

□ 1030

## UNITED STATES-PERU TRADE PROMOTION AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 801, proceedings will now resume on the bill (H.R. 3688) to implement the United States-Peru Trade Promotion Agreement.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. When proceedings were postponed on Wednesday, November 7, 2007, 20 minutes remained in debate.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) has 5 minutes remaining; the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) has 10 minutes remaining; and the gentleman from Maine (Mr. MICHAUD) has 5 minutes remaining.

Without objection, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. MCCRERY) may resume control of time from the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) and, without objection, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) may resume control of time from the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the very distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. I want to thank my friend and colleague for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution. I would like to thank Chairman RANGEL, Chairman LEVIN and the minority Members for all of their hard work on this effort. This is not a perfect bill, but it is a good bill. I have always believed that our trade policy must be a reflection of our values.

This legislation moves us a step forward in building a bipartisan trade policy. In this bill, we seek to protect the rights of workers to organize. We look out for the environment. When it comes to trade, we all live in the same House, call it the House of Peru, call it the House of America. What we do today with this resolution is in the best interests of all of us who live on this little planet, this little piece of real estate that we call Earth.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote for the passage of this bill.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, as I understand it, Mr. MCCRERY is going to use their time. Mr. MICHAUD is going to use his 5 minutes. Mr. RANGEL on our side is going to do the closing. I now have 4 minutes remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Madam Speaker, I am from Michigan. I have seen firsthand the dislocation from globalization. That's why we have been fighting for a new trade policy, a trade policy that shapes globalization. It shapes trade to expand the benefits and to address the down sides.

Enforceable worker rights and environmental standards have been at the core of this struggle. Worker rights in the trade equation fundamentally alters the power dynamics in developing countries, just as it has in our own. This is important for those workers, for Peru, who needs a middle class, for our workers who should not compete with workers who are suppressed, and our businesses and their workers who need more middle classes to sell to.

Let me close by saying a word about enforcement. The core labor standards and the environmental obligations are on a par with every other provision in this bill, every other. Any person can file a petition if there is a failure to enforce. We have the power of oversight, including subpoena power, if this administration fails to enforce.

We have worked with Peru to bring their legal structure into compliance with ILO standards. There has been reference to a recent mining strike, and we worked with the Peru Government to change their rules regarding what it takes to have a strike. Also, they are working now to determine who is, within ILO rules, the proper authority to declare a strike legal or not.

This Peru FTA is a victory. It's a breakthrough. It's a first step in a new trade policy. Our job is to lead, to build on that history, not to retreat from it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCRERY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to allow Mr. LEVIN to control 1 minute of my time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVIN. I would yield 2 minutes to our very, very distinguished leader, Mr. CLYBURN.

Mr. CLYBURN. I thank the chairman for yielding to me, and I thank the other side for allowing me this minute.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Peru Free Trade Agreement. This may come as a surprise to many of my colleagues, because I have seldom supported our previous trade agreements that have come before this body.

My reasons have been quite simple. I have considered most of the trade deals that have been offered to this body to be unfair to my constituents and many communities in my region of the country. But I want to thank the drafters of this legislation for bringing a bill to the floor that I consider to be fair. This bill addresses critical environmental and labor concerns that are very important to me and my constituents. This bill will help farmers in my district and all across this country compete in the global marketplace.

Because of the size and the diversity of this body, it is not an easy task to bring legislation to the floor that pleases everyone. Trade bills are almost certain to engender disagreements among our Members.

As I mentioned earlier, I have found many shortcomings with previous

trade initiatives that have come before this floor. This bill, however, charts a new direction in trade legislation and should serve as a template for those of us to use in moving our trade policies in a more worker friendly and environmentally protective direction.

We have come a long ways with our trade policies in recent years, and we may still have a long ways to go before we are able to consistently get trade bills that are as good as I would like.

But it is important that this new Congress continue working to bring trade bills to the floor that are fair. This bill is a fair bill, and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. RANGEL control the rest of our time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCRERY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to allow Mr. RANGEL, the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, to allocate 2 minutes of my time.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. MICHAUD. Madam Speaker, I am asking Members who are committed to a fair trade deal to vote against the Peru FTA. While I have been a Member of Congress for only 5 years, I have been a mill worker all my life. The mill I worked at in Maine shut down 3 days after I was sworn in as a Member of Congress. The culprit? Badly flawed trade deals.

This lunch bucket sits proudly in my office. It symbolizes who I am, what I stand for. It also symbolizes what has been lost.

Since the passage of NAFTA, our country has lost over 3 million jobs. When the vote on NAFTA happened, Members of Congress were promised NAFTA would raise the standard of living for all. They were sold a dream, but the dream is now a nightmare of millions of workers all across this country.

The American people get it. Polling indicates that an overwhelming number of Americans, Republicans and Democrats, are concerned about exporting our jobs. They worry whether or not they will have a paycheck in the years to come. We have all seen the ugly face of trade agreements that don't live up to the promises. The debate here today is not whether Peru is a small country and the trade impact is small compared to China. The debate is when will we truly change the course of trade policy.

If this was truly a good trade policy, I would be the first to support it. The bill's supporters claim that enhanced environmental standards in the FTA will preserve our natural resources.

Where is the strong support from Sierra Club, Greenpeace or Friends of the Earth?

The new labor provisions supposedly will improve conditions for workers in Peru and create jobs here at home. So why is no single labor union actively supporting this trade agreement? That's right, not one, not one labor union.

If this so-called new model is so great, then why aren't we hearing from all sides of the trade debate asking us to support it? If you stand with the multinational corporations that seek to offshore jobs, then vote for it. If you stand with the Chamber of Commerce who says that these labor standards are unenforceable, then vote for this trade deal. If you stand by President Bush, who has a track record of listening to corporations instead of the men and women of this country, by all means vote for this trade deal.

