

Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)

Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall

NOT VOTING—7

Clawson (FL)
Duffy
Gowdy

Grothman
Hice, Jody B.
Kaptur

Thompson (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1451

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 278, nays 149, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 358]

YEAS—278

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishkek
Bera
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Delaney

Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Esty
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp

Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Lummis
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer

Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Moore (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)

Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Moore (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)

NAYS—149

Adams
Amash
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Beyer
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DeBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah

Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Higgins
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
Labrador
Larsen (WA)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Loebbeck
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Nadler

NOT VOTING—6

Clawson (FL)
Coffman

Gowdy
Grothman

Katko
Thompson (CA)

□ 1459

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California changed her vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 358, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, on passage of H.R. 2685, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, I would have voted “yes” had I been present for the final roll (Roll no. 358).

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 11, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, U.S. Capitol, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on June 11, 2015 at 11:26 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 253.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1314, ENSURING TAX EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS THE RIGHT TO APPEAL ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 644, FIGHTING HUNGER INCENTIVE ACT OF 2015

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 305 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 305

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1314) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Ways and Means or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion. The

question of adoption of the motion shall be divided as follows: first, concurring in section 212 of the Senate amendment; second, concurring in the matter comprising the remainder of title II of the Senate amendment; and third, concurring in the matter preceding title II of the Senate amendment. The portion of the divided question on concurring in section 212 of the Senate amendment shall be considered as adopted. The Chair shall first put the question on the portion of the divided question on concurring in the matter comprising the remainder of title II of the Senate amendment. If any portion of the divided question fails of adoption, then the House shall be considered to have made no disposition of the Senate amendment.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 644) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory, with the Senate amendments thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a single motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Ways and Means or his designee that the House: (1) concur in the Senate amendment to the title; and (2) concur in the Senate amendment to the text with the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution modified by the amendment printed in part B of that report. The Senate amendments and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question. If the motion is adopted, then it shall be in order for the chair of the Committee on Ways and Means or his designee to move that the House insist on its amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 644 and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my very dear friend, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the ranking member of the Rules Committee, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in defense of Ronald Reagan Republican free trade principles and in support of trade promotion authority, which is known as TPA.

Since the days of President Ronald Reagan, Republicans have supported free trade because we know that when America competes, America wins. TPA is a vital piece of our free trade agenda because it creates the process that we need to secure trade agreements that

grow our economy, create good-paying jobs, and lower prices for American consumers.

For America to continue to determine the rules of the global economy, we need to lead by crafting free trade agreements, and thus, the House is here today to provide to the President the parameters under which he or she should negotiate a trade promotion authority.

Free trade means more good-paying American jobs. Free trade means that American workers make American products at American businesses to be sold all across the globe. More than 38 million American jobs are tied to trade, and these jobs pay well. In fact, trade-related jobs, on average, pay 18 percent more than jobs that are not trade related.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party is here today with Ronald Reagan watching from Heaven down on us, to say that we are continuing what he really began, and that is a process of American exceptionalism around the world.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume and thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary time.

Mr. Speaker, shortly after midnight Tuesday night, the Rules Committee learned we would consider the Senate's package of three sweeping trade bills. We convened mere hours later and considered hundreds of pages of new text rewriting our trade laws and the rules of the House.

Part of that package includes what is called fast track, a procedure that has outlived its purpose and circumvents congressional authority because it does not allow for committee debate or for the Members to be able to amend it or change it, just to vote up or down—at least that is what happened over here in the House.

It silences the debates of the Members of the Chamber, and by doing that, the Americans who send us here don't have a voice. We are being asked to push this Trans-Pacific Partnership through by using fast track, and what is more, we are being asked to push fast track through with a closed rule.

Now, we have been very concerned about what is in this fast track. As you know, we really aren't allowed to know. We are only allowed to vote up or down on the trade bill itself, once fast track is passed.

I realized how awful it was for us here; if we wanted to go see it, we had to take someone with us with a security clearance, but we would not be allowed to talk about it.

I learned of something this morning that is even worse, an article of The New York Times about the Australian Government and the members of Parliament there who say that, if they go down and read the trade bill, they have to sign an oath that they will not speak of it for 4 years.

Now, that asks the question: Who runs these democracies, the Represent-

atives of the people of the United States or the corporate giants who write the trade bills that we are not able to see?

It is pretty clear who runs it here because, from what we have heard, that was leaked out through WikiLeaks, is that major parts of this bill have been negotiated by Big Pharma, the pharmaceutical industries of America, and the financial system. Neither one of those have shown any aptitude to try to put the members of the public first.

Australia is so concerned about the fact that pharma is asking for 12 more years' extension on their patents that they are very much afraid it will destroy their healthcare system.

More and more people are finding out simply by the leaks of what is in this bill, and so far, according to the polls, nobody much likes it.

Instead of the weeks that we could have had a transparent debate about a bill we had seen and a bill that we know, all we do is roll what happened in the Rules Committee yesterday. Yesterday, no Member of the Rules Committee or any Member of the House who came before it was allowed to have amendments approved.

Now, the Senate did; the Senate allowed amendments to change the bills considerably, but not us. Amendments were offered in the Rules Committee to provide for transparency so that we will know what these things are all about.

To change the investor's state, what we need to really bear down on—and the Australians are also aware of—is that disputes from any of the 12 countries in this trade agreement, if they do not approve of or believe they are losing money because of our Clean Air Act or our Clean Water Act, they can go to the three-person tribunal of corporate lawyers and act against us.

We know that that is a concern in this Congress because just yesterday, they voted away the country of origin labeling because they were concerned about the WTO.

As I pointed out, we had those amendments. We also had one amendment on currency manipulation, which is a major concern. We lose lots of jobs and lots of money because of currency manipulation, and we simply allow it to happen.

We will not do anything—everybody says, if that should be in this bill at all, that the President would veto it—so the American public, once again, those of us standing here trying to take care of them, are not going to be able to do it because we only know by word of mouth or what we have been able to read in the newspapers what is in there.

Let me tell you what is in the rule. That is a very important piece. Most of the discussion in the House has been around what we call the pay-for part of the trade bill, which is called trade adjustment allowance. That is supposed to take care of all the people who are laid off, who lose their jobs. The fact

that we have asked for such a large number indicates to me that they expect an awful lot of jobs lost in this country.

So how the TAA was paid for, as it came from the Senate, was with a \$700 million cut in Medicare. NANCY PELOSI has driven mightily, along with JOHN BOEHNER, to change those cuts that will be paid for with the TAA.

I need to make it very clear, and I want everybody to understand that the bill we voted on this morning, the African growth bill, which contains the new pay-fors other than Medicare, are not valid until after the Senate acts on that bill. If tomorrow on the floor, the trade adjustment allowance and the fast track authority pass, they will go to the Senate, with the pay-fors coming from Medicare.

I think it is very important that we make that point because many of the people that serve with us here are confused about exactly where that is coming from.

Let me repeat that. The pay-fors that substitute from the use of Medicare to pay for trade adjustment allowance will not be valid until after there is Senate action, if or when that takes place.

