

concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 67) authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 67

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),*

**SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF USE OF THE CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR DC SPECIAL OLYMPICS LAW ENFORCEMENT TORCH RUN.**

On September 30, 2011, or on such other date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate may jointly designate, the 26th Annual District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run (in this resolution referred to as the "event") may be run through the Capitol Grounds as part of the journey of the Special Olympics torch to the District of Columbia Special Olympics summer games.

**SEC. 2. RESPONSIBILITY OF CAPITOL POLICE BOARD.**

The Capitol Police Board shall take such actions as may be necessary to carry out the event.

**SEC. 3. CONDITIONS RELATING TO PHYSICAL PREPARATIONS.**

The Architect of the Capitol may prescribe conditions for physical preparations for the event.

**SEC. 4. ENFORCEMENT OF RESTRICTIONS.**

The Capitol Police Board shall provide for enforcement of the restrictions contained in section 5104(c) of title 40, United States Code, concerning sales, advertisements, displays, and solicitations on the Capitol Grounds, as well as other restrictions applicable to the Capitol Grounds, in connection with the event.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 67.

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

There was no objection.

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

House Concurrent Resolution 67 would authorize the use of the Capitol Grounds for the District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run that will be held on September 30 of this year.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Economic Development, Emergency Management, and Public Buildings for introducing this resolution. I am pleased to be a cosponsor.

As in years past, the torch run will be launched from the west terrace of the U.S. Capitol and continue through the Capitol Grounds as part of the journey to the 26th Annual D.C. Special Olympics summer games. The Special Olympics is an international organization dedicated to enriching the lives of children and adults with disabilities through athletics and competition.

The Law Enforcement Torch Run began in 1981 when the police chief of Wichita, Kansas, saw an urgent need to raise funds for and increase awareness of the Special Olympics. The torch run was then quickly adopted by the International Association of Chiefs of Police.

Today the torch run is the largest grassroots effort that raises funds and awareness for the Special Olympics program. The event in D.C. is one of the many law enforcement torch runs throughout the country and across 35 nations. This year about 50 different local and Federal law enforcement agencies are participating in the day's events, and more than 1,500 law enforcement officials will be honoring the Special Olympics athletes by completing the 2-mile run.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, 2011 marks the 26th Annual Law Enforcement Torch Run to benefit the District of Columbia Special Olympics. The torch relay event is a traditional part of the opening ceremonies for the Special Olympics, which take place at Catholic University in the Nation's Capital in 2011. This event has become a popular event on Capitol Hill and is an integral part of the District of Columbia Special Olympics. Torch run participants will assemble at the U.S. Capitol Building on the west terrace steps for opening ceremonies and then proceed to run or walk a 2-mile course to Ft. McNair, also in the Nation's Capital.

Each year, approximately 2,500 Special Olympians compete in over a dozen events and more than a million children and adults with special needs participate in Special Olympics worldwide. The goal of the games is to help bring mentally challenged individuals into the larger society under conditions where they will be accepted and respected. Confidence and self-esteem are the building blocks for the Special Olympic games. The Special Olympics District of Columbia has been operating for 42 years, providing services to a wide swath of D.C. residents, and I am pleased to support such a worthy organization and event.

I also urge the House to support House Concurrent Resolution 67.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr.

DENHAM) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 67.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1745

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS) at 5 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

EXTENDING THE GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2832) to extend the Generalized System of Preferences, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2832

*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.**

(a) EXTENSION.—Section 505 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2465) is amended by striking "December 31, 2010" and inserting "July 31, 2013".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to articles entered on or after the 15th day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) RETROACTIVE APPLICATION FOR CERTAIN LIQUIDATIONS AND RELIQUIDATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1514) or any other provision of law and subject to subparagraph (B), any entry of an article to which duty-free treatment or other preferential treatment under title V of the Trade Act of 1974 would have applied if the entry had been made on December 31, 2010, that was made—

(i) after December 31, 2010, and

(ii) before the 15th day after the date of the enactment of this Act, shall be liquidated or reliquidated as though such entry occurred on the 15th day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(B) REQUESTS.—A liquidation or reliquidation may be made under subparagraph (A) with respect to an entry only if a request therefor is filed with U.S. Customs and Border Protection not later than 180 days after

the date of the enactment of this Act that contains sufficient information to enable U.S. Customs and Border Protection—

- (i) to locate the entry; or
- (ii) to reconstruct the entry if it cannot be located.