But if you stand by the working men and women of this country, I would encourage you, you must vote "no." A "no" vote calls for a new model and a new direction on trade. A "no" vote means you stand up with the workers of northern Maine; Lorain, Ohio; Flint, Michigan; Galesburg, Illinois, and men and women all across this country who are asking, no, who are begging this Congress for a new direction on trade. These workers don't want more trade adjustment assistance; they want their job back.

It's time to send a message that we embrace globalization so long as it lifts us all up. I will never forget who I am or why I am here. I hope my colleagues will do the same.

I ask my colleagues today to vote "no" on this bad trade deal.

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

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

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

Mr. MCCRERY. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this free trade agreement.

Madam Speaker, I would like to close by making several points about the value of our free trade agreements and the value of this agreement with Peru in particular.

First, free trade agreements implemented under Trade Promotion Authority have been a tremendous success story in expanding U.S. exports and reducing the U.S. trade deficit. Let me point to a very telling statistic: the U.S. trade balance with the 12 countries for which FTAs have been implemented under TPA improved by an overwhelming 162 percent between 2001 and 2006, going from a trade deficit to a trade surplus of \$13.9 billion with these countries. Our free trade agreements work.

Second, our free trade agreements create jobs. Let me give you an example. Whirlpool, a company responsible for thousands of jobs in places like Iowa and Ohio, estimates that once the Peru agreement is implemented, its sales to Peru will increase by 400 percent.

Current high Peruvian tariffs hamstring Whirlpool's ability to supply its stores in Peru with U.S.-made goods. Instead, Whirlpool primarily supplies stores in Peru with goods made in its manufacturing facility in Brazil to escape those high duties. This agreement will eliminate Peruvian tariffs for U.S. products and will allow Whirlpool to increase exports of its U.S.-made products at the expense of Brazilian goods. That means more jobs in the United States, not Brazil.

Here's another example: Our FTAs, including the Peru agreement, increase opportunities for express delivery services, both because there are more packages to ship and also because such U.S. services providers will enjoy liberalized access to their markets. UPS reports that for every 40 new packages that it ships per day, it must hire a new U.S. worker. That new worker will almost certainly be a union employee, as UPS is the largest employer of Teamsters.

Third, our free trade agreements support small and medium sized businesses. There are over 19,000 small and medium sized U.S. businesses currently exporting to the three Latin countries with whom we have pending FTAs. Nearly 81 percent of the U.S. companies that exported merchandise to Peru in 2005 were small and medium-sized businesses. These companies, which will see reduced tariffs when they export goods under these agreements, are the engine of our economy and are powerful job creators.

Finally, the Peru agreement will end one-way trade and will finally give U.S. companies equal access. Today, without agreement, Peru has almost complete duty-free access to the U.S. market, as it has since 1991, when Congress gave such access through Andean preferences—and which this Congress extended last June with 365 Members voting in favor.

For all of these reasons, in my view, if you are concerned about trade deficits or american jobs, you must support this agreement.

Madam Speaker, I want to reiterate my comments from last night: I am delighted that Chairman RANGEL and I are able to stand together today as partners in strong support of this agreement. If it weren't for his leadership, we would not be here today. I urge my colleagues to vote "aye."

At this time, Madam Speaker, for closing for our side, I would recognize the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

Mr. BOEHNER. Let me thank my colleague for yielding and thank him and the chairman of the committee and the subcommittee chairman and the ranking member of the Trade Subcommittee for their work on this Peru trade bill and the other trade bills that I hope that we will see on the floor soon.

When you look at America's economy today, I think we have to recognize that 95 percent of the consumers in the world live outside of the United States.

□ 1045

And as the U.S. economy, and certainly in certain sectors, is softening, the one area where our economy is doing very well are on our exports around the world.

And if you look at what's happened in some recent trade agreements, let's

point out the facts. In Jordan, since 2001, our exports have risen some 92 percent. If you look at Chile, a trade agreement that was passed, but since 2004, we've had a 151 percent increase in our exports to Chile. Australia, since 2005, we've had a 25 percent increase in our exports.

If I look at my home State of Ohio, Ohio's export shipments in 2006 were \$37.8 billion, up 36 percent, up 36 percent since 2002, thanks in part to many of the trade agreements that have been signed. And what this means, in terms of these increased exports, to consumers around the world are more jobs here in the United States.

In my own part of Ohio, Proctor and Gamble is a major employer. Right near my home are a number of their research and development facilities which have continued to expand employment, doing basic research, doing product research, doing marketing and doing sales efforts that support their sales and their development of new products all around the world, which means new jobs for people who live in my part of Ohio.

I understand that there's displacement in our economy; and we ought to be doing everything we can to retrain and train workers for the new economy. But that's going to happen regardless of whether we pass this.

When you look at this Peru Trade Agreement, in particular, we have, or they have open access to our market today. What this trade agreement does is allow us freer access to their economy, increasing our exports to Peru and to the rest of South America.

I'm a big believer that trade has benefited our country in a very significant way. And when you look at the fact that two out of five jobs in America, two out of five jobs are dependent on our ability to export products and services elsewhere in the world, you can begin to understand why opening markets for our companies around the world is so critically important to America's future.

So I want to congratulate my colleagues for their work on this bill and urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield myself such time that remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, this is a very exciting, historic day for me. It was an opportunity to break a deadlock of lack of civility on the Ways and Means Committee, which I really, deeply appreciate being a member, as well as being Chair; to get to know JIM MCCRERY, not as a Republican, but as someone that we can have serious philosophical and political differences, at the same time want to do what's best for our constituents and our country; for SANDY LEVIN who is more than a Member of Congress, but in the marrow of his bones he understands what it is for working people to have opportunity

to have self-esteem and to want to do for themselves, their community and their children; and to have a Speaker like NANCY PELOSI, who's prepared to think as to what's not best for Democrats or even the Congress, but what's best for the country and to encourage people who have different views to come together, so that nobody from any country could say that we have a trade policy that's Republican or Democrat, but we have in the United States of America a United States trade policy.

