The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. LANCE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

FEDERAL OBSTACLES TO SAVING FOR RETIREMENT
(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, we talk a lot in this Chamber about the negative impacts of overly burdensome rules and regulations handed down by bureaucrats in Washington.

Nowhere are the potential negative consequences more evident than the 700-page rule proposed by the Department of Labor. Among other things, it expands the Department’s complex pension rules to cover IRAs as well as changes the definition of who is classified as a financial adviser. Ultimately, I believe this rule will restrict access to advice and drive up costs for small businesses.

It also illustrates a fundamental difference between Republicans and Democrats. Democrats want everyone to end up in the same place with identical outcomes, and Republicans believe in providing individuals with the same level of opportunity. This rule seeks guaranteed outcomes for everyone, but there are inherent risks associated with investing.

While I am open to modernizing current rules in order to protect consumers against predatory practices that pose unnecessary risks, I will not support efforts that make it harder for American families to save and plan for retirement.

HONORING J.C. KILMER
(Mr. KILMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, Tom Brokaw once said:

It’s easy to make a buck. It’s much harder to make a difference.

Today I rise to honor someone who made a difference as a schoolteacher for 50 years. He began his career a half century ago at Roosevelt Junior High School in Port Angeles, Washington, where he taught seventh grade home-room and coached football.

Earlier this week, he finished out his career at the Chrysalis School in Woodinville, Washington, and yesterday he had his first well-deserved day of retirement.

Mr. Speaker, the teacher that I rise to honor today is named J.C. Kilmer, and he is my dad.

Mark Twain remarked that the two most important days in a person’s life are the day he is born and the day he figures out why. My father was born to teach. And like so many fantastic educators, he has affected so many lives in so many ways.
So today I hope you will join me in thanking a teacher. I want to congratulate him for being a great educator, a difference maker, and a terrific dad. Happy retirement, Dad.

REPEALING THE MEDICAL DEVICE TAX

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

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of repealing the medical device tax, a burdensome tax on medical devices that increases costs, stifles investment, slows the race for cures, and ultimately makes health care more expensive for patients. The tax has resulted in less spending on research and development, escalating costs on the newest technologies, a reduction in capital investments, and, ultimately, is a factor in the loss of jobs in our Nation's vital life science sector, which is critical to keeping the United States a leader in the world and is crucial to my home State of New Jersey.

One of the major newspapers in our area editorialized recently in support of our efforts, the Easton Express-Times, pointing out that the medical device tax is having a depressing effect on a sector of the economy that until recently was doing well. Some are looking to relocate overseas.

I thank my close friend, Congressman ERIK PAULSEN of Minnesota, and the Ways and Means Committee for sponsoring this legislation. I urge the House to pass repeal of the medical device tax and work with our Senate colleagues to send this measure to the President.

GOLDEN STATE WARRIORS

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, the night before last, with the whole world watching, my home team, the Golden State Warriors, brought the O'Brien Trophy back to Oakland.

The Warriors, led by NBA MVP Stephen Curry, showed the power of persistence and teamwork both on and off the court.

The finals against the well-matched and talented Cleveland Cavaliers were a thrill to watch. These games were basketball at its best, with both teams showing real passion on the court.

It has been 40 years since Oakland last brought home the championship, and throughout this long journey, Warrior fans have stayed loyal and faithful.

Thank you to the Warriors team for making our dreams of another championship a reality. I have no doubt that this remarkable team will go down in Oakland's history. Thank you to head coach Steve Kerr, Stephen Curry, Clay Thompson, finals MVP Andre Iguodala, and all of the talented players who brought this championship home.

I can't wait to celebrate this win with all the Warriors fans and players at the victory parade tomorrow morning in Oakland. Go Warriors. Go Oakland. Go Dub Nation.

IN HONOR AND MEMORY OF CLEMENTA PINCKNEY

(Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor and memory of my former South Carolina General Assembly colleague, State Senator Clementa Pinckney.

Tragedy shot through the hearts of every family and community last night in South Carolina. It is important in times like these to remember that we are all made in the image of God. We are all brothers and sisters in Christ and are there to shoulder the burden of tragedy and loss.

Please pray for the 180-year-old Emanuel AME Church, who suffered the loss; the city of Charleston, tormented with distress; the State of South Carolina and its law enforcement personnel. We all need to come together with compassion and love.

Remember from the Book of Matthew:

Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.
Blessed are those who mourn, for they shall be comforted.
Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the Earth.
Blessed are those who hunger and thirst for righteousness, for they shall be satisfied.
Blessed are the merciful, for they shall receive mercy.
Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God.
Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called sons of God.
Blessed are those who are persecuted for righteousness' sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.

May God comfort the city of Charleston and the State of South Carolina this morning.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

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

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to highlight the familiar predication Congress has found itself in because the Republican leadership continues to govern by crisis.

As of today, we have only 4 legislative days until the Export-Import Bank expires. This bank helps American businesses of all sizes and markets around the world.

China's businesses have the support of their country's export-import bank, and we need to give our businesses the same certainty.

For years, the Ex-Im Bank has helped level the playing field for businesses in my district and across this Nation, empowering and supporting them to grow and conduct business overseas.

I have had the opportunity to work with colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support businesses and create jobs in my home district in San Bernardino County.

There is no reason we can't continue working together to reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank so American workers and businesses have the opportunity to play a role in the global economy.

We cannot force American businesses and workers to pay the price for Congress' inaction. The Ex-Im Bank doesn't cost taxpayers a cent and has created or maintained 1½ million private sector jobs since 2007. We need to stop the political games and reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank.

PREGNANCY DISCRIMINATION AMENDMENT ACT

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, in the 21st century workplace, where women account for nearly half of the workforce, it is vital that our policies reflect today's new realities. Specifically, the 1978 Pregnancy Discrimination Act, PDA, is in need of modernization.

Recently, the act was litigated before the Supreme Court, but even the Justices were unable to fully resolve how to apply the PDA. That is why Senator MURKOWSKI and I have introduced the Pregnancy Discrimination Amendment Act. It says working moms-to-be should have access to reasonable accommodations from their employers if health issues arise from pregnancy.

Unlike other proposals that will create more mandates, confusion, and litigation, my bill simply clarifies existing law to ensure the 21st century workplace works for families, employers, and expectant mothers.

IRAN

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

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today as we approach the deadline of negotiations with Iran to stress that any agreement must unequivocally guarantee that Iran cannot obtain nuclear weapons.

While a diplomatic solution is the ideal method of stopping Iran's illicit nuclear weapons program, we owe it to the American people of this country to end up with not just a good deal, but a great deal.

A great deal means giving inspectors robust access to nuclear facilities to verify compliance. A great deal means Iran acknowledges the full extent of its nuclear weapons program. A great deal would remove tools that
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.

Mr. Speaker, 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.

COMMOMEMORATING 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.

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 oneself 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 upon House Resolution 321 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 321

Resolved, That the 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, State, and local fire-fighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes, with the 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 time."

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 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 time."

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,” which 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 give 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. Our 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 the 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—which 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 that are 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 trade in 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 public 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 do 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—are under the same restrictions as 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 begins to play in the public arena 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 the talk of the Chinesic industry used a trade agreement to target New Zealand’s Pharmaceutical Management Agency, PHARMAC, which is their health system.

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 to the right of people 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 industry here, and 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 to the right of people to address the immigration. They may not.

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 been appalling, and it does certainly gives us 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 real, ubiquitous, and has included shrimp contaminated with MRSA, which is fatal, and drug-resistant salmonella. What is more, the TPP report includes due deferential 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.

We have spent weeks talking about this. The United States Senate spent weeks talking about this issue. The gentleman wanted to use his time to talk about all the things that he believes are wrong with the bill, and that is okay. That really doesn’t bother me.
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 cut 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 sign a contract 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 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.

Mr. DOGGETT. Parliamentarian inquiry.

Mr. DOGGETT. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

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

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.

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

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 (Mr. SESSIONS) is recognized for 1 hour.

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 the 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 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 U.S. 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 a fight about this.

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 firefighters. 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 the vote for fast track today 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 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.

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 provisions 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. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHAKOWSKY), who has been helpful and informative.

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, that gives more to the rich. But we are not debating that today.

Mr. Speaker, we are here—and I want to be clear—about trade promotion authority, 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 Sunny Side, 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.

In my State, we export poultry, and our pork comes from beluga, and we know where our meat, our poultry, and our pork come from because the World Trade Organization and Canada and Mexico ruled against us. So we are going to give up our domestic law.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the rule and the underlying trade promotion authority 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 firefighters. 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 the vote for fast track today 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 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.

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 provisions 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. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHAKOWSKY), who has been helpful and informative.

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, that gives more to the rich. But we are not debating that today.

Mr. Speaker, we are here—and I want to be clear—about trade promotion au-
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, we 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 to 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 allies 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. EDWARDS. 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 came back to the table to reset for the future trade agreements and debating what should be the United States foreign policy as it is to our bottom line. There is no question that trade is an important, strategic soft-power tool.

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 in the room and 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 forensics policy as it is to our bottom line. There is no question that trade is an important, strategic soft-power tool.

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 corporate wheeler-dealers their hard-fought consumer protections, worker and environmental laws, etc.

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 at 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 2 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 labeled it wrong. "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 guarantee that we can change a 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 knack 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, if you are reading it 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.

Passing TPA and putting 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.

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 need to, 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 over 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 hasn’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 money and corporate types. We must vote “no” on TPA today.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman 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 granting me time to speak. 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 and distortion that 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 I think 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 not 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.


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 do not 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 be is if Congress retains the power 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.

TPA was up last week, and my colleagues that are Democrats turned down every time they come in talking about were provisions to protect the American worker. The Democratic Party voted against the American worker last week.

They are the ones that turned down exactly that the gentleman is talking about needs to be a part of this deal. The Democratic 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 Democratic 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 the vast majority 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 Blake 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 Fennell 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, 1.5 percent of U.S. citizens who are considered 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 players. 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, 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.
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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 benefitted 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 American jobs lost. This is a 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 every year 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 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 gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry. I 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.

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 why, I think, 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—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. So 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 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 the gentleman has 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 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 gentleman 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 TPA?

Could the gentleman who called the Trans-Pacific Partnership to address that, please.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. I think 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 gentleman 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 gentleman is not recognized.

The gentleman 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 gentleman 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 to 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 and American workers.

We are not voting on TPA, 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 workers 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, 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, inflating 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 360,000 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 Employees’ Retirement Act.

The underlying legislation provides an important measure of retirement security to the federal civilians 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 save the TPP.

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 497-3 and adopted unanimously in the Senate with a technical amendment. This amended legislation deserves to be considered free of political maneuvering. As long as 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, 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, and we have 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.

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.

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 have a 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 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, 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, then not a trade deal at all, 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 trade with the American people, would concede there is not what is in this agreement to the extent that the Vietnamese Polihuro does. Because so much of it has been secreted, 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 to the House, the 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. 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 TPA 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 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 support the underlying bill. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the vote to fast track any trade deal that any President negotiates anytime in the next 6 years.

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 compete. That is why we are here today.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yeas—244</th>
<th>Nays—181</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aguilar</td>
<td>Engel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannon</td>
<td>Fattah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beatty</td>
<td>Farr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becerra</td>
<td>Fazio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyer</td>
<td>Frankel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop (GA)</td>
<td>Fudge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyle, Brendan</td>
<td>Gallego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown (CA)</td>
<td>Garamendi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browning (CA)</td>
<td>Grayson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanon</td>
<td>Green, AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buhush</td>
<td>Green, Gene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cappo</td>
<td>Grijalva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cappo</td>
<td>Gutierrez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chabot</td>
<td>Bahn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaffetz</td>
<td>Reichert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins (FL)</td>
<td>Renacci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colman</td>
<td>Rice (NC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conaway</td>
<td>Rigell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>Rohrabacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa</td>
<td>Roybal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costello (PA)</td>
<td>Ruiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramer</td>
<td>Sanchez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford</td>
<td>Scott, Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crenshaw</td>
<td>Schiff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuellar</td>
<td>Shuster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delauro</td>
<td>Simpson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derby</td>
<td>Smith (MO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DesJarlais</td>
<td>Smith (NJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diaz-Balart</td>
<td>Smith (TX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donavan</td>
<td>Stefanik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duffy</td>
<td>Strickland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durty</td>
<td>Stringer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan (NC)</td>
<td>Stutzman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmer (MN)</td>
<td>Thompson (PA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson</td>
<td>Thune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fincher</td>
<td>Tibor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleischmann</td>
<td>Tipton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleming</td>
<td>Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forbes</td>
<td>Turner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foxx</td>
<td>Upton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franks (AZ)</td>
<td>Valadao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fry</td>
<td>Wagner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garamendi</td>
<td>Walker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett</td>
<td>Walden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibbs</td>
<td>Walker, Mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson</td>
<td>Walorski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodlatte</td>
<td>Watters, Mimi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gowdy</td>
<td>Wehr (WI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graves (GA)</td>
<td>Westmoreland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graves (LA)</td>
<td>Whitfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffith</td>
<td>Williams (GA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grothman</td>
<td>Williams, Tom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gutierrez</td>
<td>Winkerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanna</td>
<td>Winkler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrington</td>
<td>Winter (MI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartzler</td>
<td>Wolf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heck (NY)</td>
<td>Young (AK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herrera Beutler</td>
<td>Young (OH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hice, Jody B.</td>
<td>Zeldin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hildreth</td>
<td>Zinke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding</td>
<td>Zeldin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson</td>
<td>Zeldin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huienga (MI)</td>
<td>Zeldin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hulshgen</td>
<td>Zeldin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter (TX)</td>
<td>Zeldin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aguilar</td>
<td>Bass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beatty</td>
<td>Becerra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyle, Brendan</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browning (CA)</td>
<td>Browning (CA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanon</td>
<td>Capuano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buhush</td>
<td>Carney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaffetz</td>
<td>Carper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colman</td>
<td>Caso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conaway</td>
<td>Cartwright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>Carter (GA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa</td>
<td>Carter (TX)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crenshaw</td>
<td>Chabot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuellar</td>
<td>Chabot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delauro</td>
<td>Chaffetz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derrow</td>
<td>Childers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DesJarlais</td>
<td>Chaffetz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diaz-Balart</td>
<td>Collins (GA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donavan</td>
<td>Collins (NY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duffy</td>
<td>Connolly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durty</td>
<td>Courtney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan (NC)</td>
<td>Crowley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmer (MN)</td>
<td>Crenshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson</td>
<td>Crenshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fincher</td>
<td>Crenshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleischmann</td>
<td>Crenshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleming</td>
<td>Crenshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forbes</td>
<td>Crenshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foxx</td>
<td>Crenshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franks (AZ)</td>
<td>Crenshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fry</td>
<td>Crenshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Crenshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Crenshaw</td>
</tr>
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<td>Crenshaw</td>
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<td>Crenshaw</td>
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<tr>
<td>Goodlatte</td>
<td>Crenshaw</td>
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<td>Crenshaw</td>
</tr>
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<td>Graves (GA)</td>
<td>Crenshaw</td>
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<tr>
<td>Graves (LA)</td>
<td>Crenshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffith</td>
<td>Crenshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grothman</td>
<td>Crenshaw</td>
</tr>
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<td>Gutierrez</td>
<td>Crenshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanna</td>
<td>Crenshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrington</td>
<td>Crenshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartzler</td>
<td>Crenshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heck (NY)</td>
<td>Crenshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herrera Beutler</td>
<td>Crenshaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hice, Jody B.</td>
<td>Crenshaw</td>
</tr>
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<td>Crenshaw</td>
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<td>Huienga (MI)</td>
<td>Crenshaw</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter (TX)</td>
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</tr>
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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:

(e) 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 TradePriorities 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 or indirectly caused by barriers and policies and practices of foreign governments that distort international trade and investment and that decrease market opportunities for United States trade; and
(3) 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;
(4) to ensure that trade and environmental policies are mutually supportive and to seek to protect and preserve the environment and limit the costs of change in doing so, while optimizing the use of the world's resources;
(5) to promote respect for worker rights and the core labor standards of the ILO (as set out in section 111(7)) and an understanding of the core labor standards of the ILO (as set out in section 111(7));
(6) to take into account other legitimate objectives of the United States for agreements under which parties to such agreements enter into trade negotiations or are covered by such agreements.

(b) PRINCIPAL TRADE NEGOTIATING OBJECTIVES.—

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

(A) securing more open and equitable market access 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.

(2) TRADE IN SERVICES.—The principal negotiating objective of the United States with respect to trade in services is to obtain competitive market opportunities for United States services and to obtain fairer and more open conditions of trade, including through the 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.

(3) TRADE IN AGRICULTURE.—The principal negotiating objective of the United States with respect to agriculture is to obtain competitive market opportunities for United States 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—

(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

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 penalty-free withdrawals from retirement plans established under the Uniformed Services Retirement System, and for other purposes.

Mr. Ryan of Wisconsin moves that the House concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 2146 with the amendment printed in Senate Report 114-167.
on trade than necessary to meet the intended purpose; and
(iv) improve import check processes, including testing methodologies and procedures, for perishable and cyclical products while recognizing that countries may put in place measures to protect human, animal, or plant life or health in a manner consistent with their international obligations, including those on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (referred to in section 101(d)(3) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(3)));

(B) reducing or eliminating, by a date certain, tariffs or other charges that decrease market opportunities for United States exports—

(i) giving priority to those products that are subject to significantly higher tariffs or subsidy regimes of major producing countries; and
(ii) providing reasonable adjustment periods for United States import sensitive products, in close consultation with Congress on such products before initiating tariff reduction negotiations;

(C) reducing tariffs to levels that are the same as or lower than those in the United States;

(D) reducing or eliminating subsidies that decrease market opportunities for United States exports or unfairly distort agriculture markets to the detriment of the United States;

(E) allowing the preservation of programs that support family farms and rural communities but do not distort trade;

(F) developing disciplines for domestic support programs, so that production that is in excess of domestic food security needs is sold at world prices;

(G) eliminating government policies that create price depressing surpluses;

(H) eliminating state trading enterprises whenever possible;

(I) developing, strengthening, and clarifying rules to eliminate practices that unfairly decrease United States market access opportunities or distort agricultural markets to the detriment of the United States, and ensuring that such rules are subject to efficient, timely, and effective dispute settlement;—

(i) unfair or trade distorting activities of state trading enterprises and other administrative mechanisms, with emphasis on requiring transparency in the timing of state trading enterprises and such other mechanisms in order to end cross subsidization, price discrimination, and price undercutting;

(ii) unjustified trade restrictions or commercial requirements, such as labeling, that affect new technologies, including biotechnology;

(iii) unjustified sanitary or phytosanitary restrictions, including restrictions not based on scientific principles in contravention of obligations contained in the Uruguay Round Agreements or bilateral or regional trade agreements;

(iv) other unjustified technical barriers to trade; and

(v) restrictive rules in the administration of tariff rate quotas;

(J) eliminating practices that adversely affect trade in perishable or cyclical products, while improving import relief mechanisms to recognize the unique characteristics of perishable and cyclical agriculture;

(K) requiring that import relief mechanisms for perishable and cyclical agriculture are as accessible and timely to growers in the United States as those mechanisms that are available to producers of non-perishable products;

(L) taking into account whether a party to the negotiations has failed to adhere to the provisions of already existing trade agreements with the United States or has circumvented obligations under those agreements;

(M) taking into account whether a product is subject to market distortions by reason of a failure of a major producing country to adhere to the provisions of already existing trade agreements, and to eliminate such practice by the circumvention by that country of its obligations under those agreements;

(N) otherwise ensuring that countries that accede to the World Trade Organization have made meaningful market liberalization commitments in agriculture;

(O) taking into account the impact that agreements to which the United States is a party have on the United States agricultural industry;

(P) maintaining bona fide food assistance programs, market development programs, and export credit programs;

(Q) seeking to secure the broadest market access possible in multilateral, regional, and bilateral negotiations, recognizing the effect that simultaneous sets of negotiations may have on United States import sensitive commodities (including those subject to tariff rate quotas);

(R) seeking to develop an international consensus on the treatment of seasonal or perishable agricultural products in investigations relating to dumping and safeguards and in any other relevant area;

(S) seeking to establish the common base year for calculating the Aggregated Measure of Support (as defined in the Agreement on Agriculture) as the end of each country’s Uruguay Round implementation period, as reported in each country’s Uruguay Round Access Schedule;

(T) ensuring transparency in the administration of tariff rate quotas through multilateral, plurilateral, and bilateral negotiations; and

(U) eliminating and preventing the undermining of market access for United States products through improper use of a country’s system for protecting or recognizing geographical indications, including failing to ensure transparency and procedural fairness and protecting generic terms.

