

could leave Iran with a pathway toward nuclear weapons and provide a long-term solution. Finally, a great deal phases in sanctions relief so we aren't rewarding Iran for deception and noncompliance.

A nuclear Iran is one of the greatest threats to the United States; our greatest ally, Israel; and to regional stability in the Middle East. I cannot stress enough how important it is that Iran must not, under any circumstance, be able to obtain a nuclear weapon.

COMMEMORATING AMERICAN EAGLE DAY

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

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to once again rise to join in commemorating June 20, 2015, as American Eagle Day and celebrate the recovery and restoration of the bald eagle, the national symbol of the United States.

On June 20, 1782, the eagle was designated as a national emblem of the United States by the Founding Fathers at the Second Continental Congress. The bald eagle is the central image of the Great Seal of the United States and is displayed in the official seal of many branches and departments of the Federal Government.

The bald eagle is an inspiring symbol of the spirit of freedom and democracy of the United States. Since the founding of the Nation, the image, meaning, and symbolism of the eagle have played a significant role in art, music, history, commerce, literature, architecture, and the culture of the U.S. The bald eagle's habitat only exists in North America.

I hope my colleagues will join in celebrating June 20, 2015, as American Eagle Day, which marks the recovery and restoration of the bald eagle.

□ 0915

INTERNATIONAL YOGA DAY

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

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a resolution to commemorate the first ever International Yoga Day.

This day is occurring on Sunday, June 21, and it was a day that was designated by the United Nations with over 177 countries in support. Over 24 million Americans and 250 million people around the world practice some form of yoga, and, on Sunday, people all around the world will be celebrating the benefits of living a yoga lifestyle.

India's Prime Minister, Narendra Modi, addressed the UN General Assembly on September 27, 2014, stating:

Yoga is an invaluable gift of India's ancient tradition. It embodies unity of mind and body, thought and action, restraint and

fulfillment, harmony between man and nature, a holistic approach to health and well-being. It is not about exercise, but, rather, it is about discovering the sense of oneness within yourself, the world, and nature.

As a longtime yoga practitioner myself, I have experienced firsthand the positive impact of yoga on my own life, and I am honored to be introducing this resolution today and sharing with others the true meaning of yoga.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2146, DEFENDING PUBLIC SAFETY EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 321 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 321

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2146) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes, 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 with the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. 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 or demand for division of the question.

POINT OF ORDER

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 426 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I make a point of order against consideration of the rule, House Resolution 321.

Section 426 of the Budget Act specifically states that the Rules Committee may not waive the point of order prescribed by section 425 of that same Act.

House Resolution 321 states that it "shall be in order . . . to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion . . . that the House concur in the Senate amendment with the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying the resolution."

Therefore, I make a point of order pursuant to section 426 that this resolution may not be considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The gentlewoman from New York makes a point of order that the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The gentlewoman has met the threshold burden under the rule, and the gentlewoman from New York and a

Member opposed each will control 10 minutes of debate on the question of consideration. Following debate, the Chair will put the question of consideration as the statutory means of disposing of the point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I would like to take a moment, if I may, to mourn the horrific loss of life in Charleston, South Carolina.

Places of worship used to be places of sanctuary, but there are no more sanctuaries in the United States from gun violence. Whether it is an elementary school, a college, a hospital—anywhere in the world—gun violence is there among us. We want to all give our condolences to our colleague JIM CLYBURN, who represents that area in Charleston.

I have a personal interest in it as a very good friend of mine, who had been pastor of Baber AME Church for decades in Rochester, left us to go to pastor that church and is still an elder there. So our hearts go out to all of them for all of the grief. We hope that we will see brighter days when people can go to a sanctuary place of worship in peace.

Now to the matter before Congress today, Mr. Speaker, our Chamber and our Nation are off balance. There is something drastically wrong when Members of the people's House are asked to vote on greasing the skids for a trade deal they are discouraged from reading and, even if they do read, cannot discuss with their constituents, the people who sent them here.

That is what we are being asked to do today regarding a massive trade deal: abdicate our authority by approving fast track and to give the simple vote of "yea" or "nay" on an issue that is not simple at all. In fact, it could not be more complex or more far-reaching. Unlike the Senate action on this measure, Members of the House were totally unable to have any amendment or very much discussion of what is going on here.

Mr. Speaker, fast track is an anachronism that needs to die. There is no longer any need for it at all. It came as a matter of convenience in the seventies when the United States was the biggest manufacturer on the face of the Earth and when we were pretty sure we always would be. So it was decided by the powers that were in place then that the Congress would just hand it over to the administration to go ahead and negotiate whole trade agreements despite the fact that the Constitution of the United States gives us that power. We allowed the administration to do it. One committee, Ways and Means, got to see it. There was no amendment, and the only vote we can take on a trade bill is "yea" or "nay."

Mr. Speaker, it is not just we who are forbidden, basically, to see what is in this bill and to talk about it. It is also the countries of Australia and New Zealand. Let me read from a report on that.

They are very much concerned there with the fact that this TPP—what they had found leaked out, that what PhRMA is doing here is to extend all of their patents for 12 years so that they can not only raise those prices here in this country but for all of those countries involved in the trade agreement.

Jane Kelsey, who is on the faculty of law of the University of Auckland, described what was happening here as one of the most controversial parts—that is, the pharmaceutical part—because the U.S. pharmaceutical industry used a trade agreement to target New Zealand's Pharmaceutical Management Agency, PHARMAC, which is their health system.

This transparency act will erode the process and decisions of agencies that decide which medicines and medical devices to subsidize with public money and by how much. The leaked test shows that TPP will severely erode PHARMAC's ability to continue to deliver affordable medicines and medical devices as it has for two decades.

The parliamentarians in Australia and New Zealand are under the same restriction as we are, only theirs is even worse. A member of that Parliament who goes to read the trade agreement has to sign a paper that he will not discuss it for 4 years.

I make this point because two of the great democracies on this planet—the United States of America and Australia—have given over the right of the people's elected Representatives to know what is in these trade deals that will have such devastating effects on all of the people they represent. How in the world can this continue, and how can we let it go on?

If we don't do anything in this Congress—and we may not—I would really like to see us do away with the whole idea of fast track. We can't afford it any longer. At least I am sure, when it began, there was no problem with certain corporations deciding that they were going to make the main decisions as we have had made known by leaks here. I have not gone to read the bill. I do not want to be hamstrung by anything that I can discuss and concerns that I have with the people whom I serve. This is one of many reasons, I think, this trade bill is bad.

Let me say I have a few more here that I would like to go over, and I need to make sure that everybody understands this. When you vote for TPA today, you are voting for things that were in that Customs bill. Again, hardly any of us knew anything about it.

Let me just tell you what they are: Preventing action on climate change. This is going to be written in this bill. Nobody anywhere can even bring up climate change. It is a great step backward, and they managed to get this in, and the Pope is in sync, too. That is very interesting.

Secondly and most grievous to many of us who have worked so hard on human trafficking, including Members on both sides of this House with whom

I have worked, it weakens the language on human trafficking. They had to do that because the nation with the worst standards on human rights and human trafficking is Malaysia, which is one of the countries with whom we want to be allied.

Third, they ignore currency manipulation, which we have been told for a decade or more is one of the most serious acts against the United States from countries that trade with us, which is changing their currency. As one of my colleagues has pointed out, Mrs. DINGELL, one automobile company made more money from its trade manipulation than it did by selling its cars. We don't want to expand that. We don't want that to go on.

