

1.3 million. That is the number of private sector jobs that have been created by the Bank since 2009, with no additional cost to the American taxpayer. In fact, it makes money to help us pay down our debt.

And, finally, zero. That is what we gain by killing our Bank. Zero. We don't get the revenue. We don't get the jobs. We don't get to export our goods. Let's renew it.

REMEMBERING DOMENIC D'AMBROSIO

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

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, today I come to the floor of the House with a heavy heart. This past weekend, the city of Lynn lost a dedicated public servant, a tireless local volunteer, and an inspiring advocate for the people of our community. Domenic D'Ambrosio, known by many as Dom, was loved by many for his uncanny ability to connect with people. Whether they were old friends or someone he was meeting for the first time, Dom's compassion for others was contagious, encouraging all of us to be better members of our community.

At a time when public opinion of Congress is at an all-time low, Dom's belief in this institution and the power of the democratic process could not have been stronger. I thank him for bringing a reinvigorating energy to our Nation's political dialogue and for reminding us why we are so fortunate to have a free and democratic government, and why we should all take part in making it better.

My thoughts and prayers are with his wife, Kelly, his family, and friends. The Sixth District of Massachusetts lost a true champion, but I know that his legacy will live on through our shared commitment to public service. Dom, you will be missed.

JUNE IS ALZHEIMER'S AND BRAIN AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the month of June as Alzheimer's and Brain Awareness Month. Approximately 340,000 Texans and 5.4 million Americans currently have Alzheimer's disease. One in nine Americans over 65 is projected to develop Alzheimer's, and it is the sixth-leading cause of death in the United States.

The rapidly growing number of older Americans will lead to a corresponding rapid growth in the prevalence of Alzheimer's disease. The devastating emotional and financial impact of this debilitating disease is known by too many. My mother-in-law battled this disease, so I know firsthand how difficult it can be for patients and their loved ones.

I strongly support efforts to advocate and raise awareness and robust funding for research to find treatments and cure for this disease. Congress has a real opportunity to dramatically impact the lives of millions of Americans by funding research and outreach programs for Alzheimer's.

I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing the month of June as Alzheimer's and Brain Awareness Month. Together we can help turn the world purple for Alzheimer's, and by doing so, promote care, support, and research of this terrible disease.

REAUTHORIZE THE EXPORT- IMPORT BANK

(Ms. TITUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge Republican leadership to stop blocking the will of the House and immediately call for a vote to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank, set to expire June 30.

This May I hosted Fred Hochberg, chairman of the Ex-Im Bank, in my district to tour Innova Technologies, a leader in civil-structural engineering and one of 32 Nevada companies working with the Bank. At a time when our local economy was fighting to recover from the recession and unemployment was rampant, the Bank provided critical support that allowed Innova not just to survive but nearly double its workforce.

In 2014 alone, the Bank supported 164,000 jobs and reduced the Federal deficit by \$675 million. In Nevada, it helped increase our export value by \$165 million. Now is the time for a long-term reauthorization to renew, reenergize, and reform the Bank so it can continue supporting businesses and creating jobs in Nevada and across the country.

MAKING IN ORDER AT ANY TIME CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 55, REMOVAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM IRAQ AND SYRIA

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time to consider H. Con. Res. 55 in the House if called up by the chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or his designee; that the concurrent resolution be considered as read; and that the previous question be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question, except for 2 hours of debate equally divided among and controlled by Representative ROYCE of California, Representative ENGEL of New York, and Representative MCGOVERN of Massachusetts or their respective designees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore 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 16, 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 16, 2015 at 11:02 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 565.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

□ 1230

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2596, INTELLIGENCE AU- THORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 315 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 315

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2596) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in this section and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-19. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in

the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on the recorded vote ordered on the question of reconsideration of the vote on the question of concurring in the matter comprising the remainder of title II of the Senate amendment to H.R. 1314 may continue to be postponed through the legislative day of Thursday, July 30, 2015.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), 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. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on House Resolution 315, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring forward today this rule on behalf of the Rules Committee. This rule provides for a robust amendment debate on a wide variety of issues related to the authorization of funds for 16 intelligence agencies.

This rule provides for the consideration of H.R. 2596, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. The Rules Committee met on this measure yesterday evening and heard testimony from both the chairman of the committee and the ranking member, in addition to receiving amendment testimony from multiple Members.

This rule brought forward by the committee is a structured rule. There were 29 amendments in total submitted to the Rules Committee. Of those 29, I am pleased that the full House will debate and vote on 16 of those amendments, over half that were submitted.

The majority of the amendments made in order are bipartisan, a fact demonstrating the unity of this body in advancing funds that will go directly to fighting against terrorism proliferation and weapons of mass destruction.

“To provide for the common defense” is a common phrase to us all, and one that clearly sets forth the more basic responsibility of our government, a responsibility that the members of the Rules Committee, the Intelligence Committee, and, yes, I believe the entire House do not take lightly.

This rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

As most of the intelligence budget involves highly classified programs, all Members were given the opportunity to review the classified annexes to the underlying legislation prior to Rules Committee consideration.

Members should also be aware that section 2 of the rule provides that the motion to reconsider the vote on Trade Adjustment Assistance, or title II of the Senate amendment to H.R. 1314, may continue to be postponed through Thursday, July 30, 2015.

This postponement was necessary to allow House and Senate leadership, in addition to the President, sufficient time to consider legislative options related to this action on trade promotion authority and Trade Adjustment Assistance.

I am proud of the work undertaken by the Intelligence Committee to advance this vitally important legislation whose consideration is provided for by this rule.

There are a few key provisions that I want to ensure Members are aware of because I believe they speak to the overwhelming awareness the Intelligence Committee possesses of the responsibility of Congress to protect this Nation from terrorism, and also of our unwavering fidelity to the United States Constitution.

First, section 302 of the underlying legislation provides that the authorization of appropriations by this act shall not be deemed to constitute authority for the conduct of any intelligence activity that is not otherwise authorized by the Constitution or the laws of the United States.

Sections 303 and 304 require specific elements of the executive branch to provide Congress with timely notifying requirements on key intelligence activities. Congressional notification requirements generally remain a vitally important mechanism to ensure that Congress is able to conduct robust oversight.

Notification requirements specific to the intelligence community are even more essential, given the classified and delicate nature of the situations our intelligence agencies face every day.

The classification of documents and the decisionmaking factors that go into such classification have historically been an area of great interest and, at times, concerns by Members of this body and the citizens that we represent.

In response to the valid concerns and interest by Members and the public at

large, in the Intelligence Committee’s report on H.R. 2596, they specifically state that the committee “seeks to improve its visibility into the classification process and better understand how the intelligence community determines the classification level of especially sensitive reporting and analysis.”

In the underlying legislation, the committee carries out this goal by directing the Director of National Intelligence to provide, within 60 days of the enactment, a report to the congressional intelligence committees outlining each instance in the past 5 years that the Office of Director of National Intelligence or any other entity within the executive branch directed an element of the intelligence community to begin disseminating existing un compartmented intelligence reporting or analysis through a compartment or subcompartment.

This requirement is just one of several additional reporting requirements in the legislation to serve to enhance Congress’ role in and understanding of the classification process, again, emphasizing Congress’ oversight role. The committee has done a good job in clarifying that.

The underlying legislation also directs the Central Intelligence Agency to provide the congressional intelligence committees with all intelligence reports based on the documents collected in the May 1, 2011, raid that killed Osama bin Laden.

We live in a dangerous world and face constant and evolving threats from terrorist groups like al Qaeda, Boko Haram, al Shabaab, and ISIS. These groups successfully use the Internet to anonymously build their resources, both human and financial.

The United States Government must maintain and enhance their ability to counter extremists online. By understanding how and where terrorist groups operate, we can more effectively fight for freedom at home and abroad. I am pleased to see strong provisions in the legislation that will further this goal.

These provisions that I have just spoken of are just a few examples of the thoughtful and difficult work the Intelligence Committee undertook to bring forward this legislation that authorizes critical national security functions while staying within the funding constraints of the Budget Control Act, or BCA.

I want to thank the Intelligence Committee and their staff for their hard work on the authorization measure.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman, my friend from Georgia, for yielding the customary 30 minutes for debate.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for consideration of H.R. 2596, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, as well as provides that the

motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the Trade Adjustment Assistance measure may continue to be postponed until the end of the legislative day on July 30.

First, I commend the efforts of Chairman NUNES and Ranking Member SCHIFF for their effort in crafting a bill with largely bipartisan support that provides our Nation's intelligence community with the resources they need to keep us safe. Our national security relies on the continued strength of our intelligence community.

As we face ongoing security challenges both at home and abroad from threats such as ISIL, lone wolf attacks, the emergence of cybercrime, as well as the specter of unknown challenges that may be awaiting us, a strong intelligence apparatus is of the utmost importance.

This legislation will do much to meet those challenges. Specifically, this bill supports investments in cutting-edge technology like spy satellites, enhances our Nation's human intelligence capabilities, provides resources to safeguard valuable signals intelligence collection, and partners with our foreign allies to maximize the reach of our intelligence efforts.

This investment in our country's intelligence infrastructure comes at a critically important time. As you know, the Office of Personnel Management recently suffered a disastrous breach. Hackers were able to target OPM and gain access to personnel data, including employees' names, addresses, Social Security numbers, and numerous other personal details.

Perhaps most disturbing, OPM houses the applications and files submitted by those applying for security clearances, with data going back until 1985. These files were compromised as well, leading some experts to argue that the compromise of these files could have tremendous negative effects for our human intelligence gathering capabilities.

