

and file money through the process back to benefit Mr. Carey.

This independent financial auditor, what did we find out? We found out that he was not much more than a bookkeeper. Very qualified, but not empowered to do the kind of work that needed to be done. It only cost the rank and file Teamsters around \$60,000 a month, I believe.

What else do we know? What would we like to know? Have you heard reports that documents are being shredded at the IBT headquarters on a recent weekend? That was this past weekend. We have been informed that two IBT employees wearing green uniforms delivered an industry size shredder to the office of the IBT communications director, Matt Witt, during the week of July 13, 1998, and that the noise of the shredder operating in that office could be heard on Saturday, July 18, when Mr. Witt was in the building.

There is no corruption going on at the Teamsters. These people are acting in the best interest of the rank and file. They are acting in the best interest of the taxpayers since we have paid for this. Sorry. Wrong.

What did Mr. Edelstein say, the judge who has been watching these people for 9 years? He believes it is time for the good members of this union to rise up and revolt. Rather than aggressively going after and exercising our responsibilities, the minority says, no, let us not go too fast. This is a witch-hunt.

This is protecting the rank and file interest of the Teamsters. The nice thing about this investigation is that rank and file Teamsters are rising up in revolt, and they are sending us documents. They are sending us complaints because many of them believe that the only people who have been acting in their best interests is this subcommittee, because we have been focused on rank and file, and we are not focused on the people in the marble palace over here who are not a rightfully elected leadership, but who are all part of a failed leadership, and they are all part of a discredited election. We are not indebted to the people who write the political action committee checks out of that building to people in this building.

It is time for us to move forward. It is time for us to take a look at why all of this that has been put in place on the Teamsters, all this government intervention is not working the way that it should be.

Staff deposition authority, there are all kinds of protections built into the rules of our committee. The witnesses will be protected. They will be accompanied by counsel. The counsel will have the opportunity to review all transcripts. The minority will be advised 3 days before any staff depositions are taken.

This power is needed because, even though Mr. Severs came in and said I will do everything that I can to help move this investigation forward as quickly as possible, what does that mean that he does? It does not mean

that he voluntarily sends people to interview with our staff prior to a hearing.

He says, I will only let people come if it is in a formal hearing setting. No, I am not going to help you go through these piles of documents to find out where \$157 million went. I am not going to help you find out how we laundered a million dollars. As a matter of fact, he is not helping us. He is not even helping his own rank and file.

When we ask Mr. Severs, what investigation do you have going on? He said, I am not doing anything. Three people have plead guilty. His former bosses has been expelled from the union. This leadership is doing absolutely nothing. It is time for Congress to continue and let this committee move forward with its work.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.Res. 507. This resolution grants unprecedented powers to the House Education and Workforce Committee to take depositions behind closed doors, without a Member of Congress present. Prior to this Republican-led Congress, the power for Committee staff to take depositions in closed-door sessions was granted on only two occasions—to the Judiciary Committee for impeachment proceedings and to the nonpartisan Ethics Committee.

Today, however, the Republican leaders of this House want to continue their witch hunt regarding the Teamsters presidential election. The Republican leaders want to use their partisan advantage to stomp on the civil liberties of union-associated individuals. By giving the power to Republican staff members of the Education and Workforce Committee to take depositions behind closed doors, this resolution prevents Democrats from having any role in this investigation. Shamefully, the public is shut out completely.

The Republican leaders in this House claim that this resolution is need because the Teamsters Union has been uncooperative. The Teamsters have complied with Committee requests and have already produced more than 50,000 documents for the Committee to review. Further, the Teamsters have not refused a request to testify before the Committee. Why must depositions be taken behind closed doors by Republican staff? What do the Republicans have to hide?

This resolution represents a back-handed attempt to circumvent an open process of investigation. This entire investigation has been duplicative and wasteful. After more than 18 months, more than a million taxpayer dollars have been spent on this investigation—with little to show for the effort. How much longer must we continue this partisan charade? Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution.

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Speaker, I move the previous question on the amendment and the resolution.

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment recommended by the Committee on Rules.

The amendment was agreed to. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, further proceedings on this question are postponed until later today.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

DISAPPROVING EXTENSION OF WAIVER AUTHORITY WITH RESPECT TO VIETNAM

Mr. CRANE. Madam Speaker, pursuant to the previous order of the House of Wednesday, July 29, 1998, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 120) disapproving the extension of the waiver authority contained in section 402(c) of the Trade Act of 1974 with respect to Vietnam, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of House Joint Resolution 120 is as follows:

H.J. RES. 120

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress does not approve the extension of the authority contained in section 402(c) of the Trade Act of 1974 recommended by the President to Congress on June 3, 1998, with respect to Vietnam.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House on Wednesday, July 29, 1998, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) each will control 30 minutes.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CRANE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on House Joint Resolution 120.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRANE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield one-half of my time to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) in support of the resolution. I further ask that the gentleman from California be permitted to yield blocks of time.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that half of the time yielded to me be yielded further to the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI) and that he be permitted to yield blocks of time and that I would be permitted to yield blocks of time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

□ 1430

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 120 and in support of the extension of Vietnam's Jackson-Vanik waiver.

Since President Clinton lifted the trade embargo against Vietnam in 1994, the administration has taken steps to normalize U.S. trade relations with that country. This process is subject to the Jackson-Vanik amendment to the Trade Act of 1974, the provision of U.S. law which contains emigration criteria that must be met or waived by the President before a country subject to Jackson-Vanik can engage in normal trade relations, including normal tariff treatment, with the United States and gain access to U.S. trade financing programs.

Because Vietnam is not eligible for normal trade relations with the U.S., pending the completion and approval by Congress of a bilateral commercial agreement, the immediate effect of Vietnam's Jackson-Vanik waiver is quite limited. Specifically, the waiver only allows Vietnam to be reviewed for possible coverage by U.S. trade financing programs such as OPIC, Eximbank, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Vietnam is not automatically covered by these programs as a result of its waiver, and must still face separate individual reviews against each program's relevant criteria.

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

Madam Speaker, I would at this time insert in the RECORD a letter I received from 28 trade associations supporting Vietnam's Jackson-Vanik waiver as an important step in the ability of the business community to compete in the Vietnamese market which is the 12th most populous market in the world.

I would also insert in the RECORD a letter from our distinguished former colleague, Mr. Charlie Vanik. It is a letter that he sent to our current colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) in support of this waiver.

JULY 22, 1998.

Hon. PHILIP CRANE,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CRANE: The American business community supports pursuing a policy of economic normalization with Vietnam. We endorse the decision to grant Vietnam a waiver of the "Jackson-Vanik" amendment. The waiver gives American companies selling to Vietnam access to crucial U.S. export promotion programs and is an important first step to normalizing trade relations with Vietnam. We strongly oppose H.J. Res. 120, which would overturn the waiver. A vote on this legislation might come during the week of July 27.

Vietnam has met the requirements for a waiver. The Jackson-Vanik amendment is

meant to encourage a policy of free emigration in countries with nonmarket economies. Since the Administration normalized diplomatic relations with Hanoi in 1995, Vietnam has cleared for interview over 80 percent of all remaining applicants of the Resettlement Opportunity for Vietnamese Returnees agreement.

Pending legislation, H.J. Res. 120, would overturn the Jackson-Vanik waiver for Vietnam and deliver a serious setback to U.S.-Vietnam commercial relations. Without the waiver, American companies would be denied access to export promotion programs offered by the U.S. Export-Import Bank and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation. These programs are vital to meeting the challenges of doing business in Vietnam's emerging market.

Overturning the Jackson-Vanik waiver also would derail bilateral negotiations seeking commitments from Vietnam on market access, services, intellectual property and investment. The eventual agreement will bring Vietnamese law closer to international trade norms, thereby helping U.S. companies to tap the long-term potential of the Vietnamese market. If we fail to remain on the path of economic normalization, we risk ceding the potential of that market to competitors in Europe, Japan, and elsewhere in Asia.

Finally, overturning the Jackson-Vanik waiver for Vietnam would have important political implications. Vietnam has cooperated with efforts to search for American POWs and MIAs. Cooperation could be jeopardized if the House passes a disapproval resolution.

The American business community believes that a policy of economic normalization with Vietnam is in our national interest. We applaud the House Ways and Means Committee and Senate Finance Committee for reporting unfavorably disapproval resolutions regarding the Jackson-Vanik waiver for Vietnam. We urge you to support economic normalization with Vietnam by voting against H.J. Res. 120.

Sincerely,

Aerospace Industries Association.
American Chamber of Commerce, Hanoi.
American Chamber of Commerce, Ho Chi Minh City.
American Chamber of Commerce, Hong Kong.
American Farm Bureau.
Asia-Pacific Council of American Chambers of Commerce.
Association for Manufacturing Technology.
Chemical Manufacturers Association.
Coalition for Employment through Exports, Inc.
Electronic Industries Alliance.
Emergency Committee for American Trade.
Fertilizer Institute.
Footwear Distributors and Retailers of America.
International Energy Development Council.
International Mass Retail Association.
National Association of Manufacturers.
National Center for APEC.
National Foreign Trade Council.
National Oilseed Processors Association.
Pacific Basin Economic Council—U.S. Member Committee.
Securities Industry Association.
Telecommunications Industry Association.
U.S. Chamber of Commerce.
U.S. Council for International Business.
U.S. National Committee for Pacific Economic Cooperation.
U.S.-Vietnam Business Committee of the U.S.-ASEAN Business Council.
U.S.-Vietnam Trade Council.
USA*Engage.

Juniper, FL, July 28, 1998.

Hon. JAMES P. MORAN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR JIM: As one of the authors of the Jackson-Vanik provision of the 1974 Trade Act, I am writing to urge you to oppose the motion to disapprove trade credits for Vietnam (H.J. Res. 120).

The Jackson-Vanik provision was written with the intent of encouraging the Soviet Union to relax its restrictive emigration policy, particularly with Soviet Jewry. It specifically granted the President the power to waive restrictions on U.S. government credits or investment guarantees to communist countries if the waiver would help promote significant progress toward relaxing emigration controls. I am proud of the fact that the Jackson-Vanik provision was extremely helpful by encouraging the Soviet Union to relax its emigration policies and eventually helped open the door to improved economic relations with the Soviet Union.

In reviewing the current waiver that President Clinton granted Vietnam on June 3, I believe his actions are entirely consistent with the law. Vietnam has made significant progress on its commitments to resettle Vietnamese returnees and has consented to extend these more liberal emigration procedures to other refugee programs. I also believe the waiver will encourage the Government of Vietnam to continue to cooperate on locating U.S. servicemen missing in action, to become less isolated, and to follow the rule of law.

Sincerely,

CHARLES VANIK,
Former Member of Congress.

In the context of ongoing bilateral commercial agreement negotiations, Vietnam's Jackson-Vanik waiver puts the burden squarely on the Vietnamese to come forward with the market principles needed to conclude an agreement worthy of congressional approval and the extension of normal trade relations to Vietnam.

Terminating Vietnam's waiver will provide the Vietnamese with an excuse not to undertake further reforms and would reerect the barrier to the normalization of our bilateral trade relations.

I urge my colleagues not to take away our ability to pressure the Vietnamese for change and for progress on issues of importance to the U.S. I urge a "no" vote on H.J. Res. 120.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ), a leader in the efforts for freedom.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to lend my support to H.J. Res. 120, the resolution to disapprove the Jackson-Vanik waiver to Vietnam.

In March of this year, the government of Vietnam was granted a waiver from the Jackson-Vanik amendment. While this is a significant step towards the economic revitalization of Vietnam, the decision ignores basic human rights issues which still need to be resolved.

Madam Speaker, I have the privilege of representing one of the largest Vietnamese-American communities in the

United States right in Orange County, almost 300,000 people. They are the parents, the siblings and the offspring of families who fought communism for 2 decades, and the majority of my constituents feel that economic relations with Vietnam should not be established until specific emigration, political and human rights issues are addressed.

The Orange County Register, one of the newspapers in our area, conducted informal reader polls and found huge multiracial majorities opposed the immediate lifting of the waiver. During this past year, many of my constituents have also contacted my office directly. In this debate I am their voice.

Jackson-Vanik is about emigration, then trade. Normalize emigration; move towards normalizing trade. Waiving the Jackson-Vanik requirement for Vietnam on March 10 was a mistake. This decision only makes it harder for many Vietnamese to reunite with their families.

The simple truth is that the Vietnamese Government does not meet the conditions of free emigration. Authorities have denied United States officials access to the vast majority of returnees who are eligible to emigrate. In other words, the way it was changed was that, first, one had to get an exit permit in order to be interviewed by the United States to see if one could come to the United States, and now they have changed that. Now they have the exit permit at the back end. And what they do is provide a list to the United States about whom we may interview. And, of course, that list is very limited.