There is also a strong anti-immigration provision that we are being asked to vote on today, and we won't do that—giving up our rights as the elected Representatives of the people of the United States. It says that trade agreements do nothing to address the immigration. They may not.

Then Democratic priorities, such as ensuring that Dodd-Frank would not be affected by the trade agreement, because we have heard that financial services is very heavily involved here, were rejected in the Senate and were not included in this bill. We are very much concerned about that.

We are very much concerned about where we are going, but the fast-track deal will be an absolute rubber stamp to disaster.

As I mentioned before, it has been negotiated in a cloud of secrecy by multinational conglomerates and the financial services industry and pharmaceutical companies that have one priority, and that is the bottom line. What we know, again, is all we have heard from leaks. Not a lot has made its way to the light of day, but what has has been appalling, and it does certainly give anyone who wants to vote pause to think about what that vote means before he gives it, because we don't know what is in that bill.

One of the things that some of us are very much concerned about is food safety and prescription drugs, the erosion of environmental protections, and the degradation of the financial sector. This deal is headed down the wrong path. Not only would the TPP certainly ship good-paying American jobs overseas, but it would endanger the food on our tables by weakening the safety standards. Ninety percent of the seafood consumed in America is imported, but only 1 to 2 percent is inspected, much of it from countries with little controls on sanitation and water quality that American consumers expect.

One of the biggest threats comes from shrimp imported from Vietnam, a TPP partner. The dangerous bacteria in Vietnamese shrimp is really ubiquitous and has included shrimp contaminated with MRSA, which is fatal, and drug-resistant salmonella. What is more, the TPP report includes due def-

erential preference to rules negotiated by drug companies extending their patents, as I have said, in an unfair way for 12 years. They are rigging the system in a way that would make it harder for people in TPP countries to have access to life-saving drugs.

Now, we have got a history to warn us about this. This thing has been modeled after NAFTA, which cost us over 5 million jobs. My part of the country is just now recovering from NAFTA a little bit, and we don't want to see this happen again. All over this country, there are factories that are closed and cities that are gone—places where there, literally, is no work.

Even doing TAA, which is very important to us, would be training people for jobs, in most cases, that don't even exist; but this has been hidden away from the American people and certainly has been hidden away from the Congress, the people who represent them. It is causing a stir all the way around the world. As I pointed out, other countries are looking at this with great interest.

Let's follow what our minority leader said last week. Let's put this thing to rest and negotiate openly a trade agreement that we can be proud of. We all believe in trade. Everybody talks about free trade. I want to change that now to fair trade that will be enforceable and that will benefit everybody involved.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 0930

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I claim time in opposition to the point of order and in favor of consideration of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise with a sad heart regarding the occurrences and the things which happened in South Carolina last night. I know, I join the gentlewoman as well as all the Members of this body to express our condolences and our sorrow with the things that have happened. I know that later in the day we will take time to offer those formally by the members of the South Carolina delegation.

Mr. Speaker, the question before us is, should the House now consider House Resolution 321. That is what we are here for. While the resolution waives all points of order against consideration of the motion to concur with the amendment, the committee is not aware of any violations of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act. This is simply a dilatory tactic that the gentlewoman wants to use to talk further about the issue at hand. I get that.

We have spent weeks talking about this. The United States Senate spent weeks talking about this issue. The gentlewoman wanted to use her time to talk about all the things that she believes are wrong with the bill, and that is okay. That really doesn't bother me.

But the bottom line to the entire matter is that we are using our responsibility under the Constitution for the Congress of the United States to establish the laws and to direct the President of the United States that we believe is very constitutional to say to the President of the United States, we want you to go engage the world in a trade deal, and we are going to tell you the parameters, some 160 different parameters about how we believe you should engage the foreign countries in these trade deals.

The gentlewoman is right, there are some difficult piece parts in there, as the gentlewoman mentions about immigration. Yes, I made sure that was in there because I don't believe this should be about immigration or visas. I believe this should be about trade. And, yes, there is language that is in there about climate change because I don't believe this should be about the United States in a political circumstance trying to push our ideas on a trade deal about global warming or these considerations that might be related to that issue.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman is right, there are piece parts of this agreement, the trade promotion authority, that not everybody likes, but let's not act like you didn't have an opportunity to read the bill or understand the bill. But much like any contract—and that is what we are engaging here in. We are engaging in saying to the President, we want you to go sign a contract, an agreement with these foreign countries that are in the Far East who have not only large populations, but growing economic circumstances to buy our products, and us to make sure that we lower tariffs or taxes on those products to where they are available to us.

Yes, we understand currency manipulation is a problem, and primarily that is a problem with perhaps two countries. Neither of those countries do we have a free trade agreement with, and one of them we want to have a free trade agreement with. Another country simply, I don't believe, understands rule of law or intellectual property, and I think they are thugs and don't care. They are a country that steals openly hundreds of billions of dollars from the United States, and they do not respect any rule of law or international agreements. So we probably won't sign an agreement with them.

But this is a good deal. It is a good deal. The last 10, 20 countries that America has had a trade agreement with, we have a \$10 billion surplus with those countries because those countries want American products, because the American worker does a great job, and we have the best engineering and manufacturing and pricing, but the product is worthy in the world market and will sell.

The State of Texas, which I am from, sells \$289 billion of Texas-made products overseas every year. That is an example of how important trade is.

This trade deal contract that we are wanting to empower the President—whoever that may be for the next 7 years—is to say let's go out a deal that is good to that country and to America. In the process, Mr. Speaker, we added some language for those of our friends that are watching along with you, Mr. Speaker, as I address my comments to you.

Section 8, subsection A on page 101 says:

United States law to prevail in event of conflict.

Mr. Speaker, it lays it out right here:

No provision of any trade agreement entered into under section 3(b) nor the application of any such provision to any person or circumstance that is inconsistent with any law of the United States, any State of the United States, or any locality in the United States shall have effect.

Mr. Speaker, what I am trying to suggest to you is, there are a lot of things about this bill; some that some people like, some things that others don't like. But we had a chance to read it; we had a chance to understand it. This is a contract that we have not even agreed to yet. Why would someone go and publicly talk about a deal that they haven't made?

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe that what is happening right now is that we should say that this point of order should not prevail. I think that what we should do is move to the direct discussion that we are going to have to allow the House to continue its business, and I urge Members to vote "yes" on the question under consideration.

I reserve the balance of my time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DOGGETT. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas will state his inquiry.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, my inquiry: In the underlying bill, is there anything to prevent taxpayers from having to pay out hundreds of millions of dollars for the privilege of enforcing the very laws that the gentleman from Texas says this agreement would preserve, any local ordinance, any State agreement like happened in Canada recently, that the taxpayers end up having to pay the bill for simply enforcing existing law?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not stating a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is recognized.

Mr. SESSIONS. I urge a "yes" vote. I reserve the balance of my time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York will state her parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I need to inquire from you, if my colleague was reading from the trade bill, what he had read and is forbidden to speak about. It is

classified, you know. Did he reveal classified information?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will suspend. The gentlewoman has not stated a parliamentary inquiry. Now, if the gentlewoman has a parliamentary inquiry, please state it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. My concern is that he is reading from a classified document. I need to know if that is the case.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. SESSIONS. Section 8 of the TPA. I did not say TPP.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we have pretty well beaten this dead donkey to its point. Its logical conclusion is we now move forward. I urge a "yes" vote on the question of consideration of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

The question is, Will the House now consider the resolution?

