnam has made in re-engaging the world. Rather, I hoped my vote would cause this body to seek a consistent balance between our trade priorities and the principles we use to steer this nation. We cannot continue to hold ourselves out as a nation of laws and turn our back on our convictions at every economic opportunity. Therefore, I am supportive of the provisions of H.R. 2368, because it brings promise for human rights reform that is needed in Vietnam. This bill establishes a Congressional-Executive Commission on Vietnam to monitor the acts of the Government of Vietnam which reflect compliance with or violation of human rights, in particular those contained in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the rule of law in Vietnam and the development of U.S. programs and activities and private organizations to increase the interchange of people and ideas between the United States and Vietnam.

The bill also prohibits U.S. non-humanitarian assistance to the Government of Vietnam unless the President determines and certifies to Congress that the Government of Vietnam has complied with certain human rights requirements. It directs the Secretary of the Treasury to instruct the U.S. Executive Director of specified international financial institutions to use the U.S. vote to deny multilateral non-humanitarian assistance to Vietnam unless the President determines and certifies to Congress that such requirements have been met. It authorizes U.S. assistance for the support of individuals and organizations to promote human rights and nonviolent democratic change in Vietnam. It sets forth U.S. policy with respect to overcoming the jamming of Radio Free Asia by Vietnam, U.S. educational and cultural exchange programs to promote freedom and democracy in Vietnam and the offer of refugee resettlement to Vietnam nationals.

It is crucial that we do whatever is possible to ensure that Vietnam complies with human rights, particularly in connection with its guarantee of the freedom of religion, association and expression and its treatment of prisoners.

I have closely followed the persecution of religious leaders, including the Vietnamese government's restriction on church activities. I have commended and supported the work of courageous individuals such as Catholic priest Father Nguyen Van Ly, a champion for religious freedom in Vietnam. For example, Father Ly's parish bravely planted a large banner with the words "We Need Freedom or Religion" on the church property. It should not have to be an act of bravery to stand up for religious freedom. It should be an assured right. Father Ly also submitted written testimony for hearing of the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom and joined with other religious leaders in Vietnam to organize an Inter-religious Council to campaign peacefully for religious rights. In May, Vietnamese authorities arrested Father Ly.

I have also received dozens of letters from Vietnamese constituents expressing their own profound concern over the persecution of Father Ly and of religious leaders from the Buddhist Church. I must conclude that these concerns of my constituents are representative of those of Vietnamese heritage across the nation. More importantly, it is our role as leaders of the free world to promote the core values of our human rights.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER).

Mr. BALLENGER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time, and also the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for coming up with this bill.

Madam Speaker, I am fortunate to have many Montagnard tribesmen living in my district, so it is a pleasure today to be able to speak out in favor of this bill, H.R. 2833.

Today, we have an opportunity to send a clear message to Hanoi that human rights abuses will not be forgotten with the passage of a resolution to codify the trade agreement recently negotiated between the U.S. and Vietnam. Vietnam's record on human rights has remained poor, with very few real improvements. Government crackdowns on religious groups and political dissidents continue today. In a 1999 State Department report, it said, "In areas populated by ethnic minorities, authorities allow little discretion in practicing their faith."

One particular group that bears heavy-handed Hanoi treatment are the Montagnard people of the Central Highlands. Since 1975, the Montagnards have been singled out, in part for their past assistance to the United States, their strong commitment to the Christian religion, and a traditional way of life.

In February of 2001, several thousand Montagnard protestors gathered for a series of peaceful demonstrations throughout the Central Highlands. These peaceful demonstrations were forcibly stopped by the Vietnamese military, using helicopter gunships and tanks. In addition, refugees that did escape to Cambodia are being sought now by Hanoi for their return and, in some cases, bounties are offered by the Viet-

namese Government to ensure their return.

With these events occurring on a daily basis, it is imperative that the international community know that the United States remains committed to improving the human rights situation in Vietnam. The bill we are debating now, H.R. 2833, the Viet Nam Human Rights Act, is a positive step forward in that direction.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill. By passing this resolution, we will reaffirm our resolve to help the Montagnards, along with other ethnic minorities in the same position. The Montagnards fought hard alongside members of the United States Army Special Forces in the war in the North. Do not give up the fight for them now.

I urge all my fellow Congressmen to vote yes on H.R. 2833.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), the chairwoman of the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights who has been a very potent and strong force on behalf of human rights worldwide, but also on behalf of the Vietnamese.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of the people of Vietnam who clamor for democracy and the right to live free of oppression, on behalf of all the faithful and religious leaders who have been imprisoned, tortured and subjected to the most barbaric persecution simply for exercising their universal rights, as a refugee from another Communist regime, and as chairman of the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights, I rise in strong support of the Viet Nam Human Rights Act.

The Vietnamese regime continues to systematically violate the human rights, the civil liberties and the religious freedoms of its people. In March of this year, the Vietnamese authorities prevented the Hoa Hao Buddhist believers from participating in a mass pilgrimage to their sacred ground. Key leaders were arrested or their homes surrounded by police. Devotees were threatened or detained on their way to visit the holy site. Those who were finally able to reach the Hoa Hao village were met by police and security officials.

The extent of the human rights violations and religious persecution is so acute that on Tuesday of this week Amnesty International reported that a Buddhist monk killed himself as a form of protest for the heinous practices used by the Vietnamese authorities to usurp the rights of their people to practice their religious beliefs.

Just last night, Hong Kong AFP reports that a dozen dissidents were detained in dawn raids by Vietnamese authorities. After several hours of interrogation, they were released with warnings from security police to stop their activities.

Vietnam uses a maze of laws, decrees and regulations to prohibit religious worship and to justify the arbitrary arrest, detention, harassment, abuse and censorship of those seeking to exert their religious liberty and their right to free association.

Article IV of the Vietnamese constitution, for example, enables the security apparatus to enforce an extralegal administrative decree against any dissidents under the pretext of endangering national security. The regime is among the totalitarian or authoritarian regimes specifically rebuked by the State Department in its annual reports on religious freedoms and human rights practices.

Earlier this year, the report issued by the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom also stated that human rights and religious freedoms are "severely repressed in Vietnam in a manner common to Communist countries in general: through arbitrarily enforced registration laws, tightly controlled official organizations and strict limitations on religious activities."

This same commission created by the Congress called on the new administration and on us to factor into the development and implementation of U.S.-Vietnam policy the protection of religious freedom and human rights. It underscored the need for the Congress to pressure the Vietnamese authorities to "make substantial improvements in the protection of religious freedoms" and to "undertake obligations to the United States to make such improvements."

It further called on the Congress to incorporate Vietnam's progress in the protection and respect of human rights and religious freedoms as part of an annual review of the normal trade relation status for Vietnam.

The Viet Nam Human Rights Act is an integral component of such a strategy, using nonhumanitarian assistance, democracy programs and U.S. Government broadcasts to support the Vietnamese people in their struggle to exert their rights as human beings and as citizens. It sends a clear signal to the Vietnamese authorities that the U.S. Congress is keeping a watchful eye.

As the wife of a proud Vietnam veteran, I ask my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation, and I congratulate the gentleman from New Jersey (Chairman SMITH) for once again being the forceful leader that he is on the issue of international human rights.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for her kind comments and strong support and advocacy for human rights in Vietnam.

This is an issue, especially with the trade bill pending later on this afternoon, where we have to make a strong, cogent statement on behalf of those who are persecuted. We must stand with the oppressed and not the oppressor. I know some people, and I think it is naive, but some people honestly believe if we just engage in trade, somehow that will mitigate, and some day end, these egregious abuses. The evidence would suggest otherwise.

Having said that, we have in this legislation some very significant milestones that we call upon the Government of Vietnam to achieve. Among these are the release of political and religious prisoners, an expansion of a provision of religious freedom which allows these Buddhist and Evangelical Christians, and so many others being repressed at this particular time, to engage freely in the exercise of their religion; and stop the repression of ethnic minorities, especially the Montagnards, who have suffered a cruelty that many of us would find absolutely appalling.

Finally, on the issue of trafficking, Members may recall I was the prime sponsor last year of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000. Vietnam has a trafficking problem. There is some complicity on the part of the government.

□ 1330

This bill calls upon our own government to make a finding as to whether or not and to what extent the Government's complicity in trafficking is real or whether or not there has been progress in ending trafficking. Hopefully, for the sake of those who have been abused in modern slavery-like conditions, we will see an end to this abuse of women and children.

Madam Speaker, as we come to a close of the debate on this legislation, I want to especially thank my good friend and my former staff director on the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights which I used to chair, Grover Joseph Rees, who has done an extraordinary job in helping to shape this legislation. He has done great work getting the facts for all of us. We only deal with facts, no hyperbole, no exaggeration. What is the situation on the ground right now? What is the prognosis for reform, and how do we get there?

I want to thank Peter Yeo on the Democratic staff of the Committee on International Relations who not only serves the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) so well, but serves the entire committee so well, and I want to thank him for his contributions.

I want to thank Uyen Dinh, in the office of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) who weighed in and helped. Also thank to Tom Mooney, the staff director of the full International Relations Committee, for all the work that he and his staff did. This has been a true team effort. This is a bipartisan effort. The government of Vietnam

should be very clear that we go on record today with the support of human rights organizations, the support of the American Legion, who submitted an effective letter, which I will include as part of the RECORD, from Steve Robertson, the director of the National Legislative Commission of the American Legion.

I just want to say again how important this legislation is and, hopefully, it will pass with a vote as close to unanimous as humanly possible.

Those who vote against this are saying that human rights do not matter, because this has a waiver in it. This legislation has a provision that gives the President the ability to decide whether or not waiving a provision, a sanction, if you will, is in the national interest.

So I strongly support this legislation. It is a bipartisan product.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, DC, July 24, 2001.

Hon. CHRISTOPHER SMITH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: The American Legion thanks you for authoring H.R. 2368, the Vietnam Human Rights Act of 2001. The American Legion fully supports this important legislation which seeks to promote freedom and democracy in Vietnam.

The American Legion opposes Normal Trade Relations (NTR) with Vietnam based on what we believe is less-than-full cooperation by the Vietnamese government in regard to the accounting of the over 1,900 Americans still missing from the Vietnam War. The current state of human rights in Vietnam requires as much, if not more, attention than normalized trade relations.

Currently, Vietnamese authorities are targeting many ethnic groups who were faithful allies of U.S. forces during the Vietnam War, and denying them their basic human rights. The Montagnards of the Central Highlands are just one example. We believe H.R. 2368 will help ensure compliance with the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights by the Vietnamese government.

Although trade may be increasing between both countries, the American Legion does not believe this will, in any way, guarantee Vietnam's speedy transition to democracy. Continual pressure needs to be applied to the Vietnamese government to treat their citizens in a fair and equitable manner.

Once again, The American Legion fully supports H.R. 2368, the Vietnam Human Rights Act of 2001. The American Legion appreciates your continued leadership in addressing the issues that are important to veterans and their families.

Sincerely,

STEVE A. ROBERTSON,
Director, National Legislative Commission.

Madam Speaker, I yield any remaining time to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), my good friend.

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

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2833, the Viet Nam Human Rights Act, and I encourage my colleagues, as did the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH)

and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), to vote for passage of this very important legislation. I want to applaud the gentleman from New Jersey, my good friend, for his hard work and devotion and dedication in bringing this legislation to the floor, and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for his efforts on not only this, but on frankly all of the major important human rights issues that we have had before the Congress. I also applaud the bipartisan group of colleagues who have cosponsored this piece of legislation.

I would say to the government, is it too much to ask that the government of Vietnam be required to make "substantial progress" toward the releasing of political prisoners, ending religious persecution, increasing respect for the rights of ethnic minorities, and eliminating their participation in the trafficking of human beings before they receive any further increases in government-to-government, nonhumanitarian assistance from the United States? These steps should be at a minimum, the minimum actions taken by any Nation who is serious about establishing normal relations with the United States.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 2833 requires that the President of the United States certify that the government of Vietnam make substantial improvements in the area of human rights. Those of us who have held hearings and listened to the heartbreaking testimonies of witness after witness who have endured the persecution from Hanoi policies know that these substantial improvements are long overdue. Witnesses attest that many groups of people in Vietnam have suffered unending persecution since the war ended in 1975, and the persecution has continued.

Regarding religious persecution, no faith, no faith is untouched by Hanoi's persecution. In January, 42 colleagues in the House sent a letter to Vietnamese Prime Minister Phan Van Khai expressing concern for the lack of religious freedom and continued persecution of religious leaders in Vietnam. Catholic bishops, Buddhist monks, leaders of Christian house churches and Muslims have all endured nonstop persecution by the Communist government in Vietnam since 1975.

Earlier this year, prominent leaders of the outlawed Unified Buddhist Church of Vietnam, UBCV, the 83-year-old patriarch, Thich Huyen Quang, and Thich Quang Do, a Nobel Peace Prize nominee, were detained and placed under house arrest for what the government described as "as a number of wrongful acts they have recently committed." This action was followed by the detaining of Catholic Father Nguyen Van Ly and a stepped up offense against the Montagnard people of the Central Highlands in Vietnam, as the gentleman from California was talking about.

Many of the Montagnard are people who fought alongside American troops

years ago and are now victims of imprisonment, torture, and death for speaking out against the Communist government abuses. Christians in Vietnam have had their property confiscated and their leaders imprisoned and tortured for simply trying to worship their God. It should be clear that imprisonment, torture, and killing of innocent citizens, based on their religious beliefs by any country, will always stand in the way of normal relations with the United States.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 2833 also tries to address the issue of the complicity of the Vietnamese government in severe forms of trafficking in human beings. In June of this year, the Congressional Human Rights Caucus chaired by the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), held a hearing on the trafficking of women and children into sex markets around the world. One of the expert witnesses showed covertly filmed negotiations of girls as young as 7 and 8 years old being sold into sex markets in Vietnam, 7 and 8 years old. So as Members come pouring in down here to talk about the opportunities for trade in Vietnam, think in terms of these young girls, 7 and 8 years old. Governments who tolerate or participate in this type of cruel and inhumane behavior should never qualify, should never qualify for foreign aid or expect to enjoy Normal Trade Relations with the United States.

It is my hope that the passage of the Viet Nam Human Rights Act will send a strong message to the government in Hanoi that continued abuses of its citizens will not lead to an expansion of trade, increases in aid, or normal relations with the United States or the rest of the Free World. I encourage my colleagues to protect the innocent in Vietnam by voting for H.R. 2833. I am sure the gentleman from New Jersey and the gentleman from California will ask for a rollcall vote on this, I would assume. But hopefully, hopefully there will be no negative votes against this so that the message goes into Hanoi of the United States Congress and the people of the United States Congress, and so that the people in Hanoi and the people in Vietnam who will wake up tomorrow and find out that the Congress has passed this legislation, take hope because of the overwhelming vote.

So again, in closing, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS). I hope this bill passes with 435 votes or, if there is somebody missing, 434 to nothing, because if we really want to open up the gulags of Vietnam and allow the Catholic priests and the bishops and the monks and the Montagnard people to be heard, and stop the sexual trading that has gone on in the past, the passage of this bill will really do it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gen-

tleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State and the Judiciary, for his very, very strong statement. We both got elected back in 1981; and we have worked together on human rights issues all around the world, including in Vietnam. It was the gentleman's idea years ago to go to a gulag called Perm Camp 35, 1,000 miles outside of Moscow in the Ural Mountains. There we met with political prisoners who had been abused, who had been tortured, and that meeting and the subsequent representation that he and I and others made—but he led the way on that—helped to secure the freedom of those individuals.

We did the same thing in China and in other places in Asia. He has been all over Africa. When he speaks—and he and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) speak with enormous amounts of credibility—on humanitarianism and respect for human rights and respect for life, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), I think, takes a second to no one.

I do hope Members are listening—and K Street and some of the lobbyists, and the government of Vietnam itself, which through its embassy has admonished this Congress not to support this legislation. Why? I went to their Web site, Madam Speaker, just the other day and looked and they had a statement about how religious freedom is respected, it is constitutionally protected. Then what do they have to worry about? This simply says there has to be "substantial progress" in that area; we are not even saying achievement. We are saying progress; move in the right direction. I would hope that Members would find it in their hearts to vote for this and say, we are going to give away the store and have free trade with the hope and expectation that will lead to a liberalization of human rights. I do believe that is naive, but if this is our belief, I do not know how we cannot support this legislation. This is waivable. It provides the President, who we hope will make an honest determination, to decide whether a waiver is in the best interests of the tenets that are contained within this legislation.

Madam Speaker, we want to see real progress. We are tired of words. We want deeds by the government of Vietnam. They are repressing people. They are beating people. They are killing people. That is not hyperbole, that is the truth on the ground. There are religious believers such as the Unified Buddhist Church, as we mentioned earlier, and others have mentioned it, who have suffered immeasurably simply because of their faith. Again, the gentleman from Virginia was the prime sponsor of the International Religious Freedom Act, legislation that the previous administration did not want and then signed. I hope this administration does not follow that course as well. Embrace human rights. Be real, transparent, up front.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for his very, very strong advocacy. He is a champion and someone for whom I have a tremendous amount of respect. I hope my colleagues hear these words and will support this legislation.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time.

I want to thank all of my colleagues for their eloquent statements. Earlier this year, under the leadership of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the Democratic leader in the House, a number of us went to Vietnam to see on the ground the development of that country that has suffered so much during the long and painful war. We feel for the Vietnamese people. They are an enormously talented and hardworking, committed people to leading better lives. But we have to stand with them, not just in terms of their economic aspirations, but in terms of their aspirations along individual and human rights, rights of religious freedom, political freedom, press freedom, none of which they enjoy at the moment. This legislation attempts to address those issues.

As we open up our relations with Vietnam, politically and economically, it is critical that this body speaks out loud and clear on the issue of human rights in Vietnam. I again want to pay tribute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), my friend and colleague, who has led us on this issue, and I call on all of my colleagues to vote for this legislation.

Mr. HYDE. Madam Speaker, I submit two letters relating to the consideration of H.R. 2833, the "Viet Nam Human Rights Act."

COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL
RELATIONS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 6, 2001.

Hon. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR.,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House
of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR JIM: I am writing to you concerning the bill H.R. 2833, the "Viet Nam Human Rights Act," which contains legislative language which may be the subject of a sequential referral of the bill to your committee. From your letter of this date, I understand that you are willing to waive the right to a sequential referral which will permit this committee to move expeditiously to the floor.

I understand that this waiver in no way affects your subject matter jurisdiction, and I will support appointment of conferees from your committee on these or other related matters within your jurisdiction.

I appreciate your assistance in this matter.
Sincerely,

HENRY J. HYDE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, September 6, 2001.

Hon. HENRY J. HYDE
Chairman, House Committee on International
Relations, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR HENRY: I write regarding H.R. 2833, the "Viet Nam Human Rights Act," which was referred to the Committee on International Relations, the Committee on Financial Services, and the Committee on Rules.

As you know, the Committee on the Judiciary has a jurisdictional interest in this legislation, and I appreciate your acknowledgment of that jurisdictional interest. While the bill would be sequentially referred to the Judiciary Committee, I understand the desire to have this legislation considered expeditiously by the House; therefore, I do not intend to hold a hearing or markup on this legislation.

In agreeing to waive consideration by our Committee, I would expect you to agree that this procedural route should not be construed to prejudice the Committee on the Judiciary's jurisdictional interest and prerogatives on this or any similar legislation and will not be considered as precedent for consideration of matters of jurisdictional interest to my Committee in the future. The Committee on the Judiciary takes this action with the understanding that the Committee's jurisdiction over the provisions within the Committee's jurisdiction is in no way diminished or altered, and that the committee's right to the appointment of conferees during any conference on the bill is preserved. I would also expect your support in my request to the Speaker for the appointment of conferees from my Committee with respect to matters within the jurisdiction of my Committee should a conference with the Senate be convened on this or similar legislation.

Again, thank you for your cooperation on this important matter. I would appreciate your including this letter in the Congressional Record during today's debate of H.R. 2833.

Sincerely,
F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR.,
Chairman.

Mr. OXLEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2833, the Viet Nam Human Rights Act. This legislation is an important component of our Viet Nam trade policy.

This bill was additionally referred to the Committee on Financial Services, which I chair, because it contains provisions relating to international financial institutions and multilateral banking organizations. I am including for the record a letter to the Speaker memorializing the cooperation between my committee and the Committee on International Relations in reaching this important compromise.

I want to thank the Chairman of the Subcommittee on International Monetary Policy and Trade, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) for his hard work, and Chairman HYDE and Chairman SMITH for their willingness to engage the Committee on Financial Services on matters within its jurisdiction.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this important measure.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, September 6, 2001.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington,
DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am writing with regard to H.R. 2833, the Viet Nam Human Rights Act, which is scheduled to be considered by the House today. This bill is similar to H.R. 2368 which was reported by the Committee on International Relations yesterday and additionally referred to the Committee on Financial Services. As you are aware, both bills contain provisions relating to international financial institutions and multilateral banking organizations which fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Financial Services pursuant to clause 1(g) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

As a result of the continuing consultation between the Committees on Financial Services and International Relations, H.R. 2833 contains language responsive to the concerns raised by Members of my committee. Therefore, I have no objection to allowing the Committee on Financial Services to be discharged from the further consideration of both H.R. 2833 and H.R. 2368. By agreeing to waive its consideration of the bill, the Financial Services Committee does not waive its jurisdiction over either measure. In addition, the Committee on Financial Services reserves its authority to seek conferees on any provisions of H.R. 2833 that are within the Financial Services Committee's jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference that may be convened on this or related legislation.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,
MICHAEL G. OXLEY,
Chairman.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I want to commend Chairman Smith for crafting this important bill. I also wish to commend Committee Counsel Joseph Rees for his excellent work in helping to prepare this comprehensive measure.

Madam Speaker, the Vietnam Human Rights Act is a landmark initiative that sets out clear goals and direction for our Nation's policy towards Vietnam. It is an example of the sort of policy the State Department should be doing with other repressive governments.

Unfortunately, in the past few years, our government delinked trade restrictions to human rights improvement in Vietnam. This action was shortsighted and an insult to the memory of these American and Vietnamese men and women who died during the war attempting to bring about positive change. Their sacrifice to promote democratic governments in the region must not be forgotten.

The Vietnam Human Rights Act will ensure that the State Department puts our Nation's best foot forward. Accordingly, I strongly urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). All time for debate has expired. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, September 5, 2001, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill 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 bill.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 1, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 335]
YEAS—410

Abercrombie	Armey	Baldwin
Ackerman	Baca	Ballenger
Aderholt	Bachus	Barcia
Akin	Baird	Barr
Allen	Baker	Barrett
Andrews	Baldacci	Bartlett

Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggart
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah

Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoolley
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kerns
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Largent
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham

LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Logren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manullo
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCreey
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mink
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher

Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen

Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tiberi

Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins (OK)
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

respect to the products of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of House Joint Resolution 51 is as follows:

H.J. RES. 51

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress approves the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment with respect to the products of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam transmitted by the President to the Congress on June 8, 2001.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, September 5, 2001, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) and a Member opposed to the joint resolution each will control 1 hour.

Is there a Member opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. McNULTY. Madam Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. McNULTY) will control 60 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS).

Mr. THOMAS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield one-half of my time to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), and that he be permitted to yield time as he sees fit.

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

There was no objection.

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

House Joint Resolution 51, as appropriate with its title, deals with a trade agreement with the Socialist Republic of Vietnam. This is the most comprehensive trade agreement with a nonmarket economy country that the United States has ever entered into. That is why I want to underscore that it is with the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

Normal trade relations used to be called Most Favored Nation treatment, and frankly, it was a misnomer; most nations receive Most Favored Nation treatment. And so a few years ago we appropriately changed the terminology. I think, therefore, if we are asking that we have normal trade relations with the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, who do we not have normal trade relations with? And in this part of the world, in the Far East, there are basically two nations that do not enjoy normal trading relations with the United States. Those are Laos and North Korea. All other countries in the Far East enjoy this status.