The only significant human rights concession recently made was this exit permit at the back end instead of the front end.

Although this looks like an important concession, the United States is still forbidden to interview anyone whose name is not on the list supplied by the Vietnamese Government.

And although some of my colleagues, and I have seen these letters going around, will lead you to believe that Vietnam has cleared for interview over 80 percent of all of the remaining ROVR applicants, the fact of the matter is, many of those applicants are not even on the list.

What they leave out is the fact that the same officials who were denying the exit permits to begin with are now in the position to keep people off of those lists. And according to a recent report to Congress, the State Department acknowledges that some 15,000 former United States Government employees and their families have not been issued those exit permits.

Besides the administrative roadblocks, pervasive corruption at all levels of the government in Vietnam creates additional obstacles for emigration. Let us say that one is on that list and one moves forward to an interview by the U.S. and the U.S. says, okay, come here, and then one has to get the exit permit; what happens? One of

those government officials says, it is going to cost you \$2,000 to get this permit. Well, in a country where the annual per capita income is approximately \$300 U.S. dollars, most Vietnamese wishing to emigrate cannot afford to pay such an amount.

Contrary to the Vietnamese Government's pretense, it is saying that it has no political or religious prisoners, but many Vietnamese continue to languish in prisons because of their political or religious beliefs.

Last September I, along with the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), chaired a human rights caucus briefing on Vietnam. We heard from representatives of the international organizations and from the Vietnamese American community leaders about what is going on in current social, political and economic conditions in Vietnam. And believe me, while we may not pay much attention to what is going on in Vietnam because we have so many other issues, the Vietnamese community in Orange County and across the United States does pay, day in and day out, attention to the details of what is going on in Vietnam. We learned that we must be concerned about Vietnam's poor human rights record and religious persecution.

Madam Speaker, I began by saying that this is about emigration, and that is what I believe we need to discuss today, but let us not lose sight of the fact that human rights and business interests are also denied in Vietnam. We have learned from that briefing that we had that all religious groups face great challenges in obtaining things in Vietnam. For example, basic religious materials. And we also learned in that congressional briefing that although the Vietnamese constitution prohibits discrimination based on gender, ethnicity, religion or social class, we find that women and children and ethnic minorities are often the victims of repression.

Reports show that the Hoa Hao Buddhist Church, for example, continues to be suppressed. All of their religious activities and ceremonies are prohibited. Assembly of more than 3 persons is forbidden, and all of the assets and properties have been confiscated.

In my district, the Hoa Hao Buddhist Church brought my attention to the case of Buddhist priest Nam Liem. Mr. Liem is a 58-year-old Buddhist priest who practiced religion at a small family temple in Vietnam, and since 1975, he has been arrested and detained by the Communist authorities over 50 times. Today, he has not been released from prison.

In addition, there are many pro-democracy activists, scholars, poets, et cetera, whose only crime it was to "injure the national unity."

Of course, we have an "Adopt A Voice of Conscience Campaign" here in Congress to show the attention to the human rights abuses, religious persecution, and social state of Vietnam.

Madam Speaker, I would end by saying please, today, do not surrender our

principal leverage with the Communist regime. Vote "yes" for free emigration, vote "yes" for family reunification, vote "yes" to end religious persecution. Vote "yes" to promote free speech and democracy. It is our honor at stake today as we honor the values which we are sworn to uphold.

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

I ask my colleagues to support this disapproval of a waiver of the Jackson-Vanik requirements of the 1974 Trade Act. What were the Jackson-Vanik requirements in that 1974 Trade Act? They clearly stated that we have concerns in this House dealing with human rights, things like freedom of religion and freedom of emigration, and this President of the United States, consistent with what he has done in many other cases around the world, has decided they do not count, they do not count at all. Those requirements that were laid down by former Congresses, much less our Founding Fathers, they do not count, because human rights does not count for this administration.

I would hope that my colleagues would today join us in affirming that human rights and those principles that our country stands for do count for something, and that we do not believe in just waiving them.

What are we waiving them for? The President is waiving the Jackson-Vanik requirements in order to extend American tax dollars, our tax dollars to subsidize or insure private corporations who want to do business in Vietnam, who want to make money by investing in a Communist dictatorship. This is a moral travesty, as well as bad business.

Six months ago when the President first issued this Jackson-Vanik waiver, we basically have been looking at what Vietnam has been doing since then. There has been no liberalization, no opening up of their political system. There has been no major release of political prisoners. Human rights and religious rights continue to be trampled upon by those who hold power in Vietnam.

But what about the business end of it? Just this week I received a briefing by the GAO on the Vietnamese economy. People are jumping out of Vietnam because it is so corrupt. They showed me, the GAO showed me a 1998 report by the United Nations Development Program that shows that both the U.N., the IMF, the World Bank, and our own State Department is convinced that Vietnam has a lack of integrity and transparency in their economic dealings, and so businesses are pulling out.

Is this a time for us then to waive the human rights requirements so that businesses can go in with U.S. taxpayer guarantees and invest in Communist Vietnam? This is exactly the wrong time. They are going in the wrong direction economically, and they have not taken a step forward in terms of politically and morally.

No, what we are going to be doing is spending tax dollars with this waiver to guarantee American businessmen to go in and use cheap slave labor under a dictatorship to manufacture goods to export to the United States to put our own people out of work. That is immoral, and it does not work politically, and it does not work economically, because we are going to lose that investment money and the taxpayers will have to make up for it unless, of course, those big businessmen make a profit with the slave labor and then they will take all of that profit for themselves at our expense.

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the gentleman's resolution not to give Most Favored Nation treatment to this Communist dictatorship.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) in support of denying this waiver.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to House Joint Resolution 120 and in support of continuing to normalize relations with Vietnam. This policy will promote American interests in receiving a greater accounting of our POWs, MIAs, promoting values of democracy and human rights, as well as helping American workers.

It is important to be clear about what extending Jackson-Vanik waivers will do and what it will not do. Today's vote is not about "for or against" normal trade relations for Vietnam; only when Vietnam concludes a bilateral agreement on trade approved by the Congress will it be eligible for normal trade relations.

□ 1445

Renewal of the waiver is the most recent step in the gradual normalization of the relationship with Vietnam in the postwar era.

I understand and appreciate the frustrations of the families seeking a greater accounting of POWs and MIAs by the Vietnamese government. We are all firmly committed to this goal. We will continue to make that clear to the Vietnamese government. However, the U.S. policy of incremental normalization has gone hand-in-hand with continued cooperation on this very, very important issue of accounting of POWs and MIAs.

Vietnam does in fact fall short of our standard of human rights and political and religious freedoms. However, their continued exposure to U.S. values on human and religious freedoms will promote progress in Vietnam on these objectives that we all share.

I disagree with those who argue that revocation of the waiver is an effective means to achieve further progress. Our former colleague and prisoner of war, Ambassador Pete Peterson, has noted that improvements in our relations have only been made since we have engaged the Vietnamese. In addition, many of my colleagues who have served in Vietnam support extending the waiver: Senator JOHN MCCAIN, Senator JOHN KERRY, Senator BOB KERREY, the gentleman from Illinois Mr. LANE EVANS, Representative JACK MURTHA, to name a few.

I urge a no vote on this resolution.

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

I would like to remind Members that they all received a letter from 17 of our colleagues, on a bipartisan basis, Vietnam vets, all in support of the waiver. I would urge them to make sure that they read it critically.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO).

Mr. MANZULLO. Madam Speaker, the Jackson-Vanik amendment to the 1974 Trade Act focuses on using various U.S. trade inducements to pressure non-market countries to allow freedom of emigration. It is not supposed to be a total referendum on that nation's internal policies, and it has nothing to do with MFN, and it has nothing to do with other human rights violations, other than the freedom to emigrate. That is what we are talking about today.

The practical effect of this waiver simply allows U.S. exporters to operate more efficiently in Vietnam. Our exporters face an uneven playing field when trying to sell to Vietnam. Foreign competitors have long had the support of their home governments, equivalents of the Eximbank, OPIC, TDA, and the USDA. Foreign countries have taken export opportunities away from Americans, simply because our foreign competitors obtained a government-subsidized rate for an export loan, or dangled a foreign aid incentive before certain Vietnamese government officials. Japan alone has an \$850 million developmental assistance package to induce countries like Vietnam to buy Japanese exports.

Finally, we got the message, and the President's waiver is making a difference, particularly on infrastructure projects. U.S. workers are now making products to sell to Vietnam. Vietnam prefers buying American products. The waiver does not lower any U.S. import duties on Vietnamese products. It is totally one-sided in our favor in terms of our balance of trade.

If this resolution passes, only U.S. workers will be hurt. Larger American companies may still win export deals in Vietnam, but they will use foreign subsidiaries and foreign workers to complete the contracts. That is, U.S. companies will use their foreign subsidiaries to sell to Vietnam, thus displacing American jobs.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I support House Joint Resolution 120, which would disapprove the waiver of Jackson-Vanik. I cannot say strongly enough that 1998 is not the time to extend normal trade relations to Vietnam, to waive our requirement for free emigration from Vietnam.

I believe that Vietnam and the United States will be able to trade with each other in the future, but not until Hanoi ends its human rights abuses, allows for truly free emigration, and establishes a fair and sound economic environment for American businesses. This is going to take time to achieve. This also will require the U.S. to refrain from extending normal trade relations status to Vietnam until Hanoi makes these corrections.

I am very concerned about the human rights abuses in Vietnam that my colleagues, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), have already spoken to. While paying lip service to religious freedom and individual liberty, the Communist government of Vietnam continues to persecute those who question the authority of the state, including those in the Buddhist church who stand not only for freedom, but also for freedom to worship.

On July 15 Vietnam imposed prison sentences of 10 months to 2 year on 10 members of a religious group for engaging in heretical propaganda because they believe in their religious beliefs.

The heart of Jackson-Vanik focuses on freedom of emigration. Vietnam continues to restrict the right of its citizens to emigrate. I cannot even begin to tell you how many cases my office deals with concerning families who are split because Vietnamese authorities will not allow the emigration of a family member.

Despite these problems, I believe that, given time, Vietnam can make changes. These changes really began with the reform movement in 1986. Vietnam achieved high economic growth of 8 percent a year with low inflation. As a result, the U.S. lifted economic sanctions in 1994 and normalized relations in 1995.

That was the wrong thing to do, because it has all been downhill since then. The economic growth did not produce democratic and market reforms, as we have seen in other countries like China, South Africa, Zimbabwe. In addition to quashing the religious, political, and social freedom of its citizens, and restricting their right to emigrate, Hanoi has taken giant steps backward from fostering sound policies and stability to bolster its economy and to attract foreign investors.

As the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) pointed out, there

has been a dramatic retraction of business from Vietnam because of these policies 40 percent contracted foreign investment decreased in the last year alone. U.S. exports to Vietnam plummeted from \$616 million in 1996 to \$286 million last year. As my hometown newspaper, the San Jose Mercury News, wrote, "The ruling Communist party has stalled further reform."

I am someone who believes in trade. I also believe that in specific cases, trade can be a useful tool to change behavior. I voted for normal trade relations between the United States and China. I believe that that has helped China to improve, and hopefully they will continue to improve.

All of us in this Chamber believe in human rights. Sometimes we have reasonable differences of opinion about what are the best tools in a particular case to achieve human rights. In this case, nothing could be clearer to me than using the tool of trade to improve human rights in Vietnam.

We used that tool effectively with South Africa. I am glad we did. It is very obvious to me that Vietnam is eager, for historical reasons as well as desperate economic reasons, to have a valuable trade relationship with the United States. Our history with Vietnam shows that they will collaborate with us in the effort for human rights if we just stand firm.

Now is the time for patience. While Vietnam has taken some steps toward improvement, it has very far to go as we can see from the Hanoi government's treatment of its own people. Vietnam has failed, it has flunked, in its effort to earn normal trade relations. I think it would be a dramatic mistake for our country, for the Vietnamese people, and for world peace, if we allow the waiver of Jackson-Vanik to move forward.

I strongly, strongly urge my colleagues to vote in favor of House Joint Resolution 120.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BEN GILMAN), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

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

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

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise in strong support of House Joint Resolution 120, introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), in disapproving the extension of the waiver, the Jackson-Vanik amendment. The issues here are progress on human rights, freedom of religion, and freedom of emigration.

Simply stated, the Vietnamese government has not demonstrated any significant progress on any of these issues. Many of us have voiced our objections to the rapid pace of normaliz-

ing relations with Vietnam. Yet, our President insists that waiving the Jackson-Vanik amendment and opening programs of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation and the Export-Import Bank to Vietnam is in our best national interest, and will encourage the Vietnamese government to cooperate on many issues, including economic reforms. However, OPIC guarantees and Export-Import Bank financing programs should be a reward for achievement, and not offered as any fanciful incentive based on a hope for the future.