These cyber attacks represent a critical threat to our national security. We all love the convenience that technology provides us, but we must also be prepared to invest in technologies that will protect us from those who wish to sabotage our security in the virtual world. It is time for the OPM to implement and abide by best practices so that we never face a data breach like the one we saw last week.

To the extent that Congress will play a role in securing our virtual infrastructure, we should work as quickly as possible to ensure that our employees and our most sensitive material are not needlessly exposed to those who wish to do us harm.

Mr. Speaker, while I support the strong national security protections this authorization provides, I am extremely disappointed yet again in how my Republican colleagues have skirted the fiscal cuts imposed by sequestration in order to fund the things that they care about, while ignoring the ef-

fects such fool-headed cuts have on the vital domestic programs that they don't seem to care about. We have people hurting all over this Nation because of this irresponsible and senseless policy of sequestration.

Republicans claim to be using this policy as an important tool to rein in out-of-control government spending; yet, when sequestration affects programs and areas of the budget they care about, they magically get around this dilemma by using accounting gimmicks.

That is just what they have done here in this measure. The majority has yet again used the overseas contingency operations account to evade sequestration spending caps.

Wouldn't it be nice if Republicans wanted to evade spending caps for the Department of Education so that we can get around sequestration and properly educate our children? Or if they could use accounting tricks to get around sequestration to fully fund and repair our crumbling infrastructure? Or if they were also inclined to use their budgetary magic to get around sequestration caps to properly fund critically important agencies like the Environmental Protection Agency so that our children and grandchildren can continue to have access to clean water and clean air?

Alas, all we get from the majority is more of the same budgetary double standard, using tricks to get around spending caps on things you like to spend money on and then cry, "sequester, sequester," on things you don't like to spend money on.

□ 1245

Let's stop pretending. That isn't a plan to rein in government spending. That is just spending taxpayer money on things you deem worthy of unfettered spending and ignoring programs, for political reasons, that you don't even like, even though such programs remain vital to our country's success.

Mr. Speaker, many on my side of the aisle have taken issue with the detention facility in Guantanamo Bay since day one; I certainly have. Once again, the Republicans look to continue the operation of this prison, when we should be working to bring about its orderly closure.

We are better than this prison. As a country dedicated to the rule of law, as a country that inspires people the world over to work for and even die for the establishment of democratic rule, we are better than this prison. This prison is an exercise in Kafkaesque justice, which has long worked to undermine our standing with our allies and helped terrorist organizations recruit more and more fighters.

Look, I don't think that anyone is arguing that, if we close the prison, then the myriad terrorist groups who use it as a recruiting tool will no longer have people joining their ranks, but it would be one less arrow in their quiver.

For that reason, we need to work together to close the prison as quickly as

possible. In doing so, we will not jeopardize the safety of our country, but will act more fully to reflect our commitment to democracy and the rule of law.

We know and I know, having been in the judiciary, that our justice system is more than capable of handling the prosecution of terrorists, no matter where they are, including those held in Guantanamo Bay.

We have successfully tried Richard Reid, Umar Farouk Abdulmutallab, Faisal Shahzad, and Dzhokhar Tsarnaev—the Boston bomber—and we have either sentenced them to death or life imprisonment in our most secure prisons.

At last night's Rules Committee meeting, my friends on the other side of the aisle decided to make a last-minute change to today's rule—or, I might add, to further pollute today's rule. That last-minute change allows for the postponement of the motion to reconsider TAA.

Over the course of my tenure in Congress, I voted to support thousands of pieces of legislation. In the 20-plus years that I have served in this body, I can think of only three votes which I deeply regret making, and one of those was in support of NAFTA.

In the years since, I have seen after NAFTA a decrease in American jobs, a rollback of critical environmental protections here and in Mexico, where I was promised that the environmental circumstances in the maquiladoras would be cleaned up and they were not and a stagnation of wages that has prevented the financial upward mobility of working class and middle class Americans and has ground poor Americans into poverty beyond belief.

If we are going to create trade policy that is worthy of future generations, then we must ensure that that policy strengthens, not weakens, labor rights. It must strengthen, not weaken, environmental protections. It must ensure other countries' responsibility to adhere to basic human rights. It must expand and strengthen our middle class, not squeeze hard-working Americans in favor of corporate interests.

The legislation included in this rule today is part of a trade package that does nothing to bolster these important priorities.

Finally, as I have stated time and again, I take issue with the manner in which these important measures are being considered. Legislation as important as the ones at hand deserve an open and transparent process where Members of both parties and both Houses of Congress may debate and offer amendments as they please.

This process, envisioned and designed by our Founding Fathers to serve as a safeguard to democracy, continues to be eroded by the majority's insistence on grouping multiple, unrelated bills together under one rule and limiting the number of amendments that can be made in order, as well as the time available for debate.

