

Americans with an increase in the minimum wage and on promoting education and employment opportunities to help save the backbone of our economy: the middle class.

Americans are going to see a Congress committed to the high standards of ethical conduct and procedural fairness so that corruption will no longer find refuge within these Halls.

And they are going to see a Congress with the principle needed to truly stand up for our troops in the field by changing our course in Iraq and by rooting out the fraud, waste, and abuse that to this day endanger the very soldiers that we have asked to risk their lives countless times on our behalf.

□ 1615

Mr. Speaker, the new direction my fellow Democrats and I stand for will show our gratitude to the American people for giving us this opportunity to serve our country, to help our communities, and strengthen our future. It is in the Democratic Party's respect for the fundamental principles of our society that they will see the faith we have in the principles and their timelessness and in their strength.

It is in the challenges we choose to confront and the honest, open and fair means by which we confront them that they will see our dedication to a government of, by, and for the people of the United States.

The American people understand what is at stake in the years ahead. They understand that how we act, both in Washington and toward those at home and abroad, will determine who we are as a Nation. They want a country they can recognize. They want the country they grew up believing in. They want a Congress they can be proud of again. And, Madam Speaker, that is exactly what the Democrats are going to give them.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PUTNAM. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to my Rules Committee colleague, the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of this rule. As I was listening to the statements that have gone on, I started thinking to myself, you know, it is the Christmas season. It is a time of optimism. It is a time of reflection. It is a time when we look forward to the new year. And as I do that, as a Member of Congress, as a family member, as a member of my community, as an American citizen, I look forward to what is going to happen after this new year. But what we need to concentrate on today is to make sure that the business of the people continues in a responsible way, and that is what this rule does. It continues the government spending.

I have great regrets that we were unable to get our appropriations bills through, and I hold the other side of the aisle, the other side of the big aisle, responsible for a lot of that. But at the

same time, I think it is important for people across the Nation who are watching this to realize what we are really talking about today, and that is the continuing services, continuing benefits, continuing the work and the funding of the American government.

I think it is also important to note in this particular piece of legislation, because we are very concerned, as a Congress, about our veterans and about our VA health care, that because there could be some possible issues between now and when this expires in February, that we have allotted for the ability to have the transfer within the VA medical costs so that they won't skip a beat, and our veterans will be cared for in the manner to which we would want them to be cared for, in the manner which they deserve.

So I rise today with a heart filled with Christmas spirit, with a positive outlook, not only on this body, but this Nation. And I wish the other side good luck in the years to come, and I look forward to serving this Congress and the next Congress.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time. But let me inquire if my colleague has any more speakers.

Mr. PUTNAM. I thank the lady for her inquiry. I am advised that we have no other Members wishing to speak on the rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Then I am prepared to yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PUTNAM. Madam Speaker, before I yield back the balance of my time I, first and foremost, want to urge my colleagues to adopt the rule and adopt the continuing resolution, and express my highest regards and best wishes to the gentlewoman from New York as she prepares to take the leadership of the Rules Committee. And I wish her all the very best. And I regret that I will not be serving on the committee under her leadership, but certainly wish she and her colleagues all the opportunity and hope and advantages that come with that responsibility.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6406, TRADE LAWS MODIFICATION

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1100 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 1100

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. 6406) to modify temporarily certain rates of duty and make other technical amendments to the trade laws, to extend certain trade preference programs, and for other purposes. The bill shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. In the engrossment of the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 6111) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the Tax Court may review claims for equitable innocent spouse relief and to suspend the running on the period of limitations while such claims are pending, the Clerk shall—

(a) add the text of H.R. 6406, as passed by the House, as new matter at the end of such engrossment;

(b) assign appropriate designations to provisions within the engrossment; and

(c) conform provisions for short titles within the engrossment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The gentleman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I have, for the last time for the next 2 years, called up this resolution, and I will say that for the purpose of debate only I will yield the customary 30 minutes to my very good friend from Fort Lauderdale, Mr. HASTINGS, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. And during consideration of this resolution, all time that I will be yielding will be for debate purposes only.

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, House Resolution 1100 is a closed rule providing 1 hour of debate in the House, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill, and also provides for one motion to recommit.

