

congressional schedules keep us away from our families. Many of us have had to miss Little League games, school recitals and concerts. That is the hardest part of our job. I cannot imagine missing a year's worth of my children's lives, a year of birthdays, holidays, games, concerts and those precious daily moments.

Of all the hardships that Martin and Gracia have endured in the past 11½ months, the greatest must be their separation from their family and knowing how desperately their children miss them. I always cherish my time with my parents and my family, but this week I am especially aware of how lucky I am to have time.

I encourage the Bush administration and the Philippine government to continue their efforts, all their efforts, to free Martin and Gracia so the Burnham family can enjoy a family reunion.

As always, I ask you to join me in prayer for Martin and Gracia and their loved ones that this nightmare may soon be over.

NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS WEEK

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

Mr. PHELPS. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the opportunity to speak today on behalf of National Small Business Week. Small businesses play a crucial role in the economy of our Nation, and it is important that we take this week to recognize their efforts.

As a member of the Committee on Small Business and a former small business owner, I am aware of the everyday difficulties that many of our Nation's small businesses have to face. We must work together to ensure that their needs are met and not put behind the needs of corporate America.

With approximately 25 million small businesses in the United States, we need to focus on affordable health care for the small business employer and employee. We must ensure that pension plans will be provided to employees while protecting our system's Social Security. Last year many small businesses were left out of the President's tax cut. Let us make sure that that never happens again, and provide for fair tax breaks to small businesses who may need the extra capital to survive.

Many Americans dream of owning their own business, and we need to help that dream become a reality and stay a reality for years.

PROVIDING FOR DISPOSITION OF H.J. Res. 84, DISAPPROVING THE ACTION TAKEN BY THE PRESIDENT UNDER SECTION 203 OF THE TRADE ACT OF 1974 TRANSMITTED TO THE CONGRESS ON MARCH 5, 2002

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I

call up House Resolution 414 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 414

Resolved, That the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 84) disapproving the action taken by the President under section 203 of the Trade Act of 1974 transmitted to the Congress on March 5, 2002, is hereby laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, while I am waiting for some of my remarks, first, I would like to welcome our new colleague on the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), who will be managing the rule for the minority.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 414 is a unique rule providing for the disposition of House Joint Resolution 84, a resolution of disapproval. Under the rule, the House Joint Resolution 84 would be automatically tabled. House Joint Resolution 84 disapproves the action taken by President Bush to impose temporary tariffs on some types of steel products. Under the Trade Act, Congress has the authority to disapprove of such actions within 90 days. Such approval resolution is highly privileged, not amendable, and floor debate is limited to 20 hours.

To put it simply, a vote in favor of this rule will lay on the table the disapproval resolution and conclude further deliberations.

Responding to concerns within the steel industry, President Bush instructed the International Trade Commission on June 2001 to begin an investigation under section 201 of the U.S. Trade Law. This investigation would study the effects of steel imports on the U.S. steel industry. The ITC released their findings in October of 2001, making an affirmative determination of injury on the American steel industry caused by steel imports.

The ITC further relayed recommendations to the President for relief that would prevent or remedy such injuries.

On March 5 of this year, the President put in place trade remedies based on the ITC findings. President Bush announced trade remedies for all products on which the ITC had found substantial injuries except two specialty categories.

Under present law, the President, not the ITC, makes the final decision whether to provide relief to the U.S. industry, as well as to the type and amounts of relief.

Passing the disapproval resolution as written would not undo the remedies imposed by President Bush. Rather, it would merely put in place the tariff levels suggested by the International Trade Commission.

□ 1030

While congressional disapproval is certainly allowed under this statute, this rule recognizes that the circumstances in this case simply do not warrant such action. Even the measure's sponsor noted in committee markup that the resolution was not the best solution.

Laying this resolution on the table does not hurt the steel industry. In fact, it will keep intact the President's remedy that the industry favors. The disapproval resolution could potentially be even more harmful to the industry, nor would the resolution not eliminate tariffs on steel imports. It merely replaces one set of tariffs with another.

Mr. Speaker, let me reiterate that a vote in support of this rule will table the disapproval resolution, keep intact the President's current enacted remedy, and conclude debate on this issue.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I thank him for his kind words.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take just a moment to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), the ranking member, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), and the rest of my colleagues for my appointment to the Rules Committee.

I am honored to take the seat held for over 25 years by my friend and mentor, Joe Moakley; and before him the seat was held by the late Speaker, Tip O'Neill. I feel so privileged to be part of that legacy, and I will try to do everything possible to live up to their examples of hard work, collegiality and dedication to this House.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first rule that I have managed on the floor; and if I did not know better, I would think that my friends on the other side of the aisle were trying to make it as difficult as possible because this rule, Mr. Speaker, is a complex and convoluted contrivance designed to protect some Members from an unambiguous vote on an issue of vital importance to America's steel industry and its workers.

This rule is self-executing, which means that a vote in favor of the rule will table the resolution, thereby killing it without a clear up or down vote. While I strongly oppose the resolution proposed by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JEFFERSON), I see no reason why the committee does not simply allow this body to vote on it.

This is an issue with real consequences for hard-working Americans and their families. Quite simply, Mr.

Speaker, the American steel industry is in trouble. Foreign steel imports are causing domestic prices to plunge to record lows, and the result to date is 31 steel company bankruptcies, the loss of almost 47,000 steelworker jobs, including 2,100 in the Nation's iron ore mines, and the shutdown of nearly 20 percent of the Nation's steelmaking capacity.

We cannot continue to sacrifice American jobs. We cannot continue to stand idly by as one of the oldest and most important industries in America just disappears.

In response to the ongoing crisis in American steel, the President implemented a 30 percent tariff on steel imports, an action that will help save thousands of Americans' steelmaking jobs. This tariff is a necessary response to the unfair practices of some of our trading partners and I support it.

I believe we in Congress should be doing a great deal more for America's steelworkers and their families; but until we act, the President's decision is a welcome one.

I will vote in favor of this rule which automatically tables the resolution and, therefore, allows the President's action to stand; but I believe it is extremely unfortunate that the majority has chosen to circumvent the regular order and has refused to allow a vote on the gentleman from Louisiana's (Mr. JEFFERSON) resolution, a resolution, by the way, that I oppose.

This body deserves a fair debate and an up or down vote on this issue. The Ways and Means Committee adversely reported the resolution, yet this rule denies the members on the committee and the Members of this body a genuine opportunity to debate the merits of this issue.

The American people deserve to know who supports the President's actions to protect the American steel industry and who does not. They deserve to know who supports the effort to help the working men and women in our steel-producing communities and who does not.

There is no need for procedural smokecreens that rob the Members of this House from debating and voting on this important trade issue.

Having said that, let me attempt to clarify to Members what their choice is. If my colleagues disagree with the President's decision to impose tariffs on imported steel, then they should vote against this rule. On the other hand, if my colleagues support the President's tariff decision, then they should vote for the rule.

Mr. Speaker, there are many times when the Members of this body of both parties will disagree with the President. The Republican majority should not run away when that happens. They should allow their Republican colleagues the opportunity to vote and express their support or disapproval of the President's decision.

I regret they will not be able to vote "no" on the resolution offered by the gentleman from Louisiana. I regret

this deceptive rule, but I will not oppose it.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I want to first of all say to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), I am pleased to be able to speak on his first opportunity to have debate on a rule. As neighbors in our first term, I find that a great privilege; and I would rather be lucky than good. So it is lucky.

For my friend from Louisiana, who we agree with and work hard, it is not personal, it is just public policy; and I look forward to working with him more in opportunities in the future.