There were amendments offered last night. For example, Congresswoman SPEIER offered whistleblower protection, not made in order. My colleague Representative SCHWEIKERT from Arizona and I offered a very sensible measure under the intelligence provision to allow for us, as a sense of Congress only, to say that we will participate with Tunisia's intelligence operation in a more pronounced manner—totally innocuous, but at the very same time, helping a country that may very well make the bridge to democracy and certainly has been an ally in intelligence—and a needed one, in light of the number of people that come up from north Africa through Tunisia and wind up fighting in the Middle East.

If we are truly to operate as the deliberative body the U.S. House of Representatives was created to function as, we must do more to ensure that our Nation's most critical pieces of legislation are afforded the time and consideration they rightly deserve.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Florida. One of the things that I, coming on to the Rules Committee, have found is really the vigorous debates that we do have—and the gentleman from Florida, we have had many of those, and that is a good place for it.

It is a good place for it also here on the floor to discuss what really, as was focused on very clearly, is a rule for a bill, and then there is a procedural issue that we are extending the TAA reconsideration until July 30. I am understanding what he is saying, but I do want to make Members clear that is what is happening.

We are working on the majority side for a process that is open. Sixteen amendments are going to be made in order, and they are going to be debated right here on the floor of this House and voted. I think that is what the Republican majority is focused on.

One of the things that came up—and I want it to be clear, Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman brings up a point. It is about priorities. It is about priorities. When we are dealing with authorizations and spending bills, is what we are dealing with in the majority here, we have made it very clear, I believe, from the Republican majority standpoint, although I personally and others may have discussions on how we use overseas contingency funds, and those have been debated on this floor and should be continued to be debated on this floor.

However, one of the things that we are doing, and I believe, from our perspective, is we are putting priorities first—priorities for national defense; securing our national interest; and in light of this bill, making sure that our country is safe, abroad and here, from attacks from people who don't like us.

I don't buy the argument—and the debate on Guantanamo is a different issue—but the argument that if we closed it up, it takes away one recruiting piece. I am sorry. Boko Haram, al Qaeda, these others do not hate us only because of a prison; they just hate us because we are free. They hate us because we have a society that is open.

I understand the debate that we want to have, but let's make it crystal clear. There was no Guantanamo when they rammed planes into our World Trade Center. There was no Guantanamo at that time. They just don't like us. Let's make that very clear.

Funding is appropriate. We will debate those entirely upon this House and continue to. The Republicans will still look out for jobs and those working in the middle class, and those that are trying to find their families' priorities in their own economic sphere and looking at it in a country that is in debt and trying to make sure we make good fiscal decisions.

Our priorities are that we help businesses start, we encourage the creation of jobs, not a government strangulation of jobs, and that is what resources do.

With this bill, it is very focused, though. This is about our intelligence community. This is a rule that supports an authorization coming from a very difficult community that does a very difficult job. We are supporting a rule that funds those agencies so that it keeps us safe and does the things that keeps America free. That is the continued argument that we will continue to have.

I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, the other debates that we want to have here, but let's be focused. This rule is about that. It is also about a policy decision or a procedural decision in this rule.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, the vote on Trade Adjustment Assistance failed in the House of Representatives last Friday by a 3-1 margin; yet this rule today would extend the revote on Trade Adjustment Assistance through the end of July. This is one more attempt to play games with the future of hard-working families.

American workers demand and they deserve respect. They deserve a living wage and the right not to have their jobs shipped overseas. That is what we are united in fighting for.

A vote for this rule is a vote for fast track. A vote for fast track is a vote against jobs and against wages.

United States trade policy has been failing American workers, failing American consumers and families for 20 years.

The U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement has already cost up to 75,000 jobs, and it was just passed 3 years ago. Up to 5 million jobs have been destroyed

by currency manipulation; and a number of the signatories to this trade agreement, their policy is to manipulate their currency to have their goods sold at a lower price than American goods, putting American workers out of jobs and lowering their wages.

Joseph Stiglitz, the Nobel Laureate in Economics, has written: "Inequality is not inevitable. It is a choice that we make with the rules that we create to structure our economy."

Trade policy is one of those choices. If we approve fast track, we throw away our ability, our constitutional authority to represent the people who sent us here in good faith. We throw away that ability to be able to fix the flaws in the trade agreement, like the Trans-Pacific Partnership, to the detriment of millions of American families.

I urge a "no" vote on this rule.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Friday, this House sent a strong message to the Fast-Trackers: Not so fast.

Forty-eight hours ago, Republican leaders were telling the world that, at this moment, we would be voting to approve Fast Track; but now, the Fast-Trackers have become backtrackers, pushing back the vote.

The only reason that they seek this postponement in this rule of up to 6 weeks is that they do not have the votes to approve Fast Track today, and the only way they can get those votes today is to use this strange shenanigan of connecting it and cloaking it in a rule for the authorization of our intelligence agencies.

After Friday's Fast Track vote, one official said those who "vote against this Trade Adjustment Assistance are adding their names to the death certificate for [it]." Well, let's play it straight for a change. TAA is not authorized now. It expired last year. Its future depends, not upon this authorization, but upon an adequate level of funding.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act, and many more have not been authorized for years, but they continue to operate perfectly well, based upon appropriated funds. This TAA argument is phony.