We were told that the Speaker said over in the Senate that he would do this under unanimous consent, but we have also been told that unanimous consent will not be given.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, the advocates of the fast track and TPP are telling us that this is going to be a wonderful trade deal.

We know that it is not going to create jobs because none of them have. Those of us in upstate New York, after NAFTA, we were told we were going to get at least 250,000 new jobs; instead, as the Speaker probably knows, we lost a great deal.

If we, as Members of Congress, wanted to view the deal, we could not talk about it; and that, by itself, should be enough to have us not do it.

□ 1515

In a seminal sociological and political discussion of our early American democracy, "Democracy in America," Alexis de Tocqueville said of our Nation in 1835: "The surface of American society is covered with a layer of democratic paint. But from time to time, one can see the old aristocratic colors breaking through."

This is one of those times, Mr. Speaker, because this bill, this trade bill that affects every person in the United States—and will for maybe a generation to come—is not being written by the Members of the House of Representatives or of the Senate, but in a closed, backroom deal and, as we are told, by major corporations in the United States to benefit themselves. That certainly appears to be what we are going to get.

By giving away the role of Congress in setting the trade policies, we give away our ability to safeguard Amer-

ica's jobs and, most importantly again, as I pointed out, the American laws meant to protect the citizens we represent, such as the Clean Water Act. I have never seen in my years of Congress a trade bill come out of this Congress that benefited either the American manufacturer or the American worker. This one is the same.

Any lawmaker thinking about voting for another job-killing trade agreement should take a serious look at NAFTA and at our growing trade deficit with South Korea and think about whether they want to be responsible for shipping their constituents' jobs overseas.

Now, we know this bill has been modeled after the failed policies that have shuttered store windows and closed factories all across the Nation. That is the legacy, ladies and gentlemen, of free trade. What we ought to demand in our trading bills is fair trade. America should not be the supplier of jobs to bolster the rest of world and improve their economies at the cost of ours.

From food safety, clean air, and labor standards to environmental protections, this trade deal would impact every facet of our daily lives. Ninety percent of the seafood now that is consumed by Americans is imported. Less than 3 percent of it is inspected. Tons of it have been sent back just from that small amount being inspected.

We will not be able to interfere with them coming in here under the investor-state dispute settlement or under this free trade act.

I urge my colleague to vote "no" on the rule and carefully, carefully consider the trade package before us.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman originally, I believe, is from Kentucky, and she will recognize when I tell this awesome story about how important a free trade agreement is.

A couple of years ago, we did a free trade agreement with the country of Korea. Within a year, Mr. Speaker, as a result of that trade agreement, the number one selling car in Korea came from Georgetown, Kentucky. It is a Toyota Camry made in the United States. The Koreans love it, a Kentucky-made product.

Mr. Speaker, if we didn't have a free trade agreement with Korea, the people in Georgetown, Kentucky, couldn't claim to be the number one car in Korea.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the young gentleman from Auburn, Washington (Mr. REICHERT), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I am rising today in support of today's rule, which will allow us to proceed in consideration of trade promotion authority, trade adjustment assistance, and customs legislation.

Passage of trade promotion authority is absolutely critical to our economic growth and global leadership. Without TPA, we will not be able to bring home

the benefits of a high-standard trade agreement.

Now, what are the benefits of high-standard trade agreements? Job creation, selling American products across this globe to 96 percent of the market, which exists outside of this country. Selling American, that is what we want to do.

And, by the way, we not only create jobs, but we create jobs that are higher paid wages, which we are all trying to struggle with across this country in raising the minimum wage. We can do that in this trade adjustment and trade promotion authority.

This is counter to exactly what communities across the Nation need right now: more opportunities, more good paying jobs; and that leads to a promising future for our families, for our children, to better-paying, high-tech jobs and manufacturing jobs across this country.

I am proud to be the House sponsor of legislation to renew trade adjustment assistance because I understand the necessity of TAA.

Now, not only is this a great trade initiative here, but we are also taking into consideration, as we move ahead in this global economy, that there may be people who do have opportunities to look at other jobs; and this TAA bill provides training and education for people to have and gain better jobs, higher paying jobs. So I would encourage my colleagues to vote for this rule in support of TPA, TAA, and the customs legislation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute because I do so appreciate my friend, Mr. SESSIONS, giving us a good Kentucky story. I need to change that story just a little bit. That factory has been in Georgetown for at least three decades. It is Toyota, which is Japanese.

All of South Korea has only 26 car dealers in the country that will sell an American car. Of course, we buy Japanese cars that are made here, but they don't buy ours in Japan. I think about 2 years ago we had only sold 8,000 American cars in Japan for that entire year, and I would imagine we sell that many Japanese cars in the United States on a daily basis.

So I appreciate the story. Georgetown, I know, would love to be mentioned, but we have got to get it right.

Now I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule because America's middle class and our workers have been under economic attack. I rise to voice my opposition to the very restrictive process being used to shove these job outsourcing trade deals through Congress.

The Republican leadership has denied our House any amendment, even on currency manipulation, on legislation that is sure to impact every single American, turning our oversight role into little more than a rubberstamp. This makes a mockery of the House's

clear, constitutional authority on trade and commerce.

Worse still, this limitation is being pursued because Republican leaders simply do not want to go to conference with the Senate. This belies every American, every Member their right to be represented and have a voice in this process.

Hundreds, however, of multinational corporations and lobbyists, the 1 percent, helped to write, amend, and draft the TPP, the Trans-Pacific Partnership, line by line.

But today, years into the process and with negotiation in the final stages, Members of Congress were only recently given our first access. To read it, you have to go to a secure room, deep in the Visitor Center. We are supervised. Any notes we take are confiscated, and we can't discuss what we find with anyone unless they have top secret clearance.

The trade deal is a secret deal because they want to fast-track it through Congress, hoping Congress really won't understand what is in it. And I find it hard to imagine a more dangerous or irresponsible approach than fast-tracking another trade deal through Congress.

TPA, the authority to fast track, is a gateway to the Trans-Pacific Partnership. Both will further harm workers and communities to a faster global race to the bottom, with more outsourcing of jobs, more lower wages, more dropping benefits, more lower standards for worker safety, compensation, and environment. We have seen that since NAFTA passed 30 years ago.

For decades, I have fought against destructive trade deals that were brought down on our Nation's workers and communities.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. KAPTUR. Over this period of time, every time one of these so-called free trade deals is signed, America moves into deeper and deeper trade deficit, deeper and deeper red ink, as more of our jobs get shipped abroad.

I remember standing at the corner of Ohio and Michigan Avenues in Matamoros, Mexico, and looking at the TRICO windshield factory that was moved from the State of New York down there, and Parker Seals. It almost seemed like a movie set but for one thing, it was real.

Last year alone, our trade deficit cost us 20 percent of our GDP. Is anybody here paying attention or are we all a part of the 1 percent and forget about the 99 percent who have had to bear the brunt of this terrible, terrible outsourcing of jobs?

Average American wages across my region have dropped by \$7,000. This trade deficit didn't happen by accident. Some people got filthy rich off of it.