This is a very historic vote. It breaks the ice and opens an opportunity. But also it brings about a lot of candid discussion. And I would suggest, for any Member that has campaigned against trade, that said it over and over that trade is bad, or any person who's campaigned against NAFTA or CAFTA, or all of those things which this is not, then you owe it to yourself and you owe it to your constituents to vote against this bill, because if, in your conscience, you believe that things are so bad in your district, people have lost jobs, lost homes, lost hope, and this country has let them down and the multinationals have let them down and trade agreements have let them down, then your conscience demands that you vote "no" because this is what you believe in and this is what you should do.

But for those people who truly believe that they come from communities that God has blessed them with the opportunity to grow more food than this Nation needs, to make more equipment than this Nation needs, and to know that in their towns and villages and congressional districts, they cannot eat and they cannot use, for those people who understand that exporting things means not that we're trying to help other countries, but we need the talents, we need the productivity, we need the competition, we need the workers for the Nation to survive, for those people like the State of New York, there are patches there that people have no hope for the future, and they would want to vote against it.

But they'd better not talk with my mayor, because services are going to be a boon directly for all the people in our city.

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

(On request of Mr. McCRERY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. RANGEL was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. RANGEL. For those people on our farms that want to get rid of their surplus and sell it, for those people who really believe that we've got a long way to go to get the hopes of Americans up and to have our U.S. trade representative, our multinationals to understand that it's not just a good agreement for the shareholders, but it is a good agreement for America, for those that believe in the Speaker and the minorities, that we're doing what's best, not for labor and not just for fund

raising, but we're doing what we think is best, don't challenge our integrity. Vote your conscience.

But this is a heck of a time to make certain that we're not known to be against trade. We're for trade. We're for trade that makes sense in terms of honesty, job creation, and what's good for each and every American.

Do we have a long way to go? Yes.

Is this a beginning? You bet your life.

Anytime we're taking down trade barriers and countries are open to buy what we make in the U.S.A., it's almost unpatriotic not to let them do what we do best.

But don't you challenge my integrity, and don't do it for the Speaker, because I won't challenge your "no" because you're doing what you think is the right thing.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commend the work of my colleagues, Chairman RANGEL and Chairman LEVIN, on the U.S.-Peru Free Trade Agreement.

I applaud them, as well as Speaker PELOSI and Majority Leader HOYER for achieving a new trade policy for America, workers, and the environment.

This groundbreaking agreement is the first FTA to include fully-enforceable rights for workers—an achievement that my Democratic colleagues and I have long sought.

Bolstering workers' rights in Peru is not just the moral thing to do; it also helps to build a stable, more prosperous middle class—creating a larger market for U.S. goods.

This agreement also requires Peru to abide by multilateral environmental accords—such as protecting Peru's rainforests from illegal logging.

Most importantly, Peru may not waver from these commitments to workers or the environment in any way.

Madam Speaker, I chair the New Democrats, a group of 60 pro-growth Members.

We are dedicated to keeping America competitive—through lowering trade barriers and opening foreign markets to U.S. goods and services.

I also come from California, where more than one in five jobs is tied to trade.

I am proud to be a pro-trade Democrat in Congress, and I am proud of this landmark trade agreement the new Democratic majority has achieved.

America will not remain the world's economic and innovation leader if we refuse to do business with the rest of the world.

Likewise, we must equip U.S. workers with the tools to compete and win in a global economy, and help them through the transition, as we have with the expansion of Trade Adjustment Assistance.

Finally Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to examine the strategic implications of this agreement.

Deepening ties with our pro-growth allies in Latin America is key to security in the Western Hemisphere.

Passage of the Peru FTA is a first step in a twenty-first century trade policy: It is an expansion of trade in a way that is solidly consistent with Democratic values.

Again, I applaud Chairman RANGEL and Chairman LEVIN for their success, and I urge my colleagues to support implementation of the Peru FTA.

Ms. SOLIS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the United States-Peru Trade Promotion Agreement Implementation Act (H.R. 3688), which would implement a trade agreement reached last year between Peru and the Bush Administration.

The Peru free trade agreement (FTA) will not protect American workers nor will it protect workers in Peru. The Peruvian National Convention on Agriculture (CONVEAGRO) has estimated that approximately 1.7 million Peruvian farmers will be negatively affected by the agreement. Although efforts were made to incorporate international labor standards in the Peru FTA, it is unclear whether the Bush Administration will enforce this provision. The International Labor Organization (ILO) has stated that the Peruvian government needs to change labor laws to be in compliance with international treaties.

Serious concerns also remain about language in the Peru FTA that does not eliminate the excessive North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) Chapter 11 foreign investor privileges. These investor privileges create incentives for U.S. firms to move offshore. These investor privileges have also been used to undermine efforts to protect the environment and public health. The provisions also allow foreign investors to bring suits before tribunals to challenge the government's implementation of natural resource contracts or leases, which have the potential to continue threatening the resources in Peru. For that reason, environmental organizations have expressed significant concerns about this trade agreement even though improvements were made to help stop the flow of illegally logged timber in Peru.

The United States trade policy has resulted in a loss of at least three million manufacturing jobs since 1999 and a loss of nearly one million textile and apparel industries jobs in the last 13 years. A recent study by the Economic Policy Institute showed that a typical American working household lost more than \$2,000 in wages because of foreign trade. Further expansion of this policy could worsen conditions for workers in America that is why this legislation is opposed by groups such as the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Change to Win, Service Employees International Union, UNITE HERE, the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, Friends of the Earth, and the Sierra Club. I cannot vote for this legislation when our trade policy does not protect American workers and American jobs. In this new age of globalization, Congress must restore the economic security of working- and middle-class Americans.

Mr. MANZULLO. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the United States-Peru Trade Promotion Agreement.