The question of consideration was decided in the affirmative.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), my friend, 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.

Mr. Speaker, once again, I believe that our comments this morning should be tempered with a reminder about the events of South Carolina and how much this body and its Members offer their prayers and consideration not only of our colleagues but all the people of South Carolina, the men and women, law enforcement, and people of faith all across this country. I want to, once again, express my consideration of those ideas.

Mr. Speaker, before I go through my opening statement, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Irvine, California (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS).

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we have spent considerable time debating the merits of TPA in this body. I want to bring us back to the fundamentals of this debate. I want to talk about why trade is so important to our economy, why trade is a conservative cause, and why trade is so vital to our Nation. Simply put, free trade empowers the individual to make decisions in his or her best interest without undue government influence.

Look around at your house or at your car. Without question, there are imported products. Free trade allows you, as an individual, to make the best economic choice for your family. When economic enterprise is free from unnecessary government interference and all enterprise is treated equally, the most competitive actors will rise to the top.

That means higher quality products and lower prices, which translates to improved standards of living and economic growth.

Opponents of free trade will say we need protectionist measures to maintain certain industries, but that is a flawed argument. Protectionist measures may benefit a few in select industries, but ultimately protectionism is more harmful to the Nation's economic health. Protected industries become inefficient. Consumers are denied choice, and American businesses face retaliatory trade measures overseas. Bottom line, protectionism is an abandonment of the free market in favor of government intervention.

I believe that when American businesses and entrepreneurs are placed on an equal playing field, when we eliminate tariffs and protectionist barriers at home and abroad, American businesses can compete and win against any of their foreign competitors. The famed economist Milton Friedman said: Free trade ultimately forces competitors to put up or shut up.

Mr. Speaker, let us set the table for free trade. Let us pass TPA. I know American businesses will put up.

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.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), who has been so effective on this bill.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this fast-track bill, which is only made worse by a gimmick of it being attached to unrelated legislation designed to help Federal public safety professionals. I might add, as has already been mentioned, the general president of the International Association of Firefighters, which this rule addresses as well, has said: We urge you to oppose this rule.

For 20 years, our Nation's trade policy has been failing American workers and the businesses that want to invest in this country. It has driven away jobs, pushed down wages, and exacerbated inequality. A vote for fast track is a vote to continue that bad trade policy for another generation because if we approve fast track today, we rubberstamp the Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement.

The Trans-Pacific Partnership asks American workers to compete with labor in developing countries like Vietnam, where the minimum wage is 56 cents an hour. It does nothing to combat the biggest source of lost jobs—currency manipulation—which The Economist's Fred Burksen has said has cost us in the United States up to 5 million jobs. People lost their jobs and lost their livelihoods. It allows thousands

of foreign corporations to challenge U.S. laws on food safety, drug safety, environmental protection, health care, labor rights, the minimum wage, and, indeed, any domestic law on any subject.

□ 0945

The gentleman on the other side of the aisle said that that is not the case. Just witness what happened last week when the majority in this body voted to repeal country of origin labeling so that we know where our meat, our poultry, and our pork comes from because the World Trade Organization and Canada and Mexico ruled against us. So we are going to give up our domestic law.

This is a trade agreement that has been crafted by lobbyists for the special interests and industries that stand to gain the most by weakening U.S. regulation and shipping jobs overseas, yet the administration has shown absolutely no interest in improving this deal or even listening to our concerns. That means that when the Trans-Pacific Partnership comes to this House, we need the ability to amend it. At the very least, it must include sanctions against currency manipulation, enforceable labor, environmental standards, and include a transparent process.

If we vote for fast track today, we throw away our ability to make any of those amendments, and we turn our backs on our commitment to American workers: to their jobs, to their families, and to their economic security.

We must make this a vote, and this vote must be a turning point so that at long last the American public can say that those of us in this House opposing fast track demand policies.

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

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

Ms. DELAURO. The vote last Friday and today's vote are critical in letting the American public know where we stand and that, in fact, we prioritize their economic security, their jobs, their increased wages and that we are opposed to special interests. And that is what this Trans-Pacific Partnership is all about.

We must reject this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of confusion down here. Everybody thinks we are now talking about ObamaCare, and we are not.

The gentlewoman talked about diminishing wages, diminishing job opportunities for the future, diminishing opportunities for American workers to have higher wages. There is no bill that I have ever seen that diminished wages or people's opportunity to work the hours that they would like to work more than ObamaCare. But we are not debating that today.

Mr. Speaker, we are here—and I want to be clear—about trade promotion au-

thority, TPA—not TPP, not any of the other bills. We are here for TPA today, exactly the same bill that this House passed last week. That is what we are here for.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Sunnyside, Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE), a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the rule and the underlying trade promotion authority bill.

Look at my State of Washington. We have jobs, economic growth, and increased exports because of trade. Those benefits and the example of that can be applied to our entire Nation.

By passing TPA, Congress will set priorities to ensure that any agreement levels the playing field with our trading partners and creates jobs here at home. Without it, the administration will be setting those priorities, and we, Congress, will have no say and little oversight.

In my State, we export coffee, many agricultural products, aircraft, footwear, and software. We export, fully, 30 percent of our apples, 60 percent of our hops, and over 85 percent of our wheat. TPA is about instructing our trade negotiators to reduce the trade barriers that American farmers and manufacturers face so that we can create and sell openly around the world.

Right now, our American wines face very stiff tariffs in Japan, but Chilean and Argentinean wines face none. Our beef faces a 38 percent tariff; oranges, 16 percent. TPA will instruct our trade negotiators to work on lowering these tariffs.

The reason to vote on TPA and why it is so important is that it will make the deal public and give the American people several months to review any negotiated deal. Without passing this, there is no review period. The deal can stay secret.

Some have objected that their voices have not been heard on this matter, but for months, the House Ways and Means Committee and the Rules Committee have considered dozens of amendments to three different trade-related bills. There has been ample time for debate.

Mr. Speaker, this rule and the underlying bill are critical to our economy. Without it, our country will continue to face enormous barriers; but with it, we can grow our businesses, create more jobs, and ensure the American economy remains the most competitive and strongest in the world for decades to come.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. The administration seems to think the Democrats and the coalition that is opposing the TPP would reject any trade deal. We are called protectionists. We are called unreasonable. But that is not true. Rather than these fancy parliamentary manipulations, we should take the time now to fix it.

Some of the most odious positions that we know that are in the TPP which this fast track will speed us to are U.S. negotiating positions. Our trading partners are not clamoring for the extrajudicial investor dispute resolution authority, allowing huge corporations to challenge their hard-fought consumer protections, worker and environmental laws, et cetera. These are our negotiating positions. We could drop them and that would be welcomed abroad among our trading partners.

Countries want the opportunity and the right to protect their food supplies—and that includes us. Decrease smoking; promote Buy America; increase the minimum wage; control the cost of drugs; protect our environment. We could reset the balance of the intellectual property rights and access to lifesaving, affordable medicines by rewriting the pharmaceutical chapter, which I did look at.

More than a trade bill, this establishes a new regulatory regime that favors the wealthiest and the most powerful corporations. We could change that.

These votes we are taking today are not the end of the track. It is beginning the track to a new negotiation. It is the beginning of an opportunity for us to sit down and make sure that we get the best for workers, consumers, and our trading partners, and that we benefit our economy not just for the very few at the top that can go to some extrajudicial court and challenge our regulations, but for everyone. This is a bill that we can make better.