This is a time for America to say, "No more. No more. We are going to do it right. We are going to create trade

deals that create jobs in our country, create a stronger middle class, raise wages, improve the environment, here and abroad. No more taking it out of the hide of America's workers."

We are here because we stand on their shoulders. Vote "no" on this rule and "no" on TAA and "no" on TPP.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, you know, I love the fervency of our colleagues who come down here and argue Japan is the problem. You can't talk about the trade agreement that we have with Korea where it works—Japan, Japan, Japan.

Well, good gosh, this is about getting a trade deal with what is called TPP, of which Japan would be included. This is a deal where my colleagues come down and don't like our trade deficits, but the bottom line is that the United States has a trade surplus with its 20 free trade partners.

So we are trying to take people from nontrade agreement, where we run a deficit and they close their market, to a trade deal where we run a surplus where people want to buy American-made products. If they will listen, we have got a good deal for them today. And one of those good deals, Mr. Speaker, is agriculture, so that our men and women engaged in agriculture can sell their products around the world.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Midland, Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), the chairman of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule, and I especially want to commend Chairman RYAN and his colleagues on Ways and Means for their hard work in bringing us the underlying legislation.

Everyone in the room knows that America's farmers and ranchers are the most productive in the world. They have continuously proven their ability to meet rapidly growing and ever-changing demands here at home, and their reach stretches well beyond the shores of America. In fact, exports now account for almost one-third of total U.S. farm income. In the case of commodities like cotton, tree nuts, rice, and wheat, over one-half the total production is exported.

In 2014 alone, U.S. agricultural exports set a record \$152.5 billion, highlighting the growing demand for quality food and fiber around the world. As was noted in a recent hearing before the House Agriculture Committee, the United States exported almost as much beef, pork, and poultry to the 20 nations with which we have trade agreements as they did the other 170-plus nations in the world.

Beyond the obvious benefits to producers, trade also helps support almost 1 million American jobs in production agriculture and in related sectors like food processing and transportation. As a result, it is crucial not only to American agriculture, but to the U.S. economy as a whole, to maintain and increase access to the world's 7 billion

consumers, 95 percent of whom live outside the shores of the United States. To obtain that access, it is imperative that we work to reduce and eliminate international barriers to trade so that our farmers and ranchers can compete on a level playing field in the global market.

With negotiations in the World Trade Organization languishing for the last 14 years, regional free trade agreements represent our best opportunity for expanding trade opportunities for U.S. agricultural. History has shown that trade promotion authority in one form or another has been vital in completing and implementing past agreements. In fact, Congress has granted TPA to every President since 1974, and the 114th Congress should be no exception.

TPA will provide our negotiators with the credibility necessary to conclude the most effective trade agreements possible by making it clear to the rest of the world that Congress and this administration are serious about this endeavor.

The legislation before us today empowers Congress to move the aggressive trade agenda. It includes the strongest measures, to date, for ensuring that this President sticks to the negotiating objectives laid down by Congress, including the unicameral ability to turn TPA off on an individual agreement. At the end of the day, it is Congress that will decide the fate of each agreement.

In conclusion, I am a strong proponent of free trade and the benefits it provides our Nation's producers and consumers. However, if we are not going to continue to expand American markets, other countries, often with lower standards, will step up to the plate and fill that demand. Markets are not won or regained easily after they have been lost, and billions around the globe still want America's quality food and fiber.

□ 1530

We can win over new markets, boost our economy, and meet these global demands first and foremost by showing that we are, in fact, a strong and reliable trading partner. We can make that happen by passing this rule and the underlying TPA agreement.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for her tremendous leadership on so many issues.

I rise today in strong opposition to this rule. Our country has already lost too many good-paying American jobs because of past trade deals. We should be clear about what this rule would do. This rule is really a vote to extended Medicare sequestration and provides for no amendments in the fast track bill, Trade Adjustment Assistance, and the customs bill.

We have seen what happens when bad trade deals are passed without congressional oversight: American jobs shift

overseas—many come from communities of color; dangerous food makes its way to our meals; human rights are violated; labor standards are ignored; and the effects of climate change get worse.

The American people do deserve better. The American people deserve a trade policy that creates American jobs and an open process for passing trade deals that gives them a strong voice.

Passing this rule and passing fast track does neither. This is a bad deal for American workers. It is bad for American jobs. It needs to go back to the drawing board, a drawing board that is public and that gives the American people a voice in trade policy, not just big corporations and hedge fund managers.

Between 2001 and 2011, the growing trade deficit with China cost more than 2.7 million jobs. Nearly 1 million of these jobs, mind you, came from communities of color. After these workers lost their jobs, their situation went from bad to worse.

These workers saw their wages fall nearly 30 percent—or more than \$10,000 a year. The total economic cost of this job loss to these communities is more than \$10 billion. Now, that is \$10 billion each and every year.

We cannot allow another bad trade deal to shift millions more of American jobs overseas. We cannot allow another bad trade deal to strip billions from struggling communities. We cannot allow this rule or a flawed TAA or fast track to pass.

Make no mistake, I support trade. I have the honor of representing the Port of Oakland, and I understand the critical role that trade plays in the economy in my district in California and also in our country.

However, let me just say, trade only grows our economy. This bill is not fair; it is not open, and it is not transparent.

I have the honor of representing the Port of Oakland and I understand the critical role that trade plays in the economy of my district, California and our country.

However, trade only grows our economy when it's fair, open, transparent and creates jobs.

This bill—Fast Track—is not fair.

It's not open—

And it's not transparent.

So once again, I urge a “NO” vote on this Rule, a “NO” on the flawed TAA, and a “NO” on Fast Track.

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

Good gosh, Mr. Speaker, I was afraid she was in reference to ObamaCare, which is why we are losing American jobs all across this country.

The bottom line is that, where there is trade with other countries and we have a trade deal, America wins, and we get more jobs. As an example, 3 million jobs in the Lone Star State of Texas are related to trade, and jobs are growing nearly twice as fast as nontrade jobs. This is what is happening. It is the vibrancy of America.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Harrison Township, Michigan (Mrs. MILLER), chairman of the House Administration Committee.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in very strong support of this rule.

I come from southeast Michigan, which, of course, is the heart of American manufacturing. Michigan manufacturers, especially the Big Three domestic auto companies, have all had concerns for years about the unfair competitive disadvantage that they face by nations that manipulate their currency such as Japan, South Korea, and China.

It was very important to me that, as Congress moves forward with legislation to give trade promotion authority to this President and others, that the package must also include strong, new tools allowing America to fight back against those nations that unfairly manipulate their currency and those that harm American manufacturers.

Mr. Speaker, I am very, very thankful that Chairman RYAN and House leadership agreed to work with us to craft an approach which I believe is a strong step forward. For decades, administrations of both parties have refused to identify foreign currency manipulators or to take any action to stop it.

The manager's amendment, put forward by Chairman RYAN, that we worked with him to develop, gets very, very tough on currency manipulators. For the first time ever, Mr. Speaker, it puts in place a three-part test to define currency manipulation with specific guidance requiring nations that manipulate their currency to be named publicly.