According to the International Trade Administration, approximately 91 percent of U.S. exports to Peru are manufactured products. Currently, all of these goods are assessed high tariffs—in some instances at double-digit rates. Peruvian manufacturers are not assessed any tariffs when selling to the U.S. market. This market-opening trade agreement levels the playing field for America's manufacturers by eliminating high tariffs on all U.S. manufactured goods within 10 years. Eighty percent of Peruvian tariffs on consumer and industrial goods would be eliminated immediately upon this agreement coming into force.

To put the cost of these tariffs into perspective, a Caterpillar off-highway truck made in Illinois used for mining exported to Peru costs the end-user an additional \$100,000 because of the tariffs. This agreement eliminates this duty immediately. Because Peru does not have a free trade agreement with Japan, H.R. 3688 gives a competitive advantage to Caterpillar over its global competitors such as Komatsu of Japan. The northern Illinois district I am proud to represent has many suppliers to Caterpillar, many of them small manufacturers, selling about \$150 million worth of product each year. Having an agreement like this insures the long-term viability of the manufacturing jobs at these firms that may not even know that their product they make eventually finds its way to export markets like Peru.

Madam Speaker, this agreement will greatly benefit other manufacturers of Illinois as well. In 2001, Illinois machinery manufacturers exported \$65.8 million worth of goods to Peru. In 2006, that number more than tripled to \$198.2 million. Our manufacturers were able to do this in spite of the high tariffs. Imagine what they will be able to do when these tariffs are removed! The independent International Trade Commission estimates that U.S. exports to Peru will increase by \$1.1 billion once this agreement is fully implemented. We have seen examples of other market opening agreements that resulted in increasing U.S. exports. Since the adoption of the market-opening agreement with Chile in 2004, U.S. exports to Chile leapt by 33 percent in 2004, 43 percent in 2005, and 38 percent in 2006! Our trade agreement with Australia also helped boost U.S. exports “down under” by 25 percent in just two years.

I urge my colleagues to support America's manufacturers by voting “yes” for this agreement.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, today, I rise against H.R. 3688, the United States-Peru Trade Promotion Agreement Implementation Act. Southeast Michigan has lost tens of thousands of manufacturing jobs due to unfair free trade agreements such as NAFTA and CAFTA. Unfortunately, H.R. 3688 follows in the steps of these lopsided trade deals.

Advocates of today's legislation will insist that there are strong labor and environmental standards. However, members of the Peruvian Congress were working to pass a robust General Labor Law and now it will be tabled for a substantially weaker labor law issued by President García. Furthermore, given President Bush's track record on lack of enforcement of current U.S. law, I cannot be persuaded that many of the labor provisions will be enforced. Unbalanced trade has led to a race to the bottom which has lowered job quality and wages for U.S. workers and H.R. 3688 will further encourage this push for cheap labor.

This bill is also bad for Peruvians. More than three million Peruvians may lose their jobs from U.S. exports and may drive many rural farmers into the illegal cocoa trade. H.R. 3688 will limit Peruvian access to health care. Specifically, by approving this free trade agreement, drug companies will obtain five years of data exclusivity, or monopoly rights for pharmaceutical manufacturers in both countries, which will increase the price of medicine, delay the entry of new drugs, and restrict competition in this market. As a result, millions of Peruvians will be at risk of losing life saving drugs. Furthermore, if Peru chooses

to replace its current private Social Security system with its previous public system, then this bill may open the door to allow private foreign investors to file suit at international tribunals.

Madam Speaker, a recent poll indicated that the majority of Americans oppose the concept of free trade. It is no surprise that dozens of labor, environment, human rights, and religious organizations have opposed this bill because it is bad for both the United States and Peru. I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the U.S.-Peru Free Trade Agreement.

I oppose this bill because I come from a part of our country that has seen all the drawbacks of free trade without any of the supposed benefits. I oppose this bill on behalf of the countless Americans who spent years of their lives working in a steel mill or manufacturing plant whose lives were uprooted in the wake of NAFTA and CAFTA.

I represent the 8th District of Pennsylvania. My State has been one of the hardest hit by free trade agreements and the unfair trade practices of nations, such as China, that don't play by the rules. Bucks County was hit hard. Manufacturing jobs used to number in the tens of thousands, but by 2005, they had fallen nearly 35 percent. This devastation included major employers like US Steel, Jones Apparel, and Rohm and Haas—companies that now employ a fraction of what they once did. Each one of those lost jobs represents a worker and his or her family whose lives were turned upside down by so called “free trade.” Madam Speaker, free trade is not free if it costs American workers their jobs.

I believe that when everyone plays by the rules, American workers will beat out foreign competition every time. Unfortunately, not every nation plays by the rules and even worse, the Bush administration has done nothing to protect American workers from unfair competition. In fact, the President has gone out of his way to sign free trade agreements, like CAFTA, that harm American working men and women.

Madam Speaker, it is for that reason that I must oppose this bill. While this agreement paid heed to labor, health and environmental concerns for the first time in years, we need to back up words with action. Supporters of this bill are saying all of the right things and I am glad that these concerns were taken into account. However, when the livelihoods of American families are at stake, words simply aren't good enough. We need concrete action and this bill offers us no guarantees.

We are debating this bill under “fast-track” rules. That means that the Congress gets no say in the details of the agreement and that we simply must trust that the President is going to do right by American workers. This President has broken his word over and over again throughout his time in office and we cannot trust him again. We have seen the Bush administration repeatedly putting the interests of the few ahead of the needs of the many.

For example, if we had the ability to amend this trade agreement, I would fight to include the provisions of a bill I have introduced that would require national security reviews of trade deals before we agree to them. My bill, The Trade-Related American National Security

Enhancement and Accountability, TRANSEA, Act also would allow for the suspension of existing trade agreements if the safety, health, and welfare of Americans are in doubt. I think these provisions would have made a vast improvement to the Peru Free Trade Agreement, but unfortunately because of fast track rules, we are prohibited from even trying to offer changes to make the bill better for American workers.

