Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King (NY)
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Maloney (CT)
Manzullo
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Pappas
Parker
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Riggs
Riley
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Sandlin
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Turner
Upton
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—188

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Berry
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hill
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn

NOT VOTING—7

Brown (OH)
Burton
Goss
Kennelly
Moakley
Pryce (OH)
Yates

☐ 1420

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Burton of Indiana for, with Mr. Moakley against.

Mrs. BONO changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2621, RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENT AUTHORITIES ACT OF 1997

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 553 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 553

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2621) to extend trade authorities procedures with respect to reciprocal trade agreements, and for other purposes. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill, modified by the amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. All points of order against 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) two hours of debate on the bill, as amended, which shall be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Dallas, Texas (Mr. FROST), and pending that 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. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, the global economy is a reality. One of the facts of American life in 1998 is that those of us who are here are all impacted by economic conditions that are out there, out in the big wide world.

Singapore and Moscow may seem a long way from a kitchen table in Temple City, California, but when the couple sitting around it see their retirement savings hurt, when stock markets start falling in Asia, it hits very close to home. Sao Paulo or South Africa may be on the other side of the world from Peoria, Illinois, but when we cannot ship tractors from here to there cheaper then they can be built over there, workers in America's heartland get hurt. Geneva, Switzerland, may seem a long way from Topeka, Kansas, but if the United States is not able to lead the World Trade Organization negotiations on agriculture when they start next year because the U.S. Trade Representative is not armed with fast track, family farmers are going to see their livelihood damaged.

Finally, working families in every town in America enjoy the best selection of products at the very best prices giving them the highest standard of living possible because we trade freely with people across the globe. That fact is at the heart of why the American economy works.

This rule makes in order H.R. 2621, fast track legislation reported last year by the Committee on Ways and Means with very strong bipartisan support. As has been the case in past years, this is a closed rule. It provides for 2 hours of general debate divided equally between the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means. The rule provides that the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill modified by the amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The rule waives all points of order against the bill, as amended, and provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, American families cannot afford for the President and the Congress to hide from trade policy. This debate is about the future. Will America lead the global economy into the 21st century, or will we sit and wait to see what kind of rules, trade rules, that the French, Australian, Brazilian and Indian negotiators think up?

Debating trade policy is never easy in this House, the greatest institution of democracy the world has ever known. Election day is always too close. Divisions between interest groups are always too deep. Emotions from people who believe trade has done them wrong are always running too high.

Well, today, Mr. Speaker, is the day to step up to the plate. I believe that when America leads Americans win. If we continue to lead the international economy, we have the best chance to control our destiny and bring about a future of hope and prosperity.

The alternatives, whether in the form of the stagnant pleas for protectionism or the siren calls that next week, next month or next year are really the right time to debate this issue really appeal only to fear, fear of foreign workers, fear of foreign products, fear of losing, but most of all, Mr. Speaker, fear of the future.

International markets are watching how the United States will respond to the challenges confronting the world economy. Eyes and ears are following this debate in every capital city in every financial market around the world. But they are not the audience that I care most about. Instead I hope that working families including the rank and file union members in cities and towns across America understand what is at stake here.

Every mother needs to know that her ability to shop for the best products at the best prices from food and clothes to toys and televisions will be directly impacted by the outcome of this debate. Every American worker needs to understand that the ability to compete in export markets and sell American products abroad will be directly impacted by the fate of this fast track bill.

□ 1430

Mr. Speaker, the 21st Century demands some things from us. We need to educate and train our students and workers to be the best; we need to invest in tomorrow's technologies today; we need a Federal Government that is effective and efficient; we need private sector companies to create good jobs at good wages; and we need to make sure that international trade rules are written with American interests at heart.

Mr. Speaker, the President called fast track one of his top legislative priorities when he stood right here in this chamber and delivered his State of the Union address. Today is the day to do the right thing for America, and to enact what it is the President asked for.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), for yielding me the customary half-hour.

Mr. Speaker, the bill for which this rule provides consideration is just as bad as it was last November. In fact, besides a few little nips and tucks here and there, it is exactly the same bill. Last year that bill did not have enough votes to be brought to the floor, and today my Republican colleagues know that this bill will fail too.

Since it is doomed from the start, Mr. Speaker, it is a fair question to ask, why it is on the floor today? Since it is not going anywhere, since it is going to fail, it is reasonable to ask, why we are spending precious legislative time doing this measure?

Mr. Speaker, I suspect that the only reason that the Republican leadership is bringing this up today is because they want to try and embarrass the President. There is no other reason to bring it up.

Let me say that President Clinton has not asked for fast track negotiating authority this year. He has said he will wait for it next year, but he does not want it brought up at this time. Even without this authority, the President has already negotiated some 200 new trade deals, so this is simply not something we need to be doing at this time. The common wisdom is that this bill will fail, and, with its failure, highlight some of the erosion of support for the President.

Mr. Speaker, when, not if, this bill fails, it will mean absolutely nothing, other than it is a bad bill. It was a bad bill last November, and its appearance on the floor today is for nothing other than partisan show.

It has no worker protections, no environmental protections, and no protections for human rights. It will open American markets to goods and services from countries with lax environmental and worker protections. In doing so, it will cost Americans their jobs, and, in far too many cases, it will cost Americans their health.

There is a tragic aspect of what is happening today. Because of the cynicism of the Republican tactics, some Democrats who support the concept of fast track will vote ''no'' today. The result will be that fast track will fail by a larger margin than would have been true had the vote been taken last year, and the size of the defeat will make it more difficult for the two sides to come together with a compromise solution next spring.

Let me be very clear on that point: The Republican majority is trading short-term political gain for long-term political loss. By their very act of forcing a vote today, they significantly lessen the chances that people of goodwill in both parties may be able to arrive at a satisfactory solution next year. Business community supporters of fast track should be furious that their supposed friends on the other side of the aisle have sold them down the river for short-term partisan gain.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill. It is a sham. The bill is a sham, and the American people deserve some sincere legislation from their Congress.

I also ask my colleagues to oppose the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to make in order the McKinney amendment to establish a corporate code of conduct as a principal trade negotiating objective and the Peterson amendment expanding the Committee on Agriculture's jurisdiction with respect to trade agreements.