The idea of having a bilateral trade agreement with the Socialist Republic of Vietnam in a comprehensive way allows us to deal with access in areas of industrial and agricultural goods, in services, in intellectual property rights, in investment, and in the transparency of all of those activities.

NAYS—1

Paul
NOT VOTING—19

Conyers
Crane
Davis (IL)
Frank
Gillmor
Hastings (FL)
Hayes

Horn
Jones (NC)
Kaptur
Lipinski
Meek (FL)
Mollohan
Oxley

Portman
Sherman
Traficant
Watts (OK)
Young (AK)

□ 1407

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 335 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea".

Mr. HAYES. Madam Speaker, I was unable to be present for rollcall vote 335 due to my recovery from hip surgery. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall 335.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H. CON. RES. 144

Mr. PICKERING. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be withdrawn as cosponsor from H. Con. Res. 144.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

APPROVING EXTENSION OF NON-DISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT WITH RESPECT TO PRODUCTS OF THE SOCIALIST REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM

Mr. THOMAS. Madam Speaker, pursuant to the previous order of the House, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 51) approving the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment with

□ 1415

It is a trade agreement that will allow us to continue to improve the relations between one of the fastest growing countries, both in terms of population and in terms of economy, in Southeast Asia.

Madam Speaker, I would place in the RECORD a Statement of Administration Policy with regard to H.J. Res. 51.

This statement says, "The administration supports H.J. Res. 51 which would approve the extension of non-discriminatory, i.e., normal trade relations treatment for products of Vietnam."

The closing of the paragraph says that "the Bilateral Trade Agreement's entry into force completes a normalization process that has spanned four administrations. Completion of this process will facilitate important bilateral engagement on other issues of concern."

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT
AND BUDGET,

Washington, DC, September 6, 2001.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY
(This statement has been coordinated by
OMB with the concerned agencies)

H.J. Res. 51—Approving the Extension of Normal Trade Relations Status for Vietnam—(Rep. Arney (R) TX and 2 cosponsors)

The Administration supports H.J. Res. 51, which would approve the extension of non-discriminatory, i.e., Normal Trade Relations (NTR), treatment for the products of Vietnam.

The Administration has continued to work with Vietnam to incrementally normalize our bilateral political, economic, and consular relationship. U.S. engagement helps promote the development of a prosperous Vietnam and integrates it into world markets and regional organizations, which, in turn, helps contribute to regional stability. In addition, U.S. involvement has secured Vietnamese cooperation and engagement on a range of important U.S. policy goals, including achieving the fullest possible accounting of POW/MIAs from the Vietnam War. U.S. engagement also gives hope of producing gains in respect for human rights as well.

The U.S. has extended a Jackson-Vanik waiver to Vietnam for the past 3 years. This waiver, which is a prerequisite for NTR trade status, has permitted U.S. businesses operating in Vietnam to make use of U.S. Government programs supporting U.S. exports to and investments in Vietnam. U.S. business views Vietnam the thirteenth most populous country in the world, as an important potential market.

On June 8th, President Bush submitted the U.S.-Vietnam Bilateral Trade Agreement (BTA) to Congress for its approval as part of extending NTR to Vietnam. This BTA binds Vietnam to an unprecedented array of reforms, including tariff reductions for key U.S. exports, elimination of non-tariff barriers, intellectual property rights protection, market access for American service industries, protections for American investors, and mechanisms to promote the rule of law.

The BTA's entry into force completes a normalization process that has spanned four Administrations. Completion of this process will facilitate important bilateral engagement on other issues of concern.

PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORING

Any law that would reduce receipts is subject to the pay-as-you-go requirements of the

Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act. Accordingly, H.J. Res. 51, which would reduce revenues, will be subject to the pay-as-you-go requirement. The Administration will work with Congress to ensure that any unintended sequester of spending does not occur under current law or the enactment of any other proposals that meet the President's objectives to reduce the debt, fund priority initiatives, and grant tax relief to all income tax paying Americans.

Mr. THOMAS. Madam Speaker, the U.S.-Vietnam Bilateral Trade Agreement marks a milestone in the strengthening of our bilateral relations. This agreement is a sensible and necessary step. Vietnam has emerged as one of Southeast Asia's more promising economies, and it has the potential to be a strong trading partner for America.

Continued engagement with Vietnam must lie at the core of our relationship. It has already produced concrete results in terms of the achievement of U.S. policy objectives, such as the fullest possible accounting of U.S. servicemen missing in action and resolution of remaining emigration cases.

This trade agreement—the product of many years of bipartisan effort—will allow this engagement to continue, offering us the opportunity to promote significant change in Vietnam's trade and economic policies, enhancing both internal reform and regional stability. It commits Vietnam to the core principles of a market economy: open goods and services markets, expanded rule of law, and broader economic freedoms.

You get off the plane in Vietnam and sense immediately the profound changes that interaction with the world at large has already brought. Vietnam moves at a vibrant pace. Its streets teem with new enterprises alongside the old. Young entrepreneurs sell modern electronic goods beside ancient shopkeepers and purveyors of hand-painted bowls. Joint ventures create modern factories where remote rice paddies once lay.

But Vietnam is a work in progress. Its commitment to reform has been tested by two years of slow economic growth following an extended period of strong improvement. The economy is now recovering, but that recovery remains fragile.

The country leapt toward a market economy in the last 1980s, and its GDP doubled in the '90s, making it one of the fastest growing economies in the world with 7.6 percent growth over the last decade.

In a country where official per capita GNP hovers at \$370, poverty is declining sharply as a direct result of the government's recognition of the value of market forces.

Vietnam's ongoing commitment to structural reform has laid the path for this continuing recovery. But its economic promise has yet to be fulfilled. The bilateral trade agreement and American engagement will help move Vietnam toward fulfillment of that promise. Its exports to the U.S. are expected to more than double once the agreement is in place, helping to create jobs and raise living standards.

Just as important, what does the agreement mean for the U.S.?

First, American business gets greater access to Vietnam's market of almost 80 million people, as well as lower tariffs on U.S. goods.

The agreement also reinforces Vietnam's full commitment to cooperate in accounting for the remaining American servicemen still missing in action.

Most of all, continued engagement maximizes U.S. influence over the pace and direction of Vietnam's reforms, allowing our voice to be heard as Vietnam determines its future. And a strong Vietnam matters to America. It matters because history has proved that we pay a heavy price for instability in Southeast Asia.

I urge you to vote yes for H.R. 51.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 51, a resolution approving the U.S.-Viet Nam Bilateral Trade Agreement.

As my colleagues know, this debate is no longer about the limited use of issue of whether Vietnam should be eligible to participate in U.S. credit and credit guarantee programs, which I also oppose at this time. Approval of this resolution would allow Vietnam to be eligible to receive normal trade relation status, or NTR, on an annual basis similar to what China had for the last 20 years.

I also believe, Madam Speaker, that this debate is about something much more important. As I said last year, I do not oppose the eventual normalization of relations with Vietnam, but I do oppose declaring business as usual when the remains of American service personnel are still being recovered. According to the Department of Defense Prisoner of War Missing Personnel Office, we are receiving newly discovered remains on a fairly frequent basis.

In the most recent joint field activity accounting which concluded on August 7, 2001, just 4 weeks ago, Madam Speaker, the remains of five more American military personnel were identified. They will be formally repatriated in the next few weeks. Two of the identified are unilaterals meaning the Vietnamese simply handed over the remains. In my opinion, this indicates that the Vietnamese government has more information about our missing personnel.

My question, Madam Speaker, is this: Cannot we just wait until this process is completed?

I have stated before on this floor, Madam Speaker, the story of my family as it relates to Vietnam. On August 9 of 1970, my brother, Bill, HM-3 William F. McNulty, was killed in Vietnam. He was a Navy medical corpsman transferred to the Marines. He spent his time patching up his buddies, and

one day he stepped on a land mine and lost his life. That was a tremendous loss to the members of our family. I can tell my colleagues from personal experience that while the pain may subside, it never goes away.

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

Madam Speaker, until there is a more complete accounting for those missing in action, I will propose that my colleagues vote against NTR for Vietnam.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, clearly our relationships with Vietnam represents a major challenge. There is the troubled past, and the gentleman from New York (Mr. McNULTY) has once again reminded all of us here in the Nation of that past. The present reality is, as the chairman has indicated, we are dealing in relationships with an economy and a society still controlled by a single political entity. So the question in facing this major challenge is how do we respond.

I think we are struggling once again for a formula that combines engagement and pressure. The bill that we just passed reflects the need for pressure from this country on the country of Vietnam.

What has happened in terms of engagement is, more or less, this: we are dealing with a large nation of over 80 million people. As some progress was made in 1994 regarding POW/MIA's, the embargo was lifted. In 1995 diplomatic relationships were established. At that time, there was the beginning of negotiations for a bilateral trade agreement. These negotiations went on for several years. They were finalized within a few years, by 1997.

As the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) indicated, this agreement has some very major ingredients, and I think basically positive ingredients in terms of our national interest: market access for industrial and agricultural goods; protection of intellectual property rights; market access for services on a broad basis, assuming they are enforced in a country with a weak rule of law; investment provisions; and also, very importantly, some transparency provisions to try to strengthen the rule of law within Vietnam.

So here we are today considering normal trade relations as a result of this trade agreement. We have waived Jackson-Vanik several times now, and that allowed an agreement to provide certain economic support for our businesses.

Madam Speaker, I support this agreement, realizing and pointing out its

shortcomings. One of those relates to the failure to address labor market issues. Several years ago, a number of us urged our Ambassador in our administration to address these issues. As we review the chronology that was sent to us by the former Ambassador, Pete Peterson, it is clear that the embassy and the administration attempted to move the ball in terms of labor market issues. And I will not relate the entire history of it, but it included involvement of OPIC, of the AFL-CIO, of teams from the AFL-CIO under OPIC auspices, to discuss worker-rights issues within Vietnam.

We urged that the administration and the Ambassador go further, and I think in part because of that there was a Memorandum of Understanding that was reached with the Vietnam Government that provided for technical assistance, including by the ILO regarding labor market issues.

However, those are provisions for technical assistance. And the question remains as Vietnam goes further, what efforts will be made not only to free up their capital markets but also to free up their labor markets.

In July of this year, a letter was sent by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and Senator BAUCUS, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance, and myself to the Ambassador saying the following: "Since the BTA was signed last year, we have been working to ensure that as we move forward in strengthening the U.S.-Vietnam economic relationship, we also move forward to advance the issue of labor standards in Vietnam. Vietnam has taken some steps in that regard, including by signing a Memorandum of Understanding on labor issues with the United States last November. However, more should be done.

"To that end, we urge the administration to include a positive incentives labor provision in the eventual U.S.-Vietnam bilateral textile and apparel agreement. This approach would provide incentives for Vietnam to take additional, concrete measures to strengthen adherence to core labor rights and would reward Vietnam with tangible, commercial benefits as it continues to strengthen labor standards.

"We encourage the administration to make clear its intent to pursue a labor provision in the textile and apparel agreement as the BTA resolution moves through the Congress. We know that a number of Members of Congress share our belief that addressing these concerns will strengthen the bipartisan support necessary for prompt congressional approval of the BTA, and will represent positive action on trade legislation."

The response we received some weeks ago from Mr. Zoellick on behalf of the administration was disappointing, essentially noncommittal, so I want to say just a few things rather quickly about the labor provision.

Number one, there is no use of calling it a social issue. It is an economic

issue. It is part of the trade equation. I refer to a letter that was sent by Senator LOTT and a number of other Senators and House Members to Mr. Zoellick on February 9, 2001. It is just one example of how labor market issues are relevant to the trade and competitive equation. I quote from this letter. "We are concerned about imports from Vietnam of an Asian-type catfish displacing U.S. farm-raised catfish in the U.S. and world market.

"Most of the fish from Vietnam are grown in floating cages under the fishermen's homes under the Mekong River Delta. Vietnam can produce these fish at a much lower cost because of cheap labor and very loose environmental regulations for ponds, therapeutics and feed."

The letter continues, "It is our hope that as the USTR, you will keep our concerns foremost in mind when you meet with top Vietnamese trade officials. It is essential that we take every action possible to preserve the U.S. catfish industry."

Another example is the agreement that was negotiated with Cambodia regarding the textile and apparel industry. I refer to an article of July 12, 2001, in the New York Times, and I urge that everybody read this article if they have any doubt about the importance of labor market issues in our relationships in our competition. This article talks about this negotiation, about the efforts by Cambodia to adopt a labor code with the help of the AFL-CIO and the ILO. I quote, "The incentive to improve working conditions and permit unions has come from Washington where in 1998 trade negotiators were preparing to put quotas on fast-growing Cambodian garment imports. Amid pressure from American unions and public opinion, the Clinton administration pushed Cambodia to accept unprecedented conditions. If Washington decided in an annual review that its industry was in substantial compliance with Cambodian labor law and international standards, it would raise Cambodia's quota by 14 percent."

□ 1430

This article describes how it is an uneven picture, but I think it is basically clear that with the help of this provision in the textile agreement there has been improvement in the ability of workers in Cambodia to associate, to represent themselves, and to get a piece of the action.

So this is what I want to make clear. As we did in Cambodia, as was done in the Jordan agreement, as was done in the CBI agreement, it is important that labor market issues be part and parcel of trade negotiations.

There is going to be an annual review of Vietnam and its progress; and I want everybody to know that for myself and many, many other members, we will be watching this administration. We will be watching Vietnam to see, if and when there is an apparel and textile agreement, there is due consideration

of labor market issues as there was with the Cambodia agreement and in other trade agreements.

I consider it to be not a social issue alone. It is clearly an economic issue and indispensable issue. How we handle this can be basis for disagreement but not whether it is relevant.

So I urge support within that statement, within these circumstances for this agreement, while I also indicate that we have to be vigilant. As we are in human rights through the agreement or the resolution we just passed, we have to be vigilant that as our relationship with Vietnam unfolds, it broadens in a way that makes sense in terms of Vietnam, in terms of its ability to progress; but that we, as these relationships unfold, take into account the full economic competitive picture.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the bilateral trade agreement with the Communist government of Vietnam.

Madam Speaker, we just had a vote in this body of 410 to 1 reconfirming that we believe that human rights in Vietnam is something of importance to the people of the United States.

I would submit that large votes like that, being followed by basically agreeing to a treaty to treat the Communist government of Vietnam the same way we treat economically democratic countries of not only that region but throughout the world, is one reason why, number one, the dictators of the world do not pay attention to us and think that we are being either frivolous or lying about our commitment to human rights.

It also is a disheartening factor for people who live under tyranny, because those people who live under tyranny, their only hope for many of these people who live under tyranny is the commitment by the people of the United States of America to try to make this a better world.

These types of contradictions between human rights, but giving precisely the same trade rights and economic rights to these vicious dictatorships as we do to democracies, is very disillusioning to most of the free people of the world who struggle for democracy.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on this Vietnam bilateral trade agreement. Let us remember, as we have just stated in the last debate, during the last 12 months, despite presidential waivers, the Communist regime has actually increased its brutal repression of religious clergy, advocates of democracy and ethnic tribal minorities, many of whom were actually loyal to the United States during the war.

What does voting against this agreement really do, and what are we talking about? What will happen with this agreement? We are not talking about

breaking relations or isolating Vietnam. That is not what this debate is about. This will not in any way, no matter how we vote, break our relations with Vietnam. We will not be isolating Vietnam.

People will still be free to trade. Americans can still go over there and sell their goods and services, and so it is not about whether or not we are going to have relations or isolate Vietnam. It is not about whether American companies can sell their products there, because there will be no law in the United States preventing that.

So what is this bill all about? I have repeated this on numerous occasions because we have studied this trying to find what other reason a bill like this has such momentum in Congress.

This bill is about whether or not American businessmen who want to build factories in Vietnam to exploit the near slave labor there and the lack of labor rights that they have in Vietnam, whether or not those American businessmen will be eligible for taxpayer subsidies or loan guarantees so that they can set up their factories over there, literally putting American workers out of work and setting up factories to exploit the near slave labor of this Communist tyranny in Vietnam done with American taxpayer subsidies and guaranteed loans through the Export-Import Bank and other international financial institutions that are supported by the taxpayer.

This is a travesty. I do not know anybody who can really defend that policy. But, as I have presented the case, those people on the other side have refused to even acknowledge this part of the debate. And over the years, even though I have made this charge over and over again, no one seems to even comment on it, the people who are advocating from the other side. I would like to hear the proponents of this trade agreement tell me why it is a good thing for the American taxpayers, our working people, to be taxed in order to subsidize and guarantee loans to American businessmen so they can build factories over there which will produce goods that will compete with the jobs of the American people over here. I want to hear a comment on that. I would hope that my colleagues who are supporting this trade agreement will at least take that into consideration. So we are extending American tax dollars to subsidize and insure the businesses going into a Communist dictatorship.

This is bad business, for one thing, because the reason they need the government to guarantee, meaning our tax dollars, to guarantee their investments over there is that it is a risky proposition to invest in a dictatorship. And it is especially risky to invest in Vietnam. It is a risky thing, because when you do not have really the rule of law working in a country and it is a dictatorial regime, they can have their property confiscated. Many American businessmen have already fled Vietnam. But they will not invest with

their own money and our banks certainly will not give them a loan, unless the taxpayers guarantee it.

That is bad business, and it is also contrary to American values. If we really do believe in democracy and human rights, it is contrary to our values. If we are going to be using taxpayer dollars to guarantee loans so that American businessmen can do business in a foreign country, and I do not think we should even be doing it anywhere, but if we do, at the very least it should be with democratic countries. And by insuring these loans and insuring this type of an incentive for American businessmen to go use that slave labor, we are not only hurting our own people, we are hurting governments and people like who are in the Philippines.

In the Philippines they are struggling to have democratic government. They have got opposition newspapers. They have got opposition parties. They have trouble with keeping a truly democratic system because of corruption there. But there are honest people who want to have democratic government in the Philippines. What are we doing? Instead of encouraging our businessmen to go to the Philippines, a country that loves us, we are subsidizing our businessmen to plant factories in a Communist dictatorship. This makes no sense. No wonder why the dictators of the world do not believe us when we pass 410-1, a resolution claiming that we believe in human rights and that it is important to us.

Let me talk about one last element here, and I appreciate the gentleman from New York (Mr. McNULTY) yielding me the time that he has and the points that he made about American POWs in Vietnam. This is an important point. I have been in Vietnam numerous occasions. I took this personally upon myself.

My chief staff member here, Al Santoli, was wounded three times in Vietnam. I was not in the military, but I spent time in Vietnam during the war in 1967 doing political work there; and so I have over these last 30 years had a personal interest and have gone back many times, as has Mr. Santoli, to Vietnam.

The idea that the Communist regime in Vietnam has in good faith cooperated with us on the POW issue is a fraud. It is not true. There is no basis to it. They have exploited the POWs search since day one. Even to this day they are charging the American Government a million dollars every time we go out and try to search for some bones. What they have done is relegated our search for justice and our search for real truth about what happened to our POWs to a search for bones which they give up every now and then. The fact is that there were over 200 Americans last seen in captivity, alive and in captivity, in Communist hands that were never accounted for. Since that time, during

this supposed cooperation, the Government of North Vietnam has done nothing that will help us determine what happened to those 200 men.

I have repeatedly asked during this debate, during trips to Vietnam in which I talked directly to the leaders of North Vietnam, I asked for the records of the prisons in which American POWs were held during the war. Why? Because if we get those records, we can find out exactly who was in the prison, how many people were kept there, how much food was bought because they had the number of prisoners and we can determine if there is a difference between the number released and the number that they were taking care of during the war. What have I been told? "Oh, those records aren't available. They were destroyed in B-52 raids near the end of the war."

Well, baloney. The Communist regimes throughout this world have been noted time and again for the fact that Communists keep such incredible records. They keep records of everything. When they have meetings of their central committee, they keep intricate notes. They did not throw away those records. They were not burned by B-52 raids. They will not give them to us because it indicates that they kept Americans after the war. Now, why with a regime like this are we going to give our businessmen subsidies to invest over there and create jobs over there, exploiting their slave labor? This is ridiculous.

I would hope that we can see an evolution in Vietnam. The people of Vietnam are wonderful people. In fact, I represent many Vietnamese in my area, Vietnamese Americans. They came to the United States and under freedom these very people have prospered. They are the very best of citizens. They love democracy. They have taken advantage of the opportunity to increase the standard of living of their lives. That could be true of all of the millions of people who live in Vietnam if they were not suffering under the yoke of tyranny. This is not the time to ignore what that government has done about the POWs. It is not time for us without any democratic reform going on in Vietnam.

We have heard about what was happening in Cambodia. In Cambodia, they have not had those same reforms in Vietnam that they have had in Cambodia. In Cambodia there are opposition parties. There are actually opposition newspapers. They have got nothing like that in Vietnam. Let us see some reform there before we bestow upon them subsidies by our taxpayers and incentives for our businessmen to go over there and create jobs over there.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote against this bilateral trade agreement with Vietnam and to really take human rights seriously. If the United States takes human rights seriously like we did with Ronald Reagan and the Soviet Union during the Cold War,

we will be striking a blow for peace. Ronald Reagan never provided most-favored-nation status for the Soviet Union. And the Soviet Union fell apart, and we have a chance for true democratic government there today. Let us do the same thing in China, and let us do the same thing in Vietnam. Let us do the same thing with dictatorships around the world. Let us let America be a shining light of hope of liberty and justice for all.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT).

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution.

There has been such a long period now between our war on Vietnam and now that I think it is only appropriate to have a trade agreement which symbolizes how far our two countries have come.

It was not very long ago that President Carter and President Ford were unable to establish any kind of relationship with Vietnam, accordingly, the first Bush Administration got more positive responses to their attempts to begin a new relationship. This set the stage for President Clinton in 1994 to order the lifting the trade embargo against Vietnam. The following year the two countries established ambassadorial-level diplomatic relations. And former Congressman Peterson who had been held as a POW in Vietnam was sent as our first ambassador. I think it says a lot about the need for healing that we have the Vietnam Trade Agreement before us today. Of course, it would not have occurred if the Vietnamese had not become sensitized to our need to return American bodies to their families. And to also have yearly reports made on their progress on human rights—a subject we will discuss later today.

But it is here! A bilateral trade agreement which took almost five years to craft. When one goes to Vietnam one expects to be confronted as an American for what took place during the war but 50% of the population were not alive at that time. This is really an old country with very young population who do not see Americans in the same light as their parents and want to establish a new relationship with us.

They are eager to open up their country to trade even though to this day there is disagreement between the economic hard-liners and those who want to really open up the Nation.

This agreement will do that. Although we do not export much to Vietnam and vice versa at the present time, this is a young and vibrant nation that wants to participate in global economics.

They have a high literacy rate and the desire to open up their markets. And American industry wants to sell them lots of goods. Who would have thought that all these years later that our war with Vietnam would result in what could be a highly productive relationship. I believe this is the beginning of a whole new era.

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

First of all, all of us express continued regret about the loss of American lives in Vietnam and treatment that Americans received during that war. Some of those very same individuals have been and are Members of the United States Congress.

□ 1445

The stories that they tell are ones that truly depict a very difficult and troubled time. I do believe, however, that we can make a relatively firm statement that a no vote on this measure will not increase our ability to work with the Vietnamese for the fullest possible accounting of missing Americans.