The rule also provides that, in the engrossment of the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 6111) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the Tax Court may review claims for equitable innocent spouse relief and to suspend the running on the period of limitations while such claims are pending the Clerk shall, (a) add the text of H.R. 6406, as passed by House, as new matter at the end of such engrossment; (b) assign appropriate designations to provisions within the engrossment; and (c) conform provisions for short titles within the engrossment.

Madam Speaker, today I rise in strong support of H. Res. 1100 and its underlying legislation, H.R. 6406. While it is important to note that this bill is not a free trade agreement, we have structured a closed rule to mirror the standard procedures afforded to free trade agreements for House consideration.

This past Congress I am very proud, with your work, Madam Speaker, and

the work of many others, we have been able to pass crucial free trade agreements with the countries of Bahrain and Oman as well as the Central American countries and the Dominican Republic. Under this rule, we are continuing this commitment to free trade, and we aim to implement a number of provisions that are critical for advancing our trade agenda and ensuring the continued leadership of the United States economy in the worldwide marketplace. First, we would grant Vietnam, Southeast Asia's fastest growing economy, permanent normal trade relations (PNTR), thereby eliminating the annual evaluation of Vietnam's emigration practices under the Jackson-Vanik provision.

It is important to clarify what PNTR is and what it is not. First of all, as I said, PNTR is not a free trade agreement. Though I would be the first to support an FTA with Vietnam, the issue we are debating today is not a special trading relationship between the United States and Vietnam. It would simply grant what is known as a normal trade relationship.

Normalizing trade with Vietnam is an important step towards enhancing our ability to engage with Vietnam and encourage continued progress in the areas of economic and political liberalization. A normal trade relationship will not be a panacea or cause an instantaneous eradication of the challenges of human rights violations and other issues that Vietnam faces. But it is both by doing this, we are acknowledging the tremendous progress that has been made and an opportunity for further engagement that will help propel Vietnam forward on the path towards political and economic reform.

Furthermore, granting PNTR for Vietnam is necessary to provide access for American producers and service providers to a market that will soon be open to the rest of the world. Vietnam will accede to the WTO, the World Trade Organization, in just a few weeks, essentially normalizing its trading relationship with the entire globe. If we fail to grant PNTR for Vietnam, we will be putting American businesses and our consumers, the American people, at a competitive disadvantage with our trading partners, all of whom will have access to the market in Vietnam.

By seeking WTO accession, Vietnam has demonstrated its commitment to operate in a rules-based trading system. It has clearly signaled that it wants to be a responsible participant in the global economy, and adhere to the rules that we have all agreed to. Through PNTR, we not only open up new market access, we gain the ability to hold Vietnam accountable for its trading practices.

Many will argue that because Vietnam must still make progress in protecting human rights and ensuring individual freedoms, that we cannot normalize our trade relationship yet. I believe that it is precisely because of the need to focus on improving the human

rights situation, on bringing about a full accounting of the POW, MIAs, of dealing with enhancement of the rule of law and political pluralism, that that is exactly why we must do everything we can to expand our engagement. Bringing them in to a rules-based system of international trade will enhance transparency and accountability, and I truly believe will undermine the command-and-control concept that has existed in their government.

This is not a gift to them, Madam Speaker. What we are doing is we are playing a big role in not only enhancing the opportunity for the American people to see our standard of living and quality of life improve because of imports, but also by gaining access to their market and thereby improving the standard of living and the quality of life for the people of Vietnam. Giving them a place in the international community will increase the pressure that they feel to live up to international norms.

As I said, a great deal of progress has already been made on the part of the Vietnamese Government. Refusing to engage in a normalized trade relationship is not the way to encourage continuation of this progress that we have already seen.

Now, Madam Speaker, additionally, this bill includes an extension of the Andean preference program which expires in just a few weeks, on December 31. This program provides an incentive for U.S. companies to invest in the politically and economically fragile Andean region. Creating lawful economic activity has been critical to efforts to divert illegal coca manufacturing towards legitimate industries, especially in some of the most egregious drug trafficking countries.

And at the same time, these preferences encourage the Andean countries to pursue more permanent, two-way free trade agreements with the United States which will help to solidify our economic and political relationship with that very important region right in our back yard.