Madam Speaker, I am not an anti-trade crusader. Certainly, if trade is done the right way, with attention paid to labor, environmental and health standards, then it can benefit everybody from workers to business owners, both in the United States and other parts of the world. Unfortunately, with President Bush's disastrous record, we cannot trust him, to enforce the agreement in a way that will be fair to American working men and women. It is for these reasons, Madam Speaker, that I oppose this trade agreement.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, it is time that America work for America's workers, farmers and families. The Peru Free Trade Agreement is a step in the right direction. It marks the first time in history that a FTA has incorporated labor and environmental provisions.

This is a major step forward because it signals that the pursuit of trade is not an end, but a means to help raise living standards and provide opportunity. I represent a trade dependent city and yet my constituents are leery of FTAs because they fear that American workers have been left behind.

Today, we are at a crossroads. We can continue down the path we have been on and keep pursuing freer trade knowing that many Americans are falling through a domestic safety net built 70 years ago, or we can pursue policies that respond to a new century.

Last week the House made a good start by adopting legislation to reform the Unemployment Insurance program and update the Trade Adjustment Assistance program. We must do more. Health care that is tied to employment is insecure.

Education benefits that aren't available to working adults do not meet the needs of the modern workforce. Our trade agreements need to be smarter, too. We know that supporting core worker rights—human rights—is central to enabling workers to benefit fully from their labor.

We know that the tools of public policy need flexibility to ensure access in areas like affordable prescription drugs. We know that the Earth's environment isn't yours or mine, it's ours.

Chief Si'ahl, the inspired leader of the Duwamish and Suquamish Tribes, for whom my City of Seattle is named, said it best.

A century ago, this great tribal chief said: “We did not weave the web of life. We are merely a strand in it. Whatever we do to the web, we do to ourselves.”

My support for the Peru Free Trade Agreement is for this particular FTA, in part because of the progress we've achieved in incorporating labor and environmental standards, and health concerns.

I will continue to consider each FTA on its merits, and in its own context.

I will be paying close attention to the Administration and its commitment to Americans through TAA and healthcare for the children of working families.

In the end trade is about people and the jargon—FTA and TAA—had better produce SBA—Standing by Americans.

The research is clear; this FTA will increase American exports in key goods that come from my State, including: IT products, wheat, apples, pears, peaches and cherries. And this agreement will be good for Peru, too. If I didn't believe that, I wouldn't vote for it.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Peru Free Trade Agreement.

While I applaud the efforts to improve worker rights in the Peru FTA, the protections in the agreement fall short of addressing the concerns of workers that have been adversely affected by the passage of the North American Free Trade Agreement, the Central American Free Trade Agreement, and other recent FTAs.

The absence of clear, enforceable labor standards as detailed by the International Labor Organization, ILO, in the Peru FTA make this an agreement I cannot support. These include prohibitions of child labor and guaranteeing the right of workers in Peru to form independent labor unions.

The Peru FTA and the passage of Trade Adjustment Assistance, TAA, last week does not represent the kind of comprehensive policy that workers need to ensure that our globalization policies not only benefit multinational corporations, but workers as well.

I am not opposed to free trade agreements as long as they are fair trade agreements that benefit and protect workers in both countries, however, I have long opposed free trade agreements with countries with significantly lower standards of living, and fewer labor protections than we have here in the U.S.

I am proud to represent one of the most blue-collar districts in the country. The workers in our district benefit from the labor laws on the books in the U.S, and while our labor laws could certainly be strengthened, they ensure that our blue-collar workers receive a living wage and make up a thriving middle class in this country.

I have no doubts whatsoever about the skills and productivity of American workers, but the significant differences in the standard of living puts the American worker—and American products—at a competitive disadvantage, one that this country should not allow to be exploited through a free trade agreement.

U.S. trade policy over the last decade has resulted in the loss of millions of jobs and has led to 5 consecutive years with record setting trade deficits.

I am concerned this trade agreement does not go far enough to address the issues that caused these problems, and I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing H.R. 3688.

Mr. REICHERT. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Peru Trade Promotion Agreement. We must continue to open markets to encourage American companies to innovate and compete with their global counterparts. This grows our economy and creates jobs.

I am proud to represent a district in Washington State that integrates our Nation's leading technology innovators with a vibrant and highly productive small business community. Opening new global markets gives them incentives to improve their products, produce more goods, and employ more American workers. I have seen these job-creating effects

firsthand, with trade accounting for 1 out of every 3 jobs in my State.

The Peru Trade Promotion Agreement will level the playing field and increase market access for American and Peruvian companies. It will grow our Nation's economy by more than \$2 billion.

I hope that the passage of this agreement finally advances our broader trade agenda in Congress. I am disappointed that it has taken more than 5 months since the bipartisan deal reached in May—and over 1 year since the Peru Free Trade Agreement was signed—for this measure to finally come to the floor.

We cannot allow important pending agreements with Colombia, Panama, and Korea to languish as the Peru measure did. I urge my colleagues in the majority to stop the delays and pass these free trade agreements. Let's advance the trade measures needed to grow our economy, create jobs, and improve our relations with global partners.

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Madam Speaker, as Americans we do not live in isolation. We live in a world that has been transformed over the past half century through America's political, security and economic leadership. Globalization is a reality that has created both opportunities and challenges, but overall more people on this planet are living better, healthier and more secure lives today than at anytime in human history.

Global economic engagement is a reality that every American encounters every day in our offices or when we shop in any department or grocery store. Trade is essential for a strong, vibrant American economy and to sustain and create the jobs that keep America working. Yet, not all trade agreements are the same or beneficial in my opinion. In fact, most trade agreements that have come before this House in my 7 years in Congress, such as CAFTA, have been harmful because they have ignored key provisions for workers' rights, the environment and necessary safeguards for American workers.