I also want to respond briefly to my colleague from Michigan about the question of a lack of a labor agreement in this particular provision. The last administration, in November of 2000, entered into a very specific labor agreement with the Socialist Republic of Vietnam. I might underscore that they are no longer on my map as a North Vietnam and a South Vietnam. There is a Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

That agreement, which was announced on November 17, 2000, was a United States and Vietnam agreement on labor cooperation. The press release issued by the last administration stated, in the Secretary of Labor's words, "This is a significant step in establishing labor issues as an important component of our overall relationship with Vietnam. In fact, more than \$3 million in technical assistance is being provided in collaboration with the International Labor Organization to address such issues as establishing skills training and employment services, including placement services, development of unemployment insurance and pension systems, improving access to employment for workers with disabilities, eliminating child labor and child trafficking, and launching workplace education to prevent HIV and AIDS."

So although there is no specific labor component in this particular agreement, clearly the two countries have entered into an ongoing relationship to improve the labor standards and working conditions in Vietnam.

I would respond to my friend from California to indicate that this is a bilateral trade agreement to establish normal trade relations with the Socialist Republic of Vietnam. It pertains to the tariffs that apply to Vietnamese goods coming into the United States. It does not apply to credits extended to American business people who wish to do business in Vietnam. That is a provision of the Jackson-Vanik structure, and this body voted 91 no, 324 yes on the Jackson-Vanik waiver. That was the structure that provided the credits to the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

A no vote on this particular measure, House Joint Resolution 51, would be a vote against allowing Americans, consumers, business people, to bring Vietnamese goods into the United States

not subject to the tariff. So if you are looking for a measure to stop the international credits going to business people doing business with Vietnam, that is under the Jackson-Vanik waiver. If you vote no on this particular measure, you are trying to make sure that Americans do not get the benefit of a tax-free relationship with the products that are going to be imported into the United States.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN), a member of the Subcommittee on Trade of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Ms. DUNN. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this joint resolution to approve the United States-Vietnam Bilateral Trade Agreement. I am very happy to see that we are finally passing this important trade agreement with the third largest nation in ASEAN, which is the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, and the second most populous country in Southeast Asia.

This is an historic agreement. It will reduce tariffs and it will improve market access for United States services and for our products.

I am also very pleased with Vietnam's commitment to adopt international standards to protect intellectual property rights. This is a very important step for Vietnam, and it will help very much in reducing piracy and in safeguarding American innovation.

For the State that I represent, Washington State, this agreement could mean more high-paying jobs. The Vietnamese Government has made a commitment to purchase four 777 airplanes. These are commercial aircraft. Their construction will be directed by people who live in the district I represent.

For our farmers in eastern Washington, lower tariffs and better transparency rules will reduce the red tape that has caused us great trouble in finding markets abroad, and it will expand the exports of our apples, potatoes and wheat to Vietnam.

I think it is very important, as we continue this debate, to reaffirm that continuing economic engagement with Vietnam does not diminish our commitment for a full accounting of American soldiers still missing in action. I would say to the gentleman from California that engagement with Vietnam also does not diminish our commitment toward pressing the Vietnamese Government to respect basic human rights. This is important to all of us, and we will not take our eyes off the interaction between our governments.

We appreciate that much must be done before Vietnam can join the global community, but by expanding economic freedom, I think that we can foster an environment for further political reforms that can lead to greater openness and tolerance.

It seems to me that it is time that we no longer view Vietnam simply as a war. We have got to begin seeing the Vietnamese as a people who want to build a stronger relationship with us

and who will provide enormous economic opportunity for our American producers. Continuing our policy of engagement is the best way, I believe, to help both our people and the Vietnamese people.

I ask my colleagues to support this joint resolution.

Mr. McNULTY. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EVERETT).

(Mr. EVERETT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. EVERETT. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 51, a bill that would grant permanent normal trade relations with the communist country of Vietnam. I am especially concerned that until Vietnam stops illegally substituting an inferior species of fish for U.S. farm-raised catfish, the American consumer and the American farmer will continue to suffer.

The catfish industry in Alabama and in the southeast is a very vital industry that employs tens of thousands of workers in primarily rural and economically depressed areas, and contributes hundreds of millions of dollars annually to these states' economies. In Alabama, for example, catfish production ranked second nationally and had over \$81.6 million in sales last year. Nationwide, the catfish industry accounts for over 50% of the total volume and value of all U.S. aquaculture at 600 million pounds.

Additionally, the catfish industry has contributed over \$50 million to familiarize the American consumer with the superior quality of the U.S. farm-raised, grain-fed catfish product. As such, the substitution of fish that are not even in the same genus or species as the North American channel catfish has led to consumer confusion. These Vietnamese fish are raised in cages in rivers, the same polluted rivers that sewer and waste are dumped into. Moreover, they are fed a diet of various things including other fish, not a completely grain-fed diet like the U.S. farm-raised catfish.

Efforts to substitute the cheaper Vietnamese species of fish, through what I and many believe is the improper use of the name "catfish", has also led to unprecedented levels of imports that have displaced American catfish. In fact, Vietnamese fish imports are displacing U.S. catfish at a rate of 70 million pounds annually according to U.S. Census Bureau estimates in May. This is equivalent to an estimated 15-20% of the total U.S. farm-raised catfish market.

It also appears that Vietnam is encouraging increased production and export of these fish by recently announcing new incentives for collateral-free loans until 2005 for investment in aquaculture. Figures from the Department of Commerce indicate that imports of these fish from Vietnam have tripled from what they were this time last year, and now account for 84% of catfish imports into the U.S. This has also led to the decreased exports of farm-raised catfish from the U.S. to other countries.

U.S. catfish farmers have spent millions of dollars and years of hard work to build a market for their product based on its guaranteed quality and safety and do not deserve to have it destroyed. Moreover, consumers deserve to know exactly what kind of food they are putting on their dinner tables.

Industry officials have met with the Administration, and with the government of Vietnam and so far have not had their problems addressed. Until the Administration and the government of Vietnam address this issue satisfactorily, I cannot support normalizing trade relations with Vietnam.

Mr. McNULTY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. SHOWS).

Mr. SHOWS. Madam Speaker, I stand before you today to speak of something that I care deeply about and have been working hard to correct, irresponsible trade agreements that ignore the needs of rural communities. I am not opposed to free trade, but I am opposed to trade agreements which further harm communities, families and industries in Mississippi and across rural America.

Today we are considering extending normal trade relations with Vietnam. We must promote reasonable, responsible trade agreements, and we must be mindful of some of the unintended consequences trade agreements have had on rural America, and especially in Mississippi.

Where I come from in rural Mississippi, some of our trade agreements, like NAFTA, have failed our rural communities. The result has been factory shutdowns and job losses that have devastated communities throughout my district. This is the case in rural communities and urban cores across America.

We know that NAFTA has worked fine for many of the places in our Nation, but our rural communities have been ignored. Hard-working people in places like Prentiss, Collins, Magee or Centreville have been hurt by these trade deals. When a factory shuts down in a rural community like this, it is devastating to every family.

We have a responsibility to fight for fair trade that supports American workers, families and communities from unwise trade agreements. Today I stand in opposition to extending normal trade relations to Vietnam.

One example is the damage even restrictive trade with Vietnam has done to the catfish industry in Mississippi. Domestically grown catfish, which meet strict environmental and health standards, are being displaced by inferior and potentially unsafe products from Vietnam. These fish products are disguised by labels that imitate those placed on legitimately farm-raised catfish to mislead the consumer about the origin of the product.

I urge a no vote on this measure.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD).

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak about an issue that is very important to some of the citizens of my district. Over the August recess I met with a large group of Southeast Asian and Vietnamese Americans about issues of importance to them. The issue they expressed the greatest concern

about had to do with human rights in Vietnam. They expressed to me their fear that an increase of trade with Vietnam may only serve to strengthen the hand of the Communist government that denies its citizens basic freedoms of association, religion and other human rights. I believe those fears are valid and important for us to consider.

I do not believe we can discuss trade with Vietnam without addressing the human rights violations of the Vietnam Government. Therefore, I was very pleased that the legislation we passed earlier today addressed precisely these issues. Without adequately monitoring human rights situations and without real consequences for non-compliance, I would have had strong reservations about passing the Vietnam trade agreement we are debating now. But by considering these bills in conjunction, we will be able to send a message that the U.S. believes in engaging Vietnam and strengthening economic and political ties, but we still demonstrate our concern for the lack of rights afforded to the Vietnamese people.

I think it is especially important to send to the Vietnamese Government the message that it remains unacceptable for them to continue to imprison religious leaders, including individuals such as Father Nguyen Van Ly, the Venerable Thich Tam An, Thich Khong Tanh, Thich Quang Hue, Ly Tong, and other religious and political prisoners.

Madam Speaker, I will vote in favor of this legislation, but only because this body has assured us that we will continue to put pressure on this country to further human rights.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. BIGGERT). The gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) has 18 minutes remaining, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) has 19½ minutes, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 17 minutes remaining and the gentleman from New York (Mr. McNULTY) has 25 minutes remaining.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Madam Speaker, let us, as this debate goes on, remember that Vietnam as it is today does not have an independent court system, does not have opposition parties, does not have freedom of the press, not to mention all the political prisoners they have thrown in jail, et cetera, and the persecution of religion. But without courts, without opposition parties, without freedom of the press, what does that mean normally? What it means is exactly what you have got in Vietnam, a corrupt system.

We may try to say, well, we have already given these loan guarantees and these subsidies with the Jackson-Vanik waiver already passed by this House. The fact is, this vote freezes that into place. This vote freezes those loan guarantees and those subsidies into

place that we put into place over my objection with the passage of the Jackson-Vanik waiver.

We should not in a situation, in an environment where there are no courts or opposition parties or freedom of the press, expect that our businessmen are going to go over there and find anything available to them without a bribe. What they are going to find, and that is what is happening there, our businessmen are faced with bribes, they are faced with a corrupt regime they are not used to.

And then what happens? The American taxpayer, because we have given these subsidies and loan guarantees, has to pick up the check when these businessmen close up their operation and flee back to the United States of America.

This is a bad deal. It is bad business. Not only is it bad in terms of American values, in terms of human rights and freedom, but it is just a bad deal all around, having the taxpayers subsidize loans and guarantee these loans in order to go into this corrupt environment where you do not even have a court system that can operate independently and provide judgments there, when you have people asking for bribes, et cetera, et cetera.

This is not what we should be doing. It is bad business and contrary to our values.

Mr. THOMAS. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATKINS), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

(Mr. WATKINS of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

□ 1500

Mr. WATKINS of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I stand in support of H.J. Resolution 51. Let no one be fooled. What this basically does is normalize the trade relationship with Vietnam. We are trying to have a bilateral trade relationship with this country. I am very proud of the fact that the State of Oklahoma was the first State to have an office in Vietnam to do trade. We are still the only office basically there that has a presence, but we have an office there, and we have people there.

Yes, Oklahomans are there trying to engage in having a normal trade relationship, but we are also trying to work with educational and cultural exchanges, because we know the only way we are going to resolve the human rights problems are to be able to engage and be able to carry on that conversation one on one with our values, our values. I started to say we normalized California. A lot of Okies went out that way, but the chairman is from California so I have to be very careful about what I say about California.

But let me say I know there are conditions there, and I visited with the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) about some economic trade policies that we need to continue to be concerned about and aware of, and I

yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN).

Mr. CALLAHAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for bringing this point up.

First let me say that I have great respect for the Committee on Ways and Means chairman and the subcommittee and all of my colleagues who have worked so feverishly and so effectively on these free trade policies. I am a free trader I do not deny, and I am quite proud of it, and I have voted for each and every bill they have brought to the floor. But sometimes we have to talk to our own administration and the only chance we have to talk to them effectively, and usually I do this on the appropriation bills, is by threatening to withhold their money.

But we do have a tremendous problem in the catfish industry. The catfish industry in Alabama is a growing industry that is employing thousands of people. They have developed a hybrid catfish that is raised in fresh water ponds that are grain fed, that are high quality catfish. Now we find that the Vietnamese, and the Commerce Department or the FDA is allowing them, to ship into the United States, the Vietnamese, a poor quality fish that is not even a catfish, that is labeled a catfish.

The reason I stand here today is to shoot a bow over the front of the ship of the FDA, and I have written Ms. Janice Oliver a letter and asked for her immediate decision on this classification.

We do not mind importing any product from the Vietnamese that is a safe, edible product, but we do not want it mislabeled, and the FDA can do something about it. My message today to the FDA is to do something about it and do it immediately, or else they are going to be facing my wrath when these appropriation bills come to the floor.

I had to do it one other time. I remember I had the same problem with the chairman that is sitting right behind my colleague now, and I threatened to withhold \$1 million a day until they made a decision. I am not threatening to withhold \$1 million a day from the FDA; I am just insisting that FDA make this decision today, make it as expeditiously as they can, and let us get on with this ability to trade with Vietnam and other countries.

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

I would ask our colleague, the gentleman mentioned the catfish industry. Is the gentleman aware of whether or not the American company dealing with the catfish industry there, was there any loan guarantees by the Export-Import Bank to any American company that was involved or a subsidy from the American taxpayer involved in the creation of the catfish industry in Vietnam that is now wreaking such havoc in the gentleman's State?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I am not familiar with anything that the Ex-Im Bank has done there, although I am a big supporter of the Ex-Im Bank. I do know that the government of Vietnam is offering interest-free loans for people, which I think is in violation of all of our agreements, is offering interest-free loans to people to start catfish farms, and if they want to do that and play on the same level playing field that we are playing on here in the United States, that is all right with me too.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, there is a real possibility, and neither one of us knows that now, but I do not think there is anyone on this floor that would step up and say, no, it is impossible; the catfish industry in Vietnam has not been created with the help of subsidies from the American taxpayers. We cannot say that, because we do not know. We are laying down the rules now, so that would be a real possibility.

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the House to vote for this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the House to vote for this legislation to establish a bilateral trade relationship with Vietnam. This legislation is the product of long negotiations between our governments, and builds on the trade relationship we have been developing over the past decade. Just a few weeks ago, this House again voted by an overwhelming vote against imposing trade restrictions on Vietnam; now, we should pass this BTA by just as overwhelming a vote.

We all recognize the sensitivity of any legislation involving Vietnam because of our nation's past history. But we in the House have begun a healthy, expanding and maturing relationship with this country of nearly 80 million people. And this legislation is not about the past; it is about the future relations of our governments and our economies.

I have had the opportunity to visit Vietnam, to meet with government leaders and private citizens, and to talk at length with our former ambassador, Pete Peterson, who has been one of the most passionate supporters of improved political and economic relations with Vietnam. Ambassador Peterson has devoted countless hours during his years of service to developing improved economic and political relationships between Washington and Hanoi, and between the American and Vietnamese people. Our vote today is, in no small way, a testament to the success of his efforts and a credit to his hard work.

Vietnam is a large and changing country. There are multinationals involved in production of oil and gas and the manufacture of sportswear; Vietnam is also a country where most people labor in rice paddies and start businesses with micro-loans of less than \$100. It is a country of educated, industrious people

that will continue to play a key role in the future of Southeast Asia. We should not cut ourselves off from that nation, but rather work closely to help it advance and to encourage moves towards a more open economy.

We are building a new and positive relationship with Vietnam, which is the 12th largest population in the world and plays a key role in the political and economic security of Southeast Asia. Last year, the Congress enacted legislation I helped to write creating a program to promote higher education exchanges between our countries. We should continue to build on these efforts, because they are in the best interests of both nations.

Some may wish to turn this debate into one over sensitive issues between the United States and Vietnam. That strategy is inappropriate here, and should be rejected. Vietnam, as illustrated by our annual Jackson-Vanik votes, has made great strides on immigration and is a full partner in the effort to locate remaining American soldiers missing in action. Negative and unjustified attacks on Vietnam's efforts at cooperation can only injure future efforts, and have no place in this debate.

However, let us note that this BTA does not end our review of Vietnam's moves towards openness and transparency. We will still engage in annual reviews of its practices. Nor does this BTA or the memorandum of understanding concerning labor standards adequately address concerns I have, along with many others, about the need for a free labor movement in Vietnam that allows workers to organize and collectively bargain with their employers. As we move towards the next stages of trade agreements, we will continue to press for assurances that the working men and women of Vietnam will enjoy the basic rights to free association recognized by the International Labor Organization.

Free trade unionism, improved environmental policies, expanded political and religious rights for all Vietnamese: these are, and should be, legitimate factors for securing improved and lasting trade relations with the United States and other democracies. We will continue to work with the Vietnamese to assure that these goals are achieved.

Those are issues that remain to be discussed in the course of future negotiations. For today, we should move ahead and pass this Bilateral Trade Agreement which sets the stage for those future discussions, while helping to bring our countries and our people together.

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ).

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to House Joint Resolution 51, which extends temporary most favored nation status to the Socialist Republic of Vietnam. The Vietnam-U.S. bilateral trade agreement is unwarranted until Vietnam demonstrates tangible progress in addressing its human rights and the moving forward to a more market-oriented economy.

Free trade does not mean trade at any cost. In the case of Vietnam, certain conditions, I believe certain conditions should be met, to have long, meaningful, lasting trade relations developed. I am concerned that we are losing our economic leverage without

gaining concrete, verifiable steps towards reform in exchange.

In our support for the economic revitalization of Vietnam, we cannot ignore basic human rights issues that need to be resolved.

Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of representing the largest Vietnamese community outside of Vietnam. They are the parents, the siblings, the children of families who fought communism for over 2 decades, and they, the majority of these people, do not want to establish normal trade relations with Vietnam until we do something about immigration, political and human rights issues for the people of Vietnam.

Recently, I have learned of the distressing case of Mr. Dac Vi Hoang, a former Vietnamese businessman who fled Vietnam recently to escape persecution. His situation is emblematic of the economic repression and political corruption that stifles free enterprise in Vietnam. Mr. Hoang was a prominent Vietnamese entrepreneur who owned Thanh My, Incorporated, an international exporter of lacquerware. In fact, he enjoyed an astounding success, this private corporation, in the midst of a communist regime, with annual sales of \$3 million and over 400 employees. Thanh My was internationally recognized as the first private corporation in Vietnam to receive permission to sell its shares to a foreign entity, although that permission was eventually revoked by the Vietnamese government. Nonetheless, just 1 year ago, in August of the year 2000, Mr. Hoang found himself having to flee Vietnam with his family, leaving this entire business behind.

Let me take a minute and tell my colleagues the story. In February of 1976, nearly 1 year after the end of the war, Dac Vi Hoang started his small, family-oriented company specializing in lacquerware products. At the time, the communist government was closing down large corporations and industrial plants because they were considered to be tools of capitalism, but they allowed a few small, private companies to operate, as long as they did not have a lot of capital or heavy machinery.

Although the business was allowed to remain in operation, Mr. Hoang was imprisoned for 5 years so that he could be "reeducated," which meant that his wife had to run the business in the meantime. During his time, it should be noted that Mr. Hoang was severely tortured, mentally and physically, when he underwent reeducation.

Although business operations were kept to a minimum, when he was released, he started into the business, and by 1991, Thanh My was allowed by the Government of Vietnam to actually export its lacquerware to other countries. Ultimately, Thanh My became one of Vietnam's largest exporters with customers in the U.S., in France, Japan, Germany, Sweden, even Canada. Because of his success, however, Mr. Hoang became a well-known

member of the Vietnamese business community. He was one of the founding members of the Vietnam Chamber of Commerce and Industry; he was elected Vice President of the Union of Associations of Industry and Commerce, and he was also featured in Baron's Who's Who in the Asian Pacific Rim.

Well, all of this caught the attention of the Vietnamese communist government. Mr. Hoang voiced the concern of the business community with respect to what was going on. His criticisms of the government were unfair and arbitrary taxing against private corporations and that there was corruption at virtually every level of doing business.

In recent years, the communist government of Vietnam began cracking down on executives of leading private corporations. Using various pretexts, the communist regime has imprisoned executives of successful, private companies when they are considered too vocal, too vocal, in criticizing the government or when their companies become too successful, thereby threatening the regime's grip on power.

This is what was happening to Mr. Hoang when he decided to flee with his family. He learned from the government ministry of public security task force officer who was assigned to monitor what was going on at Thanh My that Mr. Hoang was a target for persecution. This security officer was someone that Mr. Hoang gave side bribes to in addition to the usual money you have to pay these people to supervise what was going on with Thanh My. He would give this money to get good government reviews and not have problems with the government. Finding out that a change in the government supervision over Thanh My was going to occur, was going to be an excuse for the government to come in and bring somebody to try to find incriminating evidence against him, Mr. Hoang took his family and fled Vietnam leaving the entire business behind. He currently is residing in southern California while he awaits his political asylum hearing.

I ask my colleagues to understand that this is continuing to happen in Vietnam. As the person who represents so many of the Vietnamese, we get all of these cases all of the time. After hearing this story, does Vietnam appear to be a country that is moving toward market-oriented reforms?

Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this, and I hope that my colleagues will help and not support this either.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS), a very distinguished colleague who has had a very long and deep interest in this issue.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support normal trade status for Vietnam.

The vote today is really about how we best achieve change in Vietnam, and I believe the record speaks for itself. We have achieved progress by engagement: by encouraging Viet-

namese cooperation on important issues such as human rights, immigration and political and economic reform.

I can speak about this personally. I have been to Vietnam and seen the work of the Joint Task Force-Full Accounting, our military presence in Vietnam tasked with looking for our missing servicemen and women. I have visited these young women and men, and they are among the bravest and most motivated soldiers I have ever seen. Every day, from the searches of jungle battle sites to the excavation of crash sites on precarious mountain summits, they put themselves in harm's way to recover our missing. In talking with them, it made it clear to me that they were performing a mission that they truly believed in.

On April 7 of this year, that danger became all too real. On that date, seven American members of the joint task force, along with nine Vietnamese, lost their lives in a helicopter crash as they were on their way to a recovery mission. This tragedy was a huge blow for our recovery efforts, as we lost both Americans and Vietnamese who had deeply been involved in finding our missing. We should remember our deceased Americans are heroes who gave their lives in pursuit of a mission they believed to be a high honor and a sacred duty.

The only way we can carry out this mission effectively is to have a presence in Vietnam. To maintain that presence means reciprocating on the promises that we made to reward Vietnamese cooperation. Failing to approve this resolution would definitely send the wrong signal to the Vietnamese, not to mention the brave American men and women who are still searching for our missing in the rice paddies and mountains of Vietnam.

□ 1515

The opponents of this argument or the opponents of this agreement will say that the Vietnamese Government has a terrible record on human rights, that they do not deserve normal trade arrangements with our Nation.

I will not defend the Vietnamese human rights record. It needs serious improvements. We should focus on obtaining basic freedom for all Vietnamese. But former Ambassador and colleague here in the House of Representatives, Mr. Pete Peterson, demonstrated that we can achieve progress on human rights and a number of other issues that are important to our Nation by encouraging cooperation from the Vietnamese.

As our first ambassador to this nation since the war, his stewardship led to tangible and dramatic progress on issues that have changed the lives of North Americans and Vietnamese for the better.

By continuing this policy, the families of POWs and MIAs will get the answer about their missing, Vietnamese emigres will also be reunited with their

families, and our country will have benefits from the fruits of Agent Orange research. We can risk all this if we turn our backs on this successful policy. Voting against this agreement would do just that.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this year the House overwhelmingly supported a waiver of the Jackson-Vanik amendment restrictions on Vietnam. This is the fourth year in a row that the House, with growing and overwhelming support, voted for better relations with Vietnam.