Despite the opening of relations 3 years ago, prisoners of conscience are still in prison. Thousands of our former comrades in arms are still unaccounted for in Vietnam.

The recent highly respected State Department Human Rights Report on Vietnam states,

The government arbitrarily arrested and detained citizens, including detention for peaceful expression of political and religious objections to government policies. The Vietnamese government denied citizens the right to fair and expeditious trials, and still holds a number of political prisoners.

The consequence of the Jackson-Vanik waiver granted in March of this year by the President is that our taxpayers began paying for subsidies for U.S. trade and investment in Vietnam through the Export-Import Bank and Overseas Private Investment Corporation.

These programs were designed to overcome the risks for American companies operating in a corrupt, troubled business environment in Vietnam. Yet, the business climate in Vietnam is marked by limited market access, lack of transparency, unpredictability in business dealings, red tape, and corruption. Many firms are pulling out of Vietnam, and foreign direct investment was down 40 percent last year.

An example of the risk of doing business in Vietnam is that the Eximbank, which opened their programs to Vietnam in April of this year, has not approved any guarantees or loans or insurance since that date in Vietnam. Exim is offering a limited number of programs because of Vietnam's severe credit problems. OPIC has been open for a comparable period, and like Exim, has yet to approve any financing for any American investments in Vietnam.

So we ask, how has a waiver of important American laws served our interest, as promised by the President, who is determined to help U.S. business? Furthermore, will Jackson-Vanik improve the Vietnamese record on POW-MIA issues? In the several months since the waiver has been in place, it certainly has not.

So, in conclusion, a proposed extension of the waiver of Jackson-Vanik would reward a lack of progress on human rights, immigration, and economic reform, and the POW-MIA effort. Vote yes on this resolution of disapproval, and send a strong message that our Nation values principles over potential profits.

Mr. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BOUCHER), a leader in the area of religious freedom in Vietnam.

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

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the President's decision to extend the Jackson-Vanik waiver for Vietnam, and in strong opposition to the resolution of disapproval.

The Jackson-Vanik waiver process is designed to promote immigration from countries that do not have market economies. In the case of Vietnam, the waiver is clearly working as intended. Since the waiver was granted, Vietnam has made steady progress under both the ROVR and the Orderly Departure programs. If the waiver is rescinded through passage of this resolution of disapproval, that progress, which depends entirely on the cooperation of the Vietnamese government, will almost certainly be reversed.

I urge the defeat of this resolution, a step that will encourage greater cooperation by Vietnam in resolving our ongoing discussions on other issues of concern, including human rights and trade.

By the defeat of this resolution, we will also give a vote of confidence to the outstanding work of our ambassador in Vietnam and his very fine staff. I am pleased to urge defeat of this resolution.

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

Let me remind everyone, Mr. Speaker, that this waiver only allows that Vietnam be reviewed for possible coverage by U.S. trade financing programs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the waiver extension and in opposition of the resolution of disapproval.

□ 1500

I think that Thomas Jefferson was right on target when he said, "Two thinking men can be given the exact same set of facts and draw different conclusions."

Mr. Speaker, I obviously have the highest regard for the gentleman from Dallas, Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON), my very dear friend and a great hero, a former POW himself, as well as the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) and others who are supporting the resolution, and of course the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), chairman of the Committee on International Relations, and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON),

the chairman of my Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, when I think about the changes that all of us have observed over the past several years in Vietnam, they are incredible. I went in the early part of this decade and had the chance to see Negen Kotach, who was the Foreign Minister, present to me translated copies of Paul Samuelson's economic text. There are very bold moves being made towards a free market, and in fact we are making progress in the area of human rights.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of serving on the POW/MIA Task Force. In 1986, I went with the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) on my first trip to Vietnam. It was a very, very troubling experience for all of us.

But I have concluded that over this period of time, based on every shred of evidence that we have, we have seen a dramatic improvement in the cooperation of the Vietnamese Government with the United States in trying to resolve this issue.

So, I oppose the resolution of disapproval and support the extension of the Jackson-Vanick waiver.

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

Mr. MATSUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN).

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the Rohrabacher motion. I do so with great reluctance, because I have tremendous respect for many of the people leading the fight against this waiver. But Jackson-Vanick is about immigration.

Anyone who has studied the statistics, because I know there are many anecdotal stories and there are many problems remaining, but anyone who has studied the statistics knows that in the last year there has been a dramatic reversal and a massive improvement in the Vietnamese Government's cooperation with us on processing refugees, people who were shipped back from the camps in Thailand, in Hong Kong, in Indonesia, to Vietnam against their will. Mr. Speaker, 15,000 interviews have been granted already; 82 percent of the people we are interviewing have been cleared for coming to the United States or other countries that they intend to go to.

The criteria for interviews is far more liberal than the traditional refugee definition. We cannot turn down and thereby risk the retrenchment of this program, and I urge a "no" vote on the resolution.

I urge a "no" vote against H.J. Res. 120. Vietnam is cooperating on the key issue behind granting this waiver: Jackson-Vanick.

Mr. Smith and I fought long and hard with the administration to get them to implement a Resettlement Opportunity for Vietnamese Returnees (ROVR) program. This involved Vietnamese boat people who were forced back to Vietnam after ending the program of keeping them in camps abroad. After we got the ad-

ministration to go along with it, we pressed them hard to get the Vietnamese to ensure their cooperation. And they have been successful.

So successful is the program that there are now 343 cases, involving 601 people, who have not left because, after receiving clearance from the Vietnamese Government and after having been interviewed by the INS, they have decided suddenly to get married and bring their spouses and other relatives over.

We have submitted over 19,000 names to the Vietnamese. They have cleared for interview 15,572. 991 have not been cleared, mainly because we gave the Vietnamese the wrong address. Of these, 36 have not been cleared because of criminal charges. We have put 713 on medical hold and excluded 23 for medical reasons.

This is a great achievement. Over 5,000 people have already left for the United States. More are coming and the administration is optimistic that it will have completed the program by the year's end.

This is what the Jackson-Vanik requirement is all about and Vietnam has met that requirement. Sure there has been some pushing and pulling but Vietnam has made major and significant steps to ensure the program works even though we allowed more liberal definitions of eligibility than we had applied for other immigrant applicants.

We want to encourage more openness by Vietnam generally. The success of this program and the joint accounting for POW/MIA demonstrates that we can work with Vietnam to our mutual interest.

Vote "no" on H.J. Res. 120.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), chairman of the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights of the Committee on International Relations, who is respected throughout this body for his commitment to human rights.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), my good friend, for yielding me this time and for his excellent work on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, let me just make it very clear what this vote is about. It is about U.S. taxpayer subsidies for one of the worst dictatorships in the world. Let us be clear on another thing. There is no freedom of immigration from Vietnam. If there were, there would be no need for this waiver. The administration could simply certify that Vietnam complies with the Jackson-Vanik Freedom of Information requirement. Instead, by waiving the requirement, the administration has conceded that there is no such freedom.

Yes, the government allows some people to leave when it is good and ready. But for the many thousands who have been persecuted because they were on our side during the Vietnam war, Vietnam is still a prison.

I hope my colleagues understand that this is not a vote about free trade. It is about subsidies; corporate welfare for Communists. Since the President gave the waiver in March, the U.S. taxpayer

has been paying for Eximbank and OPIC subsidies of trade and investment in Vietnam. Many of these taxpayer dollars subsidize ventures owned in large part by the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam. Over-regulation and widespread corruption make Vietnam a terrible place to do business.

Mr. Speaker, let me also remind Members, I was the prime sponsor of the amendment back in 1995. We had a hot debate, because we were sending people back who were real refugees. Yes, there has been some progress on ROVR. But we find that it slows to a trickle, to nothingness, when they decide to turn off the spigot. We should not be intimidated by that kind of opening and closing of the gates for the ROVR program.

Let me also say that in Vietnam, human rights violations are many. Catholic priests, Buddhists, are arrested and imprisoned. Vietnam enforces a two-child-per-couple policy by depriving parents of unauthorized children of employment and other government benefits. It denies workers the right to organize independent trade unions and has subjected many to forced labor.

The government not only denies freedom of the press, but also systematically jams Radio Free Asia which tries to bring them the kind of broadcasting they would provide for themselves if their government would allow them free expression.

Many organizations support the Rohrabacher resolution: the American Legion, the veterans groups. I urge my colleagues to please vote for it.

So we should disapprove the Jackson-Vanick waiver at least until the government allows all the ROVR-eligible refugees to leave. And we should also stand up for the people who never left Viet Nam and are still trapped there, including long-term reeducation camp survivors and former U.S. government employees. Many of these people are members of the Montagnard ethnic minority who fought valiantly for the U.S. and have suffered greatly ever since. As of a few weeks ago, only 4 Montagnard applicants—out of over 800 we believe to be eligible for U.S. refugee programs—have been cleared for refugee interviews.

Finally, we must not forget the prisoners of conscience. Hanoi imprisons Catholic priests, Buddhist monks, pro-democracy activists, scholars, and poets. When we complain to the Vietnamese government, they just respond that "we have a different system." They need to be persuaded that a system like this is not one that Americans will subsidize.

In Vietnam human rights violations are many. Hanoi arrests and imprisons Catholic priests and Buddhist monks. Vietnam enforces a "two-child per couple" policy by depriving the parents of "unauthorized" children of employment and other government benefits. It denies workers the right to organize independent trade unions, and has subjected many to forced labor. The government not only denies freedom of the press, but also systematically jams Radio Free Asia, which tries to bring

them the kind of broadcasting they would provide for themselves if their government would allow freedom of expression.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) has 8½ minutes remaining; the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) has 3 minutes remaining; the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) has 6½ minutes remaining; and the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI) has 11½ minutes remaining.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, at times the United States has been involved in Nation-building with our dollars. These are handouts. These are Communists.

Every Vietnam group that helped American troops while they were over there dying for peace, they have repressed every Vietnam group that was supportive of our troops.

I support the resolution. We just had a strike settled where General Motors workers won an agreement that they would not sell a couple of their plants by the year 2000. They are desperately fighting for jobs. The Congress of the United States and all our well-meaning, politically correct economic strategies is shipping jobs all over the world and is patting Communists on the back. I want no part of it.

Mr. Speaker, I support the resolution. I think we are rewarding Communists that screwed our soldiers and screwed their own people who tried to help our men who were protecting their buns.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support the resolution. I ask Congress to approve it.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) who served as a prisoner of war in Vietnam and knows that they are not cooperating on the MIA/POW issue, just to back up what the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) just stated.

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is not about Vietnam. It is about honoring and respecting the over 58,000 American soldiers who gave their lives battling communism so we could remain free. It is about our soldiers who still remain missing in action. It is about keeping the hope alive for the families who still wake up every morning asking the same question: What happened to my child, my husband, my brother, my father?

I have seen how this Communist government conducts business. I have personally experienced their threats, their lies, and their so-called promises. My distrust lies with the Vietnamese Government.

To those Members of Congress and to the administration who believe that opening up the Vietnam markets will bring closure to this chapter in history, they are wrong. I listened to their propaganda that America had betrayed us, left us to die. I knew they were wrong.

As a member of the U.S.-Russia Joint Commission on POW/MIAs, we have been negotiating for the last 5 years to get a full accounting of our missing. I can tell my colleagues that the Government of Vietnam continually refuses to cooperate.

My only request is let us stop the suffering of the parents, the children, the relatives, those who do not know the fate of their brave loved ones. Let us stand up to the Vietnam Government today and say: Give us information on our missing who died.

America demands to know what happened to our servicemen and women, the soldiers who died for this Nation to keep it free.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific of the Committee on International Relations.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support for extension of the waiver and in opposition to the resolution.

In the mid-1960s, I was an infantry officer and intelligence officer with the First Infantry Division. I completed my service, but within a month the members of my tight-knit unit were in Vietnam and taking casualties the first night. I have emotional baggage, we all have emotional baggage in this country, but I would suggest it is time to get on and not reverse course on Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) who just spoke, but I bring to the attention of the Members what we know already. Another former POW, our former colleague Pete Peterson, tells us about the dramatic progress now being made, with the Vietnamese help, in remains recovery under some very difficult and dangerous and treacherous conditions. And in fact, of course, another POW, JOHN MCCAIN, has also, along with others who served in Vietnam, supported a waiver in this instance.

But after all, this issue is about emigration. That is what Jackson-Vanik is about. So, we ought to address the issue before us.