Peru is a nation of 28 million people—one-tenth the size of the United States. It is a South American nation that faces the challenges of extreme poverty, narco-trafficking and an inequitable distribution of income. Peru is searching for economic opportunities that will lift its people and keep its citizens working. It is my hope that the United States will partner with Peru in this effort.

The cost of entering into a trade agreement with the United States is no longer about limitless access to our market without regard for workers' rights or the environment in the exporting nation. That premise has vanished with the new Democratic majority. With new Democratic leadership in Congress priorities have changed and the U.S.-Peru Free Trade Agreement is a positive example of how Democrats are shaping the trade debate to address real concerns. I support this agreement because we need strong, positive political and economic relations with partners like Peru. We also need trade agreements that reflect the priorities of the American people, such as a respect for workers' rights and the environment.

This agreement, because of the determination of Democratic leadership, especially Chairman RANGEL and Chairman LEVIN, delivers a fully enforceable commitment that Peru will adopt, maintain and enforce core labor laws and practice the five basic international

labor standards, as set forth by the International Labor Organization's (ILO) Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work. These principals include: the freedom of association; the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining; eliminating all forms of forced or compulsory labor; the effective abolition of child labor; and, the elimination of discrimination in employment. Furthermore, there is a binding, fully enforceable commitment prohibiting the lowering of labor standards. As a result, the Government of Peru has taken clear action to implement ILO standards which must be recognized as a significant step forward and a direct consequence of a Democratic agenda that values workers' rights. The labor situation in Peru is far from perfect, but these positive steps would not be taking place without Democrats demanding change in order for this FTA to move forward.

On the environment, for the first time in a U.S. free trade agreement, we will have recourse to enforce the environmental commitments our trading partner has made. Beyond merely preventing Peru from scaling back their environmental protections, this agreement contains enforceable provisions that will require significant improvements in their environmental policies. For instance, it requires that they crack down on the illegal logging of endangered species that we know is going on today. Without this trade agreement's provisions, this illegal logging will only continue unabated.

Since 1991, we have granted 98 percent of Peruvian exports free access to United States markets. In 2006, Peru's exports to the United States totaled \$5.8 billion, mostly gold, copper, copper ore and petroleum products. The U.S. exports to Peru totaled \$2.9 billion. To put the United States-Peru trade relationship into perspective: our neighbor to the north, Canada, has a population of 32 million people, four million more than Peru, and they exported \$302 billion worth of goods to the United States in 2006.

Since Peru already has almost unlimited access to the U.S. market, this agreement largely grants U.S. interests, manufacturers and agricultural products expanded access to the Peruvian market. Under the agreement, 80 percent of United States exports of consumer and industrial goods will immediately enter Peru duty-free. The duties on an additional 7 percent of products would be phased out within 5 years and the remainder eliminated in 10 years. Furthermore, two-thirds of our agricultural exports would immediately receive duty free access, including products like high quality beef, wheat, soybeans and processed food products.

What we have before us today is an opportunity to set a new standard for America's trade policy. An opportunity to change the template we will use for future trade agreements away from the flawed policies of the past and towards fair trade, labor protections for all workers, and responsible environmental practices around the globe.

I want to commend the leadership of the House for their determination to demand high standards and a solid trade agreement unlike any we have seen during the previous 6 years of the Bush administration.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the United States-Peru Trade Promotion Agreement Implementation Act.

I support this agreement because it's a good deal for American businesses. Most Peruvian goods and services already enter the United States duty-free, yet American businesses face significant barriers to Peruvian markets. This agreement creates a two-way street.

This agreement is important economically, but it is equally important from a foreign policy perspective. This agreement means a great deal to the Peruvian people and government, and will be an important tool to blunt the anti-American rhetoric of Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez. Mr. Chavez envisions himself the heir to Fidel Castro, and has tried to turn all of Central and South America against the United States. Fortunately, his recent efforts to influence Peruvian elections were rejected.

Moreover, this agreement sends a clear signal we appreciate the friendship of the Peruvian people and look forward to a long, prosperous relationship with them.

Although I am pleased we are considering this free trade agreement, it is regrettable it will not soon be followed by FTAs for South Korea, Colombia, and Panama. Our annual trade with Peru currently stands at \$5 billion. We do \$11 billion per year in trade with Colombia and \$55 billion per year with South Korea. Failure to enact FTAs with them would represent lost opportunities.

Colombia is our staunchest ally in South America. In Colombian President Uribe, we have a friend willing to stand up not only to Chavez but to the narco-terrorists, corrupt army officers, right-wing paramilitaries, and left-wing guerillas. In short, he's done what we've asked him to do, yet we continue to contrive reasons to keep a free trade agreement for Colombia off the floor. Certain members of this body are all too ready to point out the lack of friends the United States has in the world today. In Colombia, we have one, but the Democratic leadership insists on poking them in the eye.

Global trade is blamed for a great many ills. As my colleague Mr. FLAKE noted earlier in the debate, it is far easier to focus on the shuttered storefront than on the benefits of a given trade agreement. Indeed, it takes courage to overcome the inclination to insulate ourselves, and it may seem counterintuitive to many Americans who pride themselves on self-reliance. But it is the right thing to do.

We live in a global economy. We in Washington should embrace this reality. Businesses of all sizes, not just giant corporations, already do so. In a column last year, author Thomas Friedman told of a small business owner in Nebraska who makes insulated concrete forms for buildings. With the help of machinery imported from South Korea, he now can make the forms at construction sites, which removes the need to ship them to end users. His main customer is in Kuwait.

Madam Speaker, these are the multinationals of the future. Without aggressive trade promotion by our government, these stories will continue to unfold, but American businesses won't be part of the tale.

Remember, the United States accounts for only 4 percent of the world's customers. Information technology, the cornerstone of my district's economy, accounts for more than \$250 billion in exports per year, or 25 percent of U.S. exports. Workers in this industry have suffered as certain jobs have moved overseas, yet it would be a mistake to base our trade

policies on that half of the equation. To reject free trade agreements and embrace protectionist policies is to invite other countries to do the same.