(C) PAYMENT OF AMOUNTS OWED.—Any amounts owed by the United States pursuant to the liquidation or reliquidation of an entry of an article under subparagraph (A) shall be paid, without interest, not later than 90 days after the date of the liquidation or reliquidation (as the case may be).

(3) DEFINITION.—As used in this subsection, the terms “enter” and “entry” include a withdrawal from warehouse for consumption.

#### SEC. 2. MERCHANDISE PROCESSING FEES.

For the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 30, 2014, section 13031(a)(9) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(a)(9)) shall be applied and administered—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by substituting “0.3464” for “0.21”; and

(2) in subparagraph (B)(i), by substituting “0.3464” for “0.21”.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2832.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bipartisan legislation, which renews the nearly 40-year-old Generalized System of Preferences, is a vital part of a robust trade agenda, an agenda that makes American companies more competitive and increases American exports. GSP is an important tool for boosting economic growth and job creation.

Just last week, we learned that on the whole there were zero jobs created in August and that the unemployment rate remains above 9 percent. Over the next several weeks, congressional Republicans will bring several bills to the floor that will address the shortage of American jobs and help promote job creation.

This legislation is an important component of that effort because GSP is critical to the competitiveness of many American manufacturers. Having more competitive American companies means creating and supporting more American jobs. The lapse of this program since the beginning of the year has unnecessarily imposed higher costs on American manufacturers and consumers at a time when we can least afford it.

The GSP program is the largest U.S. trade preference program and provides duty-free treatment to nonsensitive imports from over 130 developing countries. Many U.S. companies source raw

materials and other inputs from GSP countries, and the duty-free treatment of these imports reduces the production costs of these U.S. manufacturers, making them more competitive. Nearly three-quarters of all GSP-eligible imports are raw materials, components, parts, or machinery and equipment used by American workers to manufacture goods in the United States for both consumption here and for export.

According to an analysis by the Coalition for GSP, approximately 82,000 jobs are either directly or indirectly associated with the importation and use of GSP-eligible imports. The clear connection with jobs reinforces how important it is the program is renewed.

Many of the jobs supported by GSP imports are in Michigan, where the unemployment rate remains almost 2 percentage points above the national average. Unfortunately, the lapse in the GSP program has forced employers in Michigan to pay over \$9 million in unnecessary duties. Instead of paying unnecessary duties, these employers could have been paying \$9 million more in needed salaries.

The legislation renews the program until July 30, 2013, and permits importers to apply for duty refunds for eligible products imported since the program's expiration on December 31 of 2010. This retroactive renewal will provide a timely infusion of capital to U.S. manufacturers that have faced higher duties and, therefore, higher production costs since the program expired. It will allow them to compete with manufacturers abroad who already have duty-free access to such inputs.

I also note that this legislation will not add to the deficit as the costs are fully offset.

I would like to thank my colleague, Ranking Member LEVIN, for working with me to find a path forward for this legislation. Given how important this legislation is, I hope that our colleagues in the other body will act quickly.

Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize how important this job-creating legislation is for American manufacturers and their employees by creating and supporting American jobs. It's a valuable part of an aggressive, pro-growth trade agenda. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in support of H.R. 2832. Unfortunately, today we are acting to rectify only one wrong in the Republican agenda of disregard for workers and economic recovery. The Generalized System of Preferences, GSP, that we extend today for 22 months should never have been permitted to lapse at the beginning of the year.

The Andean Trade Preferences program should also not stand expired. And, importantly, it is inexcusable that the Trade Adjustment Assistance

that we improved on a bipartisan basis in 2009 has stood expired since February. The only reason we are considering this legislation today is because House Republicans have been unwilling to support a simple extension of the expanded TAA Program.

□ 1750

They have been unwilling to support a program targeted at helping unemployed Americans get back to work, this at a time when more Americans have remained jobless for a longer period than ever recorded in our Nation's history.

In FY 2010 alone, more than 227,000 workers took advantage of TAA, receiving assistance such as case management, training, and income support. And there is broad support for the program. I quote just one such evidence, a letter circulated by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Business Roundtable in May 2011, which states: “TAA is as vitally important today as it has been over the years. It helps American businesses get into exporting and is designed to give displaced workers the new skills and resources they need to reenter the 21st century job market. Accordingly, we urge Congress and the administration to find a way forward to ensure that the United States has in place an effective TAA program to support U.S. global economic engagement.”

I support the GSP program and the legislation before us today. That program is an important tool in U.S. trade policy. It is a means by which the U.S. can help developing countries to capture the opportunities and meet the challenges of trade and globalization. One hundred and twenty-nine developing countries participate in GSP and depend on it to spur economic growth. This includes some of the poorest countries in the world. Moreover, GSP benefits Americans. I emphasize that. In fact, the majority of U.S. imports under GSP, approximately 65 to 75 percent, are inputs used to support U.S. manufacturing, including raw materials, parts and components, and machinery and equipment.

This program is important enough that it should not have been allowed to lapse, and can now be considered on its own merits. It appears that the prospect is that the Senate will act on GSP by adding TAA. If that is the path for the renewal of TAA, the Republicans have an obligation to ensure that it happens immediately as a primary action.

The Republicans often talk about a languishing trade agenda. What has been languishing is action on trade items ready for action—GSP, TAA, ATPA—languishing at the hands of the Republican majority here while action has been underway to address the shortcomings of the Bush trade agreements.

I am confident that each of the free trade agreements can be considered on

their own merits. Other programs, especially those vital to workers transition during this difficult economy, should never have been held hostage.

I would like now to ask that the balance of our time be managed by the ranking member on the Trade Subcommittee, JIM MCDERMOTT of Washington.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Washington will control the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMP. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT).

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, it is evident that our country is in desperate need of jobs. And I rise today to bring light on an issue that could cost literally hundreds of jobs in America. Currently, there is a flaw in the GSP, and if it is not addressed, it will cause the loss of 150 jobs in the district that I represent alone, and could cause the loss of many other jobs across the industry.

Implemented back in 1974, GSP was designed to exclude import-sensitive items, and therefore excluded all textiles. However, in the early 1990s, sleeping bags, along with a long list of other items, were added to GSP as eligible for duty-free import, causing sleeping bags to be the only manufactured textile that is allowed to be imported without a 9 percent duty.

The sleeping bags made at Exxel Outdoors in Haleyville, Alabama, are simply fabric, filling and zipper, yet they are not treated as other textiles. Sleeping bags that are manufactured in Bangladesh, where 90 percent of their value comes from materials in China, cut into America's sleeping bag sales by 20 percent a year.

Without this modest import duty, there will be at least another 150 people who will lose their jobs unnecessarily in a region where unemployment is already over 15 percent. While the economy added no new jobs in August and U.S. unemployment numbers remain stagnant, this issue gives us another example of government policy that hinders job growth and retention.

I want to thank the Ways and Means Committee for their time, attention, and concern regarding this matter and for working with us as we move forward on this process to find a resolution. I am looking forward to continuing our work with them in pursuit of a fair, commonsense solution.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2832, a bill which extends the Generalized System of Preferences, or GSP, for 22 months.

Let's make it very clear what's going on here tonight. Usually, Members of Congress come from all over the country on the first day of session, and we come back here and we rename post offices. So the President said: Why don't I go over there on Wednesday and give a speech about jobs and about the

agenda that this country ought to face. He sent a pro forma request to the leadership of the House, and they said: Oh, no. We have important business. We can't make room for you. It's the first time in history the President has been denied access to a general speech to the entire Congress.

Now, then you have the problem, what important stuff have you got? So they come looking for a bill. So this is the bill they brought forward. It's going to pass on unanimous consent. It could have passed months ago. It should have passed months ago because it is the cornerstone of our U.S. trade and development policy and has been in place since 1976.

The GSP program allows duty-free entry into the United States for lots of products coming from 129 developing countries, including some of the poorest in the world. But the poor countries are not the only ones that rely on this. As you just heard, American businesses rely on GSP to be competitive. In fact, most GSP products are import products for U.S. manufacturers. Unfortunately, GSP was allowed to lapse in December in the midst of all of the anti program; anything that the White House or anybody wanted around here, they said "no." This was no. This was the Congress of no. And so it undermined the development goals of GSP.

