

Latham	Ose	Skelton
Lazio	Owens	Slaughter
Leach	Oxley	Smith (MI)
Lee	Packard	Smith (NJ)
Levin	Pallone	Smith (TX)
Lewis (CA)	Pascrell	Smith (WA)
Lewis (GA)	Pastor	Snyder
Lewis (KY)	Payne	Souder
Linder	Pease	Spence
Lipinski	Pelosi	Spratt
LoBiondo	Peterson (MN)	Stabenow
Lofgren	Peterson (PA)	Stark
Lowey	Petri	Stearns
Lucas (KY)	Phelps	Stenholm
Luther	Pickering	Strickland
Maloney (CT)	Pickett	Stump
Maloney (NY)	Pitts	Stupak
Manzullo	Pombo	Sununu
Markey	Pomeroy	Sweeney
Martinez	Porter	Talent
Mascara	Portman	Tancredo
Matsui	Price (NC)	Tanner
McCarthy (MO)	Pryce (OH)	Tauscher
McCarthy (NY)	Quinn	Tauzin
McCollum	Radanovich	Taylor (MS)
McCrery	Rahall	Taylor (NC)
McDermott	Ramstad	Terry
McGovern	Rangel	Thomas
McHugh	Regula	Thompson (CA)
McInnis	Reyes	Thompson (MS)
McIntosh	Reynolds	Thornberry
McIntyre	Riley	Thune
McKeon	Rivers	Thurman
McKinney	Rodriguez	Tiahrt
McNulty	Roemer	Tierney
Meehan	Rogan	Toomey
Meek (FL)	Rogers	Towns
Meeks (NY)	Rohrabacher	Traficant
Menendez	Ros-Lehtinen	Turner
Mica	Rothman	Udall (CO)
Millender-	Roukema	Udall (NM)
McDonald	Roybal-Allard	Upton
Miller (FL)	Rush	Visclosky
Miller, Gary	Ryan (WI)	Vitter
Miller, George	Ryun (KS)	Walden
Minge	Sabo	Walsh
Mink	Salmon	Wamp
Moakley	Sanchez	Waters
Mollohan	Sanders	Watkins
Moore	Sandlin	Watt (NC)
Moran (KS)	Sawyer	Watts (OK)
Moran (VA)	Saxton	Waxman
Morella	Scarborough	Weiner
Murtha	Schakowsky	Weldon (FL)
Myrick	Scott	Weldon (PA)
Nadler	Sessions	Weller
Napolitano	Shadegg	Wexler
Neal	Shaw	Weygand
Nethercutt	Shays	Whitfield
Ney	Sherman	Wicker
Northup	Sherwood	Wilson
Norwood	Shimkus	Wolf
Nussle	Shows	Woolsey
Oberstar	Shuster	Wu
Obey	Simpson	Wynn
Olver	Sisisky	Young (FL)
Ortiz	Skeen	

NAYS—7

Chenoweth-Hage	Royce	Sensenbrenner
Hostettler	Sanford	
Paul	Schaffer	

NOT VOTING—16

Andrews	Gutierrez	Velázquez
Clay	Hall (OH)	Vento
Coburn	LaTourette	Wise
Cook	Lucas (OK)	Young (AK)
Engel	Metcalf	
Fossella	Serrano	

□ 1229

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. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 143 I was absent due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 673 and H.R. 1106.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska).

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 434, TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2000

Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-607) on the resolution (H. Res. 489) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 434) to authorize a new trade and investment policy for sub-Saharan Africa, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO SAME DAY CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 488 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 488

Resolved, That the requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported on the legislative day of May 4, 2000, providing for consideration or disposition of a conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 434) to authorize a new trade and investment policy for sub-Saharan Africa, or any amendment reported in disagreement from a conference thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. All time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, this rule waives the provisions of clause 6(a) of rule 13, requiring a two-thirds vote to consider a rule on the same day it is reported from the Committee on Rules, against resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules.

Additionally, the rule applies the waiver of a special rule reported on or

before May 4, 2000, providing for consideration or disposition of a conference report to accompany the bill, H.R. 434, to authorize a new trade and investment policy for sub-Saharan Africa, or any amendment reported in disagreement from a conference thereon.