Under the statute, a waiver of the Jackson-Vanik amendment may be granted if it will substantially promote

freedom of migration. Vietnam's record on emigration has improved dramatically in the last 10 to 12 years. Over 480,000 Vietnamese have emigrated to the United States under the Orderly Departure Program. And, despite some unwise things done in this House just a year or so ago, only about 6,900 ODP applicants remain to be processed.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear to this Member that in the case of Vietnam, the Jackson-Vanik amendment is working. Last October, Vietnam eliminated the requirement for applicants to obtain exit permits prior to interviews for the Resettlement Opportunity for Vietnamese Returnees, ROVR, greatly facilitating the implementation of ROVR.

Subsequently, as the waiver came up for renewal, Vietnam modified its procedures for handling the ODP cases of Montagnards and former reeducation camp detainees to conform with the ROVR procedures. The prospect of the initial waiver and later its renewal almost certainly factored in Vietnam's decision to liberalize procedures under the Orderly Departure Program and ROVR. The yearly renewal of the waiver will maintain incentives for progress toward free emigration.

Vietnam remains a difficult place for American firms to do business. That is sure. But we ought to extend the Jackson-Vanik waiver not to benefit the Government of Vietnam or its people, but for the benefit of the American people. The waiver should lead to increased U.S. exports and to have a greater impact on the way the Vietnamese regard human rights and democracy.

As Chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, this Member would suggest that now is not the time to reverse course on Vietnam. Since establishing relations three years ago, Vietnam has increasingly cooperated with the United States on a range of issues. The most important of these is, I am informed, dramatic progress and cooperation in obtaining the fullest possible accounting of Americans missing from the Vietnam War. Those Members who attended the briefing by the distinguished Ambassador to Vietnam, a former Prisoner of War and former Member of this body, the Honorable Pete Peterson, learned of the great efforts to which Vietnam is now extending to address our concerns regarding the POW/MIA issue, including their participation in physically very dangerous remains recovery efforts.

Moreover, the Government of Vietnam is proving to be cooperative on the issue of emigration—which, as Members of this body must know, is actually the issue that Jackson-Vanik addresses.

This Member would not want to permit the impression to exist among any of his colleagues that support of the Jackson-Vanik waiver is an endorsement of the Communist regime in Hanoi. We cannot approve of a regime that places restrictions on basic freedoms, including the right to organize political parties, freedom of speech, and freedom of religion.

But even in this problematic area, engagement is producing results. The American presence in Vietnam exposes Vietnamese to American ideals and principles. Vietnamese visitors to the United States including official delegations, students and businessmen, learn about the American way of life. We can expect that over time these contacts, along with access to international media and telecommunications, will have a beneficial effect on Vietnamese attitudes. Greater prosperity will lead to increased demand for responsiveness from the government, an important first step on the road to democracy.

Vietnam remains a difficult place for American firms to do business. This Member is particularly concerned about the level of corruption that has been tolerated by Hanoi. A bilateral trade agreement is under negotiation that will improve Vietnam's trade and investment environment to benefit and protect American business. Rejection of the waiver would undermine the trade negotiations and remove any incentive for Vietnam to meet United States requirements. Extending the waiver will encourage economic reforms and maintain American firms' access to the trade promotion and investment support programs of the Export-Import Bank, OPIC and USDA, enabling the firms to compete with foreign businesses that receive benefits from their own governments.

The Jackson-Vanik waiver does not give MFN to Vietnam. MFN can be considered only following the waiver and the approval by Congress of a completed bilateral trade agreement.

We should extend the Jackson-Vanik waiver, not to benefit Vietnam's Government or people, but for the benefit of the American people. The waiver should lead to increased United States exports to and investment in Vietnam, which, in turn, will lead to more jobs for American workers. Continued engagement with Vietnam is the way to promote the democratic values we uphold. Approval of the waiver will encourage Vietnam's further integration into regional organizations and world markets. This integration is a positive force for regional stability.

I urge rejection of the resolution.

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

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

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of extension of the Jackson-Vanik waiver for Vietnam and in opposition to House Joint Resolution 120.

This resolution would deny my community and others like it the opportunity to continue its humanitarian efforts with the Vietnamese people to promote emigration. UPLIFT International, Heart to Heart, the Westmoreland Scholar Foundation have made generous contributions to those in need.

One of the recipients of the Westmoreland Scholar Foundation, Joyce Nguyen, is an intern in my district office. As a Student Ambassador from Rockhurst College, she traveled to Da Nang to assess the needs of the doctors and staff. She is a first generation

American whose parents fled Vietnam after the war. Joyce learned of her cultural background and shared her American heritage with the doctors and the students that she taught English to. Her work in Vietnam allowed her to make permanent life friends and retrace the history of her ancestors.

I see many positive advantages at the local and national level for free emigration and social development. As the next millennium approaches, we should be concerned with forming a lasting friendship with Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.J. Res. 120.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the extension of the Jackson-Vanik waiver for Vietnam, and in opposition to House Joint Resolution 120. It is true that our relationship with Vietnam has been marked with sorrowful memories. Unfortunately, when the word Vietnam is spoken, it conjures up haunting images of war and not of the beautiful and culturally rich country that it is today. In 1994, the Clinton Administration lifted the U.S. Trade Embargo which allowed U.S. firms to enter Vietnam's economy and compete in the international community. This action has led to Vietnam being part of the ASEAN organization, a qualification which show promising potential for the country to be a significant trade partner with the U.S. Our goal is to forge a new relationship for both nations, so that we can both benefit from a friendship dedicated to healing and reconciliation.

Trade is important to America. More importantly, trade relations are important to the Fifth District of Missouri. Currently, Vietnam has a crumbling infrastructure, a shortage of medicine, and limited technology. Companies like Black and Veatch, Hoechst Marion Roussel (HMR), Butler Manufacturing, Burlington Air Express, and countless other companies have business ventures with the Vietnamese which are vital to my district.

Black and Veatch, an engineering firm, headquartered in Kansas City, Missouri is performing a \$2.4 million project for the people of Vietnam. Black & Veatch is an 80 year old corporation which employs 2,500 engineers and architects in the Kansas City area and over 7,000 working professionals in over 90 offices worldwide. Black and Veatch was the first engineering company to set up an office in Vietnam and is currently upgrading water treatment plants in seven towns. HMR has a subsidiary in Vietnam which markets the drugs it makes here in the United States to the people of Vietnam. About 2,000 of my constituents work at HMR World Headquarters, an established pharmaceutical company which manufacturers and markets medicine you can find in your local drugstores and across the world. Another company, Butler Manufacturing and its 5,100 employees rely upon the economic ties established in Ho Chi Minh City to deliver preengineered metal buildings and structural frames.

In Missouri, corporations are looking overseas for opportunities to sell American goods and services. Proctor and Gamble, United Airlines, Ford Motor Company, Goodyear, Pfizer International, Harley Davidson, Caterpillar, and Lucent Technologies are just a handful of companies employing thousands of Missourians who have operations and ongoing projects with Vietnam.

This resolution would deny my community the opportunity to continue its humanitarian efforts with the Vietnamese people. UPLIFT International, Heart to Heart, and the Westmoreland Scholar Foundation have made generous contributions to those in need. Corporate sponsors like Black and Veatch, Hoechst Marion Roussel, Federal Express, and Boeing have helped establish trust, and placed people before profit. What began in 1995 as a Heart to Heart airlift to supply 46 tons of medical supplies has led to additional efforts to supply the Vietnamese people with undertakings like UPLIFT's Project HOPE to ensure tuberculosis education and prevention. Under the direction and vision of Mike Meyer, UPLIFT has gained much corporate sponsorship as well as the trust of the Vietnamese government. When Typhoon Linda struck the Vietnamese coastline, Mr. Meyer was specifically asked by the Vietnamese government to help out and quickly found a way to provide the supplies needed.

The Westmoreland Scholar Foundation, named in honor of General and Mrs. William C. Westmoreland, is a non-political, non-profit educational foundation established for the purpose of educating those young people who can best contribute to reconciliation and harmony between the people of the United States of America and the people of Vietnam.

One of the recipients of the Westmoreland Scholar Foundation, Joyce Nguyen, is an intern in my District Office. As a Student Ambassador, from Rockhurst College in Kansas City, Missouri, she traveled to Da Nang, Vietnam with the intent to assess the needs of the doctors and staff. She and a fellow Rockhurst student, Son Do (sun doe) traveled to Da Nang and are both first generation Americans whose parents fled from Vietnam after the war. This was a unique experience for them to witness their parent's homeland and to communicate what the hospital lacked in essential equipment and medicines for its patients to UPLIFT International. With the support of Vietnam veterans like Ret. Col. Roger H. Donlon, the first soldier to receive a Congressional Medal of Honor in Vietnam, his wife Norma, and many community members, Joyce learned of her cultural background and shared her American heritage with the doctors and students as she taught them English. Her work in Vietnam allowed her to make permanent life friends and retrace this history of her ancestors.

The Westmoreland Scholar Foundation has Vietnamese American students enrolled in many colleges throughout the United States including Rockhurst College in my district. This program is meant to build bridges between both American and Vietnamese cultures. It ensures opportunities for students active in the Vietnamese-American communities for study and humanitarian services in Vietnam and for the exchange of Vietnamese students to study in the United States. This organization is dedicated to friendship with our Vietnamese allies, and the opportunity to gain the respect of our former Vietnamese adversaries in the tradition of patriotism, service, and leadership demonstrated by the lives of the Westmorelands.

I see many positive advantages at the local and national levels for free immigration and social development. As the next millennium approaches, we should be concerned with forming a lasting relationship with countries like Vietnam. I urge my colleagues to vote no on House Joint Resolution 120.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), a distinguished Member who has been very active in the area of trade.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I disagree with the proponents on the narrow terms of the waiver. But more importantly, I feel that they are also wrong on the big picture.

This very day, my daughter, a college-age young woman, is in Vietnam going anywhere she wishes, marveling at the friendliness of the people, over 60 percent of whom are under 25 years of age with no connection to the war, other than to live with its horrible consequences.

□ 1515

They are looking to America for a new relationship. This decision today is about whether we on this floor can exemplify the spirit of our late colleague, Walter Capps, about learning and reconciliation. It is about equipping our friend, Pete Peterson, in his mission as Ambassador to move the relationship between these two countries into the future in the spirit of healing and rehabilitation.

And most important, this debate is to assure that we, as Congress, can learn from this experience so that our children, their children and grandchildren will not be trapped by the web that so ensnared three generations of Americans.

Please, reject the resolution.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), the father of Radio Free Europe.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, this is not a debate about trade or investment. American companies, I think we all know, are free to trade with and invest in Vietnam. We all wish them well in that. This resolution does nothing to change that.

What this resolution does is to say, now is not the time to send in government agencies, OPIC and the Ex-Im Bank, which is the practical effect of this waiver, and give us more leverage to fight for the many interests we have in Vietnam.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. Since we began normalizing relations with Vietnam, we have extended more and more to the Vietnamese government. As of today, we have given it recognition. We have opened an embassy in Hanoi. We have sent an ambassador to work out the many real interests we have in Vietnam. Today we are looking at letting a Jackson-Vanik waiver to go by and opening the door for OPIC and Ex-Im Bank funding, a subsidy to Vietnam. These gradual changes in our policy I thought were to be done with a sense of expectation of the Vietnamese government. My understanding was that this was supposed to be a two-way street.

Since we began normalizing relations with Vietnam, we have extended more and more to the Vietnamese government. As of today, we've given it recognition, opened an embassy in Hanoi, and sent an ambassador to work on the many real interests we have in Vietnam, including the POW/MIA issue. Today we're looking at letting a Jackson-Vanik waiver go by and opening the door for OPIC and Ex-Im Bank funding in Vietnam.

These gradual changes in our policy. I thought, were to be done with a sense of expectation of the Vietnamese government. My understanding was that this process was supposed to be a two-way street.

I also thought we were going to bring a healthy dose of skepticism to the table. We were going to be skeptical, not because of any bitterness over our past in Vietnam, but because we understood the type of government we're dealing with: in simple terms, one of the world's most politically and economically repressive regimes.

This is the reality we must deal with in asking whether progress has been made on the issues we care about and also whether it's likely that progress will be made if we give up one more lever of influence we have over the Vietnamese government: American taxpayer subsidized trade benefits. And we should all realize that the Vietnamese government very much wants this waiver. This is real leverage. So, why give it up without human rights progress from Vietnam.

And why should U.S. taxpayers support these subsidized U.S. businesses in Vietnam, one of the least open, most state-controlled economies in the world. This economy lacks property rights and suffers from corruption. Patent piracy is a problem. Not surprisingly, the first American corporation licensed to operate in Vietnam (Vatico, Inc.) closed shop and left the country earlier this summer. So let's send in OPIC and Ex-Im to aid U.S. businesses, and even Vietnamese government-controlled businesses in partnership with American firms?