Now, this job-killing delay didn't have to happen. But like so much else, the Republicans wanted to use GSP as a hostage no matter what the cost to U.S. businesses and consumers. Despite the damage to our economy by the Republicans, I am supportive of finally passing GSP. And now that we are about to get this done, hopefully we can act on the other critical trade programs the Republicans have allowed to expire. In particular, I'm talking about the Trade Adjustment Assistance program, or TAA, as it is known around here, which helps workers who are laid off as a result of trade. It retrains workers so they can compete better in the global environment. TAA has been in place since 1962, and the bunch running this place let it expire early last year. The expansion in 2009 had strong bipartisan support as recently as up to this past December, and with good reason. Most Members understand or should understand that to compete in a global economy, you need a globally competitive workforce.

Now, the Speaker has taken TAA hostage—or the leadership of the Republican Party. I don't know who's doing it. But they have held it hostage for no good reason whatsoever, even though they voted for it in the past—unanimously voted for it in the past, and now suddenly they can't pass it.

Mr. Speaker, the level of dysfunction in this body is astonishing, and it's not just intentional delays in extending TAA and our other preference programs.

□ 1800

Mr. Speaker, the level of dysfunction in this body is astonishing, and it's not

just intentional delays in extending TAA and our other Preference programs. The Republicans have refused to act on any of the trade agenda. And why? Because they want action on the three pending FTAs first, above all else, no matter what. Even when the Obama administration wanted to move forward on the renegotiated Korea FTA last spring, the Republicans refused to act because they wanted action on all three Bush-era agreements, all at once, regardless of how flawed they might be. And as the Republicans delayed the agreements with their hostage-taking, they have criticized the administration.

Mr. Speaker, U.S. businesses are failing. They are falling behind their EU competitors who already have their agreement up and running, making contracts, while we're still sitting here waiting for the leadership of the Republican Party to let it loose.

Now, the Republican delay: Republicans kill jobs with their tactics and then they blame the President. They must have found out something in August when they went home, and that's why they're back here worried about jobs. We'll see about it. We'll see how serious they are. They spent too much time with Alice in Wonderland—where up is down and down is up. It's a cynical game the Republicans are playing with the public.

We need to act on the two FTAs that have been fixed—Korea and Panama—and also on the trade programs that have expired. For example, I have submitted a bill that will extend the important parts of AGOA—the African Growth and Opportunity Act—that will expire next year and add the new country of South Sudan to our list of trading partners. These changes need to be made soon to keep the development that is already occurring under AGOA from withering. And nobody is opposed to the changes. It's just being held as a hostage.

We need to put American jobs first and get this work done, and we need to do it quickly. We just need to pass this bill that's before us today. I'm sure it will pass by unanimous consent.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I think today we'll find that we're the Congress of "yes" on this bipartisan legislation, and I want to thank the ranking member of the Trade Subcommittee for his original cosponsorship.

With that, I yield 4 minutes to the chairman of the Trade Subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

You may not sense it from some of the remarks today, but, in truth, this bill has strong bipartisan support, and I rise in support of this legislation renewing the Preference program as one valuable step Congress can take together to help spur economic and job growth here in America.

As last week's jobs number—or, more importantly, zero jobs number—showed

us, our economy is struggling, and there are 14 million Americans who want a job that can't find a job. Twenty-two million Americans want a full-time job and can't find one. The lapse of this Preference program has hurt the competitiveness of our American manufacturers and others who rely upon these GSP imports as raw materials and inputs.

We all know our States best. In Texas, 27 companies have asked Congress to renew this Preference program. These companies import such products as chemicals, iron and steel flanges, and ceramics for use as inputs in their manufacturing operations at home in Texas. These imports support jobs in my local communities and make our manufacturers more competitive when they compete against companies overseas. And the program benefits every State in this way, not just mine.