(5) INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States regarding trade-related intellectual property are—

(A) to further promote adequate and effective protection of intellectual property rights, including through—

(i) ensuring accelerated and full implementation of the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights referred to in section 101(d)(15) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(15)), particularly with respect to meeting enforcement obligations under that agreement; and

(ii) ensuring that the provisions of any trade agreement governing intellectual property rights that is entered into by the United States reflect a standard of protection similar to that found in United States law;

(B) providing strong protection for new and emerging technologies and new methods of transmitting and distributing products embodying intellectual property in a manner that facilitates legitimate digital trade;

(C) preventing or eliminating discrimination with respect to matters affecting the availability, acquisition, scope, maintenance, use, and enforcement of intellectual property rights, including through—

(i) ensuring that standards of protection and enforcement keep pace with technological developments, and in particular ensuring that rightholders have the legal and technological means to control the use of their works through the Internet and other global communication media, and to prevent the unauthorized use of their works;

(ii) providing strong enforcement of intellectual property rights, including through accessible, expeditious, and effective civil, administrative, and criminal enforcement mechanisms; and

(D) to secure fair, equitable, and nondiscriminatory market access opportunities for United States persons that rely upon intellectual property protection; and

(E) to respect the Declaration on the TRIPS Agreement and Public Health, adopted at the Fourth Ministerial Conference at Doha, Qatar on November 14, 2001, and to ensure
that trade agreements foster innovation and promote access to medicines.

(6) DIGITAL TRADE IN GOODS AND SERVICES AND CROSS-BORDER DATA FLOWS.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to digital trade in goods and services, as well as cross-border data flows, and regard to (A) to ensure that current obligations, rules, disciplines, and commitments under the World Trade Organization and bilateral and regional trade agreements apply to digital trade in goods and services and to cross-border data flows;

(B) to ensure that—
(i) electronic delivery of goods and services receive no less favorable treatment under trade rules and commitments than like products delivered in physical form; and

(ii) the classification of such goods and services ensures the most liberal trade treat- ment possible, fully encompassing both exist- ing and new trade;

(C) to ensure that governments refrain from implementing trade-related measures that impede digital trade in goods and services, restrict cross-border data flows, or re- quire the disclosure of or access to data; and

(D) with respect to subparagraphs (A) through (C), where legitimate policy objectives require domestic regulations that affect digital trade such as price controls and cross-border data flows, to obtain commit- ments that any such regulations are the least restrictive on trade, nondiscriminatory, transparent, and promote an open market environment; and

(E) to extend the moratorium of the World Trade Organization on duties on electronic transmissions.

(7) REGULATORY PRACTICES.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States regarding government activity regulation or other practices to reduce market access for United States goods, services, and invest- ments are—

(A) to achieve increased transparency and opportunity for the participation of affected parties in the development of regulations;

(B) to require that proposed regulations be based on sound science, cost benefit analysis, risk assessment, or other objective evidence;

(C) to establish consultative mechanisms and seek other commitments, as appropriate, to improve transparency and promote increased regulatory coherence, including through—

(i) transparency in developing guidelines, rules, regulations, and laws for government procurement and other regulatory regimes;

(ii) the elimination of redundancies in testing and certification;

(iii) early consultations on significant regu- lations;

(iv) the use of impact assessments;

(v) the application of good regulatory practices;

(D) to ensure that increased openness, transparency, and convergence of standards development processes, and enhance cooperation on stand- 
sards issues globally;

(E) to promote regulatory compatibility through harmonization, equivalence, or mut- ual recognition of different regulations and standards and to encourage the use of inter- national and interoperable standards, as ap- propriate;

(F) to achieve the elimination of govern- ment measures such as price controls and refer- ence pricing which deny full services access for United States products;

(G) to ensure that government regulatory reimbursement regimes are transparent, pro- vide full market access for United States pro- ducers and service providers, and are not dis- criminatory, and provide full market access for United States products; and

(H) to ensure that foreign governments—

(i) demonstrate that the collection of un- disclosed proprietary information is limited to that necessary to satisfy a legitimate and justified regulatory interest; and

(ii) protect such information against disclo- sure, except in exceptional circumstances to protect the public, or where such informa- tion is effectively protected against unfair competition.

(8) STATE-OWNED AND STATE-CONTROLLED ENTERPRISES.—The principal negotiating ob- jectives of the United States regarding com- petition by state-owned and state-controlled enterprises is to seek commitments that—

(A) eliminate distortions and unfair competition favoring state-owned and state-controlled enterprises to the ex- tent of their engagement in commercial ac- tivity, and

(B) ensure that such engagement is based solely on commercial considerations, in particular through disciplines that elimi- nate or prevent discrimination and market-distorting subsidies and that promote trans- parency.

(9) LOCALIZATION BARRIERS TO TRADE.—The prin- cipal negotiating objective of the United States with respect to localization barriers is to eliminate and prevent measures that re- quire United States producers and service providers to locate facilities, intellectual property, or other assets in a country as a market access or investment condition, in- cluding indigenous innovation measures.

(10) LABOR AND THE ENVIRONMENT.—The prin- cipal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to labor and the environment are—

(A) to ensure that a party to a trade agree- ment with the United States—

(i) adopts and maintains measures imple- menting internationally recognized core labor standards (as defined in section 111(17)), in a manner affecting trade or investment between the United States and that party, where the waiver or derogation would be inconsistent with one or more such standards, or

(ii) its environmental laws in a manner affecting trade or investment between the United States and that party, except as provided in its law and provided not inconsistent with its obligations under common multilateral environmental agreements (as defined in section 111(b));

(B) to ensure that enforceable labor and en- vironmental standards are subject to the same dispute settlement and remedies as other enforceable obligations under the agreement;

(C) to ensure that a trade agreement is not construed to empower a party’s authorities to undertake labor or environmental law en-forcement activities in the territory of the United States.

(11) CURRENCY.—The principal negotiating objective of the United States with respect to currency practices is that parties to a trade agreement with the United States avoid manipulating exchange rates in or- der to prevent effective balance of payments ad- justment or to gain an unfair competitive advantage over other parties to the agree- ment, such as through cooperative mecha- nisms, enforceable rules, reporting, moni- toring, transparency, or other means, as ap- propriate.

(12) FOREIGN CURRENCY MANIPULATION.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to unfair currency prac- tices is to seek to establish accountability through enforceable rules, transparency, re- porting, monitoring, cooperative mecha- nisms, or other means to avoid exchange rate manipulation involving protracted large scale intervention in one direction in the ex- change markets and a persistently under- valued foreign exchange rate to gain an unfair competitive advantage in trade over other parties to a trade agreement, con- sistent with existing obligations of the United States as a member of the Interna- tional Monetary Fund and the World Trade Organization.
Agreement, the Government Procurement Agreement, and other plurilateral trade agreements of the World Trade Organization; (C) to expand competitive market opportuni-
ties for United States exports, including by work-
ing to maintain and to increase the effectiveness of such bodies; and 
(F) to encourage greater cooperation be-
 tween the World Trade Organization and other international organizations.

(14) TRADE INSTITUTION TRANSPARENCY.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to transparency is to seek transparency, consistency, and predictability in the operation of trade agreements, and to achieve fairer and more open conditions of trade in textiles and apparel.

(15) ANTI-CORRUPTION.—The principal negoti-
ating objectives of the United States with respect to transparency are to seek: 
(A) to obtain high standards and effective domestic enforcement mechanisms applicable to persons from all countries partici-
 pating in significant United States bilateral and plurilateral trade agreements that prohibit such attempts to influence acts, decisions, or omissions of foreign governments or officials or to secure any improper advantage in a manner affecting trade; 
(B) to ensure that such standards level the playing field for United States persons in international trade and investment; and 
(C) to seek commitments to work diligently to encourage and support anti-corruption and anti-bribery initiatives in international trade fora, including through the Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions of the Organization for Economic Coopera-
tion and Development, done at Paris Decem-
ber 17, 1997 (commonly known as the “OECD Anti-Bribery Convention”).

(16) DISPUTE SETTLEMENT AND ENFORC-
MENT.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to dispute settlement and enforcement of trade agree-
ments are: 
(A) to seek provisions in trade agreements providing for dispute settlement and enforcement of trade agreements in an effective, timely, transparent, equi-
table, and reasoned manner, requiring deter-
minations based on facts and the principles of the agreements, with the goal of increas-
ing compliance with the agreements; 
(B) to obtain the consistency, predictability, and comprehensiveness of the Trade Policy Review Mechanism of the World Trade Organization to review compli-
ance with commitments; 
(C) to seek to ensure that disputes are settled under the Dispute Settlement Understanding and by the Appellate Body to— 
(i) the mandate of those panels and the Appellate Body as set forth in the Dispute Settlement Understanding as written, without adding to or diminishing rights and obligations under the agreement; and 
(ii) the standard of review applicable under the Uruguay Round Agreement involved in the dispute, including greater deference, as appropriate, and the procedural and technical expertise of national investigating authorities;

(D) to seek provisions encouraging the early identification and settlement of dis-
putes through consultation;

(E) to seek provisions encouraging the early identification and settlement of dis-
putes through consultation;

(F) to ensure that such standards level the playing field for United States persons in international trade and investment; and 
(G) to ensure that such standards level the playing field for United States persons in international trade and investment; and 
(H) to provide technical assistance to that country if needed;

(17) TRADE REMEDY LAWS.—The principal negoti-
ating objectives of the United States with respect to trade remedy laws are: 
(A) to encourage and support anti-corruption and anti-bribery initiatives in international trade fora, including through the Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions of the Organization for Economic Coopera-
tion and Development, done at Paris Decem-
ber 17, 1997 (commonly known as the “OECD Anti-Bribery Convention”).

(18) BORDER TAXES.—The principal negoti-
ating objective of the United States regarding border taxes is to obtain a revision of the rules of the World Trade Organization with respect to the treatment of border adjust-
ments for internal taxes to redress the dis-
advantage to countries relying primarily on direct taxes for revenue rather than indirect taxes.

(19) TEXTILE NEGOTIATIONS.—The principal negoti-
ating objectives of the United States with respect to trade in textiles and apparel articles are to obtain competitive opportuni-
ties for United States exports of textiles and apparel articles that are substantially equivalent to the competitive opportunities afforded foreign exports in United States markets and to achieve fairer and more open conditions of trade in textiles and apparel.

(20) COMMERCIAL PARTNERSHIPS.—
(A) In general.—With respect to an agree-
ment that is proposed to enter into force with the Transatlantic Trade and Invest-
ment Partnership countries and to which section 103(b) will apply, the principal negoti-
ating objectives of the United States with respect to commercial partnerships are the fol-
lowing:

(i) To discourage actions by potential trad-
 ing partners that directly or indirectly prej-
 udice or otherwise discourage commercial activity solely between the United States and the European Union.

(ii) To discourage politically motivated ac-
tions by boycott, divest from, or sanction Israel and to seek the elimination of politi-
cally motivated nontariff barriers on Israeli goods, services, or other commerce imposed on the State of Israel.

(iii) To seek the elimination of state-spon-
sored unsanctioned foreign boycotts against Israel or compliance with the Arab League Boycott of Israel by prospective trading partners.

(B) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term “actions to boycott, divest from, or sanction Israel” means actions by states, non-member states of the United Nations, supranational organizations, and agencies of international organizations that are politically motivated and are intended to penalize or otherwise limit commercial rela-
tions with the State of Israel.

(21) GOOD GOVERNANCE, TRANSPARENCY, THE EFFECTIVE OPERATION OF LEGAL REGIMES, AND THE RULE OF LAW OF TRADING PARTNERS.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to enforcing im-
plementation of trade commitments and ob-
ligations by strengthening good governance, transparency, the effective operation of legal regimes and the rule of law of trading part-
ners of the United States is through capacity building and other appropriate means, which are important parts of the broader effort to create more open democratic societies and to promote respect for internationally recog-
nized human rights.

(c) CAPACITY BUILDING AND OTHER PRIOR-
ITIES.—In order to address and maintain United States competitiveness in the global economy, the President shall:

(1) consult the heads of relevant Federal agencies—

(A) to work to strengthen the capacity of United States trading partners to carry out obligations under trade agreements by con-
sulting with any country seeking a trade agreement with the United States concern-
ning that country’s laws relating to cus-
 tomaries and trade facilitation, sanitary and phytosanitary measures, technical barriers to trade, intellectual property rights, labor, and the environment; and 

(B) to provide technical assistance to that country if needed;

(2) seek to establish consultative mecha-
nisms among parties to trade agreements to strengthen the capacity of United States trading partners to develop and implement standards for the protection of the environ-
ment and human health based on sound science;

(3) promote consideration of multilateral environmental agreements and consult with partners to ensure that such agreements regarding the capacity of United States trading partners to develop and implement standards for the protection of the environ-
ment and human health based on sound science.

(22) GOVERNANCE, TRANSPARENCY, THE EFFECTIVE OPERATION OF LEGAL REGIMES, AND THE RULE OF LAW OF TRADING PARTNERS.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to enforcing im-
plementation of trade commitments and ob-
ligations by strengthening good governance, transparency, the effective operation of legal regimes and the rule of law of trading part-
ners of the United States is through capacity building and other appropriate means, which are important parts of the broader effort to create more open democratic societies and to promote respect for internationally recog-
nized human rights.

(c) CAPACITY BUILDING AND OTHER PRIOR-
ITIES.—In order to address and maintain United States competitiveness in the global economy, the President shall:

(1) consult the heads of relevant Federal agencies—

(A) to work to strengthen the capacity of United States trading partners to carry out obligations under trade agreements by con-
sulting with any country seeking a trade agreement with the United States concern-
ning that country’s laws relating to cus-
 tomaries and trade facilitation, sanitary and phytosanitary measures, technical barriers to trade, intellectual property rights, labor, and the environment; and 

(B) to provide technical assistance to that country if needed;

(2) seek to establish consultative mecha-
nisms among parties to trade agreements to strengthen the capacity of United States trading partners to develop and implement standards for the protection of the environ-
ment and human health based on sound science;

(3) promote consideration of multilateral environmental agreements and consult with partners to ensure that such agreements regarding the capacity of United States trading partners to develop and implement standards for the protection of the environ-
ment and human health based on sound science.

(23) GOOD GOVERNANCE, TRANSPARENCY, THE EFFECTIVE OPERATION OF LEGAL REGIMES, AND THE RULE OF LAW OF TRADING PARTNERS.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to enforcing im-
plementation of trade commitments and ob-
ligations by strengthening good governance, transparency, the effective operation of legal regimes and the rule of law of trading part-
ners of the United States is through capacity building and other appropriate means, which are important parts of the broader effort to create more open democratic societies and to promote respect for internationally recog-
nized human rights.

(c) CAPACITY BUILDING AND OTHER PRIOR-
ITIES.—In order to address and maintain United States competitiveness in the global economy, the President shall:

(1) consult the heads of relevant Federal agencies—

(A) to work to strengthen the capacity of United States trading partners to carry out obligations under trade agreements by con-
sulting with any country seeking a trade agreement with the United States concern-
ning that country’s laws relating to cus-
 tomaries and trade facilitation, sanitary and phytosanitary measures, technical barriers to trade, intellectual property rights, labor, and the environment; and 

(B) to provide technical assistance to that country if needed;

(2) seek to establish consultative mecha-
nisms among parties to trade agreements to strengthen the capacity of United States trading partners to develop and implement standards for the protection of the environ-
ment and human health based on sound science;

(3) promote consideration of multilateral environmental agreements and consult with partners to ensure that such agreements regarding the capacity of United States trading partners to develop and implement standards for the protection of the environ-
ment and human health based on sound science.
annual report on capacity-building activities undertaken in connection with trade agreements negotiated or being negotiated pursuant to this title.

SEC. 103. TRADE AGREEMENTS AUTHORITY.

(a) AGREEMENTS REGARDING TARIFF BARRIERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Whenever the President determines that one or more existing duties or other import restrictions of any foreign country or the United States are unduly burdening and restricting the foreign trade of the United States and that the purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title will be promoted thereby, the President—

(A) may enter into trade agreements with foreign countries before—

(i) July 1, 2018; or

(ii) July 1, 2021, if trade authorities procedures are extended under subsection (c); and

(B) may, subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), proclaim—

(i) such modification or continuance of any existing duty,

(ii) such continuation of existing duty free or excise treatment, or

(iii) such modification or continuance of any existing duty free or excise treatment, as the President determines to be required or appropriate to carry out any such trade agreement.

Substantial modifications to, or substantial additional provisions of, a trade agreement entered into after July 1, 2018, or July 1, 2021, if trade authorities procedures are extended under subsection (c), shall not be eligible for approval under this title.

(2) NOTIFICATION.—The President shall notify Congress of the President’s intention to enter into an agreement under this subsection.

(3) LIMITATIONS.—No proclamation may be made under paragraph (1) that—

(A) the reduction in the rate of duty (other than a rate of duty that does not exceed 5 percent ad valorem on the date of the enactment of this Act) to a rate of duty which is less than 50 percent of the rate of such duty that applies on such date of enactment;

(B) reduces the rate of duty below that applicable under the Uruguay Round Agreement on Import Restrictions or other multilateral agreements or commitments established under section 135 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155) of the United States or adversely affects the United States economy, or

(C) increases any rate of duty above the rate that was in effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(4) AGGREGATE REDUCTION; EXEMPTION FROM STAGING.

(A) AGGREGATE REDUCTION.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the aggregate reduction in the rate of duty on any article which is in effect on any day pursuant to a trade agreement entered into under paragraph (1) shall not exceed the aggregate reduction which would have been in effect on such day if—

(i) a reduction of 3 percent ad valorem or a reduction of 1/3 of the total reduction, whichever is greater, had taken effect on the effective date of the first reduction proclaimed under paragraph (1) to carry out such agreement with respect to such article; and

(ii) a reduction equal to the amount applicable under clause (i) had taken effect at 1-year intervals after the effective date of such first reduction.

(B) EXEMPTION FROM STAGING.—No staging is required under subparagraph (A) with respect to a duty reduction that is proclaimed under paragraph (1) for an article of a kind that is not produced in the United States.

The United States International Trade Commission shall advise the President of the identity of articles that may be exempted from staging under subparagraph (A).

(5) ROUNDED.—If the President determines that such action will simplify the computation of reductions under paragraph (4), the President may round an annual reduction by an amount equal to the lesser of—

(A) the difference between the reduction without regard to this subparagraph and the next lower whole number; or

(B) 1/10 of 1 percent ad valorem.

(6) OTHER LIMITATIONS.—A rate of duty reduction that may not be proclaimed under subsection (c) may take effect only if a provision authorizing such reduction is included within an implementing bill provided for under section 106 and that bill is enacted into law.

(7) OTHER TARIFF MODIFICATIONS.—Notwithstanding subparagraphs (1)(B), (3)(A), (3)(C), and (4) through (6), the consultations and layover requirements of section 115 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3529), the President may proclaim the modification of any duty or staged rate reduction of any duty set forth in Schedule XX, as defined in section 2(5) of that Act (19 U.S.C. 3501(5)), if the United States agrees to such modification or staged rate reduction in a negotiation for the reciprocal elimination or harmonization of duties under the auspices of the World Trade Organization or harmonization of duties under the auspices of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

(b) AUTHORITY UNDER URUGUAY ROUND AGREEMENTS ACT NOT AFFECTED.—Nothing in this subsection shall limit the authority provided to the President under section 110 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3521(b)).

(c) AGREEMENTS REGARDING TARIFF AND NONTARIFF BARRIERS.

(1) IN GENERAL.—(A) Whenever the President determines that—

(i) 1 or more existing duties or other import restrictions of any foreign country or the United States or any other barrier to, or other distortion of, international trade unduly burdens or restricts the foreign trade of the United States and, in the opinion of the President, adversely affects the United States economy, or

(ii) the imposition of any such barrier or distortion is likely to result in such a burden, restriction, or other distortion of, international trade unduly burdens or restricts the foreign trade of the United States and, in the opinion of the President, adversely affects the United States economy, or

(B) The President may enter into a trade agreement under paragraph (A) with foreign countries or agreements therefor, regarding whether the extension disapproval resolution under paragraph (b) before July 1, 2018; and

(c) Extension Disapproval Process for Congressional Trade Authorities Procedures.

(B) The provisions referred to in subparagraph (A) are—

(i) a provision approving a trade agreement entered into under this subsection and approving the statement of administrative action, if any, proposed to implement such trade agreement; and

(ii) a statement of its views, and the reasons therefor, regarding whether the extension disapproval resolution under paragraph (b) should be approved or disapproved.

(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS BY THE PRESIDENT.—(A) The President shall promptly inform the Ad- visory Committee for Trade Policy and Negotiations established under section 135 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155) of the decision of the President to submit a report to Congress under paragraph (2). The Advis- ory Committee shall submit a report as soon as practicable, but not later than June 1, 2018, a written report that contains—

(i) its views regarding the progress that has been made in negotiations to achieve the purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title; and

(ii) a statement of its views, and the reasons therefor, regarding whether the extension requested under paragraph (2) should be approved or disapproved.

(B) REPORT BY INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION.—The President may inform the United States International Trade Commission of the decision of the President to submit a report to Congress under paragraph (2) and the International Trade Commission shall submit to Congress as soon as practicable, but not later than June 1, 2018,
a written report that contains a review and analysis of the economic impact on the United States of all trade agreements implemented between the date of the enactment of this Act and the date on which the President decides to seek an extension requested under paragraph (2).

(4) STATUSES OF REPORTS.—The reports submitted under paragraphs (1) and (3), or any portion of such reports, may be classified to the extent the President determines appropriate.