Mr. Speaker, this is a straightforward rule to allow the House to move forward with consideration of the conference report on H.R. 434.

This measure contains no surprises and was crafted with full consultation with the minority and the appropriate chairman and ranking members of the committees involved. This procedure actually provided the committees more of an opportunity to complete important provisions in the underlying legislation by allowing them to finish their work this morning.

Mr. Speaker, both sides of the aisle would like to complete this legislation today, and we have worked closely with all parties involved to do just that.

By passing this rule today, we will allow the House to complete this very important legislation. I hope we can move expeditiously to pass this rule.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS), my dear friend, for yielding me the customary half hour.

Mr. Speaker, the way the Africa/Caribbean trade bill is being brought to the floor has been far from perfect, and this martial law rule only makes it worse.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, was put together so quickly my colleagues would think it was relatively unimportant. But the bill for which this rule provides martial law is a very important piece of legislation. That bill will affect 54 countries in Africa, 24 countries in the Caribbean, not to mention hundreds of thousands of American workers. It should be examined very closely, Mr. Speaker, before it is considered for a vote.

But it will not be examined, Mr. Speaker. It is barely off the printer.

Some of my Republican colleagues all but admitted that they are worried that once people see how badly this bill is put together, they will run the other way.

Meanwhile, the rule will enable my Republican colleagues to bring up immediately a bill that is so hastily written, if it is exposed to the light of day for too long, it will shrivel up and die.

Mr. Speaker, no one has had time to read this bill, including the conferees. So I am basing my assumption on rumors which are all I have to go by.

As I understand it, this bill will hurt American workers, it will hurt African workers, as well as the African environment. And like so many Republican

bills that have come before, it benefits the very rich, the very powerful to the exclusion of just about everyone else.

The last Caribbean-Basin-NAFTA bill lost by a two-thirds margin. The Africa bill is being called a conference report, but it did not come from a conference.

Nonetheless, today, in the wee hours of the morning, these two bills were lumped together and, with this rule, will soon be rammed down the Congress' throat.

Even the AIDS prevention provisions of the House-passed bill were dropped out of this bill.

So I urge my colleagues to oppose this martial law rule.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), I would point out that, first of all, I believe that the conference report was made available on the Web at 10 o'clock on sunshine this morning.

Number two, he and I both know that there are many times that this rule would be completed after the negotiations were done by the conference committees at some 4:30 in the morning, a little longer drive for me coming in from Arlington as my colleague coming from the city.

But the fact is that, in an orderly fashion, our colleagues on the Committee on Rules came together, as being summoned by the chairman, at 10 o'clock to say they are actively in negotiations, Republicans and Democrats, both houses, to bring about a solution that will come back to the Committee on Rules and that we could convene at 10:30 in the morning upon the agreement being brought to the light of day and ample time for us to review it. And certainly my staff has brought it to me. The Committee on Rules staff brought it to us as Rules members.

We also, in completing the rule to expedite this piece of legislation today, we have taken an opportunity to give our colleagues the ability to get our work done by late today and have Friday to go back to our districts if we so desire.

And so, this is in the light of day. We have had it. It is in sunshine. And we also got a nice sleep on the Committee on Rules, which is an unusual feat here.

As the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman, sits to my right, I know that he will address again the procedure which we were under as we postponed the consideration while the negotiations went through until about 4:30 this morning.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) the ranking

member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, before voting today on the two rules for this so-called conference agreement, I urge my colleagues to think carefully about the way this legislation has been brought to the floor.

It is a stretch to call this a conference report. Conferees were not even appointed until yesterday, and their only job was to bless an agreement that had already been worked out behind closed doors and dropped on our doorstep this morning. Little information has been released to Members and staff. The only source of information available to most of us has been leaks in the press.

Now, after that process, it takes two rules, not one, two rules to bring this conference report to the floor. Why? Because, under normal House rules, a two-thirds vote is necessary to consider a rule on the same day that the Committee on Rules reports it.

