

FUND OUR VETERANS

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

Mrs. DRAKE. Madam Speaker, this is day 31. That is 31 days so far that our veterans have not had the use of the increased funding for their benefits in health care. That is \$18.5 million a day not able to be used. And why? Because the Democratic leadership has decided to not complete this bill and send it to the President who has agreed to sign it.

In June, this House passed this appropriation bill with a \$6 billion increase in a bipartisan manner. We were proud of our work and grateful to our veterans. On September 6, the Senate passed their bill. This work is done.

Our veterans are not pawns in a political game. They are heroes. America expects us to get the job done. America expects us to provide the best care for our veterans. Please join me in calling upon the Democratic leadership to put our veterans first and send this bill to the President now.

PROTECT SEXUAL TRAFFICKING VICTIMS

(Mrs. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, today the House Judiciary Committee will hold a hearing on the Trafficking Victims Protection Act. Sex trafficking has been called the slavery issue of the 21st century. And because girls and women are its victims, it is one of the great women's issues of our time.

The lives of trafficking victims are pure horror. These photographs that are in the current issue of Prism magazine include mug shots or photographs of trafficked women arrested for prostitution over periods ranging from 1 to no more than 3 years.

Better than words could ever convey, the photos display the destruction that takes place for hundreds of thousands of trafficked girls and women. Notice how when they were first arrested, they all look distinctly different. But in the end, they all look the same. You cannot tell the difference from one to the other. That is because they have been abused, psychologically battered, broken and devastated at the hands of their pimps.

We need effective prosecution strategies against their traffickers.

We need to protect the victims of the sex trade industry and punish the predators who exploit them.

DECREASE TAX BURDEN

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

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, last week the Ways and Means Committee chairman outlined the provisions of what he has been calling the "mother of all tax bills."

The most important piece of information about this proposal is the bottom line. The proposal would mean a multi-trillion-dollar tax increase on the American taxpayer.

I think this is a good moment to take a step back and look at the philosophical difference between Republicans and Democrats. On this side of the aisle, we simply believe people know how to spend their money better than the government. But just look at the legislation passed in the House so far this year: \$431 billion in tax increases have been included in bills that have already passed the House this year.

Madam Speaker, we should remember, no one knows how to spend their money better than the taxpayer. We should be looking for ways to decrease the tax burden, not increase it.

DEMOCRATS MOVE AMERICA IN NEW DIRECTION

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, last November Democrats listened to the American people. But, unfortunately, President Bush continues to ignore them. Democrats promised to take our Nation in a new direction, and in many ways we have. We increased the minimum wage for the first time in a decade. We made Americans safer by fully implementing the 9/11 Commission recommendations. We also restored PAYGO rules so that Congress lives within its means.

We are proud of our accomplishments, but an intransigent President is blocking our efforts to do more. Life-saving cures to debilitating diseases remain out of reach because President Bush vetoed stem cell research legislation. Our soldiers continue to referee a civil war in Iraq because President Bush vetoed a bill that would have brought our troops home next year. And millions of children cannot see the doctor of their choice because President Bush vetoed bipartisan legislation that would provide health insurance to 4 million more kids.

Madam Speaker, while it is frustrating to deal with a President who continues to ignore the results of last year's elections, congressional Democrats will continue to move America in a new direction.

□ 1030

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3920, TRADE AND GLOBALIZATION ASSISTANCE ACT OF 2007

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Com-

mittee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 781 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 781

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3920) to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to reauthorize trade adjustment assistance, to extend trade adjustment assistance to service workers and firms, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor; (2) the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules, if offered by Representative McCrery of Louisiana or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. During consideration of H.R. 3920 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Vermont is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of the debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, H. Res. 781 provides for consideration of H.R. 3920, the Trade Globalization and Assistance Act of 2007, under a structured rule. The rule provides 1 hour of debate with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled

by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor. Finally, the rule makes in order a substitute amendment to be offered by Representative MCCRERY of Louisiana, or his designee.

Madam Speaker, let me begin by saying what we all know. Trade can be a very good thing for the economy of this country, and this Congress and this Member of Congress is committed to examining any trade agreement that is brought before this House in two ways: one, whether the terms and provisions will improve the economy of this country; and two, whether there is a capacity to share the benefits that that trade agreement will bring to this economy, across all sectors of it.

And what we have to acknowledge on trade agreements, and really is the underpinning of this legislation brought before the House, is that there is significant dislocation that can occur with trade. There can be winners and there can be losers, and in the adjustment to some of the consequences that have adverse impact on many of our workers across this country, we must have a substantial and vigorous and effective assistance program to help workers who are hurt regain jobs, regain employment, improve their incomes and be part of this economy and be part of the benefits, not just the downside of trade.

I want to thank Chairman RANGEL, Chairman MILLER, Congressman LEVIN and Congressman SMITH for their diligence in putting together a very strong adjustment assistance package that we will vote for later today. Among many others, they have been working on this bill for nearly a decade.

Trade adjustment assistance hadn't been started in this country until 1962; even though trade has been a very difficult political issue for this country from its inception, where there were debates about tariffs. And in our days of our history, tariffs were used basically to protect our industries and allow them to get a foothold. And then trade barriers were gradually reduced, and what we're seeing as that happens is an increase in gross domestic product and wealth, but we're also seeing an increase in dislocation among many workers, and some of that is concentrated in many of the old industrial sectors of our country.

This legislation recognizes that impact and is attempting to substantially increase our ability to address the dislocation. That underpinning is essential for the consideration of any future trade packages that will be brought before this House.

The update is long overdue. H.R. 3920 expands trade assistance to the service sector. That was denied under the previous adjustment assistance legislation, even as more and more of our economy has become service-related

and even as service sector jobs are being off-shored. So this change in trade adjustment assistance is long overdue and very necessary.