(5) Extension of disapproval resolutions.—(A) For purposes of paragraph (1), the term "extension disapproval resolution" means a resolution of either House of Congress, the sole House of Congress resolving clause of which is as follows: "That the President disapproves the request of the President for the extension, under section 103(c)(1)(B)(i) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015, of the trade authorities procedures under that Act to any implementing bill submitted with respect to any trade agreement entered into under section 103(b) of that Act after June 30, 2018.”, with the blank space being filled with the name of the resolving House of Congress.

(B) any extension disapproval resolution—
(i) may be introduced in either House of Congress by any member of such House; and
(ii) shall be referred, in the House of Representatives, to the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, to the Committee on Rules.

(C) The provisions of subsections (d) and (e) of section 103 of that Act and the date on which the President determines that such negotiations are feasible and timely and would benefit the United States, the sole House of Congress resolving clause of which is as follows: "That the President disapproves the request of the President for the extension, under section 103(b) of that Act after June 30, 2018.”, with the blank space being filled with the name of the resolving House of Congress.

(104) SEC. 104. CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT, CONSULTATIONS, AND ACCESS TO INFORMATION.

(a) Consultations with Members of Congress.—

(1) Consultations during negotiations.—In the course of negotiations conducted under this title, the United States Trade Representative shall—

(A) meet upon request with any Member of Congress regarding negotiating objectives, the status and nature of negotiations in progress, and the nature of any changes in the laws of the United States or the administration of those laws that may be recommended to Congress to carry out any trade agreement or any requirement of, amendment to, or recommendation under, that agreement;

(B) upon request of a member of Congress, provide access to pertinent documents relating to the negotiations, including classified materials;

(C) consult closely and on a timely basis with, and keep fully apprised of the negotiations, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate;

(D) consult closely and on a timely basis with, and keep fully apprised of the negotiations, the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate.

(2) Consultations prior to entry into force.—Prior to entering into force of a trade agreement, the United States Trade Representative shall consult closely and on a timely basis with Members of Congress and committees as specified in paragraph (1), and keep them fully apprised of the measures a trading partner has taken to comply with the provisions of the agreement that are to take effect on the date that the agreement enters into force.

(3) Enhanced coordination with Congress.—

(A) Written guidelines.—The United States Trade Representative, in consultation with the chairmen and the ranking members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, shall prepare written guidelines with respect to the coordination with designated congressional advisers under section 103(c) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015, and the date on which the President determines that such negotiations are feasible and timely and would benefit the United States. The United States Trade Representative shall disseminate the guidelines developed under subparagraph (A) to all Federal agencies that could have jurisdiction over laws affected by trade negotiations.

(b) Designated congressional advisors.—

(1) Designation.—

(A) House of Representatives.—In each Congress, the majority Members of the House of Representatives may be designated as a congressional adviser on trade policy and negotiations by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, after consulting with the chairmen and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means and the chairman and ranking member of the committee from which the Member will be selected.

(B) Senate.—In each Congress, any Member of the Senate may be designated as a congressional adviser on trade policy and negotiations by the President pro tempore of the Senate, after consultation with the chairmen and ranking member of the Committee on Finance and the chairman and ranking member of the committee from which the Member will be selected.

(2) Consultations with designated congressional advisers.—In the course of negotiations conducted under this title, the United States Trade Representative shall consult closely and on a timely basis (including immediately before initialing an agreement) with, and keep fully apprised of the negotiations and the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations convened under subsection (c) and all committees of the House of Representatives and of the Senate, regarding any trade laws that could be affected by a trade agreement resulting from the negotiations; and

(E) with regard to any negotiations and agreement relating to agricultural trade, also consult closely and on a timely basis (including immediately before initialing an agreement) with, and keep fully apprised of the negotiations and the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations convened under subsection (c) and all committees of the House of Representatives and of the Senate, regarding any trade laws that could be affected by a trade agreement resulting from the negotiations; and

(3) Accreditation.—Each of the congressional advisers designated under paragraph (1) shall be accredited by the President upon the recommendation of the President pro tempore of the United States Congress designated as a congressional adviser on behalf of the President as an official adviser to the United States delegations to international conferences, meetings, and negotiations relating to trade agreements.

(c) Congressional advisory groups on negotiations.—

(A) General.—By not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not later than 30 days after the convening of each Congress, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives shall convene the House Advisory Group on Negotiations and the chairman of the Committee on Finance of the Senate shall convene the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations (in this subsection referred to collectively as the “congressional advisory groups”).

(B) Membership of the house advisory group on negotiations.—In each Congress, the House Advisory Group on Negotiations shall be comprised of the following Members of the House of Representatives:—

(1) the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and 3 additional members of such Committee (not more than 2 of whom are members of the same political party).

(2) the chairman or ranking member of the House of Representatives designated under paragraph (1) shall be comprised of the following Members of the Senate:

(i) the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and 3 additional members of such Committee (not more than 2 of whom are members of the same political party).

(ii) the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Finance, and 3 additional members of such Committee (not more than 2 of whom are members of the same political party).

(iii) the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and 3 additional members of such Committee (not more than 2 of whom are members of the same political party).

(iv) the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Finance, and 3 additional members of such Committee (not more than 2 of whom are members of the same political party).

(v) the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and 3 additional members of such Committee (not more than 2 of whom are members of the same political party).

(vi) the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Finance, and 3 additional members of such Committee (not more than 2 of whom are members of the same political party).

(vii) the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and 3 additional members of such Committee (not more than 2 of whom are members of the same political party).

(viii) the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Finance, and 3 additional members of such Committee (not more than 2 of whom are members of the same political party).

(ix) the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and 3 additional members of such Committee (not more than 2 of whom are members of the same political party).

(x) the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Finance, and 3 additional members of such Committee (not more than 2 of whom are members of the same political party).

(xi) the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and 3 additional members of such Committee (not more than 2 of whom are members of the same political party).

(xii) the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Finance, and 3 additional members of such Committee (not more than 2 of whom are members of the same political party).

(xiii) the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and 3 additional members of such Committee (not more than 2 of whom are members of the same political party).

(xiv) the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Finance, and 3 additional members of such Committee (not more than 2 of whom are members of the same political party).

(xv) the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and 3 additional members of such Committee (not more than 2 of whom are members of the same political party).

(xvi) the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Finance, and 3 additional members of such Committee (not more than 2 of whom are members of the same political party).

(xvii) the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and 3 additional members of such Committee (not more than 2 of whom are members of the same political party).

(xviii) the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Finance, and 3 additional members of such Committee (not more than 2 of whom are members of the same political party).

(xix) the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and 3 additional members of such Committee (not more than 2 of whom are members of the same political party).

(xx) the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Finance, and 3 additional members of such Committee (not more than 2 of whom are members of the same political party).

(C) Commencement of negotiations.—In each Congress, the United States Trade Representative shall—

(A) meet upon request with any Member of Congress regarding negotiating objectives, the status and nature of negotiations in progress, and the nature of any changes in the laws of the United States or the administration of those laws that may be recommended to Congress to carry out any trade agreement or any requirement of, amendment to, or recommendation under, that agreement; and

(B) consult closely and on a timely basis with, and keep fully apprised of the negotiations, the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations convened under subsection (c) and all committees of the House of Representatives and of the Senate, regarding any trade laws that could be affected by a trade agreement resulting from the negotiations; and

(C) with regard to any negotiations and agreement relating to agricultural trade, also consult closely and on a timely basis (including immediately before initialing an agreement) with, and keep fully apprised of the negotiations and the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations convened under subsection (c) and all committees of the House of Representatives and of the Senate, regarding any trade laws that could be affected by a trade agreement resulting from the negotiations; and

(D) consult closely and on a timely basis with, and keep fully apprised of the negotiations, the congressional advisers for trade policy and negotiations designated under paragraph (1).
Senate that would have, under the Rules of the Senate, jurisdiction over provisions of law affected by a trade agreement negotiation conducted at any time during that Congress.

(C) ACCREDITATION.—Each member of the congressional advisory groups described in subparagraphs (A)(i) and (B)(i) shall be accredited by the United States Trade Representative on behalf of the President as an official adviser to the United States delegation in negotiations for any trade agreement to which this title applies. Each member of the congressional advisory groups described in subparagraphs (A)(ii) and (B)(ii) shall be accredited by the United States Trade Representative as an official adviser to the United States delegation in the negotiations by reason of which the member is in one of the congressional advisory groups.

(D) CONSULTATION AND ADVICE.—The congressional advisory groups shall consult with and provide advice to the Trade Representative regarding the formulation of specific objectives, negotiating strategies and positions, the development of the applicable legislation, and compliance and enforcement of the negotiated commitments under the agreement.

(E) CHAIR.—The House Advisory Group on Negotiations shall be chaired by the Chairman of the House of Representatives and the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations shall be chaired by the Chairman of the Senate.

(F) COORDINATION WITH OTHER COMMITTEES.—Members of any committee represented on one of the congressional advisory groups described in subparagraph (A)(i) or (B)(i) shall be a member of the appropriate congressional advisory group from that committee regarding any matter related to a negotiation for any trade agreement to which this title applies.

(3) GUIDELINES.—

(A) PURPOSE AND REVISION.—The United States Trade Representative, in consultation with the chairmen of the congressional advisory groups and the ranking members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, respectively—

(i) shall, not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, develop written guidelines to facilitate the useful and timely exchange of information between the Trade Representative and the congressional advisory groups; and

(ii) may make such revisions to the guidelines as may be necessary from time to time.

(B) The guidelines developed under paragraph (A) shall provide for, among other things—

(i) detailed briefings on a fixed timetable to be provided in the guidelines of the congressional advisory groups regarding negotiating objectives and positions and the status of the applicable negotiations, beginning as soon as practicable after the congressional advisory groups are convened, with more frequent briefings as trade negotiations enter the final stage;

(ii) the sharing of members of the congressional advisory groups, and staff with proper security clearances, to pertinent documents relating to the negotiations, including classified material under control of the negotiations, at negotiation sites;

(iii) the closest practicable coordination between the Trade Representative and the congressional advisory groups at all critical periods during the negotiations, including at negotiation sites;

(iv) after the applicable trade agreement is concluded, consultation regarding ongoing compliance with the negotiated commitments under the trade agreement; and

(v) the timeframe for submitting the report required under section 105(d)(3).

(4) REQUEST FOR MEETING.—Upon the request of a majority of the congressional advisory groups, the President shall meet with that congressional advisory group before initiating negotiations with respect to a trade agreement, or at any other time concerning the negotiations.

(D) CONSULTATIONS WITH THE PUBLIC.—

(1) GUIDELINES FOR PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT.—

The United States Trade Representative, in consultation with the chairmen and the ranking members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, respectively—

(A) shall, not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, develop written guidelines on public access to information regarding negotiations conducted under this title; and

(B) may make such revisions to the guidelines as may be necessary from time to time.

(2) PURPOSES.—The guidelines developed under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) facilitate transparency;

(B) encourage public participation; and

(C) promote collaboration in the negotiation process.

(3) CONTENT.—The guidelines developed under paragraph (1) shall include procedures that—

(A) provide for rapid disclosure of information in forms that the public can readily find and use; and

(B) provide frequent opportunities for public input through Federal Register requests for comment and other means.

(4) DISSEMINATION.—The United States Trade Representative shall disseminate the guidelines developed under paragraph (1) to all Federal agencies that could have jurisdiction over laws affected by trade negotiations.

(E) CONSULTATIONS WITH ADVISORY COMMITTEES.—

(1) GUIDELINES FOR ENGAGEMENT WITH ADVISORY COMMITTEES.—The United States Trade Representative, in consultation with the chairmen and the ranking members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives on Finance of the Senate, respectively—

(A) shall, not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, develop written guidelines to facilitate the useful and timely exchange of information between the Trade Representative with advisory committees established pursuant to section 135 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2171(b)) regarding negotiations conducted under this title; and

(B) may make such revisions to the guidelines as may be necessary from time to time.

(2) CONTENT.—The guidelines developed under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) enhance coordination with advisory committees described in that paragraph through procedures to ensure—

(i) timely briefings of advisory committees and regular opportunities for advisory committees to provide input throughout the negotiation process on matters relevant to the sectors or functional areas represented by those committees; and

(ii) the sharing of detailed and timely information with each member of an advisory committee regarding negotiations and pertinent documents related to the negotiation (including classified information) on matters relevant to the sectors or functional areas represented by such committee and with a designee with proper security clearances of each such member as appropriate.

(3) DISSEMINATION.—The United States Trade Representative shall disseminate the guidelines developed under paragraph (1) to all Federal agencies that could have jurisdiction over laws affected by trade negotiations.

(F) ESTABLISHMENT OF POSITION OF CHIEF TRANSPARENCY OFFICER.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF POSITION OF CHIEF TRANSPARENCY OFFICER.—

The Chief Transparency Officer shall consult with the Congress on transparency policies and practices, and shall provide guidance on transparency in trade negotiations, engage and assist the public, and advise the United States Trade Representative on transparency policy.

SEC. 105. NOTICE, CONSULTATIONS, AND REPORTS.

(a) NOTICE, CONSULTATIONS, AND REPORTS BEFORE NEGOTIATION.—

(1) NOTICE.—The President, with respect to any agreement that is subject to the provisions of section 103(b), shall—

(A) provide, at least 90 calendar days before initiating negotiations with a country, notice to the Congress of the President’s intention to enter into the negotiations with that country and set forth in the notice the date on which the President deems appropriate, and the House Advisory Group on Negotiations and the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations convened under section 104(c);

(B) provide publicly available Internet websites of the Office of the United States Trade Representative on transparency in trade negotiations, engage and assist the public, and advise the United States Trade Representative on transparency policy.

(2) NEGOTIATIONS REGARDING AGRICULTURE.—

(A) ASSESSMENT AND CONSULATIONS FOLLOWING ASSESSMENT.—Before initiating or continuing negotiations the subject matter of which is directly related to the subject matter of section 102(b)(3)(B) with any country, pursuant to the requesting country and set forth in the notice the date on which the President intends to initiate those negotiations, the specific United States objectives for the negotiations with that country, and whether the President intends to seek an agreement, or changes to an existing agreement.

(B) before and after submission of the notice, consult regarding the negotiations with the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, such other committees of the House and Senate as the President deems appropriate, and the House Advisory Group on Negotiations and the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations convened under section 104(c).

(C) upon the request of a majority of the members of either the House Advisory Group on Negotiations or the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations convened under section 104(c), shall—

(i) assess whether United States tariffs on agricultural products that were bound under the Uruguay Round Agreements are lower than tariffs bound and applied throughout the world with corresponding agricultural products that were bound under the Uruguay Round Agreements; and

(ii) consider the extent to which United States tariffs on agricultural products that were bound under the Uruguay Round Agreements are higher than United States tariffs and whether the President in consultation with the appropriate congressional advisory committees described in section 110(b)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2121(b)) is amended—

(i) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(ii) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) There shall be in the Office one Chief Transparency Officer. The Chief Transparency Officer shall consult with Congress on transparency policies and practices, and shall provide guidance on transparency in trade negotiations, engage and assist the public, and advise the United States Trade Representative on transparency policy.”
(III) consult with the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate concerning the results of the assessment, whether it is appropriate for the United States to agree to further tariff reductions based on the conclusions reached in the assessment, and how all applicable negotiating objectives will be met.

(B) CONTRACTUAL AND IMPORT SENSITIVE PRODUCTS.—(I) Before initiating negotiations with respect to agricultural and, with respect to agreements described in paragraphs (II) through (IV), other products, the President shall consult with the committees referred to in clause (i)(IV) of those products and the Committee on Finance and the Senate concerning the results of the assessment, whether it is appropriate for the United States to agree to further tariff reductions based on the conclusions reached in the assessment, and how all applicable negotiating objectives will be met.

(II) Consultation With Congress Before Entry Into Agreements.—

(1) Consultation.—Before entering into any trade agreement under section 103(b), the President shall consult with—

(A) the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate;

(B) each other committee of the House and the Senate, and each joint committee of Congress, which has jurisdiction over legislation involving subject matters which would be affected by the trade agreement; and

(C) the House Advisory Group on Negotiations and the Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations convened under section 194(c).

(2) The consultation described in paragraph (1) shall include consultation with respect to—

(A) the nature of the agreement;

(B) how and when the agreement will achieve the applicable purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title; and

(C) the implementation of the agreement under section 106, including the general effect of the agreement on existing laws.

(III) Use of the Import Tariff Commission.—The President, not later than 30 calendar days after the date on which the President enters into a trade agreement under section 103(b), shall report to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate the range of recommendations in the negotiations with respect to that agreement, that may be in the final agreement, and that could be found under—

(A) the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671 et seq.) or to chapter 1 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2251 et seq.); and

(B) any other agreement negotiated by the United States to agree to further tariff reductions by a party to the negotiations.

(4) Negotiations Regarding the Fishing Industry.—(I) The President shall consult with the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and shall keep the Committees apprised of the negotiations on an ongoing and timely basis.

(II) Negotiations Regarding Textiles.—Before initiating or continuing negotiations the subject matter of which is directly related to textiles and apparel products with any country, the President shall—

(A) assess whether United States tariffs on textile and apparel products that were bound under the Uruguay Round Agreements are lower than the tariffs bound by that country and whether the negotiation provides an opportunity to address any such disparity; and

(B) consult with the Committees on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate concerning the results of the assessment, whether it is appropriate for the United States to agree to further tariff reductions based on the conclusions reached in the assessment, and how all applicable negotiating objectives will be met.

(III) Report Regarding United States Trade Remedy Laws.—(A) Changes in Current Trade Laws.—The President, not less than 180 calendar days before the date on which the President enters into a trade agreement under section 103(b), shall report to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate the range of recommendations in the negotiations with respect to that agreement, that may be in the final agreement, and that could be found under—

(A) the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1671 et seq.) or to chapter 1 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2251 et seq.); and

(B) any other agreement negotiated by the United States to agree to further tariff reductions by a party to the negotiations.

(II) Resolutions.—(1) At any time after the transmission of the report under subparagraph (A), in conjunction with the agreements at issue, with respect to that report in either House of Congress, the procedures set forth in clauses (ii) through (vii) shall apply to that resolution if—

(I) no other resolution with respect to that report has previously been reported in that House of Congress by the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Finance, as the case may be, pursuant to those procedures; and

(II) a nonconcurrence disapproval resolution under section 106(b) introduced with respect to a trade agreement entered into pursuant to the negotiations to which the report under paragraph (A) pertains has previously been reported in that House of Congress by the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Finance, as the case may be.

(II) Purposes of this subparagraph, the term ‘resolution’ means only a resolution of either House of Congress, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: ‘That the... finds that the proposed changes to United States trade remedy laws contained in the report of the President transmitted to Congress on under section 105(b)(3) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 with respect to... is not in order for the House of Representatives to consider any resolution that is not reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, by the Committee on Rules.

(III) It is not in order for the Senate to consider any resolution that is not reported by the Committee on Finance and the Senate; and

(IV) Resolutions in the Senate—

(I) may be introduced by any Member of the Senate;

(II) shall be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, to the Committee on Rules; and

(III) may not be amended by either Committee.

(IV) Resolutions in the Senate—

(I) may be introduced by any Member of the Senate;

(II) shall be referred to the Committee on Finance; and

(III) may not be amended.

(v) It is not in order for the House of Representatives to consider any resolution that is not reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, by the Committee on Rules.

(vi) It is not in order for the Senate to consider any resolution that is not reported by the Committee on Finance.

(vii) The provisions of subsections (d) and (e) of section 152 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2192) (relating to floor consideration of certain resolutions in the House and Senate) shall apply to resolutions.

(5) Advisory Committee Reports.—The report required under section 135(e)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2156(e)(1)) regarding any trade agreement entered into under subsection (a) or (b) of section 103 shall be provided to the President, Congress, and the United States Trade Representative not later than 30 calendar days after the date on which the President notifies Congress under section 103(a)(2) or 106(a)(1)(A) of the intention of the President to enter into the agreement.

(6) International Trade Commission Assessment.—(I) Submission of Information to Commission.—The President, not later than 90 calendar days before the date on which the President enters into a trade agreement under section 103(b), shall provide the International Trade Commission (referred to in this subsection as the ‘Commission’), with the information and data the President finds to be necessary at that time and request the Commission to prepare and submit an assessment of the
(1) IN GENERAL.—At the time the President submits to Congress a copy of the final legal text of an agreement pursuant to section 106(a)(1)(E), the President shall also submit to Congress a report on the agreement implementing and enforcing the agreement.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The implementation and enforcement plan required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) BORDER PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS.—A description of additional personnel required at border entry points, including a list of additional customs inspectors.

(B) AGENCY STAFFING REQUIREMENTS.—A description of additional personnel required available for Federal government agencies responsible for monitoring and implementing the trade agreement, including personnel required by the Department of the United States Trade Representative, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of the Treasury, and such other agencies as may be necessary.

(C) CUSTOMS REQUIREMENTS.—A description of the additional equipment and facilities needed by U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

(D) IMPACT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.—A description of the impact the trade agreement will have on State and local governments as a result of increases in trade.

(E) COST ANALYSIS.—An analysis of the costs associated with each of the items listed in subparagraphs (A) through (D).

(F) BUDGET SUBMISSION.—The President shall submit to Congress a description of the impact under the trade agreement on the budget, including a description of the resources necessary to support the plan required by paragraph (1) in the first budget of the President.