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman knows that in the TPA agreement there is an agreement that she can go and attend every single round of the discussions and negotiation, by law. She can be right there. She can watch it as it happens. We can be engaged in this, as Members of Congress, the entire way. That is what this agreement is about. This is about TPA, not TPP.

The fear factor, Mr. Speaker, is incredible. Let's go and do the right thing for the American worker and our future. That is what we are doing now.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Raleigh, North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING), from the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas, my good friend, the chairman of the Rules Committee, for yielding.

Here we go again, Mr. Speaker, debating what should be the United States' future role in the global economy.

We have heard a lot over the past few months about the economic benefits associated with free and fair trade, but trade is just as important to our Nation's foreign policy as it is to our bottom line. There is no question that trade is an important, strategic soft-power tool.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think for one second China isn't watching this very debate right now, waiting to see how serious we, the Congress, are about America's economic future and commitment to retaining our position of global leadership. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I would venture to guess they have been focused on what a deal like the TPP would mean for their sitting and future ambitions in the Asia Pacific region for a long time now.

The United States can either be in a position where we can write the rules for the future trade agreements and develop closer bilateral ties with our negotiating partners, or we can sit on the sidelines.

Passing TPA is about expanding our influence in a critical region of the world with the TPP and solidifying our alliances with our partners in Europe with the TTIP. Failing to pass TPA, I fear, will confirm many of our allies' own fears that America is in retreat from the global stage.

But we can send a strong signal today, Mr. Speaker, that while our Nation's foreign policy has recently been adrift, the House of Representatives—and the United States—supports closer economic ties with our partners and wants to see an America that is engaged on the world stage.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this rule and support for the TPA legislation later today.

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

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this rule. It is such a danger, Mr. Speaker, that the majority is trying to move through the back door what it could not get through the front door on the floor of this House last week. And they are doing it in the most shameful way, Mr. Speaker: hiding behind our first responders. That is right; hiding behind firefighters and emergency personnel.

The International Association of Firefighters, representing more than 300,000 firefighters and emergency room personnel, oppose what is being done here today on this floor, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

There is one thing that I agree with the gentleman from Texas about. This is a donkey that died last week when we stood up for American workers, small businesses, and American jobs. And right now that donkey is like roadkill, and we are going to kill it right here on the floor of this House of Representatives.

We know that this body can pass legislation that in fact is not just about free trade, but is about free trade—and they are not doing it today—protecting our workers, protecting our climate, protecting our Buy America provisions for our procurement.

And so, Mr. Speaker, even as we are just getting word of the Pope's encyclical on climate change and overwhelmingly recognizing the human

cost to us all, we have a letter from our U.S. Trade Representative, Michael Froman, saying that this deal doesn't do anything to deal with the authority of the administration to negotiate climate change. That, in fact, is shameful. And what we are doing here today is against American workers, against American businesses, and against American jobs.

It is time to kill this donkey once and for all by putting it to rest and coming back to the table to reset for the American workers.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Butler, Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), one of the most exciting new Members of Congress from the Ways and Means Committee. I have visited and watched this young man as he not only ably represents a proud group of people, but is a strong American.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in this House, we have a duty to legislate based on truth, not fiction. We cannot afford to be uneducated, uninformed, or untruthful when it comes to PTA. Maybe the problem is we labeled it wrong. Maybe we should have called it "Congressional Trade Authority Oversight." Maybe that is what we should have called it.

There is a great misunderstanding—and I hope it is a misunderstanding—about what this does for us. There is no way America can compete in the global economy without strong trade agreements. When Congress sets the parameters and very carefully constructs what the agreement has to contain, there is no mystery, there is no bogeyman, there is nobody hiding under the bed, there is nobody hiding in the closet. You don't have to have a secret decoder ring. You don't have to have some magical knock at the door to read all these different items. It is there for you to look at.

For crying out loud, will you stop pushing a false narrative if it is about growing our economy? The only way we can grow is protecting what we have and then going into the global economy and increasing our market penetration. It is that simple.

If you want America to grow, then you must allow America to grow. And you must allow America to lead, because when America leads, America wins. And when America wins, the rest of the world wins. It is just that simple.

Why in the world fast track? It is not fast track. If you want to call it slow track, that is fine, because you are going to have 60 days to read it. That is pretty slow, at least around here. You want to call it smart track? That is what it is. It is smart track. It is safe track, and it is sure track. The other thing, it puts America back on the track to economic prosperity.

Pass TPA today and put America back on the track to protect American jobs. Allow the economy to grow, and allow our workers not just to produce

and distribute products at home, but around the world. That is how we win, and that is how the people who depend on us win. When America is strong, America leads.

□ 1000

When we are not strong, we create a vacuum at the top of the world that is going to be filled with bad actors.

Please stop using a false narrative. If you are not informed, get informed; if you are not educated, get educated, but for God's sake, don't be untruthful.

I urge passage of the TPA.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to others in the second person.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman for the time.

Members, what I really dislike about this whole debate is that there is so much invective thrown around, claims of untruth.

Now, here is the truth. The reality is that, if we pass trade promotion authority, we will have nothing more than an up-or-down vote at the end of the process. They don't have to take our amendments. They don't have to listen to what we say. Very likely, what will happen is that whatever has been negotiated already will be what the deal is.

For some Members to try to claim that others don't get it or they are not being honest is, quite frankly, insulting and does not add one thing to the quality of the debate.

The American people deserve to know that if trade promotion authority passes, there is a "yes" or "no" vote that will happen at the end of the process, and nobody here will be able to impact it through the normal course of events. We can go to some meetings; we can write some letters; but can we actually legislate? No.

Now, the reason that this is a very bad outcome is because the United States Constitution delegates Congress, this body, with the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations. It says: "Congress shall have power . . . to regulate commerce with foreign nations."

What we are doing here is taking that constitutional authority and we are handing it to the Executive and hoping for the best.

Now, the people who have been negotiating the Trans-Pacific Partnership all along are a body of about 600 multinational lawyers and businesspeople. The voice of the workers haven't been there. The voice of the environment has not been there. The voice of ordinary citizens who have every reason to want a better world and impact this process have been muted in favor of big multinational corporate types. We must vote "no" on TPA today.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gen-

tleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY), a member of the Ways and Means Committee and an awesome free trader.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Rules Committee for giving me time.

Let's set the facts straight here. Liberal union leaders, radical environmentalists, some of our friends on the other side have been relentless in pushing misinformation to confuse and distract the American people. It undermines the confidence that the American people have in this body, the people's House.

Let's look at the facts. TPA, trade promotion authority, it is not a trade agreement. It is the process by which we get the best possible trade agreement, the best possible agreement on behalf of the American worker and the American farmer.

This is Congress asserting its constitutional authority by setting the priorities for our negotiators. We are robustly involved in the negotiation process, and this TPA version is even better than previous ones because it empowers all Members of Congress, not just the Ways and Means Committee or the Senate Finance Committee.

TPA has been public. It has been public for months for anybody and everybody who wants to read it. Just go to congress.gov. It is not secret.

They are trying to deliberately confuse TPA, trade promotion authority, with the Trans-Pacific Partnership, which is a trade negotiation underway and not completed yet. We want a strong TPP—Trans-Pacific Partnership—agreement for the American workers and for farmers. We won't get that without TPA.