To get around this sensible, long-standing, vitally important rule of the House, the Committee on Rules met late last night again and passed a rule to waive its own rules. That is the first vote. This chicanery clears the way for a second rule that allows consideration of the so-called conference report.

Now, regardless of where my colleagues stand on this bill, and it has merits and demerits and pluses and minuses, regardless of where they stand, I do not think anybody, for the sake of this institution, should vote to condone this abusive process regardless of where they stand on the bill.

A significant part of this bill is CBI-NAFTA Parity, or CBI Parity for short. That means duty-free, quota-free access to the U.S. market for apparel and textiles assembled in 25 countries in Central America and the Caribbean. They are already the second largest exporter of textiles to this country, taken as a group.

The last time CBI Parity was on the floor was in 1997. It came to the floor under suspension of the rules. We argued then that it deserved a full, fair, and open debate. And we prevailed. It went down 182-234. And, for the same reason, it ought to go down today. The easiest way to defeat it is to vote against this rule and make it come up at a later time when we have had a better chance to look at it.

This CBI Parity was bobtailed onto this conference report even though there has been no conference on it. As such, there has been no vote on it in committee not recently, certainly not on the floor, no full and open debate. And we will not have a full and open debate today because it is a conference report, we cannot amend it.

The more I learn about this agreement, the more I think there are some

pluses and things in it I can be able to support. But why we are we being able to vote on major trade legislation without any language to examine, without even 24 hours to see and expect a conference report? I cannot believe this is a way we treat any legislation let alone major trade legislation that is bound to speed up job losses in the textile and apparel sector where the job losses are severe already.

These industries are suffering under a flood tide of imports, \$65 billion in textile and apparel imports last year, yet they still employ hundreds of thousands of Americans.

I think we owe these folks at least a fair hearing. I think we owe these employees, these workers, a full examination of this bill that is going to have far-reaching effects on their livelihood.

Let me just say that there are three things we ought to ask when we look at this bill.

First of all, will it work? Will it do what it purports to do? Secondly, whom will it help? And thirdly, whom will it hurt?

I would urge my colleagues to consider the consequences. The complicated provisions of this bill, such as I have been able to read, in my opinion, will not be possible to enforce.

As it is, Customs is hard pressed to track whole goods in the apparel sector. This agreement will require that Customs track knit apparel formed in the Caribbean of U.S. yarn subject to a cap on the total level of square meter equivalent imports.

For Africa the agreement would require verification of the amount of regional and nonregional fabric used in the production of apparel in qualifying African countries.

How do we tell the difference?

Does anybody believe that these rules are going to be enforceable? I do not. And I have worked on textile apparel trade issues for the 18 years that I have been in Congress.

As subcommittee chairman, I have held hearings, I have visited the major ports of entry, I have talked to the Customs inspectors, I have drafted legislation dealing with labeling and transshipping. And I can tell my colleagues, the complex and arcane rules in this bill cannot be enforced.

The second question, who is it going to hurt? I will tell my colleagues who it is going to hurt. It is going to hurt about a million textile and apparel workers. They are already, as I said, suffering on an onslaught of \$65 billion of imports last year. They are going to be hit even harder by imports coming in duty-free and quota-free from Africa and the Caribbean.

But these imports will not be made in Africa. They will be made in Asia, I am convinced, and shipped through Africa. They will be relabeled maybe in Africa, but they will be made in Asia.

So who gets hurt? Sixty percent of U.S. apparel workers are women. Thirty-five to 40 percent are minorities,

mostly African American. That is who it will hurt.

And finally, who will it help? It is not going to help anybody. It is not going to help the Africans because of transshipment.

Read the bill, to the extent that my colleague can. Consider the process. And vote against this rule.

□ 1245

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, we have had an opportunity to hear from a few speakers on the debate that do not favor this legislation. I would now like to introduce and yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, so he might comment on both the merits of the legislation but more importantly the merits of this rule as it comes before the House today.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS), for yielding me this time and for ably taking on what obviously is a challenging situation.