(G) ADDITIONAL COORDINATION WITH MEMBERS.—Any Member of the House of Representatives and the Senate may submit to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate the views of that Member on any matter relevant to a proposed trade agreement, and the relevant Committee shall receive those views for consideration.

SEC. 106. IMPLEMENTATION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) NOTIFICATION AND SUBMISSION.—Any agreement entered into under section 103(b) shall enter into force with respect to the United States if (and only if)—

(A) the President, not later than 30 days before the date on which the President enters into the trade agreement, submits to Congress a description of those changes to existing laws that the President considers would be required in order to bring the United States into compliance with the agreement; and

(B) the President, not later than 30 days before the date on which the President enters into the trade agreement, submits to Congress, on a day on which both Houses of Congress are in session, a copy of the final legal text of the agreement, together with—

(i) a draft statement of any administrative action proposed to implement the agreement; and

(ii) a copy of the final legal text of the agreement.

(b) Upon entering into the agreement, the President submits to Congress, on a day on which both Houses of Congress are in session, a copy of the final legal text of the agreement, together with—

(i) a draft statement of any administrative action proposed to implement the agreement; and

(ii) a copy of the final legal text of the agreement.

(c) Upon entering into the agreement, the President submits to Congress, on a day on which both Houses of Congress are in session, a copy of the final legal text of the agreement, together with—

(i) a draft statement of any administrative action proposed to implement the agreement; and

(ii) a copy of the final legal text of the agreement.

(d) The President shall make all reports required under this subsection available to the public.
shall not apply to any implementing bill submitted with respect to such trade agreement or agreements.

(i) an explanation as to how the implementing bill and proposed administrative action will change or affect existing law; and

(ii) a statement—

(1) that the agreement makes progress in achieving the applicable purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives of this title; and

(2) the forth the reasons of the President regarding—

(aa) how and to what extent the agreement makes progress in achieving the applicable purposes, policies, priorities, and objectives referred to in subclause (I);

(bb) whether and how the agreement changes provisions of an agreement previously negotiated;

(cc) how the agreement serves the interests of United States commerce; and

(dd) how the implementing bill meets the standards set forth in section 103(b)(3).

(B) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The President shall make the supporting information described in subparagraph (A) available to the public.

(3) RECIPROCAL BENEFITS.—In order to ensure that a foreign country that is not a party to a trade agreement entered into under authority of this title that is not reciprocal under the agreement unless the country is also subject to the obligations under the agreement, the implementing bill submitted with respect to the agreement shall provide that the benefits and obligations under the agreement apply only to the parties to the agreement, if such application is consistent with the terms of the agreement. The implementing bill may also provide that the benefits and obligations under the agreement do not apply uniformly to all parties to the agreement if such application is consistent with the terms of the agreement.

(A) QUALIFICATIONS FOR REPORTING RESOLUTION.—If—

(i) the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives reports an implementing bill with respect to a trade agreement or agreements entered into under section 103(b) with other than a favorable recommendation; and

(ii) a Member of the House of Representatives has introduced a consultation and compliance resolution on the legislative day following the filing of a report to accompany the implementing bill with other than a favorable recommendation,

then the Committee on Ways and Means shall consider a consultation and compliance resolution pursuant to subparagraph (B).

(B) COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF A QUALIFYING RESOLUTION.—(i) Not later than the fourth legislative day after the date of introduction of the resolution referred to in subparagraph (A), the Committee on Ways and Means shall meet on whether to report a resolution described in subparagraph (A) if the Committee on Finance reports a resolution described in subparagraph (C) and such resolution is agreed to by the Senate.

(C) RESOLUTION DESCRIBED.—A resolution described in this subparagraph is a resolution of the Senate originating from the Committee on Finance on the consultation and compliance resolution of the House of Representatives pursuant to section 105(b)(3)(B) with respect to the negotiations, agreement, or agreements.

(4) DISCLOSURE OF COMMITMENTS.—Any agreement or understanding with a foreign government or governments (whether oral or in writing) that—

(A) relates to a trade agreement with respect to which Congress enacted an implementing bill under trade authorities procedures; and

(B) is not disclosed to Congress before an implementing bill with respect to that agreement is introduced in either House of Congress,

shall not be considered to be part of the agreement approved by Congress and shall have no force or effect unless and until such implementation is consistent with the terms of the agreement.

(5) PROCEDURAL DISAPPROVAL RESOLUTION.—(A) Procedural disapproval resolution—

(i) in the House of Representatives—

(I) may be introduced by any Member of the House;

(II) shall be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, to the Committee on Rules; and

(III) may not be amended by either Committee;

(ii) in the Senate—

(I) may be introduced by any Member of the Senate;

(II) shall be referred to the Committee on Finance; and

(III) may not be amended.

(B) The provisions of subsections (d) and (e) of section 152 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2192) (relating to the floor consideration of trade agreements) apply to a procedural disapproval resolution introduced with respect to a trade agreement if no other procedural disapproval resolution is pending under section 105(b)(3)(B) (relating to the consultation and compliance resolution). After consideration of the trade agreement has been previously reported in that House of Congress by the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Finance, as the case may be, pursuant to the procedures set forth in clauses (ii) through (vii) of such section.

(C) The provisions of the House of Representatives procedures to consider any procedural disapproval resolution not reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, by the Committee on Finance;

(D) It is not in order for the Senate to consider any procedural disapproval resolution not reported by the Committee on Finance.

(5) PROCEDURAL DISAPPROVAL RESOLUTION.—(i) For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘‘procedural disapproval resolution’’ means a resolution of either House of Congress, the sole matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: ‘‘That the President has failed or refused to notify or consult in accordance with the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 on negotiations with respect to such trade agreement or agreements described in subparagraph (A) if the Committee on Finance reports a resolution described in subparagraph (C) and such resolution is agreed to by the Senate.

(C) PROCEDURE FOR CONSIDERING RESOLUTIONS.—(A) Procedural disapproval resolutions—

(i) in the House of Representatives—

(I) may be introduced by any Member of the House;

(II) shall be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and, in addition, to the Committee on Rules; and

(III) may not be amended by either Committee;

(ii) in the Senate—

(I) may be introduced by any Member of the Senate;

(II) shall be referred to the Committee on Finance; and

(III) may not be amended.

(B) The provisions of subsections (d) and (e) of section 152 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2192) (relating to the floor consideration of trade agreements) apply to a procedural disapproval resolution introduced with respect to a trade agreement if no other procedural disapproval resolution is pending under section 105(b)(3)(B) (relating to the consultation and compliance resolution).

(6) DISCLOSURE OF COMMITMENTS.—Any agreement or understanding with a foreign government or governments (whether oral or in writing) that—

(A) relates to a trade agreement with respect to which Congress enacted an implementing bill under trade authorities procedures; and

(B) is not disclosed to Congress before an implementing bill with respect to that agreement is introduced in either House of Congress,

shall not be considered to be part of the agreement approved by Congress and shall have no force or effect unless and until such implementation is consistent with the terms of the agreement.

(7) DISCLOSURE OF COMMITMENTS.—Any agreement or understanding with a foreign government or governments (whether oral or in writing) that—

(A) relates to a trade agreement with respect to which Congress enacted an implementing bill under trade authorities procedures; and
(D) APPLICABILITY OF TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply in the House of Representatives to any implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement entered into under the auspices of the World Trade Organization unless the Secretary of Commerce has issued such report by the deadline specified in this paragraph.

(2) DISPUTE SETTLEMENT REPORTS.—In the case of any agreement to which subsection (a) applies, the applicability of the trade authorities procedures to implementing bills shall be determined without regard to the requirements of section 105(a)(1) (relating only to notified agreements), and any resolution under paragraph (1)(B), (3)(C), or (4)(C) of section 106(b) shall not be in order on the basis of a failure or refusal to comply with the standards set forth in section 105(a) if (and only if) the President, as soon as feasible, notifies Congress of the negotiations described in subsection (a), the specific United States legal obligations arising from the negotiations, and whether the President is seeking a new agreement or changes to an existing agreement; and

(b) TREATMENT OF AGREEMENTS.—In the event of any agreement to which subsection (a) applies, the committee on which the bill is pending shall hold a hearing and consider the bill only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such other rules; and

(c) RULES OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE.—Subsection (b) of this section, section 103(c), and section 105(b)(3) are enacted by Congress—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the committee on which the bill is pending, respectively, and as such are deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, and such procedures supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such other rules; and

(2) with the full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedures of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as any other rule of that House.

SEC. 107. TREATMENT OF CERTAIN TRADE AGREEMENTS FOR WHICH NEGOTIATIONS HAVE ALREADY BEGUN. (a) CERTAIN AGREEMENTS.—Notwithstanding the notice and consultation requirement described in section 105(a), if an agreement to which section 103(b) applies—

(1) is entered into under the auspices of the World Trade Organization, and

(2) is entered into with the Trans-Pacific Partnership countries with respect to which notification and consultation requirement are inconsistent with section 106(a)(1)(A) as of the date of the enactment of this Act,

(3) is entered into with the European Union, and

(4) is an agreement with respect to international trade in services entered into with the World Trade Organization, if a notification has been made in a manner consistent with section 105(a)(1)(A) as of the date of the enactment of this Act, or

(b) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN TRADE AGREEMENTS WHICH WERE ENTERED INTO UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION.—Not later than December 15, 2015, the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the Committee on Ways and Means and the Senate Finance Committee, shall submit to Congress a report setting forth the strategy of the executive branch to address issues arising under the World Trade Organization.

(c) DISPUTE SETTLEMENT REPORTS.—In the case of any agreement to which subsection (a) applies, the committee on which the bill is pending shall

(1) notify Congress of the negotiations described in subsection (a), the legal obligations arising from the negotiations, and whether the President is seeking a new agreement or changes to an existing agreement; and

(2) before and after submission of the notice, consults regarding the negotiations with the committee for which the bill is pending and such procedures supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such other rules; and

(d) MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF DISCRIMINATORY TRADE PRACTICES.—In this paragraph, the term "minimum standards for the elimination of discrimination" means the standards set forth in section 108 of the Trade Agreements Act of 2002 (22 U.S.C. 7107(b)(1)).

(e) MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF DISCRIMINATORY TRADE PRACTICES.—In this paragraph, the term "minimum standards for the elimination of discrimination" means the standards set forth in section 108 of the Trade Agreements Act of 2002 (22 U.S.C. 7107(b)(1)).

(f) RULES OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE.—Subsection (b) of this section, section 103(c), and section 105(b)(3) are enacted by Congress—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the committee on which the bill is pending, respectively, and such procedures supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such other rules; and

(2) with the full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedures of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as any other rule of that House.

SEC. 108. SOVEREIGNTY. (a) UNITED STATES LAW TO PREVAIL IN EVENT OF INCONSISTENCY.—In the event of any agreement entered into under section 103(b) with a country to which the minimum standards for the elimination of discrimination are applicable and the government of which does not fully comply with those standards is making significant efforts to bring the country into compliance (commonly referred to as a “tier 3” country), as determined in the most recent periodic report submitted under section 110(b)(1) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7107(b)(1)),

(b) MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF DISCRIMINATORY TRADE PRACTICES.—In this paragraph, the term “minimum standards for the elimination of discrimination” means the standards set forth in section 108 of the Trade Agreements Act of 2002 (22 U.S.C. 7107(b)(1)).


(iv) The Convention on Wetlands of International Importance Especially as Waterfowl Habitat, done at Ramsar February 2, 1971 (TIAS 11084).


(b) Application of Certain Provisions—For purposes of applying sections 125, 126, and 127 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2315, 2316, and 2317)—

(1) any trade agreement entered into under section 103 shall be treated as an agreement entered into under section 101 or 102 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2111 or 2112), as appropriate; and

(2) any proclamation or Executive order issued pursuant to a trade agreement entered into under section 103 shall be treated as a proclamation or Executive order issued pursuant to a trade agreement entered into under section 102 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2112).

SEC. 11. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) AGREEMENT ON AGRICULTURE.—The term ‘‘Agreement on Agriculture’’ means the agreement referred to in section 101(d)(2) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(2)).

(2) AGREEMENT ON SAFEGUARDS.—The term ‘‘Agreement on Safeguards’’ means the agreement referred to in section 101(d)(13) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(13)).

(3) AGREEMENT ON SUBSIDIES AND COUNTERVAILING MEASURES.—The term ‘‘Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures’’ means the agreement referred to in section 101(d)(12) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(12)).

(4) ANTIDUMPING AGREEMENT.—The term ‘‘Antidumping Agreement’’ means the agreement on Implementation of Article VI of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994 referred to in section 101(d)(7) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(7)).

(5) APPELLATE BODY.—The term ‘‘Appellate Body’’ means the Appellate Body established under Article 17.1 of the Dispute Settlement Understanding.

(6) COMMON MULTILATERAL ENVIRONMENTAL AGREEMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘‘common multilateral environmental agreement’’ means any agreement specified in subparagraph (B) or included under subparagraph (C) to which both the United States and one or more other parties as a common multilateral environmental agreement to which to be treated as an agreement entered into under section 103 of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015.

(B) APPLICATION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS.—For purposes of applying sections 125, 126, and 127 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2315, 2316, and 2317)—

(1) any trade agreement entered into under section 103 shall be treated as an agreement entered into under section 101 or 102 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2111 or 2112), as appropriate; and

(2) any proclamation or Executive order issued pursuant to a trade agreement entered into under section 103 shall be treated as a proclamation or Executive order issued pursuant to a trade agreement entered into under section 102 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2112).

(7) TRANSMISSION OF AGREEMENTS TO CONGRESS.—Section 162(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2112) is amended—

(A) by striking ‘‘section 106(a)(1) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015’’; and

(B) in subsection (c)(1), by striking ‘‘section 106(a)(1) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015’’ and inserting ‘‘section 103 of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015’’.

(8) I NTERNATIONALLY RECOGNIZED CORE LABOR STANDARDS.—The term ‘‘international core labor standards’’ means the core labor standards only as stated in the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work and its Follow-Up (1998).

(18) LABOR LAWS.—The term ‘‘labor laws’’ means the statutes and regulations, or provisions thereof, of a party to the negotiations that are directly related to core labor standards as well as other labor protections for children and minors and acceptable conditions of work with respect to minimum wages, hours of work, and occupational safety and health, and for the United States, includes Federal statutes and regulations addressing those standards, protections, or conditions, but does not include State or local labor laws.

(19) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term ‘‘United States person’’ means—

(A) a United States citizen;

(B) a partnership, corporation, or other legal entity that is organized under the laws of the United States; and

(C) a partnership, corporation, or other legal entity that is organized under the laws of a foreign country and is controlled by entities described in subparagraph (B) or United States citizens, or both.

(20) URUGUAY ROUND AGREEMENTS.—The term ‘‘Uruguay Round Agreements’’ has the meaning given that term in section 2(7) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501(7)).

(21) WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION; WTO.—The terms ‘‘World Trade Organization’’ and ‘‘WTO’’ mean the organization established pursuant to the WTO Agreement.

(22) WTO AGREEMENT.—The term ‘‘WTO Agreement’’ means the Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization entered into on April 15, 1994.

(23) WTO MEMBERS.—The term ‘‘WTO member’’ has the meaning given that term in section 2(10) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501(10)).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 321, the motion shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2146, Defending Public Safety Employees’ Retirement Act, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.
Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Welcome back, everybody. I have to admit, I am a little disappointed that we are back here today. Last week, a bipartisan majority stopped up to pass trade promotion authority. That vote showed that Republicans and Democrats can still come together to do what is right for this country. It was a vote that I am very proud of.

Unfortunately, many of our friends on the other side of the aisle would not stand with their President and voted to sacrifice a program that they support— a program that they asked for—in order to block our path. It was disappointing, but we are not going to be discouraged. That is why we are back here today.

Enacting trade promotion authority is critical for our economy and our national security, and so we are going to get it done today. Why did we need TPA? Well, Mr. Speaker, it is pretty easy, an easy question to answer—because we need more trade. Ninety-five percent of the world’s consumers don’t live in America. They live in other countries. If we want to make more things and sell them there, then we need to tear down those trade barriers that make American goods and services more expensive.

We know that trade is good for our economy. One in five jobs in America is already tied to trade, and they pay on average 18 percent more. We also need more trade to bolster our foreign policy and our national security. Stronger economic ties lead to stronger security ties. More market share means more influence. That is why so many national security voices, former military leaders, former Secretaries of Defense, former Secretaries of State have all called on Congress to pass TPA. They understand what is at stake here, Mr. Speaker.

What is at stake here is no less than America’s credibility because the rules of the global economy are being written right now. The question is: Who is going to write those rules? Will it be the United States and our allies or will it be other nations that don’t share our values or don’t share our commitment to free enterprise and the rule of law?

Our friends in Asia and Europe are getting ready to place their bets. They want to sign up for American-style free enterprise, but they need to know that the United States is going to stand strong as a reliable ally, as a reliable trading partner before they do that. That is what TPA is all about.

So how does it work? We have heard all kinds of crazy misinformation spread by the opponents of trade. I mean, crazy stuff, really. Let me, one more time, explain what TPA is and what TPA is not. TPA is a process; it is not an agreement. It is a process that gives the President the ability to get a good trade agreement. It is a process, dating back decades, that Congress has used to insert itself into trade negotiations in order to provide more accountability and more transparency to the administration, to the President.

This TPA has more transparency and more accountability than any version ever before. It lays out 150 objectives and guidelines that the administration must follow while negotiating a trade deal. These are our priorities. If the President wants an agreement, then he must meet to address these priorities. He must meet these guidelines in order to get that trade agreement through Congress.

This TPA also requires that the administration consults with Congress during the negotiations: Give us access to all of the text, provide timely briefings on demands to attend the negotiating rounds as accredited advisers if they want to. If we are here in session, we can send our people. That is what the Zinke amendment accomplishes.

Finally, perhaps most importantly, Mr. Speaker. TPA ensures that the American people can read any trade agreement, every trade agreement long before anyone is asked to vote on it—60 days. An agreement must be made public and presented to Congress before it can even be sent to Congress. This turns fast track into slow track.

Mr. Speaker, it is transparency, it is effective oversight, and it is accountability because the President doesn’t meet these requirements or doesn’t follow the negotiating objectives, we can turn TPA off for that agreement. We can cancel the vote, we can amend the agreement, or we can stop it entirely. And it is up to Congress, we always have the final say. No agreement takes effect, no laws are changed unless we vote to allow it.

This process, TPA, creates a pact between Congress and the administration to know that we speak with one voice. It allows them to make their best efforts, knowing that as long as the administration follows TPA, Congress won’t try to rewrite an agreement later. In other words, America credibility, Mr. Speaker. And, boy, do we need credibility right now.

Make no mistake, all of my colleagues, make no mistake: the world is watching us; they are watching this vote. The foreign policy failures of the last few years, not to mention the stunt pulled here last week, have capitals all around the world wondering if America still has it. Are we still the leader? Are we still the Republic that the world counts on? They want to know that we are still willing to engage, still willing to lead, that we are still a nation that is out front. Or are we in retreat and decline?

We are here today to answer that question. America does not retreat; America leads. That is why I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” for TPA.

I reserve the balance of my time.
Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), a senior member of the House Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I thank Chairman RYAN for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, free trade is economic freedom. It is the freedom to buy and sell and compete around the world with as little government interference as possible. It is really one of the great economic rights of every American. Given the choice between more economic freedom or less, we should always choose more. We know if America doesn’t lead in free and fair trade, we will find our competitors will grow stronger, and our factories and farmers and manufacturers will be priced out and shut down.

Texas is made for trade. America is made for trade. It is time, through expanded markets and through economic principles that have helped us thrive and grow over the century. That is why Congress flexing its constitutional muscles and setting clear rules for future American trade is not just a good thing for America; it is a great thing.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), the chairman of our caucus and a member of our committee.

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this trade promotion authority legislation, as we have heard, is all about writing the rules, writing the trade deal. It is about who will lead or who will retreat on assisting free and fair trade.

This TPA legislation sets forward the instructions on how we will write the rules in any trade agreement. Okay. So who gets to write the rules? On currency manipulation, where countries, not just the companies, but the countries themselves that want to trade with us are cheating by manipulating their currency to make the goods look more expensive than American products in the same area, when those countries are cheating, what are we going to say should be the rules when it comes to currency manipulation?

Under this TPA, we can’t say anything because we are prohibited from including anything in a trade agreement that will deal with currency manipulation.

You then have to ask a second question. You are telling me that countries that are going to sign these deals are going to be allowed to cheat when it comes to currency manipulation? Is their currency so their products will look cheaper than ours? We are supposed to depend on those same countries that are cheating to now enforce the rules in these agreements against companies in those countries that are cheating? What kind of instruction is that?

What about when it comes to letting people in America know what is in these deals? What if we want to know where the products that are going to be bought and sold in our stores come from? Shouldn’t we have the right, if we want, to know the country of origin of a particular product?

I have heard about powdered milk coming from places around the world. We have heard about toys that have dangerous chemicals in them that our kids play with. Don’t we want to know where these products are coming from?