Not supporting this rule would mean letting the steel workers of our country down when they need us most. Furthermore, it would be a step backward from the progress made to help industries thus far. Free and fair trade, the proponents of trade talk about free and fair trade, and the opponents of trade talk about free and fair trade; and it was this administration that finally took action against unfair trade. That is kind of hard to believe when we had a lot of this steel crisis within the past administration, also; but it was a Republican administration that said there is illegal dumping of steel and we are going to take action against it.

So that is why this resolution, I know well-intentioned, is very detrimental to getting our steel mills and our workers back into the mills and creating jobs. We have already seen some benefits from the 30 percent trade.

Granite City Steel in Madison County, which I represent half the county, it is my home county, entered Chapter 11 bankruptcy protection in early March. Their latest report is that they have more orders than they can fill. A promising future from an industry that just months ago was on the cusp of not only destroying the tax base of a small community but also people not being able to be employed and take care of their families.

Continuing the current tariffs will mean job security for 2,700 workers of this plant, as well as many plants across the Nation that have filed or were near bankruptcy.

Another company that is moving aggressively to reopen a closed steel mill in Illinois is Alton Steel, and they have a short window of opportunity to move even rapidly now because of the tariffs, and we are working very diligently with them; and the imposition of this tariff is of great help to them and the working men and women of another part of Madison County which is Alton, Illinois.

Furthermore, the 30 percent tariffs increase the likelihood of consolidation in the industry so that those who have lost their jobs may regain employment.

Mr. Speaker, it is proven: the administration's decision for a 30 percent tar-

iff is helping. The steel industry is and will continue to benefit. So why hold it back? On behalf of the steel workers of southern Illinois, I urge my colleagues to join with me in voting for this rule.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JEFFERSON), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. JEFFERSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I am saddened and disappointed by the action of the Committee on Rules and by the response of many of my Republican colleagues to the resolution that I have filed. Just a few months ago, I joined with many of them in open discussions about the benefits of free trade to our country and to a global economy.

Yet today, they turn their back on all those arguments that they so embraced just 2 months ago during the trade promotion authority discussion; and no matter how they cast the action on this rule today, if they vote for the rule and table the resolution and prevent us from having a debate on it, what they are doing nonetheless, no matter how they cover it up, is they are voting a protectionist line when they have taken quite the opposite position just a few months ago as I said, and routinely, throughout this Congress.

What is happening here is what has been described here by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN). I have a resolution which is quite clear. It purports to ratchet down the President's tariff decision to protect the steel industry from 30 percent tariffs, generally speaking, to 20 percent tariffs under the ITC recommendation. It lowers the tariffs in almost every case; and while one can argue that it still maintains a 201 result, and it does, for those who want to see 201 action, it permits that; but it simply does it at a lower level.

What I said in committee is there is no way to undo the President's decision by action on this floor. The only thing that can be done is what is being attempted here, that is, to reduce it down to what the ITC recommended. That is the only legal course that is available. One cannot go to court or to an administrative action. This is it. So when I say in committee that what we are doing here is not fixing the problem, but making a bad situation less bad, that is precisely what is available to us. That is all that we can do. That is not the ultimate outcome I would desire, but that is all that is available to us.

This decision, Mr. Speaker, in just a few short months has rankled the ire of all of our trading partners in the European community, in Australia, in Japan, in Korea and China, in Brazil. Almost every corner of the world, they are threatened and are now imposing sanctions against our products. The European Union has estimated it will

cost \$2.4 billion in losses to them just based on what we have done here. Added to our fish problem that is already \$4.5 billion, how on God's earth can we respond to these extreme and very high costs that are being imposed by this action the President has taken?

The President is talking out of both sides of his mouth on this question. He says that he is for free trade, and yet he wants to restrict free trade when it is convenient for, as some have said, political purposes. The columnist that generally favors President Bush on all these matters, George Will, writes quite candidly it is the worst protection action taken by a President in decades. He cannot even think of one that is worse.

He also said that it is a billion dollar tax increase on those folks who buy automobiles alone and estimates an \$8 billion tax increase on consumers across the country because what happens is we are raising prices on steel products across the board, whether they are cars or toasters or vacuum cleaners. Whatever is made of steel, the prices are going to rise. They are already rising.

Beyond that, Mr. Speaker, this whole issue of free trade is supposed to be about consumers in this country, and we are going to saddle them with \$8 billion in new costs that they are going to have to pay; and in the end it is going to end up with a result that is worse than we ever imagined because we are now just getting out of, what some people say, getting out of a recession. We are going to drive this country right back into a deeper one because every one steel job we purport to save here, the estimates are we lose 10 in other industries.

So with the stevedores we will lose jobs up and down the line of those folks who make steel products. We will have layoffs because the business cannot afford to carry on with the price for steel so high, and so it is not a good trade-off for this country to save one steel job for every 10 jobs we lose in some other industry. It is a very bad trade-off.

I would like to urge this body to vote "no" on this resolution on this rule today for the simple reason we deserve a debate, as the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) has said. Whether my colleagues are for or against this, this matter deserves a debate on the floor today, and I would urge the Members of this body to do just that.

These steel tariffs the President has imposed are also not WTO consistent. That is pretty clear. There was a decision in a Korean case involving a line pipe that made quite the case that unless there are recent upsurges in the importation of a product that the 201 action does not apply. Here we have had steel importations going down the last 4 years, from 1998 to now. The better action here would have been to find some way to fix the number of imports that can come into the country at what

was the pre-1998 levels. That would have been the sensible and supportable action.

That did not happen here, Mr. Speaker; and therefore this bill is not designed to fix any problem, but it is designed for political reasons, not supported by any economist in the country, not even supported by economists in the White House, not even supported by the Secretary of the U.S. Treasury. It is unsupportable economically, and I urge this body to vote "no" on the resolution.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

□ 1045

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and in opposition to the resolution seeking to roll back steel import tariffs.

We in the Congressional Steel Caucus pushed a long time for the administration to initiate a section 201 steel investigation into dumping. We pushed the International Trade Commission to recognize the devastating effect of steel imports. We gathered with 25,000 steelworkers on the Ellipse to encourage the President to impose an effective remedy. We did get a remedy.

What has this tariff meant to the steel industry? It has helped us in Cleveland find a new owner to keep our steel mill running. It has helped create a climate to boost America's manufacturing output. Still, tens of thousands of steelworker retirees are losing health benefits, so we introduced the bipartisan Steel Legacy Relief Act to help obtain health benefits equivalent to what is provided by Medicare and a prescription drug benefit similar to the Blue Cross/Blue Shield program.

The United States should not stand by and watch while thousands and thousands of workers who helped build this country are suffering. We must say to our Nation's retired steelworkers, "You have worked all your life to make America strong. We have not forgotten, and we will not let you down."

I urge my colleagues to vote for this rule, oppose efforts to roll back steel tariffs, and sign on to our bill to address steel legacy costs.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY), who has been a great leader on behalf of workers in the steel industry.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule to table the motion of the gentleman from Louisiana. I have a great deal of respect for him, but I would point out to my colleagues that on October 22 last year, the International Trade Commission unani-

mously, three Republicans and three Democrats, found that illegally dumped steel caused serious injury to the United States of America and its workers. They were right.

Since 1977, we have lost 34.5 million tons of capacity. But, moreover, we lost many jobs. The gentleman from Louisiana mentioned earlier in his remarks that people in Korea and Japan and Brazil are upset over the President's implementation of the ITC decision. I would point out that some of the 72,567 Americans who have lost their job at bankrupt or closed companies in places like Dunkirk, New York, Vineyard, Utah, Gadsden, Alabama, Sterling, Illinois, and Sand Springs, Oklahoma, are even more upset, and they are our responsibility to protect.