This reminds me of another issue before this Congress: funding for the International Monetary Fund. There is debate over whether IMF funding, U.S. taxpayer-supported funding, can be effective in bringing about economic reform in aided countries. Many suggest that IMF support prolongs reform by propping up bad government policies. That's what happened in Indonesia. You know at least the subsidized IMF asks for change. With OPIC and Ex-Im Bank we will support businesses with only the hope that the Vietnamese government will change its policies. This is the type of wishful government-funded engagement we're considering. [By the way, the IMF has canceled loans to Vietnam.]

We've heard today that political and religious repression is pervasive in Vietnam. So it's not surprising that the Vietnamese government is jamming Radio Free Asia. Hanoi has done this almost from the beginning of RFA's Vietnamese broadcasting. Radio Free Asia is intended to provide Vietnamese with the range of information we believe will help them build democracy and free-market driven prosperity. The Vietnamese government wants none of this.

Let's remember the reaction many of us in this body had last month when Beijing denied Radio Free Asia reporters the right to travel with President Clinton to China. Many of us

condemned that. Some of us thought President Clinton should have taken a stronger stand on this fundamental issue. Yet here we have Hanoi attacking the free press, RFA, in even more direct terms. What's our response: send in OPIC and the Ex-Im Bank!

Thank you Madam Speaker. This is not a debate about trade or investment. American companies are free to trade with and invest in Vietnam. We wish them well. This Resolution does nothing to change that. What this Resolution does do is to say now is not the time to send in government agencies, OPIC and the Ex-Im Bank, which is the practical affect of this waiver, and give up more leverage to fight for the many interests we have in Vietnam. I urge my colleagues to support this Resolution.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO).

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution.

It is the actions of the 1980s and 1990s that are moving this country to a lower common denominator concerning basic human rights and disregard for the fundamental values that should serve as the core of our foreign and economic policies. We cannot change nor should we seek to change the outcome of military events in Southeast Asia 3 decades ago. But the United States can, through existing law and policy, assert foreign economic policies that provide for improvement and democratization of this part of the world, including Vietnam.

The fact is, we cannot keep spending the same dollar over and over again, talking about progress towards, while the fundamental tenets of Jackson-Vanik are not being met, much less basic human rights in this country. The fact is, we need to assert our influence now at this time to achieve that for those people in Southeast Asia that are still being ill-treated and not provided the opportunities that they merit much less any freedoms required by Jackson-Vanik.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members of this body to strongly support this resolution that opposes this type of trade liberalization.

I rise today in support of the resolution to disapprove the waiver of the Jackson-Vanik amendment to the Trade Act of 1974 for Vietnam. Serious issues remain in our relationship with Vietnam; the government of Vietnam is criticized by international human rights groups for a wide range of violations including arbitrary detention, disregard of workers rights and persecution of religious groups. The communist government in Vietnam will not allow democracy and freedom without pressure. What the United States does in regard to trade agreements does have an impact; we can be a force for positive change.

Actions of the US are most important today, because of past actions of this Congress and Administration throughout the 1980s and 1990s; the United States is regrettably moving towards a lower common denominator—concerning basic human rights, disregard for fundamental values which should serve as the core of our foreign economic policies, and yielding to political expediency. We can't change nor should we seek to change the outcome of military events in South East Asia

over two decades ago. But the US can, through existing law, and policy assert foreign economic policies that achieve an improvement in the democratization of this region of the world, including Vietnam.

The year by year rubber stamping of normal trade relations, in light of the absolute contradiction of actions and deeds, is wrong. We should pass this resolution of disapproval.

The fact is that the Vietnamese government is not meeting the conditions of free emigration. It is irresponsible to allow this country beneficial trade relations, on a veneer argument that "progress towards" this goal is being made. With rights and privileges come responsibilities and hopefully, results. Supporters cannot keep spending the same currency piece in a circular manner—suggesting that maintaining the waiver and allowing the trade benefits to follow will facilitate the Vietnamese government's respect and embracing of human rights. At this point our United States forbearance should have produced positive results. Those who are persecuted and denied basic human rights look to us, as citizens of the world's oldest democracy, to responsibly pursue policies that would permit some hope of social, political, and economic benefit.

In its origins and provisions, Jackson-Vanik is centered on freedom of emigration. Advocates of this resolution will tell you that Vietnam has eliminated the requirement for an applicant under the Resettlement Opportunity for Vietnamese Returnees program to obtain an exit visa prior to an interview with the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization service. They will point out this "progress towards" free emigration satisfies the requirements of the Jackson-Vanik trade law.

The truth is that Vietnam has not dropped its requirement for exit permits. Rather, this requirement was merely delayed until after the applicant is interviewed and approved by the United States interviewing teams. In addition to this administrative roadblock, in any instances applicants to U.S. resettlement programs are charged inordinate and significant fees that they cannot afford, in order to gain access to the programs. Vietnam doesn't meet even the basic test of the controlling law, Jackson-Vanik, much less a broader test regarding essential human rights.

In fact, Vietnam remains one of the most repressive countries in the world. Basic rights that we in the United States take for granted are denied to the citizens of Vietnam. All opposition to the communist party is crushed. Religious activities are closely regulated. Human rights organizations are not allowed to operate. Workers are not free to join or form unions of their choosing; such action requires governmental approval. Children remain at risk of being exploited as child labor workers, and women are commonly subject to serious social discrimination. At this point, Congressional action to waive the Jackson-Vanik provisions would symbolize "business as usual" for the Vietnamese leaders. Therefore, they may continue the oppression of their own people and still reap the benefits of trade relations with the United States.

Consideration of waiving the Jackson-Vanik provisions should at least be delayed until there are concrete, rather than superficial actions demonstrating that Vietnam is prepared and willing to act in good faith. This resolution will not stop U.S. trade with Vietnam, nor will it hinder free trade as Vietnam is simply not

currently eligible for Normal Trade Status (NTS). Passage of this resolution would send a clear message that our laws mean what they say, that the U.S. will stand behind its laws and values, and that freedoms systematically denied to the average Vietnamese citizens are worth speaking out in defense of and standing up for. Basic human rights are not an internal matter. Because of these unresolved issues, we should in good conscience go forward with approving this resolution of disapproval.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCREST).

Mr. GILCREST. Mr. Speaker, the main discussion here seems to be, on both sides of the aisle, the question of human rights violations, the question of religious persecution, immigration policy, and the issue of the POW and the MIAs. So how best do we deal with that particular issue right now 2 or 3 decades after the war is over?

I think that the U.S. needs to exert its influence in those areas. So how best do we exert our influence to change that, when it seems to me very obvious America's absence of engagement will create a void that will be filled by a country with little or no interest in our POWs or MIAs, human rights violations or their emigration policy.

It is the United States in this world that wants to be engaged in those kinds of problems. The Vietnamese government has shown significant improvement in all of these areas in the last couple years, especially since our former colleague, Pete Peterson, a former POW, is now the ambassador to Vietnam.

With the Vietnamese and the Americans working side by side on roads, bridges, coastal hotels, dredging the harbors, et cetera, et cetera, with the Vietnamese paying the bill, with that kind of engagement, the human contact with this country and that country will make the difference.

I urge a no vote on the resolution.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS), who knows we are not talking about the Vietnamese paying the bill. We are paying the bill.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I just say to my friend who just spoke, this is not about staying engaged with the Vietnamese. We are fully engaged. We have normalized relations. We have full trade with Vietnam. Those policies are not in question.

What is in question, though, is about, and we are not refighting the Vietnam war. We are fully engaged in this. Although the Vietnamese are showing some improvement in the area of emigration with the Rover program and others, I think they are woefully short of meeting the threshold that would allow us to use American tax dollars to subsidize American businesses doing business in Vietnam.

I have from my own district Dr. Nguyen Dan Que and Doan Viet Hoat, who are still languishing in Vietnamese prisons, on trumped up charges, for 15 years. Their families are not allowed to visit. When I was there last January, I was not allowed to visit. They are not allowed to get correspondence. They are not allowed to emigrate and come back to Northern Virginia, where they would like to join their families.

We are in a sense, by ignoring existing prisoners there who are there on trumped up charges, rewarding behavior that is woefully short of the kinds of gains that we have seen in China and other places. I do not think this behavior should be rewarded, their human rights abuses being rewarded with tax subsidies from U.S. taxpayers. I think we need to send Vietnam a message that more freedom of emigration has to be accomplished, and I would urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Joint Resolution 120, which would disapprove the President's renewal of his waiver of the Jackson-Vanik amendment for the Socialist Republic of Vietnam. As many of you know, I have been a fervent supporter of U.S. engagement with countries who have had a history of committing human rights violations. My positions rests on my belief that it is only through the gradual building of trust between nations that arises when commerce and cultural ideas flow freely, that democracy and freedom will prevail in such societies. To my deep regret, the Vietnamese government has demonstrated that no amount of economic engagement will compel improvements in its human rights record, especially when it comes to its emigration policies. The President's waiver of the Jackson-Vanik amendment this year is clearly without any basis. Indeed, it is contrary to the overwhelming evidence that the Vietnamese government does not permit free emigration as the Jackson-Vanik amendment requires before normal trading status can be conferred on Vietnam.

Having visited Vietnam this past January, I can attest to the fact that Vietnam has done little to improve its human rights violations or loosened its restrictions on free emigration. Unlike China, which has made slow but measured progress in the area of human rights as witnessed by the many Chinese religious leaders and citizens that I spoke with during my visit to China last year, the same unfortunately cannot be said for Vietnam.

Two Vietnamese-American families in my district intimately understand the agony of having a family member thrown into a Vietnamese prison simply because they promoted human and political rights. Both Dr. Nguyen Dan Que, a 53-year-old endocrinologist, and Professor Doan Viet Hoat each received 20 year sentences for conducting "activities aimed at overthrowing the people's government." Professor Hoat's sentence was later reduced to 15 years of imprisonment and 5 years of house arrest and deprivation of his civil liberties. Worried about their health and safety, their families asked me to do all I could to learn about their medical conditions. We had understood that both men were suffering from serious kidney problems. However, my request was denied. I was not permitted to visit with any political prisoners and the medical information I did receive was unclear.

The Jackson-Vanik waiver exists for the express purpose of improving emigration between nations by using the promise of economic relations as leverage. With this in mind, I do not dispute the fact that it has an unquestionably important role in normalizing U.S.-Vietnam relations. However, so much work has yet to be done in the way of individual liberty in Vietnam. I cannot help but feel that the waiver is being improperly implemented this year.

Make no mistake, I consider productive relations with Vietnam's Government to be very important. But a relationship must stand on mutual understanding and clear expectations. It is time that we make a statement to the Government of Vietnam on the state of human rights in that country. I would hope that our support for the resolution would also carry the message that we will not stand for continued human rights abuses in Vietnam.

I would like to note that trade between nations implies a degree of mutual respect and acceptance. We as a nation have demonstrated goodwill in this endeavor and still have yet to see these efforts reciprocated in accord with the waiver's provisions. Vietnam's government has had adequate time to demonstrate its commitment towards improving its emigration policies since the President ended the U.S. trade embargo on Vietnam in 1994. Given the continued restrictions on emigration and political freedoms in Vietnam, I feel that we must voice our disapproval.

I am encouraged by the fact that many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have found the proposed waiver renewal to be ill-considered. Once we see concrete progress by the Vietnamese government—that real improvements are being made so far as human liberties are concerned—then I will be one of the first to say that waiving the Jackson-Vanik amendment and normalizing U.S.-Vietnamese trade relations would further the interests of civil liberty and freedoms. Until that time, however, we must send a clear message and vote in favor of this disapproval resolution. Doing otherwise will reflect poorly on this nation and on the principles for which it stands.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY).

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

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I am joining with what I think is one of America's greatest Vietnam war heroes, a former colleague and our present ambassador to Vietnam, in asking all my colleagues to vote in opposition to this bill.

The reason for it, I think, is clear. We have Vietnam now the 12th largest country in the world in terms of population. Almost 70 percent of those residents of Vietnam are under the age of 25, the vast majority of which were born after the Vietnam war.

I think, clearly, this country has demonstrated, by a policy of economic and social and cultural engagement, we have been able to have the greatest impact in improving the quality of lives of those countries in which we reach out to. We make the greatest difference advancing human rights, the greatest difference in advancing the issue of re-

ligious freedom, the greatest impact in advancing the concept of democracy when we choose to economically and culturally and socially engage with a country. That is what it is all about, when we continue with the waiver for Jackson-Vanik.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on this motion.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, passage of House Joint Resolution 120 would not be a message, it would be a hammer. It would be a hammer because it sends the clear message to the people of Vietnam that we are not serious about trying to be constructive and open up our trade and open up our relations with this country.