Vote no on the previous question, vote no on the resolution, vote no on the bill. Let us put this partisan nonsense out of the way and get on with the business of the people.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as I prepare to yield to my friend the gentleman from Bloomfield Hills, Michigan, (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), I would simply like to say the politicization on this issue is taking place by Members who are for fast track and have made a decision to vote against fast track. I think that itself is a real tragedy.

Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG).

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for this rule, and I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation gives the office of the President the authority that it needs to make sure the U.S. is speaking with one voice during trade negotiations. A vote for fast track is not a vote for any trade agreement. Any future agreement will be subject to full Congressional scrutiny. It requires the President to consult with Congress before and during negotiations. Also, in the end, Congress gets an up or down vote. If we have any reservations at all with any specific trade agreement, we can simply vote it down.

If the United States wants to continue its leadership in the global economy, and I think we do, we must take aggressive steps to expand markets for all of our products throughout the world. This will create more jobs for American workers. In all, over 11 million jobs are supported right now by exports. These jobs pay, believe it or not, 15 percent or more on average. Fast track is crucial to ensure that American business, workers and communities continue to reap the benefits from an expanded market opportunity.

American workers are the best in the world. Their creativity, productivity and work ethic is unmatched throughout the globe. Free trade agreements are about giving those workers more, not less, opportunity, and putting the unemployed back on the job.

Fast track gives us the tools we need to negotiate these agreements and tear down those barriers to trade and investment. It opens foreign markets and creates new consumers for American products. That is good for American business, and it is even better for the American worker.

Do not let our workers be left behind. Support this rule. Support fast track.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I had thought that my Republican colleagues wanted to go into this election based on their legislative record, having changed the Washington National Airport to Ronald Reagan Airport. I thought you could go and win with that. But it looks like on the eve of the

election you are coming back with substantive legislation that, even though you know you cannot win with it, that obviously there is some point to be made, and that is probably why we saw the raid on Social Security, coupled with the tax cut. And, even though it is a loser, who would have thought that you would deliberately come back to the floor with fast track, knowing that you have got another loser?

There are certain things that we cannot do in a partisan way. Medicare reform, Social Security reform and trade agreements, they have to be bipartisan. But now that you refuse to include certain protections for the workers and for human rights and for the environment, and the President would like to work and to fashion a fast track bill that does not embarrass us with our trading partners, does not embarrass us with our business community, you insist on bringing this up before the election, not caring how many Republicans or Democrats get hurt by having to vote for a bill that is far from perfect.

It would seem to me that if we are concerned about giving the President that authority, the first thing we should do is ask the President, does he want it at this time? It seems to me that if you want the support of labor, you would sit at the table and see whether labor and management can work out something that makes it easier for us to move forward with this legislation. But if all you want to do is embarrass Democrats, always remember that as you throw mud at Democrats, some Republicans too are going to get splattered.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentlewoman from Bellevue, Washington (Ms. DUNN), a very valued member of the Subcommittee on Trade,

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the soon-to-be chairman of the Committee on Rules for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and of H.R. 2621. The world is a much different place today than it was when this House last considered fast track negotiating authority over six years ago. Capitalism has spread to every corner of the earth and once-undeveloped countries have flourished under the economic freedoms this system provides to us.

Nevertheless, a global economic downturn that began over 15 months ago is severely impacting many of these countries and is harming our ability to export goods. In Washington State alone, our combined exports to Southeast Asia are down 35 percent over last year. Consumer spending will help drive these economies out of recession, so we must make sure that our products are available to them. Our failure to negotiate trade agreements with other countries will only assure that agreements are made that exclude the United States.

Since 1992, in Latin America and Asia alone, our competitors have negotiated 20 free trade agreements that exclude the United States. Chile, for example, has a trade deal with every major economy in this hemisphere except us, giving each of our competitors an 11 percent tariff advantage, costing our citizens extra taxes on imported goods and costing our American workers jobs.

The world is not waiting for the United States. If we do not renew trade negotiating authority, we are closing the door on American workers and on American consumers. Clearly the ability to freely trade goods and services between nations is essential to achieving a long-term economic objective of the United States.

Self-interest alone would dictate that we pass this bill. As the world's lone remaining superpower, however, we must not act solely out of self-interest. These are turbulent times in many blossoming democracies, and many are crying out for the one thing the United States can provide better than anybody, and that is leadership. We must not shrink from this challenge.

For the sake of American workers and American consumers and the defense of free trade and economic freedom, I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill and support this rule.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR).

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, as we debate this fast track today, I cannot help but ask, why did the Speaker insist on bringing this up, when he knows it is going to fail? Even the Republican leadership admits that this bill does not have the votes to pass. It is identical to the bill that was pulled from the floor last year, except now it even has fewer votes.

I want to pause here for a second to commend my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI). He has made the point and he has made it very forcefully that our trade policy is too important to be used as a political football. With America's trade deficit higher than ever, we should be thinking of new ways, new ideas on trade; not rewarming yesterday's leftovers.

I had a meeting several months ago with Charlene Barshefsky, who is our Trade Representative, and she said, ''I don't know what is happening or what you are doing,'' and she was speaking to me in the generic sense, ''but,'' she said, ''our trade representatives from all over the world that I meet with now are beginning to talk about the issues that you and others have raised, the issues of the environment, the issues of labor rights and human rights. It is not something that is just coming from the majority in this body. It is coming now from the grassroots, whether it is in Canada, whether it is in Western Europe, Latin America, and,'' she said, ''it is even coming from Asia.''

America's trade policies should reflect this new thinking. If the Republican leadership was truly serious about passing fast track, they would sit down with us and they would develop a new approach based on these values.

Our trade policy is not working. After five years of NAFTA the results are in: It is bad for everyone except for big corporations. After the fast track bill was pulled last year, I got on a bus with several of my colleagues and we went to the south, and then we went to the west. We went to see the farm country and we went to see the people who worked in our factories.

In Atlanta, Georgia, I met a woman by the name of Annie Harris. She worked almost 30 years for AT&T, making phones, making about $13.50 an hour. That was before AT&T laid her off and moved her factory to Mexico. She now works for a Target Store for $7.50 an hour. She sells the same phones she used to make, except the prices went up on them.

□ 1445

She is not alone. NAFTA is hurting hundreds of thousands of people on both sides of the border.