Also, for the first time, the focus will be shifted from reporting and monitoring to actionable items and to steps that will show the impact of currency manipulation on the American economy, as well, Mr. Speaker, as requiring remedial action to be taken.

These tough steps will impact every Nation that we trade with, not just those that might be included in the TPP, but every Nation that we trade with, including South Korea and China, as I mentioned, Japan.

Certainly, while these are steps in the right direction, more needs to be done; absolutely, more needs to be done. Here in Congress, every Member of Congress continues to reserve the right to oppose any TPP agreement that does not meet the needs of the American economy and the American manufacturing industry.

With these changes that I have outlined here that are going to be in the manager's amendment, I support—and I am proud to support—this trade package that will provide an opportunity to drive our economy forward.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gen-

tleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, prior to coming to Congress, I worked for a while as an ironworker at the Quincy shipyard in Quincy, Massachusetts. I was a welder.

Unfortunately, because of bad trade policy, that shipyard closed down, and thousands of workers were laid off. Later on, I also worked at the General Motors facility in Framingham, Massachusetts, and the company decided to close that plant down, while they opened three new ones in Mexico. I have seen what lousy trade policy can do.

The fundamental problem with our trade policy is that it is negotiated in secret by multinational corporations who are basically hiring foreign labor at very low wages, move the jobs overseas, and then export the products back into the United States.

If you look at some of the minimum wages for the countries that we are dealing with in this trade agreement for Malaysia and Vietnam, it is less than \$1 an hour for the minimum wage in those countries, and they maintain those low wages so that they can attract business. It is a race to the bottom.

I do want to say that, as part of my job with the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, I have had a chance to go to South Korea and Japan to see how our trade agreements have been working out there.

I was in South Korea for several days, and just on my own, with my staff, I looked for an American car for several days. We were in traffic a lot. South Korea is a booming industrial country, major highways. I saw hundreds of thousands of cars.

I saw two—two—United States cars. One was the one I was driving in from the Embassy, and the second car was my security detail behind me. Those were the only two U.S. cars, only two U.S. cars.

Our trade with Japan—I was in Japan as well. You need a detective to find a U.S. car in Japan. That is the plain and simple fact. They import \$1 billion worth of U.S.-manufactured products in auto and the air industry; we import \$25 billion.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts just to ask one simple question: What was that trade deal that you were talking about?

Mr. LYNCH. The Korea-U.S. trade agreement.

Mr. SESSIONS. Two years ago?

Mr. LYNCH. Two years ago.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thought you said you lost your job?

Mr. LYNCH. What is that? No, no, no. The job I lost—you were talking to people—the job I lost, 2,700 workers lost at the GM plant, those plants were reopened in Mexico.

Mr. SESSIONS. When was that? What trade deal?

Mr. LYNCH. That was right after NAFTA. That was another bad trade agreement.

Mr. SESSIONS. Well, we gave you a good job, and you came to Congress.

I think the gentleman makes a point that I would like to make, and that is we need a trade deal with Japan to level the playing field, and that is exactly what we are going to do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING), who sits on the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairmen RYAN, SESSIONS, and TIBERI for their tireless effort to move us closer to realizing trade deals that will unlock new markets and bolster our national security.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of both the rule in front of us today and the trade promotion authority legislation we will consider tomorrow.

The benefits of increased free and fair trade are well established and undeniable. For companies in my State, the pending trade deals would remove tariff barriers and unlock doors for businesses such as Morris & Associates, who export the world's best poultry chilling equipment; or a company like Cummins Engine in my State to export U.S.-made engines; and to allow countless farms in my district and State to export hogs, chickens, tobacco, and sweet potatoes all across the globe. This means increased productivity, which means better wages and more jobs.

More importantly, Mr. Speaker, TPA is about empowering Congress, making sure that this body and the people's elected representatives keep tight reins on this President.

Now, I am certainly no supporter of the President's laundry list of unconstitutional actions from immigration, to his administration's unilateral attempts to salvage the sinking ship that is ObamaCare, which is why TPA is needed.

The President is going to negotiate trade deals whether or not we pass TPA. Why wouldn't we want to make this President's negotiators more accountable, the deals themselves more transparent, and make our oversight more effective?

Now, here is how it works. If the President disregards the parameters Congress sets out or fails to consult Members at every step, Congress can turn off TPA. If the President comes back with a bad trade deal, Congress can vote it down.

Mr. Speaker, we need TPA to not only get the best deals possible, but also need this authority to check the President.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule and support TPA.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gen-

tlewoman from the land of cars, Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the rule we are considering today represents everything for me that is wrong with politics. We are currently debating the most important package of trade legislation in a generation; yet, despite how critical this issue is to American jobs, this rule does not allow any amendments.

Currency manipulation, the mother of all trade barriers, has cost this country as many as 5 million jobs. A bipartisan group of 20 Members—10 Republicans, 10 Democrats—proposed an amendment to address this, and it is vital that Congress debate and vote on how to address currency manipulation as we set U.S. trade policy for the next decade.

With nothing but the deepest of respect for the chair of the Rules Committee, I want to give you the facts about the Korean free trade agreement. The reality is that after it passed, we increased exports to Korea from 14,000 to 34,000.

By comparison, Korea exported 800,000 to the U.S. before the trade agreement and now exports 1.3 million. We increased our exports to Korea by 20,000, and they have increased their exports to this country by 461,000.

Toyota made more money last year in currency manipulation in this country than Ford Motor Company did in its worldwide operations.

The American people deserve a full and open debate on trade policy, not procedural gimmicks and political games that shut out amendments and avoid the tough questions.

Let's defeat this rule and have a real debate on the issues that the working men and women of this country have sent us here to consider and that are so critical to the livelihood and the backbone of this American economy. American jobs are at stake.

□ 1545

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Sunnyside, Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE), a farmer and a rancher and a freshman Member on the Rules Committee.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. I thank the chairman for yielding his time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the rule and the underlying trade promotion authority granted by H.R. 1314.

As a member of the Rules Committee, I can affirm that the committee heard and seriously considered many amendments and concerns from both Democratic and Republican Members late into the night. This rule has been very fair, deliberative, and interested parties have been given ample opportunity to weigh in on it and on the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, as you just heard, I come from the State of Washington, which is the most trade-benefited State in the country. If my colleagues want to see the benefit trade brings and the jobs it creates, they only have to look

at my State. We export coffee, aircraft, footwear, software—you name it. We also have an enormous agriculture industry. In Washington, we export fully 30 percent of the apples we grow, more than 85 percent of the wheat, 75 percent of the hops. Right now, consumers around the world are enjoying a brand new crop of fresh Washington State cherries, but the trade success story I want to share with you today is about potatoes.

Prior to the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement that the Congress passed and the President signed in 2011, we shipped \$53 million worth of french fries to South Korea. After that agreement was passed, that value rose to \$83 million—a 57 percent increase in just 2 years—largely attributed to the trade barriers that were lowered. For the record, that potato industry supports fully 24,000 jobs in my State. Those are good-paying jobs which are all supported by trade.