That is all we are saying, just to know where they come from, not that we are going to change the place where they come from; we just want to know if it is made in the USA or made somewhere else.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. BECERRA. Under this TPA, we can’t ask those questions. We won’t be able to find out where a product is made. We won’t be able to move forward to a tribunal, not an American court—will decide whether we can label a product as made in the USA or not.

Right now, these international tribunals that have no American jurists or judges get to decide for us if Americans should have the right to know where a product is coming from that they are buying from a store in their neighborhood.

How does that lead to making sure trade is free and fair? If we can’t even put a label on a product coming from some other country that has in the past sent us tainted products? We can do much better. We have over two or three decades of experience in writing trade deals. We know what works; we know what doesn’t. The thing we know most is that enforcement is the most difficult aspect of trade because most companies in faraway places don’t follow American law and American rules and they cheat and they think they can get away with it.

We can do much better. Let’s get a better trade deal that is free and fair. This TPA doesn’t give us that. It doesn’t give us the right rules. Reject this TPA legislation.

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

Mr. LEVIN. It is now my privilege to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. LEVIN), the distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. KIND. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, last week, in a bipartisan majority, this House passed this administration trade promotion authority so that it can begin to elevate standards and level the playing field for our workers, our farmers, and our businesses so we can effectively compete in one of the fastest growing regions of the global economy.

It is time for us to move forward. I feel confident that, with the assurances that we received from the Republican leadership, this body will have another opportunity to also pass Trade Adjustment Assistance so that the training programs and education for the workers who need it will be in place.

Out of consideration for some of our colleagues who are trying to get home to their communities today after last night’s terrible shootings, I end by encouraging my colleagues to support this legislation. It is time for America to move on.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), a member of our committee.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, if at first you don’t succeed, try, try again. That seems to be the approach on trade.

Despite the fact that TPA passed the House last week by only eight votes, at no point did the light bulb go off for the leadership that perhaps they could work with the majority of the Democratic Caucus to find agreement on a bipartisan bill that didn’t know why that didn’t occur to you. Instead of cooperation, they have opted to use procedural tricks to pass the TPA.

The leadership has chosen to take a bipartisan bill passed by both Chambers of Congress that would allow our law enforcement officers and public safety workers and inject the unrelated, controversial trade debate into it. I can speak firsthand because I am one of the sponsors of the bill.

This bill, the Defending Public Safety Employees’ Retirement Act, I have worked on with my friend Congressman RIECHERT, on behalf of the men and women who serve the public in physically demanding work each and every day.

It would ensure that they could access their full retirement benefits at the time they retire without incurring a tax penalty. It is a good bill. I am not only one of the sponsors, I vote for it. Today, this bill to provide tax fairness for our law enforcement officers has been twisted and diminished to a convenient vehicle to ram through fast track for a deeply flawed trade bill.

This is not the same bill that we voted on Friday. Please read this bill. It is not. I urge a “no” vote.

In fact, Harold Schaitberger, president of the International Association of Fire Fighters, has written a letter urging Members to oppose attaching TPP to this bill.

The Trans-Pacific Partnership would establish the biggest trade agreement we have seen in years, encompassing 40 percent of the world’s economy. We need to take our time and do it right.

In its current form, TPP is woefully inadequate and fails to ensure a fair deal for American workers.

Issues such as prohibiting currency manipulation and ensuring food safety have been neglected in TPP. As an example, only 1 percent of imported fish into this country—seafood—is inspected. I hope the next time you go into the restaurant, you ask the proprietor: Has this fish been inspected?
He will look at you like you have three heads. Isn’t that interesting?

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LEVIN. This country got shafted with our deal with Korea on country of origin automobiles. You don’t really see any more cars traveling through Korea—or certainly China—that are made in the United States of America. We are taking a backseat.

Instead of protecting the interests of American U.S. workers—not protectionism, we are not advocating that—this trade bill gives protections and sweetheart deals to multinational corporations, pure and simple. The American people look at every poll—from the left, from the right, from north, south, east, west—and do not accept this deal, and we shouldn’t either.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), another member of our committee.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was thinking what a difference a week does not make. The vast majority of people in my congressional district were opposed to fast track last week, and they are even more opposed to fast track this week.

We have seen fast track before. We have seen the jobs leave our community, our State, our Nation fast enough. They don’t need our help. They don’t need anybody else’s help. We need to create jobs here, not have them flee. They don’t need anybody else’s help. We need to create jobs here, not have them flee.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR).

Mr. CUELLAR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I support TPA to give the President the authority to negotiate this agreement. It is very simple. A lot of those countries are already able to send their goods into our country duty free. What we want to do is allow our exporting companies to be able to export to those countries duty free, also, so we can send our goods over there.

Look at what has happened in Texas. Texas is more than three times bigger than Korea. Last year, up 146 percent from 2004. Let’s look at the number of companies that export. They are not the big companies. Ninety-three percent of those 40,737 exporting companies were small and medium-sized businesses.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I ask you to please support TPA. It is good for Texas; it is good for the United States, and it is a no-brainer to allow us to export to those countries.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT).

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the people of this great Nation are watching us today, and they are begging and pleading with us to please vote down this bill.

Who knows better than the American people who live in the towns and the cities where they have seen their manufacturing plants close and they have seen their jobs shipped overseas? Every trade deal has done it.

Let’s look at the China deal. As a result of the China deal, 2 million manufacturing jobs have been shipped from America over to China.

Look at NAFTA; yes, it created jobs; but where did they create jobs? They are in Mexico. Where did the manufacturing plants go? They went to Mexico. That is why the American people are ringing everybody’s office and urging them. Please let us not lose any more.

Those of you who are concerned about income equality, the reason we have that as a burning issue in the heart and soul, particularly of middle class America, is because we are seeing the middle class vanish.

These are the jobs. These manufacturing jobs, ladies and gentlemen, are not where the big corporate presidents make millions of dollars. Yes, they are making millions of dollars; but these jobs go into the middle section of our economic stream and the lower income.

Look at Akron, Ohio; look at Atlanta, Georgia; look at Chicago; look at Detroit. These are once vibrant cities. The backbone of America is manufacturing, and we are shipping it out to the world.

You know what else we are shipping out there? We are shipping these jobs—not only that, the profits of these companies. Last year, $2 trillion of profits were held in these overseas accounts, away from our taxing structure.

Can’t you see America is getting weaker because of these trade policies? I urge you to vote “no” and stand up for the American people for a change.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Lee).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, first, I thank the ranking member for yielding and, once again, for his tremendous leadership.

I rise in strong opposition to this bill and to once again say “no” to fast track. This legislation cynically uses a procedural gimmick to make plenty of congressional district were opposed to fast track last week, and they are even more opposed to fast track this week.

We have seen fast track before. We have seen the jobs leave our community, our State, our Nation fast enough. They don’t need our help. They don’t need anybody else’s help. We need to create jobs here, not have them flee. They don’t need anybody else’s help. We need to create jobs here, not have them flee.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I urge you to please vote down this bill.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I urge you to please vote down this bill.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I urge you to please vote down this bill.
Mr. LEVIN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), ranking member on the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, if you vote for this bill, you put the United States at a disadvantage. The $75 billion surplus in services brings the net to over a $100 billion deficit.

How have so many Members been misled by charlatan lobbyists into coming to this floor and giving false statistics? They are given this slippery phrase: Go down to the floor and talk about what has happened since NAFTA.

Now, "since NAFTA" usually sounds like, well, since the early 1990s. What they mean is excluding NAFTA. Excluding NAFTA when we review free trade agreements is like excluding LeBron James when you evaluate the Cavaliers.

This bill is catastrophic for our national security. It hollows out our manufacturing base, and it is the greatest gift to China that we could possibly make because it embarrasses the sacrosanct nature of currency manipulation. It says, in the future, countries can manipulate their currency all they want and there will be no accounting for it.

In addition, the rules of origin provisions allow goods that are admitted to be 50 or 60 percent made in China—that are actually 70 or 80 percent made in China—to get fast-tracked into the United States. So China gets 80 percent of the benefit of this agreement without having to admit a single American export.

As for Vietnam, we workers are going to have to compete against 56-cent-an-hour labor.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. SHERMAN. We are told that we will get free access to the Vietnamese markets. Vietnam doesn’t have freedom. Vietnam doesn’t have democracy. They are not going to buy our exports any more than their Communist Party decides to do so.

The chairman points out that with trade comes influence. That is right. There will be Nike lobbyists here, financed by this bill and its effects, lobbying against going after Vietnam for its oppression of religion and its oppression of unions. So they will have influence here in Washington. They will continue not to have freedom, and we will continue to lose jobs.

THE TRADE DEFICIT WITH FTA PARTNERS
MERCHANDISE TRADE BALANCE WITH FTA COUNTRIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>29,278,126</td>
<td>26,844,102</td>
<td>2,434,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahrain</td>
<td>9,984,243</td>
<td>7,881,892</td>
<td>2,062,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>3,039,957</td>
<td>2,397,349</td>
<td>642,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>14,013,510</td>
<td>13,670,227</td>
<td>343,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>1,651,395</td>
<td>1,508,124</td>
<td>143,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>7,927,149</td>
<td>6,277,430</td>
<td>1,649,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Rep</td>
<td>1,440,365</td>
<td>1,075,069</td>
<td>365,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>8,940,135</td>
<td>7,768,240</td>
<td>1,171,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>8,111,348</td>
<td>6,289,281</td>
<td>1,822,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>7,321,418</td>
<td>4,273,954</td>
<td>3,047,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>7,401,386</td>
<td>4,830,185</td>
<td>2,571,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>8,940,135</td>
<td>7,768,240</td>
<td>1,171,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>9,501,348</td>
<td>6,725,976</td>
<td>2,775,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>192,706,833</td>
<td>292,781,624</td>
<td>91,074,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>23,963,689</td>
<td>17,707,710</td>
<td>6,255,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>16,963,189</td>
<td>4,230,129</td>
<td>12,733,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>8,891,414</td>
<td>6,029,607</td>
<td>2,861,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>9,737,362</td>
<td>386,123</td>
<td>9,351,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>3,648,564</td>
<td>2,159,648</td>
<td>1,488,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>644,466,844</td>
<td>821,975,961</td>
<td>177,509,117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SERVICES TRADE BALANCE WITH FTA COUNTRIES

According to the Department of Commerce Bureau of Economic Analysis, we ran a surplus in services of $75 billion with FTA Countries as of 2013, the last year for which we have data on our services trade broken down for the FTA countries as a group. Assuming normal growth for 2014, our surplus in services is roughly $77 billion.

Therefore, our TOTAL TRADE BALANCE with FTA partner countries is just over $100 billion. We run a significant deficit with FTA Countries.

Explanations. There are different methods for measuring the trade balance of the United States. The table above uses the most accurate data for measuring the value of goods (merchandises) actually ‘‘Made in the USA’’ and exported from the United States to the various countries listed. The source for our data is the International Trade Commission (ITC) database, available at http://dataweb.usitc.gov. ITC measures exports in two different ways (‘‘Total Exports’’ and ‘‘Domestic Exports’’).

We use ‘‘Domestic Exports.’’ According to the ITC, ‘‘Domestic Exports measure goods that are grown, produced and manufactured in the United States, or goods of foreign origin that have been changed in the United States.’’ FTA proponents like to use an alternative measurement, ‘‘Total Exports,’’ which ‘‘measures the total movement of goods out of the United States to foreign countries,’’ whether those goods were made or altered by U.S. workers in the United States or not—it includes goods that were simply transiting the United States without alteration. Counting these ‘‘Re-Exports’’ that are included in the ‘‘Total Exports’’ measurement will give a distorted bilateral trade balance for given countries because it drastically over-counts exports. For similar reasons and in order to give an accurate, apples to apples comparison, on the import side we use ‘‘Imports for Consumption’’ which includes only imports that are not re-exported. Using the alternative ITC measurement for imports, ‘‘Total Imports,’’ would overstate imports by counting those goods coming into the United States that are going to be re-exported. See http://www.usitc.gov/publications/332/tradestatsnote.pdf for more on these terms and what the measurements represent.

Services data. Ideally our nation’s trade balance figures would provide the trade balance for both goods and services. However, services are more difficult for government agencies to track, and the agencies therefore do not break the trade data down consistently for every partner country, every year. Also, the agencies cannot compile services data as quickly as merchandise data. We use a 2013 services balance figure for FTA countries in the aggregate that the Commerce Department’s Bureau of Economic Analysis provided to the Chamber of Commerce for a report touting PTAs. We assume growth of about $5 billion in the positive services balance for 2014. See the Chamber report for these services data at https://www.uschamber.com/sites/default/files/open_door_trade_report.pdf.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. How much time remains for both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 22½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. We are the only two speakers left on our side. Because of deference to our Members from South Carolina who are trying to get home to this tragedy, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI), and then I am just going to hold to close just for our South Carolina Members.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, read the bill. I have got it right here. The only thing different is the number at the top has changed. The content is the same.
TPA is not a trade deal. It is a process that holds this President accountable. It sets in motion Congress inserting itself.

By the way, NAFTA, I mean, I just continue to get blown away by the misinformation. No wonder the American people get confused.

I take this personally. As the gentleman from New Jersey knows, my dad lost his job way before NAFTA. We have a trade surplus in manufacturing with NAFTA. We have a trade surplus in agriculture, food, and beverages with NAFTA. In fact, we have a trade surplus with NAFTA, if you take out oil and energy products. We have a trade surplus in manufacturing with NAFTA. I do get fired up about this.

Mr. Speaker, 95 percent of the world's population is outside the United States. A multinational corporation can move anywhere it wants to, a Fortune 500 company can move anywhere it wants to, and they do.

Lake Shore, in my district, a family-owned business, they cannot. This is about breaking down barriers for Lake Shore, for Screen Machine, because they can't move a plant overseas, and they are at a competitive disadvantage. A large corporation can move. They can.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is about jobs. This is about the American worker. This is about the fact that we have the ability today to compete anywhere in the world if those trade barriers are broken down.

We have to break them down, Mr. Speaker. One out of every five jobs is trade-related. They are good jobs.

Vote "yes" on TPA. Vote "yes" for the American worker.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Bass).

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, last week I spoke in favor of H.R. 1891, the AOGA Extension and Enhancement Act of 2015. In the middle of tremendous controversy and tension over TPA, it was encouraging to have legislation that wasn't controversial, in fact, had overwhelming support with 397 votes. The bill was sent to the Senate, and we were hopeful that H.R. 1891 would have already made it to the President's desk.

Unfortunately, the bill is a victim of its own success. So many rumors are floated around that because AOGA is popular, supported by both Democrats, Republicans, Senators, and House Members, that now Senators are considering adding more controversial bills into AOGA.

We worry the fast-track TAA might be added. The press is even reporting consideration is being given to using AOGA as a vehicle to extend the Ex-Im Bank. We hear the thinking is, if TAA failed in the House last week, if it is added in to AOGA, we will vote for it.

AOGA can and should and stand on its own. The Senate should pass AOGA and send it to the President.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), who is the ranking member on the Committee on Small Business.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, once again I rise to vote for an agreement that will cost jobs, undermine environmental protections, and erode workers' rights, all in the name of so-called free trade.

This agreement is being negotiated in the dark behind closed doors. That secretive process may benefit large, multinational companies and their lobbyists, but it does not help small manufacturers in Brooklyn. It does nothing for New Yorkers struggling to raise a family while keeping their jobs from being exported.

When there is a bad process, we end up with a bad deal for American workers, and we have seen this in the past. New York lost 374,000 manufacturing jobs since NAFTA and the World Trade Organization.

This vote, Mr. Speaker, comes down to a simple question: Are you going to side with Wall Street, large corporations, and their lobbyists, or will you stand with working families in your district? I will take the latter.

Vote "no."

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, in Washington we must be able to see the forest for the trees.

This is a vote to reestablish America's credibility. This is a vote for American leadership. This is a vote that holds this President accountable.

This agreement is being negotiated in the dark behind closed doors. That secretive process may benefit large, multinational companies and their lobbyists, but it does not help small manufacturers in Brooklyn. It does nothing for New Yorkers struggling to raise a family while keeping their jobs from being exported.

While they, today, are insisting on railroading this fast-track trade deal—and they say it is so sweet for working families—is it so unreasonable to ask: What do the workers think about this bill?

While the environmental provisions have been secreted away from the public, we do know that USTR does not believe in enforcement law enforcement. Is it unreasonable to stop and ask: What do those who advocate for clean water and clean air and conservation of our resources think about this trade deal?

I believe they support fair trade. They recognize that it raises all boats, but unfair trade sinks too many of them. They are capacized by competing with those who pay an average minimum wage of 60 cents an hour and whose only worker organization is the Communist Party in Vietnam.

I believe our workers deserve respect. This bill asks American businesses to go out and compete with countries that mistreat their workers, that pollute their air and water and destroy their natural resources, and that deface or adjust their currency, manipulating it in ways that are unfair.

Railroading this bill through today will deny any opportunity, which we have struggled so long for so many months to try to achieve to make this a better right-track bill. The fast-trackers have rejected every constructive improvement that we have offered to this measure. And all of us here in Congress have to concede we know less about what is in this trade bill than the Vietnamese Politburo, than the Malaysian Government that has countered sex trafficking.

The world is watching. Vote "yes."

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2146, the Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015. For the past several
years I have had many conversations about trade with the people of Northwest Oregon. I’ve spoken with farmers, environmentalists, semiconductor manufacturers, wine makers, workers, sports and outdoor apparel employees, and others.

The district I represent has many trade-dependent jobs and industries. We export a broad array of products—from computer chips to potato chips. Last year in Oregon, nearly 6,000 Oregon companies exported more than $20 billion in products. Expanding the overseas markets for U.S. goods will help businesses across our country. Trade agreements done right make it easier to sell American-made goods and they level the playing field by reducing tariffs that currently make it difficult for Oregonians to compete in many of the world’s markets.

This legislation is not the trade agreement itself, but rather a bill through which Congress establishes requirements for the negotiation of trade agreements and the procedure for Congress to use when voting on whether to approve the agreement when it is finalized. The Trade Priorities and Accountability Act earned my vote because it requires the President to negotiate a trade agreement that includes strong and enforceable labor and environmental standards, fosters innovation, would help expand exports, provides transparency for the American people, and guarantees a meaningful role for Congress in trade negotiations.

I strongly support the rights of workers and their ability to collectively bargain and work in a safe environment. I also oppose child labor and forced labor. The Trade Priorities and Accountability Act raises the bar in these areas and includes provisions that require trading partners to comply with internationally-accepted labor standards and face trade sanctions if they do not. For the first time it includes human rights—one of the cornerstones of our democratic values—as a negotiating objective. Oregon’s First Congressional District is known for its natural treasures—from the Pacific Ocean to the Columbia River to the Clatsop State Forest—and it is imperative that they be preserved for future generations. Deciding between conserving our natural resources and growing our economy is a false choice; we can and must do both. The Trade Priorities and Accountability Act ensures that our clean air, land, and water will not be up for negotiation.

The bill also protects intellectual property to safeguard innovation and fight piracy overseas, but with provisions to ensure that those protections will not impede access to much-needed medicines for people in developing countries.

The Trade Priorities and Accountability Act requires trade agreements to contain high standards and protections, and it also requires that the agreements include strong enforcement provisions to make clear that the standards and protections will be upheld and enforced.

It is important to my constituents that any trade agreement be accessible and transparent to the public. The Trade Priorities and Accountability Act includes unprecedented access to trade agreements; the entire text of the agreement must be made available to the public for a minimum of 60 days before the President signs it. In addition, after the full text of the trade agreement becomes public, there will still be months before Congress votes on whether to approve it.

To earn my vote, any trade agreement must be good for Americans. The jobs we gain by expanding exports tend to pay high wages, but there is a risk that some workers may be displaced. Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) is an important program to help workers transition into new fields by investing in skills and worker retaining. Without a reauthorization, TAA will expire at the end of September 2015. I voted in favor of TAA last week, but unfortunately it did not pass. My vote on this issue was very clear; I voted for the TPA again today because the Speaker, the Senate Majority Leader, and the President have committed that Trade Adjustment Assistance and customs enforcement legislation will also move forward without delay.

I was deeply concerned that an early version of TAA legislation included cuts to Medicare. Seniors serve our country, contribute to our economy, raise families, and strengthen communities across the nation. I urged House leadership to eliminate this provision. The bill I voted for did not cut Medicare and I will continue to work with my colleagues to ensure seniors are not singled out to pay for this program.

This trade package, however, is far from perfect, and as we move forward I will continue to work to improve the trade agreement. I am very disappointed that partisan language to tie the administration’s hands on climate change was inserted at the last minute into the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act, which passed the House of Representatives last week without my support. I am also very concerned that two very smart enforcement provisions offered by my colleague from Oregon, Representative EARL BLUMENAUER, were deleted. His “Green 301” and enforcement fund provisions were very important to the overall effectiveness of the customs bill, and I will encourage the conferees to insist upon their inclusion in the bill we ultimately send to the President’s desk for signature.

We live in a changing and global economy. Marketers, ideas, and technologies evolve and American businesses and workers need to be able to react and adapt to thrive. A 21st century trade agreement broadens our country’s reach and, done right, leads to more opportunity, more growth, and more job creation. It also supports the principle of trade according to fair rules, equally applied, as opposed to all parties doing whatever they want on a playing field that is far from level.