The President acted appropriately on March 5 by imposing 30 percent tariffs. We ought not to set the President's program back.

Additionally, I am concerned, as I address the House today, that hundreds of exemptions have been asked for by our trading partners, and hundreds more have been asked for. And now we have 1,200 exemptions that have been requested, and the Secretary of the Treasury has indicated on a recent trip to Europe that a significant number of them might be approved.

I would hope that the administration does not follow through on the implication of the Secretary's remarks, that they hold firm, and that exemptions are only granted in the case where there is no other U.S. alternative for the products made.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND).

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today to urge those Members who are undecided about how to vote on this rule to consider the hundreds of thousands of steelworker jobs that have been lost since the steel crisis began in 1998, all due to the flood of steel imports.

Last year alone, over 20,000 jobs were lost in America's basic steel industry, and half of the Nation's bankrupt steel companies have now been forced to cease operations completely. In addition to the job losses, the steel crisis has put the health care benefits of 600,000 industry retirees at risk. Over 100,000 retirees and their dependents have already lost or will lose their health care benefits following bankruptcy.

The President's decision to apply 30 percent tariffs to certain steel imports was a step forward in protecting our national security, protecting legacy costs for steel workers' health benefits, and, most importantly, protecting America's jobs. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this rule and stand up in support of rebuilding this Nation's steel industry.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK).

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of this rule to table the resolution disapproving the President's decision on the section 201 steel investigation.

While the relief under section 201 was not everything I had hoped for, I commend the President for taking action to help our ailing iron ore and steel industries and for imposing stronger remedies than those recommended by the International Trade Commission.

If this resolution passes, the President's remedies would be overturned and the ITC recommendations then would become our law. This would weaken the tariffs that have been imposed. This would withdraw the helping hand that we have finally offered to the iron ore and steel industries.

Let me give an example. In the case of slab steel, which has been so destructive to the iron ore mines I represent, I had hoped for a straight tariff on the slab imports being dumped in the United States. The ITC recommended a tariff of 20 percent in the first year for imports over the quota. President Bush instituted a 30 percent tariff on the first year over the quota for slabs. This fell short of the relief our iron ore industry needs, but this resolution would mean, if it passes, that we would have to go back to the ITC 20 percent relief that is even more watered down. We cannot allow this to happen.

Our iron ore and steel industries depend on this relief. Without it, I am afraid our iron ore and steel industries will surely perish. I urge my colleagues to vote for this rule to table consideration of House Joint Resolution 84 and for preserving our American steel industry.

Let us stand with the President in aiding the iron ore and steel industries and look ahead to other ways we can help these industries, such as the much-needed legacy cost relief. Rather than taking a step backwards, we should now work to pass effective legacy cost legislation so that we can continue our forward momentum in bringing back our iron ore and steel industries.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA).

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of tabling H.J. Res. 84. This safeguard action gives our domestic steel industry and its employees a much-needed period of readjustment to recover from the substantial damage done by the latest steel import surge that began in 1998.

Thirty-three companies have declared bankruptcy in recent years, and

17 have closed their doors completely. 46,700 steelworkers have lost their jobs and 125,000 retirees have lost their health care benefits during this crisis.

The surge of low-priced imports is the result of foreign steel companies, often subsidized by foreign governments, building huge amounts of excess steel-making capacity. With their own markets unable to absorb all of this steel, they have flooded the U.S. market with their excess capacity.

We remain the most open market in the world. We cannot have free trade unless it is also fair trade, and President Bush recognized this fact last summer when he initiated the section 201 investigation on steel imports. The International Trade Commission conducted the investigation. This is an independent body. After many days of testimony, the Commission determined that steel imports were a substantial cause of serious injury to the U.S. steel industry.

On March 5, President Bush imposed temporary steel tariffs that range from 8 percent to 30 percent for a 3-year period. It is not a permanent tariff. This type of temporary safeguard measure is specifically allowed by World Trade Organization rules. Many of our trading partners have imposed safeguard measures on a variety of other products.

U.S. steel companies and steelworkers are only asking for a level playing field. The action taken by President Bush allows time for restructuring and for talks with our trading partners to reduce the worldwide excess steel-making capacity.

A strong domestic steel industry is crucial to the economic and national security of our Nation. It is important that today we give the President's safeguard actions time to work. Vote to table H.J. Res. 84.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE).

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

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 414 and in support of the tens of thousands of steelworkers across the Nation, as we fight to rebuild an industry that has been devastated by illegal dumping of foreign steel onto American markets.

I want to say that again: Illegal dumping of steel onto American markets has devastated this industry. As a Member of Congress whose family has worked over 73 years in the steel industry, I believe it is critical that we fight to ensure that our Nation's steelworkers have a fair and level playing field to market their product. After all, this is the same industry that built America and remains its backbone.

Over the past several years, 51 steel mills have been closed, 31 steel producers have filed for bankruptcy, and over 46,000 hardworking Americans have lost their jobs. And why did they lose their jobs? Because their competitors are cheating, breaking our trade

laws. And it has been a national disgrace that we have allowed it to happen this long.

Across my district in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, once called the steel capital of the world, thousands of hardworking men and women have lost their jobs because their competitors were cheating. Without the protections provided by the President on March 5, more workers will be left jobless by foreign producers who illegally bombard our markets with cheap foreign steel.

It is for these hardworking men and women and their families that I fight today. After all, if we are going to have free trade, we first have to have fair trade. The writing is on the wall and the call of our steelworkers must be heard.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for this rule to table an ill-advised resolution which poses a direct threat to the same industry that built and continues to remain America's backbone.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 414 and in support of the President and the tens of thousands of steelworkers across our nation as we fight to rebuild an industry that has been devastated by the illegal dumping of foreign steel onto American markets.

As a Member of Congress whose family has worked in the steel industry for over 73 years, I believe it is critical that we fight to ensure that our nation's steel workers have a fair and level playing field to market their product. After all, this is the same industry that built America into the world's pre-eminent superpower and it is the same industry we will continue to rely on to remain safe and strong. The very backbone of America is being threatened today.

Over the past several years, 51 steel mills have been closed, 31 steel producers have filed for bankruptcy, and over 46,000 hardworking Americans have lost their jobs. The International Trade Commission ruled unanimously that this loss is directly the result of steel dumping and not the fault of the American steel industry. Across the district that I represent in Western Pennsylvania, an area once universally called the Steel Capital of the World, thousands of hardworking men and women have lost their jobs due to unfair competition and through no fault of their own.

In fact, the productivity, work ethic, and technology of America's steel industry is far superior to any other nation in the world. However, without the protections provided by the President on March 5th, these workers will be left jobless by foreign producers who illegally bombard our markets with cheap, foreign steel. It is for these hardworking men and women, and their families, that I fight today!

America cannot simply stand back under the banner of free trade and allow foreign nations to subsidize their steel industries, underpay their workers and dump their products on our markets with the hope of destroying the American steel industry. After all, in order to have free trade, we must first have fair trade. The writing is on the wall and the call of our steel workers must be heard.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am standing today with the President and alongside every American steel worker. I urge my colleagues to join me and vote against this ill-advised resolution

which poses a direct threat to the same industry that built, and continues to remain, America's backbone.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH), who is the Chair of the Congressional Steel Caucus.