Trade promotion authority is about creating a fair playing field for American producers so we can create more jobs here at home. Most people may not know this, but, right now, American wines face 50 percent tariffs in Japan. Chilean and Argentinean wines face no tariffs at all. Our beef faces a 38 percent tariff—our oranges, a 16 percent tariff. TPA will instruct our negotiators to work on lowering these barriers to U.S. products.

Mr. Speaker, Americans produce some of the finest products in the world, and if given the chance to compete fairly, I believe they can. I have no doubt that we can outperform almost any competitor in the world, but we can't continue to allow other countries to stack the deck against us, which is happening right now. By granting the President the power to negotiate a treaty and by Congress telling him what priorities must be negotiated, we can create a fair playing field and create those jobs we need here at home.

I understand there are concerns about the privacy surrounding the TPP deal. I share those concerns, which is why I have personally gone and reviewed the text of this deal three times now.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. The reason this vote on TPA is so important is that it will make the deal public. It will give the American people at least 2 months and as much as 5 months to review any negotiated deal. That is months to tell their Members of Congress whether they should support the deal or not. Without voting on TPA, there is no review period. The deal can stay a secret.

Mr. Speaker, this rule and the underlying bill are critical to our economy. Without TPA, our country will be left disadvantaged against other countries, and we will be left to trade with one arm tied behind our back. With it, we

can open new opportunities for our businesses. They can grow and create more jobs, and we can ensure that the American economy remains the most competitive, strongest economy in the world for decades to come.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, the rule before us today is filled with plenty of procedural gimmicks but with no opportunities to actually improve the underlying bills.

These bills fail to have enforceable environmental negotiating objectives; they fail to address currency manipulation adequately; and they fail to recognize climate change and its connection to trade. I had proposed amendments to address these issues, which were, unfortunately, not made in order.

Since NAFTA and other subsequent deals, millions of United States manufacturing jobs—one in four, in fact—have been lost, and when manufacturing workers lose their jobs due to trade, the story doesn't get much better: three in five of them take cuts if they find a new job. This is a bad deal for those who lose their jobs due to trade, of course, but it is also bad for all Americans, and it is one reason wages have stagnated for the last two decades. We cannot afford to fast-track another NAFTA on steroids.

On top of that, according to the Department of Labor, four TPP negotiating partners are using forced labor or child labor in violation of international standards. Are these the types of countries to which we want to give fast-tracked trade privileges? Plenty of multinational corporations will benefit from TPP, from increased drug prices to access to cheaper labor, when American jobs are offshored. That much is clear. Yet it is not clear how the average American worker—the people of New York's Capital Region that I represent and the people who sent all of us to be their voices in Washington—would benefit.

Let's end this foolishness and take up bills that actually help our working families by passing a minimum wage, by requiring paid family leave, by investing in STEM education and research, and by rebuilding our infrastructure.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this rule, to defeat this inadequate trade adjustment assistance and to defeat fast track. My message: Hands off the American worker. Hands off the American worker's children. Hands off the American Dream.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY), a very savvy member of our trade team and a gentleman from the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BOUSTANY. I thank the chairman for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, there are hundreds of trade agreements being carried out all over the world today, and the United

States—our country—is sitting on the sidelines. Ninety-five percent of the market is closed off in many respects because we don't have trade agreements; we don't have the market opening. We are an open economy. They are sending stuff here, but we don't have the opportunity to sell there. That is a problem.

Let's talk about what trade promotion authority really is. At a very basic level, it is the catalyst for American economic engagement around the world. It is the catalyst for American leadership. I, for one—and, I think, for most of my friends here on this side of the aisle—am not ready to just step back and relinquish American leadership to others. That is just unacceptable. Trade promotion authority gets us started.

We are on the verge of negotiating two very important trade agreements with growing areas around the world—the Asia-Pacific region and the European Union. This represents the lion's share of gross domestic product growth around the world. Why would we want to lock ourselves out of these markets? It is absolutely ridiculous. It is absurd. We want the American worker to have access to those markets. I want mothers around the world to buy goods off the shelves that read, "Made in America." Those markets are closed. Let's open them. Let's get trade promotion authority in place.

What is it?

It is not the trade agreement, itself. It is the process by which we get the strongest and highest quality trade agreement for American workers that would be most beneficial to our country. It is the whole way we are going to achieve growth in this economy. We can't do it to the extent we need to without this. It puts Congress in the driver's seat, providing over 150 negotiating priorities that we set, not the administration. We set these as we negotiate with foreign countries. If we fail to pass this, the President negotiates on his own priorities, not on the priorities of the American people.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Trade promotion authority gives more transparency to the whole process. Right now, we don't have the kind of transparency that is necessary. TPA, trade promotion authority, is public. That is public. That is the process. It is very public. Go to congress.gov. Anybody can read the legislation. It is public. Plus, passing TPA will require that the final trade agreement—those negotiations aren't done yet, but once they are concluded, the President has to make it public for 60 days in order for anybody and everybody to read it. That is transparency.

If we fail to pass this, we are giving up American leadership. We are basically throwing the American worker under the bus. We need growth. We need American leadership, and trade

promotion authority is the catalyst for providing that leadership. Trade promotion authority is necessary for Congress to provide the proper checks and balances on the administration. I don't want the administration negotiating without our having a robust consultative role in this, and that is what TPA does.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule and to support this underlying legislation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the only way to get better trade agreements is to reject this fast-track bill and develop a better alternative that reflects our values and the realities of the 21st century.

As one who has supported legislation for more trade with most of the countries that are TPP agreement countries, I would like to support more trade today, but, as happened in the Ways and Means Committee, this rule shuts out every single attempt of Democrats to strengthen and improve this bill.

These Fast Trackers—they say they want free trade. Well how about trade that is free of secrecy and connivance? How about trade that is free of deals that jeopardize our the health and safety such as the food that we eat as American families? How about trade that is free of corporate panels that will be able to award taxpayer dollars to foreign corporations with more rights than American businesses, instead of relying on our system of justice?

I think we have to look at the trade agreements we have had in the past—the free trade agreements—and realize that, for too many American workers, they haven't been free. They have come at a tremendous cost. This trade agreement has been shrouded in secrecy in order to assure there is not a full and fair debate or a discussion of the failures of the USTR.

The USTR, as of right now, has not shared with this Congress a single document to show how Vietnam, instead of being the great human rights abuser it is today, will begin to show even the slightest measure of decency to its workers. The USTR has ignored the record of sex trafficking and human trafficking in Malaysia. One of the worst and in a category by itself with North Korea—and a handful of others—in human trafficking. And they are being rewarded in this deal.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. Too often, the USTR simply does not believe in law enforcement. It wouldn't enforce the law in Guatemala and Honduras under prior labor agreements. In Peru, it ignored the audit responsibility that it had.

