Scott	Stenholm	Turner
Serrano	Stokes	Velazquez
Sherman	Strickland	Vento
Sisisky	Stupak	Visclosky
Skaggs	Tanner	Waters
Skelton	Tauscher	Watt (NC)
Slaughter	Taylor (MS)	Waxman
Smith, Adam	Thompson	Wexler
Snyder	Thurman	Weygand
Spratt	Tierney	Wise
Stabenow	Torres	Woolsey
Stark	Towns	Wynn

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—2

Sanchez	Wamp

NOT VOTING—24

Blumenauer	Goodling	Neumann
Borski	Holden	Riley
Clayton	Klug	Ros-Lehtinen
Cubin	Lantos	Sanders
Flake	Manton	Schiff
Frank (MA)	McDermott	Taylor (NC)
Gillmor	McIntosh	Walsh
Gonzalez	Myrick	Yates

□ 1813

Mr. CRAPO changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FAST TRACK

(Mr. PASCRELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I have in my left hand a document which is the bill we will be voting on tomorrow. It is called the reciprocal trade agreement, not unlike the reciprocal trade agreement in the early 1930's. The only problem is that our trade policies have not been reciprocal in particularly the last 3 years.

NAFTA has caused job losses in the hundreds of thousands for the last 34 months. In our area in north Jersey, approximately 15,000 jobs have been lost since NAFTA's inception. And in Mexico and Canada, it is graphic evidence that NAFTA is not working over the long haul. We have tripled, we have quadrupled the imbalance in trade with Mexico, 2½ times the imbalance in trade with Canada. This is not a record of accomplishment but rather of failure. Please vote ''no'' on fast track.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise to discuss a matter of great importance to my district and to the Nation as a whole—the issue of the renewal of fast-track trade negotiating authority.

As the debate moves to a close, and as supporters and detractors of the measure voice their positions, I rise today for the purpose of clarification. And to share the conclusions that I have come to regarding this important issue.

The measure seeks to extend fast-track authority for 4 years. As such, it sets our national trade policy as we approach—and then enter—the 21st century.

No one doubts the fact that we live in a global economy—and that nation's are more interconnected then ever before. No one doubts that if we are to retain our preeminent position in the world—we must lead from strength—both economically and morally.

And for me, global leadership in the arena of international trade means that fair trade should not be subordinated to the notion of free trade.

We must trade with other nations on equal footing—and not sacrifice American jobs to those earning a lower wage—particularly when that nation has not yet achieved our level of social, economic, and environmental development.

The bill that I am holding—the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Authorities Act of 1997—commonly referred to as fast track—states very clearly its objectives and scope.

Section 102(b)7(B) of the bill states that:

> The principle negotiating objectives of the United States is to ensure that foreign governments do not derogate from or waive existing domestic environmental, health, safety, or labor measures . . . as an encouragement to gain competitive advantage in international trade.

The key word in this section is ''existing.'' No country that fast track is designed to facilitate trade with, has adequate existing environmental and labor structures. Nothing in the legislation before us enables the United States to negotiate for higher standards. That is unacceptable and workers, business owners, and consumers in the United States have paid the price for this disparity in standards.

And, just as importantly, the fast-tract authority that past Presidents have had—including President's Bush and Reagan—allowed them to negotiate weak side agreements for labor and the environment; this measure does not even allow that.

Basically, we are throwing up our hands and saying let those with whom we trade improve on their own—and in their own time.

We are saying: Let them pay their workers a bowl of rice a day, let them not give their workers the right to organize, let their factories dump sewage into the rivers, let them pollute the air, let them ship tainted food across our borders to be consumed at dinner tables across the country, and on and on and on.

And make no mistake about it—this debate is not about labor versus business or Republican versus Democrat—this debate is about jobs. Its about the environment and environmental degradation. Its about consumer safety in areas like imported food. Its about the viability of small businesses who struggle to be competitive. And finally its about consumers who today are paying more now than ever before for imported apparel at the clothing store.

The proponents of fast track argue that the administration deserves this ability based on what they perceive as a successful NAFTA policy. They point to the creation of 311,000 new jobs.

I take exception to this figure and cite an alternative one from the Economic Policy Institute which states that 600,000 jobs have been lost during NAFTA's first 34 months.

In northern New Jersey alone, statistics show that approximately 15,000 jobs have been lost since 1993. Many companies in my district specifically point to NAFTA as the proximate cause of their reduction in business. In fact, the small businesses who have contacted me have had to cut jobs—and have not created a single new one since 1993.

Trade policy needs to be inclusive regarding these important elements, not exclusive. Labor and environmental provisions need to be in the core agreement. If we do not lead from the high ground we will relinquish all that we have accomplished in our long progress to achieving the society that we now live in.

The argument that this fast-track legislation represents forward progress rings hollow to my ears and to many of my colleagues. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this flawed measure.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken form the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 170. An act to provide for a process to authorize the use of clone pagers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1079. An act to permit the mineral leasing of Indian land located within the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation in any case in which there is consent from a majority interest in the parcel of land under consideration for lease; to the Committee on Resources.

S. 1455. An act to provide financial assistance for the relocation and expansion of Haffenreffer Museum of Anthropology, Providence, Rhode Island; to the Committee on Resources.

S. 1456. An act to authorize an interpretive center at Fort Peek Dam, Montana; to the Committee on Resources.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2264. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 858. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1998 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, on that, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 170, not voting 30, as follows: