

□ 1604

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. PINGREE of Maine) at 4 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER  
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken after 6:30 p.m. today.

ANDEAN TRADE PREFERENCE  
EXTENSION ACT OF 2009

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4284) to extend the Generalized System of Preferences and the Andean Trade Preference Act, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4284

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

**SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.**

Section 505 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2465) is amended by striking “December 31, 2009” and inserting “December 31, 2010”.

**SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF ANDEAN TRADE PREFERENCE ACT.**

(a) EXTENSION.—Section 208(a) of the Andean Trade Preference Act (19 U.S.C. 3206(a)) is amended in paragraphs (1) and (2) by striking “December 31, 2009” each place it appears and inserting “December 31, 2010”.

(b) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN APPAREL ARTICLES.—Section 204(b)(3) of the Andean Trade Preference Act (19 U.S.C. 3203(b)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) in clause (iii)—

(i) in subclause (II), by striking “7 succeeding 1-year periods” and inserting “8 succeeding 1-year periods”; and

(ii) in subclause (III)(bb), by striking “and for the succeeding 2-year period” and inserting “and for the succeeding 3-year period”; and

(B) in clause (v)(II), by striking “6 succeeding 1-year periods” and inserting “7 succeeding 1-year periods”; and

(2) in subparagraph (E)(ii)(II), by striking “December 31, 2009” and inserting “December 31, 2010”.

(c) REPORT.—Section 203(f)(1) of the Andean Trade Preference Act (19 U.S.C. 3202(f)(1)) is amended by striking “April 30, 2003” and inserting “June 30, 2010”.

**SEC. 3. CUSTOMS USER FEES.**

Section 13031(j)(3) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(j)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “February 14, 2018” and inserting “May 14, 2018”; and

(2) in subparagraph (B)(i), by striking “February 7, 2018” and inserting “June 7, 2018”.

**SEC. 4. TIME FOR PAYMENT OF CORPORATE ESTIMATED TAXES.**

The percentage under paragraph (1) of section 202(b) of the Corporate Estimated Tax Shift Act of 2009 in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act is increased by 1.5 percentage points.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4284. This bill extends two preference programs—the Generalized System of Preferences, known as GSP, and the Andean Trade Preference Act, known as ATPA—for 1 year. Without this extension, the two programs will expire in less than 3 weeks, on December 31.

Preferences, including GSP and ATPA, are important tools in U.S. trade policy. They are a means by which the U.S. can work with developing nations to help them capture the opportunities and to meet the challenges of trade and globalization.

Over many decades, the GSP and Andean programs have seen these results for developing nations: The GSP currently provides duty-free treatment to over 3,500 types of products coming into the U.S. from more than 130 developing countries. The program provides duty-free access to even more products from the 44 poorest, or least developed, countries. Last year, the GSP program facilitated \$31.7 billion in imports from all beneficiary nations. ATPA provided additional benefits to the Andean nations to help address their special circumstances, in particular, their efforts to fight the trade in narcotics. Under ATPA, imports grew from \$97 million in 1992, which was the first full year after enactment, to more than \$17 billion in 2008, including \$4 billion of nonfuel imports.

The programs have been crafted carefully so that they mirror the complementarities of trade between the developing nations and the United States. The needs of developing nations have been matched to the needs here at home. As a result, both programs have provided significant benefits here in the United States as well:

ATPA has developed an important market for U.S. textiles in the Andean region, and both ATPA and GSP have improved the sourcing options that many U.S. businesses, including many small and medium enterprises, use to remain competitive in the global mar-

ketplace. In recent years, for example, the majority of U.S. imports—75 percent—using GSP were imports used to sustain U.S. manufacturing, including raw materials, parts and components, and machinery and equipment.

At the same time that they have been structured to foster increased trade, the preference programs have been shaped to encourage developing countries to implement the kinds of policies that are necessary for increased trade to achieve the goal of development. Specifically, the preference programs have incorporated key eligibility criteria, including conditions regarding respect of fundamental worker rights, the rule of law, basic rules protecting innovation and investment, and policies to fight corruption.

The preference programs confirm what many of us have been saying for a long time—trade must be shaped so as to spread its benefits widely. That is true whether we talk about unilateral preference programs or bilateral and multilateral trade agreements.

I do not mean to suggest, however, that our work is done when it comes to preference programs. Far from it. We need to ask whether the preference programs are working as well as they should. This requires taking a hard look at all aspects of the programs, including how present eligibility criteria are working. In addition to considering any improvements, we also need to look at whether there is a need to include additional eligibility criteria, including relating to the environment.

This also means taking a careful look at those countries that are in an especially vulnerable situation. One example is Cambodia, which has been hard hit by the global economic recession. As many of my colleagues may recall, Cambodia and the U.S. were partners in a pioneering project called Better Factories Cambodia. That project, which grew out of the U.S.-Cambodia Textile Agreement in the late 1990s, sought to promote labor standards through a trade agreement at a time when many in the world were demonizing such efforts as protectionism. The effort bore fruit, significantly improving the rights of and conditions for workers, which, in turn, can help expand other freedoms.

However, that industry is now under siege as a result of the global recession and of competition, including from China and Vietnam. According to testimony provided in a recent Ways and Means hearing, nearly 1 quarter—80 of 340—of all exporting factories have been shut down, and nearly 80,000 workers—most of them women—have lost their jobs in Cambodia. We need to know whether the preference programs are doing enough to help these enormous challenges.

The extension we are voting on today gives us the time we need to look carefully at these important issues. The Ways and Means Committee and the