

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3009, TRADE ACT OF 2002.

Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-625) on the resolution (H. Res. 509) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 3009) an Act to extend the Andean Trade Preference Act, to grant additional trade benefits under that Act, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 3210, TERRORISM RISK PROTECTION ACT

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3210) to ensure the continued financial capacity of insurers to provide coverage for risks from terrorism, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY)?

Mr. DEFAZIO. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman to repeat the unanimous consent request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Oregon yield on his reservation?

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? The Chair hears none and, without objection, appoints the following conferees:

From the Committee on Financial Services, for consideration of the House bill and the Senate amendment thereto, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. OXLEY, BAKER, NEY, Mrs. KELLY, Messrs. SHAYS, FOSSELLA, FERGUSON, LAFALCE, KANJORSKI, BENTSEN, MALONEY of Connecticut, and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.

From the Committee on the Judiciary, for consideration of section 15 of the House bill and sections 10 and 11 of the Senate amendment thereto, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. SENSENBRENNER, COBLE and CONYERS.

There was no objection.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3009, TRADE ACT OF 2002.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 509 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 509

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the

conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 3009) an Act to extend the Andean Trade Preference Act, to grant additional trade benefits under that Act, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), 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, House Resolution 509 is a standard and fair rule providing for the consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 3009, the Trade Act of 2002. The rule waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration. Additionally, the rule provides that the conference report shall be considered as read.

Mr. Speaker, there was a time when this country could boast that we were the world leader for shaping the rules on international trade, globalization and open markets. Sadly, this is no longer the case.

□ 0030

What we have before us today is a historic opportunity to remedy this obvious shortcoming. I would like to personally commend all those on both sides of the aisle, and in both Chambers, who have worked in a bipartisan manner to make this possible.

Trade is a fundamental element of the U.S. economy, stimulating growth, creating jobs, and expanding consumer choices. Nearly one in every 10 American jobs is directly linked to the export of U.S. goods and services, and these jobs are estimated to pay 13 to 18 percent more than the U.S. national average. From family farms to high-tech startups to established businesses and manufacturers, increasing free and fair trade will keep our economy going and create jobs in our economy.

Consider a study conducted by the University of Michigan. The average American family of four could see an annual income gain of nearly \$2,500 from a global reduction in tariffs and trade barriers. That money would be a welcome addition to the family budget.

Trade is also a cornerstone of American relations with other countries. Free-flowing trade helps alleviate poverty, building stronger and more prosperous neighbors. With trade as a conduit, walls can break down and democratic ideals can be shared more openly between countries. Whether bolstering our economy at home or spreading the values of democracy worldwide, free trade is an important tool in fostering new opportunities for the United

States. Trade promotion authority is vital to making these opportunities possible.

Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of bipartisanship that has helped bring us to this point, I would like to quote President John Kennedy who, in 1960, noted, "World trade is more than ever essential to world peace. We must therefore resist the temptation to accept remedies that deny American producers and consumers access to world markets and destroy the prosperity of our friends in the non-Communist world."

At a time when America strives to enhance and strengthen our friendships around the world, it is imperative that we recognize the correlation between peace and free trade.

Mr. Speaker, this agreement has been a long time in coming. Even though every President from Richard Nixon to Bill Clinton has enjoyed the right of trade promotion authority, that authority has been lacking since its expiration in 1994. The underlying legislation will restore that negotiating authority and open the doors of prosperity for this country. Let us not make America, its workers or its products wait any longer.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Is it permissible during a debate on the rule for Members to revise and extend their remarks?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is, by unanimous consent.

Mr. CALLAHAN. At this time of morning I think it would be very wise. Since both sides have heard all of the debate, some of the Members consider the fact at this late hour that a revision and extension of remarks would serve the same purpose.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding me the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My good friend from Alabama makes a great suggestion, but an even greater suggestion would be for us not to be in the dead of night undertaking this extraordinary work.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and in strong opposition to the underlying conference report. It is the conference report on what is called TPA. Yes, TPA. By my way of thinking, that ought to stand for Thoughtless Political Action, because that is precisely what this House is prepared to do. I hope the American worker is braced for the sucker punch they are about to receive. I said exactly 1 month ago that it is no wonder that the American people have such disdain for politicians. Well, this conference report

bears that out in spades. Like the bill last month, this conference report is another perfect example of backroom deals gone bad in the dead of the night, legislating under the cloak of darkness, and accountability at its most pernicious.

On December 6 of last year, with the number of unemployed Americans totaling more than 8.25 million, the majority made a series of back-door deals to secure trade promotion authority for an administration which in my judgment has yet to prove to Americans that it really cares about their jobs. All of this was done under the pretense of furthering U.S. business interests abroad. At least the majority can rightfully argue that TPA does further U.S. interests abroad. Too bad this expansion is done at the expense of the American worker as well as the environment.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that my colleagues fully understand that since the current administration took office, an average of 157,000 Americans are losing their jobs every month. Tonight, the majority is again poised to eliminate tens of thousands of more jobs under the pretense of United States trade promotion. Knowingly eliminating any job at a time our economy has proven that it is incapable of re-creating that job is not an option that Congress should entertain. We really ought to be ashamed of ourselves for even considering this kind of measure.

You see, Mr. Speaker, this body knows that trade agreements cost American jobs. In fact, 420 of us agreed to this conclusion when the House overwhelmingly extended trade adjustment authority in June 2001. Yet the TAA provisions in the conference report are a reckless disregard of the obvious. Aside from the inept direct financial assistance available to displaced workers, the conference report has reduced the Senate-passed TAA proposal on health care to a tax credit that covers a meager 65 percent of the cost of a worker's premium. Realize, the Federal Government pays 72 percent of Members' health care premiums, and it is preposterous for us to expect the unemployed to pay any more than we do on health care.