Madam Speaker, the underlying legislation would extend these programs temporarily, but require full cooperation in the free trade arrangement negotiating process in order to continue them beyond a 6-month period.

□ 1630

What I am saying is in the first 6 months, there obviously are standards that must be met, requirements that must be met, and then we must continue in the FTA negotiations. By taking this approach, we maintain the economic benefits that the preference program has brought, while at the same time we provide a powerful incentive to move toward greater economic engagement.

Madam Speaker, this bill goes further in addition by including provisions regarding the Haitian Hemispheric Opportunity through Partner-

ship Encouragement, or the so-called HOPE Act, which provides important tax credits for new U.S. labor and capital investments in eligible countries in the Caribbean region.

This program will not only advance U.S. textile interests, but provide critical assistance and opportunities for the people in this region, again, right in our backyard, not on the other side of the world.

Madam Speaker, with that I again urge my colleagues to support this very fair rule that allows us to bring up this important underlying legislation which deserves strong bipartisan support.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Let me first thank the distinguished Chair of the House Rules Committee, my very good friend, Mr. DREIER, for yielding me the time. As a point of personal privilege, Madam Speaker, let me take a moment to commend Chairman DREIER for his able stewardship of the Rules Committee over these past several years.

I consider David to have been, on balance, a very good chairman. He certainly is an institutionalist and someone who clearly understands the role of the United States and the United States Congress in the world today. He was given the challenge of running the Rules Committee at a particularly difficult juncture in congressional history.

David, it has been a pleasure to work with you, to travel with you, and to learn from you. I look forward to our continued work together, albeit with slightly different roles in the future.

Madam Speaker, as Chairman DREIER has already pointed out, this is a comprehensive and massive trade bill that is being brought to the House floor today. It was introduced in the House within the past few hours, and we are asked to vote on it shortly. I seriously doubt that most Members have read this bill. Okay, maybe Chairman THOMAS and Mr. RANGEL. Others? Not really, not a chance.

In some respects, this was a troubling pattern in the Congress, which I hope will end tomorrow. As I have said multiple times this year, it is my great hope that this type of legislating will end at the close of this year.

Now, within this massive bill are provisions that are both positive and negative. If this bill was split into four or six separate bills, I suspect I would find myself voting against three or five of the individual pieces of legislation. But I don't have that opportunity because, once again, the outgoing leadership has closed down the process in the hopes of squelching democracy here in the people's House.

Despite my serious misgivings about several portions of this bill, I may wind up supporting it for the sections that deal with our Caribbean neighbor to the immediate south.

The major focus of this bill, as it relates to the people of south Florida and of the 23rd Congressional District, which I am privileged to represent, is the investment it makes in Haiti. The truth is, Madam Speaker, this Congress and this administration and the previous administration has had a dismal record as it relates to helping one of the most beleaguered nations in our hemisphere. This bill takes a step, albeit a small step, in helping our brothers and sisters in Haiti begin to take control of their economy, take control of their livelihoods and, hopefully, their circumstances.

It is not a panacea, far from it. But it is, in my view, a step in the right direction. One of the key provisions of the Haitian Hemispheric Opportunity Through Partnership Encouragement, as it is referred to as the HOPE Act, will be that it provides new duty free, quota-free access to the U.S. market for apparel made in Haiti.

This has a two-fold benefit. One, it should, over time, allow businesses in Haiti to flourish and build a stable economy and lead to a more stable democracy; and, two, it will also help to lessen the massive trade imbalance we currently owe to China.

Madam Speaker, as the incoming chairman of the House Ways and Means committee, my good friend, CHARLIE RANGEL, has recently said Haiti and its fledgling democracy stand at critical crossroads. This is a key moment in the relationship between the United States and Haiti.

In order to capitalize on this moment, Haiti needs to be able to create sustained economic opportunity for its citizens. The provisions of this section of the bill can and likely will go a long way to fulfilling the U.S. part of this commitment.