□ 1300

Really, it doesn't take much intelligence to see what is happening here. These Fast-Trackers are desperate, and this postponement vote for this extent, of this nature, is unprecedented in the history of this Congress. It has never happened before in American history that someone has asked to postpone a vote for up to 6 weeks.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. And understand what that means. Understand that they are looking for the ideal time—morning, noon, or night—to muscle through a broken trade policy that a majority of this House and of the American people do not want.

This rule provides that the Speaker at any time of day can come with no notice, no debate, and say, we are voting to send this bill to the President's desk.

What really needs adjusting is not trade assistance but the no-compromise, no-amendment attitude on trade that gives us broken trade policies.

This vote wouldn't be so close if this process hadn't been so closed.

Reject this rule. Vote for democracy. Don't change the precedents of the House. Don't let this be muscled through.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT), my good friend.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen, what is about to happen on this floor with this rule is a direct violation of the United States Constitution; for in the United States Constitution, it clearly says that the United States Congress shall have the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations." And in this rule is a clear violation of that.

We already voted it down overwhelmingly 302-126, Republicans and Democrats. It was the foremost bipartisan vote in this 21st century, the very thing that the American people are crying for.

Now, why did Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson and James Madison all agree? Very strong, very independent minds. Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson could hardly bear to be in the same room with each other, but they agreed on this because they knew that every State had Representatives in Congress to look out for jobs that could be shipped overseas. This is the primary reason, ladies and gentlemen.

Look at every trade agreement. This country has lost over 2 million manufacturing jobs to China as a result of the China deal. Over 150,000 jobs to Mexico. Yes, it created jobs—not in the United States. And what kind of jobs? These are jobs that impacted at the lower- and middle-income levels of our economy. It is the middle class that is the heart and the soul of America.

Let this Congress stand up and reject this rule.

We proved our mettle with that 302 vote. Congress, I am asking you, the American people are asking you: Do what Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson and James Madison asked us to do, and let it be the Congress that regulates commerce with foreign nations.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, intelligence is critical to our national security. It should not be besmirched by a controversial and unrelated procedural shenanigan, unprecedented in the annals of the House of Representatives.

In the words of the President of the United States, It is time to play it straight. TAA and TPA, that package was voted on. It was defeated. We are done. Play it straight.

Write new legislation. Put together a new package. Bring it to the floor of the House. See if it has a majority. That is playing it straight.

Instead, in an unprecedented move, a vote we took last week is being held in never-never land to be revoted on as late as the end of July. That is right. Early June votes tabulated in late July.

If you are against unprecedented shenanigans, vote "no" on the rule. If you are for playing it straight, vote "no" on the rule. If you are against TAA, vote "no" on the rule. If you are against TPA, if you are against fast track, vote "no" on the rule.

If you vote for an unprecedented procedural shenanigan, an unprecedented procedural mutation today, you can be sure it will be used against you and your district and your beliefs tomorrow. And if you are not against fast track, you should be because it gives an enormous gift to China, and we get nothing in return.

China's number one tactic for running up the largest trade surplus against us in history is currency manipulation. This deal that is put on the fast track enshrines the view that currency manipulation is just fine. Go to it. A giant gift to China.

In addition, the rules of origin provisions say that goods that the manufacturer admits are 50 or 60 percent made in China—which means actually 70 or 80 percent made in China—get fast-tracked into the United States.

Vote "no" on this procedural mutation.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, just for a moment, let's focus back on the rule and the underlying bill and the procedural issue that has been discussed. It is out in the open. It was not snuck in or anything else. It has been there and has been discussed.

But also, I want to get back to the fact of the rule, itself, which is stand alone. We are going to be voting on an intelligence bill. We are going to have a debate on an intelligence bill.

And, among other things, I will give us a reminder of what this legislation does:

It sustains critical capabilities to fight terrorism and counter the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. That is a separate bill. This is what we are going to be discussing. It

has funds to assist our efforts to recover unauthorized disclosures of intelligence capabilities. It sustains activities in Afghanistan and Iraq to continue the fight against ISIS, al Qaeda, and the Taliban. It invests in the resiliency of our national security space architecture. It provides policy discretion on sensitive intelligence operations. It promotes intelligence integration and sharing through investment in intelligence communitywide information technology enterprises. It enhances investment in military intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance aircraft. It funds initiatives to thwart cyber attacks and insider threats. And it requires a report every 60 days on foreign fighters in Syria and Iraq.

This is the bill, the underlying bill that we are discussing. And I just wanted to make a reminder of that. As we have discussions on different parts of this rule, let's be reminded also that we are dealing with a stand-alone bill that we will work.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman yield for just a question?

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Florida for just a question.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, all of the things that the gentleman from Georgia said are in the measure are true. But does he also agree that it is unprecedented that we have included a measure to delay an already-voted-on rule? Never before has that been done.