I am committed to policies that support a strong, long-term economy for hardworking Oregonians and Americans. A trade agreement done right can help achieve this goal, and passing H.R. 2146 is an important step in this process.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 321, the previous question is ordered. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

The question was taken; and the Ayes were 218, noes 208, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 374]

AYES—218


RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the motion will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the passage of H.R. 160.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were Ayes 218, noes 208, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 374]

AYES—218

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 280, nays 140, not voting 13, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yeas</th>
<th>Nays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Voting</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the Table.

Stated for:
Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 375 I was unavoidably detained and missed the recorded vote. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”
Mr. LAMAR. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 375 I was constituted with constituents including a World War II veteran and family visiting in the U.S. Capitol for the first time and missed rollcall No. 375. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”
Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 375, had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION
Mr. ROYDEN DAVIDS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, June 18, 2015, was absent.
from the House for family medical reasons. Due to his absence, I did not record any votes for the day. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on rollover 373, rollover 374, and rollover 375.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY) to inquire of the majority leader the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, no votes are expected in the House.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business.

On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business tomorrow. In addition, the House will consider H.R. 2042, the Ratepayer Protection Act, sponsored by Representative ED WHITFIELD. This bill is essential for families all across the Nation. If we do not act, the electricity bills could skyrocket as a result of EPA’s clean power plan rule.

The House will also continue the annual appropriations process with consideration of fiscal year 2016 Interior appropriation bill sponsored by Representative KEN CALVERT.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his information.

I note that the Export-Import Bank, which, of course, expires on June 30, is not among the scheduled pieces of legislation.

As the gentleman knows, Speaker BOEINER has been quoted as saying that, if we don’t pass the Export-Import Bank, that there are thousands of jobs on the line that would disappear pretty quickly if the Ex-Im Bank were to disappear in 60 days. He then again said, as the Chamber closest to the people, “The House works best when it is allowed to work its will.”

The majority leader knows that I am absolutely convinced that the Export-Import Bank is supported by a majority of Members of this House, but this House has not been allowed to work its will on the Export-Import Bank.

Predecessors of yours and a very dear friend of mine, Senator BLUNT, said not too long ago that he believed that, if a bill like that were to come to the floor of the House, it would have the votes. More importantly, because he is now, of course, in the other body but is among the leadership in the other body, he said that the bill had the votes in the Senate. I believe he is right on both of those observations.

I understand the majority leader is not for the bill. It is my understanding that the Speaker by lip service I would hope that those of us who support it and, frankly, those who oppose it would have the opportunity, as the Speaker indicated, for the House to work its will.

Can the gentleman tell me whether there are plans prior to June 30, when the Export-Import Bank authorization to give loans expires, are there any plans to bring that legislation before this House in a timely fashion so that the authorization would not expire?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman did say he knows my stance on this issue; and, no, there is no action scheduled before the House. Mr. HOYER. I apologize. Could the gentleman repeat himself?

Mr. MCCARTHY. There is no action scheduled for this House, no. Mr. HOYER. The majority leader intend to, therefore, have the authority of the Export-Import Bank expire, notwithstanding the Speaker’s observation and that it will cost thousands of jobs?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Again, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

There is no action scheduled at this appropriate time.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for repeating his answer. I heard that answer, but my question to the gentleman was: Is it his intention that the Export-Import Bank expire and, therefore, not bring legislation to the floor?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding for the third time with the same question.

There is no pending action before this House for next week.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for repeating for a third time his answer to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply observe, sadly, that the representation the Speaker has on an issue of great importance to the United States and to jobs in the United States will not be brought to this floor, notwithstanding the fact that 180 Democrats have signed a discharge petition and 60 Republicans filed a bill to extend the Export-Import Bank.

That is 240 votes, Mr. Speaker, as the Speaker well can add himself. Two hundred and forty votes is a majority of this House. They reflect in my view, Mr. Speaker, the will of this House.

It is extraordinary regrettably that, when the Speaker of the House says that, if we don’t do something, thousands of American jobs are going to be lost—it is particularly regrettable, just after we had a vote on a bill that many people believed that many people believe is going to lose us jobs and, therefore, they opposed.

How sad it is that we don’t bring to the floor a bill which will, like 85 other countries—85 other countries—help us export goods? Those 85 countries, Mr. Speaker, are not going to stop helping their countries export goods, so the loss will be to our exporters and those they employ.

I express regret that that won’t be brought to the floor. As the majority has told me, it is not scheduled; I know it is not scheduled. I lament the fact that it is not scheduled.

Representative CHRIS COLLINS of New York said: I can’t figure it out in the life of me why my party, the Republican Party, that stands for jobs, and in every conference meeting, it is jobs and the economy.

The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee is on the floor; he talks about jobs and the economy.

Here I am, says CHRIS COLLINS, in the majority of my own Conference, fighting to defend the Export-Import Bank, which is the best example of creating jobs in America.

I regret that that is not being brought to the floor. I won’t ask the question again because he has already told me it is not scheduled, and apparently, there is no intent to schedule. I regret that.

Now, Mr. Leader, if I can ask you, we passed now six appropriations bills. Yesterday, the Labor, HHS bill was marked up in subcommittee and the Financial Services in full committee.

Can the gentleman tell me whether it is the intention, whether they are scheduled right now or not, to bring all 12 appropriations bills to the floor before—well, whenever—all 12 bills to the floor?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. This bill is essential for the House to work its will on an issue of jobs and the economy.

As the gentleman knows, this is the earliest we have ever started the appropriation process. The gentleman is correct that we are halfway through the 12 bills, having passed 6 already, and we are bringing up Interior next week. It is our intention to do the work that we are responsible for in finishing the appropriation process.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that.

Let me ask him further as he knows what is happening in the Senate and whether they can take those bills up: Does the gentleman contemplate, as the majority leader knows, whether whether the Senate contemplates any effort to come to a bipartisan agreement as was done when Mr. RYAN and Senator MURRAY met and came to grips with a resolution and a compromise on what otherwise would be the sequester 2013(a) allocations on discretionary spending, which the chair of the committee, as you know, Chairman ROGERS, has called ill-conceived and unrealistic?

Mr. MCCARTHY. The majority leader knows whether there is any plan to try to get us from the gridlock, which we are apparently in one more time on the appropriations process, to a place as
Ryan-Murray got us where we moved ahead in a bipartisan way and, in fact, funded the government?

Although, it was not until December, and we had a stopgap measure in there. Is there anything scheduled to discuss that we don't compromise? I yield to my friend.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman knows, there is no gridlock here. We have passed half of the appropriation bills already. We have started the process earlier than ever before. As the gentleman knows, with just the bill before—very bipartisan—more than 46 Democrats joined us in repealing the medical device tax.

I would probably tell the gentleman that his question really goes to the minority leader on the Senate side, HARRY REID. In reading some of his statements, he wants to create a shutdown, which I think would be wrong for the American people.

I think the best way forward is for the Democrats and the Republicans in the Senate to take up DOD appropriations and move that to the President's desk.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend.

There is no Democrat in this House, in the Senate, or in the White House who wants to shut down this government. As a matter of fact, we have not done that. It was done in '95 and in early '96. It was done last year when many of my party said ‘shut it down’ if the President doesn’t change his immigration policy. Any suggestion, Mr. Speaker, that Democrats want to shut down the government is simply incorrect.

Now, what the minority leader has said in the Senate, I believe, is that, until such time as sequester is changed that it is not useful to waste time on bills that will not become law as we did, of course, many years during the Ryan budget, which he was never implemented, and they were never implemented in the House of Representatives fully—not once. Why? It is because, as Mr. ROGERS said, they were ill-conceived and unrealistic.

I just want to make it clear to the majority leader that I am prepared to work with him and with others to get us to a compromise on levels of funding that are realistic and well conceived by Mr. ROGERS, by Mr. COCHRAN, and by others.

Until we do that, we are going to be in a place where we are going to be, I predict, in late September, on the threshold of giving some fear that the government is going to shut down again, the greatest government on the face of the Earth. I am not sure what people around the world thought when we shut our government down for 16 days. It was not a confidence builder.

That is for sure.

We have another item that we are losing confidence on, the highway bill. You didn’t mention, Mr. Leader, anything about the highway bill being scheduled. I understand it does not exist until July 31, so we have about 6 weeks, maybe a little longer than that. Does the gentleman know whether there is any compromise being achieved so that we can give confidence to States, counties, municipalities, contractors, the business community that they will have a funding stream to invest in building, repairing, and maintaining our infrastructure in this country?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for his observation. I think that is my reputation, that of wanting to work to constructively achieve joint objectives—in this case, the highway bill.

Mr. RYAN is on the floor, but I won’t ask him to yield for a question as to whether or not the Ways and Means Committee has come up with a way to finance the highway bill.

I know he said that there is not going to be a gasoline tax, which, historically, Republican Presidents have been of I am not suggesting this bill, but maybe tax reform as my friend has said publicly for that.

I will repeat, Mr. Leader, there is no Democrat who wants to shut down the government. I hear what you said. I know the quote. What they have said is they are not going to shut it down indirectly as you want to do. Now, you have done it directly.

I do not mean you, personally, but the only two times that I have served in the Congress of the United States over the last 24 years when the government was shut down as a policy was in 1995 under Newt Gingrich and in the last Congress. Those were the only times and I have been down.

Has it happened inadvertently for a couple of days? Yes, it has, because the legislation was not agreed to or we couldn’t get it to the President in time or things of that nature.

Let me say something because, on your side of the aisle, you love to say this. You love to place sequestration at the feet of President Obama’s. Now, my friend, the majority leader, Mr. Speaker, has not been here as long as I have, and I know the quote. What they have said is certainly in Gramm-Rudman—or it may have even started before then—with Phil Gramm, a Republican from Texas, and Mr. Rudman, a Republican from New Hampshire. That is when it started then. We did the across-the-board cuts—the 1 percent, the 2 percent, the 3 percent. Now, we have defeated them, but that is a part of sequestration.

More importantly, on 7/15/11, your side, in charge of the Congress, offered a bill that you called Cut, Cap, and Balance. Now, this was 5 days or 6 days before your allegation that Mr. Lew went to the majority leader then, Mr. REID, and said maybe sequestration will help get this bill through.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, we were confronting the failure to reauthorize the payment of America’s bills, the debt limit. That was what we were facing, Mr. Lew said to Mr. REID, was that the Republicans liked sequestration, so maybe if we put that in the bill, even though we don’t like it, they will vote for not defaulting on the national debt.

In that, is that what happened; but if you look at your Cut, Cap, and Balance bill—your bill I voted against—the fallback that you suggested was sequestration. That was about a week before Mr. Lew said to Mr. REID that maybe we get your Republican friends to support paying the national debt.

That passed, by the way, on the July 19, 2011. It was 6 days later that Mr.
Lew, in trying to get something done to make sure that America did not default, suggested to Mr. Reid maybe putting that in the bill will get the Republicans’ votes so that we will pay our debts.

The problem is, if you know the facts, you get a little frustrated with hearing this representation, the President was for sequester. Let’s just, for the sake of argument, say that nobody here was for sequester. Then let’s get rid of sequester. If you are for sequester, I get it. You don’t want to change it.

There are a lot of your Members who certainly don’t want to change it. I tell people all over this country when I talk to them that sequester is a complicated word. It starts with an S. It stands for “stupid.” It is a policy unrelated to opportunities, to challenges, and to needs. It was a number pulled out of the air.

I yield here, Mr. Leader, that we don’t talk about “you did it” and “you did it.” Let’s talk about how we solve the problems confronting our country. Appropriations bills that we can agree on is another and highway bill funding to give confidence to our economy and to our entities that have to keep people moving and commerce moving.

Let’s give them confidence. Let’s sit down. Let’s get these done. Let’s bring it to the floor. As Speaker Boehner said, work its will.

The gentleman referred to the 46 Democrats who voted with him and his party on the most recent bill, which was a tax reduction and which is, as are all of the tax reductions that you have brought to the floor, unpaid for.

Very frankly, as the father of three daughters, as the grandfather of three grandchildren, and as the great-grandfather of three great-grandchildren, I don’t like the fact that the expectation is that will pay the bill. They don’t vote, of course, so they can’t vote for or against us.

My daughters can, notwithstanding the 46 people who voted for it on our side of the aisle because they are for the policy, I will tell you I have talked to a lot of them, and they are not for not paying for it, but they were put in the position of either being for something, therefore, or being against something because it is not paid for and is hurting future generations.

The primary reason I mention that is the gentleman brought it up, and I will tell him that there is very broad, almost unanimous sentiment on our side that we ought to pay for things, and when that policy was in place, we balanced the House adjourns for a row. I yield to my friend.

Mr. McCarthy. I appreciate the gentleman’s comments. Hopefully, I can take from the gentleman’s comments that he is willing to work with us on highways and on coming back to the table. I appreciate that.

We may disagree on whether the administration put it in the bill in se-quester, but I think history will prove me right. I look forward to it just as we worked throughout this week and passed two bills today on a bipartisan level.

You may have disagreed with one, but 29 on your side of the aisle agreed with it, so did your President. We look forward to getting this work done for the American people. We work within the current law. That is what we look to do, and I look forward to continuing to work with Mr. Hooyer. I appreciate the gentleman’s observations.

I would simply say, Mr. Speaker, that in that spirit, there are 240 people in this House who think the Ex-Im Bank ought to be extended and reauthorized. I hope we will follow that process. I would reiterate, yes, I am willing to work with the gentleman on highways or on anything else which will benefit the American people and our country.

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

HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, JUNE 16, 2015

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members on both sides of the aisle be granted equal time to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1190, Protecting Seniors’ Access to Medicare Act of 2015, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

PROTECTING SENIORS’ ACCESS TO MEDICARE ACT OF 2015

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 319, I call up the bill (H.R. 1190) to repeal the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act providing for the Independent Payment Advisory Board, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. 

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 319, the amendment printed in part B of House Report 114-157 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE. This Act may be cited as the “Protecting Seniors’ Access to Medicare Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. REPEAL OF THE INDEPENDENT PAYMENT ADVISORY BOARD. Effective as of the enactment of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148), sections 3403 and 10320 of such Act (including the amendments made by such sections) are repealed, and any provision of law amended by such sections is hereby restored as if such sections had not been enacted into law.

Section 4002(b) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 300u-11(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “2017” and inserting “2016”;

(2) in paragraph (5)—

(A) by striking “2022” and inserting “2026”; and

(B) by redesignating such paragraph as paragraph (7); and

(3) by striking paragraphs (3) and (4) and inserting the following:

“(3) for fiscal year 2017, $380,000,000;

“(4) for each of fiscal years 2018 and 2019, $487,000,000;

“(5) for each of fiscal years 2020 and 2021, $585,000,000;

“(6) for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2025, $780,000,000; and”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chairs and ranking minority members of the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Ryan), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Levin), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Pritzker), and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Pallone) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.
find where they are going to cut Medicare payments to providers to hit that quota. They can do all of this without Congress’ approval. The idea, of course, is that unelected bureaucrats know best, unelected bureaucrats know better than patients, their doctors, or their representatives in Congress; they will know which treatment works the best because they are detached, they are distant, they are above the fray, they are not involved in the emotions or the personal relationships that such personal decisions like your health care ultimately involve.

That is the big problem. They are totally unaccountable. They are divorced from reality. Health care is not a statistic. It is not a formula. It is not uniform. It is not cookie cutter. It is personal. It is individual. It is distinct.

Every patient is different. This is why patients, along with their doctors, need to be put in charge of their health care, because they know best what is essential, what is ration health care. It would take control away from patients.

Now, the other side says, Hey, no, not so fast; Congress can override them—but that is only with a supermajority vote.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen this movie before. It never ends well. Seniors will suffer the consequences. Medicare is more than a program; Medicare is a promise. Seniors have worked hard; they have paid their taxes; they have planned on Medicare throughout all their working lives, and now that they are retired, it is something that they deserve, a secure retirement. It needs to be there, just like it has been for our parents.

Think about what a Member of Congress will do. This Board of unelected bureaucrats will say, We are cutting Medicare X, Y, and Z ways to these providers for Medicare, which will deny services to seniors; and they will do it according to this formula that is in law.

If Congress doesn’t like it, then the law says Congress has to go cut Medicare somewhere else and overturn this law says Congress has to go cut Medicare somewhere else. It never ends well. Seniors will suffer the consequences. Medicare is something that they are paying for it by taking away something that really, really matters. The Republicans come forth with a pay-for, and that is tobacco use prevention.

They can do all of this without Congress’ approval. It is a right to seek conferees on H.R. 1190 and ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during consideration of the bill on the House floor. Sincerely,

Fred Upton,
Chairman.

House of Representatives,
Committee on Ways and Means,
Washington, DC, June 9, 2015.

Hon. Fred Upton,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,
Washington, DC.

Dear Mr. Chairman: Thank you for your letter regarding the Committee’s jurisdictional interest in H.R. 1190, the Protecting Seniors’ Access to Medicare Act of 2015, and your willingness to forego consideration by your committee.

I agree that the Committee on Energy and Commerce has a valid jurisdictional interest in certain provisions of the bill and that the Committee’s jurisdiction will not be adversely affected by your decision to forego consideration. As you have requested, I will support your request for an appropriate appointment of outside conferees from your committee in the event of a House-Senate conference on this or similar legislation should such a conference be convened.

Finally, I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of H.R. 1190. Thank you again for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Paul Ryan,
Chairman.

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

The real purpose of this bill at this time, indeed, is to take a further effort to repeal ACA. That is really what this is about at this particular moment. The Republican leadership is, yet again, taking aim at ACA. H.R. 1190 would repeal the Independent Payment Advisory Board, IPAB. This would really be the 59th vote to repeal or undermine ACA.

Since it passed, we have seen the slowest growth in healthcare prices over any period of that length in nearby 50 years. Growth in per enrollee healthcare spending across both the public and private sectors has been controlled.

The three slowest years of growth in real per capita national health expenditures on record were 2011, 2012, and 2013. The ACA, in essence, has changed the healthcare cost landscape, keeping cost increases down and keeping or helping at least, to keep families out of debt.

While we know the Medicare delivery system reforms have been working to deliver value and lower costs, the IPAB was created as a backstop—a backstop—only to come into effect if other efforts weren’t successful. This should be clear. IPAB only comes into being if delivery system reforms aren’t doing their job to manage Medicare.

According to the CBO, Medicare growth rates are projected to remain beneath IPAB targets throughout the entire budget window, thereby not triggering the Board’s provisions until 2024. I think, when you subtract from 2015 from 2024, you get 9 years; so here we are, on this date, at this time, 9 years, according to CBO, before the provisions would come into effect, asking this Congress to repeal the IPAB provision. If the ACA’s delivery system efforts continue to be successful, IPAB may never even need to be constituted. It is specifically prohibited from cutting benefits or raising costs on seniors.

Walls that can never be paid for: is to make recommendations to go after overpayments, go after fraud and abuse, and try to improve, if needed, the way there is reform of the delivery system. IPAB will not take away Medicare benefits; it will not shift costs to seniors.

If we in Congress are doing our job as stewards of Medicare, we can manage cost growth while protecting beneficiaries on the front end. In the event IPAB makes recommendations, Congress always has the ability to disapprove or modify them. If we do our job, we won’t need IPAB. If we fail to do our job, IPAB will prod us to action 9 years from now or perhaps later.

Let me talk a few words about the offset. It is a significant reduction of funding for the prevention and public health fund. While the Republicans so far have come forth with their proposals that have not been paid for, this time, they have decided to have a pay-for, but it would cut by half or more than that the current funding for the prevention and public health fund.

That fund was established in the ACA to provide expanded and sustained national investments in prevention and public health and will provide $900 million this year alone for interventions that will reduce smoking, tackle heart disease, and help improve prenatal outcomes.

I have a listing of what it has meant for Michigan, just as one example: $3.5 million for State health department efforts to prevent obesity and diabetes; $5 million to address disease risk factors among African Americans, American Indians, Latinos, and other minorities; $3.3 million for community transformation grants in central Michigan to address heart disease prevention and diabetes; almost $3 million for tobacco use prevention.

Here we are, at long last, the Republicans come forth with a pay-for, and they are paying for it by taking away something that really, really matters.

We have in front of us a Statement of Administration Policy, and I ask that it be placed in the RECORD. It just repeats some of the points that I have
Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT), ranking member on the Health Subcommittee.

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill.

This legislation is a ghost hunt. It doesn't exist. There is no IPAB. There is nobody that has been appointed. Nothing is going to happen until 2024.

So the question you have to ask yourself is: Why are we doing this? Well, we are out here because some people think that trying to control costs in health care is a bad idea.

If you go back and read the Medicare legislation when it was put in, the AMA extracted from this Congress the charge that Medicare is going to ration seniors' access to care. Now, when we had Simpson-Bowles—Mr. Speaker, I know the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee thought the Simpson-Bowles idea was a good idea—what happened after it was brought out in public? Nothing. We ignored it.

And I know the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee thought the Simpson-Bowles idea was a good idea—what happened after it was brought out in public? Nothing. We ignored it.