We also went to Mexico. I know met with people like Rosa Maria Gonzales, who works at a modern factory assembling circuit boards. She makes 59 cents an hour, 59 cents an hour. She lives in a cardboard shack next to a sewage canal. She lives in a shack made out of the cardboard that she helps package the circuit boards in.

This is the grim harvest of NAFTA. Yet the Republican fast track supporters want everybody to ignore all this. They want us to repeat the mistakes of the past.

We say no. We can do and have to do much better than that. This is not a debate, as they may say, about free trade versus protectionism. That debate ended a long time ago. This is a debate about our future. It is about American leadership. It is about our prosperity.

America needs a new trade policy based upon our democratic values that our mothers, our fathers, and our grandfathers fought so valiantly for: the right to organize, the right to work, the right to collective bargaining, the right to a decent wage, to clean air, clean water. Our trade policy betrays those issues and those values.

We need a new trade policy that harnesses the power of markets to lift standards abroad, not tear them down here at home. We stand ready to make that happen, because we believe in a better future. This fast track is not the way to that future. This fast track drags America backwards. Do not vote for this Trojan horse designed to divide and distract. It will not work. Vote no.

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

I would like to quote President Clinton on July 23, just a few weeks ago, when he said, ''I would support voting on fast track whenever we think we can pass it.'' Mr. Speaker, it is very clear that if a majority of the Members of this House were to do the right thing, we could pass it today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Terrace Park, Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN).

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from California, for yielding time to me.

I would like to say to the gentleman who just spoke, this is not a debate today about trade policy. If he wants to talk about trade policy, he ought to talk to President Clinton about what kind of multilateral agreements he might want to negotiate with foreign countries. This is about giving the President the ability to enter into those agreements.

This is so straightforward. I cannot believe this Congress on both sides of the aisle is not going to allow this administration, on behalf of our country, to negotiate trade agreements with countries that are entering into agreements with other trading blocs and, thus, we are losing markets.

The way it currently stands, if we do not have this trading authority, we will not be able to enter into extremely important multilateral agreements that have to do with the future of the U.S. economy. Over one-third of our growth is directly related to exports. We have the freest country in the world in terms of trade. Other countries have higher barriers. It is very simple. We want to knock those barriers down.

Look at this chart. Here are some negotiations coming up within the next year that the United States will not be able to participate in because this Congress will not give this administration the ability to enter into these negotiations with some sort of credibility, with some sort of authority. If Congress in the end decides the agreements they reach are not agreements we can support, we can always vote those agreements down, but let us give them the ability to get in there and fight for America.

Latin American trade negotiations, a $300 billion, import market. WTO negotiations next year in Geneva on agriculture. What could be more important for the U.S. economy, particularly at this point when our agriculture community in this country is suffering so much? WTO government procurement negotiations, a $1 trillion global market. We are not going to be able to get in there and negotiate on behalf of the United States. WTO services negotiations. Finally, there is the Asia-Pacific negotiations. This chart is an indication of the number of dollars, trillions of dollars, involved in these negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a no-brainer. I urge my colleagues to put politics aside, allow America to regain its place as a leader in this world with regard to trade, and support fast track.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, the North American Free Trade Agreement, NAFTA, was the trade agreement that made it easier for employers in America to close plants here and reopen them in Mexico. NAFTA gave leverage to companies to threaten plant closures, since American workers are competing for their jobs with Mexican workers, whose wages are one-tenth of our wages because their labor unions are brutally repressed.

NAFTA gave license to companies to pollute all they want, since Mexican environmental laws are rarely enforced, and NAFTA gave unprecedented powers to corporations to sue governments for damages when they try to pass tighter environmental laws.

Since NAFTA, America's trade surplus with Mexico has turned into a trade deficit. Fast track expands NAFTA and will expand the defects which NAFTA creates.

NAFTA defects include low NAFTA partner wages. What does fast track legislation do to remedy the defect? Nothing for Americans.

NAFTA defect: increased import of contaminated food. What does the fast track legislation do to remedy that defect? Nothing for Americans.

NAFTA defect: Trade deficit growth. What does the fast track legislation do to remedy that defect? Nothing for Americans.

NAFTA defect: pressure to lower U.S. wages. What does the fast track legislation do to remedy that defect? Nothing for Americans.

NAFTA defect: employer threatens to move to NAFTA partner country. No action for Americans with this legislation, nothing for Americans.

There is nothing for Americans in fast track except closed plants, lost jobs, lower wages, and trade deficit growth. The bill, this fast track bill, closes plants on a fast track. It cuts jobs on a fast track. It increases the trade deficit on a fast track.

Fast track is a fast move to expand NAFTA and worsen the problems NAFTA has created. Vote no on the rule. Vote no on fast track.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to yield 2 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Morristown, New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), one of the great champions of the cause of free trade.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule and fast track legislation authorization for the President.

First, this rule and this bill are in every way about jobs: job preservation, job expansion, and job creation. Just about every sector of our economy, and most particularly my home State of New Jersey, is or will be dependent on foreign markets. The passage of this agreement is all about present and future jobs and keeping men and women across America working and supporting their families. It is all about protecting our standard of living, our future standard of living, and doing so as soon as possible.

While fast track is important to our Nation, it is important to my State, where trade provides an enormous boost for diverse New Jersey industries. New Jersey is the ninth largest exporter among 50 States, at $22.4 billion in goods and exports. Over 13 percent of the private sector in my State are related directly or indirectly to international trade and investments.

New Jersey is home to a majority of our Nation's pharmaceutical industries. These workers are counting on these international trade agreements and our participation. It is also home to businesses which lead our Nation's telecommunications and electronic industries, as well as to biotechnology, aerospace, chemical and food manufacturing. The future of these companies and their workers in my State, large and small, and their ability to retain and promote jobs is directly related to the passage of this bill.

It would be inconceivable that all of us would not support this rule and this bill.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, why in the world are we bringing up this bill when it is sure to fail? Mr. Speaker, this is too important an issue to sacrifice long-term considerations for any short-term political advantage. Trade issues do deserve better than this.

This is not a question of whether we want and need more international trade. We do. That is why I worked actively to help shape the Uruguay Round, and voted for it. The question is, more international trade under what conditions?