As I said, Madam Speaker, this is not a perfect bill, and it certainly is not a perfect process. But this is what we have to work with today, and I may support this bill, warts and all, because of what it may do for the future of Haiti and its citizens who are desperately in need of support from the United States and other donor countries.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, let me begin by expressing my appreciation for my very good friend, Mr. HASTINGS, for his kind words and I look forward to working with him and Mrs. SLAUGHTER. We don't know all the other new members of the Rules Committee who will be joining us, but we look forward to working in a bipartisan way to address the many challenges the United States of America faces.

Mr. HASTINGS and I are in agreement on our quest to try to make sure that we implement this very important legislation. It does touch a number of areas, but as I said, it reaffirms our very strong commitment to doing all that we can, all that we can to expand the cause of freedom and the recogni-

tion of the interdependence of economic and political liberalization.

I was just talking to one of my colleagues a few minutes ago, Madam Speaker, and he made the statement to me that he is concerned about the Vietnam agreement because we should not be engaging with a communist country.

I think it is for that precise reason that we have what to me is an authoritarian dictatorship in Vietnam. I believe that by tying their hands, forcing them to live with a rules-based trading system, by doing everything that we can to bring them, as I said in my statement, into a world trade community, they will be able to have to comply with international norms, and there will be greater transparency and disclosure, so that the horrendous human rights issues that we have seen can more readily be addressed.

I am one who has believed at my core that trade promotes private enterprise, which creates wealth, which improves living standards, which undermines political oppression. If one looks at the last two decades of our Nation's history, we found countries with authoritarian dictatorships where we have maintained strong economic engagement, and, in so doing, we have been able to bring about the kind of political reform that I believe to be essential.

Two instances in this hemisphere alone, Venezuela and Chile, these are two countries which have had oppressive dictatorships. Yet through the decades of the 1980s, we maintained strong economic engagement with them. What has happened? Well, we have seen blossoming, strong political liberalization and the building of democracies in those nations, the recognition of the rule of law.

Similarly, if we shift to Asia, shift to Asia and look at countries like South Korea and Taiwan, places where we saw authoritarian dictatorships for many, many years and we as a Nation, under the leadership of Ronald Reagan and George H.W. Bush maintained strong economic ties with those countries, what has happened? Well, we see vibrant, growing democracies, both on Taiwan and on South Korea.

Now, I believe similarly that doing the kinds of things that can help us in the recognition of the importance of improving human rights, the importance of dealing with the violations of international norms that we have observed in Vietnam, we all acknowledge them. I served for years as a member of the POW/MIA Task Force. I made several trips to Vietnam in our quest to bring about a resolution on that. We continue today to be committed to this. I believe that our bringing Vietnam into this international norm, the trading status, will help us resolve these very, very important issues.

Another question that came forward was the deleterious impact this could potentially have on the textile industry here in the United States as it re-

lates to India, as it relates to Haiti. I know there has been some concern raised about ATPA, the Andean Trade Preference Status.

Madam Speaker, I think it is important for us to recognize that change is inevitable. I am one who believes passionately in what is known as the "economic theory of comparative advantage." We do what we do best, and others will do what they do best.

Madam Speaker, it is in our interest to see a strong, growing, global economy. It is also in our interest to do everything we can within our own hemisphere to ensure that we can compete globally. By proceeding with our focus on the Andean region, as we deal with the scourge of illicit drugs, as we deal with the economic devastation in Haiti, and I am very proud of the fact that the House Democracy Assistance Commission, that my colleague, DAVID PRICE and I have worked on, are focusing on building the parliament in Haiti, that our doing what they can there to enhance that political pluralism will be very important, very important for the stability of this hemisphere. I believe it will be very important for the consumers of the United States of America as well.

While this isn't a perfect measure, frankly, I wish we could do more, I wish we could immediately pass the FTAs with Peru, Colombia and we look forward to the South Korea FTA. I mean, I can go to other parts of the world. I very much want us to see more and more of these. I know come June we will see the expiration of trade promotion authority.

I see my very good friend from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), and he and I worked very closely on the issue of trying to enhance our opportunity, on trying to embark on more negotiations for FTAs. I believe it is imperative for us.

Madam Speaker, as I listen to many people decry the notion of trade and talk about the devastation that it has wrought to the U.S. economy, I remind them that just yesterday we got a near record report of a drop in jobless claims. We have a 4.6 percent unemployment rate, near record low.