Too often workers are not provided with the training that they need under current training assistance bill. This bill doubles the current training fund cap to \$440 million. Beyond expanding coverage to more workers, this TAA improves their training opportunities, as well as the all-important health care benefits.

Many of the folks who have been adversely affected by trade have come from older industries with strong unions where they had substantial and very important health care benefits. This trade adjustment assistance extends them.

It also creates new benefits for industries in communities that have been hardest hit by creating 24 manufacturing redevelopment zones to encourage the redevelopment of communities that have been hit the hardest by manufacturing decline.

What this legislation starts to understand is that one of the responses that we must have strategically to the acceleration of globalization is the intensification of localization. Our economies that have been hardest hit have to rebuild in part from the bottom up using the resources that we have in those communities, keeping dollars in those communities that can be reinvested and then create jobs and wealth in those communities.

Madam Speaker, one of the things that has been happening over the past generation is a widening gap between the highest and lowest paid among us. According to a 2006 survey conducted by the Wall Street Journal, the case right now is that the average CEO in the United States earns 262 times the pay of the average worker. It means that the CEO earned more in one work day than an average worker earned in the entire year.

And we have to look at this discrepancy because one of the actual facts that has to be recognized, whatever your position on trade, is that there has been this widening gap, and historically, this country has always been its best when we've had economic policies that have shared the wealth that is generated by people working hard in this country.

H.R. 3920 is an important bill for our economic stability and workforce growth. It's also a bill about fairness.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and on this beautiful day in our Nation's Capital, I wish you and our colleagues a Happy Halloween and say that it is an honor to be here on what is a very important piece of legislation.

I thank my friend for yielding me the customary 30 minutes and want to congratulate him on his very thoughtful statement and say that I consider him to be one of the most able Members of

the new class that has come in. I hope my saying that doesn't jeopardize his standing in the Democratic Caucus, but I do appreciate his hard work on the Rules Committee.

I was prepared, Madam Speaker, to rise in support of this rule, but I've decided to oppose the rule, and the reason I've decided to oppose the rule is not the fact that we, for the first time in the 110th Congress, have a substitute made in order on a bill that has come forth from the Committee on Ways and Means. I should say at the outset that last night our colleague Mr. HASTINGS of Ft. Lauderdale, Florida, said that there was only one instance in the 109th Congress where an amendment was made in order by the then-majority for the consideration of a Ways and Means Committee bill, when, in fact, we researched that overnight and found that there were five instances, five instances in the 109th Congress where our majority, in fact, made in order an amendment to a Ways and Means Committee bill.

Madam Speaker, I would, at this point, include in the RECORD that statement which outlines those measures that we have put forward.

Bills referred to the Committee on Ways and Means considered under "structured" or "modified closed" rules in the 109th Congress:

1. H.R. 8—Death Tax Repeal Permanency Act of 2005.
2. H.R. 6—Energy Policy Act of 2005.
3. H.R. 4297—Tax Relief Extension Reconciliation Act of 2005.
4. H.R. 4437—Border Protection, Antiterrorism, and Illegal Immigration Control Act of 2005.
5. H.R. 4157—Health Information Technology Promotion Act of 2005.

Madam Speaker, so I do say that here we are on Halloween for the first time in this 10-month period of time having a substitute made in order, and I was, as I said, prepared to support the rule, but I've decided to oppose it. I decided to oppose it because of an article that I read in the Roll Call this morning which made it very clear that the Democratic majority is once again going down a path that they abandoned last summer, I'm happy to say, but they've unfortunately brought it to the forefront again, and that is the notion of casting aside the opportunity for the single bite at the apple that the minority has, and that is to offer the motion to recommit on measures.

Now, I know, Madam Speaker, that's a very inside baseball discussion, but our colleagues know that the motion to recommit is something that was often denied the Republican minority during the four decades before 1994, and when we won the majority in 1994, we made it very clear that we would, in fact, guarantee the minority, guarantee the minority a right to a motion to recommit, meaning at least one bite at the apple on a measure, even if all amendments were denied.

Now, this report has come forward that the distinguished Chair of the Committee on Rules, Ms. SLAUGHTER of

Rochester, New York, is in the midst of a discussion, and she said in this quote in the paper that she wants to not say that it is imminent but she wants to get it right, getting it right, shutting down the opportunity for the minority to have that single opportunity to address an issue in the bill. And so the mere fact that this has come to the forefront again, Madam Speaker, has led me to come to the conclusion that I can't be supportive of this rule that we're debating here today.

I will say that I am in opposition to the underlying legislation itself, but as I said, I'm very happy that we have the opportunity to debate a minority substitute for a major package from the Committee on Ways and Means.

Now, I mention this nearly 1-year period of time we've gone through, completed 10 months here, and we saw at the beginning of the Congress this wonderful document that I'm sure you've seen, Madam Speaker, that was put forward by Speaker PELOSI. It's entitled "A New Direction for America." Now, in this document, she says that basically every measure that is considered here on the House floor, and I quote from this document. It says, "should include procedure that allows an open, full and fair debate consisting of a full amendment process that grants the minority the right to offer its alternatives, including a substitute."

Now, Madam Speaker, that was what was stated by Speaker PELOSI at the beginning of this Congress, and today, Halloween 2007, October 31, marks the first time, the first time in the 110th Congress that this opportunity for the minority has been availed us.

□ 1045

I will say that we have repeatedly considered in the Rules Committee Ways and Means measures, and we have repeatedly asked for a minority substitute to be made in order so that our constituents, and this has nothing to do simply with party, this has to do with the right of each Member of Congress who represents 600,000 and some people to have their opportunity to be heard here. Unfortunately, throughout this entire year, up until this point, every request for that minority substitute has, unfortunately, been denied.