But all of this does not even matter if the Treasury Department does not establish the guidelines for a complex TAA program, or if States do not release the TAA funds once they have been administered. It is funny how language ensuring the distribution of TAA funds is mysteriously missing from this report that was on the Internet at 4, or at 7:15, take your pick. The majority maintains that it is obvious that States will release the funds. I say if it is so obvious, put it in writing.

Realize, providing open-ended authority to the President without requiring that environmental, labor and agricultural standards be included in any trade agreement is nothing short of hammering another nail in the coffin of hundreds of American industries nationwide.

I support free trade. I have in the past and I will again in the future. However, any free trade agreement must also be a fair trade agreement. Through the eyes of a farmer, it is outrageous to expect the American agricultural industry to compete with South American, Central American or Asian agricultural industries who are not required to pay their workers a living wage and are not held to the same environmental standards as farmers are here in the United States.

Don't believe me? Look at what NAFTA did. I voted for that measure, and it is the worst vote I have cast in this body. Just look at what it did to my home State of Florida, specifically the agriculture industry. From citrus to sugar and from rice to tomatoes, Florida's agricultural industry has lost thousands of jobs as a direct result of NAFTA. The tomato industry went basket belly up after dumping. While Mexican farmers have profited, and I hold no grudge against them, companies have closed; and Florida farmers no longer have jobs or farms.

Mr. Speaker, we can continue to stay here in the middle of the night and play politics with Americans' lives under the pretense of U.S. trade promotion, or we can get serious about securing the future of American jobs and industries. This report does not re-create the 364,000 jobs which were lost in the month of June, and it certainly does not re-create the 1.7 million jobs we have lost since September 11. This report does not ensure the future of United States agriculture, and it definitely does not ensure the future of the U.S. steel and textile industries.

It is one thing to talk politics, and it is another thing to talk policy, but when the politics begin to interfere with the policy and that policy interferes with American lives and livelihoods, then we have a problem. Tonight, Mr. Speaker, we have a problem.

This report lays the foundation for hundreds of thousands of U.S. jobs to be shipped off to foreign countries with no guarantee that displaced American workers will be compensated. The environmental and labor provisions that do exist in the report are as disingenuous as the pretenses with which the majority brings this legislation to the floor this morning. This so-called Trade Promotion Act does indeed grant some significant benefits to some workers. Regrettably, not the workers who pay our salaries with their hard-earned tax dollars. There is nothing in this bill that promotes the interest of the American worker. Nothing.

This bill does so little for the American worker, under the guise of doing so much, that I recommend changing the name TPA to the Trade Pretense Act. I urge a "no" vote on the rule and a "no" vote on the conference report.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER).

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise today in strong support of both the rule and the underlying legislation, the conference report on the Trade Act of 2002.

First and foremost, as a member of the conference committee on the 2002 Trade Act, I wish to express my gratitude to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, for his leadership and diligence in bringing this important legislation to the floor today. I commend the chairman for his devotion to promoting the principles of free trade and ensuring the U.S.'s prominence in the international marketplace.

Mr. Speaker, in one of his first requests to the 107th Congress, President Bush requested the authority to negotiate trade agreements with credibility in the international arena. The President understands what so many macroeconomists have proclaimed, trade is beneficial to all nations and all peoples. Through trade agreements with other nations, new horizons are opened for U.S. exports, helping to create high-quality new jobs for Americans while American consumers gain access to lower-cost goods. The President knows that free trade benefits the U.S. economy. Given our recent economic uncertainty, it is important that we finally grant his request for the authority to negotiate trade agreements in order to help strengthen our economy.

Finally, without this legislation, the House of Representatives has no voice in the negotiation of trade agreements. The House is elevated by the trade promotion authority provisions included in the 2002 Trade Act, which require the President to consult with both the House and the Senate throughout trade negotiations. Once an agreement has been reached, the House and Senate each have the opportunity to approve or disapprove the agreement. Mr. Speaker, this conference report gives the House of Representatives a voice in trade negotiations, a voice which would otherwise be silent.

I urge my colleagues to vote in support of the rule and the conference report to ensure that we may participate in future trade negotiations.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), who has extensive knowledge on the subject that we are talking about.

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

□ 0045

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, I am amazed that it would be suggested here that we only rise and decide to extend our remarks and not talk about the substance. We are talking about a 300-page bill, is it? We are talking about a bill that is going to set the stage for trade negotiations for the

next half decade, and we are doing it at a quarter to 1:00? It is suggested also that we not speak on the substance?

I am speaking now because I want us to get off on the right foot. This is not a debate over expansion of trade. I favor it. It is not a debate over globalization. It is here to stay. The issue is whether we are going to wrestle with the new issues inevitably rising in this new era of trade, or we are going to look the other way.

Issues like core labor standards, this bill pretends to address them. It does not. It says it follows the Jordan standard. It does not. It pretends to address the issues of investment. It does not. Like the bill that came through here, it is a facade. It says it addresses, it was just said, the role of Congress. It does not. It is a facade. If anything, it makes it worse. In this new era of trade, it leaves us as simply a body to be consulted, and not a partner.

Look, inevitably there are new issues. If ever there were a requirement for bipartisanship in trade, it was in this new era. So it called for a bipartisan effort. A partisan approach to trade is built on sand, and the majority here started on the wrong foot. They started with a partisan approach. They are going to end up on this floor with essentially a partisan vote.