If we believe that, by imposing these stricter standards of economic engagement with Vietnam, we are going to send a message and have some success; and if we are going to look at examples like South Africa, we have to remember that South Africa were multilateral sanctions where we had virtually an entire world behind those efforts to change South Africa.

We cannot say that about Vietnam. We know for a fact that the Europeans, Japan, other Asian countries, Latin America, they are all ready to go in and fill a void if the U.S. disengages. That will not just be at the expense of U.S. business, it will be at the expense of the U.S. government and the U.S. people.

We must engage. If no one has faith with the folks that are speaking here, please remember our former colleague, Pete Peterson, ambassador to Vietnam, a former POW who says it is right to do this. Please oppose House Joint Resolution 120.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. CLEMENT).

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the President's waiver of the Jackson-Vanik trade restrictions on Vietnam.

I am a veteran myself. I have served almost 30 years with the National Guard. I have been on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, serve on the House Committee on International Relations. I realize that times come when we have to move toward normal relations with Vietnam. It was a terrible war. It was a terrible conflict. It was a war of containment. I would not call it a war that we won.

Our former colleague, now the U.S. ambassador to Vietnam, Pete Peterson has nothing but praise for the Vietnamese efforts to aid the U.S. in locating and identifying the remains of POWs and MIAs. The ambassador says that the two countries are cooperating at an unprecedented level for former combatants.

I say to the critics of the waiver, listen to the words of the VFW. They say, We believe that current U.S. trade poli-

cies may have resulted in both gradual improvement in U.S.-Vietnamese relations and general and proportional improvements.

Oppose the resolution.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE).

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

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, at this point I think we need to add little, but perhaps some other observations.

I consider the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) not only my colleague but my dear friend, and I would say that on almost everything we have been together where human rights are concerned. I feel that we just have a difference of view today, and I hope that his, in this instance, does not prevail. Not because of any argument about commitment to human rights but what the best course is today in order to advance human rights.

I make a plea to all of my colleagues who know Pete Peterson, not just as I do, as a colleague and dear friend, but know what he went through as a POW. Surely, surely, as the first ambassador to Vietnam since the war, we owe him the opportunity to carry through on all of the elements that he thinks he can bring to bear to see not only human rights but the relationship between Vietnam and the United States of America blossom.

If we can conduct trade with China, surely we can conduct trade, surely we can give Mr. Peterson the opportunity to conduct the business of the United States. Surely, if we have this opportunity to make a statement that individuals can make a difference, that the Vietnam war can be healed, that those of us who have been scarred in this country by everything that took place there can find a healing purpose in giving Pete Peterson the opportunity to carry through on the program that he has put forward. If that is accomplished, I can assure Mr. ROHRBACHER and my colleagues here, all of whom stand united on behalf of human rights, that a great advancement will have taken place. We will have made a step today in that direction that we can all be proud of.

Mr. Speaker, I want to add to the comments that have been made this afternoon opposing this resolution because I believe passing it will not accomplish goals we all seek, such as greater accounting for POW's/MIA's and economic reforms.

I firmly believe that we are more likely to succeed in our foreign policy and human rights objectives by continuing and building on the work already begun by our ambassador, Pete Peterson, a former Member of Congress and a POW.

The purpose of the Jackson-Vanik amendment is to promote free emigration. As of July 13, 4,388 Vietnamese had departed for the United States under the Resettlement Opportunity agreement. Since the Jackson-Vanik waiver was granted, Vietnam has greatly reduced the red tape for prospective emigrants.

Both supporters and opponents must concede that progress is being made in emigration, business development, investment opportunities, and accounting for U.S. military personnel which are of vital interest and concern to America and the families of missing service men and women.

This bill will not only end the progress that has been made, but reverse the positive developments that have occurred. It will be a setback for our efforts to account for missing U.S. military personnel and other objectives.

I urge a "no" vote on the resolution.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP), my distinguished colleague from the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, there have been many references to our former colleague, now ambassador, Pete Peterson. I wish everyone could have heard his very powerful and compelling testimony before the Subcommittee on Trade about reconciliation and engagement in Vietnam. This is not about MFN. I have heard some references to MFN or normal trade relations. That only occurs after a negotiated bilateral trade agreement. This is about allowing private overseas investment loan guarantees.

□ 1530

We must talk about our relations with Vietnam and what kind of leverage we have if we do not engage Vietnam. We lose leverage in obtaining more information from the Vietnamese government on those POWs and MIAs that we are still not sure about.

The VFW in a statement released on July 28 said that disapproving the waiver would harm the prospects for the cooperation between our governments that is necessary for a successful resolution and accounting for our missing Americans. We also lose leverage in bringing Vietnam closer into the community of nations. We lose leverage in encouraging Vietnam to promote the freedom of immigration, the very point of the Jackson-Vanik amendment when it was passed back in 1974.

I urge the defeat of H.J. Res. 120.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from San Diego, CA (Mr. HUNTER) a Vietnam veteran and a man whose standards are very much respected in this body.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time. A couple of facts here are incontrovertible. One is that we have over 1,500 Americans still missing in Vietnam, including all 448 American pilots who were shot down in Vietnam-controlled Laos. That can mean only one thing. Not one of those pilots came home out of that 448. It means the North Vietnamese leaders had a policy of execution of the pilots that went down in that area. That is a war crime. There should be war trials for the criminals, for the Vietnamese communist leaders

who propagated that policy of execution, if we could find them, if we could apprehend them, if we could lay hands on them. If we had treated Himmler and Goering like we are treating the Vietnamese communist dictatorship, they would be attending World Trade Organization meetings instead of the Nuremberg war trials. I think if we keep devaluing the sacrifices of our veterans like we are doing with this bill, someday we are going to have a war and they are not going to come.

Support Rohrabacher.

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

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

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Joint Resolution 120. I believe that this resolution is counterproductive to the national interests of the United States and to the continued improvement in the bilateral relationship between our Nation and Vietnam.

I did not have the privilege of serving in this House with Ambassador Pete Peterson, but over the course of the last 2 weeks I have had an opportunity to sit with him on several occasions and talk to him about his experience as ambassador to Vietnam from this country. Ambassador Peterson, I think, more than anyone else understands the problems and the complex nature of the issue as we transition from a very negative relationship with Vietnam to hopefully a better and more understanding relationship.

Ambassador Peterson tells me that Vietnam is a country in transition. It is a country in transition culturally, philosophically, economically, socially and even educationally. I believe that it is important, it is vital that we remain engaged with Vietnam and that we assist Vietnam and provide the leadership to help with that assistance to that country so that they can transition from a dictatorship to ultimately a democracy. I had an opportunity this morning to again be with Ambassador Peterson in the Cannon Building where there is an exhibition and it is simply titled "Vietnam, The Land That We Never Knew."

Mr. Speaker, I was in Vietnam 30 years ago. I spent 13 months there in the United States Army. I told Ambassador Peterson that I really did not have any interest in going back, but he has convinced me that with the policy of engagement, it is our obligation and our duty to go back and see the Vietnam that we never knew.

I am opposed to this resolution and I urge my colleagues to oppose it as well.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), a combat veteran who served in southeast Asia.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution. As the

gentleman from Illinois said, I did serve in the Vietnam War. I was a Navy officer on swift boats patrolling rivers and canals down in the delta region. But let me make it very clear that in my view having served in Vietnam does not give me any special qualification to have an opinion on this issue. Maybe it gives me some background on which to draw in making a decision. And I would use it to draw on a historical perspective.

In 1991, it was President Bush that proposed a road map, and I was very much involved in the Congress at the time that was being considered, for improving our relations with Vietnam. To follow the road map, Vietnam had to take steps to help us account for our missing servicemen. In return for the cooperation, the United States was to move incrementally towards normalized relations.

Progress was made, and in 1994 a second step was taken when President Clinton lifted the trade embargo against Vietnam. In 1995, formal diplomatic relations were established between the United States and Vietnam.

Today's vote is just one more step along this road. As Ambassador Pete Peterson has said, if we grant this waiver today, he will have some of the tools he needs to convince Vietnam's leaders to improve human rights conditions, to continue support for the resolution of our POW and MIA cases that are still unresolved, and to maintain their commitment to liberalizing their economic and political institutions.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation has always recognized a clear distinction between being at peace and being at war. We cannot, we must not forget the pain and suffering of war. But by granting this waiver and advocating for even greater liberalization of Vietnamese society, we can say to Americans who served in Vietnam that their commitment is vindicated as economic and political freedom takes root in that country.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this resolution.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS), a Vietnam veteran, the ranking member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, this is really a vote on whether we are truly dedicated to resolve the full accounting of our missing from the Vietnam war. As the Veterans of Foreign Wars have said, passing this resolution of disapproval will only hurt our efforts at a time when we are receiving the access that we need from the Vietnamese to determine the fate of our POW/MIAs.

As many of the speakers have said, there is no more authoritative voice on this issue than our former colleague and now Ambassador to Vietnam, Pete Peterson. He supports the Jackson-

Vanik waiver. As a prisoner of war who underwent years of imprisonment in the notorious Hanoi Hilton, Ambassador Peterson should have every reason to be skeptical and harbor bitterness towards the Vietnamese. Yet he believes that the best course is to further develop relations between our two nations.

He knows this because it is in our Nation's best interest. We have achieved progress on the POW/MIA issue because of our evolving relationship with Vietnam, not despite it. He also knows that without access to the jungles and the rice paddies, without access to the archival information and documents, and to the witnesses of these tragic incidents, we cannot give the families of the missing in action the answers they deserve.

Our Nation is making progress on providing these answers. Much of this is due to the Joint Task Force on Full Accounting, our military presence in Vietnam which is tasked with looking for our missing. I have visited these young men and women and they are among the bravest and most gung ho group of soldiers I have ever met. Every day, from the searches of battle sites in treacherous jungles or the excavation of crash sites on the sides of mountains, they put themselves in harm's way to perform a mission they deeply believe in. It is truly touching to these men and women, some of whom were not even born when our missing served, so dedicated to a mission that they see as a sacred duty. They told me time and time again, allow us to remain here so we can complete this mission, so that we can do this job. If we pass this resolution today, we risk all the progress we have made.

I ask my colleagues to please vote against the resolution.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Today's debate is not about whether we respect our wonderful former colleague and now ambassador, Mr. Peterson. We do, although we note there are others who were prisoners of War in Vietnam who feel that we should support this resolution. This debate is about whether we use this tool available to us to get Vietnam to do the right thing, to allow for free emigration. If they were doing the right thing, we would not need to have this waiver before us at all. We must stand firm for human rights by using this tool to increase performance.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ).

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I would just say to my colleagues that today is about reunification of families. It is not about trade. I am for trade. This is about reunification of families. It is about doing the right thing. I know. Because when you have a Vietnamese American in your district who wants to get their wife over after 15 or 20 years, after having tried to find her, after

finding her in a camp and he cannot, he calls my office because I have the Vietnamese staffer who will help them. I get to hear the stories.

Please vote for this resolution.

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

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is about disapproving the waiving of the Jackson-Vanik restrictions which the President would like to do of the 1974 trade act. The fact that he is asking us to waive the restrictions of Jackson-Vanik mean that the communist Vietnamese are not meeting the moral standards that we set. So all of this talk about all the progress that we have heard about going on in communist Vietnam is so much baloney. The President himself is acknowledging that they are not doing that because he has asked us to waive those standards.

What is the purpose behind waiving the standards, the standards we put in place in face of the persecution of Jews in Russia that we wanted to deal with back in the 1970s? Why he is doing this? Why are we replacing those standards? So that our businessmen can go over, with government guarantees and government subsidies, meaning our taxpayer dollars, and invest in this dictatorship and make a profit and then export their goods to the United States and put our own people out of work. That is what this is all about.

I ask the American people to determine if you tried to set up a business, if you are trying to pay your mortgage, do you get a loan guarantee or a subsidy from the taxpayers? No. This is what the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) said it is. This is corporate welfare for communists at its very worst because we are lowering our standards in order to do so.

By the way, all this talk about MIA and POWs, I hope Members listened to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) and all this talk about Pete Peterson whom I respect and admire and served with in this House. The communist government of Vietnam has not given us the records of the prison that the gentleman from Texas was kept in or the prison that Pete Peterson himself was incarcerated in for 6 years. We requested that and they have denied even giving us those records because if we got the records, we would know that they have not come clean on the MIA/POW issue. That is why almost all of the veterans organizations are asking support of my resolution because they want to keep faith with those people who fought for freedom and keep faith with our principles of democracy.

