

Smith (NE)	Titus	Westerman
Smith (NJ)	Trott	Westmoreland
Smith (TX)	Upton	Whitfield
Smith (WA)	Van Hollen	Williams
Speier	Wagner	Wilson (SC)
Stefanik	Walorski	Womack
Stewart	Walters, Mimi	Yarmuth
Stutzman	Wasserman	Young (IA)
Takai	Schultz	Young (IN)
Takano	Waters, Maxine	Zeldin
Thornberry	Webster (FL)	Zinke
Tiberi	Welch	

NOES—172

Aguilar	Griffith	Paulsen
Amash	Guinta	Payne
Babin	Gutiérrez	Peters
Barr	Hanna	Peterson
Beatty	Hastings	Pittenger
Benishek	Heck (NV)	Poe (TX)
Bera	Herrera Beutler	Poliquin
Beyer	Hice, Jody B.	Price, Tom
Bishop (MI)	Holding	Ratcliffe
Bost	Honda	Reed
Boyle, Brendan F.	Hudson	Renacci
Brady (PA)	Huizenga (MI)	Rice (NY)
Brownley (CA)	Hunter	Rice (SC)
Buck	Israel	Richmond
Bucshon	Issa	Rigell
Burgess	Jackson Lee	Rogers (AL)
Capuano	Jeffries	Rohrabacher
Cárdenas	Jenkins (KS)	Ros-Lehtinen
Carter (GA)	Jenkins (WV)	Rouzer
Castor (FL)	Johnson (OH)	Royal-Allard
Chaffetz	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Clark (MA)	Jones	Sánchez, Linda T.
Clarke (NY)	Jordan	Sanchez, Loretta
Clyburn	Joyce	Sarbanes
Coffman	Kelly (IL)	Schakowsky
Connolly	Kilmer	Schiff
Costa	Kind	Schrader
Costello (PA)	Kinzinger (IL)	Sewell (AL)
Davis, Rodney	Kirkpatrick	Lance
DeFazio	Lance	Sherman
DeGette	Langevin	Sinema
Delaney	Lee	Sires
Denham	Levin	Slaughter
DeSantis	Lewis	Smith (MO)
Diaz-Balart	Lieu, Ted	Stivers
Dold	LoBiondo	Swalwell (CA)
Duckworth	Love	Thompson (MS)
Duffy	Lynch	Thompson (PA)
Duncan (SC)	MacArthur	Tipton
Ellison	Maloney, Sean	Tsongas
Farenthold	Marchant	Turner
Fitzpatrick	Matsui	Valadão
Fleming	McDermott	Vargas
Flores	McGovern	Veasey
Forbes	Messer	Vela
Foxx	Miller (FL)	Velázquez
Fudge	Moore	Visclosky
Garamendi	Mulvaney	Walberg
Garrett	Murphy (FL)	Walden
Gibbs	Murphy (PA)	Walker
Gibson	Napolitano	Watson Coleman
Gosar	Neal	Weber (TX)
Graves (GA)	Neugebauer	Wenstrup
Graves (LA)	Nolan	Wilson (FL)
Graves (MO)	Norcross	Wittman
Green, Al	Nugent	Woodall
Green, Gene	Palazzo	Yoder
	Pallone	Yoho

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Gohmert

NOT VOTING—21

Amodei	Ellmers (NC)	Ryan (OH)
Ashford	Foster	Thompson (CA)
Bass	Frankel (FL)	Tonko
Clawson (FL)	Gowdy	Torres
Collins (GA)	Grijalva	Walz
Collins (NY)	Meeks	Young (AK)
Doyle, Michael F.	Pearce	
	Pitts	

□ 1657

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1700

FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY AND FLORIDA POWER AND LIGHT PARTNERSHIP

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

Mr. CURBELLO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the newly announced partnership with Florida International University, a nationally respected institution of higher learning in my district, and Florida Power and Light.

FIU and FPL are working toward providing cleaner energy solutions to south Florida, something I wholeheartedly support. The project involves the installation of more than 5,700 solar panels on 23 canopy-like structures that will be constructed over the next few months in FIU's engineering center parking lot. Engineering students at FIU will directly monitor the amount of energy generated from these solar panels and the effects they have on the electricity grid that provides power for south Florida.

It was recently announced that FPL, which already is the largest generator of solar energy in Florida, is expected to triple its presence in the business by 2016. Such an undertaking is only possible with talented and capable students, and I am glad to see FPL is helping to train a new generation of engineers that will create fresh solutions for our energy needs.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate FIU and FPL on their partnership and wish them success. I look forward to visiting the campus soon and seeing the progress being made.

OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS

(Ms. DUCKWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, this year's Defense Appropriations bill relies on adding an additional \$38 billion into the overseas contingency operations account, the OCO account. This budgeting gimmick is an end around to sequestration. It avoids the hard work that is required to reach a budget agreement and repeal sequestration once and for all. OCO funds are supposed to be used for war operations, and their use in the legislation misleads the American people.

The sequester cuts continue to have devastating impact on our schools, our Nation's infrastructure, and our investments in scientific research. Now is the time to fix this sequester, not deceive the American people about defense spending.

Our servicemembers and their families deserve to know their future more than just 1 year at a time. As a nation, we need to base our military strategy on an appropriate, long-term defense

spending plan, not a budgetary gimmick.

Mr. Speaker, I voted for this legislation because we cannot leave our troops who are currently in harm's way without funding. As the appropriations process moves forward, I urge my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to provide our military with the long-term support it needs and the American people with the transparency that they deserve.

IN MEMORY OF LOWELL ROBINSON

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, tonight I rise in fond memory of a friend from Nevada County, Lowell Robinson, who is a community icon who passed away just recently at age 86.

Born in Nevada City in April 1929, his entrepreneurial career started in 1949 when he designed equipment for a local sawmill. A few years later, he began the logging business known as Robinson & Sons. In 1971, he helped establish Robinson Enterprises, which includes gold mining, road construction, logging, and petroleum distribution and sales.

Mr. Robinson was an active supporter, in many ways, of the Nevada County community. Indeed, he was a very kind gentleman, liked by everybody, and his legacy will be felt for many, many years in the work he did for helping United Way, FFA, 4-H, Boy Scouts. Just about anything worth doing, he was involved with in Nevada County, including my own personal travels.

This little old Indian Springs school still stands where he attended and his family owns. I hope some day they can renovate it in his honor.

So I join the community of Nevada County in mourning this loss, a great friend, a personal friend of mine who was always a kindhearted person whom you just got along great with. Our condolences go out to Wanda and his whole family.

ADMINISTRATION'S FOREIGN POLICY IS A SERIOUS MISCALCULATION

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have generally admired President Obama's bold foreign policy decisions. However, the administration's latest announcement to send an additional 450 U.S. military advisers to Iraq and to arm the Sunni tribes, the Shia forces, and the Kurdish Peshmerga, alike, is a grave misjudgment.

Arming the Sunni tribes could undermine Iraqi Prime Minister Abadi and the central government the U.S. is trying desperately to prop up. Sunni assistance may, in turn, push Iran to

more aggressively arm their Shia militias in Iraq.

Worse still, arming the Shia fighters will further inflame Iraq's deep sectarian divide, which ISIS has exploited so skillfully. The Kurdish Peshmerga is perhaps the only reliable and ready force deserving of U.S. military assistance, but no amount of heavy weaponry will defeat ISIS without a concerted political settlement both in Baghdad and Damascus.

All of this comes just days after President Obama has said, yet again, we do not have a complete strategy to defeat ISIS in Iraq or Syria.

The U.S. has few palpable options when it comes to untangling the region's current chaos. However, the administration's current strategy "to arm everyone and let God sort them out" is a serious miscalculation.

FAST TRACK

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOST). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am going to address the issues that we will be voting on tomorrow: trade adjustment assistance and the trade promotion authority, or fast track.

I know that a number of my colleagues are within the sound of my voice, and I hope that if they share my views on these issues they will come down to the floor and invite me to yield them time. Until then, I am going to first focus on the trade adjustment assistance bill that will be before us tomorrow.

There are so many reasons to vote against trade adjustment assistance in this form, even if it was a freestanding bill. First, it is inadequate. It has got roughly \$450 million, and there is no assurance that that money will be available next year or the year after that.

We know that the majority of this House is actually opposed to funding this program at all. They are doing it in an effort to pass fast track. Once fast track is passed, every effort will be made on this floor to cut this program to zero. Bait and switch, you have been warned.

Second, this amount of money, who is supposed to be eligible? The proponents of fast track have said, well, we have expanded those who are eligible, not just those who lose their jobs because of the Trans-Pacific Partnership trade deal we are planning, not just those who lost their job because of NAFTA, but everybody who has lost their job because of globalization in any of its forms. Well, that is also a bait and switch.