Shame on this approach. You make Trade Promotion Authority one without value. Time will show that what you are doing here is going through the motions, instead of erecting a strong foundation for trade policy in the 21st century. Turn down this rule and turn down the bill.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI).

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say this: What are we really talking about here? Let us talk about the legislation for a moment. It is a quarter to 1 right now. We just got a 360-page bill about 5 hours ago. We dealt with the homeland security legislation, so no one really has had a chance to read it.

I have to say that many people are saying though the trade adjustment assistance provision, in which we are supposed to help displaced workers, many of the colleagues on my side of the aisle, and I imagine on your side of the aisle, have basically said this will help those workers who lost their jobs because factories are closing.

But the reality is that is not so. The Senate had a provision in there that if a company would move offshore, let us say to China, and 500 employees in your home community were laid off, then trade adjustment assistance and health care benefits would click in.

Unfortunately, in the conference, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) insisted that that provision be re-

moved. Now, about 75 percent of plant closings are because of companies moving offshore. It is not because of import competition. So, a great number of employees that many of our constituents right now think will be covered, will not be covered.

I think it is going to be rather tragic when the Senate talks about this next week, and our colleagues go back home, after voting for this bill, and find out they made a grave mistake.

Lastly, let me just say, when this bill comes back in terms of a multinational 144-country agreement 3 years from now, we are going to have changes that Members would never have thought about. You are going to have changes in U.S. antitrust laws; you are going to have changes in food safety laws; you are going to have changes in accountant standards.

So essentially it means, let us say we have another Enron 2 years from now, 3 years from now. The WTO will tell us exactly what kind of accounting standards we are going to have. We could not do it on our own. We are giving up our authority under article I, section 8 of the U.S. Constitution. We have the authority to make all trade laws.

Essentially we are delegating this authority to the President of the United States. We should have some limitations on that authority if in fact we want good trade legislation.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, may I please inquire as to the amount of time remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) has 18 minutes remaining and the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) has 24½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. May I inquire if the gentleman from New York is inclined, that he have a few speakers, so that we can even out the time?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Florida, I have some speakers left, but I was under the impression the gentleman had many, so I was looking to continue moving through the flow. We will not use the entire time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. We will take one more, and then, most respectfully, I will ask the gentleman to utilize some of his time.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), my good friend who serves with me on the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise at 1 a.m. this morning in opposition to this rule, born out of martial law, and in strong opposition to this conference report. This is simply a bad deal for American workers. This is a very complex conference report that deserves serious

consideration by this House, which, sadly, it will not get.

It is not an emergency. It does not require that the House override its most basic procedures and principles of fairness. The conference report can just as easily be taken up in September, which would allow the Members of this House to have a genuine understanding of the changes made during conference negotiations.

If Members are going to be asked to turn the clock back nearly 30 years on the role and jurisdiction of Congress in our trade laws, if Members are going to be asked to give up our constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign and domestic commerce, then the least we should provide to the Members of this House is the time to read both the bold and the fine print of this conference report and to have the opportunity to talk to the companies and the workers in our districts most likely affected.

Some of these industries, Mr. Speaker, are in my district, textile industries in Fall River. Like recent trade agreements, the conference report continues to view the American textile industry and its workers as expendable.

It also deprives secondary workers who lose work or who lose their jobs because of trade agreements from receiving the same trade adjustment assistance benefits they were granted under NAFTA.

Let us be clear on this point. It means secondary workers who lose their jobs because a plant moved to Mexico may qualify for TAA benefits, but secondary workers who lose their jobs because a plant moves to China or Chile will not qualify for such benefits. That makes no sense.

Under this conference report, if a trade agreement makes the food our families eat dangerous to their health, too bad. If a trade agreement undermines our environmental protections, too bad. If a trade agreement weakens our ability to enforce our antitrust laws, corporate accountability procedures and advertising standards, still too bad. Too bad, because Congress will not be able to do a thing about it.

This conference report is an outrage. This rule and this martial law process is an insult. It is an insult to the Members of this House, both Democratic Members and Republican Members, and it is an insult to the American people. I urge my colleagues to vote no on the rule and no on the conference report.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the rule, which will allow for consideration of the Trade Act of 2002 conference report. It has been a long and arduous process that has brought us here this evening. The House originally passed the Andean Trade Promotion and Drug Eradication Act on November 16, 2001 and then followed with the passage of the Trade Promotion Authority on December 6. It is now more than 8 months

since the passage of the first bill, and I believe that we have a product today that is of extreme importance really in the national security of the United States.

We have a unique opportunity to strengthen democracies under great pressure in this hemisphere. Nations in this hemisphere are facing numerous challenges that threaten their fledgling democracies, including narco trafficking and terrorism.

One of the surest ways to support democracies under extreme pressure in our hemisphere is by facilitating the emergence of a Common Market of the Americas, the free trade area of the Americas. Free trade among free peoples is good policy and good for the people of the Western hemisphere. To achieve a Free Trade Area of the Americas, Mr. Speaker, it is crucial that we approve this conference report and finally give the President the authority he needs to get this process going and to make it a reality.

I rise in strong support of the rule and the underlying bill due also to another provision that has been very needed for a long time.

This bill includes the extension of the Andean Trade Preference Act. Due to the ATPA, the U.S. and the Andean nations have enjoyed an \$18 billion beneficial trade relationship for the last decade. The extension of the ATPA is not merely a matter of economic or trade policy, but it is a decision with consequences for U.S. foreign and national security policy in this hemisphere.