We have a very strong GDP growth rate. We want it to be stronger, not quite as strong for this quarter as it has been in the past, but it still is strong GDP growth. I believe that has come, in large part, due to our strong commitment to the global leadership role.

If we as a Nation, if we don't lead globally, we will see others take that lead. What we are going to be voting on later today is very important in our quest to do that.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. I want to thank the gentleman; I want to thank Chairman DREIER.

Madam Speaker, I think it is important to concede that it is possible to be in favor of trade, but at the same time be very concerned about the rules which attend a trade, about the structures that are set up to facilitate trade that may not take into account the rights of people, the rights of workers.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us might have Vietnam in its name, but it is a hodgepodge collection of an agenda impacting Africa, Haiti, as well as Vietnam.

□ 1645

If we wanted to raise wages around the world, improve the livelihoods of a majority of citizens, we wouldn't send them on a global race to the bottom. That is precisely what this bill does.

Let me talk about Vietnam. A lot of us feel very badly about the legacy of the U.S. war in Vietnam. We feel badly about the napalm and carpet-bombing and the damage that was done to the lives of innocent people. We feel we should do something positive for the people of Vietnam. And I agree. We will have a moral obligation to the people of Vietnam far into the future.

But foisting the rules of globalization on the Vietnamese people is no gift. Let us remember that NAFTA was no gift to the Mexican farmers, who lost their markets and their livelihoods and who are poorer now after NAFTA than they were before NAFTA.

This bill is no gift. The global experience of developing countries with WTO rules provides a warning. During the WTO decade of 1995 to 2005, the number and percentage of people living on less than \$2 a day has jumped in South Asia, sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America, the Middle East and the Caribbean. The rate of worldwide poverty reduction has slowed.

When you add in the full range of globalization's institutions, the picture gets even bleaker, from the specter of a developing country. Per capita income growth in poor nations declines when they sign up for the structural adjustment policies of the IMF and the World Bank. Per capita growth from 1980 to 2000 fell to half of what occurred between 1960 and 1980, prior to the imposition of the WTO-IMF, or International Monetary Fund, package.

I worry about the damage to the people in Vietnam if this permanent trade agreement passes. As poor as that country is, it actually has a lot more to lose. This permanent trade agreement we are talking about, here is what it could cause. It could cause millions of peasants to be thrown off their land as agricultural supports are withdrawn. It can cause millions of workers to lose their jobs as state enterprises wither in the face of foreign competition or downsize and speed up operations in an effort to stay competitive.

As a result of these and other factors, there will be a surge in income and wealth inequality, exacerbating dangerous trends already underway. Foreign tobacco companies will gain

greater access to the Vietnamese market, which almost certainly means there will be a rise in smoking rates among women and children and may result in millions of excess tobacco-related deaths.

The U.S. balance of trade with Vietnam has already gone from a surplus in 1993 to a deficit of over \$5 billion. As Chinese manufacturers move south to Vietnam in search of even cheaper labor, more and more exports will come from Vietnam to the United States, and more and more jobs in the United States will disappear.

Haven't we learned enough about the folly of the World Trade Organization? Haven't we lost enough good-paying jobs? Haven't we learned that the U.S. cannot for long be the world's biggest market and biggest consumer if our people are not making wealth through manufacturing?

What will have to happen for us to learn that we cannot sustain trade deficits forever? The U.S. is borrowing almost \$800 billion per year from the international community. That is the trade deficit. One day, our Chinese, British, German, Canadian and Vietnamese creditors will want a say in U.S. economic policies, and that is not going to be in the interests of U.S. workers. Vote "no" on H.R. 6346.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, being the eternal optimist that I am, I will put my friend from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) in the "undecided" column on this.

Pending that, I am happy to yield 5 minutes to my very good friend, the former mayor of Alexandria, Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Rules Committee, my friend, Mr. DREIER.

I am a cosponsor of this legislation because I do agree with the premise, as articulated by Mr. DREIER, that trade liberalization inevitably does lead to political and social liberalization. We tried the other approach in Vietnam and we lost 58,000 people and have very little to show for it. But it doesn't mean that we are going to look the other way when human rights are being violated. In fact, this gives us more ability to intervene and to protect American citizens and Vietnamese citizens.