There is little controversy about granting fast track for WTO negotiations on services, information technologies, agriculture or, probably, for that matter, Chile.

I say, by the way, to my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), we can start negotiations in these matters with or without fast track, as was true of the Uruguay Round. The main issue underlying the fast track controversy is how to respond to the burgeoning trade with industrializing nations, Brazil, India, China, Mexico. Our trade with these nations has exploded in the last 5 years from one-third to almost one-half of our imports. These Nations have very different rules regarding environment, labor markets, State subsidies, et cetera. What will be the rules of competition with these nations?

The fast track proposal before us limits the ability of the President to negotiate on these items. It limits it. Unlike for any other previous President, it sets up restrictions like ''directly related'', and says it is okay if we would require Nations to maintain present standards, but we can negotiate to improve them.

The Kyoto agreement is opposed, and I think correctly, because it would give

industrializing nations a free ride on global warming. Why tie the hands of the President to press other environmental issues and labor market issues in trade negotiations?

We can do better than this fast track bill, much better. When it comes up today, vote no.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pontiac, Illinois (Mr. EWING), a great champion of our Nation's farmers,

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

Mr. Speaker, the vote we are about to cast on granting fast track authority is one of the most important this Congress will take before we adjourn. With current international economic turmoil, it is absolutely essential that the United States show strong leadership and commitment to international trade and to emerging global markets.

Over the past 10 years, our economy has prospered as a result of the increase in world trade. If we reject fast track, Congress would prevent the U.S. from having the negotiating authority to knock down trade barriers that hinder opportunities to expand our markets abroad. No sector would be hurt more by defeating fast track than American agriculture. Our farmers depend on foreign markets for a significant portion of their income.

Not only does international trade benefit our farmers, but it benefits all the industries connected with agriculture. Government estimates show that exports have created more than 3.5 million new jobs since 1990, and that is nearly 30 percent of the jobs created in this decade. These are quality jobs which pay about 15 percent higher wages than the average.

Since fast track authority expired in 1995, there have been 20-plus trade agreements negotiated in the Western Hemisphere alone. These agreements were negotiated by some of our biggest trading partners while the United States sat on the sidelines and watched as these countries enhanced their own competitiveness at our expense.

The next round of WTO liberalization talks are scheduled to begin in 1999. The issue of liberalizing of agricultural policy is being pushed to the top of the agenda. The American farmer would be the clear winner of any agreement that eliminates or reduces tariffs.

For the American farmer, for all of business, I urge a positive vote on the rule on fast track.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and in opposition to giving the President fast track negotiating authority.

Mr. Speaker, we have had 4 years to analyze the results of NAFTA, a trade deal negotiated under fast track, 4 years to watch our trade deficit skyrocket, workers' wages decline, and jobs leave the United States by the hundreds of thousands.

From 1993 to 1997, under NAFTA, a $1.7 billion trade surplus with Mexico has been turned into a $14.5 billion trade deficit. We went from a surplus to a deficit. During the debate over NAFTA, the multinational corporations who told us how great this policy would be predicted that NAFTA would create 200,000 jobs by 1995. Instead, we lost 400,000 jobs by 1997.

□ 1500

Further, NAFTA is being used as a corporate tool to threaten workers and to lower wages. According to a study done at Cornell University, 62 percent of corporations in America have used NAFTA or similar agreements to drive down wages and benefits.

This Cornell study also found that U.S. companies used the threat of moving their companies to Mexico more frequently now than before NAFTA was enacted. These are some of the great results of NAFTA.

Mr. Speaker, last year I went to Mexico, along with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) to see what was going on there in the wake of the NAFTA agreement. I saw with my own eyes the horrendous pollution caused by the maquiladora companies in the area, pollution which is hurting the Mexicans as well as Americans along the border. Let us vote this agreement down. Let us kill it.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Huntington Beach, California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule, but I am opposed to fast track authority. I have long supported free and fair trade among free people. However, I adamantly oppose to giving fast track authority to the President so he can put anything he wishes into legislation implementing a trade agreement, and place it before the Congress for an up-or-down vote.

This authority lends itself to abuse. The last time we awarded the President fast track authority, this President betrayed our trust. He included in the GATT implementation legislation a provision that dramatically changed our patent system, and this change was not mandated by the GATT agreement treaty.

Mr. Speaker, for 4 years this body has spent considerable time and effort trying to undo what fast track did to us the last time. Knowing good and well that Congress would have only one up-or-down vote and take the package as a whole or leave it, the President just decided to throw this provision into fast track, or into that implementing legislation.

With fast track authority, we can expect that implementation legislation in the future for future trade pacts will be buried with time bombs that will sabotage our economy or change substantive law in our country, things that we might even take for granted.

One of the provisions of fast track gives the President the right to offset any decrease in revenue that is put forward by a trade agreement. Does that mean that the President can have a tax increase or a ''revenue raiser'' as they claim? Sure. Sure, that is exactly what it means.

In the future, we should be far less generous in terms of our giving away our authority in Congress, especially giving the President more authority. We should be less generous in giving him the authority to make international trade agreements, in contrast to what we have heard this morning.

Mr. Speaker, the idea of a global economy has been used to take authority out of the hands of the people elected by the American people and giving it to unelected government officials, even foreigners.

I urge my colleagues to vote against fast track and for the rule.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this rule. This is a closed rule that is not going to allow any amendments or improvements to this process that could have, in my opinion, increased support for this bill.

Yesterday, I presented an amendment before the Committee on Rules that would have made this a better situation, but because of this rule, it will not be considered.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment that I drafted would provide tremendous benefits for our Nation's farmers in future trade negotiations by moving the Committee on Agriculture and agriculture to the table in our international trade agreements.

The Committee on Agriculture in the House and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry in the Senate would be given enhanced authority and jurisdiction for agricultural trade. The amendment would allow these agriculture committees the opportunity to approve further fast track authority or to disallow further authority if the process or consultation are flawed or weak.

At this time, these committees have no authority to stop or continue the process. In fact, until a recent agreement with the Committee on Ways and Means was reached, there was not even language allowing the Committee on Agriculture to be consulted.

The U.S. is a major player in the world market. In fact international trade is absolutely critical to the future success of our farmers. However, those of us from farm country, and those of us who have set out to protect American agriculture on the committee, have no methods to safeguard

farmers' interests during the trade talks.