TPA puts a strong check on the President, placing the Congress in the driver's seat with 150 negotiating objectives that must be addressed or else the final agreement won't be brought up for a vote. We will kill it. We have the power, not the President.

It contains strong protections against the President from putting in any new immigration authority in violation of American law. It prevents the President from subverting U.S. sovereignty and all these urban myths that are out there.

Frankly, the misinformation is disturbing, and it undermines the trust of this body. We have to put the facts on the table for the American people. This has been supported by a wide number of groups—business groups, conservatives, many other groups.

If you support transparency, if you support placing a check on the President, if you support robust oversight, and if you support getting the best deal for the American worker, knocking down barriers—whether they are tariff or nontariff barriers in these other countries—to give the American worker a break, open markets, then you support TPA.

TPA is a catalyst for economic growth. It opens the door for a robust trade agenda for the United States.

We created the global trading system after 1945. Are we going to walk away from it? We only have 20 agreements—with 20 countries, that is, free trade agreements. These are important agreements. Other countries have 40, 50, hundreds of them.

Why are we sitting on the sidelines? We have been sitting on the sidelines for decades. It is time for American leadership. We can't walk away from the trading system we created. Our partners around the world want us engaged.

This is the catalyst for American leadership. This is an important part of our national strategy and an important part of our foreign policy.

You want a strategy? You want economic growth? You want fairness for the American worker? Support TPA as a catalyst for growth and leadership.

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

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for the time.

I am not going to go into the exact same debate we had 1 week ago because the facts are still the same. If we pass fast track authority, the facts are identical around the fact we will lose jobs here in this country and we will depress our wages here in this country. We will lose our sovereignty and control over our laws, and we will have problems with everything from food safety to intellectual property rights and so many other laws.

What is different about this week from last week is this is not the same trade promotion authority. This trade promotion authority will take away American jobs, but it lacks the trade authority that gives us the assistance and the dollars to help those people find other jobs.

This includes all of the amendments that affect us from taking away the provisions the Senate put in around currency manipulation, take away the amendments around human trafficking, and specifically say that we cannot address climate change in these trade negotiations.

Now, that alone is an issue that I want clarity from the White House on. I have been in and looked at the language, and I will not talk about classified language on the floor, but the amendment specifically—we need clarity about where we are on climate change in this agreement.

This is not the same TPA. It will cost jobs. It will lower our wages. It will not provide any protections for those workers who lose their jobs because of this. Now, because of last week's actions, the bill before us is a far, far worse bill.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues, let's let the American people have a say. The only way they will is if Congress retains our authority to amend and debate this bill. If we give that away, it is our own fault today.

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

Once again, I have to remind my colleagues we have got to follow some understanding about what we are trying to do here. This is TPA.

TAA was up last week, and my colleagues that are Democrats turned down the same things they are now talking about were provisions to protect the American worker. The Democrat Party voted against the American worker last week.

They are the ones that turned down exactly what the gentleman is talking about needs to be a part of this deal. The Democrat Party turned their back on the American worker. That was last week.

This week, now, they are trying to talk about things that are in TPP. Mr. Speaker, we are not here today for TPP. We are here today for trade promotion authority. That is it, TPA.

The gentleman, Mr. KELLY, was very right to say let's talk about the real facts of the case and the truth. This is about TPA. It is exactly the same bill that was here last week.

There were other considerations last week. The Democrat Party turned their back last week on the worker. We are not trying to do that today—trade promotion authority.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Cincinnati, Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), the chairman of the Small Business Committee.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to support the rule, and I think every Member of this body, on both sides of the aisle, have something in common. We all have small businesses in our district and probably a lot of them.

One of the privileges we have, as Members of Congress, is to talk to those people and find out what is important to them. What is important to them is important to the country because about 70 percent of the new jobs that are created in the American economy nowadays are created by small businesses.

In thinking about what I would say about TPA here this morning, I thought, rather than just tell people what I thought about it, I thought I would bring some examples of some of those folks that we have talked to.

As Chair of the Small Business Committee, I get to talk to small businesses all across the country. Here are some examples of what they are telling us.

Here is Michael Stanek of Hunt Imaging in Berea, Ohio. He said:

Free trade agreements are extremely important as they lower foreign barriers to our exports and produce a more level playing field.

Without TPA, the U.S. is relegated to the sidelines as other nations negotiate trade agreements without us, putting American workers and companies, especially small ones, at a competitive disadvantage.

Here is Dyke Messinger of Power Curbers in Salisbury, North Carolina:

Passage of TPA, which lapsed back in 2007, is critical to restore U.S. leadership on trade.

Manufacturers in the U.S. face steeper trade barriers abroad than virtually any other major country, including Mexico and China and European countries, largely because those countries have entered into more market access agreements than the United States. Trade and foreign markets are critical for small businesses like Power Curbers.

Here is Kevin Severns of Severns Farm in Sanger, California.

Without TPA, critical negotiations with some of our key export markets may well stall. My understanding is that, on average, U.S. citrus exports to countries included in the Trans-Pacific Partnership can currently face tariffs as high as 40 percent.

That is tariffs at 40 percent.

Given that 35 percent of California's citrus crop is exported around the world, access to these markets is vital to us.

Here is Brian Bieron of eBay, which helps many small businesses sell their products abroad. He said:

Through our experience, we have found that technology is transforming trade by allowing Main Street businesses to directly take part in globalization, reaping the benefits of markets previously only open to the largest global companies. This is good economics because it means more growth and wealth, and it is good for society because it means a more inclusive form of globalization.

That is what people from around this country—small-business men, small-business women—are saying about TPA and TPP and trade. In effect, they are saying, if we want to grow the American economy and create jobs, which I think we all want to do, we must be proactive on trade, and that means passing TPA and then TPP.

Better trade agreements mean small businesses will be able to access new international customers and offer their products more easily and at a lower cost than ever before.

It means that more products will be built and sold. When that happens, jobs are created, wages go up, and more opportunity is available to all.

You put an American worker against anyone in the world, and I will take that bet every day of the week and twice on Sunday; but we can't get there without TPA.

Without TPA, other nations, especially China, will dictate the rules of the new economy, nations that do not respect the rule of law or the rights of individuals in many cases, especially in the case of China.

Ninety-six percent of the people that are on this globe that we all share live outside the borders of the United States. Many of the world's consumers are not here. We want to sell our products overseas, and TPA gets us on the right track.

□ 1015

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the ranking member, Ms. SLAUGHTER, for yielding.

I wish to say that if the underlying Trans-Pacific Partnership were such a good deal, then why is the Rules Committee limiting our ability to read it and vet it fully and amend it?

By voting for the trade promotion authority, what we basically do is handcuff Members of Congress. So we should vote "no."

Why should we believe anything the executive branch sends up here? We have a right to read it fully and vet it fully.

Let's look at the history of these trade agreements. Over the last 25 years, every time we have signed a so-called free trade agreement that benefits the 1 percent—not the 99 percent—America has lost more jobs. Post-NAFTA, look what happened. We used to have trade balances with these countries. They have all gone into trade deficit, which means they send us more goods than we are able to get into their markets. Here is what happened after the WTO. Then we got into the China PNTR deal. Then the Colombia deal. Then with Korea.

There hasn't been a balanced trade account in this country for 30 years; 40 million lost jobs; \$9.5 trillion of trade deficit, trading away one-fifth of our economic might to other places.

And what did the American people get? Lost jobs, outsourced jobs, stagnant wages. The average income in regions like mine—\$7,000 less a year than 25 years ago. Not a good deal.

