I rise in support of this rule and in support of the agreement. This will, in fact, enhance an important relationship with Australia, a country where we already do enjoy, the record is clear, a trade surplus. It is important nationally. It is important to the State that I represent, not just for the technology industry, our number one source of export from our economy. It is going to make a difference of $4,000 per truck that is manufactured in my hometown by union machinists, painters, and Teamsters and exported to Australia.

I note that Australia has strong labor protections. One would only wish that the United States labor provisions were enforced and would provide the same level of protection to American workers to be able to organize as they see fit.

I appreciate the comment of my friend, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, referencing the importance to build a bipartisan consensus on trade in the global economy. This is a very important discussion, one that we have already enjoyed here today. I think it is making us move down a path where future and more contentious issues can be dealt with in a thoughtful fashion.

I appreciate the warning that was issued by my good friend, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. *Allen*), about the needless addition in this trade agreement of an unfortunate precedent dealing with our health policy. It is not going to affect drug reimportation now because of restrictions in Australian law, but it is not a good precedent in terms of what the majority of the House is seeking to do with prescription drugs in this country.

But I must also mention another precedent that I find equally troubling, which deals with the treatment of sugar.

It is still the policy of the United States government to penalize United States consumers, forcing them to pay far more than the world price. It discriminates against sugar-based industries in the United States, driving confectionery factories from Illinois across the border to Canada. It is troubling that we see agreements take the sugar issue off the table in a concession to that powerful interest.

This is bad for our ultimate posture on trade, because it shows us to be hypocritical. It is bad for United States consumers. It is bad for the environment. It is bad for poor people around the world who could work their way out of poverty.

I will support the rule and the agreement, but I certainly hope that this is the last provision we have that enshrines protectionist treatment for the sugar interests in this country.