Or to your knowledge, has it been?

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Well, I think it is a fact that it is a part of this rule. The gentleman from Florida states it in whatever adjectival terms he wants to give. But it is in the rule. We have not made it secretive that it is part of this rule. And we can discuss either part.

I will just simply focus on the intelligence part.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), my good friend.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding and for the astute question that he asked, which is one that I would like to follow up on.

Mr. Speaker, let me say to the gentleman from Georgia that he is quite right. There are very serious and important components of the intelligence bill covered by this rule.

As many of us have experienced over the last couple of days, we are in and out of intelligence and security briefings because that is the era in which we live. And in most instances, Members draw their concern from the responsibility they have for protecting the American people.

I am on the Homeland Security Committee and have continued on that committee since the tragedy, the heinous act of 9/11, and before, when the

select committee was in place. So I have no quarrel with some of the important elements of this legislation. But the gentleman from Georgia should recognize that this is an aberration.

There are two or three points that I would like to make:

First of all, we are long overdue for getting rid of the sequester. This joke was played on Members and the American people only because of the supercommittee—not because of any individual Members, but there was a supercommittee structure put in place, the time ran out, and they could not come to a budget conclusion. So this was the ultimate end. Members didn't vote on this. They voted on the supercommittee, and then this was the hatchet that fell when the supercommittee did not work. So sequester should be something that Speaker BOEHNER puts on the floor and immediately gets rid of.

And the reason why I say that is because I am going to talk about the shenanigans dealing with the trade bill. But what I am going to say is that the overseas contingency fund is being used to bolster up this bill, the intelligence bill. But I can't get those resources to be utilized for infrastructure or summer jobs or fixing the education system that we have responsibilities for or providing opportunities for young people to finish their education or criminal justice reform. So this is being 43 percent pumped up when used by funds that are not in the stream.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman.

The funding is not in the stream of funding that other appropriators have to utilize. That is wrong.

Then I might conclude on the shenanigans of the trade fix, if you will. I am for TAA, the Trade Adjustment Assistance. I want it to be voted on straight up or down, like many Members do, to provide for workers and not have, unfortunately, the addition that was added coming from the other body. So now we know that, whatever shenanigans that will come up, it probably won't be in the way that will help American workers.

Mr. Speaker, this rule should be voted down because we need an opportunity to work on behalf of the American workers, to get rid of sequester, and to find a way to move this country forward.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should say to the membership of this body that if they vote against this rule, it doesn't mean that we would not have an intelligence authorization. It simply would mean that those of us—my friend from Georgia and myself—would have to go back to the Rules Committee and fash-

ion a rule that does not include an unprecedented matter that should not be in this Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 in the first place.

And toward that end, among the things that were sought to be included, if we were going to include the TAA measure, then the ranking member, Ms. SLAUGHTER, proposed on behalf of the minority that we also include a vote on the Trans-Pacific Partnership, TPP, for the reason, one, TAA was overwhelmingly—3-1—defeated; TPP passed by a very thin margin.

So if we are going to twist arms and find methodologies to employ to try to change the minds of Members over a 6-week period of time, then perhaps it would be those of us who are opposed to the measure would have an opportunity to try to persuade some of those people who caused the thin margin of it to pass on TPP. We felt that was a fairness measure. At least if you were going to include it, that should have been included as well.

Before proceeding, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should learn how much time each side has at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 19½ minutes remaining.

□ 1315

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am waiting for one additional speaker, but perhaps I can engage in a colloquy with my colleague from Texas.

Mr. DOGGETT. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOGGETT. You served both on the Intelligence Committee and on the Rules Committee. There is reason to authorize intelligence, but am I correct it has nothing to do with this sneak attack to put in a postponement that has never been done in American history, where never has anyone sought to delay for 6 weeks the consideration of this bill that we are doing today; isn't that correct?

Mr. HASTINGS. I think you are absolutely correct, and it is unprecedented. At the very same time, as my friend from Georgia pointed out, they have done so transparently by putting it here, but that does not mean it would not be used at some point in the future.

Mr. DOGGETT. Does this rule provide any notice to Members of the House, or can this be entirely a surprise attack? Can they come out here on the floor at any time, perhaps when the floor is as empty as it is now, and give no notice to the Members of the House that they are about to move to send this bill to the President's desk, have absolutely no debate on that rule, but then have a vote here, perhaps a day when some Members are out on important business in their district, basically picking the best time because

they are so desperate to force through a bill that they know a majority of this House does not support and that the American people don't support because it will just foist off on us a broken, failed trade policy that does not respect the interests of the American people? Is that what is happening here?

Mr. HASTINGS. That is certainly allowed. Anytime before July 30, the measure could be brought to the floor, and it could be brought to the floor without any notice to the membership because it is a motion to reconsider. It is a part of this particular rule sought by the Speaker of the House, I might add, and therefore it could be brought at any time under the aegis of the Speaker's authority.