Bolivia, Colombia, Peru and Ecuador are nations that we must continue to help. They have indicated over the past decade that they wish to be strong members of a free and democratic hemisphere, a hemisphere that will one day be free of terrorism and free of tyranny. Continuing ATPA will help the Andean nations fight poverty, terrorism and drug protection, as well as protect democracy and promote human rights. ATPA promotes job creation in a region with where the alternative for many workers is easily a life devoted to drug promotion.

Promoting development in this region is crucial to a U.S. foreign policy that seeks to support countries fighting against terrorism and fighting against the drug trade.

I urge my colleagues to consider the benefits of extending ATPA, not only to our South American neighbors, but also because of the effect on the American consumers, who will enjoy a wide variety of product choice with fewer artificial constraints and restrictions.

Extending and improving ATPA is a decisive step toward improved relations with this hemisphere. This legislation will foster the expression of a mutually supported and beneficial relation between the U.S. and the democracies of the Western hemisphere.

I want to thank the gentleman from California (Chairman THOMAS) and those who have worked so hard to fi-

nally bring to a reality before us tonight. I urge my colleagues to pass the rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to appeal to the Members on this floor and beyond, because I looked through these 304 pages, thank you for giving me that courtesy, and looked very, very carefully for the sections on child labor. And I want you all to know that it has been taken out at the conference level.

We know what goes on in other countries. So do not talk about the free market. This is child slavery. Everybody in this room knows about it. Everybody reads about it, day in and day out.

Why was that taken out of this bill? That is only one section of the 304 pages. Why was it taken out? It was taken out because what we are going to do this evening, this morning, or tomorrow afternoon, whenever we end this debate, what we are going to be doing is allowing the same corporate cowboys that we have been talking about for the last 3 weeks on this floor and out there to make the decisions on trade.

This is not free trade. This is at the expense of little children, and you know it and everybody else knows it. Whether you are talking about farm, whether you are talking about textile, whether you are talking about steel, everyone knows it. This was the battle, this was the major battle between Jefferson and Hamilton, when they decided to extract from the Federalist Papers, 50 of which were written by Alexander Hamilton, to discern that we need a diverse economy, not one based on one single item. And what have we reaped? We have lost 1,300,000 manufacturing jobs, and this is where we are headed. I was not sent here to surrender my rights and responsibilities under the Constitution.

□ 0100

I did not come here to surrender Article I, Section 8. Maybe that is why some of us were sent here, but I was not. I hold that Constitution, I carry it with me everywhere I go. I know what my responsibilities are as a Congressman, and I intend to follow through.

I want to be more than a rubber stamp for the President of the United States, be he or she Democrat or Republican, on trade agreements. That is not why we were sent here. They defied every agreement since 1994, and you know it and everybody knows it. I ask my colleagues to vote against the rule.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, since I have been here I have voted to give the President trade negotiating

authority on every trade bill that has come to the House floor. I want the President to have that authority, and of all of the presidents that I voted to give that authority to, President Bush is on the top of my list, because I have tremendous confidence in his ability to conduct the proper negotiations for the United States. Let us face it. We do need some real negotiations with the other industrial leaders of the world.

But I have a bit of a dilemma here tonight. I am looking at the Rules of the House, and this one particular rule is titled, "Appropriations on legislative bills." It says, "A bill or joint resolution carrying an appropriation may not be reported by a committee not having jurisdiction to report appropriations." And when I began to read through this bill, once it was available to us, I found, in an amendment to section 174 of the Workforce Investment Act, an appropriation. It is not an authorization for appropriations, but an actual appropriation of \$60 million for worker assistance programs. This particularly caught my attention because when the House passed the supplemental, which was one of the most difficult conferences that I have ever taken part in, we included \$300 million for this worker assistance program. But I had to take it out of the supplemental conference agreement because we were spending too much money.

The problem that I am having tonight is, why is it too much money if the proper committee provides it, but it is not too much money when an authorizing committee, which does not have the jurisdiction, provides it?

Money spent is money spent, whether it is mandated by an authorization bill or whether it is appropriated by the Committee on Appropriations. That is what got my attention. As I read this bill, I came up with 4 additional sections of the bill where it provides an appropriation. So while this has become an appropriations bill, the Committee on Appropriations has not had much of a chance to even take a look at it.

So I am in a dilemma, because I want to vote for the President to have this negotiating authority, but I also want to preserve the integrity of the Rules of the House. I also want to preserve the integrity of the appropriations process, which is starting to break down because the budget process died on the vine.

We are trying to appropriate with a budget where the House has a budget resolution that is \$9 billion less than the Senate. Now, anybody that can add and subtract knows we cannot reconcile appropriations bills when one body has one number, and another body has another number. But that is where we are today, and the appropriations process is dragging because of that.

So I have a real problem here. I want to do something to make sure the President has the authority, but I need to protect the integrity of the process. When this bill comes time to vote, I

will decide how I am going to vote. But I think it is important that we all know that if there is a rule of the House, we ought to abide by it. The Committee on Appropriations should appropriate; the Committee on Ways and Means should deal with its jurisdictions and authorities; other authorizing committees should deal with their authorities and jurisdictions, and we should each stick to what has worked so well for so long.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), who has very few peers in this body that have as clear an understanding of trade.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding and say that I rise in opposition to the rule on the conference report.

The American people know something is wrong in Washington when every single trade bill passed by this Congress and signed by the President results in more lost jobs, more penny-wage jobs, more lost markets as imports deluge in here from every single country in the world and we cash out good jobs with good benefits in textiles, in electronics, in agriculture, in automotive, in machine tools, in steel; even baseball and U.S. flags.

TPA expands NAFTA to the entire hemisphere. Before NAFTA, we had a trade balance, I say to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), with Mexico. Every year the trade balance has gone down, gone south, losing over hundreds of thousands of jobs into Mexico and cashing out our automotive and machine tool industry and even agriculture now down there. And when people start getting paid \$3 a day, then guess what happened? They moved the jobs to China.