Let me give you an example. There is a gentleman by the name of Hoan Nguyen. He has been a United States citizen for over 30 years. He has been on the Board of Visitors of George Mason University for 5 years. He is an internationally recognized humanitarian and educator.

He went to Vietnam to open the Hanoi International School for the children of diplomats and corporate executives because he wanted to help his native country to develop and to grow. But under the current regime, without this trade agreement, he is required to accept a local partner that the Vietnamese Government assigns him.

Well, this school worked and it began to make money, and so he started to

pay off his American investors who had invested in the school. The local partner, with the assistance of Vietnamese officials, decided they wanted to seize the school. What they did was to arrest Mr. Hoan Nguyen. He is now in prison, without charges, without evidence, without the ability to consult his lawyer, without trial. He can't have an American lawyer.

His wife, with the help and advice of the U.S. Embassy, paid \$85,000 in bail for his release on October 14, 2006. The government took the money and wouldn't release him. Now they want more money. It is pure extortion. She can't pay it, and she shouldn't. It is a brazen attempt to take over this school.

Now, my constituents who know Hoan Nguyen say the answer is to defeat the Vietnam Trade Agreement. I think the answer is just the opposite, because that is the kind of situation that exists today for every American investor. It won't exist when we have the kind of transparency that is guaranteed through this agreement.

What we are trying to get is the protection of commercial transactions, the protection of money that is invested in Vietnam. This is a quid pro quo, and there are a lot of Vietnamese Communist officials who are very uneasy about what this will require. They should be uneasy, because we won't allow this kind of situation to continue to occur.

This situation is not fair, in Vietnam or in any authoritarian Communist countries. China is not dissimilar from Vietnam. But the answer is not to engage militarily and I don't think the answer is to turn our back.

The answer is to change the situation, peacefully, diplomatically, legally. And that is what these trade agreements are all about: sitting down, negotiating; coming up with requirements for transparency; coming up with the ability to get insurance, with the ability to protect your investment, with the ability to take your case to court and have a fair trial, to introduce justice into these authoritarian systems.

Now, it is going to be slow, it is going to be frustrating, but it has got to be the way we go in the 21st century. We have got to engage with our competitors, even our former enemies, in this global economy, and this I think is the appropriate way to do so.

I would urge a "yes" vote on this trade agreement.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to my good friend the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I want to particularly thank my colleague from the State of Florida for the time.

Madam Speaker, I rise to oppose the rule for consideration of H.R. 6346 because under today's marshal law and the closed rule before us, no amendments were made in order.

I oppose this legislation, and I particularly want to reference a provision which allows the administration to revoke India's competitive need limitations waivers on certain items after 6 months. Although India continues its economic development, the vast majority of Indians are still desperately poor. The GSP program has become very important to India's smaller businesses, such as the jewelry industry.

Approximately 325,000 workers employed by the Indian jewelry industry, many of whom are from the countryside and are extremely poor, depend on GSP benefits. By providing alternative employment opportunities, the jewelry industry is helping to address the challenges India faces with increasing unemployment and desperation in rural areas, particularly for vulnerable populations such as women and low-skilled workers. It has afforded workers and their families access to basic necessities, such as basic education and health care.

From a development standpoint, restricting GSP benefits for India would have an adverse effect on this progress. These workers will simply lose their jobs, putting a tremendous burden on them and their families.

In addition, India is an important source of diamond jewelry to American jewelers today. Revoking these benefits would significantly increase the cost of many jewelry products for jewelers and their customers here, causing real harm to the industry in the United States.

The contention for revoking these benefits is to allow smaller GSP beneficiary countries to develop this industry. However, it would not increase sourcing from these lesser-developed countries or from domestic sources here in the United States. Instead, the U.S. market would simply turn straight to China, which is extremely cost competitive and has a well-established industry.

So I urge the administration to disregard the authority that is given under this bill to revoke India's competitive-need limitations. I hope the President will recognize the importance this program has on India's poor.

Again, I would urge Members to vote "no" on the rule and also on the subsequent bill.

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

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

Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I would add further compliments to the final rule that our distinguished chair is bringing to the House as the chair in the majority, and to thank him again for his leadership of the Rules Committee and his friendship as we have progressed along. Having learned the things that I have from him, I am sure now that I will be able to teach him a thing or two in the next majority.