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Speaker, this is a critical issue. I came to the floor prepared to give a lengthy and detailed speech, and, instead, I will simply submit that for the record. I would like to take 2 minutes to speak from the heart on what I think is an absolutely critical issue for the American economy.

George Bush, when he took office last year, took a look at the issue facing steel, took a look at the crisis in American steel and initiated a WTO consistent process to evaluate the situation. The finding of the International Trade Commission was this: That, clearly, we were facing a surge of imports; clearly, there are unfair traders involved; and, clearly, we need to have an opportunity to give a breathing space to the U.S. industry.

The authors of the resolution today are opposed to what the President is trying to do, and I hope that this resolution will be tabled. We will be sending the wrong message to our international trading partners if we allow the Jefferson resolution to stand.

The Jefferson resolution, in effect, sends the message that it is open season on America's manufacturing sector. It simply says you do not have to play by the rules; that the global excess capacity in steel can continue to be dumped on the American market. And it will send a very clear message that notwithstanding the fact that America has some of the most productive steel mills in the world, America will not be able to defend itself when facing unfair trading practices in this critical sector.

The message that this resolution would send is that we are not prepared to defend ourselves in the critical area of trade; that we are not prepared to insist on maintaining an internationally competitive manufacturing sector in this globe.

We need to stand up for steel. We need to stand up for the President. Today, table this resolution and let our trading partners know we stand for fair trade.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for Congress to rally behind the President and stand up for steel. The passage of H.J. Res. 84 would send a clear message to the world that it is open season on the American manufacturing base. Anything less than the Section 201 relief provided by the President is unacceptable.

The Bush Administration labored over the various options for relief under Section 201 and it represents a milestone shift toward a stronger trade policy that insists on a level playing field of trade for domestic producers. The relief provided by President Bush is balanced, allowed under U.S. Trade Law and consistent with the rules under the World Trade Organization.

A strong tariff-based remedy is the only way to prevent the loss of thousands of additional steel-related jobs and indicate to foreign producers that the United States is not a dumping ground for excess steel products. But today we find ourselves faced with H.J. Res. 84. It's a joke of a proposal that dramatically weakens the tariff remedies by up to 10 percent for certain steel products by tossing aside the President's remedy and instead using the majority view of the International Trade Commission.

Let me assure you Mr. Speaker that weak action would silence many more steel plants, destroying jobs as well as the families and communities who depend on them, all while dealing a blow to our national economy and security. Because of eight years of inaction by the previous administration on this issue, 33 steel companies have declared bankruptcy, which translates into 45,000 steelworkers who have lost their jobs because of this most recent surge in steel.

Make no mistake—I am very strongly pro-trade, yet when it comes to steel it is distorted trade. And keep in mind that we are already witnessing the positive effects of the relief provided by the President. Imports have slowed and the window has opened to allow the domestic steel industry to recover from the devastating import surge. We are providing the time the domestic steel industry needs to restructure to remain competitive in the tight global steel market.

President Bush labored over this decision, carefully weighing all of the options on the table. His decision was tailored to provide relief to the steel industry while minimizing the negative impact on the rest of the economy. Very simply, the ITC decision was not.

President Bush's remedy reflects thorough consideration given to developing countries, trading partners who have entered into trade agreements with the United States, and to domestic steel mills with specific needs for imported steel products while crafting the tariffs and tariff-rate quota.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, H.J. Res. 84 does reflect the majority opinion of the ITC, while the President's remedy went beyond that.

The same statute that allows the gentleman from Louisiana to bring this resolution before us is the same statute that allowed the President to go beyond the majority opinion of the ITC. According to the U.S. Trade Act of 1974 Section 203, the President has the right to take action that he determines will facilitate efforts by the domestic steel industry to rebound and provide greater economic and social benefits when compared with the costs.

Clearly, the President and I are in agreement—the majority ITC opinion would have been ineffective. It would not return steel prices to their normal pre-crisis levels, and allow American steel companies to make the necessary investments to remain viable and competitive in the future while providing good-paying jobs.

The plight of the steel industry is grim but both Congress and the administration are working hard to give employers the tools they need to be competitive in the global market. Strong relief, coupled with the Bush Administration's continued efforts to address foreign market distortions and global steel overcapacity, will allow domestic steel manufacturers to restructure and regain ground lost to the injurious imports. This will ensure the continued viability of an industry that is a cornerstone of our economy and national security.

The domestic steel industry is at a significant crossroad. By granting relief under Section 201 of the U.S. trade laws, the Bush Administration provided critical breathing space for this strategic industry. Congress must not turn around and apply a choke hold.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule.

□ 1100

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I share the frustration of the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JEFFERSON) on the procedures that are being used here; and I do not speak to the procedures, but I am going to vote to uphold the rule of law and support the resolution.

We have laws that are WTO-consistent. They are here to protect our country from illegally imported products. In December 2001, the International Trade Commission, which is a nonpartisan body, unanimously found that the domestic steel industry had been harmed by the flood of foreign steel imports into the U.S. market since 1998. They found that our country became the dumping ground for illegally imported subsidized steel. As a result, our domestic steel producers were damaged.

In October, Bethlehem Steel Corporation filed for Chapter 11 bankruptcy protection. We now have 33 steel companies in the United States which are in some form of bankruptcy. They are there not because they cannot produce cost-effective steel. They can compete if it was fair competition, but we do not have fair competition because we have excess capacity in the world in producing steel.

The United States made it a policy to reduce its capacity in the last decade. We cannot produce enough steel to meet our domestic needs. We need to import steel. We have done what was necessary to restructure our steel industry on capacity. But it is our trading partners that still have the excess capacity that is causing U.S. steel companies to go in bankruptcy because of the dumped steel.

After we get rid of this resolution, we need to turn our attention to legacy costs because U.S. steel producers need help on the retiree costs if they are going to be able to compete on a fair, level playing field. I hope today's action will not be the last action in supporting the President. It is legacy protection for our steelworkers.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

Mr. VITTER. Madam Speaker, I rise to strongly support American jobs and employment here at home, economic development; and because of those values and because of that focus, I strongly support the Jefferson resolution and active consideration and debate of it.

U.S. port authorities, port terminal operators, longshore labor unions,

other U.S. port and transportation industry organizations all have opposed President Bush's decision to impose tariffs and quotas on fairly traded steel products imported into the United States, and all of those entities are home to good, viable, important, well-paying American jobs.

This is not a one-sided debate about American jobs. I am very sympathetic to U.S. steel producers and their employees, but that is not the only place jobs are impacted in terms of this action. They are impacted even more on the negative side by President Bush's decision with regard to ports and other maritime-related commerce.

I know that very well from my home, the New Orleans area. Forty percent of the revenue from the port of New Orleans is directly tied to steel imports. That supports more than 8,600 jobs just within the Greater New Orleans area, and if we look at Louisiana as a whole, there are thousands more, and if we look at the Nation, there are tens of thousands more.

There are far more good American jobs that will be cut, that will be hurt because of this decision than those jobs in the domestic steel industry that will be saved, and that is why I strongly support this resolution and believe that we should have full debate and consideration of it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JEFFERSON).

Mr. JEFFERSON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) for his remarks in support of the resolution and in opposition to the process being used here. Many of the speakers who have preceded me have talked about the ITC decision, the merits of it, that it was a 6-member vote, 3 on the Democratic side and 3 on the Republican side supporting it.

If the resolution passes, the ITC decision is in effect. This does not undo the ITC decision because it cannot. Honestly, I wish it could; but it cannot. The ITC decision will stand if this resolution should pass.