Madam Speaker, to remain strong is to open our doors to trade and competition. We can build walls, but they won't make the problem go away. They'll only hide it, allow it to fester and ultimately weaken all of us.

I urge my colleagues to engage the global economy. Pass free trade agreements—for Peru, Panama, Colombia, South Korea, and rise to the challenge ahead of us.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 3688, the United States-Peru Trade Promotion Agreement Implementation Act, introduced by my distinguished colleague from Maryland, Representative HOYER. This piece of legislation amends the antiquated Trade Agreements Act of 1979, and while it represents an attempt to incorporate workers' rights and environmental concerns into trade legislation, I believe that it does not contain strong enough guarantees against labor violations and other human rights abuses. Madam Speaker, we cannot ignore the gross violations of labor rights allowed to persist by the Peruvian government or the loss of American jobs this legislation might entail.

The nation of Peru has made many strides forward in recent history. It has begun to move down the path of democracy, fighting off state-sponsored socialism, seen some government accountability to the judiciary, and entered into the global economy.

However, Peru has a long way still to come. Peru has yet to adopt and apply the 1998 International Labor Organization's Declaration of Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work, an obligation that serves as a condition for the current legislation. While this is a step in the right direction, it is more advisory than binding, requiring FTA nations to "refer only" to ILO Declarations, and will be incredibly difficult to enforce.

The Free Trade Agreement we are considering today calls on the Peruvian government to apply greater labor rights and environmental standards in order for the agreement to persist. Peru must adopt, maintain, and enforce laws relating to labor rights that meet ILO standards as stated in the ILO 1998 Declaration. This is a step forward, but to make it truly significant, the United States must adopt some sort of accountability mechanism in order to ensure compliance on the part of the Peruvian government. Until such accountability exists, I do not believe we should be approving this agreement.

The Peru FTA agreement further obligates the government of Peru to implement and enforce various environmental multilateral agreements to which Peru is already a part. This too has the potential to lead to a precarious situation. Peru is already a party to the mentioned multilateral environmental agreements and has failed to apply or enforce their obligations outlined therein, why would they change now? We must create incentives for our trade partners to comply with international labor and environmental standards, and I fear there is much more to do in the case of Peru.

The United States-Peru trade agreement as it stands today allows Peruvian products tariff free entry into the United States while products from the United States are taxed upon their entry to Peru. This trade practice has

been deeply detrimental to American workers who are consistently undercut by cheaper, tax-free, foreign labor, services, and products. Under the proposed the Peru FTA, products and services from the United States will no longer be muddled by the protections policies of the past, with 80 percent of goods being allowed tax-free entry into the Peruvian market immediately, with the remaining 20 percent gaining free entry over time. While this may prove beneficial to corporations within the United States, we must be careful that this trade policy does not benefit the wealthy few at the cost of both American and Peruvian workers.

A great deal of Americans worry about the effect this legislation will have on their job security. It is important to note that the Peru FTA does not pose a significant threat to American jobs, with trade from Peru not consisting of a heavy intensity and consequently not having any significant impact on the American economy. I acknowledge that we are engaged in a global economy and am eager to move forward in free trade agreements with nations throughout the world, however, I cannot overlook the threats this legislation poses. Since the era that began with the NAFTA agreement, over 3 million manufacturing jobs have been lost and while the Peruvian economy may not be large enough to have a "significant" impact upon the United States, I fear that the impact it will have will be enough to further harm the American worker who has already suffered a decrease in job security and wages. The American people elected this Congress to change the trajectory that the United States was on, and this legislation is more of the same foreign investment and procurement policy that the majority of American rejected after the inception of NAFTA and CAFTA.

This bill provides security in the sense that it gives United States the authority to administer dispute settlement proceedings, arbitrate certain claims made against the United States, and enact specific tariff modifications. This bill does not hold the Peruvian government accountable, the United States' authority to arbitrate disputes and claims made against the United States will not be sufficient to ensure the protection of the Peruvian and American workers that this legislation will harm. The ability to protect American companies does not equate to meaningful security to the parties involved.

I applaud the efforts made by this legislation in ensuring worker rights within Peru, however, I believe it falls short of being comprehensive in a number of areas. Issues of worker rights abroad have been endemic within the United States since the signing of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) as reports emerge of the horrific conditions of workers within the countries with whom we engage in trade. Urging Peru to "refer" to ILO standards will not ensure that American trade policy is not meant merely to benefit the few multinational corporations and rather protects all our partners in today's globalized economy, including foreign laborers. The Peruvian people have been working hard to restore social justice and labor rights after the ruthless dictatorship of Former President Fujimori. We must be cautious not to undermine any organic social justice movements within Peru that has spent the last 6 years trying to get their Congress to pass the General Labor Law.

Beyond my concerns with this piece of legislation itself is a further concern about the intentions of this Administration. I do not believe we can trust the Bush Administration to enforce the labor and environmental provisions of this or any other FTA. We are not in a position to enter into any new FTA's at this time, I believe we must ensure the security of American economic lives before we rush into any new agreements. Furthermore, only yesterday, Peru's Labor Ministry declared a national mining sector strike as illegal.

This strike, headed by Peru's National Federation of Mining, Metallurgy, and Steel Workers, began Monday and was aimed at 7 pressuring the government to pass legislation ensuring increase rights and benefits of miners. Peru's Labor Ministry responded by "ordering them back to work" and declaring their strike illegal. No concessions have been made by the government and miners face being fired should they not return to work by the end of the week. This is not a government we can trust to uphold labor rights.