You can't create jobs in America and have free trade when you have closed markets abroad. Japan is closed. Korea is closed. China is closed. Europe limits 10 percent imports. We don't. We have an open market.

You can't create jobs and have free trade when you try to trade with countries where their people have no rights, no legal rights.

This Congress should vote "no" on this Trans-Pacific Partnership, the underlying bill, and the trade promotion authority because we have a right to read the agreement and openly debate it.

Right now we have to go down to a secret room. We have people who monitor us. And we can't even talk to the American people about what is in it. What is free about that?

The executive branch has totally overreached its power. Only four titles of the dozen in this TPP are actually about tariffs.

This bill is a treaty. It should be considered as a treaty, openly read by the Senate, and it should be able to be amended and fully vetted. This is so important. When you have gone through a quarter century of job loss and income loss by the American people, why can't we produce a bill that benefits the 100 percent—not just the 1 percent, the ones that were able to pay the plane tickets to go over to Asia and help to represent very important transnational interests? But there are not just the interests of those companies. We have to represent the interests of the American people.

Let's balance these trade accounts and develop a new trade model—not a NAFTA-based trade model, but a model that produces jobs in America, good

wages, and balanced trade accounts for the first time in a quarter century.

I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry. We forgot to make sure everybody knew: we are only doing TPA today. We are not doing TPP. We are not doing these other agreements. I am sorry. I forgot to say that for the 57th time.

Where we cut deals, we win. With the 20 trade agreements America has, we had a \$10 billion surplus last year alone.

I don't know where all these people are getting off and scaring and making fear statements about the American worker. I don't get it, when they talk about us not passing TAA when they are the ones—the Democrat Party—that turned it down. I don't understand why they are beating us up for putting in provisions about immigration. I guess they want to flood our workforce with foreign workers. I don't get where the Democrat Party and its great stalwarts are coming from today. This is about TPA, and that is what we are going to vote on.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let's be clear, the Members on this side of the aisle—the Democratic Party Members on this side of the aisle—completely understand what we are debating today. We know we are debating the rule on TPA, the same TPA which has been modified. As the gentleman has said, we are not debating TPP.

The problem we have is, the trade promotion authority is intended to be the method by which this body, this Congress creates the parameters for negotiation of trade agreements, such as the Trans-Pacific Partnership. And the reason that this has been difficult, this House and the Republican leadership, in particular, is trying to create a TPA that accommodates the already negotiated TPP.

So while it is a good rhetorical argument to say we are not debating TPP, the fact of the matter is, the reason that there has been such a lack of willingness to consider any modification, any amendments to the TPA bill is because any change would not align with the already negotiated Trans-Pacific Partnership.

The reason, for example, that a bipartisan amendment that I and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CLAWSON) offered—with equal numbers of Democrats and Republicans, 22 of us—to deal with currency manipulation was not made in order is because it would not align with the already negotiated Trans-Pacific Partnership.

Most everybody agrees that it would be good policy, but this deal is already written. And now we are trying to back in a TPA bill that it will accommodate the TPP.

So it is rather difficult for me to accept the argument that this TPA question has nothing to do with the Trans-Pacific Partnership when everybody in this House of Representatives knows that it has everything to do with it.

The other thing that is important for us to keep in mind is that this is a worse piece of legislation than the bad one that came before the House last week. Because of the modifications to TPA that came through in the customs bill, as my colleagues have said, despite the fact that many on the other side have argued that our attempts to deal with climate change here in the U.S. alone will not be affected because it is not a global approach, when we have an opportunity to take a broader approach, representing 40 percent of the global economy and deal with climate change, we now have an absolute prohibition, a gag order where we can't talk about climate in the greatest opportunity we would have to deal with climate change; nor can we have even a weak provision regarding currency, which has been excised from the TPA. And, unbelievably, we will actually weaken our ability to deal with bad actors when it comes to human trafficking.

This is shameful, it ought to be rejected.

Mr. SESSIONS. I reserve the balance of my time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). The gentlewoman from Ohio will state her parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. KAPTUR. I would like to know, if Members vote in favor of the trade promotion authority currently before us, will Members be allowed to amend the underlying bill, the TPP?

Could the chairman of the Rules Committee address that, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is engaging in debate and is not making a parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. KAPTUR. Well, in what form could I ask the question that I could get a straight answer as to whether Members will be able to amend the underlying 1,000-page trade agreement called the Trans-Pacific Partnership?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman may look to the managers for a specific item of debate.

Ms. KAPTUR. So, in other words, the chairman of the Rules Committee cannot answer my question? He is my friend. I think it would be important for Members to know that because it is my understanding that we are not allowed to amend the agreement if, in fact, TPA passes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is no longer recognized.

The gentlewoman from New York is recognized.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule and the underlying bill.

TPA shouldn't stand for "trade promotion authority"; it should stand for "taking prosperity away," because that is exactly what it is going to do for millions of hard-working Americans.

The House failed to advance its proposal less than a week ago, and today the TPA we are voting on is even worse.

And hiding the vote behind our brave first responders? This is shameful.

Republican leaders are doing everything they can to jam through a special interest agenda that will depress wages, exacerbate inequality, and cost jobs. TPA will take away the constitutional responsibility that Congress has to strengthen and improve the Trans-Pacific Partnership. If we approve this measure, we are surrendering our ability to improve a trade agreement for working families.

We are not voting on TPP, as the chairman said, but we are voting on TPA, on the rules to govern these negotiations and the process to be filed. And if we vote for this TPA, we are saying that we are fine moving forward on a trade agreement that has no enforceable provisions against currency manipulation; meaning, there are no protections to stop countries from devaluing their currency, artificially reducing the price of their goods, and putting American manufacturers and American jobs at a competitive disadvantage. We are saying, we are fine with a trade agreement that fails to address the critical issue of climate change. We are saying that we are fine with entering into a trade agreement with countries like Brunei, where LGBT individuals can be stoned to death and women can be flogged in public. We are saying, we are fine with having a trade agreement that weakens protections against human trafficking; and we are fine with entering into a trade agreement with countries like Vietnam, which denies workers even the most basic collective bargaining rights, while throwing workers' advocates into prison.

So we are not voting on TPP. We are voting on TPA. But we are setting the rules for governing the negotiations, and we are removing ourselves from the process of improving and strengthening this trade agreement.

The House should reject this proposal and stand with hard-working Americans. We should oppose TPA. We should oppose the rule.

For 30 years, we have had trade policies in this country that have failed American workers, driving down wages, increasing income inequality, and, as a result of it, costing jobs. A vote for fast track is a vote to abandon our responsibility to ensure that trade works for our country and for American workers.

I urge my colleagues to reject this rule, to reject the underlying bill, and to vote "no" on TPA.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) will control the time for the minority side.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I insert into the RECORD a letter to Members of Congress from the general president of the International Association of Firefighters opposing House Resolution 321 when it attaches trade promotion authority to H.R. 2146, the Defending Public Safety Employees' Retirement Act.

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF FIRE FIGHTERS,
June 18, 2015.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of more than 300,000 professional fire fighters and emergency medical personnel, I strongly urge you to oppose H.Res.321 which attaches Trade Promotion Authority to HR 2146, the Defending Public Safety Employee's Retirement Act.

The underlying legislation provides an important measure of retirement security to the federal fighters who protect our nation's defense installations, VA hospitals and other vital facilities. It should not be politically exploited and used in a last ditch, desperate effort to pass TPA.