What is most egregious this morning is not whether you disagree with the position on the merits of the resolution, but whether we are going to have a debate on this matter or not. That, it seems to me, is the undeniable wrongness that is being accomplished here. I believe it is a shameful process, and in some respects it is a very hypocritical process. I have no problem with the idea that steelworkers need relief. I think the relief ought to come from making sure that we continue our work on eliminating the overcapacity in not only our markets but the world markets.

I think it comes in making sure that the quotas are right for pre-1988 importation levels, and I think it is also important to think about the legacy cost issues which are not addressed by this resolution and the President's action, to see what we can do to make sure that the \$13 billion legacy costs that

are out there get taken care of. That is not the subject of any of these discussions, yet they are talked about by Members who oppose this resolution as if they were a part of what we are dealing with here.

Today on this vote the only issue is whether there will be a full debate on this question today or not. How in the world can the House oppose a full debate on a matter of such dimensions as the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) has described, as I have described, and as others have described? It is a matter which has put the President's economic advisers on one page opposing the President's action. Some political advisers say it is a good idea, but his economic advisers do not support it. It is not justifiable on any economic ground. Give us a chance to debate. Vote no on the resolution.

Madam Speaker, I will move for the previous question when the vote is called.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PHELPS).

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

Mr. PHELPS. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the rule, and I support the President's decision to impose a 30 percent tariff as a first step in saving our American steel industry and the job and health insurance of Illinois steelworkers and retirees. The American steel industry and steelworkers are in the midst of the worst crisis in many years due to the continued illegal dumping into this country of foreign-made steel. Thousands of steelworkers have lost their jobs, and countless more are in jeopardy.

In my congressional district in central and southern Illinois, the effects have been devastating. I am troubled by foreign producers seeking additional exclusions from the tariffs for specific steel products, despite that these products are available from domestic producers. More disturbing are reported statements that a significant proportion of these exclusion requests will in fact be granted. Further exclusion will turn the section 201 tariffs into Swiss cheese where the holes will allow so much low-priced steel to enter the U.S. market that the industry will receive no meaningful relief.

The domestic steel industry has invested billions of dollars in upgrading and modernizing its facilities, and as a result is among the most productive makers of high-quality steel in the world. No industry, no matter how productive, however, can compete against the onslaught of low price and often unfairly traded steel imports. The section 201 relief that the President announced in March can provide substantial relief to the industry, but this will only occur if the tariffs stay in place without additional exclusions. It is imperative that we send the strongest

possible message to deter our trading partners from further illegal dumping, and to give the domestic steel industry the time it needs to recover from its injury. Anything less would be a disservice to those working men and women who are counting on the government to stand up for them. Vote yes on the rule to table House Joint Resolution 84.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JEFFERSON).

Mr. JEFFERSON. Madam Speaker, at the end of this discussion, I will urge Members to oppose the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to the rule. The amendment provides that the underlying resolution, H.J. Res. 84, disapproving the action taken by the President under section 203 of the Trade Act, will be considered by the House separately with a clean vote, and not simply tabled as the rule provides.

Madam Speaker, whether or not the Members agree with the President's action on this issue of considerable importance, we should all agree that this deserves to be considered under the process that was set up in section 203 of the Trade Act of 1974. That act allows the House to take an up or down vote on the President's action. This convoluted process of tabling the disapproval resolution before we even get to a vote completely short-circuits the regular process. Vote no on the previous question so we can all vote up or down on H.J. Res. 84.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment be printed in the RECORD immediately before the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, this process is not very clear. I wish it were different, but in the end I am going to support the rule because I believe in upholding the President's decision on tariffs because in the end I think it will save jobs in this country.

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

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

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to have worked on this rule with the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN). This is his first rule as a member of the Committee on Rules, but all remember his years of service to Joe Moakley when he was a staffer before being elected to his seat. It is an honor to serve with the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) now as a member of the Committee on Rules.

House Resolution 414 is a unique rule providing for the disposition of House Joint Resolution 84, a resolution of disapproval. Under this rule, H.J. Res. 84 would be automatically tabled. H.J. Res. 84 disapproves the action taken by President Bush to impose temporary tariffs on some types of steel products.

Under the Trade Act, Congress has the authority to disapprove of such actions within 90 days. Such a disapproval resolution is highly privileged, not amendable, and floor debate is limited to 20 hours. To put it simply, a vote in favor of this rule will lay on the table the disapproval resolution and conclude further deliberations. While congressional disapproval is certainly allowed under the statute, this rule recognizes that the circumstances in this case simply do not warrant such action. Laying this resolution on the table does not hurt the steel industry, as we have heard from so many Members on a bipartisan basis from the Steel Caucus. In fact, it will keep intact the President's remedy that the industry favors. The disapproval resolution could potentially be even more harmful to the industry. This disapproval resolution does not eliminate tariffs on steel imports either. It merely replaces one set of tariffs with another.

Madam Speaker, let me reiterate that a vote in favor of this rule will table the disapproval resolution, keep intact the President's current remedy, and conclude debate on this issue. I urge an aye vote. I urge my colleagues to table the resolution by voting aye.

The material previously referred to by Mr. JEFFERSON is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 414

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert:

That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 84) disapproving the action taken by the President under section 203 of the Trade Act of 1974 transmitted to the Congress on March 5, 2002. The joint resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except one hour of debate on the joint resolution equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BONIOR. Madam Speaker, if you want to know how foreign steel is affecting our communities just ask Ernie Ronn. Ernie is a retired iron ore miner from the Upper Peninsula of Michigan.

If you ask Ernie, or thousands of other iron ore and steel workers how steel dumping is affecting our community, they'll all tell you the same thing—this foreign steel is killing us.

Last July, thousands of iron ore workers in Marquette, Michigan held a rally which filled and entire indoor stadium. Later the workers, their families, children and business owners filled the streets of Marquette.

They know that when a mine shuts down in the U.P. or a steel factory closes in River Rouge you cripple an entire community, you erode the tax base, police and fire services suffer, and no one goes unaffected.

The citizens of Marquette marched because their jobs, their community, and their future was—and still is—at stake.

At that rally a year ago, Ernie Ronn told us that this was the fourth demonstration he'd been to. He said, "my grandfather and your grandfather, they came to this country—from Poland, Finland, Slovenia, Ukraine, Italy and Germany—to make better lives for you and I. That's what we want to do for our kids, make it a better world. It's a common thread for people. We've built a great community, and now we must keep it strong. We shouldn't have to keep trying to get that message across."

While Mr. Ronn said those words nearly a year ago, they couldn't be more apt today. It's time to end this debate. The President has taken action; his decision has already been implemented. It's time to move forward.

For the iron ore workers in Marquette and the steelworkers down river of Detroit this is a matter of putting food on the table, paying the mortgage or rent, and keeping their families healthy and safe. Vote for this rule to table the resolution.

Mr. BACHUS. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the rule to table this misguided resolution.

If we pass H.J. Res. 84 we're going to be sending a message to the rest of the world. And that message is: Foreign countries, go ahead. Flood our markets. Illegally dump your products here. Because the United States is not going to enforce our trade laws. We'll be declaring "open season" on America's manufacturing base and on American workers.

We cannot let that happen. We must stop it. And I'm proud that our President, George W. Bush, took decisive action to restore fair competition for our steelworkers. If American steelworkers are allowed to compete on a level playing field, they will win. But if we do not restore that level playing field, more American steelworkers will lose their jobs.

This problem has been going on for years, and President Bush showed real leadership when he put these tariffs on. This action is absolutely necessary to defend steelworker jobs against illegally traded steel and ensure America has a steel industry five and ten years from now.