The world is now immersed in a globalized economy. We cannot go back in time, nor do we want to. We must work with what we are given now. The U.S.-Peru Trade Promotion Agreement is an important first attempt, however, we must continue to work to ensure that labor rights are universally acknowledged and environmental standards systemically upheld on a larger scale than this legislation entails. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this legislation, and to call for still more to be done.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 801, the bill is considered read and the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. MICHAUD. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 285, nays 132, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 1060]

YEAS—285

Ackerman Biggert  
 Akin Bilbray  
 Alexander Bilirakis  
 Bachmann Bishop (GA)  
 Bachus Bishop (NY)  
 Baird Blackburn  
 Baker Blumenauer  
 Barrett (SC) Blunt  
 Barrow Boehner  
 Bartlett (MD) Bonner  
 Barton (TX) Bono  
 Bean Boozman  
 Becerra Boswell  
 Berman Boustany  
 Berry Boyd (FL)

Capps  
 Cardoza  
 Carter  
 Castle  
 Castor  
 Chabot  
 Clarke  
 Clay  
 Cleaver  
 Clyburn  
 Coble  
 Cole (OK)  
 Conaway  
 Cooper  
 Costa  
 Cramer  
 Crenshaw  
 Crowley  
 Cuellar  
 Culberson  
 Davis (AL)  
 Davis (CA)  
 Davis (KY)  
 Davis, David  
 Davis, Lincoln  
 Davis, Tom  
 Deal (GA)  
 DeGette  
 Dent  
 Diaz-Balart, L.  
 Diaz-Balart, M.  
 Dicks  
 Dingell  
 Doggett  
 Doolittle  
 Drake  
 Dreier  
 Edwards  
 Ehlers  
 Ellsworth  
 Emanuel  
 Emerson  
 Engel  
 English (PA)  
 Eshoo  
 Etheridge  
 Everett  
 Fallon  
 Farr  
 Fattah  
 Feeney  
 Ferguson  
 Flake  
 Forbes  
 Fortenberry  
 Fossella  
 Foxx  
 Frank (MA)  
 Franks (AZ)  
 Frelinghuysen  
 Gallegly  
 Garrett (NJ)  
 Gerlach  
 Gilchrest  
 Gillibrand  
 Gingrey  
 Gohmert  
 Gonzalez  
 Goodlatte  
 Gordon  
 Granger  
 Graves  
 Hall (TX)  
 Harman  
 Hastert  
 Heller  
 Hensarling  
 Hergert  
 Herseth Sandlin  
 Hill  
 Hinojosa

Abercrombie

Aderholt  
 Allen  
 Altmire  
 Andrews  
 Arcuri  
 Baca  
 Baldwin  
 Berkeley  
 Bishop (UT)  
 Boucher  
 Boyda (KS)  
 Brady (PA)  
 Burgess  
 Capuano  
 Carnahan

NAYS—132

Carney  
 Chandler  
 Cohen  
 Conyers  
 Costello  
 Courtney  
 Cummings  
 Davis (IL)  
 DeFazio  
 Delahunt  
 DeLauro  
 Donnelly  
 Doyle  
 Duncan  
 Ellison  
 Filner

Pomeroy  
 Porter  
 Price (GA)  
 Price (NC)  
 Pryce (OH)  
 Putnam  
 Radanovich  
 Ramstad  
 Rangel  
 Regula  
 Rehberg  
 Reichert  
 Renzi  
 Reyes  
 Reynolds  
 Rogers (AL)  
 Rogers (KY)  
 Rogers (MI)  
 Rohrabacher  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Roskam  
 Ross  
 Royce  
 Ruppertsberger  
 Ryan (WI)  
 Salazar  
 Sali  
 Saxton  
 Schiff  
 Schmidt  
 Schwartz  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Sessions  
 Sestak  
 Shadegg  
 Lowey  
 Shays  
 Shimkus  
 Shuster  
 Mack  
 Simpson  
 Sires  
 Skelton  
 Smith (NE)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Smith (WA)  
 Snyder  
 Souder  
 Stearns  
 Sullivan  
 Tancredo  
 Tanner  
 Tauscher  
 Terry  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thornberry  
 Tiahrt  
 Tiberi  
 Towns  
 Turner  
 Udall (CO)  
 Upton  
 Van Hollen  
 Walberg  
 Walden (OR)  
 Walsh (NY)  
 Wamp  
 Wasserman  
 Schultz  
 Watt  
 Waxman  
 Weiner  
 Weldon (FL)  
 Weller  
 Westmoreland  
 Whitfield  
 Wicker  
 Wilson (NM)  
 Wilson (SC)  
 Wolf  
 Young (AK)  
 Young (FL)

Michaud  
 Miller (NC)  
 Miller, George  
 Mollohan  
 Murphy (CT)  
 Murphy, Patrick  
 Murphy, Tim  
 Nadler  
 Napolitano  
 Obey  
 Olver  
 Pallone  
 Pastor  
 Paul  
 Payne  
 Peterson (MN)  
 Rahall  
 Richardson  
 Rodriguez  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Rush  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Sánchez, Linda  
 T.  
 Sanchez, Loretta  
 Sarbanes  
 Schakowsky  
 Scott (GA)  
 Scott (VA)

NOT VOTING—16

Boren  
 Braley (IA)  
 Buyer  
 Carson  
 Cubin  
 Giffords  
 Hunter  
 Jindal  
 LaHood  
 Lantos  
 Lungren, Daniel  
 E.  
 Miller (FL)  
 Moore (WI)  
 Oberstar  
 Poe  
 Rothman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1119

Mr. PALLONE and Mr. CONYERS changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 1060 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Stated against:

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I narrowly missed the vote on rollcall No. 1060. Had my vote been recorded, I would have voted "nay."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 1060 on H.R. 3688, I mistakenly voted my vote as a "yea" when I should have voted "nay." This was on the Peru Trade Agreement. I took the floor last night around 10 o'clock in the evening and spoke strongly against the bill, and then today I thought it was the rule and I voted for it.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3222, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 806 and ask for its immediate consideration.