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

I saw our distinguished ambassador, Mr. Peterson, sitting back here. I think he deserves the respect and honor of all of us not only for the outstanding job he has done there but for his service, his tour of duty, which included 6½ years at the Hanoi Hilton. And so we

pay tribute to you, Pete. Keep up the good work.

Mr. Speaker, one of the issues that has not been elaborated on in this proposal deals with immigration. I want to just touch briefly on that and point out that over the past 10 to 15 years, more than 480,000 people have entered the U.S. under the Orderly Departure Program from Vietnam. Applicants under the Resettlement Opportunity for Vietnamese Returnees, what is called the ROVR program, those numbers are also impressive. The government of Vietnam has cleared for interview over 15,500 of the ROVR applicants and permitted over 4,300 persons qualified for ROVR already to depart to the United States.

□ 1545

INS expects to complete most interviews of ROVR applicants by the end of this year.

I think basically what we are talking about is maintaining an improved relationship rather than putting barriers to increased communication and improved relations with a country that is going through transition and going through a transition in a positive way, and we have encouraged that transition, and for that reason I would ask all of my colleagues to join with us in voting to oppose H.J.Res. 120 because I think it sets us back.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.J. Res. 120.

America needs to heal from the tragedy of the Vietnam War.

Preserving the Presidential waiver for Vietnam will help alleviate the pain.

Extending the waiver promises a path towards mending the horrors of war because it provides an avenue for serious open dialogue.

The Jackson-Vanik waiver has given momentum to reconciling America's questions regarding POWs.

It has increased humanitarian efforts, enhanced leverage in treaty negotiations and allowed increased economic opportunities for American businesses.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars has witnessed first-hand the positive impact that the waiver has produced.

The Jackson-Vanik waiver has strengthened US-Vietnam cooperation by establishing the Joint Document Center in Hanoi.

The Trilateral Recovery Operations of the U.S., Laos and Vietnam.

And the Vietnamese governments has publicized activities related to missing Americans.

These are concrete results and real outcomes.

And these accomplishments have come about because of the Jackson-Vanik waiver.

The Jackson-Vanik waiver has been our diplomatic leverage—without it, we threaten America's interests.

The past makes us all uneasy—however, as we enter into the new millennium, we must work on forging relationships for the future.

We must start now—this waiver provides the tool to achieve our goals.

A vote against this harmful resolution sends a clear message of a commitment to the healing of America and Vietnam.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this measure.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.J. Res. 120. The full story of how the President and his senior advisors made decisions on Vietnam has never been told.

I am very concerned that the American people do not know the complete story on what influenced the decision to extend normal Diplomatic relations to the People's Republic of Vietnam.

Now we have to once again look at the President's actions and challenge why, in spite of evidence to the contrary, he is giving a waiver to Vietnam on an important human rights issue.

In October 1996 I began an inquiry of the current Administration and the potential impact foreign money might have had on our Foreign and Defense policy.

My goal was to acquire all information from the President and other senior members of his Administration about their connections with John Huang and the Lippo Group.

From 1996 to this day I believe the administration may have improperly assisted the Lippo Group in developing business in the People's Republic of Vietnam.

My fear was (and still is) that campaign contributions by Mochtar and James Riady and John Huang all improperly influenced our Foreign policy on Vietnam.

And to this day I feel the American people have not been given the truth on all the activities undertaken by the President, John Huang and the Lippo Group.

In 1992 the Riadys were the largest single campaign donors to then Presidential candidate Clinton.

Now all Americans are finally finding out that for the last five and a half years Foreign money may have corrupted our Foreign and Defense Policy, especially in Asia.

It was shocking to find, as early as November 1992, the late Ron Brown was meeting with Vietnamese government officials about lifting the U.S. embargo while Presidential candidate Clinton was taking a much harder line on full accounting for POW-MIAs.

Then, after being appointed Secretary of Commerce, Ron Brown met with John Huang, who at that time was the senior Lippo official in America, to discuss Vietnam.

It took years for the truth to come out.

Years later the Wall Street Journal reported that soon after he was first elected President, Mr. Clinton received a personal letter from Mochtar Riady, Chairman of the Lippo Group.

In his letter to the President, Riady was strongly lobbying for the immediate U.S. diplomatic recognition of Vietnam.

Riady's letter was very clear—not only should America move to quickly recognize Vietnam, but Mochter brazenly informed the President that Lippo had employees on the ground in Vietnam ready to do business.

While Riady's letter was kept secret there were important and serious debates by well meaning members on both sides of the aisle as to the merits of recognizing Vietnam.

Issues such as full accounting for Pow-Mias, religious freedom for Vietnamese citizens, free emigration and free speech were debated. But one has to ask if the fix was in all along to help the Riadys.

Now, today once again with a bipartisan spirit Congress is addressing what to do about assisting Vietnam.

It is my position that, because of previous bad faith in providing full disclosure to con-

gressional oversight, we can't have a fair debate on the merits of the assisting Vietnam until we find out exactly what the Administration did to help the Lippo group.

The great tragedy of the ethical cloud hanging over our Foreign Policy is that we become uncertain as to the validity of the Administration's position on any foreign economic issue.

Did the Administration sell out American business interests by improperly helping a foreign firm, the Lippo Group, with inside information about the timing of our recognition of Vietnam? This type of information could be worth millions at the expense of American Firms.

So I look with great skepticism at the President issuing a waiver. I am perplexed as to who will eventually benefit. On the merits of the case I don't think the average Vietnamese will benefit, since the IMF has held up loans to Vietnam because the government has not made appropriate economic reforms.

The President's waiver is suspect as to why he continues to insist his action will substantially promote the freedom of emigration provisions.

In fact Congress has the names of hundreds of Vietnamese who have been denied emigration since 1975. This pattern of human rights abuse continues to this day.

Finally, as a practical matter, if Vietnamese leaders think American Foreign Policy can be influenced by Lippo money they will have no incentive to take our positions seriously on any issue especially enforcing the freedom of emigration provisions in the Jackson-Vanik amendment.

Now is the time to send a signal to the World that the Congress takes very seriously our oversight responsibilities and we pledge to bring sunlight on the Administration's actions.

Vote to support H.J. Res. 120 and show Vietnam and the world that Congress will not allow our Foreign Policy to be sold for campaign contributions.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to join the Congressional Dialogue on Vietnam. This group facilitates an open exchange among Members of Congress, the Administration, and the public on issues that affect those who have personal interests tied to Vietnam.

In particular, I wish to call attention to the grassroots campaign, "Adopt a Religious Prisoner in Vietnam." This group notifies its members on the current state of religious persecution in Vietnam as well as the plight of people who have been imprisoned for their religious beliefs.

The current Vietnamese government detains individuals for a variety of ideological reasons, including those who openly discuss religious ideas. These prisoners of conscience are writers, philosophers, and artists who have never served in combat and yet some have been incarcerated since the Vietnam War.

This past January I had the unique opportunity to visit Vietnam. Despite the advancements our countries have made in diplomatic relations, we still differ on issues concerning religious prisoners. On my visit I was denied the opportunity to visit with prisoners of conscience, and what medical information I did receive was ambiguous.

In my opinion, this underscores the value of the "Adopt a Religious Prisoner in Vietnam" campaign and its ties to overseas religious institutions. I want to take a moment to tell you

about my own adoptee. The Venerable Thich Tue Sy has been a Buddhist monk from the age of seven years. He taught himself several languages including Classical Chinese, English, and Sanskrit. A noted scholar and founder of the Free Vietnam Force, he was arrested by Vietnamese government authorities on April 2nd, 1984. Four years later he was prosecuted on national security charges and sentenced to death, but protests from the international community helped to commute his sentence to 20 years in a government "re-education" camp. He has been jailed for the past 14 years in a camp where nutrition and health conditions are typically poor.

The "Adopt a Religious Prisoner in Vietnam" campaign affords Members of Congress the opportunity to address two very important audiences. One is the world community, and the message is that as concerned legislators we decry the blatant oppression of individuals worldwide, especially when it is based solely on differing ideology. We also send a message to the adoptee, telling that person there is an advocate who is appealing for his or her release, and encouraging that individual to continue pursue the goals of free speech and religious liberty.

Mr. Speaker, I again encourage my colleagues to join the Congressional Dialogue on Vietnam as well as the "Adopt a Religious Prisoner in Vietnam" program. The Congressional Dialogue was founded by the gentlewomen from California, Ms. Loretta Sanchez and Ms. Zoe Lofgren and represents a committed bipartisan endeavor to support the progress of US-Vietnam relations. In defense of fundamental human rights and in the interests of our many Vietnamese-Americans who have ties to Vietnam, I hope that all of my colleagues will participate in these efforts.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 120 and in support of waiving the Jackson-Vanik amendment for Vietnam.

Last August, I visited Vietnam as part of a Congressional delegation, although there was a certain level of economic and political interaction between the United States and Vietnam, there was still the need to increase this interaction. The Jackson-Vanik waiver, enacted for the first time on March of this year, is a tool for this interaction, for this engagement.

Not only has the Jackson-Vanik increased the freedom of emigration in Vietnam, our American businesses investing and exporting to Vietnam are benefitting from federal economic programs, such as those administered by the Export-Import Bank. Removing the waiver could mean job losses for workers in the United States.

It will be a great setback not to grant the waiver. Let us not use this issue to act as a referendum on our total relationship with Vietnam. I understand that we still have many issues with Vietnam which we are not satisfied, such as human rights and POW/MIA concerns. In fact there are separate vehicles for these other concerns. By waiving the Jackson-Vanik, we continue to increase our engagement with Vietnam and we will have even greater opportunities to discuss other issues such as human rights, issues which I agree are just as important to the American people.

We are linked to Vietnam economically, politically and even culturally. We should not move backwards by passing this resolution. I

urge my colleagues to vote against H.J. Res. 120.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.J. Res. 120 which denies President Clinton's waiver for Vietnam from the Jackson-Vanik freedom of emigration requirement of the Trade Act of 1974. On June 3, 1998, President Clinton notified Congress of his intention to extend Vietnam a Jackson-Vanick waiver for an additional year from July 3, 1998 to July 3, 1998.

Vietnam's trade status is subject to the Jackson-Vanik amendment to Title IV of the Trade Act of 1974. This provision of law governs the extension of normal trade relations, as well as access to U.S. government credits or credit or investment guarantees, to nonmarket economy countries ineligible for normal trade relations tariff treatment. A country subject to the provisions may gain MFN treatment and coverage by U.S. trade financing programs by complying with the freedom of emigration provisions of the Trade Act. The Trade Act authorizes the President to waive the freedom of emigration requirements with respect to a particular country if he determines that such a waiver will substantially promote the freedom of emigration provisions.

Extension of the Jackson-Venice waiver for Vietnam gives Vietnam access to U.S. government credits or credit or investment guarantees such as those provided by Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC) and Export-Import Bank support for U.S. businesses in Vietnam. Vietnam has not yet concluded a bilateral commercial agreement with the United States and therefore, Vietnam is ineligible to receive normal trade relations tariff treatment.

Recently, the Subcommittee on Trade held a hearing on Vietnam. U.S. Ambassador Pete Peterson and Senator John Kerry eloquently testified about the importance of having a policy of engagement with Vietnam. Both of these men heroically served our country during the Vietnam War and they strongly believe that we should work with the Vietnamese government and form a stable, fruitful relationship between the two countries.

Vietnam has made consistent progress on its commitments under the Resettlement Opportunity for Vietnamese Returnees agreement. The United States government has made it its highest priority to obtain the fullest possible accounting of missing U.S. citizens from the Vietnam War. The Vietnamese government has been extremely cooperative. Human rights in Vietnam need to be improved and hopefully, engagement will do this.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution. We should not forget about the past or the dedication of our servicemen who fought in Vietnam, but we should move forward. If those who were prisoners of war in Vietnam believe that it is time to engage Vietnam and normalize relations with Vietnam, we should listen to their advice. It is time to move forward with Vietnam and build a relationship that benefits both the United States and Vietnam.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Joint Resolution 120. This resolution would disapprove the President's determination that a waiver of the so-called Jackson-Vanik requirements would substantially promote freedom of emigration objectives with

respect to Vietnam. This waiver permits U.S. Government financial support for American businesses to invest and trade with Vietnam and is a precondition for concluding a commercial agreement to establish normal trading relations.

By passing this resolution, Congress would disapprove and reverse the most recent step taken by the United States to normalize relations with Vietnam. This policy of gradual engagement after trying to isolate Vietnam began in the early 1990s with the lifting of the trade embargo and the establishment of full diplomatic relations in 1995.

Since the normalization process began the Vietnamese government has cooperated in POW/MIA accounting, made progress on its emigration practices, and is now undertaking market-oriented reforms of its state-controlled economy.