Madam Speaker, I testified before the International Trade Commission on several occasions about the illegal import crisis and its effect on our steel-producing areas like my home State of Alabama. I told them about the dangers this crisis presents to our national security. And in this time of war, what is more important than the security of our Nation and its ability to defend itself?

Vote yes on the rule. Stand with our President. And stand up for the hardworking citizens who built this country into the great and powerful Nation it is today.

Mr. COSTELLO. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.J. Res. 84, to disapprove the President's steel tariffs.

Our domestic steel industry is currently in a crisis situation. The fundamental cause of this crisis is massive foreign overcapacity, which has caused the United States to become a dumping ground for world excess steel products. As a result of this, since 1997, 33 steel companies have filed for bankruptcy, affecting over 62,000 American steel workers. Almost 90 percent of the capacity reduction occurred in 2001.

Our domestic steel industry is vital to our national security. American Armed Forces de-

pend on American steel for their planes, tanks and ships. A dependence on foreign steel could be catastrophic for our national defense.

Last year, I joined my colleagues on the Congressional Steel Caucus in urging the President to implement a Section 201 investigation by the International Trade Commission to determine if our domestic markets had been harmed by illegal dumping. In the fall, I testified before the ITC to express my concerns regarding the steel crisis. The ITC ruled unanimously that the steel industry had indeed been harmed.

In March of this year, the President announced his intention to impose tariff safeguards of up to 30 percent on major steel products. While the President could have imposed tariffs of up to 40 percent, I am hopeful that the 30 percent tariff will be sufficient to give the industry a chance at recovery, and am pleased that the President did decide to take action. His actions sent a strong message that we will no longer tolerate the unfair trade practices which have harmed the steel industry.

Madam Speaker, voting no on this resolution is paramount to the U.S. domestic steel industry, and I urge my colleagues to join me with a no vote.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. JEFFERSON. 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. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 8 and 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting, if ordered, on the question of adoption of the resolution, and thereafter on the motion to suspend the rules and concur in Senate amendments to H.R. 3525 debated yesterday.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 355, nays 62, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 129]

YEAS—355

Abercrombie	Berkley	Brown (OH)
Ackerman	Berry	Brown (SC)
Aderholt	Biggert	Bryant
Akin	Bilirakis	Burr
Allen	Bishop	Callahan
Andrews	Blagojevich	Calvert
Armey	Blumenauer	Camp
Baca	Blunt	Cannon
Bachus	Boehert	Cantor
Baird	Boehner	Capito
Baker	Bonilla	Capps
Baldacci	Bonior	Cardin
Ballenger	Bono	Carson (OK)
Barcia	Boozman	Chabot
Barr	Borski	Chambliss
Barrett	Boswell	Clement
Bartlett	Boyd	Clyburn
Barton	Brady (PA)	Coble
Bass	Brady (TX)	Collins
Bereuter	Brown (FL)	Combest