In the last couple of trade agreements, in the GATT agreement, we gave access to the multinationals in banking and insurance and a lot of those kinds of issues. In exchange, we let the European farmers keep subsidies that are more than my people get from their entire crop.

In the NAFTA agreement that we agreed to, we opened up the borders. But in the case of their supply management systems in dairy and poultry and eggs, we allowed them to keep their system and we cannot export dairy into their country. That is the kind of problems that those of us in agriculture are concerned about.

I believe that the fast track mechanism is outdated and a flawed tool that cannot adequately protect our farmers. The fast track authority that was originally granted was used for the Tokyo Round. This was the entire Tokyo Round. It is 50 pages.

Then we had the NAFTA. This is one-third of the NAFTA agreement. We changed all kinds of United States laws through this process.

This is the GATT agreement. This is one sixth of the GATT agreement. I submit that we have to have another process where we can bring more people in, especially in the agriculture area, so that we can have a look at these laws that are changed in our jurisdiction, that we can make sure that these agreements are going to protect our farmers, and that we are going to come back with agreements that are going to be good for American agriculture and, therefore, good for the country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat this rule and defeat this fast track vote.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I first would like to inquire how much time is remaining on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) has 11½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alpine, California (Mr. HUNTER), my very good friend, my classmate who came with us in the class of 1980, and we both agree strongly on the importance of passage of this rule.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California, my good colleague who came in with me in 1980 and somehow went wrong, but he is my great friend.

Mr. Speaker, one of the first rules in business is one does not give financial power to bad businessmen. The negotiators on the Clinton trade team are bad businessmen. That is, they have a bad record.

NAFTA took us from a $3 billion surplus in trade over Mexico to an annual $15 billion loss. It took us to an increased trade loss with China that brings us close to a $40 billion annual trade loss.

The trade agreement with Japan under the Clinton administration has broken down. The Clinton team consists of trade losers. Do not give power to trade losers. Not this President, not this time.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, in particular clause 3, says that Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations.

As of today, there are about 55 Members of this Congress who have asked the President to resign. I am one of them. There are a number of others who think there ought to be a formal board of inquiry as far as impeachment brought before the House.

My question is how can the same people who are asking the President to resign turn around and give their constitutionally mandated authority to regulate commerce between nations to that same person?

I am not going to do that. This is my job. I do not want the President's job. I want him to do his job. But the Founding Fathers gave Congress the power to regulate commerce between nations, and I am not going to vote to give it away.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to vote against the rule and I encourage them to vote against the bill.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the fast track bill before the House today. If fast track were to become the law of the land, the President could negotiate trade agreements that Congress is not allowed to amend, as the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) pointed out. That means the main force for protecting American workers' and consumers' interest would be eliminated.

Therefore, unless the fast track rules under which a trade agreement is negotiated contain adequate protections for labor and the environment, I must vote against the deal. Unfortunately, that is the case today. In fact this rule will not even allow amendments to protect workers' rights, human rights, and the environment. Therefore, I will vote against both the rule and the bill and urge my colleagues to do likewise.

Unlimited fast track procedures also brought us NAFTA, which I believe has been a failure. The fast track NAFTA deal with Mexico and Canada in 1993 is a perfect example of what happens when we rush into agreements that do not take into consideration the concerns of workers and consumers. Ever since NAFTA became law, America has lost more than 400,000 jobs as corporations move production to Mexico and Canada.

Employers are using the threat of plant closures to drive wages down as well. People who found new employment after their jobs moved to Mexico took an average pay cut of $4,400 a year. Air and water pollution along the U.S.-Mexico border has become significantly worse since we have NAFTA, while the amount of hazardous waste crossing the border increased 30 percent in 1995, the last year in which we have statistics.

Increased agricultural imports and inadequate border inspections have increased the threat of unsafe food in our supermarkets and unsafe trucks on our highways.

Mr. Speaker, this is the legacy of NAFTA and fast track. When we move too fast, we make mistakes. America has negotiated hundreds of successful trade agreements without fast track authority. Given NAFTA's failure, why rush into more unlimited fast track trade deals?

Congress should vote for the right track, not the poorly drafted fast track.

I urge my colleagues to oppose fast track. Even the President, who supports basic fast track, is opposed to this. So, we ought to vote this down. We ought not to be for election time gimmicks. We ought to do what is right for the American people.

Again, I urge my colleagues to vote for the right track, not this poorly drafted fast track. Defeat the rule and defeat the bill.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Staten Island, New York (Mr. FOSSELLA), my dynamic and eloquent friend.

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I think at this point just let me note that the power under this legislation is granted to not an individual, but the office of a presidency. And the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR), my good friend, acknowledges Congress still maintains its right as vested in the United States Constitution, because at the end of the day we have the right to vote ''yes'' or ''no'' on the underlying legislation.

The reality is that throughout our Nation's history there are people who look inward constantly to create jobs and those who look outward to determine that there are no limits to America's horizons. And we demonstrate time and time again, the hard-working people that I represent, that we can trade freely and fairly throughout this world and create wealth, not just for the people of this country but throughout this great world of ours.

The reality is that we are talking about free and fair trade. Not looking inward, but looking outward. The people on Staten Island that I represent go

to work every single day with no limits to their horizons. I say let us continue that growth.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, in Central Texas, international trade has meant more good, high-paying jobs, not fewer. I personally believe that we gain from more international commerce, by building bridges, not erecting barriers. To do that, the President does need reasonable authority to expand international commerce. But the vote that we are having today is not about more international commerce, it is about more domestic politics.

Mr. Speaker, is it not ludicrous, indeed bizarre, that the same House Republicans that on Monday were releasing a videotape and complaining about an abuse of power by this President have waited all the way to Friday to say that we must have a vote today about giving that same person more power?

□ 1515

This is not about more power for President Clinton, really. It is about more votes for NEWT GINGRICH, and that is the last thing that America needs.

We do need a bipartisan coalition for trade in this country. It ought to be trade that recognizes that some of the concerns that have been advanced about working conditions, about environmental concerns are very real, and there is a way to address those at the same time that we seek more international commerce.

But today is not the day to do that. What we have here is not really a vote about fast track, perhaps fast track in name only. This is really only a sidetrack. It is wrong, and this measure ought to be voted down.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Dallas, Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), a champion of free trade.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of fast track.