It is also true that Vietnam violates human rights and denies religious and political freedoms to its citizens. But as is the case with China, we cannot isolate Vietnam unilaterally in a global economy. Continued exposure of the Vietnamese people to American values of human and religious rights and democratic principles through increased trade and investment and continued engagement with the Vietnam government provides the best means to achieve fullest possible POW/MIA accounting and to promote political and economic reforms.

Disapproving the waiver will signal a return to a previous policy of isolation which failed. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.J. Res. 120.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). All time for debate has expired.

The joint resolution is considered read for amendment.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 29, 1998, the previous question is ordered.

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

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

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

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 163, nays 260, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 356]

YEAS—163

Aderholt	Barr	Blunt
Andrews	Bartlett	Bonilla
Bachus	Barton	Bonior
Baker	Bilirakis	Bono

Brown (OH)	Hill	Peterson (PA)
Bryant	Hilleary	Pitts
Bunning	Hinchee	Pombo
Burton	Hobson	Porter
Buyer	Hoekstra	Quinn
Canady	Holden	Radanovich
Chabot	Horn	Regula
Chenoweth	Hostettler	Riley
Christensen	Hunter	Rivers
Coble	Hutchinson	Rogers
Coburn	Hyde	Rohrabacher
Collins	Inglis	Ros-Lehtinen
Cook	Jackson (IL)	Royce
Cooksey	Jackson-Lee	Ryun
Cox	(TX)	Sanchez
Coyne	Jenkins	Sanders
Crapo	Johnson, Sam	Saxton
Cubin	Jones	Scarborough
Cunningham	Kelly	Schaefer, Dan
Davis (VA)	Kennedy (RI)	Schaffer, Bob
Deal	Kildee	Sessions
DeFazio	King (NY)	Shadegg
DeLay	Kingston	Shuster
Diaz-Balart	Klug	Smith (MI)
Dickey	Kucinich	Smith (NJ)
Doolittle	LaHood	Smith (TX)
Duncan	Lazio	Snowbarger
Ehrlich	Lewis (KY)	Solomon
Emerson	Lipinski	Souder
English	LoBiondo	Spence
Ensign	Lofgren	Stearns
Everett	McCarthy (NY)	Strickland
Forbes	McCollum	Stump
Fossella	McGovern	Stupak
Fox	McIntyre	Talent
Franks (NJ)	McNulty	Tauzin
Frelinghuysen	Meeks (NY)	Thornberry
Gallely	Menendez	Thune
Gekas	Metcalf	Tiahrt
Gibbons	Miller (FL)	Torres
Gilman	Myrick	Traficant
Goode	Nadler	Turner
Goodling	Neumann	Upton
Graham	Ney	Vento
Green	Northup	Wamp
Gutknecht	Norwood	Waters
Hall (TX)	Packard	Watts (OK)
Hansen	Pappas	Weldon (FL)
Hastert	Pascrell	Whitfield
Hayworth	Paul	Wolf
Hefley	Pelosi	

NAYS—260

Abercrombie	Clayton	Gejdenson
Ackerman	Clement	Gephardt
Allen	Clyburn	Gilchrest
Archer	Combust	Gillmor
Armey	Condit	Goodlatte
Baesler	Conyers	Gordon
Baldacci	Costello	Goss
Ballenger	Cramer	Granger
Barcia	Crane	Greenwood
Barrett (NE)	Cummings	Gutierrez
Barrett (WI)	Danner	Hall (OH)
Bass	Davis (FL)	Hamilton
Bateman	Davis (IL)	Harman
Becerra	DeGette	Hastings (FL)
Bentsen	Delahunt	Hastings (WA)
Bereuter	DeLauro	Hefner
Berman	Deutsch	Herger
Berry	Dicks	Hilliard
Bilbray	Dingell	Hinojosa
Bishop	Dixon	Hooley
Blagojevich	Doggett	Houghton
Bliley	Dooley	Hoyer
Blumenauer	Doyle	Hulshof
Boehlert	Dreier	Jefferson
Boehner	Dunn	John
Borski	Edwards	Johnson (CT)
Boswell	Ehlers	Johnson (WI)
Boucher	Engel	Johnson, E. B.
Boyd	Eshoo	Kanjorski
Brady (PA)	Etheridge	Kaptur
Brady (TX)	Evans	Kasich
Brown (CA)	Ewing	Kennedy (MA)
Brown (FL)	Farr	Kennelly
Callahan	Fattah	Kilpatrick
Calvert	Fawell	Kim
Camp	Fazio	Kind (WI)
Campbell	Filner	Kleccka
Cannon	Foley	Klink
Capps	Ford	Knollenberg
Cardin	Fowler	Kolbe
Carson	Frank (MA)	LaFalce
Castle	Frost	Lampson
Chambliss	Furse	Lantos
Clay	Ganske	Largent

Latham Nussle Shays
 LaTourette Oberstar Sherman
 Leach Obey Shimkus
 Lee Olver Sisisky
 Levin Ortiz Skaggs
 Lewis (CA) Owens Skeen
 Lewis (GA) Oxley Skelton
 Livingston Pallone Slaughter
 Lowey Parker Smith (OR)
 Lucas Pastor Smith, Adam
 Luther Paxon Snyder
 Maloney (CT) Payne Spratt
 Maloney (NY) Pease Stabenow
 Manton Peterson (MN) Stark
 Manzullo Petri Stenholm
 Markey Pickering Stokes
 Martinez Pickett Sununu
 Mascara Pomeroy Tanner
 Matsui Portman Tauscher
 McCarthy (MO) Poshard Taylor (MS)
 McCrery Price (NC) Taylor (NC)
 McDermott Pryce (OH) Thomas
 McHale Ramstad Thompson
 McHugh Rangel Thurman
 McInnis Redmond Tierney
 McIntosh Reyes Velazquez
 McKeon Rodriguez Visclosky
 McKinney Roemer Walsh
 Meehan Rogan Watkins
 Meek (FL) Rothman Watt (NC)
 Mica Roukema Waxman
 Millender- Roybal-Allard Weldon (PA)
 McDonald Rush Weller
 Miller (CA) Sabo Wexler
 Minge Salmon Weygand
 Mink Sandlin White
 Moakley Sanford Wicker
 Mollohan Sawyer Wilson
 Moran (KS) Schumer Wise
 Moran (VA) Scott Woolsey
 Morella Sensenbrenner Wynn
 Murtha Serrano Yates
 Nethercutt Shaw Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—11

Burr McDade Smith, Linda
 Gonzalez Neal Towns
 Istook Rahall Young (FL)
 Linder Riggs

□ 1609

Messrs. FOLEY, RANGEL, SPRATT, LEWIS of Georgia, and Ms. LEE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. KELLY, and Messrs. SMITH of Michigan, NORWOOD, MCCOLLUM, PETERSON of Pennsylvania, TORRES, and COLLINS changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

The joint resolution was not passed. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PROVIDING SPECIAL INVESTIGATIVE AUTHORITY FOR THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The pending business is the vote de novo on agreeing to the resolution, House Resolution 507, as amended, on which further proceedings were postponed.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 222, noes 200, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 357]

AYES—222

Aderholt Gilchrist Packard
 Archer Gillmor Pappas
 Arney Gilman Parker
 Bachus Gingrich Paxon
 Baker Goode Pease
 Ballenger Goodlatte Peterson (PA)
 Barr Goodling Petri
 Barrett (NE) Goss Pickering
 Bartlett Barton Pitts
 Barton Branger Pombo
 Bass Greenwood Porter
 Bateman Gutknecht Portman
 Bereuter Pryce (OH) Hall (TX)
 Bilbray Hansen Quinn
 Bilirakis Hastert Radanovich
 Bliley Hastings (WA) Ramstad
 Blunt Hayworth Redmond
 Boehlert Hefley Regula
 Boehner Herger Riley
 Bonilla Hill Rogan
 Bono Hillery Rogers
 Brady (TX) Hobson Rohrabacher
 Bryant Hoekstra Ros-Lehtinen
 Bunning Horn Roukema
 Burton Royce
 Buyer Houghton Ryun
 Callahan Hulshof Salmon
 Calvert Hunter Sanford
 Camp Hutchinson Saxton
 Campbell Hyde Scarborough
 Canady Inglis Schaefer, Dan
 Cannon Jenkins Schaffer, Bob
 Castle Johnson (CT) Sensenbrenner
 Chabot Johnson, Sam Sessions
 Chambliss Jones Shadegg
 Chenoweth Kasich Shaw
 Christensen Kelly Shays
 Coble Kim Shimkus
 Coburn King (NY) Shuster
 Collins Kingston Skeen
 Combest Klug Smith (MI)
 Cook Knollenberg Smith (NJ)
 Cooksey Kolbe Smith (OR)
 Crapo LaHood Smith (TX)
 Cubin Largent Smith, Linda
 Cunningham Latham Snowbarger
 Davis (VA) LaTourette Solomon
 Deal Lazio Souder
 DeLay Lewis (CA) Spence
 Diaz-Balart Lewis (KY) Stearns
 Dickey Livingston Stump
 Doolittle LoBiondo Sununu
 Dreier Lucas Talent
 Duncan Manzullo Tauzin
 Dunn McCollum Taylor (MS)
 Ehlers McCrery Taylor (NC)
 Ehrlich McHugh Thornberry
 Emerson Thune
 English McIntosh Tiahrt
 Ensign McKeon Upton
 Everett Metcalf Walsh
 Ewing Mica Wamp
 Fawell Miller (FL) Watkins
 Foley Moran (KS) Watts (OK)
 Fossella Weldon (FL) Weldon (PA)
 Fowler Myrick Weller
 Fox Nethercutt White
 Franks (NJ) Neumann Whitfield
 Frelinghuysen Ney Wicker
 Gallegly Northup Wilson
 Ganske Norwood Wolf
 Gekas Nussle Young (AK)
 Gibbons Oxley

NOES—200

Abercrombie Borski Conyers
 Ackerman Boswell Costello
 Allen Boucher Coyne
 Andrews Boyd Cramer
 Baesler Brady (PA) Cummings
 Baldacci Brown (CA) Danner
 Barcia Brown (FL) Davis (FL)
 Barrett (WI) Brown (OH) Davis (IL)
 Becerra Capps DeFazio
 Bentsen Cardin DeGette
 Berman Carson Delahunt
 Berry Clay DeLauro
 Bishop Clayton Deutsch
 Blagojevich Clement Dicks
 Blumenauer Clyburn Dingell
 Bonior Condit Dixon

Doggett Lampson Poshard
 Dooley Lantos Price (NC)
 Doyle Lee Rangel
 Edwards Levin Reyes
 Engel Lewis (GA) Rivers
 Eshoo Lipinski Rodriguez
 Etheridge Lofgren Roemer
 Evans Lowey Rothman
 Farr Luther Roybal-Allard
 Fattah Maloney (CT) Rush
 Fazio Maloney (NY) Sabo
 Filner Manton Sanchez
 Forbes Markey Sanders
 Ford Martinez Sandlin
 Frank (MA) Mascara Sawyer
 Frost Matsui Schumer
 Furse McCarthy (MO) Scott
 Gejdenson McCarthy (NY) Serrano
 Gordon Gephart McDermott
 Green McGovern Sisisky
 Gutierrez McHale Skaggs
 Hall (OH) McIntyre Skelton
 Hamilton McKinney Slaughter
 Harman McNulty Smith, Adam
 Hastings (FL) Meek (FL) Snyder
 Hefner Meeks (NY) Spratt
 Hilliard Menendez Stabenow
 Hinchey Millender Stark
 Hinojosa McDonald Stenholm
 Holden Miller (CA) Stokes
 Hooley Minge Strickland
 Hoyer Mink Stupak
 Jackson (IL) Moakley Tanner
 Jackson-Lee Mollohan Tauscher
 (TX) Moran (VA) Thompson
 Jefferson Murtha Thurman
 John Nadler Tierney
 Johnson (WI) Oberstar Trafficant
 Johnson, E. B. Obey Turner
 Kanjorski Olver Velazquez
 Kaptur Ortiz Vento
 Kennedy (MA) Owens Visclosky
 Kennedy (RI) Pallone Watt (NC)
 Kennelly Pascrell Waxman
 Kildee Paster Wexler
 Kilpatrick Pastor Weygand
 Kind (WI) Paul Wise
 Kleczka Payne Woolsey
 Klink Pelosi Wynn
 Kucinich Peterson (MN) Yates
 LaFalce Pickett
 Pomeroy

NOT VOTING—13

Burr McDade Towns
 Cox Neal Waters
 Gonzalez Rahall Young (FL)
 Istook Riggs
 Linder Torres

□ 1627

So the joint resolution, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1630

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4276, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, FY 1999

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 508 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 508

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4276) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and