Mr. DOGGETT. Was the gentleman present in the Rules Committee when every single constructive improvement to this fast-track bill was rejected by the Rules Committee—not with your vote, of course—but a majority of the Rules Committee said “no” to telling the Members of this Congress as much about this deal as the Vietnamese Politburo already knows, saying “no” to at least meeting the standards on the environment that the Bush administration agreed to, saying “no” to putting the foreign corporations on the same level as our American corporations and businesses so that foreign corporations wouldn't have an advantage to come in and attack health, safety, and environmental rules that might be established by the Congress or the State of Florida or a city like San Antonio or Austin? Because under this fast-track bill, we are headed toward jeopardizing those rules, those State laws, and those Federal laws that deal with the needs of the American family and letting these foreign corporations circumvent them as they did in Canada, recently, to demand millions of dollars of taxpayer money for a decision locally to just prevent the expansion of a quarry. We can't have that happen. But the Rules Committee would not allow us to address those problems.

Mr. HASTINGS. Many of those measures in a 5½-hour, into-the-night session that the Rules Committee operated.

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the gentleman.

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

I would urge that Members understand that we have already voted on this measure, and it was defeated, as I say, 3-1.

Robust funding for our intelligence infrastructure is clearly needed and, indeed, welcomed, but enough is enough. It is time for Republicans to stop squeezing important domestic programs through their arbitrary implementation of sequester. We must invest in education in this country; we must invest in our decaying infrastructure; we must invest in a clean environment; and we must invest in a strong middle class.

Republicans want to make investments in our intelligence community.

Great. So do I. We all do. But at some point, we have to start asking: What is it that that community is protecting? Without investments in education, infrastructure, and our middle class, we risk undermining what makes this country so exceptional and worth protecting in the first place.

I urge a “no” vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I appreciate the discussion we have had over the last little bit. I appreciate the gentleman from Florida. Again, although we have some differences—those have been evident today—the rule provides for ample debate on the floor and the opportunity to debate and vote on up to 16 amendments offered by a largely bipartisan group of Members.

I look forward to those debates. I look forward to the debate on how best to provide tools for our intelligence community and to combat the dangerous threats that we face while still respecting both the constitutional and budgetary restraints. Those are things that sometimes, I think, in the midst of discussion today, got lost in that this is a separate vote that we are going to be voting on our intelligence bill. There is a procedural issue that is part of this that is, again, not snuck in. It has been posted; it has been online; and it is there for Members to see.

When we look at priorities, again, I think, for us, it goes back to, again, in the overall budgetary and authorization process, the Republican majority stands for protecting our national interests, protecting and empowering the voters who actually send us here, not for growing and empowering an ever-encroaching Federal Government. This is what the budgets reflect. This is what the authorizations reflect. These are the priorities of the American people, and these are the priorities of the Republican majority.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. 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 House Resolution 315 will be followed by a 5-minute vote on agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 236, nays 189, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 366]

YEAS—236

Abraham	Amodei	Barletta
Aderholt	Ashford	Barr
Allen	Babin	Benishke

Bilirakis	Harper	Pitts
Bishop (MI)	Harris	Poe (TX)
Bishop (UT)	Hartzler	Poliquin
Black	Heck (NV)	Pompeo
Blackburn	Hensarling	Price, Tom
Blum	Herrera Beutler	Ratcliffe
Bost	Hice, Jody B.	Reichert
Boustany	Hill	Renacci
Brady (TX)	Holding	Ribble
Brat	Hudson	Rice (SC)
Bridenstine	Huelskamp	Rigell
Brooks (IN)	Huizenga (MI)	Roby
Buchanan	Hultgren	Roe (TN)
Buck	Hunter	Rogers (AL)
Bucshon	Hurd (TX)	Rogers (KY)
Burgess	Hurt (VA)	Rohrabacher
Calvert	Issa	Rokita
Carter (GA)	Jenkins (KS)	Rooney (FL)
Carter (TX)	Jenkins (WV)	Ros-Lehtinen
Chabot	Johnson (OH)	Roskam
Clawson (FL)	Johnson, Sam	Ross
Coffman	Jolly	Rothfus
Cole	Jordan	Rouzer
Collins (GA)	Joyce	Royce
Collins (NY)	Katko	Russell
Comstock	Kelly (PA)	Ryan (WI)
Conaway	King (IA)	Salmon
Cook	Kinzinger (IL)	Sanford
Cooper	Kline	Scalise
Costa	Knight	Schweikert
Costello (PA)	Labrador	Scott, Austin
Cramer	LaMalfa	Sensenbrenner
Crawford	Lamborn	Sessions
Crenshaw	Lance	Shimkus
Culberson	Latton	Shuster
Curbelo (FL)	LoBiondo	Simpson
Davis, Rodney	Long	Smith (MO)
Denham	Loudermilk	Smith (NE)
Dent	Love	Smith (NJ)
DeSantis	Lucas	Smith (TX)
DesJarlais	Luetkemeyer	Stefanik
Diaz-Balart	Lummis	Stewart
Dold	MacArthur	Stivers
Donovan	Marchant	Stutzman
Duffy	Marino	Thompson (PA)
Duncan (SC)	McCarthy	Thornberry
Duncan (TN)	McCaul	Tiberi
Elmrs (NC)	McClintock	Tipton
Emmer (MN)	McHenry	Trott
Farenthold	McKinley	Turner
Fincher	McMorris	Upton
Fitzpatrick	Rodgers	Valadao
Fleischmann	McSally	Wagner
Fleming	Meadows	Walberg
Flores	Meehan	Walden
Forbes	Messer	Walker
Fortenberry	Mica	Walorski
Fox	Miller (FL)	Walters, Mimi
Franks (AZ)	Miller (MI)	Weber (TX)
Frelinghuysen	Moolenaar	Webster (FL)
Garrett	Mooney (WV)	Wenstrup
Gibbs	Mullin	Westerman
Gibson	Mulvaney	Westmoreland
Goodlatte	Murphy (PA)	Whitfield
Gosar	Neugebauer	Williams
Gowdy	Newhouse	Wilson (SC)
Granger	Noem	Wittman
Graves (GA)	Nugent	Womack
Graves (LA)	Nunes	Woodall
Graves (MO)	Olson	Yoder
Griffith	Palazzo	Yoho
Grothman	Palmer	Young (AK)
Guinta	Paulsen	Young (IA)
Guthrie	Pearce	Young (IN)
Hanna	Perry	Zeldin
Hardy	Pittenger	Zinke