Cooksey	Jackson (IL)	Rahall		NAYS—62	Biggert	Gonzalez	McCollum
Costello	Jackson-Lee	Ramstad	Baldwin	Holt	Bilirakis	Goode	McGovern
Cox	(TX)	Rangel	Becerra	Israel	Bishop	Goodlatte	McHugh
Coyne	Jenkins	Regula	Bentsen	Jefferson	Blagojevich	Gordon	McInnis
Cramer	John	Rehberg	Berman	Kucinich	Blumenauer	Goss	McIntyre
Crenshaw	Johnson (CT)	Reynolds	Boucher	Lantos	Blunt	Graham	McKeon
Crowley	Johnson (IL)	Rivers	Capuano	Lee	Boehrlert	Granger	McKinney
Cubin	Johnson, E. B.	Rodriguez	Castle	Lewis (GA)	Bonilla	Graves	McNulty
Culberson	Johnson, Sam	Roemer	Clayton	Lofgren	Bonior	Green (TX)	Meehan
Cummings	Jones (NC)	Rogers (KY)	Condit	Lynch	Bono	Green (WI)	Meek (FL)
Cunningham	Kanjorski	Rogers (MI)	Conyers	Markey	Boozman	Greenwood	Meeks (NY)
Davis (IL)	Kaptur	Rohrabacher	Davis (CA)	McCarthy (MO)	Borski	Grucci	Menendez
Davis, Jo Ann	Keller	Ros-Lehtinen	Davis (FL)	McDermott	Boswell	Gutierrez	Mica
Davis, Tom	Kelly	Ross	DeFazio	McGovern	Boucher	Gutknecht	Millender-
Deal	Kennedy (MN)	Rothman	DeGette	McKinney	Boyd	Hall (TX)	McDonald
DeLay	Kennedy (RI)	Roukema	Delahunt	Meek (FL)	Brady (PA)	Hansen	Miller, Dan
DeMint	Kerns	Roybal-Allard	DeLauro	Meeks (NY)	Brady (TX)	Hart	Miller, Gary
Deutsch	Kildee	Royce	Dooley	Menendez	Brown (FL)	Hastings (WA)	Miller, George
Diaz-Balart	Kilpatrick	Rush	Ford	Moran (VA)	Brown (OH)	Hayes	Miller, Jeff
Dicks	King (NY)	Ryan (WI)	Frank	Napolitano	Brown (SC)	Hayworth	Mink
Dingell	Kingston	Ryun (KS)	Harman	Neal	Bryant	Hefley	Mollohan
Doggett	Kirk	Sandlin	Hastings (FL)	Oberstar	Burr	Hill	Moore
Doolittle	Klecza	Saxton			Callahan	Hilleary	Moran (KS)
Doyle	Knollenberg	Schaffer	Burton	Honda	Calvert	Hilliard	Morella
Dreier	Kolbe	Schakowsky	Buyer	Jones (OH)	Camp	Hinchey	Murtha
Duncan	LaFalce	Schiff	Carson (IN)	Kind (WI)	Cannon	Hinojosa	Myrick
Dunn	LaHood	Schrock	Clay	Miller, George	Cantor	Hobson	Napolitano
Edwards	Lampson	Scott	Crane	Nadler	Capito	Hoeffel	Neal
Ehlers	Langevin	Sensenbrenner	Hall (OH)	Ose	Capps	Hoekstra	Nethercutt
Ehrlich	Larsen (WA)	Serrano			Capuano	Holden	Ney
Emerson	Larson (CT)	Sessions			Cardin	Holt	Northup
Engel	Latham	Shadegg			Carson (OK)	Hookey	Norwood
English	LaTourette	Shaw			Chabot	Horn	Nussle
Eshoo	Leach	Shays			Chambliss	Hostettler	Oberstar
Etheridge	Levin	Sherman			Clayton	Houghton	Obey
Evans	Lewis (CA)	Sherwood			Clement	Hoyer	Olver
Everett	Lewis (KY)	Shimkus			Clyburn	Hulshof	Ortiz
Farr	Linder	Shows			Coble	Hunter	Osborne
Fattah	Lipinski	Shuster			Collins	Hyde	Otter
Ferguson	LoBiondo	Simmons			Combust	Inslee	Owens
Filner	Lowey	Simpson			Condit	Isakson	Oxley
Flake	Lucas (KY)	Skeen			Conyers	Israel	Pallone
Fletcher	Lucas (OK)	Slaughter			Costello	Issa	Pascarell
Foley	Luther	Smith (MI)			Cox	Istook	Pastor
Forbes	Maloney (CT)	Smith (NJ)			Coyne	Jackson (IL)	Paul
Fossella	Maloney (NY)	Smith (TX)			Cramer	Jackson-Lee	Pelosi
Frelinghuysen	Manzullo	Snyder			Crenshaw	(TX)	Pence
Frost	Mascara	Solis			Crowley	Jenkins	Peterson (MN)
Gallegly	Matheson	Souder			Cubin	Johnson (CT)	Peterson (PA)
Ganske	Matsui	Spratt			Culberson	Johnson (IL)	Petri
Gekas	McCarthy (NY)	Stark			Cummings	Johnson, E. B.	Phelps
Gephardt	McCollum	Stearns			Cunningham	Johnson, Sam	Pickering
Gibbons	McCrery	Strickland			Davis (IL)	Jones (NC)	Pitts
Gilchrest	McHugh	Stump			Davis, Jo Ann	Kanjorski	Platts
Gillmor	McInnis	Stupak			Deal	Kaptur	Pomeroy
Gilman	McIntyre	Sullivan			DeFazio	Keller	Portman
Gonzalez	McKeon	Sununu			DeGette	Kelly	Price (NC)
Goode	McNulty	Sweeney			Delahunt	Kennedy (MN)	Pryce (OH)
Goodlatte	Meehan	Tancred			DeLauro	Kennedy (RI)	Putnam
Gordon	Mica	Tanner			DeLay	Kerns	Quinn
Goss	Millender-	Tauscher			DeMint	Kildee	Radanovich
Graham	McDonald	Tauzin			Deutsch	Kilpatrick	Rahall
Granger	Miller, Dan	Taylor (MS)			Diaz-Balart	King (NY)	Ramstad
Graves	Miller, Gary	Taylor (NC)			Dingell	Kingston	Rangel
Green (TX)	Miller, Jeff	Terry			Doggett	Kirk	Regula
Green (WI)	Mink	Thomas			Doolittle	Klecza	Rehberg
Greenwood	Mollohan	Thompson (CA)			Doyle	Knollenberg	Reyes
Grucci	Moore	Thompson (MS)			Dreier	Kucinich	Reynolds
Gutierrez	Moran (KS)	Thornberry			Duncan	LaFalce	Rivers
Gutknecht	Morella	Thune			Dunn	LaHood	Rodriguez
Hall (TX)	Murtha	Thurman			Edwards	Lampson	Roemer
Hansen	Myrick	Tiahrt			Ehrlich	Langevin	Rogers (KY)
Hart	Nethercutt	Tiberi			Emerson	Lantos	Rogers (MI)
Hastings (WA)	Ney	Toomey			Engel	Larson (CT)	Rohrabacher
Hayes	Northup	Towns			English	Latham	Ros-Lehtinen
Hayworth	Norwood	Turner			Eshoo	LaTourette	Ross
Hefley	Nussle	Udall (NM)			Etheridge	Leach	Rothman
Henger	Ortiz	Upton			Evans	Lee	Roukema
Hill	Osborne	Velazquez			Everett	Levin	Roybal-Allard
Hilleary	Otter	Visclosky			Farr	Lewis (CA)	Royce
Hilliard	Owens	Walden			Fattah	Lewis (GA)	Rush
Hinchey	Oxley	Walsh			Ferguson	Lewis (KY)	Ryan (WI)
Hinojosa	Pallone	Wamp			Filner	Linder	Ryun (KS)
Hobson	Pascarell	Watkins (OK)			Fletcher	Lipinski	Sabo
Hoeffel	Paul	Watts (OK)			Foley	LoBiondo	Sanchez
Hoekstra	Pence	Weiner			Forbes	Lowey	Sanders
Holden	Peterson (PA)	Weldon (FL)			Ford	Lucas (KY)	Sandlin
Hookey	Petri	Weldon (PA)			Fossella	Lucas (OK)	Saxton
Horn	Phelps	Weller			Frank	Luther	Schaffer
Hostettler	Pickering	Wexler			Frelinghuysen	Lynch	Schakowsky
Houghton	Pitts	Whitfield			Frost	Maloney (CT)	Schiff
Hoyer	Platts	Wicker			Gallegly	Maloney (NY)	Schrock
Hulshof	Pombo	Wilson (NM)			Ganske	Manzullo	Scott
Hunter	Pomeroy	Wilson (SC)			Gekas	Markey	Sensenbrenner
Hyde	Portman	Wolf			Gephardt	Mascara	Serrano
Inslee	Pryce (OH)	Wynn			Gibbons	Matheson	Sessions
Isakson	Putnam	Young (AK)			Gilchrest	Matsui	Shadegg
Issa	Quinn	Young (FL)			Gillmor	McCarthy (MO)	Shaw
Istook	Radanovich				Gilman	McCarthy (NY)	Shays

NOT VOTING—17

□ 1140

Messrs. WATT of North Carolina, PASTOR, PRICE of North Carolina, HOLT, SANDERS and WU, and Ms. WOOLSEY and Mrs. NAPOLITANO changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. FARR of California, BACA, POMEROY, and SCHIFF, and Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD, Ms. SOLIS, Ms. SANCHEZ, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. REYNOLDS. 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 Resolution 414.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. JEFFERSON. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 386, noes 30, answered “present” 1, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 130]

AYES—386

Abercrombie	Bachus	Bartlett
Ackerman	Baird	Barton
Aderholt	Baldacci	Bass
Akin	Baldwin	Becerra
Allen	Ballenger	Bentsen
Andrews	Barcia	Bereuter
Armey	Barr	Berkley
Baca	Barrett	Berry

Sherman Sununu Walden Ballenger Evans Larsen (WA) Reynolds Shows Thurman
 Sherwood Sweeney Walsh Barcia Everett Larson (CT) Rivers Shuster
 Shimkus Tanner Wamp Barr Everrett Larson (CT) Rodriguez Shuster
 Shows Tauscher Watkins (OK) Farr Latham Simmons
 Shuster Taylor (MS) Watt (NC) Fattah LaTourette Roemer Simpson
 Simmons Taylor (NC) Watts (OK) Leach Ferguson Rogers (KY) Skeen
 Simpson Terry Weiner Watts (OK) Lee Filner Rogers (MI) Skelton
 Skeen Thomas Weldon (FL) Levin Lewis (CA) Rohrabacher Slaughter
 Skelton Thompson (CA) Weldon (PA) Lewis (GA) Ros-Lehtinen Smith (MI)
 Slaughter Thompson (MS) Weller Thompson (MS) Ross Smith (NJ)
 Smith (MI) Thornberry Wexler Rothman Smith (TX)
 Smith (NJ) Thune Whitfield Berkley Berman Fossella Linder Smith (WA)
 Smith (TX) Thurman Wicker Berry Frank Lipinski LoBiondo Snyder
 Snyder Tiahrt Wilson (NM) Biggert Frank LoBiondo Snyder
 Solis Tiberi Wilson (SC) Bilirakis Frost Lowey Lucas (KY) Royce
 Souder Tierney Wolf Ganske Lucas (OK) Ryan (WI) Rush
 Spratt Toomey Woolsey Gekas Luther Sabo Stark
 Stark Towns Wu Blumenauer Gekas Luther Sabo Stark
 Stearns Turner Wynn Young (AK) Lynch Maloney (CT) Stearns
 Strickland Udall (NM) Young (FL) Maloney (NY) Saxton Stump
 Stump Upton Velazquez Gilchrist Gilman Markey Schaffer Stupak
 Stupak Velazquez Visclosky Schiff Sweeney Schackowsky Sununu
 Sullivan Visclosky Schrock Tanner Scott Sensenbrenner Taylor (MS)
 Sessions Taylor (NC) Terry Shaw Thomas Thompson (CA)
 Shays Sherman Thompson (MS) Sherrman Thorneberry Young (FL)
 Shimkus Thune

NOES—30

Baker Ehlers McCrery
 Berman Flake McDermott
 Boehner Harman Moran (VA)
 Castle Hastings (FL) Payne
 Cooksey Herger Smith (WA)
 Davis (CA) Jefferson Stenholm
 Davis (FL) John Tauzin
 Davis, Tom Kolbe Vitter
 Dicks Larsen (WA) Waters
 Dooley Lofgren Watson (CA)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Tancredo

NOT VOTING—17

Burton Honda Riley
 Buyer Jones (OH) Sawyer
 Carson (IN) Kind (WI) Traficant
 Clay Nadler Udall (CO)
 Crane Ose Waxman
 Hall (OH) Pombo

□ 1151

Mr. HORN changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

So House Joint Resolution 84 was laid on the table.