So we have had a sucking sound to Mexico which is now shifting over to China, and I defy any American to go into a store today and buy something that is not made in China, and the American people can verify this through their own experience.

Now, I say to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), he did not really talk about the pain and suffering. Talk to the workers at Brachs Candy in South Chicago. They are about to go through that shutdown, a 100 year-old company. It is one in a long line of millions of U.S. jobs.

I used to feel sorry for you that you really did not understand, but I feel much sorrier for the workers and the farmers of this continent and the world, because you are creating a great divergence between wealth and poverty. You are drawing a new Mason Dixon Line. It is different than what we experienced inside the United States. The wealthy, the shareholders, those on Wall Street and the futures markets, they love this system. But the workers of our country and the farmers of the world, they are being hurt. What do you think is fueling im-

migration into this country from the south?

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule and "no" on the report. Do not vote for a world with these kinds of extremes in wealth and poverty that are cashing out our middle class and creating global environmental cesspools and corporate slums and global plantations with penny-wage jobs. Vote for the kinds of trade agreements that build a middle class here at home and abroad and true world peace.

And what a shame for us, what a shame for us that this is being brought up at 1 o'clock in the morning, just like GATT was about 8 years ago, because they want to do it in the quiet of the night when most people are sleeping. It is too important for that. Have some self-respect for us. Let us debate as we should one of the most important bills that will come before this Congress.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The Chair would remind Members to address their remarks to the Chair and not to each other directly.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we have waited far too long to have the ability to sell American products overseas. It is just critical, critical to America's economy and jobs that we get back into the game, that we start to sell American products, because we have been on the sidelines since 1994. The rest of the world is running circles around us. It is Lewis and Clark days out there and every Nation is out there staking out markets for their country except America.

The potential is just huge for our Nation. Ninety-six percent of the world's population lives outside of the country. As of last year, half of the adults in the world, half of the adults, have yet to make their first telephone call, their first telephone call. That means that if European countries land those contracts, they will create European lands. If Asia lands those contracts, they will create Asian jobs. But if America has the opportunity to get out there and compete, we will create American jobs.

These international trade jobs, they pay more than our domestic jobs here at home. They are less likely to be laid off. In Texas, in our region, in manufacturing alone, since NAFTA, we have created enough new manufacturing jobs to fill every seat in the Astrodome twice over. Two out of every three new jobs we are creating in our State comes from international trade, and we have \$1 billion of environmental projects along our border with Mexico: clean air, clean water, waste water and sewer that we would never have without trade.

Trade is good for our jobs, good for our economy, good for labor rights.

There is a principle here. The principle is if Americans build a better mousetrap, we should be free to sell it anywhere in the world without discrimination. And if someone else builds a better mousetrap, we ought to be able to be free to buy it for our families and for our businesses. We should not retreat from fair trade competition; we should embrace it, because competition is what America is about. It is the key to our high-wage and our high-tech future.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is, we do not have a salesman. America needs a sales force and a sales leader out there. We are providing the President with that. We should support this rule.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), my good friend, who simply has, throughout time, stood eyeball to eyeball and toe to toe with all who would argue on the subject of trade.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is 1:10 in the morning, and I think that all Members of this House recognize that in order for our country to enjoy economic growth, that we have to engage in international trade. We also recognize that the power of commerce and trade remains in this House, but it does not make a lot of sense to believe that 535 lawmakers will be negotiating trade agreements.

So therefore, the power should be given to the executive branch to actually negotiate these agreements, but it does not mean that the House of Representatives should give up its authority to protect the American people and American workers as we yield to the executive branch. Why? Because it is the executive branch that yields a part of our power to world trade organizations, to international organizations.

All we are saying on our side is that there should be some standard for the leader of the Free World, the United States of America, to be able to say that as we engage in trade, with all of our power and prestige, that there is minimum standards that we expect other nations to follow with their workers, with their right to organize, with their ability to dream, like Americans dream, that their life can be improved.

Do we say that it should reach our standards? No. What we are saying is that there should be standards involved. There should be standards involved in protecting what is not ours, not the United States' and not other countries', but what God has given the world, and that is our environment to live in. Something else that we say we should have, and that is the laws of the United States Congress should not be changed by foreign nations. We should preserve that right.

So all we are saying is that all of us want trade. We recognize that it is necessary for us, better for developing nations; not Cuba, because of the sovereign State of Florida and the Republic of Florida as they dictate our foreign policy and trade policy, but I suggest this is a bad rule and a bad time to be debating such an important subject.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) has 8½ minutes remaining; the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to reserve the balance of our time and ask most respectfully that the gentleman from New York even out some of the time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Committee on Rules has requested such time as he may consume, and if the gentleman from Florida is prepared to close, I will urge that upon my chair, as he would speak to close.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman saying he does not have any more speakers other than the chairperson, or whomever will close?

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is correct.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), a very good friend of mine.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, fast track essentially extends our current trade policies. And why in God's name would we want to do that when our current trade policy is an absolute disaster that has cost this country millions of decent-paying jobs and has resulted in the pushing down of wages from one end of America to the other?

□ 0115

The facts are clear. They are not disputable. When we have a failed policy, why do we want to extend it?

I hear some people talking about how fast track and trade policies have created new jobs. What world are they living in? The reality is today, nobody disputes it, we have a \$346 billion trade deficit, recordbreaking. No one disputes that between 1994 and 2000, the United States lost more than 3 million decent-paying manufacturing jobs due to our trade policies. In 2001, manufacturing lost 1.3 million jobs. Over the past 4 years, this is incredible, our Nation has lost 10 percent, 10 percent of our manufacturing base.