They are able to tell tens of millions of Americans you are going to be eligible for this program, but the program has only \$450 million in it nationwide. So it is like you win because we give

you a lottery ticket, and then we determine whether you will be one of the very small percentage of those who have lost their job due to globalization who benefit from the program.

This program is inadequate. It also explicitly contains language excluding any public sector employee from a benefit. Imagine that great unfairness. If you are at a public university and somehow grading of tests is offshore, you can't benefit. But if you are at a private university, same job, same offshoring, whether it be a call center or any of the other services that can be offshore in today's modern age, you could possibly—you are probably not going to get anything—but you can, at least, apply for a benefit.

The exclusion of the public sector may have made sense 40 or 50 years ago when only manufacturing jobs were subject to foreign competition. Today, anything that is done on the Internet, anything that is done on the phone, anything that is part of the information economy is a job that can be taken offshore. It is going to be very difficult for Members of this House to explain that they voted for a program that slapped in the face those who lose their jobs because it is a public sector job.

The biggest problem with TAA is that it cuts Medicare two different ways. One way we are told is an acceptable way to cut Medicare, and the other we are told isn't going to really happen. It is actually two cuts to Medicare.

The first that they say they have ironed out is the \$700 million cut to Medicare that will, under the rule just passed in this House by a small majority, graft itself onto the Trade Adjustment Assistance bill if that bill unfortunately passes. So you will be in a position to explain why you voted for a bill, knowing full well that as soon as it passed, a \$700 million cut to Medicare was grafted on it and that the President would have on his desk and intended to sign a bill that cut Medicare by \$700 million.

Now, you can present a complicated chart showing how you voted for Trade Adjustment Assistance but you didn't vote for the rule, and the cut for Medicare was supposed to be undone by the other bill that you voted for before you voted against it. And if you are able to make that explanation, more power to you.

But if you are a Democrat, you will be in a particularly weak position to make that explanation, because the AFL-CIO issued a letter today that said a vote for Trade Adjustment Assistance in this form with this rule in this "here you see it, now you don't; we will take it away, don't worry about it" Medicare cut is a cut to Medicare. So you are going to be explaining why your opponent's attack on you is unfair when you are a Democrat and you say it is unfair, but the AFL-CIO says it is not only fair, it is absolutely true. A special problem for Democrats. Repub-

licans will not have the difficulty in explaining why they disagree with the AFL-CIO.

Then there is a Medicare cut that is supposed to become law. This is the dialysis cut, and here is the thinking: Medicare will be more efficient in dealing with dialysis. We pass a statute that allows them to make use of clinics instead of hospitals. So through new procedures and new technology, Medicare will save roughly \$250 million.

Okay. Does Medicare keep that savings? No. It is used to buy votes for fast track.

Now, how is Medicare going to be sustained if every time new technology allows Medicare to save money, we take the savings and use it for something else, but every time new technology creates new medical costs, new things for Medicare to pay for, well, Medicare has to pay for them?

If we establish a principle that every new technology that saves Medicare money is money to be spent on something else and every change in medical technology that increases Medicare's cost has to come out of Medicare, Medicare will be bankrupt and will go bankrupt more quickly as we change medicine.

□ 1715

That cut is supposed to become law if you vote for TAA, but TAA is on this floor for only one reason. It is a way to put a bandaid on a giant decapitation of the American middle class, a tiny program designed to facilitate the passage of a trade bill which will govern 40 percent of the world's GDP.

Don't be in enabler. Do not go back home and say you opposed fast track, but that you voted for the bill that will enable fast track. If you are against fast track, then you have got to vote "no" on TAA.

Well, what about fast track? What about this new Asia deal that is being negotiated? In the past, the proponents of these trade deals have come forward and said that they were going to reduce our trade deficit and create more jobs than will be lost.

For this deal, they don't even make that assertion. Their bait and switch is to say it will create some jobs in exports, but they are so arithmetically challenged, they don't then subtract out the jobs that will be lost to imports.

The fact is that time and again the proponents of our current trade policy have wildly misestimated the job effect of each action. For example, on this floor, we were told that the trade agreement with South Korea would reduce our trade deficit. That deficit has skyrocketed. We were told that permanent most favored nation status for China would increase our trade deficit by only \$1 billion. The proponents were off by 30,000 percent.

Now, they don't even say that we are going to get more jobs than we will lose; they simply say the jobs we lose don't count because that involves subtraction. The fact is that this is bad for