Thank you very much, David, for your friendship.

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

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

Madam Speaker, I, of course, express my great appreciation to my friend from Florida for his very kind words, and I do look forward to learning from him. I see the distinguished future chairman of the Ways and Means Committee here, my very good friend, Mr. RANGEL. We are going to have an interesting 2 years, and it is going to be a different opportunity for all of us.

I just reminded Paul Hayes of the fact that he, 15 years ago, said to me that he looked forward to the day when I would be able to, by direction of the Committee on Rules, call up a resolution for us to consider here on the floor, and I have been able to do that now for 12 years. We have this 2-year intermezzo that we are going to be going through, and I look forward to working in a bipartisan way with my colleagues on a wide range of issues.

I believe that this measure that we are considering right here on our global leadership role is an important bipartisan effort.

Madam Speaker, Mr. RANGEL and I spoke yesterday at length about the need for us to move ahead with our global trade agenda, and I look forward to continuing our effort together. On all of the public policy questions that we will be facing here in this House, I look forward to working with Mrs. SLAUGHTER and Mr. HASTINGS and the other members of the Rules Committee.

On this measure itself, Madam Speaker, I believe that for the cause of freedom, for the cause of our global leadership role, and, as Mr. MORAN said so eloquently, the effort to ensure the rule of law and political pluralism and the building of democratic institutions, this effort to pass these agreements is essential for us. So I urge support for the rule.

□ 1700

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

Mr. 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 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of H. Res. 1100 will be followed by a 5-minute vote on suspending the rules on H.R. 5948.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 207, nays 193, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 536]

YEAS—207

Akin	Baird	Bass
Bachus	Barton (TX)	Bean

Beauprez	Fossella	Ortiz
Berkley	Franks (AZ)	Osborne
Berman	Frelinghuysen	Pearce
Biggert	Garrett (NJ)	Pence
Blibray	Gerlach	Peterson (PA)
Bilirakis	Gilchrest	Petri
Bishop (NY)	Gingrey	Pickering
Bishop (UT)	Gohmert	Pitts
Blackburn	Goodlatte	Platts
Blunt	Granger	Poe
Boehlert	Graves	Pombo
Boehner	Green (WI)	Porter
Bonilla	Gutknecht	Price (GA)
Bonner	Hall	Pryce (OH)
Bono	Harris	Putnam
Boozman	Hart	Radanovich
Boren	Hastert	Ramstad
Boustany	Hastings (WA)	Rangel
Bradley (NH)	Hayworth	Rehberg
Brady (TX)	Hensarling	Reichert
Brown (SC)	Herger	Renzi
Burgess	Hobson	Reynolds
Butterfield	Hoekstra	Rogers (KY)
Buyer	Hulshof	Rogers (MI)
Calvert	Hyde	Rohrabacher
Camp (MI)	Inslee	Ros-Lehtinen
Campbell (CA)	Issa	Royce
Cannon	Istook	Ruppersberger
Cantor	Jenkins	Ryan (WI)
Capito	Johnson (CT)	Schiff
Capuano	Keller	Schwartz (PA)
Cardin	Kennedy (MN)	Schwarz (MI)
Cardoza	Kind	Sekula Gibbs
Carnahan	King (IA)	Sensenbrenner
Carter	King (NY)	Sessions
Case	Kirk	Shadegg
Castle	Kline	Shaw
Chabot	Knollenberg	Shays
Chocola	Kuhl (NY)	Shimkus
Clay	LaHood	Shuster
Cole (OK)	Larsen (WA)	Simmons
Conaway	Latham	Smith (TX)
Costa	Leach	Smith (WA)
Crenshaw	Levin	Snyder
Crowley	Lewis (CA)	Sodrel
Cuellar	Lewis (KY)	Souder
Culberson	Linder	Stearns
Davis (AL)	Lungren, Daniel	Sullivan
Davis (FL)	E.	Tanner
Davis (KY)	Mack	Terry
Davis, Tom	Maloney	Thomas
Dent	Manzullo	Thompson (CA)
Diaz-Balart, L.	Marchant	Thornberry
Diaz-Balart, M.	Matheson	Tiberi
Dicks	Matsui	Turner
Doggett	McCaul (TX)	Upton
Drake	McCollum (MN)	Walden (OR)
Dreier	McKeon	Walsh
Duncan	McMorris	Wamp
Ehlers	Rodgers	Weldon (FL)
Emanuel	Meeks (NY)	Weldon (PA)
Emerson	Mica	Weller
English (PA)	Moran (VA)	Whitfield
Eshoo	Musgrave	Wicker
Everett	Neugebauer	Wilson (NM)
Feeney	Northup	Young (AK)
Ferguson	Nunes	Young (FL)
Flake	Nussle	