Then people come up here and they say, let us continue; let us extend this absurd and failed policy. When will they catch on, when there are no more manufacturing jobs in America? When all of our kids are flipping hamburgers?

Everybody knows the truth, and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) said it. We all know it. When we go to a department store and buy a product, where is that product manufactured? We all know it. It is not manufactured in Vermont; it is not manufactured in California. It is manufactured in China.

Why is it manufactured in China? We know the answer to that. In China, desperate people, desperate people are working for 20 cents an hour, and the corporate titans in this country have sold out our people and have taken their plants to China, where people go to jail if they try to form a union; where women are brought in from the countryside to work 15, 16 hours a day making sneakers for pennies an hour.

We all know that big money has contributed huge amounts to both political parties in order to move these trade issues, but let us stand up for ordinary Americans and for the middle class. Let us not become a poor, low-wage Nation. Let us reverse our trade policies. Let us demand that corporate America reinvest in Vermont, in America, and not just in China. Let us have a fair trade policy, rather than this disastrous so-called free trade.

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

Mr. Speaker, if this rule passes, we will have great debate by sponsors of the legislation. As I have said many times, managing this rule in what is now hopefully the final legs of an opportunity to pass this conference report that is not a partisan matter on trade, it is a bipartisan matter in both Houses as we look to the debate, and then to move forward with the will of the House.

In my home State, international trade is a primary generator of business and growth. In the Buffalo area, the highest manufacturing and employment sectors are also among the State's top merchandise export industries, including electronics, fabricated metals, industrial machinery, transportation equipment, and food and food products.

Consequently, as exports increase, employment in these sectors will increase. In the Rochester area, companies like IBM and Kodak play a significant impact on the local economy. In employment they will benefit directly from increased exports and international sales that will result from new trade agreements and open markets that are negotiated under the trade promotion authority.

For example, about one in every five Kodak jobs in the United States depends on exports. New trade agreements are needed to break down foreign barriers and keep American-made goods competitive overseas, as well as open up foreign markets on domestic companies.

This body and the other body will have the final say on those trade agreements. There are 28 bilateral agreements by Mexico and countries throughout the world. There are 27 by

the European Union. Mr. Speaker, this country only has two. The trade promotion authority gives us an opportunity to move forward and an opportunity to see more jobs.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), who has been the leader in this regard.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Florida, for yielding time to me.

Yesterday, under enormous pressure from defrauded investors, the Republican leadership finally, reluctantly agreed to bring a strong accounting bill to the floor. But tonight, the Republican-dominated House is poised to turn around and give corporate America its most desired prize of all, trade promotion authority, or fast track. The fast track conference agreement is a great deal for huge corporations, but it is a bad deal for American workers.

Republican leadership has given these corporations everything it wants in this Congress: insurance companies write legislation to privatize Medicare; energy companies write our energy policy; chemical companies write our environmental policy; Wall Street writes Social Security privatization legislation.

Fast track, the granddaddy of them all, would prevent thousands of displaced workers from obtaining training, trade adjustment assistance, and health care coverage. It fails to make labor and environmental standards required negotiating objectives for future trade agreements.

But it is worse than that. This TPA, this fast track, shifts power from democratic governments to corporations. It allows corporations to challenge laws, environmental laws, food safety laws, worker protection laws that were passed in this Congress, that were passed in the 50 State legislatures, regulations that protect workers and protect the environment.

This legislation threatens food safety, it threatens clean air laws, it threatens safe drinking water laws, it threatens worker safety laws. Vote "no" on trade adjustment.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Just a small bit of history, Mr. Speaker. I came to this Congress under the Presidency of William Jefferson Clinton, when many times we tried to craft a trade bill that respected and understood the role that this Congress has in oversight, respecting the laws of this Nation, understanding the needs of workers and the environment, and protecting children.

But it is interesting that under William Jefferson Clinton, this Republican

House could never get a trade bill to be passed. Now, all of a sudden, there is this great energy to move a bill forward that does not take into consideration the very thoughtful Levin amendment that considered the environment, considered child labor, prohibition, and considered health benefits for laid-off employees.

This particular legislation that has come in the dead of night, when no one has been able to read it, is a trade bill for the trash heap, the trash heap of a Constitution that has been shredded in this trade bill.

Why do I say that? Because this trade bill allows racial profiling to go on by members or employees of the United States Government. I respect the U.S. Customs Agency; but for the life of me, I cannot understand why we have refused to acknowledge that we in this country deserve constitutional rights.

What they have done is they have decided to say that African American women, who are nine times more often stopped by U.S. Customs agents than white women, have no constitutional rights. It says to them that they can take a plane load of individuals from Italy, and take all the African Americans off of the plane and search them and find no contraband, and under the trade bill the customs agents would do this with impunity.

I believe we can have a trade bill. It can also be a bipartisan trade bill, a responsible trade bill; but I will not lose my constitutional rights on a trade bill that deserves to be put on the trash heap of disappointments.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), who serves on the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations from the number one agricultural State in America, California.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to respond to the request, rather flippantly, that we go back to the offices and read on the Internet what this bill is. I read it, not in my office, because we were voting; but there are 304 pages right here on the floor for 435 Members to read.

I want to wake up America at 1:25 in the morning to tell them they had better understand what is going on here tonight. This is not one little simple trade bill; this is five trade bills. This is a fast track bill, an Andean trade preference bill, a customs reauthorization bill, a trade assistance package, and a dozen provisions including giving the U.S. Trade Representative a slush fund to pay WTO fines without congressional approval.

This bill gutted the Eshoo trade preference adjustments. Reading this bill,

it is a travesty to California agriculture. We sell out California flower growers. We sell out California asparagus growers. Yet they were able to protect the Puerto Rico rum producers. We sell out textiles, shoes, and jewelry; and we ignore the child labor problems that are in Ecuador in the banana industry, as pointed out by the New York Times.

This is a bad bill. Vote against the rule.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield the remainder of our time to my good friend, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT), who serves on the Committee on Ways and Means and certainly has a clear understanding of the measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to sit on the Committee on Ways and Means with the smartest chairman we have in the entire history of the Committee on Ways and Means. He sat out here and lectured us about the fact that we had not picked up off the Web this 340-page bill that was sent to us at 6:53, right in the middle of the discussion of the homeland security bill.

What we were supposed to do was get an e-mail from Diane Kirkland. You all know who she is; she is very familiar to all of you. This e-mail says, go and get a link and get this bill. And the chairman stands over there with that haughty look and says, you were not smart enough to know where to look for the thing that I hid. Vote "no."

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, it is true that it is 1:30; but we have been debating this bill since 1994, because 1994 is when this authority expired, and we have been working long and hard to promote free trade.

As I have listened to the horror stories that have come from the other side of the aisle, I would have to remind them once again, we have seen 134 trade agreements established in the world since that expiration, and the United States is a party to only three of them. We have not had the authority that will allow us to respond to many of the problems that exist out there.

The world has access to the U.S. consumer market. What trade promotion authority will do is it will allow us to pry open markets where 90 percent of the world's consumers are. That is about creating jobs right here in the United States. That is what trade promotion authority is about. Vote "yes" for the rule and vote "yes" for the conference report.

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

move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

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.

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 220, nays 200, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 369]

YEAS—220

Aderholt	Gibbons	Nussle
Akin	Gilchrest	Osborne
Armey	Gilman	Ose
Bachus	Goodlatte	Otter
Baker	Goss	Oxley
Ballenger	Granger	Paul
Barr	Graves	Pence
Bartlett	Green (WI)	Peterson (PA)
Barton	Greenwood	Petri
Bass	Grucci	Pickering
Bentsen	Gutknecht	Pitts
Bereuter	Hall (TX)	Platts
Biggert	Hansen	Pombo
Bilirakis	Hart	Portman
Boehlert	Hastert	Pryce (OH)
Boehner	Hastings (WA)	Putnam
Bonilla	Hayes	Quinn
Bono	Hayworth	Radanovich
Boozman	Herger	Ramstad
Brady (TX)	Hilleary	Regula
Brown (SC)	Hobson	Rehberg
Bryant	Hoekstra	Reynolds
Burr	Horn	Riley
Burton	Hostettler	Rogers (KY)
Buyer	Houghton	Rogers (MI)
Callahan	Hulshof	Rohrabacher
Calvert	Hunter	Ros-Lehtinen
Camp	Hyde	Royce
Cannon	Isakson	Ryan (WI)
Cantor	Issa	Ryun (KS)
Capito	Istook	Saxton
Carson (OK)	Jenkins	Schaffer
Castle	John	Schrock
Chabot	Johnson (CT)	Sensenbrenner
Chambliss	Johnson (IL)	Sessions
Collins	Johnson, Sam	Shadegg
Cooksey	Keller	Shaw
Cox	Kelly	Shays
Crane	Kennedy (MN)	Sherwood
Crenshaw	Kerns	Shimkus
Cubin	King (NY)	Shuster
Culberson	Kingston	Simmons
Cunningham	Kirk	Simpson
Davis, Jo Ann	Knollenberg	Skelton
Davis, Tom	Kolbe	Smith (MI)
Deal	LaHood	Smith (NJ)
DeLay	Latham	Smith (TX)
DeMint	LaTourette	Smith (WA)
Diaz-Balart	Leach	Souder
Dicks	Lewis (KY)	Stearns
Dooley	Linder	Stenholm
Doolittle	LoBiondo	Sullivan
Dreier	Lucas (KY)	Sununu
Duncan	Lucas (OK)	Sweeney
Dunn	Manzullo	Tancredo
Ehlers	Matheson	Tanner
Ehrlich	McCrery	Tauscher
Emerson	McHugh	Tauzin
English	McInnis	Taylor (NC)
Everett	McKeon	Terry
Ferguson	Mica	Thomas
Flake	Miller, Dan	Thornberry
Fletcher	Miller, Gary	Thune
Foley	Miller, Jeff	Tiahrt
Forbes	Moran (KS)	Tiberi
Fossella	Moran (VA)	Toomey
Frelinghuysen	Morella	Upton
Gallely	Myrick	Vitter
Ganske	Nethercutt	Walden
Gekas	Northup	Walsh

Wamp	Weldon (PA)	Wolf
Watkins (OK)	Weller	Young (AK)
Watts (OK)	Wicker	
Weldon (FL)	Wilson (NM)	

NAYS—200

Abercrombie	Gutierrez	Neal
Ackerman	Hall (OH)	Norwood
Allen	Harman	Oberstar
Andrews	Hastings (FL)	Obey
Baca	Hill	Olver
Baldacci	Hilliard	Ortiz
Baldwin	Hinchev	Owens
Barcia	Hoeffel	Pallone
Barrett	Holden	Pascrell
Becerra	Holt	Pastor
Berkley	Honda	Payne
Berman	Hooley	Pelosi
Berry	Hoyer	Peterson (MN)
Bishop	Inslee	Phelps
Blagojevich	Israel	Pomeroy
Blumenauer	Jackson (IL)	Price (NC)
Bonior	Jackson-Lee	Rahall
Borski	(TX)	Rangel
Boswell	Jefferson	Reyes
Boucher	Johnson, E. B.	Rivers
Boyd	Jones (NC)	Rodriguez
Brady (PA)	Jones (OH)	Roemer
Brown (FL)	Kanjorski	Ross
Brown (OH)	Kaptur	Rothman
Capps	Kennedy (RI)	Royal-Allard
Capuano	Kildee	Rush
Cardin	Kilpatrick	Sabo
Carson (IN)	Kind (WI)	Sanchez
Clay	Klecicka	Sanders
Clayton	Kucinich	Sandlin
Clement	LaFalce	Sawyer
Clyburn	Lampson	Schakowsky
Coble	Langevin	Schiff
Condit	Lantos	Scott
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Costello	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Coyne	Lee	Shows
Cramer	Levin	Skeen
Crowley	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
Cummings	Lofgren	Snyder
Davis (CA)	Lowey	Solis
Davis (FL)	Luther	Spratt
Davis (IL)	Lynch	Strickland
DeFazio	Maloney (CT)	Stupak
DeGette	Maloney (NY)	Taylor (MS)
Delahunt	Markey	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	Mascara	Thompson (MS)
Deutsch	Matsui	Thurman
Dingell	McCarthy (MO)	Tierney
Doggett	McCarthy (NY)	Towns
Doyle	McCollum	Turner
Edwards	McDermott	Udall (CO)
Engel	McGovern	Udall (NM)
Eshoo	McIntyre	Velazquez
Etheridge	McKinney	Visclosky
Evans	McNulty	Waters
Farr	Meek (FL)	Watson (CA)
Fattah	Meeks (NY)	Watt (NC)
Filner	Menendez	Waxman
Ford	Millender-	Weiner
Frank	McDonald	Wexler
Frost	Miller, George	Wilson (SC)
Gephardt	Mink	Woolsey
Gonzalez	Mollohan	Wu
Goode	Moore	Wynn
Gordon	Murtha	Young (FL)
Graham	Nadler	
Green (TX)	Napolitano	

NOT VOTING—14

Baird	Hinojosa	Roukema
Blunt	Lewis (CA)	Stark
Combest	Lipinski	Stump
Gillmor	Meehan	Whitfield
Hefley	Ney	

□ 0151

Mr. HILL and Mr. WYNN changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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.

REMOVAL OF CONFEREE AND APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREE ON H.R. 3210, TERRORISM RISK PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Without objection and pursuant to clause 11, rule I, the Chair removes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) as a conferee on H.R. 3210, Terrorism Risk Protection Act, and appoints the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) to fill the vacancy.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will notify the Senate of the change in conferees.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3009, TRADE ACT OF 2002

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 509, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 3009) to extend the Andean Trade Preference Act, to grant additional trade benefits under that Act, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Pursuant to House Resolution 509, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see prior proceedings of the House of today.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) each will control 30 minutes.

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

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

First of all, I want to thank all the Members of the House and especially those 18 members on this conference committee of six different committees on House side and the five Senators from the Finance Committee for allowing all of us to be placed in a time period which is extremely unusual to resolve a conference committee. It was done in a manner and an attitude that produced a product that I think the institution, the House of Representatives and the Senate, should be pleased, notwithstanding the fact the President has not had the power to negotiate since 1994 when finally the Senate acted and the House was able to go to conference with the Senate. We have relatively quickly resolved the differences between the two Houses.

Notwithstanding the fact that we have fallen behind in terms of bilateral and multilateral trade relationships around the world because the Presidents have not had this power, the House and the Senate in this particular historic agreement have understood in a far more sophisticated way completely the consequences of trade.

Clearly when we engage in trade, it means change. The positive change is, of course, better-paying jobs, and it

provides cheaper goods to consumers. The downside of course is that that change means some jobs are traded for other jobs. And what has not been fully recognized is that we get the benefits of the upside, but a full understanding of trade means we need the protections on the downside because if you can take care of those who, through no fault of their own, have lost their job through trade, you create an atmosphere and a desire to engage in even more trade.

And that is what this conference report reflects. An understanding the President needs the negotiating power but that also included is a structure to make sure that through no fault of those who lose their job, they are taken care of, not just in terms of employment or retraining, but in terms of providing, for example, health insurance, to the extent that it is entirely possible that under these provisions, someone, who was not able to get health insurance when they were employed during the retraining program, would get health insurance. That is how enlightened this particular measure is.

I am extremely pleased to say that four of the five Senators, two of the three Democratic Senators, have agreed with this conference report, and I would like to say that the chairman of the Finance Committee, Senator MAX BAUCUS of Montana, deserves an enormous amount of credit in terms of his willingness to sit very long hours discussing issues that sometimes are very difficult to resolve but nevertheless having the will and the fortitude to come out the other side to produce this document.

And then just let me say that we would not be here tonight if it were not for three very brave, I was going to say colleagues. I will say friends of mine on the other side of the aisle, ironically someone represents a district that is directly next to mine. We share a portion of the San Joaquin Valley, the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY); the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER); and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JEFFERSON).

If they did not have the courage and the conviction to sit down and say it has been too long, let us try to work out a document, because as has been the case most frequently, this House led. It led in a bipartisan way. And we are here tonight largely because of their courage and conviction. And I want to thank them very much.

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

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

I did not know how many other Democrats the distinguished chairman was going to laud here, but I see they all fled the floor.

Mr. Speaker, on this historic occasion at two o'clock in the morning, the chairman would like for everyone to believe that we are embarking on a