I believe that we should follow this course. Let us support the Joint Task Force for Full Accounting, and let us support our Nation's bipartisan policy that has only furthered our goals towards a more cooperative and open Vietnam. Please vote for this resolution.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we have learned that the Vietnamese catfish industry is having a very detrimental impact on Americans who were involved with producing catfish for the American table. Yet also, at least I suggested, and I have not heard anything to the contrary, that what we are doing is laying down the economic ground rules so that we can subsidize, through American taxpayer subsidy or loan guarantees, businessmen to go to Vietnam and set up other businesses in order to do to the current businesses of the United States what the catfish industry from Vietnam did to the catfish industry here.

That does not make any sense to me. What is this all about? This is about a dictatorship in which some American businessmen want to go over there and exploit the slave labor, and want to do so with loan guarantees and subsidies by the American taxpayer.

I am very happy to hear that Oklahoma set up a business office in Vietnam. A lot of other people set up business offices in Vietnam. But what we need to hear about are all the offices that have closed up, all the businessmen who thought they were going to do business there, but the environment is so corrupt that they were unable to do business, and that they have closed shop and left.

The only way American business companies are going to go over there is if we guarantee their loans and subsidize them. That makes no sense. We have already put all these people who grow catfish, we put them out of work. What is the next industry that we want the Vietnamese slave labor forces to be able to put out of work with the subsidy from American taxpayers? What industry is that?

How about refrigerators, radios, clothing? I do not know what factories these people want to open. Probably I would guess it would be tennis shoes.

I believe in free trade. People who oppose this particular trade legislation, it does not mean they are opposed to free trade. I believe in free trade between free people. When we sort of set

the same rules with vicious dictatorships as we do with democratic countries, surprise, surprise, we are going to bolster the strength of the regime, of the clique that holds power in those dictatorships.

No, we should be having freer trade with countries like the Philippines, who are struggling, struggling to have a good democracy with human rights, instead of giving more incentives and more ways of making profit by setting up businesses in dictatorships like Vietnam.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), someone who has been extensively involved in a number of trade discussions and debates.

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

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

I thank the gentleman again for yielding me this time, and I appreciate the leadership he has shown with his committee on so many trade issues this year. This is just one of them.

Mr. Speaker, I do rise today in support of House Joint Resolution 51, which would extend normal trade relations to the nation of Vietnam. Let us begin, as I know the chairman has made clear earlier, what this is and what this is not. This is not a free trade agreement. It is a bilateral trade agreement, a trade agreement that allows us to trade on the same basis as we trade with all the other countries of the world except the very small handful with whom we do have a free trade agreement.

Because Vietnam is a socialist or a Communist country, it comes under the banner of the Jackson-Vanik requirements, and still, with this passage, would require an annual Jackson-Vanik waiver from the President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, in 1995 this country embarked on a new path with the country of Vietnam. We chose to take a different direction toward better political, economic, and consular relations. In making that decision, we recognize the need to encourage the development of Vietnam as a prosperous country, and believed, as I believe today, that doing so would begin to bring about the fruition of democracy within that country.

We understood how important it is to integrate our former adversary, with whom some of us in this body itself fought in a war in that country, to integrate that former adversary into the economic progress of Asia and ultimately into the global community.

Since starting down the path, our policy, I believe, has reaped some very important benefits. It secured Vietnamese cooperation on achieving the fullest possible accounting of the POWs and MIAs from the Vietnam War. It has helped to contribute to regional

stability. It has helped to open a new market for U.S. businesses and U.S. workers in the world's 13th most populous country.

Mr. Speaker, just 2 weeks ago today I returned from a trip to Vietnam. It was my first time in that country in 10 years, in exactly the 10 years ago that I was there, and the 22 years before that that I had been there during the Vietnam War. I was struck with the tremendous changes that have taken place over the last 10 years.

Ten years ago, we had no embassy in Hanoi. We had no consular office in Ho Chi Minh City. We had no American business presence. In fact, there was almost no foreign business presence anywhere in Vietnam at that time.

Today we find the city of Ho Chi Minh, or Saigon, with five-star hotels, with very upscale restaurants and shops catering to foreign shoppers, high-rise buildings and a skyline that is beginning more to resemble Hong Kong or Bangkok than the somnolent Saigon many of us knew during the time of the Vietnam War when we served there 30-plus years ago.

It is a different city. It is changing. I believe with this agreement we will accelerate that change. I believe that change will be to the good, both for the United States, but most importantly, for the people of Vietnam.

Certainly the U.S.-Vietnam foreign policy relationship is one that is still maturing. We would all agree that we must continue to make progress in our relationship along several dimensions.

But today, this legislation marks a very important milestone in the development of that relationship. Today we can support the extension of normal trade relations between our two countries. U.S. trade and economic ties with Vietnam can help the country see the benefits of developing a society that is based upon the rule of law. That faith in the rule of law can then serve as a foundation upon which further social and political development can be based.

Mr. Speaker, no country can engage in trade with other countries, can engage in foreign relations, without ultimately having to come to terms with the rule of law. That is the most important aspect of this legislation.

So to my colleagues in the House, I urge their support for this resolution.

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

(Ms. LOFGREN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I oppose House Joint Resolution 51, and I urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution. I am fortunate to represent Santa Clara county, an area in California with a vibrant Vietnamese-American population. Quite a few of my constituents came to San Jose as refugees escaping an oppressive political regime.

Over the last 25 years, as the Santa Clara County supervisor, as an admin-

istration lawyer, and as a Member of Congress, I have worked closely with these Americans; and many of them have become my friends. I value their knowledge, experience, and support, and believe they have a unique perspective on the United States' relationship with Vietnam.

While we are told that the government in Vietnam is making progress in the area of human rights, I continue to hear about religious persecution, political persecution, and unwarranted detentions from my friends in the Vietnamese community. During the past 12 months, the Vietnamese Government has intensified its campaign of brutal oppression, especially against religious leaders and ethnic minorities.

When I, along with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Davis) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Sanchez) hosted a hearing on human rights in Vietnam this spring, we learned of this firsthand. One after another, religious leaders testified to the lack of religious freedom in Vietnam. Several invited witnesses were unable to leave Vietnam to deliver their testimony in the face of government threats. They smuggled out written or audio testimony so their stories could be heard.

In light of the government crackdown on religions, dissidents, and minorities, unconditional ratification of the bilateral trade agreement will send the wrong message to the Vietnamese leadership. The U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom recommended that the U.S. Congress ratify the BTA only on the condition that Vietnam undertake substantial improvements in its policy towards and treatment of religion.

I am a firm believer in trade. I have voted repeatedly for trade agreements, but the situation in Vietnam is different. We have a clear opportunity to change the course of the nation's behavior by denying it what it desires greatly, a trading relationship with America.

President Bush, please stand up to the communists in Vietnam and insist on human rights in exchange for trade. We have the tools at hand to improve the human rights situation in Vietnam. I ask my colleagues how they justify not using this tool when so many have asked for our help.

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

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

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

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation, until such time as the administration can reach a fair agreement with Vietnam on the catfish issue.

□ 1530

Well, my suggestion is that they are going to continue stealing our software

in Vietnam, just as in China, now that we have liberalized trade with them. It has not changed their practices one iota at all.

So let us understand that when we make agreements with these types of regimes, these criminal regimes around the world, surprise, surprise, we are not going to be treated as if we are dealing with an honest democratically elected government that keeps its word. Instead, we are dealing with gangsters who pirate, and not only pirate but repress their own people, even commit murder. I mean, they murder their opponents in these regimes, and that means Vietnam, and yet we expect them to abide by some nice trade agreement with us? No. The agreements that they make with us will only be followed to the point that they are beneficial to the Vietnamese Government and the clique that runs that country.

Let us take a look. We have heard about the catfish industry. I am very happy that the catfish industry was brought up today because we do not know whether or not the catfish industry in Vietnam was established with the help of a taxpayer loan or subsidy from the U.S. taxpayers, but we do know that we have several Congressmen from a variety of States here worried about their constituents being put out of work because catfish from Vietnam are flooding into our market. We do not know whether or not that catfish industry was set up with a taxpayer subsidized loan; but we do know that there is slave labor in Vietnam, that there are none of the environmental health standards in Vietnam, and there are none of the other types of protections in Vietnam that would be required of them if they were raising those catfish in the United States.

And by the way, those same requirements might be put on Vietnam if they had a democratic government. If they had a democratic government, maybe they would be forced to pay their people more, or perhaps the people of Vietnam would demand higher health standards. But they do not have a democratic government. They have a gangster clique that runs the country and they are going to manipulate the catfish industry for their benefit. I would bet some of this clique in Hanoi are making money off the catfish industry by putting our people out of work.

By making this agreement today, we will just do for the rest of American industry, step by step, what was done to the catfish industry, and we will be doing it with subsidies from the American taxpayers and loan guarantees from the American taxpayer. It makes no sense.

Let us talk a little bit about the issue of human rights. And I will just say to my colleagues that suggest that if we would just open up these economic ties, there will be more respect. In fact, we have heard some people claim there has already been progress.

There has been no progress. There has been retrogression in China, and there has been no progress about opening up that system democratically in Vietnam whatsoever. There are more five-star hotels around so that there our big businessmen with guaranteed loans in their pockets from the American taxpayers can go over there and invest and set up factories over there to use slave labor. Oh, yes, there are some five-star hotels, but that is not progress. That is not progress at all.

What we still have are no opposition parties, no independent courts at all. There is no rule of law in that country, no freedom of the press, so nobody can criticize the corruption there. And that is why people do not invest unless they have government guarantees and loans or subsidies, because it is too risky a proposition.

Why are we setting up the rules of the game and doing trade with a country like that when instead we should be seeking to encourage people to invest in democratic countries like the Philippines or in our own country to protect people with our own jobs?

Last but not least, the POW issue. I have spent so much time on this issue over my 13 years in Congress. I cannot say it is more than any other Member, but I know that I have spent considerable time on it. I have been to Vietnam numerous occasions and Southeast Asia numerous occasions on this issue. I have studied it and I, without hesitation, can tell my colleagues that I do not believe this government has cooperated in good faith with the United States in trying to have an accounting for those Americans who were seen alive in captivity before the return.

There were over 200 of those Americans who were in captivity; we knew they were, yet they were not returned at the end of the war. We want to find out what happened to those people. We do not want to have this obfuscation. We do not want this issue sugar-coated or candy-coated.

They show pictures of this issue, of our people there digging for bones. Yes, digging for some of those bones will bring closure to some people, but we want truth. We want to establish the truth. If they kept those people and they murdered them later on, let us hear about it, and we can close this chapter of the book. But let us not let them get away with the same falsehood they have been using on their own people.

I would ask for my colleagues to join me in opposition to this trade deal. It is contrary to America's interests. It is a bad deal. It is contrary to our values and will not bring a close to the Vietnam era. It will just leave this corrupt dictatorship thinking they put one over on us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in

allowing me to speak on this important legislation.

I agree with one thing from the comments of my colleague from California, and that is that this is closing a chapter in American history. But I think, most important, it represents opening a new era in relationships between the United States and Vietnam.

We have heard people talk on this floor about the painful experience. And I think there is no question why people feel so strongly and passionately about it. This was a chapter in our history where traditional measures simply do not apply.

Traditional concepts are of winning or losing a war, for example. Certainly the American public has lost over the course of the last third of a century. Certainly we paid heavily in economic terms, costing billions of dollars and throwing our economy into chaos.

Families lost. We all know people who lost loved ones. Over 56,000 Americans did not return. And there have been massive efforts on behalf of both the United States and the Vietnamese Governments to try to account for everyone, more than any other war in American history. Yet we are still striving to close that chapter.

And, of course, we have to look no further than the streets of America now where we see troubled and, in some cases, homeless veterans who returned seared by the process.

But those of us who have experienced a little bit of the situation in Vietnam recently, who have talked to our constituents who are here now and who are of Vietnamese heritage know that this chapter exacted a horrible price on Vietnam itself. There were hundreds of thousands of casualties, tens of thousands of missing and still unaccounted for, and it produced a flirtation with global communism as an ally that has delayed the modernization of that country, including not just its economy and human rights, but reintegration into the family of nations.

Thankfully, soon after the formal fighting ended, there were courageous people who stepped forward to try to begin this new era. No discussion of this issue would be complete without noting the unique contributions by American heroes, like Senator MCCAIN, Senator KERRY, and our own former colleague on the floor of this House and ambassador to Vietnam, Pete Peterson, who worked to engage our two countries.

We have made tremendous progress in reconciling our past to the new future. It is still not going to be easy. This terrible tragedy in Vietnam continues to claim victims every day. And those who visited the country lately cannot help but be touched by the young children who continue to be maimed by land mines and other unexploded ordnance, by people struggling with war injuries, physical and psychological, children with birth defects.

We have hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese who have fled to the United

States, who are now citizens of our country, who are trying to reconcile it as well, struggling with the past, and who are hungry for reconciliation with divided families. This trade agreement is an opportunity to open up whole new avenues of commerce and contact between our two countries, but particularly for Vietnamese Americans.

Vietnam today is an entirely different nation, unlike what some would lead us to believe. It is entirely different from what we saw 40 and 50 years ago. The architects of the Vietnam War on the side of the Vietnamese, like Ho Chi Minh and his contemporaries, are gone. It is an oft-cited statistic that 60 percent of the Vietnamese people have been born after the conclusion of that war and the vast majority have no memory of those efforts.

I appreciate the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) yielding me this time, and I apologize if I got carried away a little bit, but we see this new country that is emerging that can take advantage of this trade agreement to forge new links. Southeast Asia is a cauldron today of over 600 million people, of diverse countries rich in natural resources, economic energies and rich cultures, and Vietnam is right in the middle of it. It is a country that has a long history of being leery of the country of China, for instance, and a thousand years of experience to back it up.

We have seen people labor mightily over this trade agreement. We are going to see a new era of economic prosperity in Vietnam. It is going to help us economically, but it will be transformational for them, and it is going to empower a new generation of leaders, of entrepreneurs, speed the healing, and give them the energy to slam the pages closed on this chapter and open a new one.

I deeply appreciate the leadership of the Committee on Ways and Means, my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), in bringing this forward, the many people who have labored mightily for this agreement, and I strongly urge its passage.

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

I had a chance at the beginning to lay out a perspective of mine and, I think, many, many of my colleagues on the Democratic side. I think this has been a useful discussion, and I hope many have heard it, though not here. I simply want to reemphasize that this is not an easy relationship. It is a complex relationship because of the past, but also because of the present and likely the near future.

There should be no rose-colored lenses. We are dealing with a society, a structure, that is very different from ours. Very different. A political structure that is very different and an economic structure that is very different. As a result, there is no automatic factor here. There is no magic wand. One thing will not lead automatically to another. I do not think a free capital

market will lead automatically to a free labor market or to human rights.

I think, as a result, we need a well-rounded comprehensive approach. I think included must be engagement, including on intellectual property. This agreement covers intellectual property. It has restrictions in terms of how the Vietnamese handle it.

But beyond that, I think comprehensiveness must increasingly include, with this authoritarian society, their movement towards a free market in labor as well as in capital. That is why I think we need to both engage and pressure Vietnam. That is why I think, as we negotiate further agreements with Vietnam, we must consider the factors, including the labor market factors and perhaps even the environmental factors that at this point are not as critical.

□ 1545

So, in a word I think we need to move forward but in a comprehensive way. And on balance, I believe that this bill represents a movement forward, as long as we keep in mind the reality of a very different society with a very different structure that requires a different formula as we did with Cambodia, as we have wrestled with, with other countries, we would apply, if we were negotiating or approving an agreement with another industrialized democratic society.

So with this, I close, hoping that we will pass this within the framework that I have suggested and I believe so many of my colleagues agree with.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, my other colleagues who are in opposition to this measure have eloquently outlined the many reasons to oppose it. I will close by concentrating again just on the MIA issue.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Boyd Sponaugle, Ron Cima and Chuck Hentley of the Office of the Secretary of Defense for the updated information on the search for our MIA's. I am grateful to them and all who are working to bring our MIA's home.

As I grow older, Mr. Speaker, I try to keep my priorities straight. That is why when I get up in the morning, the first two things I do are to thank God for my life and then veterans for my way of life. Because had it not been for my brother Bill and all of those who gave their lives in service to this country through the years, had it not been for people like the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) and PETE PETERSON and Senator MCCAIN who endured torture as prisoners of war, had it not been for people like Pete Dalessandro, a World War II Congressional Medal of Honor winner from my district who was laid to rest 2 years ago in our new cemetery in Saratoga, had it not been for them and all of those who wore the uniform of the United States military over the years,

I would not have the privilege as an American citizen to go around bragging, as I often do, how we live in the freest and most open democracy on the face of the Earth. Because freedom is not free. We paid a tremendous price for it.

So today, Mr. Speaker, based upon the comments that I made earlier and the comments of my colleagues, and on behalf of all 1,474 Americans who are still missing in Vietnam, I ask my colleagues to join me, the American Legion, the Veterans of the Vietnam War, the National Vietnam Veterans Coalition, and the Disabled American Veterans in opposing this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me say that ordinarily in this debate the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE), would be heavily involved in the debate; but due to a family circumstance, the gentleman is not here today.

Mr. Speaker, in my response to my friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. McNULTY) and his poignant comments, I too share the concern that he expresses.

I think it is important to note, however, that, for example, in World War II there were more than 50,000 missing in action. It is true we have a better capability and we have carried on a much longer search to verify each and every individual who was missing in action; but the two former major Axis Powers are now two of our major trading partners. I do have to say we engage in trade disputes periodically, but we do so in an ordered process.

I believe most of us who are in support of this resolution to enter into normal trade relations with the Socialist or Communist Government of Vietnam is to believe that this too will have a better outcome.

I do want to respond to my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), about his concern in terms of taxpayers' money. While this debate has gone on, we have engaged in a number of conversations. For example, the Export-Import Bank of the United States has indicated that there have been no transactions, therefore, no funds have been authorized for participation in Vietnam by American businessmen.

We pursued farther. The Overseas Private Investment Corporation has indicated that there has been no activity. Beyond that they are required by law to examine any project to determine if it would have a negative impact on the U.S. economy and business. They would be required by law to turn a project down. So although there may be somebody's private dollars involved in the catfish operation, at this point I believe I can offer a degree of assurance to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) that there has been no taxpayer dollars.

But the point he makes, if not specific to the catfish industry, is one that

we have to be concerned about. And that is why this agreement can be revoked at any time by the President under the structure that we have established. This is a year-to-year renewal. It is an embarkation on an attempt with a nonmarket economy to improve not only the labor areas that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has indicated he has a concern about, but the intellectual property rights guarantee that has caused so much pain by the copying around the world. Of course, the key to that is the transparency in the transactions. This will be a good test of the Government of Vietnam to see if they can be trustworthy.

In fact, I find it entirely appropriate to reflect on the comments of the President of Mexico in the address he gave to the joint session today. He indicated one of the key commodities to improve the relationship between the United States and Mexico is a degree of trust. He indicated that notwithstanding the democratic title of the country over a number of years, it was far more authoritarian, that was his word, than democratic, but that there is a new era.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot say the same for the current government of Vietnam, but I do believe sincerely that this agreement will move us more in the direction of an open opportunity for Vietnamese citizens to express themselves.

Currently, this will be in the more economic realm rather than in the political realm. There is no question they have what they believe to be a semblance of what they call a democracy; but the fundamental core of a democracy is that the decisions be made quantitatively with each person getting equal weight. We know that is not now the case in the Socialist or Communist Republic of Vietnam.

All of those facts laid bare on the table, House Joint Resolution 51, introduced by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the majority leader, and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the minority leader, with the support of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Trade, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE), is worthy of a "yes" vote. We should move forward with this ongoing engagement with the Socialist or Communist Republic of Vietnam. It will be a yearly test to see if, in fact, our trust is well placed. If it is not, we can change. But for today, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on House Joint Resolution 51.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 51, a resolution approving the extension of the waiver authority contained in section 402(c) of the Trade Act of 1974 with respect to Vietnam.

Amnesty International reports that the government of Vietnam continued to prevent independent human rights monitors from visiting the country and dozens of prisoners of conscience remained in prison throughout 2000. Restrictions on released prisoners continued to be harsh. Political dissidents, independent

labor leaders and religious critics of the government were subjected to imprisonment, beatings, torture, surveillance, harassment and denial of basic freedoms, including freedom of expression.

Last year, five members of the Hoa Hao Buddhist Church were sentenced to between one and three years' imprisonment on trumped up charges.

The State Department points out that the government of Vietnam prohibits independent political, labor, and social organizations; such organizations exist only under government control. The Vietnamese Government also restricts freedom of religion and significantly restricts the operation of religious organizations other than those entities approved by the State. Dissident groups of Buddhists, Hoa Hao, and Protestants, in particular, faced harassment by authorities.

Accordingly, we should not reward the Vietnamese communist dictatorship with trade benefits. It is an insult to the thousands of American and Vietnamese men and women who were wounded or died during the war fighting for democracy, the rule of law and human rights.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to vote against H.J. Res. 51.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, last January, I traveled to South Korea, Cambodia and Vietnam to discuss issues of peace, reconciliation, trade and security between the United States and Asia. It was a remarkable trip that helped us to learn. We learned so much about Vietnam and I became convinced that implementation of this Bilateral Trade Agreement is the right policy both for the Vietnamese and the American people. Therefore, I urge Members to vote for the Vietnam trade agreement to establish a regular trade regime between the United States and Vietnam.

Thanks to Pete Peterson, former Ambassador to Vietnam, thousands of American and Vietnamese veterans, and the hard work of literally millions of people we have made large strides in reconciling our two nations after the agony of the Vietnam war. Over 50,000 Americans died in that conflict, thousands more were injured, and the war took the lives of hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese and left the country devastated. Pete Peterson has said: "We cannot change the past. What we can change is the future."

Working in this spirit, America and Vietnam have established diplomatic ties, undertaken joint efforts to locate the remains of those still missing in action, and trade between our countries has increased. Last year, the United States and Vietnam completed this bilateral trade agreement, to set the stage for an even closer relationship between our nations and a trade regime that is more robust.

On the last night of our trip, I spoke in Hanoi to the American Chamber of Commerce. That night, it became clear that both Americans in Vietnam and the Vietnamese wanted free and fair trade to lift up the lives of both our peoples. There is a hunger not to forget but to use the war as a springboard for healing and hope for the future of both countries. Virtually everyone we met said they wanted to join the global community and reap the benefits of the twin revolutions in trade and technology that are sweeping the globe.

Our challenge is to work with Vietnam among other partners in trade to bend globalization for progressive ends: to make

sure globalization produces higher living standards and stronger economies in developing and developed nations alike. This agreement is only a first step to raise living standards in Vietnam. It is not a free trade agreement. It establishes a formal trade relationship between our countries, lowering tariffs, increasing the flow of trade, and providing important new protections of intellectual property and investments in Vietnam by American companies.

I hope that passage of this agreement will eventually help to strengthen labor rights and human rights for the Vietnamese people. We must continue the dialogue developed by Ambassador Peterson on labor rights and the U.S. technical assistance program. Also, I strongly support the suggestion from Congressman LEVIN, among others, that any textile agreement between Vietnam and the United States include a provision to promote labor rights. The model for such a provision lies in the agreement between America and Cambodia, to provide positive incentives in which we have promised to increase textile quotas once progress on labor issues has been established.

I urge the Bush administration to continue to press in Vietnam for progress on human rights and religious freedom. If Vietnam moves towards the rule of law in commerce, I believe that it must also make progress in freedom for the Vietnamese people.