I find it very amazing that my colleagues and friends, including those from Texas, blame this on politics. I will tell my colleagues who I blame it on. I blame it on people like the Texas Farm Bureau and the Texas and Southwest Cattle Raisers who have asked me and told me point blank, it is the most important vote that could take place in the remainder of this session. They are for opening markets and creating jobs. They are for American export businesses. They recognize that 96 percent of the consumers in the world live outside the United States. Lastly, they realize that 30 percent of the growth of the markets that they have come directly from overseas markets.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell my colleagues, I do not blame this on NEWT GINGRICH. I blame this on the Texas Farm Bureau, the Texas and Southwest Cattle Raisers and 75 other people who are in the agribusiness.

I will vote yes with them.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, this debate on fast track is not about whether or not the United States should be participating in the global economy, because we all agree on that. It is about how we are going to participate in that economy.

Are we going to allow multinational corporations to bargain down the environmental protection standards of nations around the world in the name of economic competitiveness? Are we going to allow our own strong environmental and health laws and regulations to be knocked down as barriers to trade?

I urge my colleagues to consider our experience with NAFTA. Thanks to NAFTA and the environmental side agreement to NAFTA, we now have more factories along the heavily polluted U.S.-Mexican border dumping an even greater amount of hazardous waste, mostly illegally. Risks to the health and safety of American working families are increasing as food imports rise while the number of inspections plummet. These environmental and public health problems are the result of inadequate free trade agreements that create pressure on neighboring governments to relax environmental regulations in an effort to lure manufacturers across the borders, allowing these companies to profit by polluting and abusing natural resources.

I urge my colleagues, do not be fooled again. We already were fooled once with NAFTA. We need a trade policy that opens markets while at the same time setting high health, environmental and labor standards.

I urge my colleagues to vote no both on the rule, because it is essentially unfair, not allowing other amendments, and also to vote no on fast track. Let us not make the same mistake again.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the Woodlands, Texas (Mr. BRADY), another champion of free trade.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I fully support this bill and this rule.

I come from a State that has benefited from fast track and from international trade. One out of every three new jobs created in Texas are as a result of international trade because of NAFTA, even with its imperfections. We have tens of thousands of new jobs that Texas families now enjoy because we are willing to compete.

I did not move to Washington. I live in Texas and just commute each week. On my drive to the airport and back to my district, I see and go by dairies and farms and small businesses and large companies where there are Texas workers, American families who are enjoying the American dream, putting their kids in school, saving for college, purchasing a home because they believe in the American principle of free, fair, competition.

Ninety-six percent of all the world's consumers live outside of America. They all cannot buy as much as we do today because they are growing fast. Other countries are competing for them. I want our American companies out there competing today for that market and those sales, because it is not our jobs that we are looking at, it is our children's jobs and our children's children's jobs that depend upon our competing today internationally.

I golf twice a year, whether I need to or not. My friends who golf more often and like to wage a friendly bet tell me that the outcome of those friendly bets are often determined on the first tee, when the rules are drawn up and the strokes are given.

In international trade today, America is not on that first economic tee. The strokes are not coming to American companies. The rules do not favor fair treatment for our companies. We are losing jobs because of it.

Let us not practice partisan politics. Let us not pit the President against the Republicans. I think jobs for our workers, for our farmers, for our small businesses ought to take precedence over partisan politics, which is being encouraged today.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY).

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, free trade for corporations or fair trade for people? I vote for the people every time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this rule because, as with all trade agreements that come before this House, it lacks a very important component, a minimum code of conduct by which American companies should abide.

Most Americans know the story of sweatshops in Latin America and Southeast Asia, but do Americans know about Guess Jeans? Guess was cited for violation of wage and hour laws in the United States. Not surprisingly, it has now moved 40 percent of its manufacturing to Mexico and South America, thereby escaping union organizers and Department of Labor oversight. Ironically, they have subsequently run an advertising campaign that claims that their jeans are 100 percent sweatshop free.

Or do Americans know about accounting audit reports of Nike that were uncovered by TRAC, the Transnational Research and Action Center? Manufacturers of Nike products are paying wages of less than $2 per day in factories in China and Vietnam. But only because of public pressure and bad press, Nike has promised to do better. Adoption of our code of conduct will assure that they do better.

Unfortunately, U.S. companies are engaging in even grosser abuses as they

operate free from the deterrence of media, public scrutiny or U.S. law.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and accept my amendment which establishes a code of conduct for American corporations. Otherwise, we will have to live with the fact that the shoes on our feet and the blue jeans on our bodies might just be made from the sweat of children living in squalor.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ocala, Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, the proponents of fast-track wrap their arguments around a banner of false logic and false promises. Granting any President fast-track authority clearly violates the constitutional responsibilities of Congress. Article I, Section 8 explicitly states that, ''The Congress shall have Power . . . to regulate Commerce with foreign nations.''

While the United States has entered into thousands of trade agreements in our history, only five have received fast-track authority. The Clinton administration itself has negotiated over 200 trade agreements while in office without fast-track trade authority. Just NAFTA and the Uruguay Round of GATT had fast track authority.

Any Administration can and should negotiate bilateral and multilateral trade agreements with the advice and consent of Congress. That is the Constitution!

The United States is the ''Mother of all Markets.'' Every nation on earth wants access to our markets. If gaining access requires the involvement of Congress in negotiating trade agreements, then every nation must accept our rule of law.

Let us be honest with each other. There have been some real devastating aspects of the previous fast-track, which brought us NAFTA, especially as it affected my home state of Florida.

The Florida tomato industry has lost over $750 million since the beginning of NAFTA. Import of tomatoes from Mexico has surged by 71% under NAFTA, putting hundreds of farmers out of work and losing thousands of farm related jobs, and no relief has ever been granted by this Administration.

These losses in exports are directly tied to the unfair trading practices that have been waged against Florida's farmers. Mexico has dumped tomatoes and other winter vegetables on the U.S. market. The Department of Commerce recognizes that Mexican tomatoes were dumped, but the Administration has never done anything about it.

The Administration made promises to protect agriculture against unfair trading practices with the last fast-track bill. They never fulfilled those promises and now they are offering new promises to protect agriculture.