I am happy that we are finally, today, allowing what I know will be a very thoughtful substitute that will be debated by my California colleague, Mr. McKEON, the ranking Republican on the Committee on Education and Labor, as well as the ranking Republican on the Ways and Means Committee, our friend from Louisiana (Mr. McCRARY).

I do commend my colleagues on the Rules Committee, the majority on the Rules Committee, for taking this first step. I hope very much that it is a sign of a new day at the Rules Committee. I hope that we will have this greater transparency, openness and bipartisanship which we were promised at the beginning of this year.

The underlying bill was actually a good place to start with this, in part, because the issue in question is so important, and, in part, because the proposal that has been reported from the Ways and Means Committee is in such dire need of improvement, that's why I believe that this substitute is one which should be able to enjoy very strong bipartisan support.

Madam Speaker, as you know very well, and you have been involved in the trade debate since you have come to the Congress, and I suspect you were probably interested in it even before you came to the Congress, the issue of trade adjustment assistance is a very, very critical and important and a very well-intentioned program that does need to be reformed and modernized in order to effectively help American workers compete in the worldwide marketplace. My friend from Vermont talked very thoughtfully about the issue of globalization and the fact that we have seen a dramatic improvement in our gross domestic product growth.

In fact, just this morning, I know it surprised many, we got the report that we have a 3.9 percent GDP growth rate annualized, the report that came from the Commerce Department this morning, demonstrating that opening up new markets and developing opportunities for U.S. workers and consumers has, in fact, been a positive. I will acknowledge, and I know we are going to be hearing a lot of sob stories through this debate, and, frankly, I am sympathetic with those sob stories, the stories about people who have been victimized by trade.

But I have got to say that one of the sad things that I have observed in the debate on trade is that it is blamed for virtually every ailment of society. In fact, I often am reminded of the fact that one time a constituent came up to me a couple of years ago and said we didn't have a single illegal immigrant coming from Mexico into the United States until you passed the North American Free Trade Agreement.

We know very well that the North American Free Trade Agreement has actually created a third of a trillion dollars in cross-border trade between the United States and Mexico. I argue that the problem of illegal immigration would have been dramatically worsened had we not put into place the trade agreement which has improved the quality of life and the standard of living in both countries.

I will say that the middle-class population in Mexico today is larger than the entire Canadian population, and that is by virtue of the fact that we have seen economic growth take place in Mexico that is a by-product of the North American Free Trade Agreement.

But having said all of that, as we will continue to rage on with the debate on the benefits of trade as we face, I hope, in the coming weeks and months the trade agreements for Peru, Panama, Colombia and South Korea, I will rec-

ognize that there are some sectors of our society that have not benefited from trade, and that's why we are here today. We are here today to recognize that it is very, very important for us to do everything possible to address the concerns of those workers who have been negatively impacted by trade.

Unfortunately, what the Democrats have done is to take an inefficient program and compound the inefficiencies and inadequacies and block all efforts to build more accountability into the system, which we all believe is very important. Then they intend to self-execute the fusion of this ill-advised proposal with another bill that imposes massive new regulations on American job creators. Perhaps most troubling is that this bill opens the door for TAA benefits to be granted to illegal immigrants. If we look at that problem, potentially having illegal immigrants benefiting from the program, if we look at the regulatory burden which is going to impinge on those who are creating jobs, I think we have got to recognize that we have a lot of work to do on that. I believe the substitute is the best answer.

The Democratic majority has tried to distract us all from the mess they have created by throwing billions of dollars at the problem. Of course, since money sadly does not grow on trees, the Democratic majority has once again resorted to raising taxes to pay for their boondoggle that won't actually do what they claim, in this case helping American workers deal with job loss. In fact, by saddling businesses, large, medium and small, with hefty new regulations, they are further diminishing our economic competitiveness and, in fact, exacerbating the problem that they purport to address with the measure that they have brought forward.

How the Democratic majority can say with a straight face that they want to help workers and yet are determined to shut down the job creators is beyond me. Whoever said irony was dead should just turn to C-SPAN. It's alive and well here on the House floor.

The challenges facing Americans in 2007 are very, very different than the challenges of just a few years ago, let alone when the TAA was established. Fundamentally, we are still striving for the same things we always have, good jobs that allow us to provide for our families and ensure a better life for our children. But we are achieving these goals in very different ways, and facing very different obstacles. The reality is that opportunity and challenge often go hand in hand.

One enterprising young entrepreneur may be very successful at tapping into the global economy, finding clients and contractors all over the world, allowing businesses to grow here at home and creating lots of good, well-paying jobs for Americans. But the company down the street might not navigate the effects of globalization so successfully. It may find itself struggling to compete with Indian software designers or

Polish manufacturers or Australian marketing firms. The opportunities are limitless, but the challenges are broad-based. Limiting our focus to just those whose jobs are directly impacted by trade is a hopelessly narrow and simplistic approach. Trade is just one factor in the ever-churning economy that we face.

As I said, unfortunately, there is this tendency by many, the moment they witness any kind of change, the moment they witness any kind of displacement, the moment they witness any kind of problem at all, they want to blame it on trade, and that is just plain wrong.

There are new technologies growing exponentially and changing the nature of jobs and job creation irreversibly.

There are new competitors halfway across the globe that are in the marketplace whether we trade with them or not. There are 100 million Chinese workers who have been lifted out of abject poverty and are entering the middle class for the first time ever. Madam Speaker, you know as a proponent of trade that these are all good things, but we have to change our thinking in a very broad way if we don't want to drown in a sea of changes that we aren't prepared to navigate.

We need better math and science education from kindergarten all the way up. We need to make adult continuing education a part of everyday life. We need to enhance the financial literacy of American families. We need an economic agenda that is focused on growth and competitiveness, including opening up new markets for American producers and service providers. In other words, we need policies that assure that individuals are always finding new and better job opportunities.