Since the war ended in 1975, our countries have traveled on a journey, often difficult and agonizing, yet remarkable all the same; a journey defined by peace and reconciliation, motivated by healing and deeper human understanding. This trade agreement moves both countries forward in this remarkable effort. It is a positive development for both people. I hope all of my colleagues will support this resolution, and help us take another step on the road to healing and hope for all.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I stand in firm support of House Joint Resolution 51, which approves the U.S.-Vietnam Bilateral Trade Agreement, grants NTR status to Vietnam, completes the normalization of our diplomatic relations begun in 1995. A failure to support this key legislation risks undercutting long-standing U.S. foreign policy objectives in Southeast Asia, damaging the credibility of the reform faction within the Hanoi government, and causing Vietnam's 80 million people to slide backwards toward isolationism.

In 1986, Hanoi initiated a policy of *doi moi*, or "economic renovation." For the first time the government encouraged private business start-ups and permitted inward foreign investment. As a result, Vietnam sustained on average nearly 8 percent annual GDP growth and welcomed \$8.3 billion in foreign investment during the 1990s.

I visited Vietnam this past April and was struck by its 92 percent literacy rate, its thriving entrepreneurship, and the thousands of zooming motorbikes. Industrial parks now line the suburbs of the major cities, and government is planning to open a stock exchange in downtown Ho Chi Minh City. As GDP has doubled and per capita income has risen 60 percent since 1990, a small but growing, consumer-oriented middle class is taking root.

Signed in July 2000, the U.S.-Vietnam BTA will buttress these enormous economic and social reforms. The BTA represents the most

far-reaching and comprehensive trade agreement ever negotiated with a non-market economy country. It grants the United States vastly improved access to Vietnam's potentially enormous consumer class, and improves market access for industrial and agricultural goods, services, intellectual property rights, and investment, while requiring greater transparency.

The U.S.-Vietnam Bilateral Trade Agreement will help Vietnam's reformers lock in the economic transformation that slower growth after the Asian financial crisis threatens to unravel. Continued engagement with the Vietnamese government also advances key U.S. foreign policy objectives, including the fullest possible accounting of Prisoners of War/Missing in Action (POW/MIA), freedom of emigration, increased U.S. business opportunities in Vietnam, and promoting Asian regional stability.

Former Vietnamese Ambassador to the United States, Le Van Bang recently noted the positive influence that continued engagement has had on the Vietnamese people. He said that since we first reestablished diplomatic ties, the Vietnamese people have changed their attitudes toward Americans from "the bitterness of war to a love of America." In such a fresh and positive atmosphere, our values in other key areas surely stand a much better hearing and more open consideration if we continue down this road. Approval of the U.S.-Vietnam BTA demonstrates we too are healing from one of the most divisive wars in our nation's history and that we seek to begin a new and truly productive era in U.S.-Vietnamese relations.

Congressional approval of the U.S.-Vietnam Bilateral Trade Agreement and the expansion of business contacts between our two nations provides the strongest foundation for encouraging even further progress and reform in Vietnam. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote yes for H.J. Res. 51.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this measure to expand our trade relations with Vietnam.

This resolution, which ratifies the U.S.-Vietnam bilateral trade agreement and extends normal trade relations to Vietnam, enjoys broad bipartisan support. The agreement represents a milestone toward building a stronger commercial relationship with Vietnam and promoting U.S. security and diplomatic interests in the region.

We have seen tremendous progress in our diplomatic and economic relations with the Vietnamese Government. The country is experiencing a new era, driven by a population where 65 percent of its citizens were born after the war. Vietnam today welcomes U.S. trade and economic investment.

Through a policy of engagement and U.S. business investment, Vietnam has improved its policies on immigration, cooperated on U.S. refugee programs, and worked with the United States on achieving the fullest possible accounting of POW/MIAs from the Vietnam War.

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

However, this resolution is not a blank check to Vietnam. Before the United States grants NTR status to Vietnam, the Vietnamese Government is required to sharply lower most tariffs; phase out all non-tariff measures; and adhere to WTO standards in applying customs, import licensing and other measures.

This measure also takes an important step in requiring Vietnam to allow U.S. firms over a period of time to enter its services market in a full range of areas, including financial, telecom, engineering, computing, education, health and other services. Two other critical areas of this agreement require Vietnam to protect U.S. investments from expropriation and adopt a fully transparent trade and investment regime.

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

Approval of this bilateral agreement will advance U.S. economic interests and, more importantly to our regional interests in Asia, further integrate Vietnam into the global economy. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of H.J. Res. 51. I am pleased to have the opportunity to vote in favor of free trade while respecting my commitment to Human Rights.

Mr. Speaker, last year the U.S. signed a sweeping bilateral trade agreement with Vietnam.

The State Department year 2000 review of Vietnam human rights noted that Vietnam has made improvements in its human rights record. Despite these improvements, the State Department still rated Vietnam as "poor" overall on human rights, highlighting continued government repression of basic political freedoms. The State Department also noted that the Vietnam Government is intolerant of dissenting viewpoints, and selectively represses the religious rights of its citizens.

Because of these factors, I voted in favor of H.J. Res. 55, legislation disapproving Waiver Authority with respect to Vietnam. Mr. Speaker, my vote was a protest vote, for I believe we cannot continue to hope that trade alone will guarantee the basic human rights of our trading partners.

Today, this House also considers H.R. 2368, the "Vietnam Human Rights Act," which establishes a commission to monitor human rights in Vietnam. I regard this as a step in a new direction, and one that I applaud. By discussing trade with Vietnam in the same context as its human rights situation, we are finally moving in a more comprehensive direction that respects our global obligations.

As the leader of the free world, we have an obligation to promote core values when engaging the rest of the world. Thus, I have fewer reservations about moving forward with Vietnam.

As we move into this new millennium, our actions here today signal a commitment to expanding the marketplace in a manner that benefits both the United States and Vietnam. The extension of Normal Trade Relations will grant market access to American industrial and agricultural products previously denied

from competition. U.S. firms are also granted access to the Vietnam services market. We will be allowed to compete in telecommunications, financial services, engineering, accounting, and a variety of industries that will help develop an infrastructure in Vietnam to support our new commitment to engage Vietnam on all levels of concern.

The approval of this legislation will ensure that U.S. firms committed to trade with Vietnam receive the protection of investments necessary to commit resources in a foreign country. By requiring a fully transparent trade regime with the promulgation of laws and regulations through a public process, this legislation helps Vietnam develop policies that will help this nation fully engage the world.

This legislation cannot be evaluated, however, without the approval of H.R. 2368. Advancing the agenda of global trade in countries that do not respect their citizens is tantamount to modern day feudalism, and should not be supported by this House.

Establishing a trade regime with Vietnam that will ease this nation's transition into the WTO means nothing unless prisoners like Catholic Priest Nguyen Van Ly, Mr. Le Quang Liem of the Inter-Religious Council, and Buddhist leaders the Venerable Thieh Huyen Quang and the Venerable Thieh Quang Do are ensured their right to freely exercise their respective religions.

Mr. Speaker, today this House goes a long way toward reconciling the concerns of all parties interested in global trade and its consequences. Passage of H.J. Res. 51 ensures that American products will be given fair access to the Vietnamese marketplace. By combining the extension of this trade with the recognition of Human Rights here on the House Floor, we set a positive precedent for future trade legislation. I therefore support H.J. Res. 51.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). All time for debate has expired. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, September 5, 2001, the joint resolution is considered 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, was read the third time, and passed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.J. Res. 51, the joint resolution just passed.

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

There was no objection.

REREFERRAL OF H.R. 1448 TO COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES AND COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means be discharged from consideration of the bill,

H.R. 1448, and that the bill be re-referred to the Committee on Resources and to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY,
SEPTEMBER 10, 2001

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR
WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON
WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

□ 1600

SUDAN SPECIAL ENVOY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the President of the United States, President George W. Bush, for the appointment today of a special envoy, former Senator Danforth from Missouri to work on the issue of bringing peace in Sudan.

I also want to thank Secretary of State Colin Powell for his efforts and his work. I think the Bush administration, President Bush and Secretary Powell, have really taken a very bold and a very, very important step.

I also want to congratulate or thank or commend Senator Danforth for accepting this very difficult job. As many people know, there has been a war going on in Sudan for almost more than 18 years.

I have visited Sudan four times in the last 10 years. In Sudan more than 2.2 million people, most Christians, a number of Animists and a number of Muslims, have been killed as a result of this war.

There has been unbelievable famine in Sudan. In Sudan, every major ter-

rorist group, Hamas, Abu Nidal and others, has had operations in and around Khartoum, and there is also, as many people know, Osama bin Laden had been in Sudan for a period of time.

There is slavery in Sudan. What happens is the militia go into the villages, kill the men, rape the women and take the children away for slavery.

So I think the move by President Bush today, working through the good efforts of Secretary Powell, appointing Senator Danforth will really make a tremendous difference. It is the greatest opportunity we have had in years to bring about a just and a lasting peace.

This puts a tremendous burden on the Khartoum government and both sides having to come together whereby the people of the south and the people of the north can live in peace.

This has been a particularly difficult time because with the revenue, over \$700 million this year of oil revenues, they are using that revenue to buy weapons and helicopter gun ships to kill the people in the areas where they have discovered and are now drilling for oil.

This is an opportunity.

I want to also thank all of the groups, and I will submit for the record all of the names, but those individuals who have been working on this issue for so long. I am reluctant to get into specifics because there are so many; but I will at the end of the statement submit with it their names and all the people who have been working for the last, some for 10, 11 and 12 years, a number of Members of Congress.

When I think on the Senate side, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. FRIST) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK). On the House side, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and other Congressmen who have been to the region that are working on this. Also, the numerous groups of all denominations from throughout America that are participating and because of their efforts this day has taken place.

With prayer and with the hard work of Senator Danforth, it will be my hope that we can bring peace whereby the people of Sudan could live in peace.

In closing, from the bottom of my heart, I want to thank President Bush for this action, those on the President's staff who helped put this together; also Secretary Powell for his actions and those who work at the State Department that are involved in this very, very important issue. Perhaps they will all be like Esther: they are being called just for a time like this, to bring about peace, whereby the people in the south and the north can live together.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank and congratulate President George W. Bush and his administration for naming former Senator John Danforth of Missouri as the United States Special Envoy to Sudan. Earlier today, in a beautiful and powerful ceremony in the Rose Garden at

the White House, President Bush, supported by Secretary of State Colin Powell, expressed to Sudan and the world that the United States is deeply committed to helping resolve the conflict in Sudan that has claimed an estimated 2.2 million lives during the past 18 years of civil war. This is a conflict that has also driven another 4 million from their homes, threatens 2 million additional innocent victims with starvation, has witnessed deliberate aerial bombings of schools and churches by the government of Sudan, and has even tolerated the disgrace of slavery in the 21st century.

It was noted today, that the degree of difficulty in bringing an end to the suffering in Sudan is very high, but if there is even a chance of success, then the United States must accept this role of peacemaker in this struggle. I applaud Senator John Danforth for stepping forward and accepting this most challenging position of trust. I believe he has the experience, character and reputation around the world to succeed in this job.

Everyone who has been involved in bringing an end to the suffering in Sudan acknowledges that this job will not be easy. This effort will require the United States government to speak as one voice. It will require the desire for peace by the combatants in this war, the government of Sudan and the SPLA. It will require the support of the European Union and neighboring countries of Sudan, such as Egypt Kenya and others. And it will require the support of non-government organizations, religious leaders and citizens of the world. I firmly believe that if successful in bringing a just peace to Sudan, Senator Danforth should win the Noble Peace Prize.

Today's ceremony announcing Senator Danforth as Special Envoy to Sudan was a long time in coming. It came after many long hours and hard work by many individuals and groups around our country. The bright blue skies and bi-partisan crowd in the Rose Garden reflected the perfect backdrop for this ceremony today and signal bright hope for tomorrow for the people of Sudan.

As I mentioned earlier, many individuals and organizations are responsible for helping shape the administrations policy with regard to Sudan. I applaud the bi-partisan efforts of members of Congress in supporting the appointment of a high-level Special Envoy to Sudan. Representatives DICK ARMEY, TOM TANCREDO, DON PAYNE, TOM LANTOS, ED ROYCE, SPENCER BACHUS, J.C. WATTS, CYNTHIA MCKINNEY, CHRIS SMITH, TONY HALL, former Congressmen Walter Fauntroy and Harry Johnston as well as Senators SAM BROWNBACK and BILL FRIST all have played critical roles in seeing that this day finally arrived and they deserve special mentioning.

Many in the administration also deserve mentioning for their efforts in making this day happen. Assistant Secretary of State Richard Armitage, National Security Adviser, Condoleezza Rice, Karl Rove at the White House, Andrew Natsios, the director of USAID, Roger Winter, USAID, Elliot Abrams, former chairman of the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom and current Assistant to the President at the National Security Council, Walter Kansteiner, Assistant Secretary for African Affairs, and Ted Dagne of the Congressional Research Service have all played pivotal roles in shaping U.S. policy.

Religious leaders and organizations around our country have also provided unbending

support in these efforts. Franklin Graham, Cardinals Bernard Law and Theodor McCarrick, the late Cardinal John O'Connor, Father Michael Perry of the United States Catholic Conference, Faith McDonald of the Institute of Religion and Democracy, as well as, the Presbyterian Church, Jewish leaders and Christian colleges across our country have all contributed as well.

Finally, many outside of government have steadfastly beat the drum calling for action in Sudan. I would be remised if I didn't mention a few of them as well. Nina Shea and Rabbi David Saperstein, both commissioners on the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom, Roger Robinson and Adam Penner of the Casey Institute, Michael Horowitz, Professor Eric Reeves of Smith College, Chuck Colson and Mariam Bell of Prison Fellowship, radio personality Joe Madison of WOL-Am in Washington, D.C., Steven Morrison of the Center for Strategic and International Studies, Jerry Fowler of the U.S. Holocaust Museum, and Charles Jacobs of the American Anti-slavery group are just a few of the patriots for justice who have continued the efforts that led to a special envoy being named for Sudan.

Today is a great day of hope for those who speak out for the voiceless and innocent of Sudan who have suffered for too many years. But, today is just the beginning of the efforts that are hoped to bring a just peace to the insanity that has taken place in Sudan for the past two decades.

Today, President Bush described the war taking place in Sudan as brutal and shameful. He said it deserves the attention and compassion of the world if it is to end. Senator Danforth noted that the U.S. can encourage the peace, but can not make it happen on our own. He will need much help in successfully bringing the atrocities to an end.

It is my hope that through much prayer and hard work, both sides in this conflict will resolve to bring an end to the suffering of so many innocent people and end this war for ever. I thank and applaud President Bush, Secretary Powell, Senator John Danforth and everyone involved in making this day happen. I encourage the American people to stay vigilant in seeing to it that peace comes to Sudan. I pray for the people of Sudan that today will mark the beginning of peace in your country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. THUNE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE U.S. DOLLAR AND THE WORLD ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I have taken a Special Order today to address the subject of the U.S. dollar and the world economy, and in the words of James Madison, the pestilent effects of paper money.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has a constitutional responsibility to maintain the value of the dollar by making only gold and legal silver tender and not to emit bills of credit, that is, paper money. This responsibility was performed relatively well in the 19th century despite the abuse of the dollar suffered during the Civil War and despite repeated efforts to form a Central Bank.

This policy served to maintain relatively stable prices, and the shortcomings came only when the rules of the gold standard were ignored or abused.

In the 20th century, however, we saw the systematic undermining of sound money with the establishment of the Federal Reserve System in 1913 and the outright rejection of gold with the collapse of the Bretton Woods agreement in 1971. We are now witnessing the effects of the accumulated problems of 30 years of fiat money, not only the dollar but also all the world currencies, something the world has never before experienced.

Exactly how it plays out is yet unknown. Its severity will be determined by future monetary management, especially by the Federal Reserve. The likelihood of quickly resolving the deeply ingrained and worldwide imbalances built up over 30 years is remote. Yielding to the addiction of credit creation, as has been the case with every market correction over the past 30 years, remains irresistible to the central bankers of the world. Central planners who occupy the seats of power in every central bank around the world refuse to accept the fact that markets are more powerful and smarter than they are.

The people of the United States, including the U.S. Congress, are far too complacent about the seriousness of the current economic crisis. They remain oblivious to the significance of the U.S. dollar's fiat status. Discussions about the dollar are usually limited to the question of whether the dollar is now too strong or too weak. When money is defined as a precise weight of a precious metal, this type of discussion does not exist. The only thing that matters under that circumstance is whether an honest government will maintain convertibility.

Exporters always want a weak dollar; importers, a strong one. But no one demands a stable, sound dollar, as they should. Manipulation of foreign trade through competitive currency devalu-

ations has become commonplace and is used as a form of protectionism. This has been going on ever since the worldwide acceptance of fiat money 30 years ago. Although some short-term advantage may be gained for certain manufacturers and some countries by such currency manipulation, it only adds fuel to the economic and financial instability inherent in a system of paper money.

Paper money helps the strong and hurts the weak before it self-destructs and undermines international trade. The U.S. dollar, with its reserve currency status, provides a much greater benefit to American citizens than that which occurs in other countries that follow a very similar monetary policy. It allows us to export our inflation by buying cheap goods from overseas while our dollars are then lent back to us to finance our current account deficit. We further benefit from the confidence bestowed on the dollar by our being the economic and military powerhouse of the world, thus postponing the day of reckoning. This permits our extravagant living to last longer than would have otherwise occurred under a gold standard.

Some may argue that a good deal like that should not be denied, but unfortunately the piper must eventually be paid. Inevitably the distortions such as our current account deficit and foreign debt will come to an end with more suffering than anyone has anticipated.

The monetary inflation of the 1990s produced welcomed profits of \$145 billion for the NASDAQ companies over the 5 years between 1996 and 2000. Astonishingly, this entire amount was lost in the past year. This does not even address the trillions of dollars of paper losses in stock values from its peak in early 2000. Congress has expressed concern about the staggering stock market losses but fails to see the connection between the bubble economy and the monetary inflation generated by the Federal Reserve.

Instead, Congress chooses to blame the analysts for misleading investors. The analysts may not be entirely blameless, but their role in creating the bubble is minimal compared to the misleading information that the Federal Reserve has provided with artificially low interest rates and a financial market made flush with generous new credit at every sign of correction over the past 10 years.

By preventing the liquidation of bad debt and the elimination of malinvestment and overcapacity, the Federal Reserve's actions have kept the financial bubble inflated. Of course, it is an easy choice in the short run. Who would deliberately allow the market tendency to deflate back to stability? That would be politically unacceptable.

Talk of sound money and balanced budgets is just that. When the economy sinks, the rhetoric for sound policy and a strong dollar may continue, but all

actions by the Congress and the Fed will be directed toward reflation and a congressional spending policy oblivious to all the promises regarding a balanced budget and the preservation of the Social Security and Medicare Trust Funds.

But if the Fed and its chairman, Alan Greenspan, have been able to guide us out of every potential crisis all the way back to the stock market crash of 1987, why should we not expect the same to happen once again? Mainly because there is a limit to how long the monetary charade can be perpetuated. Now it looks like the international financial system built on paper money is coming to an end.

Modern day globalism since gold's demise 30 years ago has been based on a purely fiat U.S. dollar with all other currencies tied to the dollar. International redistribution and management of wealth through the IMF, the World Bank, and the WTO have promoted this new version of globalism. This type of globalism depends on trusting central bankers to maintain currency values and the international institutions to manage trade equitably, while bailing out weak economies with dollar inflation. This, of course, has only been possible because the dollar's strength is perceived to be greater than it really is.

Modern day globalists would like us to believe they invented globalism. Yet all they are offering is an unprecedented plan for global power to be placed in the hands of a few powerful special interests.

Globalism has existed ever since international trade started thousands of years ago. Whether it was during the Byzantine Empire or the more recent British Empire, it worked rather well when the goal was honest trade and the currency was gold. Today, however, world government is the goal. Its tools are fiat money and the international agencies that believe they can plan globally, just as many others over the centuries believed they could plan domestically, ignoring the fact that all efforts at socialism have failed.

The day of reckoning for all this mischief is now at hand. The dollar is weakening in spite of all the arguments for its continued strength. Economic law is overruling political edicts. Just how long will the U.S. dollar and the U.S. taxpayers be able to bail out every failed third-world economy and pay the bills for policing the world? U.S. troops are now in 140 nations around the world. The answer is certainly not forever and probably not much longer, since the world economies are readjusting to the dislocations of the past 30 years of mismanagement and misallocation of capital characteristic of fiat money.

Fiat money has been around for a long time off and on throughout history, but never has the world been so enthralled with the world economy being artificially structured with paper money and with a total rejection of the

anchor that gold provided for thousands of years.

□ 1615

Let there be no doubt, we live in unprecedented times and we are just beginning to reap what has been sown the past 30 years. Our government and the Federal Reserve officials have grossly underestimated the danger.

Current concerns are expressed by worries about meeting the criteria for a government-declared recession and whether a weaker dollar would help. The first is merely academic, because if you are one of the many thousands who have been laid off, you are already in a recession.

The second does not make a lot of sense unless one asks, compared to what? The dollar has been on a steady course of devaluation for 30 years against most major currencies and against gold. Its purchasing power in general has been steadily eroded.

The fact that the dollar has been strong against Third World currencies and against most major currencies for the past decade does not cancel out the fact that the Federal Reserve has systematically eroded the dollar's value by steadily expanding the money supply. Recent reports of a weakening dollar on international exchange markets have investment implications, but do not reflect a new policy designed to weaken the dollar. This is merely the market adjusting to 30 years of systematic monetary inflation.

Regardless of whether the experts demand a weak dollar or a strong dollar, each inevitably demands lower interest rates, hoping to spur the economy and save the stock market from crashing. But one must remember that the only way the Federal Reserve can lower interest rates is to inflate the currency by increasing the money supply and by further debasing the currency.

In the long term, the dollar is always weakened even if the economy is occasionally stimulated on a short-run basis. Economic growth can hide the ill effects of monetary inflation by holding some prices in check, but it cannot prevent the overcapacity, the malinvestment which causes the economic downturn.

Of course, the central bankers cling to the belief that they somehow can prevent the ugly corrections known as "recessions." Economic growth, when artificially stimulated by money growth and low interest rates, generates the speculation we have seen in the stock, bond and real estate markets, along with the accumulation of excessive debt. Once the need for rectifying the overcapacity is recognized by the market, these imbalances are destined to be wiped out.

Prolonging the correction phase with the Fed's effort to reflate by diligently working for a soft landing, or even to prevent a recession, only postpones the day the economy can return to sustained growth. This is a problem the United States had in the

1930s and one that Japan has experienced for more than a decade with no end in sight.

The next recession, from which I am sure we are already suffering, will be even more pervasive worldwide than the one in the 1930s due to the artificial nature of modern globalism with world paper money and international agencies deeply involved in the economy of every nation. We have witnessed the current and recent bailouts of Mexico, Argentina, Brazil, Turkey, and countries in the Far East. While resisting the market's tendency for correction, faith in government deficits and belief in paper money inflation will surely prolong the coming worldwide crisis.

Alan Greenspan made a concerted effort to stave off the 1991-1992 recession with numerous reductions in the Fed funds rate, to no avail. The recession hit, and most people believe it led to George Bush's defeat in the 1992 election. It was not that Greenspan did not try. In many ways, the Bush people's criticism of Greenspan's effort is not justified. Greenspan, the politician, would have liked to please the elder Bush, but was unable to control events as he had wished.

This time around, however, he has been much more aggressive, with half-point cuts, along with seven cuts in just the last 8 months, for a total of 3 points cut in the Fed funds rate. But, guess what? So far, it has not helped; stocks continue to slide and the economy is still in the doldrums. It is now safe to say that Greenspan is pushing on a string.

In the year 2000, bank loans and commercial paper were growing at an annualized rate of 23 percent. In less than a year, in spite of this massive influx of new credit, these loans have crashed to a rate of minus 5 percent.