NAYS—193

Abercrombie	Cramer	Hastings (FL)
Ackerman	Cummings	Hayes
Aderholt	Davis (CA)	Hefley
Alexander	Davis (IL)	Herseth
Allen	Davis (TN)	Higgins
Andrews	Deal (GA)	Hinchee
Baca	DeFazio	Hinojosa
Baldwin	DeGette	Holden
Barrett (SC)	Delahunt	Holt
Barrow	DeLauro	Honda
Bartlett (MD)	Dingell	Hooley
Becerra	Doolittle	Hostettler
Berry	Doyle	Hoyer
Bishop (GA)	Edwards	Hunter
Boswell	Engel	Inglis (SC)
Boucher	Etheridge	Israel
Boyd	Farr	Jackson (IL)
Brady (PA)	Filner	Jackson-Lee
Brown (OH)	Fitzpatrick (PA)	(TX)
Brown-Waite,	Forbes	Jindal
Ginny	Fortenberry	Johnson, Sam
Capps	Fox	Jones (OH)
Chandler	Frank (MA)	Kanjorski
Cleaver	Gonzalez	Kaptur
Clyburn	Goode	Kelly
Coble	Gordon	Kennedy (RI)
Conyers	Green, Al	Kildee
Cooper	Green, Gene	Kilpatrick (MI)
Costello	Grijalva	Kingston

Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lynch
Markey
Marshall
McCarthy
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)

Moran (KS)
Murphy
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Regula
Reyes
Rogers (AL)
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky

Schmidt
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Westmoreland
Wexler
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—33

Baker
Blumenauer
Brown, Corrine
Burton (IN)
Carson
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Evans
Fattah
Ford
Gallegly

Gibbons
Gillmor
Gutierrez
Harman
Jefferson
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Kolbe
McCrery
Miller, Gary

Norwood
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Sherwood
Simpson
Strickland
Sweeney
Tancred
Taylor (NC)
Watson

□ 1729

Messrs. HEFLEY, LOBIONDO, MILLER of Florida, KINGSTON, RYUN of Kansas, GEORGE MILLER of California, MOORE of Kansas, RUSH, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Messrs. VAN HOLLEN, BECERRA, SAXTON, MORAN of Kansas, and Mrs. SCHMIDT changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. CAPUANO changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BELARUS DEMOCRACY REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2006

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 5948, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GALLEGLY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5948, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 397, nays 2, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 537]

YEAS—397

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Billbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Burgess
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro

Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herse
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)

Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungrun, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCauley (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
Rodgers
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Osborne
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts

Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders

Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sekula Gibbs
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thomas

Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—2

Flake Kucinich

NOT VOTING—34

Baker
Blumenauer
Brown, Corrine
Burton (IN)
Carson
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Evans
Fattah
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gallegly

Gibbons
Gillmor
Gutierrez
Harman
Jefferson
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kolbe
McCrery
Miller, Gary

Norwood
Otter
Paul
Sherwood
Simpson
Strickland
Sweeney
Tancred
Taylor (NC)
Watson

□ 1739

So (two-thirds of those voting having responded in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 536 and 537, had I been present, I would have voted “no” on 536 and “yes” on 537.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of TEXAS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 536 and 537, had I been present, I would have voted “no” on 536 and “yea” on 537.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to make the following rollcall votes on December 8, 2006:

H. Res. 1101, Waiving all points of order against the conference report to accompany H.R. 5682 and against its consideration (rollcall vote 529). On agreeing to the resolution, had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”