The reason for IPAB is to put pressure on the Congress to act to control costs. I guess Republicans don't care about costs because they don't understand that there are 10,000 people signing up for Social Security every single day. That is 3.5 million people a year. And I know the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee thought the Simpson-Bowles idea was a good idea—what happened after it was brought out in public? Nothing. We ignored it.

Mr. Speaker, we just spent, in a bipartisan way, 3 years working through SGR reform. Seventeen times, we kicked the can down the road so our seniors would be denied access to care. This bill is basically SGR on steroids. It trumps all the work we just did on SGR reform.

Any proposal made by IPAB will be considered using expedited procedures, and the only reviews possible in the Senate, Congress can only modify the type of cuts proposed, not the amount, so we have to do the amount. If Congress doesn't act on IPAB's recommendation, the cuts will automatically go into effect. To make matters worse, it is not subject to administrative or judicial review.

On the projections between 2020 and 2024, the CBO can't tell me from year to year, within the tens of billions of dollars, what exact amount is going to be each year, so I don't put a lot of stock in that.

If the President does not nominate individuals to serve on the IPAB or if the IPAB fails to recommend cuts when required to do so, the Secretary of Health and Human Services has the power to make the changes unilaterally.

One person will make those changes for the entire country. Think about that for a second. One person would have the ability to reshape a program that has 55 million enrollees. Whatever you think of the President's healthcare law, this just isn't right.

After practicing medicine for more than 30 years, I can tell you that no two patients are the same and that different approaches are required for different patients. If IPAB is blind to that fact and will ration seniors' access to care through a one-size-fits-all payment policy.

Medicare desperately needs reform to ensure it continues to be there for current beneficiaries and the next generation, but this is not the way. We can do better.

It is time to go back to the drawing board and urge my colleagues to support this bill and all medical decisions back where they belong. Mr. Speaker, that is between patients and doctors.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDermott), ranking member on the Health Subcommittee.

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill.

This legislation is a ghost hunt. It doesn't exist. There is no IPAB. There is nobody that has been appointed. Nothing is going to happen until 2024.

So the question you have to ask yourself is: Why are we doing this? Well, we are out here because some people think that trying to control costs in health care is a bad idea.

If you go back and read the Medicare legislation when it was put in, the AMA extracted from this Congress the charge that Medicare is going to ration seniors' access to care.

If you go back and read the Medicare legislation when it was put in, the AMA extracted from this Congress the charge that Medicare is going to ration seniors' access to care.

Mr. Speaker, we just spent, in a bipartisan way, 3 years working through SGR reform. Seventeen times, we kicked the can down the road so our seniors would be denied access to care. This bill is basically SGR on steroids. It trumps all the work we just did on SGR reform.

Any proposal made by IPAB will be considered using expedited procedures, and the only reviews possible in the Senate, Congress can only modify the type of cuts proposed, not the amount, so we have to do the amount. If Congress doesn't act on IPAB's recommendation, the cuts will automatically go into effect. To make matters worse, it is not subject to administrative or judicial review.

On the projections between 2020 and 2024, the CBO can't tell me from year to year, within the tens of billions of dollars, what exact amount is going to be each year, so I don't put a lot of stock in that.

If the President does not nominate individuals to serve on the IPAB or if the IPAB fails to recommend cuts when required to do so, the Secretary of Health and Human Services has the power to make the changes unilaterally.

One person will make those changes for the entire country. Think about that for a second. One person would have the ability to reshape a program that has 55 million enrollees. Whatever you think of the President's healthcare law, this just isn't right.

After practicing medicine for more than 30 years, I can tell you that no two patients are the same and that different approaches are required for different patients. If IPAB is blind to that fact and will ration seniors' access to care through a one-size-fits-all payment policy.

Medicare desperately needs reform to ensure it continues to be there for current beneficiaries and the next generation, but this is not the way. We can do better.

It is time to go back to the drawing board and urge my colleagues to support this bill and all medical decisions back where they belong. Mr. Speaker, that is between patients and doctors.
out because they know how the Congress does. This is just another way to try to undercut and make Medicare and the ACA not work.

Mr. LEVIN pointed out the other thing that is important, and that is the place where the money is going to go to community health, health departments. Nobody needs health departments. Why do you need people looking at restaurants to see if they are safe to go into, or to look at the water supply or look at what is happening in sewage? You don’t need that stuff.

This $7 billion they are going to grab here is straight out of the health departments of our country. Every one of your counties is going to be facing the impact of this.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. The only thing that I think one can say is that it is a bad idea to get rid of some muscle to force us to look at costs, but it is worse to pay for it by taking money away from the health departments. They are the ones that always get cut.

Who wants inspectors? The other side says: We don’t like regulations. It is regulations that are ruining America. We have got to get those regulations out.

You don’t want regulations enforced in restaurants? Then take $7 billion away from it and see what kind of restaurant problems you start to have.

Milwaukee had the cryptosporidium organism in the water supply. That is a health problem that is dealt with by the actual health department in the county. We are taking $7 billion to pay for this badly constructed idea.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE).

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have spent going on four decades taking care of health issues in rural east Tennessee, and I saw access becoming more and more and more of a problem. It is a serious issue now, as Medicare costs have gone up and up and up.

I have a mother who is almost 93. She has a difficult time affording her health care and other needs that she has. One of the things I am very concerned with, as Dr. MCDERMOTT said, we have 10,000 seniors a day getting on that program. We need to leave those decisions to doctors and patients, not to bureaucrats.

Let me give a little more information. There is a similar panel in England called NICE, the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, I believe, and they look for the money is going to go to.

The other day, the Royal College of Surgeons talked about how they noticed that over 75, almost nobody got operated on for breast cancer; almost nobody over 75 got a gall bladder operation, almost nobody over 75 got a knee, almost nobody over 75 got a hip fixed. That is wrong, and that is exactly the pathway we are going down if we don’t stop this nonsense.

There is a very good article in the New England Journal of Medicine published in 2011. I recommend you all read it. It is a look back from 25 years. That is the only information they had. This particular author was not for IPAB against it; he just analyzed it.

Twenty of those 25 years, IPAB would have kicked in, meaning those cuts would have happened. And I can tell you this right now: our seniors better look at this with a laser beam on because their care is going to be cut if this goes into effect. We need to get rid of it now, before that happens.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California), a very active member of our committee.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about H.R. 1190, the Protecting Seniors’ Access to Medicare Act.

I am the lead, along with Congressman Phil ROE, and I am proud of the bipartisan work we have done to repeal the unelected bureaucracy known as the Independent Payment Advisory Board, or IPAB. I proudly voted for the ACA, and I think time has shown it works. The ACA has reduced the number of uninsured Americans, lowered healthcare costs, prevented disease, and increased access to cures.

Despite the success of the law, no bill is perfect. I believe that there are certain areas for improvement in the ACA, and I am committed to working in a bipartisan manner to solve these issues and provide our constituents with the world-class health care that they deserve.

The ACA is a good law and a few small tweaks can make it stronger, and that is why I decided to reach across the aisle to work with Congressman ROE on this legislation. Repealing IPAB is the only way to have bipartisan support of the Republican Party, and it is a bipartisan effort.

Unfortunately, much like the last time Congress considered IPAB repeal in 2012, an unpalatable pay-for-undermined the bipartisan support for a deal. I know Congressman ROE has worked tirelessly to avoid repeating the pay-for battle that we had back in 2012 in order to retain Democratic support.

Despite these efforts, Republican leadership has chosen to draw from the prevention and public health fund to pay for H.R. 1190. This is something that I simply cannot support, and it is with great disappointment that I must cast my vote against H.R. 1190. I truly believe that repealing IPAB is the right thing to do, but I cannot support gutting a great provision in the ACA to get rid of a bad one.

The prevention and public health fund is an unprecedented investment in public health to prevent costly and life-threatening diseases. The fund has invested nearly $5.25 billion in States, cities, and communities to keep our constituents healthy and safe before they need costly, long-term care to manage their illnesses.

The fund also exists to prevent stroke, cancer, tobacco use, and obesity, while also funding vital childhood immunization programs, and invests in new detective tracking, and responding to infectious diseases. County public health departments rely on this fund to serve their constituents, and I know my home State of California has received over $185 million thus far.

Despite all this, the Republican leadership has decided to take approximately $8.85 billion from the fund which actually helps lower the cost of health care through prevention, eliminating the need, ironically, for IPAB in the first place.

In closing, I again want to thank Congressman ROE and the 235 bipartisan cosponsors for their hard work. I am disappointed that I must vote against my own bill, because I know the underlying policy is good policy, but I cannot vote for something that drains an essential fund from the ACA.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time allotment remaining?

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 5 1/2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan has 1 1/2 minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP).

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, let me take a couple of minutes to explain why Americans fear the Independent Payment Advisory Board, as it meddles with their health care.

As I stand here today, I will tell you that I am a physician, and I can tell you what is already taking place within private insurance with these peer reviews when you recommend something.

I recommended an MRI to a patient. That afternoon, I get on the phone. The woman says: I have had cortisone injections, physical therapy, blah, blah, blah.

I said: You need an MRI.

I am being denied the MRI by the insurance company because I have only seen her once. And I said to the gentleman, the doctor on the phone: How many times have you seen her?

None.

I ask: What State do you have a license to practice in?

Not Ohio, which is where we were.

And so I said: Tell me your specialty. My specialty is foot and ankle. This woman was in for a foot problem.

He said: I am an emergency room doctor.

I said: Well, then you would refer her to a specialist, which is where she is today.

He said: Well, I am not going to let you get away with that.

I said: I hope this call is monitored for quality assurance, because I want someone to hear what you said to me today.
And then I asked the patient if she would go to her HR director and call the insurance company and say: We are going to drop the insurance because you are not letting the patients get the care their doctor recommends.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), a valued member of our Health Subcommittee.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1190, the Protecting Seniors’ Access to Medicare Act of 2015. The time has come for the House to take action to protect seniors and rein in the runaway Medicare cost growth that is relentlessly devouring seniors’ retirement savings. Congress simply must stop ceding legislative power to outside bodies.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARABANES) extend his remarks to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LEVIN) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), who are not present.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1190. This bill would repeal the Independent Payment Advisory Board, or IPAB, and pay for it by drastically reducing our investment in prevention and public health.

Mr. Speaker, I do not support IPAB. I oppose independent commissions playing a legislative role other than on the recommendatory basis. It is not the job of an independent commission to make decisions on healthcare policy for Medicare beneficiaries. Congress simply must stop ceding legislative power to outside bodies.

However, IPAB remains an insignificant provision from the Affordable Care Act, as it has not even been convened. Because of how well other provisions of the ACA are working, Medicare cost growth rates are projected to remain beneath IPAB targets through the entire budget window, thereby not triggering the IPAB provisions until 2024 at the earliest.

That said, I urge this House to oppose H.R. 1190. Congress should pay for IPAB repeal by effectively gutting the Affordable Care Act’s prevention and public health fund, an incredibly significant provision from the ACA.

The prevention and public health fund is a mechanism to provide expanded and sustained national investments in prevention and public health, to improve health outcomes, and to enhance healthcare quality. The fund has worked to reduce tobacco use, promote community prevention and use of preventive services, and combat healthcare associated infections.

This year the fund will invest nearly $1 billion in programs that will benefit every State, and these dollars go to proven, effective ways to keep Americans healthier and more productive.

In my home State of New Jersey, we have received more than $47.5 million for prevention and public health fund programs. This bill would walk back the other important strides we have made in public health and prevention.

This bill is yet another Republican attempt to attack and undermine the Affordable Care Act. I urge my colleagues to vote ‘no’ and send the bill back to the White House with the understanding that the only way to do that, by cutting reimbursement rates for doctors and hospitals, is bad for the 180,000 seniors in my district.

Support this bill, and let’s abolish IPAB. I look forward to a bipartisan vote in support of H.R. 1190. IPAB’s job is to control Medicare spending. That sounds nice, but they only have one way to do that, by cutting reimbursement rates for doctors and hospitals.

Seniors rely on Medicare, as well as the doctors who will see them. If this unaccountable Board cuts reimbursement rates, doctors will stop seeing Medicare patients. That is bad for the 180,000 seniors in my district.

Support this bill, and let’s abolish IPAB. I look forward to a bipartisan vote in support of H.R. 1190. IPAB’s job is to control Medicare spending. That sounds nice, but they only have one way to do that, by cutting reimbursement rates for doctors and hospitals.

Seniors rely on Medicare, as well as the doctors who will see them. If this unaccountable Board cuts reimbursement rates, doctors will stop seeing Medicare patients. That is bad for the 180,000 seniors in my district.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this legislation. H.R. 1190, for reasons that I will detail in a moment, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the minority whip.

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

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman indicated there were 235 people for this bill in this House. I just observed a few minutes ago there are 240 people for Export-Import Bank. We have brought this bill to the floor. I would hope the gentleman would urge his side, when 60 of his folks are for it, all of ours are for it, to send this Export-Import Bank to the floor because it is about jobs.

Having said that—and I want to acknowledge that I am a good friend and
Mr. Speaker, the House has a choice.

Today, as has been observed, there are no members appointed yet; there are no recommendations to the Congress of the United States, and the Congress of the United States can reject them; and/or the President of the United States, if the Congress passes legislation to set that aside, can consider it as well.

IPAB develops proposals to contain the rate of growth of Medicare spending. The Board has not been formed. There are no people appointed to this Board yet.

The Affordable Care Act has slowed the growth of healthcare costs to its lowest rate in 50 years. That helps every American, whether they are covered by the Affordable Care Act or private employer insurance or self-insured.

As a result, CBO predicts that action by the Board would not even be triggered until 2024, but the cuts to the prevention fund would act now. Republicans are paying for this bill by cutting funds for disease prevention and public health now. Even then, CBO reports that this bill still bends the healthcare cost curve in the wrong direction over the long run.

Today, as has been observed, we passed another bill. That one was without offset. This one will create an additional $24 billion deficit.

Mr. Speaker, the House has a choice. It can continue the same old partisan attacks against affordable health care and add billions to the deficit, undermine Medicare and bring outsized deficit-financed tax cuts passed by this Republican-led Congress up to $610.7 billion since January.

Somebody is going to pay that bill because we are not. My generation is not being asked to pay for it, $610.7 billion. It could reject, of course, the politics as usual and, instead, work together in a bipartisan way to focus on creating jobs, lowering the deficit, and investing in a competitive economy.

You heard the sponsor of this bill saying, I cannot support it, the gentlewoman from California, because the proponents of this bill would rather attack the Affordable Care Act than they would to pass this bill.

Now, they want to pass this bill, but their priority is undermining the Affordable Care Act, which is why they didn't work with Congresswoman SANCHEZ and others who agree with them on the policy. I have to disagree with them on the policy; but they have even put people who agree with them in a place where they cannot support the undermining of the Affordable Care Act and preventive health in America.

Let’s choose to work together to do what American people are asking us to do, not undermine the critical healthcare reforms that are containing costs, increasing access, and improving quality.

That is why I opposed the medical device tax bill, and that is why I am urging my colleagues to defeat this one as well.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the distinguished minority whip, I do support Ex-Im Bank and urge my leaders to act on it. We are together on support of that.

Let me just mention a few things to correct the record. Number one, we had Secretary Burwell before the committee earlier this year and Dr. LARRY BUCHON, on our Health Subcommittee, asked her specifically, when the IPAB cuts would begin to take effect. She said in 2019. In fact, the President’s own budget request would begin the cuts of IPAB in 2019.

Now, you don’t have to have the members of the IPAB appointed in order to have the cuts. The law, IPAB, designates the Secretary of HHS with the authority to make those cuts. To overrule those cuts, you really have to have two-thirds votes in the House and the Senate, with commensurate cuts from somewhere else in Medicare to replace those cuts that you are over-coming.

So this is a Board that has tremendous power that will deal with provider payments and cuts.

We just repealed the SGR, the sustainable growth rate, in a bipartisan manner. We acted to repeal the sustainable growth rate that required cuts to provider payments for seniors, and it was supported overwhelmingly.

But if you liked the SGR, you will love IPAB. This is the SGR steroids. It will be very difficult to overcome these 15 unelected bureaucrats, experts, whatever you want to call them—it can’t be a majority of docs, by the way—or the Secretary, whoever makes the recommendations.

We use the prevention fund as a pay-for, taking funds from the prevention fund until 2023 to reach the $7.1 billion. This prevents 1.5 million Americans from dying every year, beginning this year and every year ad infinitum. So $2 billion in 2015, 2016, ’17, ’18, ’19, ’20, ’21, ’30, ’31, ’40. Every year, the Secretary gets $2 billion to use at her sole discretion. That doesn’t have to use it for public health purposes. She has sole discretion on how this money is used.

Would you like to know some of the things she has used the money for so far?

Well, $450 million was used for the Navigator program and implementing the Affordable Care Act; $400,000 has been used for pickle-ball; $335,000 for massage therapy, kick boxing, and obesity classes, because that’s $7.5 million on promoting free pet neutering; $3 million for the New York Department of Health to lobby for the passage of a soda tax; money for gardening projects, fast food, small businesses, bike clubs.

Rather than spend money on questionable projects, lobbying campaigns for higher taxes, and for Affordable Care Act media campaigns, H.R. 1190 would rather use these funds to protect Medicare seniors and their health care because the money for the operation of IPAB, for these salaries, for their travel, for all their expenses comes directly out of the trust fund moneys for seniors, used for seniors and those with disabilities. That is wrong.

We are constraining. We are not repealing the prevention fund to pay for this, but we need to constrain the use of that fund. And good public health policy, cogent, compassionate, understood by this Congress, not be at the sole discretion of this one Secretary or czar or however you might want to term it.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak in favor of this legislation, H.R. 1190, and I urge the Members to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I oppose H.R. 1190.

If the Republican appetite for the repeal of the Independent Payment Advisory Board was based solely on its merits, I might be a little bit more charitably disposed of this bill to the floor because, as you have seen from the speakers on our side, there is a legitimate debate on the merits. I have some concerns myself about the IPAB. But, unfortunately, I think that where this coming from is it is important to use this kind of use to undermine and dismantle the Affordable Care Act, and the evidence of that is in the pay-for.

Why would you want to go undermining the public health portion, really, a significant commitment that was made through the ACA to begin to turn our healthcare system towards prevention, towards public health?
I just want to read into the RECORD, so that we have this information, a couple of observations from some of the groups out there that are most engaged in prevention and public health across the country and the perspective that they have in terms of this offset, of undermining and depleting the prevention and public health fund.

The American Lung Association said, using money from the prevention fund as a pay-for would have a devastating effect on the public health fund.

The American Heart Association: Cardiovascular disease is a leading cause of death in the United States and is our most costly disease. The fund supports evidence-based initiatives like WISEWOMAN, a preventive health services program that provides lifestyle programs and health counseling that help low-income, uninsured, and underinsured women ages 40 to 54 prevent, delay, or control heart disease and stroke.

And there are others that have observed—the March of Dimes, the Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids—that it doesn’t make any sense to go raid the prevention and public health fund to support this repeal of the IPAB.

For those reasons and the others that have been presented here today, I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 1190.

I yield back the balance of my time.
I oppose this bill strongly because by repealing IPAB before it has a chance to work, the bill would eliminate an important safeguard that will help reduce the rate of Medicare cost growth responsibly while protecting Medicare beneficiaries.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1190 is nothing but another attempt, in a long line of House Republican efforts to undermine both the Medicare guarantee and the Affordable Care Act.

Repealing IPAB cost over $7 billion during the course of a ten year period according to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO). Republicans refuse to pay for the cost of this repeal with cuts to the ACA’s Prevention and Public Health Fund.

This fund has invested nearly $55.25 billion into programs that support a number of public health initiatives, including obesity prevention and childhood immunization. It has been used to increase awareness of and access to preventive health services and reduce tobacco use—concentrating on the causes of chronic disease to help more Americans stay healthy.

Eliminating these funds in the name of damaging the sustainability of Medicare is a two-pronged attack on our nation’s public health.

After more than five years under the Affordable Care Act, 16.4 million Americans have gained health coverage; up to 129 million people who could have otherwise been denied or faced discrimination now have access to coverage.

Mr. Speaker, given the real challenges facing our nation, it is irresponsible for the Republican majority to continue bringing to the floor bills that have no chance of becoming law and would harm millions of Americans if they were to be enacted.

House Republicans have tried 58 times to undermine the Affordable Care Act, which has enabled more than 16 million previously uninsured Americans to know the peace of mind that comes from having access to affordable, accessible, high quality health care.

Their record to date is 0–58; it will soon be 0–59 because the President has announced that he will veto this bill if it makes it to his desk.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to look at the facts before prematurely repealing sections of the ACA that have significant negative impacts on Americans currently insured.

The Independent Payment Advisory Board recommends to Congress policies that reduce the rate of Medicare growth and help Medicare provide better care at lower costs.

IPAB has been highlighted by the non-partisan CBO, economists, and health policy experts as contributing to Medicare’s long-term sustainability.

The Board is already prohibited from recommending changes to Medicare that ration health care, restrict benefits, modify eligibility, increase cost sharing, or raise premiums or revenues.

Under current law, the Congress retains the authority to modify, reject, or enhance IPAB recommendations to strengthen Medicare, and IPAB recommendations would take effect only if the Congress does not act to slow Medicare cost growth.