HR 2146, which simply enables federal fire fighters to access their own retirement savings once they reach retirement age, was passed by the House by a vote of 407-5 and adopted unanimously in the Senate with a technical amendment. This amended legislation deserves to be considered free of political gamesmanship and procedural tricks.

The IAFF urges you to oppose this rule, and consider HR 2146 without controversial amendments.

Sincerely,

HAROLD A. SCHATZBERGER,
General President.

Mr. MCGOVERN. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, if we vote for trade promotion authority, fast track, without Trade Adjustment Assistance, if that is how we vote today, that is what we will get.

The Republican chair of the Rules Committee has made it clear. He has already used his precious time to start blaming Democratic leadership for the fact that Trade Adjustment Assistance will not become law.

The fact is that if Trade Adjustment Assistance ever comes before this House, it will, no doubt, be loaded up by the Republican leadership with a host of poison pills, making sure that Democrats cannot vote for it. I can't vote for Trade Adjustment Assistance if you terminate the Affordable Care Act as part of the bill, for example.

Now the proponents of trade promotion authority have had to misstate the actual economic facts, the figures on our trade surpluses and deficits, in order to make their case. They have come again and again and said, we have a trade surplus with our free trade agreement partners.

Completely false. I will put into the RECORD the chart listing each of our

free trade agreement partners, and we are running a \$177 billion deficit in goods. Including services, you are now down to a little over a \$100 billion deficit.

□ 1030

Now, how is it that Member after Member has come here and said something demonstrably false? They have been fooled by slippery charlatans who feed them the following line: Since NAFTA, we have a surplus with those countries that have a free trade agreement.

"Since NAFTA" implies since the early 1990s. No, they mean those agreements we entered into after NAFTA. So they look at our free trade agreements while ignoring NAFTA. That is like looking at the Cavs and ignoring LeBron. You can't do that.

Mr. Speaker, if you look at the success and failure of our free trade agreements, number one is NAFTA. If you include all of our free trade agreements, including NAFTA, we have a \$177 billion goods deficit. And then if you look at MFN for China, most favored nation status for China, well, then you are talking \$400 billion of deficit. That was not a free trade agreement. That was an even worse agreement.

This TPP is a gift to China. First, it enshrines the idea that currency manipulation will be allowed, even encouraged. It sets Chinese rules for trade in Asia, preserving for them their number one tactic in running such a huge trade surplus with the United States. It hollows out American manufacturing, thus endangering our national security. And the rules of origin provision available for review in the basement will show you that goods that are 50 and 60 percent made in China, admitted to be made in China, which means actually 70 or 80 percent really made in China, come fast-tracked into the United States. China gets the benefit and doesn't have to make a single concession.

Vote "no."

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. First, we were all on the fast track, then the slow track with postponement into July, and now we are back on rush-hour scheduling, being told that fast track, which has been mangled in the meantime with new changes, has to be approved by high noon today.

Railroading this bill through now will deny any opportunity to ensure that our trade policy gets on the right track. The fast-trackers have rejected every constructive improvement for a better trade measure that we have advanced. And even these fast-trackers, if they are really candid with the American people, would concede there is not a Member of this Congress who knows what is in this agreement to the extent

that the Vietnamese Politburo does. Because so much of it has been sequestered, we do not have one word that has been made public or accessible to us about how it is that Vietnam will enforce provisions to ensure greater worker freedom and opportunity instead of being part of a race to the bottom.

What we do know about this fast-track agreement from a recent Canadian ruling, *Bilcon v. Canada*, is that corporate panels will be empowered to charge taxpayers millions of dollars for the privilege of maintaining public health and safety laws. The language to which my colleague from Texas has referred about preserving American laws is really meaningless because, yes, they are preserved, but when your city or your State acts to protect you, foreign corporations are accorded more rights than American businesses, and they can demand millions for keeping our laws in place.

What we do know is that, since last week, this railroad has picked up some mighty unsavory characters. The irony is that on the very day Pope Francis is formally releasing his encyclical on global warming, this railroad has picked up a troubling new provision that would deny any opportunity to address the greatest environmental challenge that our world faces.

Even Trans-Pacific Partnership supporters concede that it looks like a charter for corporate America rather than a high-level trade agreement. The *Financial Times* said, "In too many aspects, it looks like a charter for corporate America."

We learn, I think, more from USTR's past failures than from its current promises. USTR has never in its history successfully challenged worker or environmental abuses by any of our foreign trading partners. Usually the reason that USTR fails is that it doesn't really try. It doesn't seem to have a belief in law enforcement when it comes to worker and environmental abuse. In Guatemala, it took it eight years to even bring a dispute. In Honduras, it took nearly four years to issue another bureaucratic report. In Peru, we cannot get the audit that USTR was responsible for obtaining.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, "Asleep at the Wheel" is a great Texas swing band, but it is a horrible philosophy for trade law enforcement. Reject this rule; help us get a better trade policy; protect American families; and advance our economy. We can do better than this by rejecting this rule.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

First of all, let me say to my colleagues that they should be appalled by

this process. This is again being brought up under a process where nobody—not just Democrats, but Republicans as well—can offer amendments.

In the United States Senate when TPA was considered, they were able to offer amendments, but when it came before the House last week, we were told we could offer no amendments. The excuse we were given is because, if we passed it, it would go right to the White House. But what we are doing today is actually not going to the White House. It is going back to the Senate, yet we are again being presented with a closed process.

Why can't Members of both sides of the aisle have an opportunity to make their views known on this important issue? Why are we being shut out when it comes to the issue of trade and TPA?

I heard a number of speakers say that this debate is not about TPP. Well, this is indeed about the Trans-Pacific Partnership. Whether or not TPP is implemented will depend almost entirely on whether the President has fast track in place.

The vote on fast track, or TPA, will determine the fate of the TPP trade deal. So a "yes" vote on TPA is a "yes" vote on TPP. It is that simple. History shows that is how it has worked time and time and time again.

Fast track is not just about TPP. If we vote for TPA for fast track, we are fast-tracking any trade deal that any President negotiates anytime in the next 6 years. We have no idea who the next President will be, but you are giving the next President—or next Presidents—the authority to have fast-track authority on whatever they want. Why are we just giving away all of our ability to play a role in these negotiations? The problem with these trade deals is that only the well-off and well-connected have a seat at the table.

I urge my colleagues to put American workers first. Vote "no" on the rule and vote "no" on the underlying bill.

Again, Mr. Speaker, the TPP is modeled after a failed trade agreement. It will further erode our national economy and change the rules in ways that hurt American workers. We are supposed to be here to protect the American workers and to create more opportunity, and we are yet going down the road of another trade deal that is going to rob America of important middle class jobs. It is appalling, and this process is appalling.

Vote "no" on the rule, and vote "no" on the underlying legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this debate today has been most interesting about the differences between the speakers who showed up today. One group of speakers is for America, for growth, for America leading, for America engaging the world, and for cutting deals with our friends against one other huge country that will overrun in every sin-

gle economic circumstance the rest of the world because they do not respect intellectual property or rule of law.

Mr. Speaker, this is about gathering together the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate to where we gather together the best rules and regulations that we can, parameters by which the President would go negotiate. This isn't about abdicating our role and responsibility. It is trade promotion authority.