This was not our first choice to be here under what is considered an expedited procedures rule, but we are here because negotiations were not going on into the night; it was staff paperwork that was really being completed well into the night. And while the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) prides himself on working the Committee on Rules at 1:00, 2:00, 3:00 in the morning, the fact of the matter is that some of the rest of us like to sleep at that hour, but the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), we let him have that chance to sleep last night and obviously it ruffled his feathers so he came down to oppose this expedited procedures rule.

We are doing the right thing. As my friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), knows very well, we have spent years working on this legislation. My very good friend from California (Mr. ROYCE), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa, and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Trade of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE), have worked long and hard on this.

This is a very important piece of legislation. We have 700 million people in sub-Saharan Africa who are going to be impacted by this. We have a chance to improve the quality of life for the American people, and I believe that we have done the right thing in proceeding with this rule.

The reason is that last night at 10:30 when we found that we were going to be doing this and we were assured that we could first thing in the morning make available on the World Wide Web a copy of the conference report, we did just that. If we had met at 5:00 this morning, the difference would have been just a few hours, and while the

gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) would have, of course, after his morning run been at his desk at 6:00 to carefully scrutinize the conference report, most of the rest of our colleagues would most likely have waited until 10:00, which is exactly when it was filed.

So this is really a question of whether or not we are going to proceed with important legislation that my friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) and many of the rest of us have strongly supported for years and years and years, or are we going to try and block it because, guess what, Mr. Speaker, this is the one chance that we had to do it. This is our opportunity to do this. Why? Because we have lots of important legislation that we need to consider in the coming weeks. We have scheduled it for this week; and unfortunately, it took a little more staff time than we would have liked overnight to get the work completed.

We have this procedure so that we can move ahead in an expeditious manner on very important legislation. So I encourage my colleagues to support both rules that we have and then to vote in favor of the conference report so that we can finally lay the groundwork for a win/win/win issue, which is going to improve the quality of life for the American people and our friends in Africa, and I believe make great strides in blazing the trail for an even more important trade vote that we are going to be having the week of May 22.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, who is the author of the underlying bill.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) for giving me this time to speak.

Mr. Speaker, certainly on most occasions if we had an expedited rule I would be on the side of having as much time for the Members to review not only the rule but the underlying legislation as possible, but when there is a situation where it is either an expedited rule or no rule at all, clearly we have to take a closer look at the legislation that we are about to consider and ask why should it be expedited, if at all?

First of all, when we talk about the Caribbean Basin parity bill, the word "parity" means that we already had an agreement with these countries in the Caribbean. We already reached out to our neighbors in the area and said that we are living now in a decade where we do not want to talk about just aid. We want to talk about commerce. We want to talk about trade. We want to talk about support for democracies.

So when we went into an agreement with the North American Free Trade Agreement, what happened was that they got an edge on these little countries in the Caribbean and the President and the Congress said, hey, we promised to give them parity. So we are not talking about something new. We are talking about something we have been waiting for for years and that is to bring some equity in our relationship and our trade agreements with these countries in the Caribbean so that they would not be adversely affected by NAFTA.

Then, of course, when one talks about the historic legislation that we have where for the first time we are opening up our commercial doors to 48 countries in sub-Saharan Africa, this is the first time that we are really treating countries in this continent the way we treated the rest of the world. For those people who just want to scream that we are talking about Chinese goods and Asian goods and transshipment through the Caribbean, that is so unfair to say and so untrue. There are no tighter rules that could be written than those that are in the bill to stop transshipment. In addition to that, it is almost insulting to the countries that are involved that are so in need of jobs, to believe that they would give those jobs to Asia and not to the people in their country.

I am suggesting as well, and as has been said by the chairman of the Committee on Rules, we know that the mother of all trade bills will be coming to the floor, and that is normal trade relations with China. It would be sad, it would be painful, it would be disgraceful for these smaller countries, these developing countries, to get caught up into that type of debate.

I am asking not to like the rule but to vote for these rules because it is necessary that not only we expedite the rule but we expedite the passage of this legislation so that it does not get caught up with the debate that is going to come on whether or not we should give normal trade relations to China.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong support of the rules for H.R. 434, the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act.