We can do better than this. We can do better than some kind of Christmas

wish list of multiple objectives that this President doesn't have to follow. And indeed, this Christmas wish list is being proposed for the next President, who has not even been elected—an open-ended ability to have more trade agreements that come at the cost of too many families. We can do better.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I just love our friends who come up to the podium and talk about jobs; yet it is this administration and the Democrat policies that have taken American jobs, including ObamaCare, climate change, and all of the other rules and regulations—175,000 pages of rules and regulations—and have inhibited growth and job development in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Butler, Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), one of the most exciting new, young Members of Congress.

□ 1600

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this. We have a duty here to legislate based on truth and not on fiction. Let's establish the facts. First of all, if you want really strong trade agreements, then you have to be in a position to negotiate those because, I will tell you, my friends, if we are not at the table, we are on the menu.

As we talk about growing the economy and growing jobs and making sure that America is secure going into the future, and if you are worried about having an agreement that doesn't meet the demands that the American people are asking for, trade promotion authority is the only thing that gives us the ability to drive strong trade agreements to make sure that every single American is taken care of.

Now, this TPA does not give President Obama any new power, none whatsoever. For those of us who don't trust the President's judgment, then TPA is absolutely necessary. It is not an option. We look at things and we talk about the people's House and what the responsibility of the people's House is and how would the people's House move forward.

This puts us in the driver's seat. This allows this Congress, the people's House, to set the parameters of any future trade agreements. It does not negate them; it enforces them. So if you are worried about a strong trade agreement, then make sure that we give ourselves the power to actually set the parameters of the way a trade agreement should look.

It is time to get rid of all this bogeyman talk about what is going on. I have got to tell you, if you want the United States of America to dominate a global economy and not just participate in a global economy, then you have to have trade promotion authority. My lifetime has been spent negotiating. When you sit down at the table to actually negotiate something, the question that always came up to me: Was there anybody else other than yourself that would be responsible for

making the decision? Without that decision, without that clarity, we can't draw on strong trade agreements. TPA is the only thing that gives us that. If you want to strengthen our country, if you want to grow our economy, if you want to create new jobs for America, then we need strong trade agreements.

Now, fast track, anything but fast track. Smart track, safe track, sure track, and something that gets America's economy back on track—absolutely. Vote for TPA. Vote for American jobs. Vote for the United States of America to drive the global economy and continue to write the rules and not China.

If you really are concerned about American jobs, and if you are really concerned about America's role in the world, then don't put us behind; put us in front. Let America, with the strongest economy, drive the trade agreements. TPA gives us that, gives us the ability to grow an American economy, grow American jobs, and make America more safe and secure. And it gives our partners around the world the certainty that America has not walked away from the table; America will continue to be your strongest partner and your strongest ally to build a stronger and more safe world.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, this rule covers three bills. It covers TAA and TPA. I asked Rules to place in order a substitute bill on TPA that would have helped a full discussion of this vital issue affecting 40 percent of global GDP. Under the rule before us, if a majority does not vote for TAA, there will not be a vote on TPA tomorrow. This will give the House another opportunity to improve TPA and TAA, of which I am an author. TAA should not be a bargaining chip for a flawed TPA bill.

The third bill, Customs, weakens the TPA bill on human trafficking, prohibits any provision in TPP relating to climate, likewise as to immigration, and strikes out the Schumer provision on currency manipulation. The manager's amendment on currency is more rhetorical language without any teeth.

I urge a "no" vote on the rule.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Genoa Township, Ohio (Mr. TIBERI). He is one of our three captains that has driven this entire thing in addition to Chairman PAUL RYAN and myself. He has done an outstanding job.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership. Texas is lucky to have him.

Ladies and gentlemen, today and tomorrow, we are not voting on a trade agreement. We are not voting on a trade agreement. In fact, we are voting

on a bill called TPA, which is this. It is public. We can all read it. Our constituents can read it. We are not voting on anything today or tomorrow that we can't read, that is secret.

A lot of confusion out there. Here is what TPA is, and you have heard it before. It is a process. It is a process where Congress inserts itself to what the executive branch already can do, which is negotiate a trade agreement. But it is a process that, quite frankly, empowers the Congress. It tells the President, as the lead negotiator, this is what we would like him to do, and we are going to hold our authority, and we are going to say whatever the President negotiates, we are going to either approve it or not.

But you know what? By passing TPA, we are going to require that, whatever is negotiated, the public is given 60 days to review, which doesn't have to be done unless TPA is passed.

Mr. Chairman, I didn't have 6 hours to review ObamaCare—not 6 hours. My constituents will have 60 days before the President can sign any deal he negotiates. That is what TPA does. It inserts Congress. It inserts the American people into any trade agreement the President—this one or the next—negotiates. It empowers the people to review that process, to review that agreement—no secrecy.

This is what we are voting on tomorrow, ladies and gentlemen, TPA. Please go to congress.gov to look at it. Another day, maybe tomorrow, we will talk a little bit about what trade has done, not done, what it has done for American consumers and American employees and American businesses.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HILL). The gentlewoman from New York has 5 minutes remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Let me take 30 seconds and say, that is really great, go ahead and read the TPA, but it is the bill we are worried about, the TPP. We have to have an armed guard, practically, to go look at that.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, there really is quite a lot on the line here, despite what some speakers would submit, which is, oh, you know, this is just the TPA; it is not a big thing. No, this is a huge thing.

As a matter of fact, this particular rule we are voting on right now does three important things. One is that it has the pay-for for the trade adjustment assistance that includes cuts to Medicare. No matter how you slice it, if you vote for this rule, you are voting to cut Medicare. Then what it does, it sets up a vote for the trade adjustment assistance and trade promotion authority.

The fact is, if you go home and you try to explain to Americans, "Oh, I

didn't vote to cut Medicare," the fact is you will not be able to honestly say that. You might be able to say, "Well, I did, but then they fixed it." You might be able to say, "Well, yeah, I cut Medicare, but then later on we passed a thing and maybe MITCH MCCONNELL won't try to change it later." You can say anything you want, but the maneuverings on this floor and in this body to get us to where we are have not changed one solid fact, which is that we are voting to cut Medicare.

Now, there are all kinds of cute procedural maneuverings and different kinds of rules we are invoking, but you cannot escape the essential fact: the cut to Medicare is not going to be cut and excised out of this. If you vote for the rule, you voted to cut Medicare. Our seniors have taken enough on the chin. Do not put their livelihood at risk.

Now, let me also say that this TAA is not supported by the AFL-CIO. Trade adjustment assistance is to help workers who are displaced by bad trade deals. Wouldn't you think that the president of the AFL-CIO would say, "Yeah, well, we definitely would want TAA"? And he usually almost always does, but not this time because he knows what all of us should know, which is this trade adjustment authority is cutting Medicare.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. ELLISON. This trade adjustment authority is paid for by Medicare. It continues to be underfunded. Trade adjustment authority is underfunded. It is like if you kick somebody off their job because of a bad trade deal and then you tell them, "We are going to help you adjust to it." Well, you know what? At least we should fund it properly. Given the billions of dollars that will be made by this trade deal by multinational corporations, doesn't it make sense that we should at least try to fully fund trade adjustment authority, trade adjustment assistance? But we don't.

Then the fact is that it excludes public sector workers. Public sector workers are negatively impacted by bad trade deals, just like all other workers. Why wouldn't we include them in it? They are not included in it.