The lapse of the program since the beginning of the year has cost these Texas companies over \$21 million in unnecessary duties. That \$21 million could have been used to hire more employees and invest in new equipment. Instead, it was taxed away from them. This legislation would provide a retroactive renewal of the program and give these companies the opportunity to get these duties refunded to them. And I know they can use this money more effectively to promote jobs and invest in our economy than sending it here to Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly pleased there is strong bipartisan support for this legislation under the leadership of Chairman DAVE CAMP, along with Ranking Member LEVIN and Congressman MCDERMOTT—my friend and coworker on the Trade Subcommittee—who are original cosponsors of this legislation. As a result of this strong bipartisan support, I expect it to pass strongly tonight in the House. I hope the other body will move quickly to consider this legislation.

Last December, during the holidays, the House passed by voice vote a renewal of this program that would have prevented the lapse of the program. Unfortunately, it never made it out of the Senate. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge not only bipartisan support for this legislation but bicameral support for it as well so we can get this money back in the hands of American manufacturers and job creators.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. My good friend from Texas is right; there is strong bipartisan support for this legislation. There was bipartisan support for the legislation when it passed in the House last December when it expired. But, unfortunately, the Senate shut down. It would not be allowed to move forward by the Republicans in the other body, and it died inexplicably. I don't understand the workings of the other body and why Republicans would re-

quire supermajorities to move things through that will ultimately pass unanimously.

There was bipartisan support for this legislation in January, in February, March, April, May, June. I am proud to support it now, and I'm pleased that the Republican leadership and my friend, Chairman CAMP, brought it forward. But there's just as much support today as there was in January.

It made me feel bad that our friend from Texas talked about the \$21 million that was lost to his Texas industries. It didn't need to happen. Any night that we came into session at the beginning of any week, the legislation could have come forward, since January. This is important, and I'm pleased we're having the discussion now. I will do anything I can to lobby people in the other body to move forward with it. But it's part of a simple bipartisan agenda where there's no objection. These are the sorts of things that can come forward.

In the 1960s, a growing number of nations agreed that more needed to be done to bring the benefits of trade to the developing world and devised a system of trade preferences to meet this objective. The United States enacted it first in 1974, and criteria under this System of Preferences were not merely related to trade but reflected our Nation's social values when we inaugurated this program, Preferences, in 1974 and included a statement of the policies we feel valuable in our trading partners and about which policies we feel drive the development of nations. It's often referred to as a tool of foreign policy as well as trade.

Among the criteria we judge our trading partners on in eligibility for this program are the protection of American commercial interests like the protection of intellectual property, the prevention of seizure of property belonging to United States citizens and businesses, as well as the protection of individual rights such as the protection of commonly accepted labor rights and the elimination of child labor.

I wonder at this point if I may ask a question of my friend, the chairman of the committee.

As I scanned the legislation, I don't see any reference in the elements to the protection of the environment. Is there anything in this legislation that would speak to that?

Mr. CAMP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CAMP. Well, the short answer is no. The gentleman is correct in his analysis or reading of the bill. This is a straightforward extension of the existing program, so it has not added any additional eligibility criteria in this legislation. This is just simply a straightforward extension.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. If the gentleman would entertain an additional question. I appreciate that this has not been incorporated in the past and that this is just a simple extension over the course of the next 22 months.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. As we move forward, hopefully we won't be dealing with the expiration in the future. I'm wondering if the gentleman would entertain working with us and, as we come forward in the course of a replacement, if we might consider including environmental protections in the list of accepted criteria.

Mr. CAMP. I haven't had a chance to review your suggestion but would be happy to take a look at it.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Thank you. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy and interest in at least looking at it.

□ 1810

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that we have done with the trade agenda in 2007 was establish environmental protections which are part of future FTAs. We've kind of turned the corner with trade agreements. And I'm hopeful that this relatively modest—and I would think noncontroversial—item could be included so that as we move forward in the future we add to our list and would benefit developing countries' respect for the environment.

Trade can have a powerful effect on environmental protection. We've worked hard to include them in previous items. And I'm hopeful that we can work together to make sure when this comes before us again that the environment is given its due protection.

Mr. CAMP. I am prepared to close at this point if the gentleman has no further speakers.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. I have no other speakers, so I will close on our side.

Mr. Speaker, I expect this bill will pass in 5 minutes without a vote against it.