When all else fails, we need worker assistance programs that help all workers get the training they need throughout an entire lifetime in an effective way that actually allows them to continue to climb up the economic ladder. We need programs that help to keep workers competitive, regardless of why they have lost their jobs. Whether the blame lies with technology, lost competitiveness, or simply dying industries that are going the way of blacksmiths and buggy whip makers, the only thing that matters is that every American can find a job and remain upwardly mobile throughout a lifetime.

As I said, Mr. MCCRERY and Mr. MCKEON have crafted a very thoughtful substitute that would work to accomplish just that. It would integrate trade adjustment assistance into other Federal worker programs so that we can help all workers facing tough times to get the training they need to remain competitive. Let me say again, we are very, very committed to ensuring that those workers who are facing tough times because of displacement that has come about due to trade agreements, that their concerns and their needs are addressed.

It would integrate trade adjustment assistance, as I said, in other Federal worker programs. In particular, it focuses on the Workforce Investment Act which has, as we all know, been very, very effective. This substitute would provide greater flexibility for workers so that they can actually get their training and education while they work, over a longer period of time. It would bring trade adjustment assistance into the 21st century, broadening its focus to reflect the new realities of the worldwide marketplace. It would ensure that the program remains accountable so that we can assure the taxpayers that their money is being spent in an effective and an efficient way. It would do all this without raising a single tax or creating any additional barriers to innovation and entrepreneurship.

This very thoughtful substitute is based on the premise that broad, far-reaching challenges demand broad, far-reaching solutions. And it is based on the very logical and simple fact that workers don't benefit when government puts job creators out of business. The Democrats' bill, on the other hand, takes a very narrow and flawed approach, while drastically increasing the money that we are wasting. Only the Democrats could manage to think small and spend big all in the same bill.

I hope today we can have a meaningful debate on the important issue of enhancing the competitiveness of the U.S. economy and ensuring that American workers, all workers, have access to new and better opportunities. I believe that our substitute gets us closer to that goal, and I anxiously look forward to the debate on this proposal.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, I just want to read one section from the bill to allay the apprehensions about benefits going to illegal aliens: section 226, Restriction of Eligibility For Program Benefits, states very specifically that "no benefit allowances, training or other employment services may be provided under this chapter to a worker who is an alien, unless the alien is an individual lawfully admitted for permanent residence in the United States."

At this time, Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California, a member of the Rules Committee, Ms. MATSUI.

Ms. MATSUI. I thank the gentleman from Vermont for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the rule and the underlying legislation, the Trade and Globalization Assistance Act of 2007.

I want to congratulate Chairman RANGEL and members of the Ways and Means Committee on bringing this bill before us.

In 1962, Congress and President Kennedy created the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program to protect American workers and communities adversely impacted by international trade.

□ 1100

Back then, our Nation enjoyed a large trade surplus, our manufacturing industry was thriving, and our economy was moving forward.

By establishing the TAA program then, our Nation had the foresight to recognize that even when economic times were good, international trade and development could also cause a rift in our workforce and in our communities.

Now it is our time to provide the foresight for future generations of workers and companies who will face the continued pressure of globalization. The mark of a strong Nation is this ability to create a vision for itself and to adapt to that vision.

Like our economy, the TAA must change and evolve to meet the new challenges of the day. Under current law, the TAA program only offers benefits to those workers who lost their jobs in the manufacturing industry due to international trade.

Today, no sector in our economy is safe from outsourcing or trade activities. We are seeing IT jobs, call center jobs, and other U.S. service jobs move abroad.

Our commitment to the American worker is more important now than ever before. It is critical to continue to improve the benefits for displaced workers. But it is also essential that we not ignore other sectors of the economy that have been hard hit by outsourcing or trade competition.

That is why I'm pleased that the bill before us today expands current TAA coverage to include the service workers. More than 70 percent of our workforce today is in the service industry. Updating the TAA program to reflect this shift in the workforce is essential to the long-term health of our country.

This bill also improves health care benefits in the TAA program to make it a more affordable option for our workers. This bill also doubles the current funding to better train and relocate displaced workers.

Madam Speaker, the impact of globalization on our economy is not limited to workers. These affected workers reside in communities that experience massive job losses due to unfair trade practices. This bill attempts to help those communities get back on their feet.

Now more than ever, the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program is needed to position our workforce and economy at the forefront of an increasingly global economy. This bill moves us forward in the right direction.

Madam Speaker, Congress needs to be a partner to the communities in which we serve. This bill lays the groundwork for that. The Trade and Globalization Assistance Act of 2007 represents a big step in the right direction.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I'd like to reserve the balance of my time, if I might.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON), a member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SUTTON. Madam Speaker, I support the TAA reauthorization and appreciate the important improvements this legislation makes in the program. But, unfortunately, there's a larger problem at work, and TAA only addresses the symptoms, not the cause.

So-called free trade has been anything but free. Our current trade policies have been devastating for communities in northeast Ohio and across this Nation. One only has to look at our record trade deficit and this growing TAA program to see this reality.

Madam Speaker, people across this country know that our trading system is broken. The fact is TAA became necessary because this country kept entering into unfair and harmful trade agreements that cost American workers their jobs and hurt businesses and communities.

While reauthorizing and improving the TAA program is important, what our working families really need are trade policies that do not jeopardize American jobs in the first place.