NAYS—189

Adams	Cárdenas	Davis, Danny
Aguilar	Carney	DeFazio
Amash	Carson (IN)	DeGette
Bass	Cartwright	Delaney
Beatty	Castor (FL)	DeLauro
Becerra	Castro (TX)	DelBene
Bera	Chu, Judy	DeSaulnier
Beyer	Cicilline	Deutch
Bishop (GA)	Clark (MA)	Dingell
Blumenauer	Clarke (NY)	Doggett
Bonamici	Clay	Doyle, Michael
Boyle, Brendan	Cleaver	F.
F.	Clyburn	Duckworth
Brady (PA)	Cohen	Edwards
Brooks (AL)	Connolly	Ellison
Brown (FL)	Conyers	Engel
Brownley (CA)	Courtney	Eshoo
Bustos	Crowley	Esty
Butterfield	Cuellar	Farr
Capps	Cummings	Fattah
Capuano	Davis (CA)	Foster

Frankel (FL)	Loeb sack	Roybal-Allard
Fudge	Lofgren	Ruiz
Gabbard	Lowenthal	Ruppersberger
Gallego	Lowey	Rush
Garamendi	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Ryan (OH)
Gohmert	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Sánchez, Linda T.
Graham	Lynch	Sarbanes
Grayson	Maloney,	Schakowsky
Green, Al	Carolyn	Schiff
Green, Gene	Maloney, Sean	Schrader
Grijalva	Massie	Scott (VA)
Gutiérrez	Matsui	Scott, David
Hahn	McCollum	Serrano
Hastings	McDermott	Sherman
Heck (WA)	McGovern	Sinema
Higgins	McNerney	Sires
Himes	Meeks	Slaughter
Hinojosa	Meng	Smith (WA)
Honda	Moore	Speier
Hoyer	Moulton	Swalwell (CA)
Huffman	Murphy (FL)	Takai
Israel	Nadler	Takano
Jackson Lee	Napolitano	Thompson (CA)
Jeffries	Neal	Thompson (MS)
Johnson (GA)	Nolan	Titus
Johnson, E. B.	Norcross	Tonko
Jones	O'Rourke	Torres
Kaptur	Pallone	Tsongas
Keating	Pascrell	Van Hollen
Kelly (IL)	Payne	Vargas
Kennedy	Pelosi	Veasey
Kildee	Perlmutter	Vela
Kilmer	Peters	Velázquez
Kind	Kuster	Peterson
King (CA)	Pingree	Visclosky
Kirkpatrick	Pocan	Walz
Kirkpatrick	Polis	Wasserman
Kuster	Posey	Schultz
Langevin	Price (NC)	Waters, Maxine
Larsen (WA)	Quigley	Watson Coleman
Larsen (CT)	Rangel	Welch
Lawrence	Rice (NY)	Wilson (FL)
Lee	Richmond	Yarmuth
Levin		
Lewis		
Lieu, Ted		
Lipinski		

NOT VOTING—8

Barton	Kelly (MS)	Sanchez, Loretta
Byrne	King (NY)	Sewell (AL)
Chaffetz	Reed	

□ 1356

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and SINEMA changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. ASHFORD changed his 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.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA CONCERNING PEACEFUL USES OF NUCLEAR ENERGY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114-43)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message