This bill could be law by tomorrow at noon if the Senate would act, and I hope that my colleagues on the other side will do as we will do on this side, which is to contact our colleagues in the Senate and ask them this time, put it up and move it. Now, if they don't, all you can say is this was a trial balloon we put up in the air, and we found out the Senate was asleep or dysfunctional or—I don't know what you would put on it. They have to act on this if they're serious about a trade agenda for this country, and I hope that we can make it happen for the American worker.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I want to thank both of my colleagues for their commitment to work with the other body to ensure that this legislation becomes law. As we all know, we can use all the help we can get when we get to the other side of the Capitol. But I want to just reemphasize that this is part of a 40-year history of more competition for U.S. manufacturers and U.S. companies. This is bipartisan legislation which has been around for a long time.

It is important to continue to grow markets and create exports; and this legislation helps American employers, American manufacturers—and their employees, more importantly—by creating and supporting jobs here in America. So it's just an important, valuable part of our export policy, and I urge all of my colleagues to join in supporting this bipartisan legislation.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2832.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 6:30 p.m.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WEST) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

AUTHORIZING USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SPECIAL OLYMPICS LAW ENFORCEMENT TORCH RUN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on the motion to suspend the rules previously postponed.

The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 67) authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 379, nays 0, not voting 52, as follows:

[Roll No. 692]

YEAS—379

Ackerman	Altmire	Baca
Adams	Amash	Bachus
Aderholt	Andrews	Baldwin
Alexander	Austria	Barletta

Barrow	Fitzpatrick	LoBiondo
Bartlett	Flake	Loeb
Barton (TX)	Fleischmann	Loftgren, Zoe
Bass (CA)	Fleming	Long
Becerra	Forbes	Lowe
Berg	Fortenberry	Luetkemeyer
Berman	Fox	Lujan
Biggert	Frank (MA)	Lummis
Bilbray	Franks (AZ)	Mack
Bilirakis	Frelinghuysen	Manzullo
Bishop (GA)	Fudge	Marchant
Black	Galleghy	Marino
Blackburn	Garamendi	Markey
Blumenauer	Gardner	Matheson
Bonner	Garrett	Matsui
Bono Mack	Gerlach	McCarthy (CA)
Boswell	Gibbs	McCauley
Boustany	Gingrey (GA)	McClintock
Brady (PA)	Gohmert	McCollum
Brady (TX)	Gonzalez	McCotter
Braley (IA)	Goodlatte	McDermott
Brooks	Gosar	McGovern
Broun (GA)	Gowdy	McHenry
Brown (FL)	Granger	McIntyre
Buchanan	Graves (GA)	McKeon
Bucshon	Graves (MO)	McKinley
Buerkle	Green, Al	McMorris
Burgess	Green, Gene	Rodgers
Burton (IN)	Griffin (AR)	McNerney
Butterfield	Griffith (VA)	Meehan
Calvert	Grimm	Meeks
Camp	Guinta	Mica
Campbell	Guthrie	Michaud
Canseco	Hahn	Miller (FL)
Cantor	Hall	Miller (MI)
Capito	Hanabusa	Miller (NC)
Capps	Hanna	Miller, George
Capuano	Harper	Moore
Cardoza	Harris	Moran
Carnahan	Hartzler	Murphy (CT)
Carney	Hastings (FL)	Murphy (PA)
Carson (IN)	Hastings (WA)	Murrick
Carter	Hayworth	Nadler
Cassidy	Heck	Napolitano
Castor (FL)	Heinrich	Neugebauer
Chabot	Hensarling	Noem
Chaffetz	Hergert	Nugent
Chandler	Herrera Beutler	Nunes
Chu	Himes	Nunnelee
Cicilline	Hinche	Olson
Clarke (MI)	Hinojosa	Olver
Clay	Hirono	Owens
Cleaver	Hochul	Palazzo
Clyburn	Holden	Pallone
Coble	Holt	Pascarella
Coffman (CO)	Hoyer	Pastor (AZ)
Cole	Huelskamp	Paulsen
Conaway	Huizenga (MI)	Payne
Connelly (VA)	Hultgren	Pearce
Conyers	Hunter	Pelosi
Cooper	Hurt	Perlmutter
Costa	Inslee	Peters
Courtney	Israel	Peterson
Cravaack	Issa	Petri
Crawford	Jackson (IL)	Pitts
Crenshaw	Jackson Lee	Platts
Critz	(TX)	Poe (TX)
Crowley	Jenkins	Polis
Cuellar	Johnson (GA)	Pompeo
Culberson	Johnson (IL)	Posey
Cummings	Johnson (OH)	Price (GA)
Davis (CA)	Johnson, E. B.	Price (NC)
Davis (KY)	Johnson, Sam	Quayle
DeFazio	Jones	Quigley
DeGette	Jordan	Rahall
DeLauro	Kaptur	Rangel
Denham	Keating	Reed
Dent	Kelly	Rehberg
DesJarlais	Kildee	Reichert
Deutch	Kind	Renacci
Diaz-Balart	King (IA)	Ribble
Dicks	King (NY)	Richardson
Dingell	Kingston	Rigell
Doggett	Kinzinger (IL)	Rivera
Dold	Kline	Roby
Donnelly (IN)	Kucinich	Roe (TN)
Doyle	Labrador	Rogers (AL)
Dreier	Lamborn	Rogers (KY)
Duffy	Lance	Rogers (MI)
Duncan (SC)	Lankford	Rohrabacher
Duncan (TN)	Larsen (WA)	Rooney
Edwards	Larson (CT)	Ros-Lehtinen
Ellmers	Latham	Roskam
Emerson	LaTourette	Ross (AR)
Eshoo	Latta	Ross (FL)
Farenthold	Lee (CA)	Roybal-Allard
Farr	Levin	Royce
Fattah	Lewis (CA)	Runyan
Filner	Lipinski	Ruppersberger