In just the last 7 years, we've lost more than 3 million manufacturing jobs in this country, and more than 200,000 in Ohio alone. Some estimates attribute more than 50,000 of Ohio's job losses directly to NAFTA. And we've seen the consequence of this job loss in the record numbers of families in foreclosure, and in families falling off of the health care rolls, and families sustaining benefits going out the window. These are families full of proud, hard-working Americans who have had their futures and opportunities undercut by our trade policies. It doesn't have to be that way. This country owes these workers the kind of assistance TAA aims to offer, because we must remember that very often it was our Nation's broken policies that set in motion the loss of their jobs. And because of this, it's this government's moral responsibility to try and help them land on their feet.

But wouldn't it have been better if those jobs had never been lost? And wouldn't it be better, Madam Speaker, to fix our broken policies so that they no longer allow other countries to engage in unfair trade tactics that leave U.S. businesses at a disadvantage and U.S. workers out of jobs?

This reauthorization bill recognizes the disastrous consequences that poorly conceived trade agreements such as NAFTA, CAFTA and the proposed Peru, Colombia, Panama and South Korean free trade agreements have had and will continue to have for our manufacturing and service industries.

Make no mistake. Our policies must not just sound good on paper. They must work for our businesses, our workers, our farmers, and our communities. Indeed, they must work and be fair to this country. If this Congress does not act on this reality which is

being felt in places like Lorain and Akron and in districts across this country, we'll need more and more TAA programs every year as more and more American workers are let down by a broken and mismanaged system.

Madam Speaker, all the good intentions and helpful programs in TAA cannot disguise the fact that we're going about things backwards. We should start with American workers and communities, and end with multinational corporations, not the other way around. We must make sure that our trade policies do not leave our businesses and workers at an unfair disadvantage or provide incentives to move jobs offshore.

Many displaced workers have been turned away from TAA in Ohio in the past, due to chronic underfunding and complex eligibility rules and requirements. And for others it's been very difficult finding new good-paying jobs to support their families. In Ohio, only 65 percent of workers laid off between 2003 and 2005 had found new jobs by 2006, and only two-thirds of those jobs were remotely of similar pay.

And while the improved funding and expansions provided by this bill are welcome and certainly overdue, the most important message we should take away from this TAA reauthorization is the fact that it recognizes how much damage has been caused by our broken trade policies.

We should reauthorize this program, and I certainly appreciate the improvements in the bill. But as I said earlier, TAA only addresses the symptoms, not the cause.

We know what the problems are, and American workers and businesses are facing them every day. It is time for this Congress to step up and recognize the reality that millions of Americans are facing these issues due to our broken trade policies and finally take real and effective action.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I'd like to continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ARCURI), a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Speaker, my colleague from the Rules Committee talked about the fact that the American people would hear sob stories. Well, I don't know if I have a sob story to tell, but I certainly have a true story to tell about the people in my district and how they have been affected by trade.

I rise today in strong support of the rule and the Trade Globalization Assistance Act. Unfortunately, it seems some of my colleagues only want to focus on the long-term effects of trade and globalization and neglect the short-term consequences.

Trade clearly creates an ebb and flow of jobs coming and going, and we have been hearing that. The problem in my district is, while the jobs have been going, they have not been coming back.

The high-tech, the high-quality, high-paying jobs have not come back to my district. We have only seen the grave loss of jobs.

Over the last 30 years, my upstate New York district has been devastated by job loss. The fact is that since 1974, employees of businesses in my district have applied for trade adjustment assistance 227 times.

This is a list of some of the companies that have applied. They're companies like Utica Cutlery, Chicago Pneumatic, Oneida Ltd., General Electric, IBM, Smith Corona, Burrows Packaging. These were keystone companies in upstate New York economy, and in most cases, these companies ended up closing their doors.

It's important to look at commercial air travel in our district and how that's been affected by the loss of business as a result of trade. In our district, the Syracuse Airport during the 1970s serviced about 1.6 million flights a year. The Oneida County Airport, 750,000 flights a year. Today the Syracuse Airport has 1.2 million flights, and the Oneida County Airport is closed. That's well over a million flights a year that used to fly out of central New York that no longer do. The reason? The loss of jobs, the loss of business, and the loss of people.

The drastic loss of business and slow recovery creates a dilemma that the Trade and Globalization Assistance Act seeks to address. Most notably, the legislation provides for creation of 24 manufacturing redevelopment zones to encourage the redevelopment of communities that have suffered substantial decline in their manufacturing base.

The legislation also doubles the amount of training funds from \$200 million to \$440 million, so that workers eligible for TAA training are no longer turned away because the program has been inadequately funded.

Madam Speaker, we have to be realistic about trade and we need to empower our workers with adequate training services. The Trade and Globalization Assistance Act is not a government handout. It's not wasteful Federal spending. It's a way to be helpful to Americans who now need our help. And after all, isn't that what government is all about, the ability to help people who need it when they need it?

This is a good act, this is a good rule, and it's a very good bill. It's a commonsense plan to address the short-term consequences and long-term effects of trade globalization.

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

And I would say to my good friend from New York that I think he's taken out of context my use of the term "sob story."

Now, as I said, I am a strong proponent of trade adjustment assistance and want to do everything that I possibly can to ensure that workers who have been negatively impacted by any kind of trade agreement are, in fact,

able to receive the training and the benefits that can help them improve their standard of living and their quality of life.

But, Madam Speaker, when I was using the term “sob story,” what I was talking about is the fact that time and time again we have demands made on those job creators out there, demands made of job creators which undermine their ability to create jobs and opportunities for people so that they can succeed. And then we, unfortunately, are faced with complaints coming from those people who are negatively impacted by the demands of policies that they have made to increase the regulatory burden, to increase the tax burden, which prevents those who are struggling to create new opportunities for U.S. workers from having an opportunity.

It looks like my friend would like me to yield to him. I am happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. ARCURI. You talked in your statement about the increase in the middle class of China, and that’s a wonderful thing. But I’m concerned about the middle class here in this country.