Don't believe any of the latest claims that fast-track will protect our agricultural industries. This Administration lied before, they are lying now, and they will lie tomorrow!

Mr. Speaker, I also would like to include a letter from the Florida Farm Bureau Federation dealing with this legislation:

FLORIDA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Gainsville, FL, September 25, 1998.

Hon. CLIFFORD STEARNS,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE STEARNS: After having reviewed the provisions that have been added to H.R. 2621, the Fast Track bill, we thought that it would be important for Florida Farm Bureau to let you know we are still opposed.

While these provisions are a beginning, they do not answer our concerns. Until these concerns are met, we cannot support Fast Track. We urge you to oppose H.R. 2621.

Sincerely,

CARL B. LOOP, Jr.,
President.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Stillwater, Oklahoma (Mr. WATKINS), a hard-working member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, Fact: 96 percent of the consumers live outside the United States. Are we fearful of competing for that market?

I want to make sure we do everything we can for our children and for our citizens to penetrate those markets by selling United States products and agriculture commodities.

It was Franklin Delano Roosevelt who said, we have nothing to fear but fear itself. If we are fearful of entering those markets, we are surely to shrink. We are surely to sell the future of our children down the drain, and we will become a second-class economy.

One year from this December, just 15 months from now the World Trade Organization will meet to negotiate international agriculture trade agreements. Are we going to send our negotiators there with one arm or maybe both arms tied behind us? I fear the fact we are not going to give or arm our negotiators with the opportunity to enter trade agreements to sell agriculture commodities at a time when we are hurting worse on the American farm than any time since the Great Depression.

That is the reason why in this bill, let there be no mistake, I have placed the toughest language to assist in our agriculture negotiations that we have ever had. In fact, we establish in this bill a chief negotiator for agriculture with ambassador status, because I want someone around the table, whether it is in Geneva or wherever, negotiating for the farmers and ranchers of this country.

Are we going to give to our negotiators the opportunity to negotiate trade agreements for our citizens? I am going to vote yes for fast track because I want to build a future for our children and our grandchildren. They have no choice. They will have to compete in a global economy. Many of us can back away and say, well, that may not affect us. But I could not face your children or my children and grandchildren without trying to give them the best opportunity possible to compete in this global economy.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tucson, Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), a great champion of trade, one of our hardest workers and one of the most thoughtful Members of the House.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I do rise in support of this rule and for the legislation granting fast track authority to the President.

Mr. Speaker, it is a sad day to have to listen to many of the speeches that we have heard here today. The fear that some members have for America's future, their fear about America being able to compete in the world. Do they have so little confidence in America that they do not think that American workers and American citizens can compete in this world?

We have been hearing a lot about how NAFTA is the source of our problem. Maybe NASTA explains why our unemployment rate is at an all-time low. Maybe it explains why we have created so many jobs in this world, more than 6 million jobs created since 1994. We heard about 400,000 lost jobs. How about the 6 million that have been created?

Maybe we should attribute all of those to the creation of NAFTA. The fact of the matter is, we have had a tremendous surge in exports over the last several years. Look at this chart, at how exports have grown 3,000 percent over the last 35 years. That has created jobs for American workers who produce those exports that have gone overseas. We are the beneficiary of growing exports. And just in the last 12 years, look at the increase in the gross domestic product of this country attribute to trade—$500 billion. That would not have been there otherwise if we had not had foreign trade.

So why do we need fast track now? Because there is much that remains to be done. There are many things that we need, to have negotiating authority for this President to be able to attempt to reduce the 100 percent tariff that Indonesia has on American automobiles, to eliminate the European Union's 25 percent tax on our trucks and try to get those down, and Brazil's inordinate tax on computers. Next year we are going to begin negotiations on agriculture. We are the world's largest agricultural exporter. We need to have this authority so that we can sit at that table with the rest of the world while they talk about it and so that we can reduce those tariffs for the United States. We need fast track authority, as President Clinton himself has said.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this rule and for fast track authority.

□ 1530

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KLINK).

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. For those who may not have been here

back in 1993 when we were negotiating with each other as to whether or not we should pass the NAFTA agreement which was negotiated under fast track authority, I would remind my colleagues that in that year, we had a $1.7 billion trade surplus with Mexico. That has turned into a $17 billion trade deficit. The economists across this country tell us that each billion dollars represents between 116,000 jobs and 120,000 jobs. Do the mathematics and find out whether or not NAFTA negotiated under fast track authority has been good for us. In fact, now our trade deficit combined with our NAFTA trade partners, Canada and Mexico, is $31 billion.

How many jobs would we be able to create if we had fair trade rather than fast track free trade? The point is that we here in Congress in 1993 knew there were things about the NAFTA agreement that we wanted to change. We wanted protection for labor. We wanted environmental riders. We were told, ''Well, you can get these side agreements.'' You can blow your nose with those side agreements. They do not carry the impact of law. They have not been enforced.

What this argument is about today is whether or not we in Congress have the required amount of guts to say to the Administration, ''We as the elected Members of Congress, we as the elected representatives of the people want something to say.'' Fast track is the wrong track. The rule should be voted down and so should the bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to make in order the McKinney amendment to establish a corporate code of conduct and the Peterson amendment to expand the role of the Committee on Agriculture in reviewing trade matters.

I urge my colleagues to postpone debate on this issue. There is no chance to pass it today. We should not sacrifice long-term, bipartisan cooperation on fast track for short-term political gain.

Mr. Speaker, the text of the amendment to be offered if the previous question is defeated is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO BE OFFERED IF PREVIOUS QUESTION IS DEFEATED

On page 2, line 10, strike ''and'' the second time it appears.

On page 2 line 11, after ''(2)'', add the following:

''a further amendment printed in section 2 of this resolution and numbered (i), if offered by Representative McKinney of Georgia or her designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for thirty minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; (3) a further amendment printed in section 2 of this resolution and numbered (ii), if offered by Representative Peterson of Minnesota or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for thirty minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (4)''

On page 2, after line 11, add the following new section:

''Section 2. The text of the amendments follows:

(i) Amendment to H.R. 2621, as reported, to be offered by Representative McKinney of Georgia

In section 102(b)(7), add the following at the end:

(C) To ensure that any entity that receives benefits under any trade agreement entered into under this title adopts and adheres to the following principles in all domestic and foreign operations:

(i) Provide a safe and health workplace.