Where is the money going? Some of it probably has helped to prop up the staggering stock market, but that cannot last forever. Plenty went into consumption and to finance extravagant living. The special nature of the dollar as the reserve currency of the world has permitted the bubble to last longer. That would be especially beneficial to American consumers. But in the meantime, understandably, market and political forces have steadily eroded our industrial base, while our service sector has thrived.

Consumers enjoyed having even more funds to spend as the dollars left manufacturing. In a little over a year, 1 million industrial jobs were lost, while saving rates sank to zero and capital investments plummeted. Foreigners continue to grab our dollars, permitting us to raise our standard of living, but unfortunately, it is built on endless printing of fiat money and self-limiting personal debt.

The Federal Reserve credit created during the last 8 months has not stimulated economic growth in the technology or the industrial sector, but a lot of it ended up in the expanding real estate bubble, churned by the \$3.2 trillion of debt maintained by the GSEs,

the Government Sponsored Enterprises. The GSEs, made up of Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac and the Federal Home Loan Bank, have managed to keep the housing market afloat, in contrast to the more logical slowdown in hotel and office construction. This spending through the GSEs has also served as a vehicle for consumption spending. This should be no surprise, considering the special status that the GSEs enjoy, since their implied line of credit to the U.S. Treasury keeps their interest rates artificially low.

The Clinton administration encouraged growth in housing loans that were financed through this system. In addition, the Federal Reserve treats GSE securities with special consideration. Ever since the fall of 1999, the Fed has monetized GSE securities just as if they were U.S. Treasury bills. This message has not been lost by foreign central banks, which took their cue from the Fed and now hold over \$130 billion worth of United States GSE securities.

The Fed holds only \$20 billion worth, but the implication is clear: Not only will the Treasury loan to the GSEs, if necessary, since the line of credit is already in place, but if necessary, Congress will surely accommodate with appropriations as well, just as they did during the savings and loan crisis of the 1970s.

But the Fed has indicated to the world that the GSEs are equivalent to U.S. Treasury bills, and foreign central bankers have enthusiastically accommodated, sometimes by purchasing more than \$10 billion worth of these securities in 1 week alone. They are merely recycling the dollars we so generously print and spend overseas.

After the NASDAQ collapsed last year, the flow of funds into real estate accelerated. The GSEs accommodated by borrowing without restraint to subsidize new mortgages, record sales and refinancing. It is no wonder the price of houses are rising to record levels.

Refinancing especially helped consumers to continue spending, even in a slowing economy. It is not surprising for high credit card debt to be frequently rolled into second mortgages, since interest on mortgage debt has the additional advantage of being tax deductible.

When financial conditions warrant, leaving financial instruments such as paper assets and looking for hard assets such as houses is commonplace and is not a new phenomenon. Instead of the newly inflated money being directed toward the stock market, it now finds its way into the rapidly expanding real estate bubble. This, too, will burst, as all bubbles do. The Fed, the Congress or even foreign investors cannot prevent the collapse of this bubble, any more than the Japanese banks were able to keep the Japanese miracle of the 1980s going forever.

Concerned Federal Reserve economists are struggling to understand how the wealth effect of the stock market

and real estate bubbles affect economic activity and consumer spending. It should be no mystery, but it would be too much to expect the Fed to look to itself and its monetary policy for an explanation and assume responsibility for engineering the entire financial mess we are in.

A major problem still remains. Ultimately, the market determines all values, including all currencies. With the current direction of the dollar, certainly downward, the day of reckoning is fast approaching. A weak dollar will prompt dumping of GSE securities before Treasuries, despite the Treasury's and the Fed's attempt to equate them with government securities. This will threaten the whole GSE system of finance, because the challenge to the dollar and the GSEs will hit just when the housing market turns down and defaults rise.

Also a major accident can occur in the derivatives market, where Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac are deeply involved in hedging their interest rate bets. Rising interest rates that are inherent with a weak currency will worsen the crisis.

The weakening dollar will usher in an age of challenge to the whole worldwide financial system. The dollar has been the linchpin of economic activity, and a severe downturn in its value will not go unnoticed and will compound the already weakening economies of the world.

More monetary inflation, even if it is a concerted worldwide effort, cannot solve the approaching crisis. The coming crisis will result from fiat money and the monetary inflation. More of the same cannot be the solution. Pseudo free trade, managed poorly and driven by fiat money, is no substitute for true free trade in a world with a stable commodity currency, such as gold.

Managed trade and fiat money historically have led to trade wars, which the international planners pretend to abhor. Yet the trade war is already gearing up, and the WTO, purported to exist to lower tariffs, is actually the agency that grants permission for tariffs to be applied when complaints of dumping are levied.

We are in the midst of a banana, textile, steel, lumber and tax war, all managed by the WTO. When cheap imports hit our market, it is a good deal for our consumer, but our manufacturers are the first to demand permission to place protective tariffs on imports. If this is already occurring in an economy that has been doing quite well, one can imagine how strong the protectionist sentiments will be in a worldwide slowdown.

Congress is starting to realize that the budget forecast based on an overly optimistic growth rate of 3 percent is way off target, and even the pseudo surpluses are soon to be eliminated.

Remember, the national debt never went down with the so-called surpluses. The national debt is currently rising at more than \$120 billion on an annualized

rate, and is destined to get worse. Our dollar problem, which affects our financial and budgetary decisions, originated at the Fed with our country's acceptance of paper money 30 years ago. Federal Reserve officials and other government leaders purposely continued to mislead the people by spouting the nonsense that there is no evidence of inflation as measured by government rigged price indices.

Even though significant price increases need not exist for monetary inflation to place a hardship on the economy, stock prices, housing prices, costs of medical care and education and the cost of government have all been rising at very rapid rates. But the true inflation, measured by the money supply, is rising at a rate greater than 20 percent as measured by MZM. This fact is ignored.

The deception regarding price increases is supported to reassure us, and may do so for a while. The Fed never admits it, and the Congress disregards it out of ignorance, but the serious harm done by artificially low interest rates leading to malinvestment, overcapacity, excessive debt and speculation are the distortions that always guarantee the next recession.

Serious problems lie ahead. If the Fed continues with the same monetary policy of perpetual inflation and the Congress responds with more spending and regulations, real solutions will be indefinitely delayed. The current problems hopefully will cause us as a nation and, in particular, Congress to reassess the policies that have allowed the imbalances to develop over these last 30 years.

Some day, stable money, based on the gold standard, must be reconsidered. Stable money is a constitutional responsibility of Congress.

□ 1630

The Federal Reserve Board's goal of stable prices, economic growth and interest rates, through centralized economic planning, by manipulating money and credit, is a concoction of the 20th century Keynesian economics. These efforts are not authorized by the Constitution and are economically detrimental.

Economic adjustments would not be so bad, as many mild recessions have proven, except that wealth is inexorably and unfairly transferred from the middle class and the poor to the rich. Job losses and the rising cost of living hurt some more than others. If our course does not change, the entire middle class prosperity can be endangered, as has happened all too often in other societies that pursued a false belief that paper money could be satisfactorily managed.

Even the serious economic problems generated by a flawed monetary system could be tolerated, except for the inevitable loss of personal liberty that accompanies government's effort to centrally plan the economy through a

paper monetary system and ever-growing welfare state. Likewise, an imperialistic foreign policy can only be supported by inflation and high taxation.

This policy compounds the threat to liberty because, all too often, our leaders get us involved in overseas military adventurism in which we should have no part. Today, that danger is greater than ever as we send our dollars and our troops hither and yon to areas of the world most Americans have no knowledge or interest in. But the driving force behind our foreign policy comes from our oil corporations, international banking interests, and the military industrial complex which have high-stake interests in the places our troops and foreign aid are sent.

If, heaven forbid, the economy sinks as low and for as long as many free market economists believe, what policy changes must we consider? Certainly, the number one change ought to be to reject the ideas that created the crisis, but rejecting old ways that Congress and the people are addicted to is not easy. Many people believe that government programs are free. The clamor for low interest rates and, therefore, more monetary inflation, by virtually all public officials and prominent business and banking leaders is endless. And, the expectation for government to do something for every economic malady, even if ill-advised government policy had created the problem in the first place, drives this seductive system of centralized planning that ultimately undermines prosperity. A realization that we cannot continue our old ways may well be upon us, and the inflating, taxing, regulating, and the centralized planning programs of the last 30 years must come to an end.

Only reigning in the welfare-warfare state will suffice. This eliminates the need for the Fed to monetize the debt that politicians depend on to please their constituents and secure their reelection. We must reject our obsession with policing the world by our endless foreign commitments and entanglements. This would reduce the need for greater expenditures, while enhancing our national security. It would also remove pressure on the Federal Reserve to continue a flawed monetary policy of monetizing endless government debt.

But we must also reject the notion that one man, Alan Greenspan, or any other chairman of the Federal Reserve, can know what the proper money supply and the proper interest rates ought to be. Only the market can determine that. This must happen if we ever expect to avoid continuous and deeper recessions and to get the economy growing in a healthy and sustainable fashion. It also must happen if we want to preserve free market capitalism and personal liberty.

The longer the delay in establishing a free market and commodity currency, even with interrupted blips of growth, the more unstable the economy and the more difficult the task becomes. Instead, it will result in what

no one wants: more poverty and political turmoil.

There are no other options if we hope to remain a free and prosperous Nation. Economic and monetary meddling undermines its principles of a free society. A free society and sound money maximize production and minimize poverty. The responsibility of Congress is clear: avoid the meddling so ingrained in our system and assume the responsibility all but forgotten, to maintain a free society, while making the dollar, once again, as good as gold.

Now, I want to close with a quote from James Madison from *The Federalist Papers*, because the founders of this country faced the dilemma of runaway inflation with the continental currency and that is where our slogan comes from: "It is not worth a continental." This was a major reason why we had the constitutional convention because they knew and understood the evils and the disastrous effects of what paper money could do to a society. These are the words of James Madison. He says, "The extension of the prohibition to bills of credit must give pleasure to every citizen in proportion to his love of justice and his knowledge of the true springs of public prosperity. The loss which America has sustained since the peace, from the pestilent effects of paper money on the necessary confidence between man and man, on the necessary confidence in the public councils, on the industries and morals of the people, and on the character of republican government, constitutes an enormous debt against the States chargeable with this ill-advised measure."

BRINGING BROADBAND TO RURAL AMERICA

(Mr. BOSWELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, a recent Department of Commerce report states that only 38.9 percent of rural households have Internet access.

In this unprecedented age of information and global interaction, broadband access and the Internet are critical elements. Americans are increasingly using online services to conduct such everyday activities as bank account transactions, personal correspondence, shopping, and research. As our Nation continues to evolve, access to the opportunities of the Internet will have an important supporting role in the economic, educational, and social successes of our citizens.

Today, along with the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE), I am introducing the Rural American Technology Enhancement Act, or RATE, of 2001. The legislation will: one, provide incentives to expand broadband/high-speed telecommunications access to rural America; two, provide incentives and tax credits for expanding and relocating high-tech businesses to rural

America; three, provide funding to prepare, educate, and train our current and future workforce for high-tech-based employment; and finally, establish an Office of Rural Technology within the Department of Agriculture to coordinate rural technology programs and act as a clearinghouse for government and private, high-tech grant information.

Broadband access should not be an intangible idea lying beyond the reach of our rural citizens. We must continue to take steps to expand access to these information resources and include those Americans who are currently being left behind in the effort to eliminate the digital divide.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in the support of this legislation.

MARKING AN IMPORTANT MILESTONE FOR PARKINSON'S DISEASE RESEARCH, THE MORRIS K. UDALL RESEARCH ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to come to the floor this evening to mark the fourth anniversary of the passage of the Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research Act, an anniversary that occurred this week.

In 1999, along with my friends and colleagues, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON); the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS); the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN); the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MARK UDALL); the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. TOM UDALL); and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), I formed the Congressional Working Group on Parkinson's Disease. The working group strives to ensure that the Nation's decisionmakers remain ever aware of the needs of the more than one million Americans struggling with the devastating disease of Parkinson's.

Four years ago this Monday, Senator WELLSTONE was successful in adding the Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research Act as an amendment to the Senate Labor-HHS Appropriations bill. Not surprisingly, the amendment was approved by a vote of 95 to 3.

Named for Arizona Representative Mo Udall to honor his legacy, the Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research Act was originally introduced on April 9 of 1997. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) were the bill's lead sponsors in the House, and Senator McCAIN and Senator WELLSTONE were the sponsors in the Senate. In the 105th Congress, this bill had over 255 cosponsors, and I was proud to be an original cosponsor.

The Udall Act expanded basic and clinical research in Parkinson's disease. It established Udall Centers of

Excellence around the country and set up the Morris K. Udall Awards in Parkinson's Research to provide grants to scientists who are working to cure Parkinson's. One of the 11 Udall Centers is located in the City of New York. The New York group is doing innovative research, including identifying new genes, that when either expressed or suppressed, contribute to the degeneration of key nerve cells. They are also investigating gender and ethnic differences in people with Parkinson's Disease.

Notably too, Columbia University's Dean of Medicine is the former director of NIH's National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke, Dr. Gerald Fischbach. The work at this Udall Center, as well as centers across the country, is leading to a better understanding of the brain and how this disease affects it. The ground-breaking research at the Udall Centers, as well as our Nation's public and private sector research efforts, will lead to better treatments and hopefully, a cure for Parkinson's.

In this Congress, I will proudly join the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MARK UDALL) and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. TOM UDALL) and members of the Congressional Working Group in introducing a reauthorization of the Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research Act. I urge all of my colleagues to join us in this effort.

In the spirit of Mo Udall's tenacity and strength of purpose, we cannot stop now. We must wholeheartedly support Parkinson's research until we find a cure.

As the President has said, we must continue on a path to doubling the NIH budget by 2003. In last year's appropriations, over \$71 million of the NIH budget was designated for Parkinson's disease research, but this is only year 1 funding of the NIH's 5-year plan for Parkinson's disease research.

Leading scientists describe Parkinson's as the most curable neurological disorder. That is why I urge my colleagues to support the second year funding of the 5-year NIH plan. Recent advances in Parkinson's disease research have given us hope that a cure is very near. The science regarding Parkinson's has advanced to a stage where greater management and coordination of the federally funded research effort will accelerate the base of scientific progress dramatically. I ask all of my colleagues to support the NIH research agenda by fully funding the \$143 million increase for fiscal year 2002 in the Labor-HHS appropriations bill.

Secondly, we must continue to fund the U.S. Army's Neurotoxin Exposure Treatment Research Program. The research not only strives to improve the treatment of neurological diseases, but also aims to identify the causes of diseases and prevent them. I am heartened by the scientific progress being made. We are very close to a cure for this disease.

As my colleagues may know, this is a personal issue for many of us. Some of

my colleagues are struggling with Parkinson's or have family members who are living with this terrible disease. My own father has been afflicted by Parkinson's, and I have seen the impact of this disease firsthand and have spoken to the experts. Professionals at NIH have said that this disease is curable within as little as 5 years, and I hope that our government will be part of making this research happen.

Mr. Speaker, an important part of curing Parkinson's disease depends on stem cell research and allowing that research to go forward.

WELCOMING OUTSTANDING
WOMEN FROM AROUND THE
GLOBE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome 24 outstanding women who represent eight countries on the continent of Africa who have come at the request of the League of Women Voters, who have come to look at what we, the women of the House, do in order to empower ourselves and empower the women throughout this country.

□ 1645

I am so pleased to welcome my friends from Ethiopia, Ghana, Nigeria, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia, and Zimbabwe. These women represent non-governmental organizations, but are interested in the political process and how they can better serve the people of their respective countries upon their return.

As we all recognize, the League of Women Voters encourages the informed and active participation of citizens in government, works to increase understanding of major public policy issues, and influences public policy through education and advocacy.

They have come in that role as advocates to take back with them how we, the 62 women who make up the House of Representatives, function: the types of policies that we pass out of this House.

I happen to serve as the co-chair of the Congressional Caucus on Women's Issues, and I simply told them that to empower themselves is to become part of the democratic process, and that is to vote, to encourage all of the folks within their countries to vote, to be participatory in the election process, and then to seek the needs of women and families so that they can address those through an advocacy program to follow the needs of those respective constituents, and certainly it will help them to build the base that is necessary to run for office.

Those of us who are women here in the House have not sought to get these seats initially. We were teachers and nurses and social workers and other

types of fields of endeavor. But when the need came and when folks in our communities told us that the education systems were broken, that there were so many children who were not insured with health insurance, then we took up the gauntlet, and we began to build a base to run for office.

We encourage not only the women who are here who see this floor, who see this House, the House that receives people from around the globe. Earlier today we welcomed the President of Mexico, Mr. Vicente Fox. We are welcoming them today. We welcome all who come to seek out what we do in the House, the people's House, a House where we pass laws to make the quality of life better for all people.

It has been my pleasure to host them today with the members of the Congressional Conference of Women's Issues, and with women and men Congresspersons who came to welcome them to the House.

Mr. Speaker, I welcome them to this House.

UNITED STATES DECISION TO
PULL OUT OF THE UNITED NATIONS
WORLD CONFERENCE
AGAINST RACISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong opposition and disappointment with the Bush administration's decision to end the United States participation in the World Conference Against Racism and not to even send initially Secretary of State Colin Powell to represent our interests.

Once again, the United States is on the wrong side of history. I traveled to South Africa to participate in the World Conference Against Racism as a congressional adviser, along with several of my colleagues with the Congressional Black Caucus.

Prior to attending the conference, I joined my colleagues in urging the Bush administration to send a high-level delegation led by Secretary of State Colin Powell.

As we all know, the decision of the United States to not participate in the conference was based on language in the draft document that would have resurrected the controversial debate of Zionism equals racism. Why then, on such an important issue, was the Secretary of State prevented from making every effort, and I mean every effort, to get rid of this destructive language? He should have been there doing that.

I am totally convinced that the United States should have been represented by Secretary Powell because he is well respected, very bright, and probably would have been able to help the conference move forward by insisting that it stay focused on its purpose, the elimination of racism, rather than the Middle East crisis, which warrants

our full attention in trying to get the peace process back on track.

America should have asserted its leadership by fully engaging in the world conference against racism, not by detaching from it.

It is an outrageous insult to millions of Americans that our first African American Secretary of State, Colin Powell, was not allowed to join in this important discussion. Many Americans are equally and rightfully outraged by the Bush administration's decision.

We know, I know, this House knows, that this country has a long history embedded in racism. Full participation in the conference would have sent a message that the United States was joining the world in efforts to discuss strategies to eliminate racism, xenophobia, sexism, hate crimes, religious intolerance, and other forms of intolerance. No other country has this tragic history as we do. Who else should be leading the world community in addressing this? We should.

However, the manner in which the United States has addressed the World Conference Against Racism is really a disgrace. It is a slap in the face to millions of Americans who have been affected by past United States policies rooted in racist ideology and are dealing with the consequences each and every day in their daily lives.

The United States is sending a message that it is indifferent to the issues of circumstances facing Native Americans, Latino and Hispanic Americans, Asian Pacific Americans, as well as African Americans. I firmly believe that this is a grave mistake and a missed opportunity of the greatest magnitude.

The World Conference Against Racism provided an important and credible platform to address racism in all its forms. This platform is also critical to the discussion of the 10 priority action points of consensus presented by the Africans and African descendants at the conference, and should have been embraced by the conference and by the United States Government.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD this statement on the Ten Priority Action Points.

The document referred to is as follows:

TEN PRIORITY ACTION POINTS OF CONSENSUS
AFRICAN AND AFRICAN DESCENDANTS CAUCUS

1. The Slave Trade, Slavery and colonialism are crimes against humanity.
2. Reparations for Africans and African Descendants.
3. Recognition of the economic basis of racism.
4. Adoption of corrective national (domestic) public policies with emphasis on environmental racism and health care.
5. Adoption of culture-specific development policies.
6. The adoption of mechanisms to combat the interconnection of race and poverty, and the role that globalization (caused by governments and the private sector) has in this interconnection.
7. Adoption of mechanisms to combat racism in the criminal punishment (penal) system.
8. Reform of the legal system including national constitutional reforms and develop-

ment of international and regional mechanisms for dismantling racism.

9. Adoption of policies specific to African and African Descendant Women that recognize and address the intersection of race and gender.

10. Support for the adoption of policies that recognize and address the intersection of race and sexual orientation.

Mr. Speaker, the United States Government sanctioned slavery for hundreds of years, completely devastating the lives of generations and generations of Africans in America. It is long past time that this government formally deal with its participation in the institution of slavery and to begin the healing process for millions of Americans who are descendants of slaves.

The United States should be leading the charge to address the lasting impact of the transatlantic slave trade, what to do about it, and specifically to discuss reparations. We cannot forget that America's racism is rooted in the institution of slavery. That must be dealt with in order to move forward as a healed and healthy country.

As an African American woman and a Member of Congress, it is embarrassing that this miscalculated and callous decision to abandon the conference will once again leave the United States out of serious international dialogue.

Racism is a fundamental question of human rights, and in the House Committee on International Relations and here on the floor we regularly question human rights practices in other countries. It is equally important that we apply the same scrutiny to our own society and examine the easily recognizable vestiges of slavery manifested in the current racial and economic divides that we experience today.

The World Conference Against Racism provided our government with a credible platform to do this. Yet once again, as with the previous two conferences, we are absent.

I want to urge my colleagues to support legislation offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), H.R. 40, which would commission a study to examine the effects of slavery and to begin a substantive discussion which I believe will move us forward toward healing our Nation. This legislation must move forward.

Again, let me reiterate my deep disappointment at the decision of the administration to pull out of this conference. The next time this opportunity presents itself, the United States not only needs to attend this conference, but to host it.

U.N. CONFERENCE AGAINST
RACISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WATSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I attended the conference in Durbin on racism with the gentleman from California (Ms. LEE). The Congressional Black Caucus had seven

members there, and I think we were the ones that gave credibility to the United States, because I really feel that we missed an opportunity.

So I would like to read to this body my statement that was delivered while we were there in Durbin, South Africa, at the United Nations Conference on Racism, Xenophobia, and Other Intolerance, because I think it states the point.

"It is a distinct honor to participate with representatives from around the world who are joined in one common concern, and that is the elimination of the scourge of racism. No nobler intent can there be to express our support for eradicating this menace that has permeated our halls of justice, our halls and places of power, our board rooms, our schoolrooms, and our main streets.

I use as a frame of reference my own place of birth, the United States of America, which has failed to send a high-level delegation. So I have to say, shame, shame on America. You have demonstrated your reluctance to sit at the table of nations to discuss past policies that have contaminated our relations between the majority and the minority in our own country. So deep are the wounds that healing appears to be unattainable and the political will evasive.

The legacy of slavery not only has broken the spirit of many African Americans in the Diaspora, but also left generations to come without the hope to look ahead with clarity. We seek a future without the pain of suffering from the indignities and intolerances spawned by the involuntary seizure of a people from the very continent on which we stand today.

The Congressional Black Caucus stands with the participating nations asking for a healing that will repair the broken and make them whole. But first our country must recognize its past mistakes and own up to them.

It is disingenuous for critics to harp on the theme that the past is the past, which they had nothing to do with, and now we must fast-forward to the future. It loses sight of the psychological and sociological damage remaining from the harsh and unjust treatment of the past. This refrain, "the past is the past," cannot be washed away with only an apology, but could with a series of meaningful discussions held in the United States that acknowledge the past and develop plans for the future to eradicate racism.

I therefore call on the United States to host its own conference on racism in the near future and to support the legislation of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), H.R. 40, which will ask for a discussion, a study on racism.