Ryan (OH)	Smith (NE)	Velázquez
Ryan (WI)	Smith (NJ)	Walberg
Sánchez, Linda	Smith (TX)	Walden
T.	Smith (WA)	Walz (MN)
Sanchez, Loretta	Southerland	Wasserman
Sarbanes	Speier	Schultz
Scalise	Stark	Waters
Schakowsky	Stearns	Watt
Schiff	Stivers	Waxman
Schilling	Stutzman	Webster
Schmidt	Sullivan	Welch
Schock	Sutton	West
Schwartz	Terry	Westmoreland
Schweikert	Thompson (CA)	Whitfield
Scott (VA)	Thompson (MS)	Wilson (FL)
Scott, Austin	Thompson (PA)	Wilson (SC)
Scott, David	Thornberry	Wittman
Sensenbrenner	Tierney	Wolf
Serrano	Tipton	Womack
Sessions	Tonko	Woodall
Sherman	Towns	Woolsey
Shuler	Tsongas	Yarmuth
Shuster	Turner	Yoder
Simpson	Upton	Young (IN)
Slaughter	Van Hollen	

NOT VOTING—52

Akin	Grijalva	Pence
Bachmann	Gutierrez	Pingree (ME)
Bass (NH)	Higgins	Reyes
Benishek	Honda	Richmond
Berkley	Kissell	Rokita
Bishop (NY)	Landry	Rothman (NJ)
Bishop (UT)	Langevin	Rush
Boren	Lewis (GA)	Schrader
Clarke (NY)	Lucas	Scott (SC)
Cohen	Lungren, Daniel	Sewell
Costello	E.	Shimkus
Davis (IL)	Lynch	Sires
Ellison	Maloney	Tiberi
Engel	McCarthy (NY)	Visclosky
Fincher	Miller, Gary	Walsh (IL)
Flores	Mulvaney	Young (AK)
Gibson	Neal	Young (FL)
Giffords	Paul	

□ 1854

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. WALSH of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 692, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Ms. SEWELL. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 692, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, on September 7, 2011, I inadvertently missed rollcall vote No. 692. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained in my district and missed the vote on September 7, 2011. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 692, H. Con. Res. 67.

□ 1900

ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING CLASSIFIED SCHEDULE OF AUTHORIZATIONS AND CLASSIFIED ANNEX ACCOMPANYING INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION BILL FOR FY 2012

(Mr. ROGERS of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce to all Members of the House that the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has ordered the bill, H.R. 1892, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal