

Wamp	Weldon (PA)	Wolf
Watkins (OK)	Weller	Young (AK)
Watts (OK)	Wicker	
Weldon (FL)	Wilson (NM)	

NAYS—200

Abercrombie	Gutierrez	Neal
Ackerman	Hall (OH)	Norwood
Allen	Harman	Oberstar
Andrews	Hastings (FL)	Obey
Baca	Hill	Olver
Baldacci	Hilliard	Ortiz
Baldwin	Hinchev	Owens
Barcia	Hoeffel	Pallone
Barrett	Holden	Pascrell
Becerra	Holt	Pastor
Berkley	Honda	Payne
Berman	Hooley	Pelosi
Berry	Hoyer	Peterson (MN)
Bishop	Inslee	Phelps
Blagojevich	Israel	Pomeroy
Blumenauer	Jackson (IL)	Price (NC)
Bonior	Jackson-Lee	Rahall
Borski	(TX)	Rangel
Boswell	Jefferson	Reyes
Boucher	Johnson, E. B.	Rivers
Boyd	Jones (NC)	Rodriguez
Brady (PA)	Jones (OH)	Roemer
Brown (FL)	Kanjorski	Ross
Brown (OH)	Kaptur	Rothman
Capps	Kennedy (RI)	Roybal-Allard
Capuano	Kildee	Rush
Cardin	Kilpatrick	Sabo
Carson (IN)	Kind (WI)	Sanchez
Clay	Klecicka	Sanders
Clayton	Kucinich	Sandlin
Clement	LaFalce	Sawyer
Clyburn	Lampson	Schakowsky
Coble	Langevin	Schiff
Condit	Lantos	Scott
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Costello	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Coyne	Lee	Shows
Cramer	Levin	Skeen
Crowley	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
Cummings	Lofgren	Snyder
Davis (CA)	Lowey	Solis
Davis (FL)	Luther	Spratt
Davis (IL)	Lynch	Strickland
DeFazio	Maloney (CT)	Stupak
DeGette	Maloney (NY)	Taylor (MS)
Delahunt	Markey	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	Mascara	Thompson (MS)
Deutsch	Matsui	Thurman
Dingell	McCarthy (MO)	Tierney
Doggett	McCarthy (NY)	Towns
Doyle	McCollum	Turner
Edwards	McDermott	Udall (CO)
Engel	McGovern	Udall (NM)
Eshoo	McIntyre	Velazquez
Etheridge	McKinney	Visclosky
Evans	McNulty	Waters
Farr	Meek (FL)	Watson (CA)
Fattah	Meeks (NY)	Watt (NC)
Filner	Menendez	Waxman
Ford	Millender-	Weiner
Frank	McDonald	Wexler
Frost	Miller, George	Wilson (SC)
Gephardt	Mink	Woolsey
Gonzalez	Mollohan	Wu
Goode	Moore	Wynn
Gordon	Murtha	Young (FL)
Graham	Nadler	
Green (TX)	Napolitano	

NOT VOTING—14

Baird	Hinojosa	Roukema
Blunt	Lewis (CA)	Stark
Combest	Lipinski	Stump
Gillmor	Meehan	Whitfield
Hefley	Ney	

□ 0151

Mr. HILL and Mr. WYNN changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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.

REMOVAL OF CONFEREE AND APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREE ON H.R. 3210, TERRORISM RISK PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Without objection and pursuant to clause 11, rule I, the Chair removes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) as a conferee on H.R. 3210, Terrorism Risk Protection Act, and appoints the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) to fill the vacancy.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will notify the Senate of the change in conferees.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3009, TRADE ACT OF 2002

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 509, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 3009) to extend the Andean Trade Preference Act, to grant additional trade benefits under that Act, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Pursuant to House Resolution 509, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see prior proceedings of the House of today.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS).

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

First of all, I want to thank all the Members of the House and especially those 18 members on this conference committee of six different committees on House side and the five Senators from the Finance Committee for allowing all of us to be placed in a time period which is extremely unusual to resolve a conference committee. It was done in a manner and an attitude that produced a product that I think the institution, the House of Representatives and the Senate, should be pleased, notwithstanding the fact the President has not had the power to negotiate since 1994 when finally the Senate acted and the House was able to go to conference with the Senate. We have relatively quickly resolved the differences between the two Houses.

Notwithstanding the fact that we have fallen behind in terms of bilateral and multilateral trade relationships around the world because the Presidents have not had this power, the House and the Senate in this particular historic agreement have understood in a far more sophisticated way completely the consequences of trade.

Clearly when we engage in trade, it means change. The positive change is, of course, better-paying jobs, and it

provides cheaper goods to consumers. The downside of course is that that change means some jobs are traded for other jobs. And what has not been fully recognized is that we get the benefits of the upside, but a full understanding of trade means we need the protections on the downside because if you can take care of those who, through no fault of their own, have lost their job through trade, you create an atmosphere and a desire to engage in even more trade.

And that is what this conference report reflects. An understanding the President needs the negotiating power but that also included is a structure to make sure that through no fault of those who lose their job, they are taken care of, not just in terms of employment or retraining, but in terms of providing, for example, health insurance, to the extent that it is entirely possible that under these provisions, someone, who was not able to get health insurance when they were employed during the retraining program, would get health insurance. That is how enlightened this particular measure is.

I am extremely pleased to say that four of the five Senators, two of the three Democratic Senators, have agreed with this conference report, and I would like to say that the chairman of the Finance Committee, Senator MAX BAUCUS of Montana, deserves an enormous amount of credit in terms of his willingness to sit very long hours discussing issues that sometimes are very difficult to resolve but nevertheless having the will and the fortitude to come out the other side to produce this document.

And then just let me say that we would not be here tonight if it were not for three very brave, I was going to say colleagues. I will say friends of mine on the other side of the aisle, ironically someone represents a district that is directly next to mine. We share a portion of the San Joaquin Valley, the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY); the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER); and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JEFFERSON).

If they did not have the courage and the conviction to sit down and say it has been too long, let us try to work out a document, because as has been the case most frequently, this House led. It led in a bipartisan way. And we are here tonight largely because of their courage and conviction. And I want to thank them very much.

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

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

I did not know how many other Democrats the distinguished chairman was going to laud here, but I see they all fled the floor.

Mr. Speaker, on this historic occasion at two o'clock in the morning, the chairman would like for everyone to believe that we are embarking on a