So this TAA, this trade adjustment assistance, package is insufficient. We must vote it down. I urge a "no" vote. I just want to let Members know, when you walk into that senior center and Mrs. McGillicuddy asks you, "Did you vote to cut Medicare?" I hope you can answer truthfully you did not vote to cut Medicare. Vote "no" on this rule.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers.

I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's bad trade bills have gutted our manufacturing economy, transformed our stature on the global stage,

and taken millions of jobs from American workers. Heavens to Betsy, let's not do it again. We need to demand a trade deal that will let us sell American-made goods to every customer in the world, and we need a trade bill that is negotiated through a transparent and open process that doesn't mortgage our patents, our innovation, and our future.

Let me echo what Congressman ELLISON just said. This rule, this vote right now that we are about to take, codifies, it ensures, that this money for the trade adjustment assistance will come from Medicare. That is what will go to the President. If you vote for this, you are voting for Medicare to be used in that way.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule and on the underlying bills.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I support TPA because it provides an unprecedented level of transparency. Let me be clear. A vote for TPA is a vote for jobs. It is a vote so that we can grow our economy. It is not a vote for a secret document. It is a vote to set up a process that ensures the American people understand exactly what any trade deal is before Congress votes on it. We will have 60 days to do that. TPA requires that the President make public the text of a complicated trade agreement for at least 60 days, and we are going to do just that.

Over the last few months, I have worked with Chairman PAUL RYAN and Chairman PAT TIBERI and other Members of Congress to strengthen TPA so that the President cannot hijack free trade agreements. I think it is obvious here: no one in this body really trusts the President of the United States to go and negotiate something that we would be in favor of. That is why we are making this trade TPA, so that we are following our agenda, one that we know that we have heard of. We have heard the concerns of the American people regarding immigration, climate change, currency, American sovereignty, and I think we have addressed all of these.

My constituents are just like me. They want to know that we are going to support jobs. But we do not trust the President, and that is why we are doing this deal today. This grants no new authority to the President of the United States.

Just the other day, I began working further after the Senate passed their TPA bill, and I worked with Congressman STEVE KING of Iowa to ensure that the trade agreements do not require changes to U.S. immigration laws or to obligate the United States to gain access or to extend access to visas.

We had an excellent idea, also, that we took from Senator TED CRUZ from Texas. We just strengthened it and made it more straightforward, and it is in this deal that we do.

This trade package also includes language that would prohibit the adminis-

tration from attaching any climate change commitments to a trading agreement.

□ 1615

We have also worked to guarantee that American sovereignty is upheld. TPA reflects what the Constitution requires, and that is that Congress maintain authority over any changes to U.S. law and our constitutional rights to approve any trade agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this rule. I look forward to the debate that will follow. I urge my colleagues to listen to every single bit of this, and they will understand why a vote for TPA and this rule is the right thing to do.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule to consider the Senate amendment to H.R. 644, Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015.

I strongly support legislation to update the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) as it exists today. That said, I must voice my great dismay with the inclusion of H.R. 878, the "United States Customs and Border Protection Authorization Act," in a vehicle that circumvents regular order and is under threat of veto.

Enactment of CBP authorization legislation could help clarify and enhance Congressional intent for this critical agency as well as the oversight of its activities. In the previous Congress, the Committee on Homeland Security marked up and reported such legislation, which was subsequently considered and passed by the House. Because authorizing such a large and important agency requires a thoughtful and thorough approach, H.R. 878 should have gone through regular order this Congress.

There are 10 new Members of Congress serving on the Committee on Homeland Security this Congress. Upending regular order, as the House Leadership is doing, effectively prevents my Committee and its newest members from applying the knowledge we acquired through oversight about CBP programs and activities to improving the legislation before us today.

Moreover, the text of the legislation in which these important provisions are included was just made available at midnight on Wednesday, and we are now considering it under a rule that does not allow for amendments. By limiting the ability of my Members to weigh in on the CBP Authorization provisions, even if only on the House floor, we are denied the opportunity to address changes that the Ways and Means Committee made to the text.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I support authorizing U.S. Customs and Border Protection but am deeply disappointed that the fate of this non-controversial legislation, which was overwhelmingly approved by the 113th Congress on suspension, is now tied to controversial measures that the President may well veto. This, Mr. Speaker, is no way to legislate.

Mr. SESSIONS. 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. The question is on the resolution.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. 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, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the resolution will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 217, nays 212, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 359]

YEAS—217

Abraham	Guina	Pittenger
Aderholt	Guthrie	Pitts
Allen	Hanna	Poe (TX)
Babin	Hardy	Poliquin
Barletta	Harper	Pompeo
Barr	Hartzler	Price, Tom
Barton	Heck (NV)	Ratcliffe
Benishek	Hensarling	Reed
Bilirakis	Herrera Beutler	Reichert
Bishop (MI)	Hill	Renacci
Bishop (UT)	Holding	Ribble
Black	Hudson	Rice (SC)
Blackburn	Huelskamp	Rigell
Blumenauer	Huizenga (MI)	Roby
Boehner	Hultgren	Roe (TN)
Bost	Hunter	Rogers (AL)
Boustany	Hurd (TX)	Rogers (KY)
Brady (TX)	Hurt (VA)	Rohrabacher
Brooks (IN)	Issa	Rokita
Buchanan	Jenkins (KS)	Rooney (FL)
Bucshon	Jenkins (WV)	Ros-Lehtinen
Burgess	Johnson (OH)	Roskam
Byrne	Johnson, E. B.	Ross
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Rouzer
Carter (GA)	Jolly	Royce
Carter (TX)	Joyce	Russell
Chabot	Katko	Ryan (WI)
Chaffetz	Kelly (MS)	Sanford
Coffman	Kelly (PA)	Scalise
Cole	Kind	Scott, Austin
Collins (GA)	King (IA)	Sensenbrenner
Collins (NY)	King (NY)	Sessions
Comstock	Kinzingler (IL)	Shimkus
Conaway	Kline	Shuster
Connolly	Knight	Simpson
Cook	LaMalfa	Smith (MO)
Cooper	Lamborn	Smith (NE)
Costello (PA)	Lance	Smith (NJ)
Cramer	Larsen (WA)	Smith (TX)
Crawford	Latta	Stefanik
Crenshaw	LoBiondo	Stewart
Cuellar	Long	Stivers
Culberson	Loudermilk	Thompson (PA)
Curbelo (FL)	Love	Thornberry
Davis, Rodney	Lucas	Tiberi
Delaney	Luetkemeyer	Tipton
Denham	MacArthur	Trott
Dent	Marchant	Turner
DeSantis	Marino	Upton
DesJarlais	McCarthy	Valadao
Diaz-Balart	McCaul	Wagner
Dold	McClintock	Walberg
Donovan	McHenry	Walden
Duffy	McKinley	Walker
Duncan (TN)	McMorris	Walorski
Ellmers (NC)	Rodgers	Walters, Mimi
Emmer (MN)	McSally	Weber (TX)
Farenthold	Meehan	Wenstrup
Fincher	Messer	Westerman
Fitzpatrick	Mica	Westmoreland
Fleischmann	Miller (FL)	Whitfield
Flores	Miller (MI)	Williams
Forbes	Moolenaar	Wilson (SC)
Fortenberry	Mullin	Wittman
Fox	Murphy (PA)	Womack
Frelinghuysen	Neugebauer	Woodall
Gibbs	Newhouse	Yoder
Goodlatte	Noem	Young (AK)
Granger	Nugent	Young (IA)
Graves (GA)	Nunes	Young (IN)
Graves (LA)	Olson	Zeldin
Graves (MO)	Palazzo	Zinke
Grothman	Paulsen	