Reparations can consist of a variety of approaches that indeed further the advancement of those oppressed and provide benefits for their offspring. We need to look at better educational opportunities for our young people from kindergarten to college; health insurance coverage, maybe; the unjust justice system; racial profiling; affordable

housing; environmental racism; job opportunities; creation of entrepreneurs. There are many, many ways in which 40 acres and a mule can translate into productive activities without the need for budget-busting expenditures.

Let us start the debate here, and then go to our respective homes and continue these dialogues until the culture of racism and intolerance is eliminated from the face of the Earth, and especially, from the soil that we tilled and sowed.

PROGRESS ON CURING PARKINSON'S DISEASE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to commemorate the anniversary of the Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Disease Research Act. This act, which was passed 4 years ago this month, has strengthened our national research effort to develop more effective treatments and hopefully a cure for Parkinson's disease.

Before I say what I have to say, I want to salute the millions of people who are in the daily battle against this disease.

□ 1700

I also want to thank Joan Samuelson and the Parkinson's Action Network for their hard work on behalf of all of us.

Additionally, I want to take this opportunity to thank all of my colleagues on the Congressional Parkinson's Working Group. To name a few, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS), and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN); they have been on the front lines in fighting for research dollars and holding various projects accountable for the wise use of these funds.

Parkinson's is a devastating disease that affects more than 1 million Americans and their families. Fifty thousand people are newly diagnosed with Parkinson's each year, and of those with Parkinson's today, roughly 40 percent are under the age of 60. Most of us know someone with Parkinson's, or we know someone whose life has been touched by Parkinson's. For some of us, this issue hits close to home.

Many people knew my dad, Mo Udall, and his story. He enjoyed great health until 1976, when he broke both his arms in a fall off a ladder, caught viral pneumonia, his appendix burst, he got peritonitis, and he contracted Parkinson's Disease, all within 8 months. He had a long battle with Parkinson's before he passed away in December of 1998.

One way my father chose to deal with Parkinson's was to make light of it.

Shortly after he was diagnosed, there was a scandal involving a woman by the name of Paula Parkinson, a blond lobbyist who kissed and told about her affairs with several Congressmen. He used to tell a joke that there were two kinds of Parkinson's disease, the kind discovered by an English doctor during the 1800s and the kind you get when you go to Florida with a blond lobbyist. There were no similarities between the two afflictions, he said, except they both cause you to lose sleep and they both give you the shakes.

In all seriousness, though, I think Mo would be humbled and honored by the fact that this important act and the centers of excellence it creates are named after him. He dedicated his life to making a difference in the lives of people, and by having his name associated with this act, he continues to have an impact on the world even after his death.

The act authorizes \$100 million at the National Institutes of Health for Parkinson's research. It also establishes 10 centers for research throughout the Nation and creates a national Parkinson's information clearinghouse for support of research and education.

Mr. Speaker, the Udall Act has helped us make tremendous progress in the fight against Parkinson's and in understanding other neurodegenerative diseases. That is why we need to act soon and reauthorize the act. We need to give researchers the necessary funding and support to combat this debilitating and ruthless disease.

We will be introducing legislation in the next month to reauthorize the act, and I fervently hope that my colleagues will work with us to make the dream of finding a cure for Parkinson's come true.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield to my colleague and good friend, the gentleman from the great State of North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me and want to commend him for calling this Special Order today and giving Members an opportunity to join in honoring the late Morris Udall and in observing the fourth anniversary of the Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research Act.

Mr. Speaker, Parkinson's disease and related disorders afflict approximately 1 million Americans. Sixty thousand more are diagnosed each year with Parkinson's disease. Approximately 40 percent of those afflicted are under the age of 60. This is a devastating disease, and its incidence probably actually is underreported. Because it is not contagious and it does not have to be reported, we probably underestimate the extent of this devastating disorder. It is estimated that Parkinson's disease costs society \$25 billion or more annually.

I appreciate very much our colleague, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL), coming to the floor today and sharing the story with his colleagues of

his father's illness; and of course, we all remember his father's great accomplishments. Mo Udall was one of this body's greatest Members in the 20th century, a man of great humor, great concern for those in this society who are less fortunate, and a man of great achievement in this body. Mo Udall's last years were marred by Parkinson's disease, but he dealt with it courageously.

We are all fortunate that his son, our colleague from Colorado, and his nephew, the gentleman from Arizona, are carrying on his good work in this body. We appreciate what the gentleman from Colorado is doing today and appreciate especially his sharing the story of his father with us and reminding us of the importance of carrying on this work, which we do in his name.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. I thank the gentleman for expressing those sentiments, and I know everyone in my family appreciates the affection and respect that the gentleman has acknowledged that exists for my father.

I would add to the comments that the gentleman made that I think Parkinson's disease should truly be characterized as the most common uncommon disease. And by that I mean, the researchers tell us only about a million Americans have the disease. But I guarantee that if we were to walk out on the streets outside the Capitol here and we were to talk to four or five people, by the time we would get to the fifth person, they will know somebody in their immediate family or a friend who has Parkinson's disease and who is battling it valiantly.

They would also, I think, be excited to know that we are so close to not only finding ways to combat the disease but to actually identify a cure, and that is why it is so important to reauthorize this act and continue the momentum that has been generated over the past 10 years.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. That is absolutely true. The number of families affected by this disease directly and indirectly is, of course, in the millions, and that includes my own family. My late father had a brother who was afflicted with Parkinson's. He had an uncle who was afflicted with Parkinson's.

My dad, incidentally, was a great fan of the gentleman's father. I remember when I was the Democratic Party chairman in North Carolina, we were fortunate enough to line up Mo Udall as the speaker at our annual party banquet. It was over in the western part of the State, so my dad, who resided in east Tennessee, was able to come over for this function. He could not stop laughing. He said Mo Udall was the funniest man he had ever heard or seen anywhere, almost enough to make a Democrat out of him!

Mo Udall was a wonderful man who brought great good humor to politics, great warmth, and a wonderful spirit. He later autographed his book "Too Funny to Be President," and we gave it

to my dad to his great delight. So Mo Udall was a huge personal favorite in our family.

One cannot imagine a more fitting monument, a more fitting tribute to Mo Udall, than to pass this research act aimed at the scourge of Parkinson's disease and to carry out this path-breaking research in Mo Udall's name.

The gentleman, of course, is quite accurate also in depicting the promise of this research. We have now across the country 11 Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research Centers. One of those is at Duke University in my part of North Carolina. Dr. Jeffery Vance leads the Udall Center at Duke University, where a research team is using several state-of-the-art methods to find genes that may contribute to the etiology of Parkinson's disease and to distinguish the genes that contribute to familial Parkinson's from those involved in sporadic cases. That is path-breaking research, typical of what is going on in these research centers.

The Udall program also has expanded basic and clinical research at institutions across this country. It has established the Morris K. Udall awards to encourage innovative research, and supported the creation of Parkinson's data banks and information clearing-houses in support of research and education.

So this is a landmark statute and the programs that it has spawned are ongoing and are full of promise. It is very, very important not only to observe this fourth anniversary of the Udall Act's passage, but also to pledge here and now that we are going to continue this work and build on this work.

We must double the NIH's budget over these 5 years, and I hope and believe we are on the way to doing that in this year's appropriations cycle. NIH has developed, under the directions laid down by the Udall Act, a 5-year Parkinson's disease research agenda. Last year, Congress funded the first year of that plan, so within NIH it is vitally important to continue that specific research program.

The Udall Act has gotten us started, and it has provided the framework for the comprehensive research that we simply must undertake as a Nation on Parkinson's disease. And I would say to the gentleman that I hope, in having this Special Order today and observing this fourth anniversary, that this can be an occasion for all of us, all of our colleagues, to resolve to continue to build upon the vital and necessary work that the Udall Act has gotten under way.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. If I might add an additional comment, I am confident that our colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join us in this important effort to reauthorize this piece of legislation. Parkinson's is not a Republican or a Democrat or a Green Party or Libertarian Party disease. It affects people across our country and across the world. And the work that has been

done, as the gentleman points out, is far-reaching. And we are so close to understanding how to not only, as I mentioned earlier, make sure that the disease is mitigated but literally cured.

The area of the brain where this takes place has been identified and mapped. And as the gentleman points out, there are indications that the disease is, in some cases, genetic or hereditary; but in other cases, is environmentally induced. There is excellent work going on in the Department of Defense also, working with veterans, and they are looking through their own program on how to combat Parkinson's disease or contributing to the efforts at NIH has undertaken.

I want to again thank the gentleman for taking his time to come to the floor and to point out to our colleagues the great opportunity we have to make a difference in a lot of lives. If we think about a million Americans who have the disease, think about the extended families that are affected by the disease and the costs that are incurred, not just financially, but emotionally, in these communities, this is a terrible disease; and it is one that we can cure and we ought to get about the business of it now.

So I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman from Colorado for his comments here today and for carrying on this great work. We must use this occasion to resolve to press forward.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. I thank the gentleman for joining us today.

It is my pleasure at this point to yield time to my colleague, the gentleman from the great State of Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado, for yielding time for me to speak on this issue. Before I begin, I want to mention that, of course, I never had the opportunity to meet his father, Mo Udall, but I have nothing but respect for the reputation that he has established in public service, and I know that he would be proud of his son, the gentleman from Colorado, in continuing that proud family tradition of strong commitment to public service.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the fourth anniversary of the passage of the Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research Act and to stress the vital importance of expanding support and research for treatment of Parkinson's disease. Named for Arizona Representative Mo Udall, the Parkinson's Research Act expands basic and clinical research on Parkinson's disease and establishes Morris K. Udall Centers for awards for excellence in Parkinson's disease research.

Since its introduction, this landmark legislation has received overwhelming congressional support. In the 105th Congress, the Morris K. Udall Parkin-

son's Research Act garnered 255 cosponsors, and in the 106th Congress it passed the Senate by a nearly unanimous vote of 95 to 3.

I am proud that Congress embraced this initiative, as more people suffer from Parkinson's disease than multiple sclerosis, muscular dystrophy and Lou Gehrig's disease combined.

□ 1715

But our work is far from over. About 60,000 Americans are diagnosed with this disease each year, that is one person every 9 minutes, and more than half a million living with Parkinson's disease today.

Fortunately, there may be some hope on the horizon. Parkinson's disease is one of the many diseases for which stem cell research offers significant promise. Yesterday I testified before the Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee about the potential for embryonic stem cell research to alleviate pain and suffering in millions of people. It is my strong hope that our Nation's premier researchers will be able to engage in this ground-breaking research expeditiously to save, lengthen, and dramatically improve the quality of life of those who live with Parkinson's and other debilitating diseases and conditions.

On this anniversary of the Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research Act, I urge my colleagues to follow through on our commitment to double the budget of the National Institutes of Health, increase funding for the Morris K. Udall Center, and break down the barriers to unprecedented, life-saving stem cell research. Until we have conquered Parkinson's, our work is not complete.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for taking the time to come speak on this important issue; and I want to associate myself with his comments on stem cell research.

Stem cell research is an important part of understanding Parkinson's disease and eventually finding a cure. I look forward to working with the gentleman in the days and months and years to come to see that that promise is fulfilled. I thank the gentleman for taking the time to join us today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the State of Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL), one, for his vision, for his family, and for this very special legislation of the day to honor the authorization, the fourth anniversary of the authorization and passage of the Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research Act. This is an important anniversary.

Throughout our tenure in Congress there are ups and downs. What I consider an up is an opportunity to meet with my constituents from my district and all over the Nation. Some of the most eloquent and articulate persons

are those who are physically suffering from Parkinson's and others who come to collaborate on the importance of finding a cure and the ability to research this debilitating disease.

In the name of Morris K. Udall, this legislation passed an important milestone in striking a chord for finding out the reason that this disease has gotten such a grip on people around the world. This research or this research act has been funded and the legislation, of course, was passed through the leadership of Senator WELLSTONE in terms of adding an amendment and adding additional dollars. We now come to a time where it is necessary to reauthorize it.

Even more so during this stem cell research debate that I find the importance of this particular legislation which continually persists in attempting to find a cure by added research. It never allows to rest the continued theorizing and study of the importance of discovering new ways to attack this disease.

I am certainly disappointed that we are at a certain standstill in stem cell research. I would have wanted and do want the President to go further. I believe that he was well-intentioned but may be misadvised by those who would think that we had enough of the research elements that could do the vast massive research that needs to be done. This research act has shown that the broader, the better, the fuller, the better.

Let me congratulate the gentleman on the number of centers that already exist. We look forward to helping the funding expand, not frivolously, but so that centers could be expanded across the country. I would certainly welcome one in Houston, Texas.

Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman for, one, having the insight to be at the forefront of the reauthorization of this legislation. Let me also say that I would willingly join as an original co-sponsor of this legislation and offer to say to those who have been suffering from Parkinson's for time before and today and tomorrow that we will continue to fight until we can find a cure.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for her remarks and for her vision as well.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I would like to urge all of the Members of this body to join us in a bipartisan fashion when we introduce this legislation in the next couple of weeks to reauthorize the Udall Act.

I want to thank, in particular, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS), and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) for their support and hard work on behalf of all the people and all the families who suffer from Parkinson's disease. I know we will do the right thing in this body and reauthorize this very, very important act and we can all be proud

when we find the cure for Parkinson's sooner rather than later.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the fourth anniversary of the passage of the Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research Act. I cannot think of a more fitting tribute to my friend and colleague than this legislation.

Mo Udall was a member of the House Representatives for thirty years from 1961–1990. He earned the respect of all who served with him through his humor and civility as well as his ability to work with Members from both sides of the aisle. Mo's courage and determination to continue to serve even after being diagnosed with Parkinson's disease in 1978 was an inspiration for all who had the privilege to be around him during that time. He was determined to continue to lead a full and vigorous life even in the face of this debilitating disease. Although his death in 1998 was a blow to all of us, his legacy lives on in the great and important work started through this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, Parkinson's disease afflicts 1 million Americans, 40 percent of whom are under the age of 60. This landmark legislation dramatically expanded and coordinated clinical research into Parkinson's disease as well as established the Morris K. Udall Centers across the country. These centers have been an invaluable resource in the fight against Parkinson's disease. They have provided state-of-the-art training facilities for new researchers and the resulting work has greatly increased our knowledge and understanding of the disease.

We have an opportunity and an obligation today to rededicate ourselves to the goal of finding a cure for Parkinson's disease. Our initial investment into research four years ago has yielded impressive returns. Still, however, much more needs to be done. Mr. Speaker, I call on Congress to continue the valuable work we started four years ago and fully fund federal research into Parkinson's disease done by the National Institutes of Health and the Morris K. Udall Centers.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I commemorate today the anniversary of the Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Research Act, and I am pleased to be here among other champions of the cause from the Parkinson's Working Group here in the House.

Mo Udall was more than a colleague. He was a friend. We didn't always agree on politics, but we could always share a laugh. I remember flying him around on my plane in NM. And, I remember helping to pick up his papers when they fell to the ground in the Interior Committee.

But, this anniversary honors more than Mo Udall. It honors our commitment to helping science keep its promise. It has been more than fifteen years since America began to hear that a cure for Parkinson's was just around the corner, . . . perhaps just five years away. Yet it is not here yet. This Udall Act of 1997 was the first time we put the money where science's mouth was. Thanks to NIH, the U.S. Army, Udall Centers of Excellence, and private research carried on largely thanks to an outstanding advocacy community, we are still on target.

As this Anniversary hits . . . it also marks the sunset of the bill. Perhaps it is time we reauthorize it. Let us continue to help science keep its promise. Thank you.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, we are here today to honor the memory of one of our great former colleagues, the late Mo Udall, who served in this House for nearly three decades. Four years ago this week, Congress passed the Morris K. Udall Parkinson's Disease Research Act as a tribute to his service and the courage that he displayed in the face of his illness. Sadly, Mo lost his battle with Parkinson's Disease in 1998. But his memory lives on in this Congress and in the research labs across the country that bear his name.

I served with Mo Udall from 1983 to his retirement in 1990. During those years, I came to know and admire him as an effective legislator, a consummate humorist, and a dear friend. Mo always had a kind word and a joke for everyone. He brought a levity to this body that you wouldn't expect from someone fighting for his life. Ask anyone here who had the pleasure to serve with Mo and they will have a side splitting tale of the time that Mo brought the house down. Coupled with his good humor, was a commitment to serve this nation well. Despite his Parkinson's Disease, he served as chairman of the Interior Committee where he was a champion of preserving America's wilderness areas. I admired Mo then, but my esteem for him grew even greater when I was diagnosed with Parkinson's Disease in 1995.

Our purpose here is to commemorate the passage of the Udall Act, which brings much needed resources to the study of Parkinson's Disease. The time has come to reauthorize the bill. And today, we have the honor of being joined by Mo's son, Congressman MARK UDALL, who will lead the charge to see this program continued. We will be introducing the reauthorization bill in the coming month. I hope that all of our colleagues will join us in supporting that bill.

The 11 Morris K. Udall Centers are busy conducting research on every aspect of Parkinson's Disease. The scientists there are some of the best and the brightest in their field. They believe that a cure for Parkinson's Disease is on the horizon—that it could be discovered in as little as five years. These researching give me hope. They are out there everyday working to make my life and the lives of the one million Americans living with Parkinson's Disease better. And let me tell you—it's nice having these bright men and women on your side. I know they will find a cure, but they can't do it without our continued support.

These Udall Centers are just one component of a larger effort on the part of NIH to develop more effective treatments, enhance prevention efforts, and eventually find a cure for Parkinson's Disease. At the request of Congress, NIH developed a five year Parkinson's Disease Research Agenda to bring the nation closer to a cure. Last year, we funded the first year of that agenda. This year, we must fund the second year by increasing funding for Parkinson's Disease research by \$143 million. I am hopeful that the Appropriations Committee will follow through with what it started and honor Congress' commitment to the NIH Research Agenda.

These initiatives are the lifeblood of the Parkinson's community. The Udall Centers and the NIH funded research are leading the world in the path to a cure. I encourage my colleagues support these programs.

RACISM IN SOUTH AFRICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting as I had the opportunity to share with the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) on a very important legislative initiative, this comes to mind that a key word that everything we do in this country and this Congress is engage, engagement, to be engaged.

I would be remiss if I did not take this time to join my colleagues, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and as well the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON), to speak to a situation, a conference, a series of events that are going on in South Africa that I think have been sorely misrepresented and misinterpreted, that is, the historic World Conference on Racism, the first conference like this in the past 18 years.

Of course, the first conference was in 1979. The second conference was in 1983 where the focus was on apartheid in South Africa. Gratefully, that conference was successful. Those who have not yet visited South Africa can see a country, with the opportunity to visit it, that seeks reconciliation, a country that is diverse, that struggles every day to ensure that no matter what one's color is, there is a seat at the table of empowerment.

I was very proud to be a member of the United States delegation comprised of Members of Congress, particularly and, in addition, members of the Congressional Black Caucus, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), as well as members from the State Department.

What I was most disappointed in is that the country that is the greatest democracy that the world knows, the United States of America, founded in the Declaration of Independence, that declares that we all are created equal, had the misguided interpretation that the best role for them would be to disengage and not to be engaged. That meant that they did not send, did not allow Secretary Colin Powell to be a part of this world conference.

Mr. Speaker, I truly believe, having been intimately involved in the processes of this conference for a good number of days at the heart of the conference, that the leadership of the United States, the leadership of Secretary Powell, would have been immensely important in steering this conference to its rightful place in history. What is that place? The place of reconciliation.

After I returned to the United States, it pained me to see Catholic school girls running the gauntlet of attempting to get to their schools as Protestants stood by and chanted and jeered and cast aspersions, but more importantly, perpetrated violent acts.

This world is riveted by ethnic, religious, and racial divide. The conference

that we were at was not one to cast doubt, to cast accusations, but frankly it was to bring about resolution.

The bulk of the people there, unfortunately, not brought to the attention of the American people, but the bulk of the people there were of goodwill and good intentions. Clearly they wanted to seek to clear the air. Gypsies were there asking for the ability not to be discriminated against. The untouchables of India were there to ask not to be discriminated against. The countries of Africa that suffered so brutally in the trans-Atlantic slavery as well as colonization were there asking, not to accuse, but simply asking to create a better world.

Those of us from the United States who were descendants of slaves were there asking that we provide a sense of healing, how can we move our Nation away from the divisiveness of race. Yet there was another issue, the tragedy of the Mideast, the PLO, and the Israelis. But there was a misguide there, a misdirect, a misconnect, and there was an attempt to write hateful language that should not have been present.

On September 2, 2001, I stood in that conference and denounced that kind of language, that we should move away from hateful language accusing one nation of racism, Zionism is racism; and, frankly, we should be engaged in the Mideast process to bring about peace.

An issue separate and apart from the racism conference, truly an issue for the United Nations and the United States, be engaged in peace, but do not bring down a conference of reconciliation, a conference that should be healing, a conference that should bring us together around the question of race.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the media has not told the story, the stories of meeting with heads of states, diverse heads of states, the President of Latvia, an Eastern European country, who wanted to be part of solving the question of race.

Those stories, the Mexican delegation, the delegation from Israel, the Arabs who were interested in ensuring that the conference was successful.

I am here to tell the story and say apologetically that the United States missed its opportunity of leadership, missed its opportunity to use the bully pulpit to stand before the world, 169 countries, denounce Zionism as being racist, and talk about peace and reconciliation, talk about bringing us together and healing the racial divide and making a difference.

Mr. Speaker, this conference will be successful if the right people take charge, and I will continue to work for peace and reconciliation and ending the racial divide.

D.C. APPROPRIATION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor not to take the whole hour, but for a few minutes because the D.C. appropriation today passed in full committee under the chair of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH). This was a noteworthy subcommittee markup.

Mr. Speaker, the controversy often associated with the D.C. appropriation was not there today. The bill passed unanimously. One important reason for this, indeed the most important reason for the smooth way in which the bill transacted its way through the committee today was its chairman, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG). Like a laser beam, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) has been focused on the clear obligation of the chair of an appropriation subcommittee, and that is to get his bill to the floor as clean as he can get it so that it can get the necessary votes on the floor from both sides of the aisle.

I appreciate the way this bill was handled in subcommittee today, especially in contrast to when the District of Columbia appropriation finally got out of the House last year. It was in December, remember. The appropriation year ends September 30. My colleagues can imagine the hardship on our local jurisdiction that does not get its budget until almost Christmas. It was so late even when we got the bill itself out, that was sometime in November, it was held over in order to be the vehicle to carry other appropriations that had had difficulty getting out of committee.

So here we had the spectre of a local jurisdiction not being able to spend its own money while the bill was held hostage for Federal appropriations. It seems to me there is something in reverse order about that, that the smallest appropriation was being held to carry gigantic appropriations like HHS over.

I am deeply grateful that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) helped me get this bill out. I went to his office and described the hardship. I asked Mayor Tony Williams to help me describe it. With the help of the Speaker, we finally got our bill out in December.

What the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) has done is to take a first step toward avoiding any kind of train wreck of that kind for the District of Columbia.

□ 1730

Perhaps it will not happen because, if there are riders on our appropriation, get yourself ready for a fight. But if there are, they certainly will not be there because the chairman has been an enabler of such extraneous, irrelevant, undemocratic riders.

True to his word, the chairman himself respected local decision-making, and the way he did so was by announcing in advance shortly after he assumed the chairmanship that he did

not want any riders in his appropriation. I do not think I have heard that for a very long time; but when a chairman says that, I think you will get a lot of respect from Members of the House because he is announcing how he wants his own appropriation to be handled.

He went further. In the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) looked at a project we in the District and I here in the House and with Members of the Senate for a couple years now have been working on.

Since home rule, there have been riders willy-nilly put on the District of Columbia's appropriation that went to operations and went to finances. Many of these are redundant of Federal law. They are redundant of District law. They are so out of date some of them that if they were, in fact, to be acted on they could cause a catastrophe.