Mr. Speaker, please, we understand that some people haven't read the bill. We understand some people think this is about TPP or other agreements, but it is not. This is about a simple process: Are we going to exert our constitutional authority? Are we going to engage the President where the President can go engage the world on behalf of the American worker? Are we going to lead, or are we going to stick our head in the sand?

Mr. Speaker, America needs to lead, and the world wants us to lead. Mr. Speaker, the world wants American products, and American business wants to sell to others without high prices and without tariffs. What we want to do is to compete. That is why we are here today.

I urge adoption of this rule. I look forward to the debate that will follow, and I look forward to our young chairman, PAUL RYAN, leading that effort, proving not only to the Members here today and to you, Mr. Speaker, but to the American people that we want more jobs. We have not created all the jobs that we need in this country. We need more, and this is a part of that effort.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the underlying bill.

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. MCGOVERN. 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 agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 244, nays 181, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 373]

YEAS—244

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benish

Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat

Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot

Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Delaney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Goodlatte
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)

Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Loudermilk
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—181

Adams
Aguilar
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline

Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison

Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman

Israel	McGovern	Schakowsky
Jackson Lee	McNerney	Schiff
Jeffries	Meeks	Schrader
Johnson (GA)	Meng	Scott (VA)
Jones	Moore	Scott, David
Kaptur	Moulton	Serrano
Keating	Murphy (FL)	Sewell (AL)
Kelly (IL)	Nadler	Sherman
Kennedy	Napolitano	Sinema
Kildee	Neal	Sires
Kilmer	Nolan	Slaughter
Kirkpatrick	Norcross	Smith (WA)
Kuster	O'Rourke	Speier
Langevin	Pallone	Swalwell (CA)
Larsen (WA)	Pascarell	Takai
Larson (CT)	Payne	Takano
Lawrence	Pelosi	Thompson (CA)
Lee	Perlmutter	Thompson (MS)
Levin	Peters	Titus
Lewis	Peterson	Tonko
Lieu, Ted	Pingree	Torres
Lipinski	Pocan	Tsongas
Loeback	Polis	Van Hollen
Lofgren	Price (NC)	Vargas
Lowenthal	Quigley	Veasey
Lowe	Rangel	Vela
Lujan Grisham	Rice (NY)	Velázquez
(NM)	Richmond	Visclosky
Lujan, Ben Ray	Roybal-Allard	Walz
(NM)	Ruiz	Wasserman
Lynch	Ruppersberger	Schultz
Maloney,	Rush	Waters, Maxine
Carolyn	Ryan (OH)	Watson Coleman
Maloney, Sean	Sánchez, Linda	Welch
Matsui	T.	Wilson (FL)
McCollum	Sanchez, Loretta	Yarmuth
McDermott	Sarbanes	

NOT VOTING—8

Byrne	Gohmert	Jolly
Clyburn	Gosar	Kelly (MS)
Davis, Rodney	Hurt (VA)	

□ 1108

Mrs. ROBY and Mr. BRADY of Texas 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.

Stated for:

Mr. HURT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for rollcall vote No. 373 on H. Res. 321. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

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.

□ 1115

DEFENDING PUBLIC SAFETY EMPLOYEES’ RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 321, I call up the bill (H.R. 2146) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). The Clerk will designate the Senate amendment.

Senate amendment:

On page 3, strike lines 9 through 11 and insert the following:

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to distributions after December 31, 2015.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. Ryan of Wisconsin moves that the House concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 2146 with the amendment printed in House Report 114-167.

The text of the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the text is as follows:

At the end of the Senate amendment, add the following:

TITLE I—TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY
SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015”.

SEC. 102. TRADE NEGOTIATING OBJECTIVES.

(a) OVERALL TRADE NEGOTIATING OBJECTIVES.—The overall trade negotiating objectives of the United States for agreements subject to the provisions of section 103 are—

(1) to obtain more open, equitable, and reciprocal market access;

(2) to obtain the reduction or elimination of barriers and distortions that are directly related to trade and investment and that decrease market opportunities for United States exports or otherwise distort United States trade;

(3) to further strengthen the system of international trade and investment disciplines and procedures, including dispute settlement;

(4) to foster economic growth, raise living standards, enhance the competitiveness of the United States, promote full employment in the United States, and enhance the global economy;

(5) to ensure that trade and environmental policies are mutually supportive and to seek to protect and preserve the environment and enhance the international means of doing so, while optimizing the use of the world’s resources;

(6) to promote respect for worker rights and the rights of children consistent with core labor standards of the ILO (as set out in section 111(7)) and an understanding of the relationship between trade and worker rights;

(7) to seek provisions in trade agreements under which parties to those agreements ensure that they do not weaken or reduce the protections afforded in domestic environmental and labor laws as an encouragement for trade;

(8) to ensure that trade agreements afford small businesses equal access to international markets, equitable trade benefits, and expanded export market opportunities, and provide for the reduction or elimination of trade and investment barriers that disproportionately impact small businesses;

(9) to promote universal ratification and full compliance with ILO Convention No. 182 Concerning the Prohibition and Immediate Action for the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labor;

(10) to ensure that trade agreements reflect and facilitate the increasingly interrelated, multi-sectoral nature of trade and investment activity;

(11) to recognize the growing significance of the Internet as a trading platform in international commerce;

(12) to take into account other legitimate United States domestic objectives, including, but not limited to, the protection of legitimate health or safety, essential security, and consumer interests and the law and regulations related thereto; and

(13) to take into account conditions relating to religious freedom of any party to negotiations for a trade agreement with the United States.

(b) PRINCIPAL TRADE NEGOTIATING OBJECTIVES.—

(1) TRADE IN GOODS.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States regarding trade in goods are—

(A) to expand competitive market opportunities for exports of goods from the United States and to obtain fairer and more open conditions of trade, including through the utilization of global value chains, by reducing or eliminating tariff and nontariff barriers and policies and practices of foreign governments directly related to trade that decrease market opportunities for United States exports or otherwise distort United States trade; and

(B) to obtain reciprocal tariff and nontariff barrier elimination agreements, including with respect to those tariff categories covered in section 111(b) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3521(b)).

(2) TRADE IN SERVICES.—(A) The principal negotiating objective of the United States regarding trade in services is to expand competitive market opportunities for United States services and to obtain fairer and more open conditions of trade, including through utilization of global value chains, by reducing or eliminating barriers to international trade in services, such as regulatory and other barriers that deny national treatment and market access or unreasonably restrict the establishment or operations of service suppliers.

(B) Recognizing that expansion of trade in services generates benefits for all sectors of the economy and facilitates trade, the objective described in subparagraph (A) should be pursued through all means, including through a plurilateral agreement with those countries willing and able to undertake high standard services commitments for both existing and new services.

(3) TRADE IN AGRICULTURE.—The principal negotiating objective of the United States with respect to agriculture is to obtain competitive opportunities for United States exports of agricultural commodities in foreign markets substantially equivalent to the competitive opportunities afforded foreign exports in United States markets and to achieve fairer and more open conditions of trade in bulk, specialty crop, and value added commodities by—

(A) securing more open and equitable market access through robust rules on sanitary and phytosanitary measures that—

(i) encourage the adoption of international standards and require a science-based justification be provided for a sanitary or phytosanitary measure if the measure is more restrictive than the applicable international standard;

(ii) improve regulatory coherence, promote the use of systems-based approaches, and appropriately recognize the equivalence of health and safety protection systems of exporting countries;

(iii) require that measures are transparently developed and implemented, are based on risk assessments that take into account relevant international guidelines and scientific data, and are not more restrictive