(ii) Ensure fair employment, including the prohibition on the use of child and forced labor, the prohibition on discrimination based upon race, gender, national origin, or religious belief, the respect for freedom of association and the right to organize and bargain collectively, and the payment of a living wage to all workers.

(iii) Uphold responsible environmental protection and environmental practices.

(iv) Promote good business practices, including prohibiting illicit payments and ensuring fair competition.

(v) Maintain, through leadership at all levels, a corporate culture that respects free expression consistent with legitimate business concerns, does not condone political coercion in the workplace, encourages good corporate citizenship and makes a positive contribution to the communities in which the entity operates, and promotes ethical conduct that is recognized, valued, and exemplified by all employees.

(vi) Require, under terms of contract, partners, suppliers, and subcontractors of the entity to adopt and adhere to the principles described in clause (v).

(vii) Implement and monitor compliance with the principles described in clauses (i) through (vi) through a program that is designed to prevent and detect conduct that is not in compliance with such principles by any employee of the entity, or any employee of the partner, supplier, or subcontractor of the entity, and that includes—

(I) standards for ethical conduct of such employees which refer to the principles;

(II) procedures for assignment of appropriately qualified personnel at the management level to monitor and enforce compliance with the principles;

(III) procedures for reporting violations of the principles by such employees;

(IV) procedures for selecting qualified individuals who are not employees to monitor compliance with the principles, and for auditing the effectiveness of such compliance monitoring;

(V) procedures for disciplinary action in response to violations of the principles;

(VI) procedures designed to ensure that, in cases in which a violation of the principles has been detected, reasonable steps are taken to correct the violation and prevent similar violations from occurring;

(VII) procedures for providing educational and employment-related counseling to any child employee in violation of the principles; and

(VIII) communication of all standards and procedures with respect to the principles to every employee, by requiring the employee to participate in a training program, or by disseminating information in writing that explains the standards and procedures.

(ii) Amendment to H.R. 2621, as reported to be offered by Representative Peterson of Minnesota

Page 12, strike line 19 through 23 and insert the following:

(A) consult closely and on a timely basis (including immediately before initialing an agreement) with, and keep fully apprised of the negotiations—

(i) the congressional advisers for trade policy and negotiations appointed under section 161 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2211);

(ii) the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives; and

(iii) the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate; and

Page 23, line 17, insert ''and the Committee on Agriculture'' after ''Rules''.

Page 24, line 7, insert ''and the Committee on Agriculture'' after ''Rules''.

Page 25, line 3, insert ''and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry'' after ''Finance''.

Page 25, line 4, insert ''and the Committee on Agriculture'' after ''Ways and Means''.

Page 27, line 8, insert ''and the Committee on Agriculture'' after ''Ways and Means''.

Page 27, line 10, insert ''and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry'' after ''Finance''.

Page 32, line 14, strike ''or'' and insert a comma.

Page 32, line 16, insert '', or the chairman or ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture'' after ''Rules''.

Page 32, line 19, insert ''and the Committee on Agriculture'' after ''Rules''.

Page 32, line 20, strike ''either'' and insert ''any such''.

Page 33, line 7, insert ''and the Committee on Agriculture'' after ''Rules''.

Page 31, insert the following after line 6 and redesignate the succeeding paragraphs accordingly:

(1) DISAPPROVAL OF THE NEGOTIATION.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply to any implementing bill that contains a provision approving any trade agreement that is entered into under section 103(b) with any foreign country if the Committee on Finance or the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate or the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives disapprove of the negotiation of the agreement before the close of the 90-calendar day period that begins on the date notice is provided under section 104(a) with respect to the negotiation of the agreement.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The gentleman from California is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, no matter what you think about the President, no matter what you think about the U.S.-Canada trade agreement and its impact on Northern Plains farmers and ranchers, no matter what you think about the North American Free Trade Agreement and its impact on Florida's tomato farmers, no matter what you think about the impact of economic development on farmers in Mexico, dolphins, sea turtles or the Amazon rain forest, there is just one question that we must ask ourselves today: Are the American people better off if America is at the table when countries make new trade deals? Should we be at the table when the nations of the world sit down at the WTO to negotiate new trade rules for agriculture, services and intellectual property? Or when the countries of Latin America entertain offers for preferential access to their

growing markets? Or when the countries of Asia talk about ways to rebound from their economic crisis?

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, we are much better off if we, the world's only complete superpower, are at the table for trade negotiations. The world will not stop to wait for us if we simply miss the bus. We will be the losers, Mr. Speaker.

We have got to pass this rule and pass fast track so, as President Clinton said on July 23, we can have these votes and put it together. We can have bipartisan support for a very important policy.

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

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

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

Mr. FROST. 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.

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule XV, the Chair will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of agreeing to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 193, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 465]

YEAS—230

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

NAYS—193

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Goode
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Hooley
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
John
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn

NOT VOTING—11

Burton
English
Furse
Goss
Jefferson
Kennelly
Moakley
Payne
Pryce (OH)
Rush
Yates

□ 1552

Mr. GONZALEZ changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. SOLOMON and Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 4095

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a co-sponsor of H.R. 4095.

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

There was no objection.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENT AUTHORITIES ACT OF 1997

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 553, I call up the bill (H.R. 2621) to extend trade authorities procedures with respect to reciprocal trade agreements, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 553, the bill is considered read for amendment.

The text of H.R. 2621 is as follows:

H.R. 2621

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Reciprocal Trade Agreement Authorities Act of 1997''.

SEC. 102. TRADE NEGOTIATING OBJECTIVES.

(a) OVERALL TRADE NEGOTIATING OBJECTIVES.—The overall trade negotiating objectives of the United States for agreements subject to the provisions of section 103 are—

(1) to obtain more open, equitable, and reciprocal market access;

(2) to obtain the reduction or elimination of barriers and distortions that are directly related to trade and that decrease market opportunities for United States exports or otherwise distort United States trade;

(3) to further strengthen the system of international trading disciplines and procedures, including dispute settlement; and

(4) to foster economic growth, raise living standards, and promote full employment in the United States and to enhance the global economy.

(b) PRINCIPAL TRADE NEGOTIATING OBJECTIVES.—