Last summer, the House understood the importance of doing what we can to encourage greater trade between the United States and Africa. We acted by passing this historic bill. We now have a chance to send this bill to the President's desk for a signature and open a long overdue era of new relations between the United States and Africa, one that recognizes the strong economic potential of a continent of some hundreds of millions of people.

I wanted to address for just a moment the issue of transshipments. Textile and apparel imports from sub-Saharan Africa do not present increased transshipment concerns. In fact, Customs estimates its current enforcement rate as one of the highest.

I should just share that the U.S. Trade Representative tells us there are no cases, to her knowledge. The Customs publishes a list of foreign factories involved in transshipment. Its current transshipper list does not include any African countries. The reason for this substantial compliance rate on the part of the African continent for textile and apparel imports from sub-Saharan Africa is because Africa has a small number of factories which makes it easy for the U.S. Customs to monitor transshipment, and African countries are starting from a low production base; and U.S. Customs would be able to immediately detect any sudden increases in production and determine whether transshipment is occurring.

Now, this bill provides \$5.9 million for additional resources for Customs enforcement efforts that have proven the most effective, which is stationing Customs personnel in sub-Saharan countries, use of jump teams, informants, collection of production information, monitoring and analyzing import trends; and in addition the legislation also requires beneficiary countries to cooperate with U.S. Customs in enforcement against transshipment and to enact laws to prevent circumvention.

Now, what would happen if a country did not cooperate? The answer to that is very clear. They lose the benefits under the bill, so they have a very real incentive to cooperate.

What this bill does is to build a partnership between America and those African nations which are committed to reforming their economies in a way that allows for America to sell more goods and services.

In short, this legislation treats trade as a two-way street. Already the United States exports some \$6 billion worth of goods and services to Africa each year.

Now, in my opinion this is not as powerful a bill as was passed by the House last July. The U.S. Trade Representative, she argues otherwise. Rosa Whitaker feels that in some way the bill is strengthened and is as good as the bill passed.

In conference, the Senate demanded additional restrictions on trade with Africa, and in my view this is unfortunate. We would have liked trade with Africa to be regulated more by markets and less by bureaucrats, especially when we are dealing with the world's poorest continent; but this conference report clearly is an important step in the right direction toward greater trade between the United States and Africa.

Many Members of Congress have worked on this legislation to develop a new trade relationship with Africa for several years. It is the result of years of hearings in the Committee on International Relations and in the Committee on Ways and Means. We have debated this bill on the floor twice. We have passed this bill twice. This bill is a solid and well-reasoned, bipartisan effort. We have done this work in our relations with Africa with, frankly, a sense of urgency, urgency because Africa could be on the brink of permanent economic marginalization. Unless we help bring Africa into the world economy and do it now, Africa will never develop; and Americans are fooling themselves if we think we could ignore an undeveloped Africa in which war and disease become commonplace.

Let us do something to help Africa help itself, and let us do something to help America. This bill is a win/win.

Let me say the Caribbean Basin Initiative Enhancement offers similar benefits to American businesses while promoting economic development and political stability in the Caribbean region. These countries are close neighbors to America, and we have a stake in their well-being. This Congress has the opportunity to make a firm step towards greater engagement with these regions, and I look forward to bringing this conference report to the floor. I appreciate the efforts of the Committee on Rules and look forward to passage of this important legislation.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY).

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this particular procedural method to try and rush this matter to the floor, and I take a bit of issue with the chairman of the Committee on Rules who stated that there was a need to bring this matter to the floor today because otherwise we would not be able to get to it with our absolutely busy schedule here in the House. For those of us that have languished these last few days as we were waiting around for any of the business of the House to come forward, we know that that is a little bit of an overstatement. In fact, it is a gross overstatement. The majority has set so much time for Members to be back in their districts. We might as well try to move the Capitol elsewhere to catch up with where the Members are in accordance with the schedule.

The fact of the matter is that what they are asking the Members to do here is to set aside their right under the rules to have time to scrutinize the bill so we can deliberate it. It might have gone up on the Internet at 10:00 this morning; but if all people needed was two hours before we debated a bill and deliberated it, then that is what

our rules would call for. But our rules call for these matters to sit for a day so people can have time to look through these bills.

