

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would say to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS), 161 Democrats voted for the fast track bill. Do not stand up here and say the issue is whether one is for or against free trade. That is nonsense.

Mr. Speaker, also nonsense is this argument about the Senate stripping House language using an Andean bill. That is pure hokum. What the Senate did was to take the Andean bill that passed here and put other trade bills in it, including their Andean bill.

So Members do not need this bill. The subjects are on the table for the conference. They are trying to load the deck. That is what they are trying to do. They are trying to do it by a rule that has 191 pages and adding DeMint, which might be the only subject that could not be brought in the conference. That is what they are doing here. Be honest, they are trying to load the deck as they enter conference, and they should not be handling serious trade matters in this way.

For that reason, because we see through the smoke screen, Members should vote no on this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I have great respect and admiration for the gentleman from Michigan, but, for the life of me, I cannot understand why the minority must not have the confidence in the Senate conferees. They must not trust their ability to negotiate, the integrity of the Senate language.

But what I find most perplexing is how the minority, with a clear conscience, would want to send our own conferees into conference with no position, because what is there are the Senate provisions in the conference. I have read the report under our rule that was the opinion of CRS that clearly talks about definitions of that position.

It is important for us to reflect on the fact that the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, in seeing that, clearly brought to this House, which we will have a vote on in a moment, but to the Committee on Rules the fact that we were not on a level playing field, and that was not right. It was not right for this House, and it is not right for the debate that needs to happen in that conference report.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman from New York to look at me: this side of my mouth, that side of my mouth. You are talking out of both sides of your mouth. What you are saying is that, on the one hand, you have 160 pages that you passed; and then you say we have no position. You cannot have it both ways.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. 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 40, nays 384, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 263]		
YEAS—40		
Berry	Gonzalez	Mink
Bishop	Hastings (FL)	Obey
Boucher	Hoekstra	Olver
Brown (FL)	Honda	Pelosi
Capuano	Hoyer	Sanders
Carson (IN)	Jackson-Lee	Sandlin
Clay	(TX)	Stupak
Conyers	Johnson, E. B.	Taylor (MS)
DeFazio	Jones (OH)	Thompson (MS)
Dingell	Kaptur	Towns
Doggett	Lynch	Velazquez
Evans	McDermott	Waters
Farr	McGovern	Wynn
Filner	Meek (FL)	
NAYS—384		
Abercrombie	Carson (OK)	Foley
Ackerman	Castle	Forbes
Aderholt	Chabot	Ford
Akin	Chambliss	Fossella
Allen	Clayton	Frank
Andrews	Clement	Frelinghuysen
Armey	Clyburn	Frost
Baca	Coble	Gallegly
Bachus	Collins	Ganske
Baird	Combest	Gekas
Baker	Condit	Gephardt
Baldacci	Cooksey	Gibbons
Baldwin	Costello	Gilchrest
Ballenger	Cox	Gillmor
Barcia	Coyne	Gilman
Barr	Cramer	Goode
Barrett	Crane	Goodlatte
Bartlett	Crenshaw	Gordon
Barton	Crowley	Goss
Bass	Cubin	Graham
Becerra	Culberson	Granger
Bentsen	Cummings	Graves
Bereuter	Cunningham	Green (TX)
Berkley	Davis (CA)	Green (WI)
Berman	Davis (FL)	Greenwood
Biggart	Davis (IL)	Grucci
Bilirakis	Davis, Jo Ann	Gutierrez
Blagojevich	Davis, Tom	Gutknecht
Blumenauer	Deal	Hall (OH)
Blunt	DeGette	Hall (TX)
Boehlert	DeLauro	Hansen
Boehner	DeLay	Harman
Bonilla	DeMint	Hart
Bonior	Deutsch	Hastings (WA)
Bono	Diaz-Balart	Hayes
Boozman	Dicks	Hayworth
Borski	Dooley	Hefley
Boswell	Doolittle	Herger
Boyd	Doyle	Hill
Brady (PA)	Dreier	Hilleary
Brady (TX)	Duncan	Hilliard
Brown (OH)	Dunn	Hinchey
Brown (SC)	Edwards	Hinojosa
Bryant	Ehlers	Hobson
Burr	Ehrlich	Hoefel
Burton	Emerson	Holden
Buyer	Engel	Holt
Callahan	English	Hooley
Calvert	Eshoo	Horn
Camp	Etheridge	Hostettler
Cannon	Everett	Houghton
Cantor	Fattah	Hulshof
Capito	Ferguson	Hunter
Capps	Flake	Hyde
Cardin	Fletcher	Inslee
NOT VOTING—10		
Delahunt	Owens	Stark
Jefferson	Pastor	Traficant
LaFalce	Roukema	
Nussle	Smith (MI)	

□ 1613

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. HILLEARY and Mr. PICKERING changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

RELATING TO CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3009, ANDEAN TRADE PROMOTION AND DRUG ERADICATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) has 10½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) has 4 minutes remaining.

□ 1615

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time and ask the gentleman, because of the imbalance of time, if he would proceed with some of his speakers. We have but two speakers remaining.

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

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, for the gentleman who is managing the minority side of the rule, I intend to have him speak. I then intend to have the Chairman of the Committee on Rules close. There will be no further speakers other than I as the manager of the rule.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), my good friend, the Democratic whip.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time and for his brilliant arguments against this outrageous rule, which I rise not only to oppose but to implore my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to disassociate themselves from.

This is not a rule proposed by the Grand Old Party. This is not about Republicans in our country. This rule is outrageous. It is a rule that limits freedom in this, the people's House.

Every child in school learns how laws are made. They visit here, this temple of democracy, and yet what is happening here today is to shred that book.

American people think of this as the people's House, where issues and policies are debated, a marketplace of ideas. They do not think of it as a place of bait and switch. This House voted on a bill; I opposed it. It won by one vote, but it would be the House's bill to go to conference.

Because the majority did not like how the other body treated this same legislation on trade promotion, they decided that they would usurp the power of this House and give that power to one person to go to the Committee on Rules and have over 50 pages of changes on a 191-page rule, that by passing the rule my colleagues are deeming those provisions passed, provisions that have never been debated and considered in this House. We might as well tear up the book on how a bill is passed in terms of process, in terms of precedent, in terms of policy.

This is a very dark day for the House of Representatives. We had all hoped, many of us, that the bill would come back in the form we could have a great amount of support for, to give the President trade promotion authority. Instead of doing that, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means has made matters worse with this outrageous procedure and this outrageous bill.

We are the model of democracy to the world, to the world. The world is watching what we do here. Young children study what we do here; and instead of being an example, we are a place where today freedom and democratic debate are being greatly diminished.

It is no wonder the gentleman from New York has no speakers on this rule. It is no wonder that in the course of the debate many people spoke up to defend the minority position and only two people could speak in favor of this rule. It is an embarrassment to this House, and it should be an embarrassment to the Republican party.

Why do we not want to have this debate in the light of day instead of just by stealth into the Committee on Rules and on to this floor? Because this is a disgrace and a disservice, a disservice to American workers. It deprives them of the debate on their health benefits, on workers' rights.

We can come together in a bipartisan way. I implore my colleagues to reject this outrageous rule. Vote no.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS).

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a colloquy between the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PICKERING) and myself be made a part of the RECORD.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Under the rules, that cannot be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) has 10½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) has 1 minute remaining.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield the remaining time of the minority to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, my good friend.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, there is a way to get out of this dilemma in an attempt to restore some degree of bipartisanship to a trade bill. This is what we enjoyed when we were dealing with the Caribbean Basin Initiative, with China, with the African Growth and Opportunity bill. We worked out our differences; and even though we disagreed, we were not disagreeable.

The problem that we have here is not one of substance. We have one that the integrity of the House of Representatives is on, and I am saying that history will not treat us kindly if, for the first time in over 200 years of the House of Representatives, we attempt to take substantive legislation and have the Committee on Rules roll it up into a rule and to have us vote on it.

True, the Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means will tell my colleagues that 80 percent of this has already been passed one way or the other by the House, but what about the 20 percent? When does the 20 percent become 30 percent or 40 percent? This did happen once before, and that is when the House was closed down. There was no way to communicate with the Senate, and we did use the Committee on Rules in order to legislate.

But I ask my colleagues to vote down the rule. Let us do it the right way.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PICKERING) for the purposes of entertaining a colloquy.

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire about the impact of the hybrid cutting provision with respect to CBI that is contained in the amendment. As my colleagues know, the amendment contains language requiring that apparel made of U.S. knit or woven fabric assembled in the CBI qualifies for benefits only if the U.S. knit or woven fabric is dyed and finished in the United States. The hybrid cutting provision allows benefits under CBI if apparel is made of components cut in the United States and in the CBI of fabric wholly formed in the United States from yarns wholly formed in the United States.

Is it my colleague's understanding that the dyeing and finishing requirements for U.S. fabric contained in the amendment also apply to the hybrid cutting provision?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKERING. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I tell the gentleman from Mississippi, the answer is an unequivocal yes.

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

While the rest of the world speeds ahead when it comes to free trade, the United States desperately needs to get back on track. Trade promotion authority is the most effective way to accomplish that, and this rule simply allows the process to move forward so we can get one step closer to retaining and regaining America's global trade pre-eminence.

I ask my colleagues to join me in freeing the hands of our conferees and not restrict our ability to negotiate before they even get to the table. That is why I have urged a yes for this resolution; and when the end of the day comes for a vote in moments, it is going to come down to either my colleagues supported free trade and they