What happens is they kind of stay on. The White House, seeing them on, carries them over from year to year; and so there are attachments to the District's appropriation that I think will embarrass this House because they have nothing to do with today. They are ancient. It is as if they were written in the last century.

We thought that such riders could do real harm. Because they are there and until they are gone, you are supposed to do what they say.

The fact that they are redundant or out of date does not mean that you are not supposed to do what they say, and they really cause great confusion in the local community that tries to abide by what indeed the Congress has said.

We worked hard last year while Mr. Clinton was in office and this year as well to see whether we could get the White House to agree with us that certain riders were operational and financial riders were no longer applicable and then to work with the District to see they were no longer applicable.

We did, and to his credit a great many of these riders, 35 of them, have been removed by Chairman KNOLLENBERG.

I regret to say that there are controversial riders that, of course, remain on our appropriation. They have been there for eternity, through Democratic and Republican Houses and Presidents. They are the kind of riders that hundreds of jurisdictions in the United States of America do not regard as riders at all because they have decided that those are the kinds of things they do not want to do.

Then there are hundreds of jurisdictions that have decided they want to do precisely what the Congress has forbidden us to do, and the chairman of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), could not do anything about those; and we do not hold him accountable to those.

Those, of course, are riders of the most controversial kind in this House.

Riders, for example, under domestic partners that allow domestic partners in the District no matter what their sexual orientation. I guess most of them in the District would not be gay, but would allow a domestic partner to pay for the health benefits of his partner if the person worked for the District government with no cost to the District government.

Hundreds of jurisdictions allow that all across the United States. Many more private corporations allow it. It is a matter of when you consider the cost of health care, seems to me that anybody would want to help somebody get health insurance who wanted to pay for it and get on a group plan, particularly at a time when there are very serious consequences to not doing so.

There is one that this House rebels against that, again, all across the United States can be found. Members, I am sure, will vote against it. Live in places where this is done and, that is, riders allowing the local jurisdiction to pay for abortions for poor women out of its own funds.

Respecting the fact that this body has said you cannot pay for abortions out of Federal funds, you will not find a big city in the United States and many small towns which do not decide to pay for abortions out of their own local funds. Only with your Nation's capital does the Congress say no Federal and no local funds can be used, and they say so for these two items; and they have said so for other matters in the past.

Everybody who votes for it knows it is wrong. They know it flies in the face of Federalism, not to mention devolution. We will continue to fight those. We know that the chairman of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), was in no position to do anything about them; and the burden is on us to convince this body.

We accept that burden and we must find a way out of that dilemma so that we are treated in exactly the same way as every other jurisdiction in the United States.

I am a fourth generation Washingtonian. I can trace my American ancestry back to virtually the beginning of the 19th century. The fact that before slavery some of them believed they would find a better life in the District of Columbia and walked off the plantation should not mean that today the District of Columbia has fewer rights than any other local jurisdiction and that nobody in my family for four generations has had the same rights as every other Member of this body. I take it personally. And, of course, I take it as my obligation to do something about it for 600,000 people who live in the District of Columbia.

I want to also pay tribute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chair of the Committee on Appropriations. Every year the gentleman from Florida tries to help the District of Columbia get its appropriation out. Again

he is simply doing his duty as chairman. He wants to get his appropriations through. He has a well-known desire not to have riders cloud up his various subcommittee appropriations, and he does whatever he can to ward them off and to try to facilitate Members in getting their bills through.

I appreciate that the gentleman from Florida has met every year with our new Mayor, actually he is in his third year now, who has done so well in our city, Tony Williams, and tried to help us to design a way to get our appropriation in and out. It ought to be the fastest and the easiest of all 13 appropriations. It is not your money; it is ours. When it comes to the hard work the Members do here, and they do work very hard, you would think that coming to the D.C. appropriation would be a rest period for the Members of this body. Instead, it has tended to be among the most controversial when it affects nobody in this body. I want to say not only that Speaker HASTERT has been very helpful to this city in trying to move the appropriation but the gentleman from Florida has been very helpful as well.

Finally, I must say a word about the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH), who is the ranking member of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia. This is the first time that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has been on the Committee on Appropriations at all. He is so clever that he managed to get himself a chairmanship straight off because of the way the bidding is done. But what marvelous good fortune it is for the District of Columbia because the gentleman from Pennsylvania comes from a jurisdiction much like our own. He is the first big-city Member to serve in such a position on our committee since Julian Dixon, the much revered chair of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia for 14 years who died last year.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania not only comes from a similar jurisdiction just a few hundred miles up the East Coast, but he comes from a jurisdiction that has been through exactly what the District of Columbia went through about 5 years ago when it had to get a control board. So what we have is a ranking member who was the prime mover in getting a control board for the city of Philadelphia which sprang back as a result of it. Now the District of Columbia has sprung back as a result of both the work of the control board and of our Mayor and city council. We have a ranking member who has a deep understanding of big cities, their finances and their educational systems in particular.

What the gentleman from Pennsylvania brings to the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia is almost instinctive understanding of what should pertain here for this city, an instinctive empathy with residents who live and have to watch as the Congress of the United States doubles back over what its own Mayor and city council

have approved in their budget and sometimes in their laws.

And so, Mr. Speaker, thanks to the chairman and the ranking member and the cooperation of the full committee, I might add, the D.C. bill is on its way to full committee. I come to the floor this evening to ask that the full committee show this kind of respect for the independent jurisdiction that is your Nation's capital, the District of Columbia, that the chairman has shown; that we follow his lead and that out of committee come a bill that is at least as clean as the bill was when it was passed off today to the full committee.

Mr. Speaker, we have many miles to go before this session is over. I hope and pray we are not here as long as we were last year. But if we spend a lot of time ruminating about the District of Columbia, we may well be here. You have got yourself a Republican President now. I think he wants to sign bills and not veto them, although I must say unless you get this surplus matter figured out, you are likely to have a Republican President vetoing bills that came from a Republican House. In any case, I want us all to focus on getting out of here and getting these bills, which are already very late, done.

I think that the last thing that should make us tarry is a local jurisdiction unrelated to your own business and your own district. I ask that you respect the work of our chairman, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), allow a clean bill to come out of the full committee and then out of this House. And, of course, I ask you to respect the 600,000 people who live in the Nation's capital, who are second per capita in Federal income taxes and ask of you only that you let them spend their own money as they see fit.

COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF MEMBER OF THE HONORABLE JENNIFER DUNN, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) laid before the House the following communication from Shannon Flaherty, staff assistant to the Honorable JENNIFER DUNN, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
September 5, 2001.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington,
DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena for testimony issued by the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

SHANNON FLAHERTY,
Staff Assistant.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RUSH (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of a death in the family.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of personal business.

Mr. OXLEY (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of traveling with the President.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

The following Members (at the request of Mr. EVANS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. ISAKSON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. WOLF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. THUNE, for 5 minutes, today.

The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. BOSWELL, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. LEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATSON of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, September 10, 2001, at 12:30 p.m., for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3487. A letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Foreign Futures and Options Transactions—received August 15, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3488. A letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Treatment of Customer Funds—received August 15, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3489. A letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Com-

mission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Delegation of Authority to Disclose and Request Information—received August 15, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3490. A letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Fees for Reviews of the Rule Enforcement Programs of Contract Markets and Registered Futures Association—received August 15, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3491. A letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Recordkeeping Amendments to the Daily Computation of the Amount of Customer Funds Required To Be Segregated (RIN: 3038-AB52) received August 15, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3492. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Fludioxonil; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP-301161; FRL-6797-5] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received August 29, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3493. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Unregulated Contaminant Monitoring Regulation for Public Water Systems; Amendment to the List 2 Rule and Partial Delay of Reporting of Monitoring Results [FRL-7048-8] received August 29, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3494. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

3495. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

3496. A letter from the Adviser, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule—Exchange Visitor Program—received August 29, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

3497. A letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Privacy Act of 1974; Systems of Records; Biennial Publication—received August 15, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

3498. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Methods of Withdrawing Funds from the Thrift Savings Plan—received August 17, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

3499. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—2001-2002 Refuge-Specific Hunting and Sport Fishing Regulations (RIN: 1018-AG58) received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3500. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFIS, National

Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Fishery Management Plan for the Summer Flounder, Scup, and Black Sea Bass Fisheries; Recreational Measures for the 2001 Fisheries [Docket No. 010511122-1179-02; I.D. 031901C] (RIN: 0648-AN70) received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3501. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; Gulf of Alaska, southeast of Narrow Cape, Kodiak Island, AK [COTP Western Alaska-01-002] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3502. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; Maumee River, Rossford, Ohio [CGD09-01-111] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3503. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; Indian Summer Festival 2001, Milwaukee, Wisconsin [CGD09-01-110] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3504. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Security Zone; Arthur Kill, Staten Island, NY [CGD01-01-135] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3505. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Security Zone; Vicinity of Atlantic Fleet Weapons Training Facility, Vieques, PR and Adjacent Territorial Sea [CGD07-01-33] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3506. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class E airspace, Poplar, MT [Airspace Docket No. 00-ANM-22] received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3507. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Florida East Coast Railroad Bridge, St. Johns River, Jacksonville, FL [CGD07-01-052] received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3508. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operating Regulation; Mississippi River, Iowa and Illinois [CGD08-01-015] received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3509. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operating Regulation; Inner Harbor Navigation Canal, New Orleans, LA [CGD08-01-002] (RIN: 2115-AE47) received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5

U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3510. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operating Regulation; Ouachita River, LA [CGD08-01-007] (RIN: 2115-AE47) received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3511. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30264; Amdt. No. 2065] received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3512. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30265; Amdt. No. 2066] received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3513. A letter from the Associate Administrator for Aerospace Technology, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Patents and Other Intellectual Property Rights (RIN: 2700-AC48) received August 15, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

3514. A letter from the Associate Administrator for Aerospace Technology, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Boards and Committees (RIN: 2700-AC46) received August 15, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

3515. A letter from the Associate Administrator for Aerospace Technology, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Inventions and Contributions (RIN: 2700-AC47) received August 15, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

3516. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Branch, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Change in Flat Rate of Duty on Articles Imported for Personal or Household Use or as Bona Fide Gifts [T.D. 01-61] (RIN: 1515-AC90) received August 29, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3517. A letter from the Acting Director, Statutory Import Programs Staff, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Changes In the Insular Possessions Watch, Watch Movement and Jewelry Program [Docket No. 991228350-1118-02] (RIN: 0625-AA57) received September 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HANSEN: Committee on Resources. H.R. 434. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into a cooperative agreement to provide for retention, maintenance, and operation, at private expense, of the 18 concrete dams and weirs located within the

boundaries of the Emigrant Wilderness in the Stanislaus National Forest, California, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 107-201). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 2844. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to the participation of the public in governmental decisions regarding the location of group homes established pursuant to the program of block grants for the prevention and treatment of substance abuse; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 2845. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a monthly insurance benefit thereunder shall be paid for the month in which the recipient dies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAIRD (for himself and Mr.

RYAN of Wisconsin):

H.R. 2846. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide comparable unrelated business taxable income treatment to tax exempt organizations which hold interests in S corporations to the treatment as is provided to such organizations for interests held in partnerships; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOSWELL (for himself and Mr.

OSBORNE):

H.R. 2847. A bill to encourage the deployment of broadband telecommunications in rural America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BROWN of Florida:

H.R. 2848. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1601-1 Main Street in Jacksonville, Florida, as the "Eddie Mae Steward Post Office"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Ms. BROWN of Florida (for herself and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida):

H.R. 2849. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 440 South Orange Blossom Trail in Orlando, Florida, as the "Arthur 'Pappy' Kennedy Post Office"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. DEAL of Georgia:

H.R. 2850. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to eliminate the five-month waiting period in the disability insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 2851. A bill to provide for the use and distribution of the funds awarded to the Western Shoshone identifiable group under Indian Claims Commission Docket Numbers 326-A-1, 326-A-3, 326-K, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. HULSHOF:

H.R. 2852. A bill to reduce temporarily the duty on (3-(1-methylethyl)-1H-2,1,3-benzothiadiazin-4(3H)-one 2,2 dioxide; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULSHOF:

H.R. 2853. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 5-methylpyridine-2,3-dicarboxylic acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULSHOF:

H.R. 2854. A bill to reduce temporarily the duty on 5-methylpyridine-2,3-dicarboxylic

acid diethylester; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULSHOF:

H.R. 2855. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 5-ethylpyridine dicarboxylic acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULSHOF:

H.R. 2856. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on (E)-o(2,5-dimethylphenoxy methyl)-2-methoxyimino-N-methyl-phenylacetamide; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULSHOF:

H.R. 2857. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 2-chloro-N-(4-chlorobiphenyl-2-yl)nicotinamide; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULSHOF:

H.R. 2858. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 3-(3,5-dichlorophenyl)-5-ethenyl-5-methyl-2,4-oxazolidine-di-one; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULSHOF:

H.R. 2859. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on tetrahydro-3,5-dimethyl-2H-1,3,5-thiadiazine-2-thione; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULSHOF:

H.R. 2860. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Methyl N-(2[[1-(4-chloro-phenyl)-1H-pyrazol-3-yl]oxymethyl]-phenyl) N-methoxy carbamate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULSHOF:

H.R. 2861. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 3,7-dichloro-8-quinoline carboxylic acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KELLY (for herself and Mr. SWEENEY):

H.R. 2862. A bill to provide for reclassification of certain counties for purposes of reimbursement under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT (for himself and Mr. EVANS):

H.R. 2863. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish and maintain a panel to provide expert scientific recommendations in the field of cell development; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MINK of Hawaii:

H.R. 2864. A bill to provide for an educational center in Haleakala National Park in Hawaii; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. ROGERS of Michigan (for himself, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. TIBERI, Ms. HART, Mr. PENCE, Mr. PLATTS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. GRAVES):

H.R. 2865. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to require a sequestration of discretionary non-defense spending for fiscal year 2002 equal to the size of any on-budget deficit for fiscal year 2001; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Ms. SANCHEZ:

H.R. 2866. A bill to restore freedom of choice to women in the uniformed services serving outside the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PHELPS, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. ROSS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 2867. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to require the Administrator to submit certain disagreements to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget for resolution, and to establish a minimum period for the solicitation of offers for a bundled contract; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.J. Res. 60. A joint resolution honoring Maureen Reagan on the occasion of her death and expressing condolences to her family, including her husband Dennis Revell and her daughter Rita Revell; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HYDE (for himself, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEACH, Mr. FALCOMA, and Mr. ISSA):

H. Con. Res. 217. Concurrent resolution recognizing the historic significance of the fiftieth anniversary of the alliance between Australia and the United States under the ANZUS Treaty, paying tribute to the United States-Australia relationship, reaffirming the importance of economic and security cooperation between the United States and Australia, and welcoming the state visit by Australian Prime Minister John Howard; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota:

H. Con. Res. 218. Concurrent resolution honoring Robert Hautman for winning the 2001-2002 Federal Duck Stamp Contest; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SCHAFFER (for himself, Mr. BILLIRAKIS, Mr. WYNN, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CRANE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. HEFLEY, and Mr. UNDERWOOD):

H. Con. Res. 219. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding United States policy toward Taiwan's membership in international organizations; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. TANCREDO (for himself and Mr. GOODE):

H. Con. Res. 220. Concurrent resolution affirming the commitment of Congress to preserving the sovereignty of the United States and the integrity of its border; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEXLER (for himself, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. STUMP, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. WYNN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. WU, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. DEUTSCH):

H. Con. Res. 221. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that it is the policy of the United States that the future of Taiwan should be resolved peacefully through a democratic mechanism with the express consent of the people of Taiwan and free from outside threats, intimidation, or interference; to the Committee on International Relations.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 13: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California and Mr. VITTER.

H.R. 28: Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 117: Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 123: Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 162: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. WYNN, Mr. SIMMONS, and Mr. WU.

H.R. 168: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 220: Mr. WELDON of Florida.

H.R. 274: Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 281: Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 296: Mrs. CLAYTON.

H.R. 298: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 303: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 325: Mr. FILNER and Mr. BORSKI.

H.R. 458: Mr. WELDON of Florida.

H.R. 476: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 488: Mrs. ROUKEMA.

H.R. 504: Mr. BALDACCIO, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. STUPAK, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 537: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 570: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 580: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. STARK, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 597: Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 599: Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 600: Mr. JOHN.

H.R. 630: Mr. WALSH and Mr. WICKER.

H.R. 662: Mr. KERNS, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 677: Ms. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 702: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.

H.R. 744: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. WELLER.

H.R. 792: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 817: Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.

H.R. 822: Mr. HOLT, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 826: Mr. WELDON of Florida.

H.R. 827: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 840: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. BARRETT.

H.R. 876: Mr. DELAHUNT.

H.R. 902: Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 938: Mr. HILLIARD and Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 968: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 975: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 991: Ms. HART.

H.R. 1084: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1089: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. GREENWOOD, and Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 1143: Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 1161: Mr. LEACH and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 1170: Mr. MENENDEZ.

H.R. 1194: Ms. RIVERS.

H.R. 1201: Mr. MEEKS of New York and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 1202: Mrs. BONO, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. CRANE.

H.R. 1212: Mr. KELLER.

H.R. 1220: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1254: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 1305: Mr. JENKINS.

H.R. 1556: Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. PENCE, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. OSBORNE.

H.R. 1594: Mr. FRANK, Mr. McNULTY, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1597: Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 1604: Mr. COSTELLO and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 1624: Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. FILNER, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. CASTLE, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, and Mr. CALLAHAN.

H.R. 1700: Mr. MURTHA, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. STARK, Mr. GILMAN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. BISHOP, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. WEXLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. FALCOMA, and Mr. HOEFFEL.

H.R. 1711: Mr. NETHERCUTT.

H.R. 1717: Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 1731: Mr. WELLER, Mr. KERNS, and Mr. OTTER.

H.R. 1734: Mr. SAWYER.

H.R. 1750: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1751: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1766: Mr. FORBES.

- H.R. 1767: Mr. FORBES.
 H.R. 1779: Mr. WYNN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ROTHMAN, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 1784: Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. OLVER.
 H.R. 1795: Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. MATSUI, and Mr. COSTELLO.
 H.R. 1798: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. MCINTYRE.
 H.R. 1806: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
 H.R. 1810: Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, and Mr. WEINER.
 H.R. 1897: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 1950: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 1961: Mr. BRYANT, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. BOYD, and Mr. HOLDEN.
 H.R. 1968: Mrs. CLAYTON and Mr. MCINTYRE.
 H.R. 1979: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
 H.R. 1988: Mr. FROST.
 H.R. 1997: Mr. WALSH.
 H.R. 2022: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
 H.R. 2071: Ms. BALDWIN and Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.
 H.R. 2096: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.
 H.R. 2098: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
 H.R. 2125: Mr. FARR of California, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. ROSS, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Ms. LEE, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. COYNE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. McNULTY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. PASCRELL.
 H.R. 2138: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mrs. MORELLA.
 H.R. 2157: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.
 H.R. 2160: Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD.
 H.R. 2173: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. BALDACCI.
 H.R. 2200: Mr. LEACH, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 2211: Mr. TIERNEY.
 H.R. 2220: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. WELLER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. GORDON, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. ISAKSON, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
 H.R. 2227: Mr. EVERETT.
 H.R. 2269: Ms. DUNN, Mr. GREENWOOD, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. CLEMENT, and Mr. MATHESON.
 H.R. 2308: Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. GORDON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MASCARA, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. NETHERCUTT.
 H.R. 2316: Mr. OTTER, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. POMBO, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. LINDER, Mr. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. GRAVES, and Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota.
 H.R. 2322: Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.
 H.R. 2335: Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma and Mr. KLECZKA.
 H.R. 2338: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 2348: Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. WEINER.
 H.R. 2355: Mr. GILLMOR.
 H.R. 2375: Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CLEMENT, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MENDENDEZ, Mr. HONDA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MEHMAN, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. CASTLE, and Mr. ENGEL.
 H.R. 2383: Mr. DOOLEY of California.
 H.R. 2405: Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
 H.R. 2466: Mr. RILEY and Mr. WELLER.
 H.R. 2484: Mr. LAFALCE, Mrs. THURMAN, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MOORE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MEHMAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 2485: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 2507: Mr. FORBES.
 H.R. 2549: Mrs. CAPPS.
 H.R. 2550: Mr. PALLONE, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. CROWLEY.
 H.R. 2555: Mr. SCOTT, Mr. RUSH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. OWENS.
 H.R. 2578: Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. BONO, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HONDA, Ms. LEE, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. RADANOVICH, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. WATSON, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mrs. CAPPS.
 H.R. 2614: Mr. WEINER.
 H.R. 2615: Mr. KERNS, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. BARR of Georgia, and Ms. RIVERS.
 H.R. 2623: Mr. WALSH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FOSSELLA, and Mr. COYNE.
 H.R. 2629: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. OWENS.
 H.R. 2630: Mrs. MORELLA and Mr. ANDREWS.
 H.R. 2631: Mr. SCHAFFER and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.
 H.R. 2635: Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BACA, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. REYES, Mr. OWENS, Mr. STARK, and Mr. CROWLEY.
 H.R. 2640: Mr. FROST, Mr. McNULTY, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. OWENS.
 H.R. 2641: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 2662: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.
 H.R. 2663: Mr. HANSEN.
 H.R. 2667: Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota.
 H.R. 2675: Mr. CHABOT.
 H.R. 2709: Mr. WELLER.
 H.R. 2716: Mr. SIMPSON.
 H.R. 2725: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. WOLF, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. PHELPS, and Mrs. TAUSCHER.
 H.R. 2730: Mr. HYDE.
 H.R. 2747: Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. THURMAN, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 2750: Ms. MCKINNEY and Mr. HILLIARD.
 H.R. 2794: Mr. HERGER and Mr. MANZULLO.
 H.R. 2795: Mr. GOODE and Mr. GUTKNECHT.
 H.R. 2800: Mr. TANCREDO and Mr. DOOLITTLE.
 H.R. 2802: Mr. SESSIONS.
 H.R. 2805: Ms. HART, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. PENCE, Mr. SHOWS, and Mr. STEARNS.
 H.R. 2806: Mr. FROST.
 H.R. 2830: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FRANK, Mr. OWENS, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.
 H.R. 2833: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. DELAY, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. HYDE.
 H.R. 2836: Mr. KING.
 H.J. Res. 8: Mr. VISCLOSKEY.
 H. Con. Res. 20: Mr. OSBORNE.
 H. Con. Res. 23: Mr. WELDON of Florida and Mr. KERNS.
 H. Con. Res. 38: Mr. WALSH.
 H. Con. Res. 48: Mr. WELDON of Florida.
 H. Con. Res. 97: Mr. CLAY.
 H. Con. Res. 102: Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
 H. Con. Res. 104: Mr. EDWARDS.
 H. Con. Res. 164: Mr. BACA and Mr. LOBIONDO.
 H. Con. Res. 184: Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. PENCE, Mr. FORBES, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. BRADY of Texas, and Mr. WHITFIELD.
 H. Con. Res. 197: Mr. GRAVES, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. TERRY, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. ISAKSON.
 H. Con. Res. 206: Mr. TOOMEY and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
 H. Con. Res. 214: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. TANCREDO, Mrs. JOANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. SCHROCK, and Mr. CALVERT.
 H. Res. 230: Mr. SHAW and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H. Con. Res. 144: Mr. PICKERING.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2586

OFFERED BY: Mr. SCOTT

AMENDMENT NO. 1: At the end of title XXXV, add the following:

SEC. USE OF CONVEYED NDRF VESSELS.

Section 3603(a) of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105-261; 112 Stat. 2273) is amended by inserting "or as a bulk grain carrier" after "for use as an oiler".