Regardless of what the Members on both sides of the aisle have said, some agree and some disagree with what they think may be in this bill. That is exactly the point. People need time to scrutinize the bill to see what might have been slipped in from time to time.

We understand that there was language on AIDS medical relief in here that may have been taken out, put back in with some changes, taken out again. People need to know this and debate this important issue through its final resolution.

We need to talk about whether or not the child labor language stays in the bill or is taken out and what the content of it is if, in fact, it is in.

We need to know so much more. When we are talking essentially of increasing NAFTA to 65 more countries, we need to know what about labor protections, what about the environment; and in fact, there are any number of labor groups and environmental groups who wish that there were issues to be brought up and debated, and people should have the time to look at this bill and be able to do just that.

The last speaker mentioned the fact of how favorable this bill was and the fact that we had debated this bill previous times and voted upon it and passed it twice.

□ 1300

That is only part of the bill. In the course of last evening, also put into this bill was the Caribbean Basin Initiative, and that, in fact, was never passed by this House; that was defeated by this House by almost a 2/3 margin, because it was, in fact, an extension of NAFTA without any protections for labor and environmental concerns, in fact, without any language even in side agreements that would do that.

Mr. Speaker, I just suggest that these rules that we have here in the House to allow people 24 hours to look at these matters are there for a reason, and that there was no countervailing reason why we should set aside that rule and set aside the opportunity of Members to have the deliberative time, the time to scrutinize these provisions, so that we can all be certain that when it finally does come for debate, each and every important matter and aspect is talked about, is reviewed and has the sunlight of daytime shining on it, so when people finally come to a vote, we can talk about all the issues that are important: The number of jobs that may be lost, the number of special favors being done for some people who are going to be very wealthy off of this bill, and all of those points are important, important enough for us not to rush this through prematurely or unnecessarily.

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

Mr. Speaker, as I listened to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY) talk about being back in our district on Friday, one of my great heros of this great House is the former speaker of Massachusetts, I am reminded every day that all politics is local. I am looking forward to being back in my community on Friday because we have the opportunity to debate this today.

I think it is important, as I share with my father, that when we debate this, it is not a Republican or a Democrat or a majority or a minority issue; this is you are either a free trader and opening up those countries, as my colleague from New York (Mr. RANGEL) pointed out, or you are a protectionist, and that is fine, and that debate should be in this hall and it will be.

And I just want to remind my colleagues how much time today we are going to have to debate this issue. We are going to debate it for an hour now on the rules to suspend and waive the rules, so we can have immediate consideration. Right after this legislation passes or is defeated, we will have a debate on the rule itself, and that will be another hour. And then we will have an hour debate on the conference report as the merits of the legislation by those who negotiated it through the wee hours of this morning had the opportunity to bring to the floor for all of our colleagues to participate in that debate, a rather lengthy debate on the issue.

And when we conclude today, we have actually had more debate on this issue, no matter where you come down on the issue, than we would have on any other normal circumstances, and we have done it in the light of day. And the chairman of the Committee on Rules has given us a night's sleep, which is an unusual occurrence if you are a Member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. 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 301, nays 114, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 144]
YEAS—301