Mr. DREIER. If I can reclaim my time, Madam Speaker, the point that I try to make on trade is that it is a win-win. As I said in my statement, we have just this morning gotten the news of a 3.9 percent Gross Domestic Product growth rate, annualized, which is the largest growth rate that we’ve had in a year and a half.

Now, I recognize that we have problems out there with the subprime market. We have lots of difficulties with which we’re trying to contend.

I think it’s very important, Madam Speaker, for us to note that as we deal with these problems they are not trade related. They are not trade related. In fact, the standard of living, quality of life, 3.9 percent GDP growth rate that we’re enjoying is due to the fact that we are in the midst of prying open new markets for U.S. workers so that they can sell to them.

As I said in the Rules Committee last night, Madam Speaker, 96 percent, 96 percent of the world’s consumers are outside of our borders. The world has access to our consumer market. The world can sell to the consumers in New York, in California, and in other States as well. That has helped improve the quality of life and the standard of living for the American people. And so as that has happened, we have access to our market, but unfortunately, those other markets around the world are not as open as ours.

What is it that these agreements do that have been negotiated with Peru, Panama, Colombia and South Korea, and I hope, Madam Speaker, that we can do many more of these agreements. What they do is they pry open their markets for U.S. goods and services.

□ 1115

For example, in Colombia, the tariff rate on U.S. goods going into Colombia

is 11 times greater than the tariff rate on Colombian products coming into the United States.

So, Madam Speaker, what we are saying is we want to create opportunities for U.S. workers so that they can export more. And, yes, if there is some displacement, we want to do everything that we possibly can to ensure that those workers who are negatively impacted by trade are, in fact, able to be trained and have the assistance that they need.

With that, I would like to inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 8 minutes. The gentleman from Vermont has 11½ minutes.

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

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ARCURI).

Mr. ARCURI. I would just simply say that those are fine words and 3.1 percent is wonderful.

Mr. DREIER. It’s 3.9.

Mr. ARCURI. I’m sorry, 3.9 percent. The problem is that that 3.9 percent can go to the people who are unemployed and, frankly, do nothing whatsoever for them because they are out of work as a result of loss of jobs, the people in upstate New York, the people in Ohio, the people in the Northeast who have lost their jobs as a result of trade. You can talk about what the percentages are and how much the GDP grew, but the fact of the matter is they have lost their job and they are out of work. Today we are here to help those people that have lost their job by supporting this rule and by passing this bill because this will help them in the short term to make it until they find new employment.

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

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

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I will say I completely concur with my friend on the need for us to ensure that those who are negatively impacted by trade are, in fact, benefited.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

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

The point that I am trying to make is that people who are impacted on a wide range of other factors that are not trade related are not those who should be directly benefiting from this.

We need to look at ourselves, what it is that we as a Nation can do to ensure that those individuals about whom my good friend has just spoken, who are laid off and are looking for new opportunities and want to have an opportunity to succeed, we need to look at what policies we can pursue in ensuring that we create the kind of opportu-

nities those people deserve. Because right now government policies with a tax and regulatory policy and a lack of opportunity to sell in new markets around the world, because we have not proceeded with those trade agreements, are the things that are jeopardizing the ability for those U.S. workers to find the kind of opportunities they need.

With that, Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I will reserve the balance of my time until the gentleman has closed for his side and yielded back his time.

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

A couple of things. At the outset, Madam Speaker, I referred to a statement that was made by my good friend from Fort Lauderdale on the Rules Committee last night when he said that there was only one opportunity in the 109th Congress for an amendment to be made in order for a Ways and Means Committee bill when, in fact, we researched that, as I said, and Mr. HASTINGS was absolutely wrong when he said it. We have five instances in the 109th Congress where we, in fact, did make in order amendments for Mr. RANGEL on the Ways and Means Committee for the consideration of measures.

Also stated last night, unfortunately, our friend from Worcester (Mr. McGOVERN) made a statement that all trade adjustment assistance measures have been considered under suspension or closed rules. There was an item that was considered under suspension. As I said, if it’s considered under suspension and passed, it means that there is clearly a strong bipartisan consensus because, as our colleagues know, Madam Speaker, one is required to have a two-thirds vote to make that happen.

But there was another bill that dealt with this issue. It was H.R. 3090, the Job Creation and Worker Assistance Act of 2002, and it was considered under a structured or modified closed rule in the 107th Congress and it provided then-Ranking Member RANGEL with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. So I just think it’s important for us to make clear that we, in fact, did provide those kinds of opportunities.

Madam Speaker, as I said, I was prepared to support this rule. I do believe that it is a monumental accomplishment that, as we have gotten to October 31, Halloween, we are for the first time seeing a substitute made in order for the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee, and I congratulate the Democratic majority, after having made this promise in January in a New Direction for America, that great document put forward by Speaker PELOSI in which the promise was made that amendments, open, full, fair debate, including a substitute, and it has taken us until October 31 before that has happened, but I celebrate,

Madam Speaker, the fact that we have finally gotten to this point. That was what was going to lead me to be supportive of this rule.

But then I picked up the Roll Call newspaper, one of our affectionately called “rags” on Capitol Hill here. On page 3 I looked, and I have a printout of it right here, the article goes through a press conference that the majority leader held yesterday and a statement by the very distinguished Chair of our committee, the gentlewoman from Rochester (Ms. SLAUGHTER), in which she said the following: “Nothing is imminent. We want to take our time and do it right.”

Madam Speaker, what she is referring to is this quest that was launched by the Democratic majority to undermine the minority’s right to offer a motion to recommit. Now, again, as I said earlier, this is all inside baseball, but the motion to recommit means that nearly half of the American people, through their elected representatives, Democrat or Republican, have a right to offer a motion to recommit.