ENHANCED BORDER SECURITY AND VISA ENTRY REFORM ACT OF 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and concurring in the Senate amendments to the bill, H.R. 3525.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill, H.R. 3525, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 411, nays 0, answered "present" 2, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 131]

YEAS—411

Ackerman Andrews Baird
 Aderholt Armeey Baker
 Akin Baca Baldacci
 Allen Bachus Baldwin

Walden Barcia Ballenger
 Walsh Barr Barrera
 Wamp Barr Barrett
 Watkins (OK) Barlett
 Watt (NC) Bereuter
 Watts (OK) Barton
 Weiner Basso
 Weldon (FL) Becerra
 Weldon (PA) Bentsen
 Weller Bereuter
 Wexler Berkley
 Whitfield Berman
 Wicker Berry
 Wilson (NM) Biggert
 Wilson (SC) Bilirakis
 Wolf Bishop
 Woolsey Blagojevich
 Wu Blumenauer
 Wynn Blunt
 Young (AK) Boehlert
 Young (FL) Boehner
 Bonilla Bonior
 Bono Bono
 Boozman Bozski
 Borski Boswell
 Bouche Boyer
 Brady (PA) Brady (TX)
 Brady (TX) Brown (FL)
 Brown (FL) Brown (OH)
 Brown (OH) Brown (SC)
 Bryant Burr
 Callahan Calvert
 Camp Cannon
 Cantor Cantor
 Capito Capito
 Capps Capps
 Capuano Capuano
 Cardin Cardin (OK)
 Castle Castle
 Chabot Chabot
 Chambliss Chambliss
 Clay Clay
 Clayton Clayton
 Clement Clement
 Clyburn Clyburn
 Coble Coble
 Collins Collins
 Combust Combust
 Condit Condit
 Conyers Conyers
 Cooksey Cooksey
 Costello Costello
 Coyne Coyne
 Cramer Cramer
 Crenshaw Crenshaw
 Crowley Crowley
 Cubin Cubin
 Culberson Culberson
 Cummings Cummings
 Cunningham Cunningham
 Davis (CA) Davis (CA)
 Davis (FL) Davis (FL)
 Davis (IL) Davis (IL)
 Davis, Jo Ann Davis, Jo Ann
 Davis, Tom Davis, Tom
 Deal Deal
 DeFazio DeFazio
 DeGette DeGette
 Delahunt Delahunt
 DeLauro DeLauro
 DeLay DeLay
 DeMint DeMint
 Deutsch Deutsch
 Diaz-Balart Diaz-Balart
 Dicks Dicks
 Dingell Dingell
 Doggett Doggett
 Dooley Dooley
 Doolittle Doolittle
 Doyle Doyle
 Dreier Dreier
 Duncan Duncan
 Dunn Dunn
 Edwards Edwards
 Ehlers Ehlers
 Ehrlich Ehrlich
 Emerson Emerson
 Engel Engel
 English English
 Eshoo Eshoo
 Etheridge Etheridge

Larsen (WA) Evans
 Larson (CT) Everrett
 Latham Farr
 LaTourette Fattah
 Leach Ferguson
 Lee Filner
 Levin Flake
 Lewis (CA) Fletcher
 Lewis (GA) Foley
 Lewis (KY) Forbes
 Linder Ford
 Lipinski Fossella
 LoBiondo Frank
 Lofgren Frelinghuysen
 Lowey Frost
 Lucas (KY) Gallegly
 Lucas (OK) Ganske
 Luther Gekas
 Lynch Gephardt
 Maloney (CT) Gibbons
 Maloney (NY) Gilchrist
 Manzullo Gillmor
 Markey Gilman
 Mascara Gonzalez
 Matheson Goodlatte
 Matsui Gordon
 McCarthy (MO) Goss
 McCarthy (NY) Graham
 McCollum Granger
 McCrery Graves
 McDermott Green (TX)
 McGovern Green (WI)
 McHugh Greenwood
 McInnis Grucci
 McIntyre Gutierrez
 McKeon Hall (TX)
 McKinney Hansen
 McNulty Harman
 Meehan Hart
 Meek (FL) Hastings (FL)
 Meeks (NY) Hastings (WA)
 Menendez Hayes
 Mica Hayworth
 Millender Hefley
 McDonald Herger
 Miller, Dan Hill
 Miller, Gary Hillery
 Miller, George Hilliard
 Mink Hinchey
 Mollohan Hinojosa
 Moore Hobson
 Moran (KS) Hoeffel
 Moran (VA) Hoekstra
 Morella Holden
 Murtha Morella
 Myrick Murtha
 Napolitano Myrick
 Neal Neapolitano
 Nethercutt Neal
 Ney Nethercutt
 Northrup Ney
 Norwood Northrup
 Nussle Norwood
 Oberstar Nussle
 Obey Oberstar
 Olver Obey
 Ortiz Olver
 Osborne Ortiz
 Otter Osborne
 Owens Otter
 Oxley Owens
 Pallone Oxley
 Pascarell Pallone
 Pastor Pascarell
 Paul Pastor
 Payne Paul
 Pelosi Payne
 Pence Pelosi
 Peterson (MN) Pence
 Peterson (PA) Peterson (MN)
 Petri Peterson (PA)
 Phelps Petri
 Pickering Phelps
 Pitts Pickering
 Platts Pitts
 Pombo Platts
 Pomeroy Pombo
 Portman Pomeroy
 Price (NC) Portman
 Putnam Price (NC)
 Quinn Putnam
 Radanovich Quinn
 Rahall Radanovich
 Ramstad Rahall
 Rangel Ramstad
 Regula Rangel
 Rehberg Regula
 Reyes Rehberg

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Abercrombie

Tancredo

NOT VOTING—21

Burton Hall (OH) Pryce (OH)
 Buyer Honda Riley
 Carson (IN) Jones (OH) Sawyer
 Cox Kanjorski Traficant
 Crane Kind (WI) Udall (CO)
 Goode Nadler Waxman
 Gutknecht Ose Woolsey

□ 1201

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendments were concurred in.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall No. 131, on the motion that the House suspend the rules and agree to the Senate amendments to H.R. 3525, I inadvertently voted "present." It was my desire to have my vote recorded as "yea," and I ask that the RECORD reflect that.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 131, I was absent for the five-minute rollcall vote. Had I been present I would have voted "yeas."

□ 1200

CORRECTING THE ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 3525, ENHANCED BORDER SECURITY AND VISA ENTRY RE- FORM ACT OF 2001.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 106) to correct the enrollment of H.R. 3525, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 106

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That, in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 3525) to enhance the