Abercrombie	Fowler	Metcalf
Ackerman	Franks (NJ)	Mica
Aderholt	Frelinghuysen	Miller (FL)
Archer	Galleghy	Miller, Gary
Armey	Ganske	Minge
Bachus	Gekas	Mollohan
Baird	Gibbons	Moore
Baker	Gilchrest	Moran (KS)
Ballenger	Gillmor	Moran (VA)
Barr	Gilman	Morella
Barrett (NE)	Goodlatte	Murtha
Bartlett	Goss	Myrick
Barton	Graham	Nethercutt
Bass	Granger	Ney
Bateman	Green (WI)	Northrup
Becerra	Greenwood	Nussle
Bentsen	Hall (TX)	Ortiz
Bereuter	Hansen	Ose
Berkley	Hastings (WA)	Owens
Berman	Hayworth	Oxley
Berry	Hefley	Packard
Biggert	Herger	Pascrell
Bilbray	Hill (MT)	Pastor
Bilirakis	Hilleary	Paul
Bishop	Hilliard	Payne
Blagojevich	Hinojosa	Pease
Bliley	Hobson	Peterson (PA)
Blunt	Hoefel	Petri
Boehlert	Hoekstra	Pickering
Boehner	Holt	Pitts
Bonilla	Horn	Pombo
Bono	Hostettler	Pomeroy
Borski	Houghton	Porter
Brady (PA)	Hoyer	Portman
Brady (TX)	Hulshof	Pryce (OH)
Brown (FL)	Hutchinson	Quinn
Brown (OH)	Hyde	Radanovich
Bryant	Insee	Ramstad
Burr	Isakson	Rangel
Burton	Istook	Regula
Buyer	Jackson-Lee	Reynolds
Callahan	(TX)	Riley
Calvert	Jefferson	Rivers
Camp	Jenkins	Roemer
Campbell	Johnson (CT)	Rogan
Canady	Johnson, E. B.	Rogers
Cannon	Johnson, Sam	Rohrabacher
Capps	Jones (NC)	Ros-Lehtinen
Cardin	Jones (OH)	Rothman
Carson	Kasich	Roukema
Castle	Kelly	Royce
Chabot	Kilpatrick	Ryan (WI)
Chambliss	Kind (WI)	Ryun (KS)
Chenoweth-Hage	King (NY)	Salmon
Clayton	Kingston	Sanford
Clement	Knollenberg	Sawyer
Coble	Kolbe	Saxton
Collins	Kuykendall	Scarborough
Combust	LaFalce	Schaffer
Cooksey	LaHood	Scott
Cox	Lampson	Sensenbrenner
Crane	Largent	Sessions
Crowley	Larson	Shadegg
Cubin	Latham	Shaw
Cummings	LaTourette	Shays
Cunningham	Lazio	Sherman
Davis (FL)	Leach	Sherwood
Davis (IL)	Levin	Shimkus
Davis (VA)	Lewis (CA)	Shuster
Deal	Lewis (KY)	Simpson
DeGette	Linder	Sisisky
DeMint	Lipinski	Skeen
Diaz-Balart	LoBiondo	Slaughter
Dickey	Lofgren	Smith (NJ)
Dicks	Lowey	Smith (TX)
Dixon	Luther	Smith (WA)
Dooley	Maloney (CT)	Snyder
Doolittle	Manzullo	Souder
Dreier	Martinez	Stabenow
Duncan	Matsui	Stearns
Dunn	McCarthy (MO)	Stenholm
Ehlers	McCarthy (NY)	Stump
Ehrlich	McCollum	Sununu
Emerson	McCrery	Sweeney
English	McHugh	Talent
Everett	McInnis	Tancred
Ewing	McIntosh	Tanner
Farr	McKeon	Tauscher
Fattah	McNulty	Tauzin
Fletcher	Meehan	Taylor (NC)
Foley	Meek (FL)	Terry
Ford	Meeks (NY)	Thompson (MS)
Fossella	Menendez	Thornberry

Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Toomey
Traffican
Turner
Upton
Vitter

Walden
Walsh
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller

Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Wu
Young (FL)

NAYS—114

Allen
Andrews
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Blumenauer
Bonior
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Capuano
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
DeFazio
DeLaHunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Filner
Forbes
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Goode

Gordon
Green (TX)
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hill (IN)
John
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
Lantos
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lucas (KY)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Mascara
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
Miller, George
Mink
Moakley
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Norwood
Oberstar

Obey
Oliver
Pallone
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pickett
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reyes
Rodriguez
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Schakowsky
Shows
Skelton
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Visclosky
Wamp
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weygand
Woolsey
Wynn

NOT VOTING—19

Baca
Clay
Coburn
Cook
DeLay
Engel
Goodling

Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Lucas (OK)
Millender-
McDonald
Serrano
Smith (MI)

Spence
Thomas
Velazquez
Vento
Wise
Young (AK)

□ 1325

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. RUSH changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. FORD changed their 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.

Stated against:

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I was not able to be here, but had I been here I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 144.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 434, TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2000

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 489 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 489

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the