NAYS—212

Adams	Garrett	Neal
Aguilar	Gibson	Nolan
Amash	Gohmert	Norcross
Ashford	Gosar	O'Rourke
Bass	Graham	Pallone
Beatty	Grayson	Palmer
Becerra	Green, Al	Pascarell
Bera	Green, Gene	Payne
Beyer	Griffith	Pearce
Bishop (GA)	Grijalva	Pelosi
Blum	Gutiérrez	Perlmutter
Bonamici	Hahn	Perry
Boyle, Brendan	Harris	Peters
F.	Hastings	Peterson
Brady (PA)	Heck (WA)	Pingree
Brat	Hice, Jody B.	Pocan
Bridenstine	Higgins	Polis
Brooks (AL)	Hinojosa	Posey
Brown (FL)	Honda	Price (NC)
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer	Quigley
Buck	Huffman	Rangel
Bustos	Israel	Rice (NY)
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Richmond
Capps	Jeffries	Rothfus
Capuano	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Cárdenas	Jones	Ruiz
Carney	Jordan	Ruppersberger
Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Rush
Cartwright	Keating	Ryan (OH)
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Salmon
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	Sánchez, Linda
Chu, Judy	Kildee	T.
Cielline	Kilmer	Sanchez, Loretta
Clark (MA)	Kirkpatrick	Sarbanes
Clarke (NY)	Kuster	Schakowsky
Clay	Laborador	Schiff
Cleaver	Langevin	Schrader
Clyburn	Larson (CT)	Schweikert
Cohen	Lawrence	Scott (VA)
Conyers	Lee	Scott, David
Costa	Levin	Serrano
Courtney	Lewis	Sewell (AL)
Crowley	Lieu, Ted	Sherman
Cummings	Lipinski	Sinema
Davis (CA)	Loeb sack	Sires
Davis, Danny	Lofgren	Slaughter
DeFazio	Lowenthal	Smith (WA)
DeGette	Lowe	Speier
DeLauro	Lujan Grisham	Stutzman
DelBene	(NM)	Swalwell (CA)
DeSaulnier	Luján, Ben Ray	Takai
Deutsch	(NM)	Takano
Dingell	Lummis	Thompson (MS)
Doggett	Lynch	Titus
Doyle, Michael	Maloney,	Tonko
F.	Carolyn	Torres
Duckworth	Maloney, Sean	Tsongas
Duncan (SC)	Massie	Van Hollen
Edwards	Matsui	Vargas
Ellison	McCollum	Veasey
Engel	McDermott	Vela
Eshoo	McGovern	Velázquez
Esty	McNerney	Visclosky
Farr	Meadows	Walz
Fattah	Meeks	Wasserman
Fleming	Meng	Schultz
Foster	Mooney (WV)	Waters, Maxine
Frankel (FL)	Moore	Watson Coleman
Franks (AZ)	Moulton	Webster (FL)
Fudge	Mulvaney	Welch
Gabbard	Murphy (FL)	Wilson (FL)
Gallego	Nadler	Yarmuth
Garamendi	Napolitano	Yoho

NOT VOTING—5

Amodei	Gowdy	Thompson (CA)
Clawson (FL)	Himes	

□ 1650

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mrs. WALORSKI, Messrs. WITTMAN, BLUMENAUER, DELANEY, and ROHRABACHER 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.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 239, nays 172, answered "present" 1, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 360]

AYES—239

Abraham	Esty	Maloney,
Adams	Farr	Carolyn
Aderholt	Fattah	Marino
Allen	Fincher	Massie
Barletta	Fleischmann	McCarthy
Barton	Fortenberry	McCaul
Becerra	Franks (AZ)	McClintock
Bilirakis	Frelinghuysen	McCollum
Bishop (GA)	Gabbard	McHenry
Bishop (UT)	Gallego	McKinley
Black	Goodlatte	McMorris
Blackburn	Graham	Rodgers
Blum	Granger	McNerney
Blumenauer	Grayson	McSally
Bonamici	Grothman	Meadows
Boustany	Guthrie	Meehan
Brady (TX)	Hahn	Meng
Brat	Hardy	Mica
Bridenstine	Harper	Miller (MI)
Brooks (AL)	Harris	Moolenaar
Brooks (IN)	Hartzler	Mooney (WV)
Brown (FL)	Heck (WA)	Moulton
Buchanan	Hensarling	Mullin
Bustos	Higgins	Nadler
Butterfield	Hill	Newhouse
Byrne	Himes	Noem
Calvert	Hinojosa	Nunes
Capps	Hoyer	O'Rourke
Carney	Huelskamp	Olson
Carson (IN)	Huffman	Palmer
Carter (TX)	Hultgren	Pascarell
Cartwright	Hurd (TX)	Pelosi
Castro (TX)	Hurt (VA)	Perlmutter
Chabot	Johnson (GA)	Perry
Chu, Judy	Johnson, Sam	Pingree
Cielline	Jolly	Pocan
Clay	Kaptur	Polis
Cleaver	Katko	Pompeo
Cohen	Keating	Posey
Cole	Kelly (MS)	Price (NC)
Comstock	Kelly (PA)	Quigley
Conaway	Kennedy	Rangel
Conyers	Kildee	Reichert
Cook	King (IA)	Ribble
Cooper	King (NY)	Roby
Courtney	Kline	Roe (TN)
Cramer	Knight	Rogers (KY)
Crawford	Kuster	Rokita
Crenshaw	Labrador	Rooney (FL)
Crowley	LaMalfa	Roskam
Cuellar	Lamborn	Ross
Culberson	Larsen (WA)	Rothfus
Cummings	Larson (CT)	Royce
Curbelo (FL)	Latta	Ruiz
Davis (CA)	Lawrence	Ruppersberger
Davis, Danny	Lipinski	Russell
DeLauro	Loeb sack	Ryan (WI)
DelBene	Lofgren	Salmon
Dent	Long	Sanford
DeSaulnier	Loudermilk	Scalise
DesJarlais	Lowenthal	Schweikert
Deutsch	Lowe	Scott (VA)
Dingell	Lucas	Scott, Austin
Doggett	Luetkemeyer	Scott, David
Donovan	Lujan Grisham	Sensenbrenner
Duncan (TN)	(NM)	Serrano
Edwards	Luján, Ben Ray	Sessions
Emmer (MN)	(NM)	Shimkus
Engel	Lummis	Shuster
Eshoo		Simpson