There have been some very thoughtful motions to recommit, 21, 22 of them that have succeeded in this Congress. Madam Speaker, we are in the minority. They would not have succeeded had we not seen a large number of Democrats join, and in a number of cases they have been passed nearly unanimously on recorded votes. So now with what are described as simply political moves, which are, interestingly enough, very thoughtful proposals that have been propounded by the Members of the minority, we are being told that once again the majority is looking to deny nearly half the American people the right to be heard on one single instance. So for that reason, I am going to encourage my colleagues to vote “no” on the rule.

I am going to ask Members also to oppose the previous question on the rule so that I can amend the rule to allow the House to go to conference with the Senate on the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs appropriations bill, which passed this House with overwhelming bipartisan support.

There have been reports that the majority leadership is planning on playing a political game with our veterans and our men and women on the front lines by wrapping the Defense bill and the Veterans Affairs bill into the Labor, Health and Human Services bill.

The Military Construction bill could have been sent to the President’s desk weeks ago, but the Democratic leadership was content to play political games with America’s kids. All we have asked this majority to do is to simply come to the table and I am asking here today that we oppose the previous question so that I can make in order an amendment that would allow us to proceed with this.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment and extraneous material be inserted in the RECORD just prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, we are here discussing trade adjustment assistance, and it is designed to ensure that, we as an institution, will have an opportunity to, as I said earlier, open up those very important markets around the world. They’re all relatively small, and the United States of America has a \$13.3 trillion economy, the largest economy the world has ever known. We have lots of things that are trade-related that are beneficial to the United States of America. First and foremost is our national security. I think it is critical for us to proceed with passage of the Panama, Peru and Colombia free trade agreements for the security of this hemisphere. Similarly, the Korea agreement is very important because we all know about the challenges that exist on the Korean peninsula, and engaging in greater economic exchanges between and among these countries is very important for our Nation’s security.

At the same time, Madam Speaker, it is important that we do what we can to ensure that we have the very important trade adjustment assistance for those Americans who are negatively impacted by trade.

With that, I am going to urge a “no” vote on the previous question. And if by chance the previous question proceeds, I am going to urge a “no” vote on this rule because of the kinds of things that the new majority is trying to do to undermine the rights of nearly half the American people.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I thank the gentleman from California, my good friend and colleague on the Rules Committee, for his kind words and his usual vigorous argument for the point of view represented on his side.

A couple of things. One, this is a good opportunity for the House to have a full and fair debate on the substance of this legislation and on the substitute. We will have that debate, we will have the vote, and we’ll see which side prevails. So I am delighted that all Members of the House are going to have a full and fair opportunity to make their case.

Second, before we get to the specific details on what is contained in this trade adjustment assistance, there is really a bottom line that has to be acknowledged and it’s this: that the road to prosperity has to be built on a foundation of fairness. What has happened in this country, despite the economic growth of 3.9 percent most recently, the highest gross domestic product in the history of the world, over \$13 trillion, is that average, everyday working people are falling farther behind.

We have had the greatest disparity in wealth in this country since the 1920s, and there is a fundamental question that we have to answer, and it’s this:

Are we going to include all Americans in the benefits of a rising economy, or are we going to pursue policies that allow for the intensification of that widening gap between the very wealthy and everyone else?

Our party has made a commitment to the basic proposition of democratic fairness that requires everyone to have an opportunity to participate in the benefits of a rising and strengthening economy. And that hasn’t happened. But what we have done with the legislation we have brought before this House is essentially tried to build that foundation of fairness and provide a new direction on our economic agenda, one that includes all Americans.

Let me just give, Madam Speaker, a few examples. We raised the minimum wage, something that hadn’t been done in over 10 years. We had people working harder, making less, many of them paying more in taxes because of the Social Security payroll tax increases than at any time in history. In the average families, they found themselves working two and three jobs in an effort to pay the light bill, in an effort to pay the fuel bill, losing health care.

We increased access to college education by taking a free ride away from the international banks that were literally getting a taxpayer guarantee in subsidized profits and gave that benefit to students so that their student loans were cut in half in the interest rate, from 6.8 to 3.4. We passed the child health care, which extends benefits to working families, basically, to 10 million children throughout this country, something our kids need.

□ 1130

And these are oftentimes the children of the working poor. These are folks working hard. They would rather not have to have any help, but they can’t afford health care. We passed prescription drug price negotiation. Instead of giving away guaranteed legislated profits to the drug companies, we, in the House, it’s languishing in the other body, required price negotiation so that we can get the benefit of lower prices that we’re entitled to because of bulk purchasing.

We passed many provisions that are going to strengthen our small businesses across this country because we know the small business is a job creator. And we stood up to an administration, at a time when our veterans and our soldiers are doing more for this country than in recent memory, by passing the highest increase in the budget for veterans in the history of the Veterans Administration.

The bottom line here is that this Congress, this leadership has made a commitment to a new direction. And the new direction is the old-time values of making certain that workers, average families, and communities that are fully engaged as American citizens participate in the benefits of our economy.

Trade adjustment assistance is one more brick in that foundation of fairness. We can’t have trade agreements

that are tilted so that the benefits are not shared and the burdens of dislocation are not shared.

So, Madam Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question on the rule.

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

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 781 OFFERED BY MR. DRIER OF CALIFORNIA

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 3. The House disagrees to the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 2642, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, and agrees to the conference requested by the Senate thereon. The Speaker shall appoint conferees immediately, but may declare a recess under clause 12(a) of rule I for the purpose of consulting the Minority Leader prior to such appointment. The motion to instruct conferees otherwise in order pending the appointment of conferees instead shall be in order only at a time designated by the Speaker in the legislative schedule within two additional legislative days after adoption of this resolution.

(The information contained herein was provided by Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, (VI, 308-311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the definition of the previous question used in the Floor Procedures Manual published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress, (page 56). Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information from Congressional Quarterly's "American Congressional Dictionary": "If the previous

question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business."

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Democratic majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. TAUSCHER). 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. DREIER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of H. Res. 781, if ordered, and approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 190, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 1021]

YEAS—224

Abercrombie	Cleaver	Gonzalez	Kildee	Murphy (CT)	Shea-Porter
Ackerman	Clyburn	Gordon	Kilpatrick	Murphy, Patrick	Sherman
Allen	Cohen	Green, Al	Kind	Murtha	Shuler
Altmine	Conyers	Green, Gene	Klein (FL)	Nadler	Sires
Andrews	Costa	Grijalva	Kucinich	Napolitano	Skelton
Arcuri	Costello	Gutierrez	Langevin	Neal (MA)	Slaughter
Baca	Courtney	Hall (NY)	Lantos	Oberstar	Smith (WA)
Baird	Cramer	Hare	Larsen (WA)	Obey	Snyder
Baldwin	Crowley	Harman	Larson (CT)	Oliver	Solis
Bean	Cuellar	Hastings (FL)	Lee	Ortiz	Space
Becerra	Cummings	Herseth Sandlin	Levin	Pallone	Spratt
Berkley	Davis (AL)	Higgins	Lewis (GA)	Pascarella	Stark
Berman	Davis (CA)	Hill	Lipinski	Pastor	Stupak
Berry	Davis (IL)	Hinchey	Loebssack	Payne	Sutton
Bishop (GA)	Defazio	Hinojosa	Lofgren, Zoe	Perlmutter	Tanner
Bishop (NY)	DeGette	Hirono	Lowe	Peterson (MN)	Tauscher
Blumenauer	Delahunt	Hodes	Lynch	Pomeroy	Taylor
Boren	DeLauro	Holden	Mahoney (FL)	Price (NC)	Thompson (CA)
Boswell	Dicks	Holt	Maloney (NY)	Rahall	Thompson (MS)
Boucher	Doggett	Honda	Markey	Rangel	Tierney
Boyd (FL)	Donnelly	Hooley	Marshall	Reyes	Towns
Boyd (KS)	Doyle	Hoyer	Matheson	Richardson	Tsongas
Brady (PA)	Edwards	Inslee	Matsui	Rodriguez	Udall (CO)
Braley (IA)	Ellison	Israel	McCarthy (NY)	Rothman	Udall (NM)
Brown, Corrine	Ellsworth	Jackson (IL)	McCullum (MN)	Royal-Allard	Velazquez
Butterfield	Emanuel	Jackson-Lee	McDermott	Ruppersberger	Viscosky
Capps	Engel	(TX)	McGovern	Rush	Walz (MN)
Capuano	Eshoo	Jefferson	McIntyre	Ryan (OH)	Wasserman
Cardoza	Etheridge	Johnson (GA)	McNerney	Salazar	Schultz
Carnahan	Farr	Johnson, E. B.	McNulty	Sánchez, Linda	Waters
Carney	Fattah	Jones (OH)	Meek (FL)	T.	Watson
Castor	Filner	Kagen	Meeks (NY)	Sanchez, Loretta	Watt
Chandler	Frank (MA)	Kanjorski	Melancon	Sarbanes	Waxman
Clarke	Giffords	Kaptur	Michaud	Schakowsky	Weiner
Clay	Gillibrand	Kennedy	Miller (NC)	Schwartz	Welch (VT)
			Miller, George	Scott (GA)	Wexler
			Mitchell	Scott (VA)	Woolsey
			Mollohan	Serrano	Wu
			Moore (KS)	Sestak	Wynn
			Moore (WI)	Moran (VA)	Yarmuth

NAYS—190

Aderholt	Ferguson	Marchant
Akin	Flake	McCarthy (CA)
Bachus	Forbes	McCaul (TX)
Baker	Fossella	McCotter
Barrett (SC)	Foxx	McCrery
Barrow	Franks (AZ)	McHenry
Bartlett (MD)	Frelinghuysen	McHugh
Barton (TX)	Gallegly	McKeon
Biggert	Garrett (NJ)	McMorris
Bilbrey	Gerlach	Rodgers
Bilirakis	Gilchrest	Mica
Bishop (UT)	Gingrey	Miller (FL)
Blunt	Gohmert	Miller (MI)
Boehner	Goode	Miller, Gary
Bonner	Goodlatte	Moran (KS)
Bono	Granger	Murphy, Tim
Boozman	Graves	Musgrave
Boustany	Hall (TX)	Myrick
Brown (GA)	Hastert	Neugebauer
Brown (SC)	Hastings (WA)	Nunes
Brown-Waite,	Hayes	Pearce
	Heller	Pence
	Hensarling	Peterson (PA)
	Herger	Petri
	Hobson	Pickering
	Hoekstra	Pitts
	Hulshof	Platts
	Hunter	Poe
	Inglis (SC)	Porter
	Issa	Price (GA)
	Capito	Pryce (OH)
	Carter	Putnam
	Castle	Radanovich
	Chabot	Ramstad
	Coble	Regula
	Cole (OK)	Rehberg
	Conaway	Reichert
	Crenshaw	Reynolds
	King (IA)	Rogers (AL)
	King (NY)	Rogers (KY)
	Kingston	Rogers (MI)
	Kirk	Rohrabacher
	Lamborn	Ros-Lehtinen
	Latham	Roskam
	LaTourette	Royce
	LeDrake	Ryan (WI)
	LeHeller	Sali
	LeLinder	Sensenbrenner
	LoBiondo	Sessions
	Lucas	Shays
	LuLungren, Daniel	Shimkus
	Everett E.	Shuster
	Mack	Simpson
	Feeney	Smith (NE)