Despite the Supreme Court’s upholding of the law’s constitutionality, the re-election of President Obama, and Speaker JOHN BOEHNER’s declaration that: “Obamacare is the law of the land,” Republicans refuse to stop wasting time and taxpayer money in their effort to take away the patient protections and benefits of the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that we stop wasting our time in taking away healthcare protections and benefits and work to ensure that we support the current law.

A law that is providing access to an industry once denied to so many Americans and now supports millions.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against H.R. 1190.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question was taken; and the bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. Speaker, the question is on the passage of the bill.

The Speaker announced that the yeas and nays were ordered. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

REPEAL THE MEDICAL DEVICE TAX

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

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Speaker, Maine is home to the most skilled woodworkers on Earth, but ObamaCare’s medical device tax is killing our jobs.

Hardwood Products and Puritan companies in Guilford have been family-run businesses for nearly 100 years. 450 hard-working Mainers produce 3.5 million popsicle sticks per day. The company also manufactures more tongue depressors and medical swabs than any other business in the Western Hemisphere. Its only competitor is located in China.

Puritan Company pays nearly $250,000 per year in medical device tax. As a result, they can’t afford to buy new equipment to manufacture new medical products or hire more workers. It is not right for this ObamaCare tax to export our manufacturing jobs to China. It is not right for this punitive tax to smother innovation that helps Americans enjoy longer and healthier lives.

Today, let’s all band together, Republicans and Democrats here in the House, to deep-six this horrible tax.

PROTECTING SENIORS’ ACCESS TO MEDICARE ACT

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

Mr. LAMAR Furlong. Mr. Speaker, today in support of H.R. 1190, the Protecting Seniors’ Access to Medicare Act, which repeals ObamaCare’s arbitrary Independent Payment Advisory Board, known as IPAB.

One of the most concerning and equally troubling aspects of ObamaCare is its unprecedented shift of power to Washington bureaucrats. The Independent Payment Advisory Board is no exception to that. Entrusting 15 unelected bureaucrats with access-to-the-board power to reduce Medicare spending and decide which treatments are determined necessary only serves to jeopardize access to quality care for our seniors.

We know by now that one-size-fits-all solutions coming from D.C. will not fix our healthcare system. Instead, we should focus on advancing well thought-out, long-term solutions to make Medicare more sustainable so we can protect access to care now and for future generations.

This bill brings us one step closer to getting Washington out of the way and putting Americans back in charge of their healthcare decisions.
DACA ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, this week we marked 3 years since President Obama created the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, or DACA. He did this in response to Congress’ failure to pass the DREAM Act and help children of undocumented immigrants stay here and help build a better future for America.

For children who probably know no language other than English and know no country other than America, for many of these immigrants brought here as children through no fault of their own, America is the only home they have ever known. They love this country, and they deserve a chance to stay and contribute to our Nation’s future.

President Obama announced an expanded DACA last year, along with the program that deals with parents of such children to help the immigrant parents of American citizens and legal residents. Unfortunately, a partisan lawsuit has held up their implementation, and Republicans have now voted three times to end this opportunity for children of immigrants. They would split families apart.

If my Republican friends wish to change our immigration policies, they have a perfect vehicle, Mr. Speaker, for changing our immigration system and create a pathway to citizenship for these DREAMers. Let’s bring such a bill to the House supported, in my opinion, by a majority of the House Representatives. Let’s bring such a bill to the floor so that we can fix our broken immigration system and create a pathway to citizenship for these DREAMers and others who have been living and working here for almost all their lives.

OUR DOCUMENTS OF FREEDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. LOUDERMILK, is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, quite often, as others have already done today, when I have come before this body, it has been to recognize someone who has done something significant. It makes me think about a bill, whether I was for it or against it, or a piece of policy or an issue. But today I don’t have prepared remarks. I just wanted to remind those of us who are here of why we are here. Why do we attend sessions here in this body day in and day out? What is the purpose for our being here?

Before I begin remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would like to personally extend my thoughts and prayers on behalf of myself and my family, as well as those of the 5th Congressional District in Georgia, to those victims of the horrific attack that happened last evening in Charleston, South Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the Committee on Homeland Security as well as the special task force on foreign fighters, and as part of that, we spend a lot of time studying terrorism and the terrorist attacks against this Nation. One thing that I have seen that is consistent with all terrorist attacks is that they are attacking us not because of who we are. Most of them don’t even know our names. They may not know our families or what we believe, and it may well be the case in Garland, Texas, in the attacks there, they didn’t even know their victims. But what I have seen with these attacks of terrorism is they are attacks about what we stand for, and that is freedom.

In Garland, Texas, it was an attack on the First Amendment, our freedom of speech. Last night, it was an attack on the most fundamental right that our Founding Fathers gave us, and that is our freedom of religion, a right that, as the Lord has taught us by God and cannot be taken away.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity since being in Congress a short amount of time—and it is more than an opportunity, it is really a privilege—to walk the halls of our Capital, to see the stupendous courtrooms and monuments to the Founding Fathers of the United States. As I walk down the Halls of this building and I point out the statue of Thomas Jefferson that we have right outside the Chamber, or even as I stand here, the image of Moses that he is looking over the Chamber, as I see the statues of our Founding Fathers, they have left us reminders of why we are here.

Mr. Speaker, as we are getting close to the great anniversary festival of the birth of this Nation, I think it is imperative and important that we as a body are reminded of why we are here. I just want to speak briefly about two phrases that you can find in Washington, D.C., that remind us not only of why we are here, but what it takes to preserve the freedom that we have been given.

Mr. Speaker, as I walked down the aisle to come to this podium, I just glanced up above the rotunda where you are standing, and I see four words, “In God We Trust.” That is one of the phrases that my eyes often go to as I am sitting in this Chamber as we are debating bills. I reflect back on why do we have that phrase here.

Well, to jump from one phrase to another phrase that I have seen recently as I was taking a tour of The Mall outside this building, where we have the museums of the heritage of this Nation. There is also a building there, the National Archives. Inside that building are the documents of freedom, the most hallowed of all of our documents: the Constitution; the Bill of Rights; and the one that we hold the most sacred, the one that is most requested by visitors to this Nation’s Capital to see, and that is the Declaration of Independence.

In that Declaration, our Founding Fathers expressed what they believed that this Nation would be one day. It was their vision, it was their faith, and it was their philosophy about this new Nation. They were revolutionary ideas that they brought forth because it was the first time in the history of mankind that a government existed with all power in the hands of the individual, empowering the individual. Every other government on the face of the Earth before this had focused its attention upon a group, a collective, whether it was by their race or their religion or their family line. But our Founding Fathers sensed something different: if we empower the individual, if we recognize the rights that God has given them and we give them the freedom to excel and exceed, then our Nation, as a whole, would excel.

They believed that these rights were important to be protected: the right to speak freely, the right to have ideas, the right to pursue happiness, the right to pursue commerce, and the right to not be afraid of government because it threatened the power base of those governments. In fact, they knew they would have to take on the most powerful military force in the history of the entire world if they were ever going to see these ideas come to fruition.

Now, think about that. This ragtag rabble of Washington’s soldiers would have to take on the most powerful military force in the history of the world. It was an impossible task, and they understood that. But, Mr. Speaker, that phrase that is in marble above the rostrum reflects one of those two key phrases, because in the last line of the Declaration of Independence, our Founding Fathers wrote these words: “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.”

Now, outside the National Archives, where that Declaration is still on display, are the words, “Eternal vigilance is the price of freedom.”

What is the price of freedom? It is the right to live. It is the right to work. It is the right to speak freely, the right to worship without fear of oppression to form, to pursue happiness, the right to have ideas, the right to have property, the right to a good education, the right to a safe environment, the right to health care, the right to a clean environment. It is the right to pursue our dreams, to give our children the opportunity to pursue their dreams.

Now, as we approach this remarkable anniversary festival of the birth of this Nation, let’s remember why we are here. I think it is important for us to remember why we are here. I think it is important for us as a body to remember why we are here.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity to take on the most powerful task of anybody that I have had the opportunity to take on the most powerful task of any leader in this chamber as we are debating speeches, and those brave soldiers that we honor today were a part of the special task force on foreign fighters. I think it is important for us to remember that.

Before the end of this week, we will honor those brave men and women that have paid the ultimate sacrifice for our country. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important for us to remember why we are here. I think it is important for us as a body to remember why we are here.

Now, outside the National Archives, where that Declaration is still on display, are the words, “Eternal vigilance is the price of freedom.”

“Eternal vigilance is the price of freedom.”

You see, that is the second phrase that I think we must remember today. The second part of that last line of the Declaration of Independence says, “we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes, and our sacred Honor.” You see, freedom is not free, and it is held and it is protected and it is preserved.
Omaha Beach. I started reflecting upon the price that was paid that day for our freedom and our liberty. I brought back a little bit of the sand from the beach, as my dad was in World War II and served in that theater. And as I sat at home right around Memorial Day. I was looking at that jar of sand, and I started thinking: What if these sands could speak? What would they say? What would they tell us in this august body here? What would they tell the people of our Nation if that sand could speak?

You see, that sand absorbed the blood of American patriots who had the courage to step off of those Higgins boats into the line of fire, and I wondered why would they do that, knowing that more than likely they would never return back home. You see, that sand absorbed the blood of these patriots.

The sand also may be able to tell us of the last words that were spoken by some of those patriots as they drew their last breath after giving their lives, their very lives, for our freedom. Would they tell the name of the father or mother as they cried out their last cry of hope?

Would they tell the name of a sweetheart which they will never embrace or a brother or a sister or a child that they will never see?

As I started thinking about it, I started realizing that sand held the DNA of these soldiers—not just DNA of the soldiers, but the DNA of our entire Nation.

I believe today, Mr. Speaker, that, if that sand could tell us anything today in this body, it is to remember what they died for.

I believe, if that sand could speak today, that sand would tell us these words: This is why we die, because we hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal and they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that amongst these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to ensure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

As we are nearing that celebration—we celebrate 239 years of the birth of this Nation—I call upon the Members of this body to once again reflect on why we are here, and that is to preserve freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for this opportunity to speak.

I yield back the balance of my time.

**ISIS CRISIS**

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Newhouse). Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. Russell) for 30 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, in the last couple of weeks, America has asked what is our strategy to defeat ISIS and what is the President’s plan to prevent the spread of barbarism in Syria and Iraq.

For all of our advancement in self-governance, the rule of law, and a betterment of people’s lives, the world stands in future generations, crucifixions, sexual enslavement, and human suffering as a way of governance could exist on earth today.

As the world has watched in horror, it has also looked to America. Where America leads, nations stand shoulder to shoulder; where America is absent, tyranny takes its chances and rears its ugly head—but who would have thought barbarity would emerge?

Since last year, the President has been unable to articulate his strategy to aid our ally in Iraq to combat ISIS. As a combat veteran of Iraq that has had to watch my American and Iraqi friends die, that has had to handle the flesh and blood of battle, that has had to do terrible things to destroy enemies; who had to witness the good of the people of Iraq suffer in absence of effective government, this is deeply personal.

It is personal because I have lived among the Sunni Arab. I have celebrated his children, his birthdays, and his accomplishments. I have mourned as close Iraqi friends who died to acts of terror and mourned when Iraq’s educated, intelligent, and free people have been expunged.

The President refusing to negotiate a status of forces agreement and decision to abandon Iraq in 2012 is largely responsible and aided ISIS’ path to destruction in that country.

We soldiers and servicemembers who have sacrificed so much in Iraq weep. We defeated Saddam’s army, toppled the Ba’athist government, captured and brought a world tyrant to justice, fought an insurgency, and stood shoulder to shoulder with disenfranchised Sunnis. We turned around, and brought a world tyrant to justice, and restored leadership of the town. The President used that pause for abandonment and political expediency; where we sacrificed, he quit. I speak for so many of the Iraq veterans when I say: Mr. President, you have hurt us deeply. You have torn a hole within us. We are at a loss to see the state of Iraq today.

Now, as we ask what can be done, we see a strategy offered by this administration. I heard it yesterday in the House Armed Services Committee when Secretary of Defense Carter and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs Dempsey attempted to articulate it. I left more confused than when I entered.

The President’s refusing a plan without vision or conviction. Indeed, Secretary Carter could not even name it, calling it the so-called nine-line strategy. So-called? Do we not even have enough conviction to call the strategy by name? Is it a strategy or not? Are we so unsure of it that we do not even know what to call it? Then we were informed of the “lily pad strategy.” I suppose that is the one that makes us look like a bunch of toads.

The nine lines, if we decide to actually call it that, this strategy, when taken together, is mostly passive and defensive. In my 21 years of military infantry service, I have never seen enemy defeated by defense.

While passive measures are important, they are only complementary. The President is looking for nations in the Middle East to lead. Middle Eastern countries are locked to the United States for leadership. We cannot approach this problem like pushing a strand of wet spaghetti. Grab it by the front, and it will go where you want it to go.

If Iraq and Syria were a crime-ridden neighborhood, this nine-line strategy would be like relying on neighborhood watches to physically fight criminals and restore leadership of the town. The mayor and police would then tell them, Well, if you clean up your neighborhood, then we will come and provide the protection that you require—if only life worked that way.

The military can provide pauses, but we cannot provide an Iraqi collapse when the President pulls out all the troops necessary to sustain a nascent government. If the United States is not committed with a diplomatic, economic, and information solution, all the herculean exerted by our men and women in uniform to provide a window will be squandered once again if we abandon our gains.

Secretary Carter and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs Dempsey spoke of trying to find people willing to fight in Iraq. There are plenty of them. The problem is they are Sunni Arabs and Kurds. They do not wish to live under ISIS; yet we will not organize them into a Sunni-Arab and Sunni-Kurd federation that would actually stand a chance of success and would be a deadly blow to the objectives of ISIS.

They want to govern themselves because Baghdad cannot include them. They do not wish to live under ISIS’ barbarity, and we should embrace them.

In the interim, what can be done that is not passive? How about some of this? Cripple Raqqa. This town, it is clear, is the center of ISIS power. The President’s Cabinet says: We are worried about collateral damage and civilian casualties.

News flash, the most humane thing we can do to end the suffering of hundreds of thousands of people is cripple what ISIS draws its strength from; destroy their infrastructure, hammer the electricity capacity of that city, destroy the bridges on their roads of ingress and egress, take away the oil refining installations that they possess and use to fund themselves with millions of dollars of illegal cash.

We have the ability to crush those latter, but ISIS would be diminished deeply by their loss. The most humane thing we can do to protect civilians is defeat the barbarians, causing their
suffering. That is true humanity. If the United States leads, others will stand shoulder to shoulder. Mr. President, we need you to lead.

We hear talk about counterterrorism. Well, here is something every American can help with. News programs stop putting ISIS recruiting videos as B-roll on your newscasts. Replace it with crosshairs and explosions of their defeat, or show the world their acts of barbarity, instead, for the B-roll. Stop using their images and their propaganda for furthering American newscasts. Americans, write your local news stations and tell them to stop.

Iran, here is the cold reality and its impact on ISIS and Middle East unrest. Lifting sanctions on Iran will introduce tens of billions of dollars into these war-torn nations and will destabilize the entire region. Mr. President, do not lift the sanctions on Iran. They must show good action before we show good faith.

Finally, we must go back to the drawing board on this so-called strategy of halfheartedness. Using American warriors should mean backing them with the full weight and might of this Republic.

Mr. President, do you not realize that our enemies hear you loud and clear when you say you will not sign the Defense Authorization? Secretary Carter, do you not realize that we are still negotiating it between both Houses of Congress? Why do you say you support a veto when we are still in the process of its negotiation? By such actions, one thing is certainly clear: nothing is too good for the troops, and nothing is what they will get.

Instead, lead, achieve, get an ISIS strategy worthy of this mighty Republic, sign the Defense Authorization, and let’s get back to our constitutional requirement to provide for our Nation’s defense.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to a perceived viewing audience.

WEEK IN REVIEW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMET) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMET. Mr. Speaker, we had an interesting vote today on the trade agreement, and I know my friends at Club for Growth have scored that.

They wanted people to vote “yes” because they believed, as some have said, it is about free trade; but it is a bit ironic for those who follow politics because, on the one hand, Republicans were being told this will allow us to force the President to keep us apprised, to give us notice of what is going on so that we can reign anything in that is not helpful to the country.

I didn’t have that impression of the bill, not when reading the TPA, not going to the classified setting. I mean, I did that: I read the TTP, most of it. Having been a lawyer and a judge, prosecutor, done defense, a chief justice, I have litigated a lot of loopholes. There are a lot of loopholes in that TTP. There were loopholes in the TPA.

One of my Democratic friends was telling me, Mr. Speaker, that he was being told that the whole reason the President came up here is that, by passing this trade agreement here, it is going to allow the President to get his agenda done in the next 18 months without Congress being able to stop him.

Some of my Democratic friends prefer that Congress have more say than that, and some were not happy with the proposal at all. They also were smart enough to know there are a lot of American jobs that will be lost because of that bill. I am not an isolationist. I believe in free trade, but I don’t believe in free rein for a President. I am afraid that is what it will do, and that is why I had to vote “no” once again.

But it passed, and now, we will see if what some of my Democratic friends were told is accurate in that the bill will allow the President to achieve his agenda without Republicans being able to stop him. It appears that way to me, in reading the bills, that he has got enough loopholes he can take advantage of.

Plus, even without loopholes, there is a requirement of notification. He was required to notify us before he released anybody from Guantanamo. He didn’t do it. He went ahead and released five of the worst murderers in return for a guy who is, we are told, about to be charged with desertion.

The President doesn’t seem to be bogged down by having to follow the law, but I am impressed with my friends who think—but, yes—if we pass one more law that makes him give us notice, after 6½ years of his not keeping us apprised as the law requires, this time, we think he really, really will.

I am impressed with that kind of optimism, even though the old expression here in Washington is, no matter how cynical you get, it is never enough to catch up. Sometimes, I think there is merit to that.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, there is an issue even far more important than trade that is about to hit this country. It could create a constitutional crisis of proportions that some of the Justices on the Supreme Court can’t imagine. Mr. Speaker, I’m going to pull up the law. This is the law. It is not an ethical requirement.

I mean, having been a prosecutor, a defense—heck, I was even court-appointed to appeal a capital murder conviction. I don’t know how many here have a capital murder conviction. I begged the judge not to appoint me, but he did anyway, and when I got into the thousands of pages of records, I found out he had not gotten a fair trial.

I fought for him in the highest court in Texas and got the death penalty reversed. Some clients felt like I was a pretty good lawyer. I was told before I was sworn in that the only reason the judge after against what was then the largest oil company in the world. I don’t know if it was or is. That is what I was told.

I know something about practicing law. I know something about being a judge. I know that, with any case in which the public would suspect that I could not be impartial, I would have to recuse myself. Sometimes, judges will just recuse themselves so they don’t have to make a tough call—I never did that—but there are times when you have such a strong opinion about a matter that you have no business sitting on that case.

Now, ethical requirements would insist that a judge conduct his performance as a judge in such a way that it comports with the requirements of the canons of ethics. However, this isn’t an ethical violation that would get you a letter from some bar president or from somebody saying: We think you violated the canons of ethics.

This isn’t it. This is United States law. This is the law of the land. This is part A. Part B goes into some different possibilities when a judge might have to recuse him or herself, but it is unlikely to be brought under either of the United States Code, section 455, and section A doesn’t have any subparts to it like B does. B is, like I say, other examples where the judge might have to recuse himself, but A is unequivocal.

“Any justice, judge, or magistrate judge of the United States shall”—that is a “shall”—“disqualify himself”—generic, male or female—“in any proceeding in which his impartiality might reasonably be questioned.”

This isn’t it. That is United States law. No one in the country, including on the United States Supreme Court, is supposed to be above the law. As we have talked about, we have two Justices who have performed same-sex marriages.

In fact, the article by Greg Richter, May 18 of 2015, is quoting from Maureen Dowd in her article in which Maureen Dowd writes regarding Justice Ginsburg: "Women don’t look and special emphasis on the word ‘Constitution.’ Justice Ginsburg said that she was pronouncing the two men married by the powers vested in her by the Constitution of the United States.

On the bench that I got the only one in the country, including on the United States Supreme Court, is supposed to be above the law. As we have talked about, we have two Justices who have performed same-sex marriages.

In fact, the article by Greg Richter, May 18 of 2015, is quoting from Maureen Dowd in her article in which Maureen Dowd writes regarding Justice Ginsburg: "Women don’t look and special emphasis on the word ‘Constitution.’ Justice Ginsburg said that she was pronouncing the two men married by the powers vested in her by the Constitution of the United States.

On the bench that I got the only one in the country, including on the United States Supreme Court, is supposed to be above the law. As we have talked about, we have two Justices who have performed same-sex marriages.
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What happens when someone who is disqualified for sitting on a case sits on a case anyway in order to use her partial, biased position to bring about a majority opinion? It would certainly seem that that would be an illegal act, not criminal--this isn't criminal law--but it is better than an illegal act for someone to violate this law.

Then, of course, we also had Justice Kagan as mentioned in the fall of last year, in September of last year, in The Hill, when Peter Sullivan reported: "Supreme Justice Elena Kagan officiated a same-sex wedding on Sunday," a court spokeswoman told the Associated Press.

"The ceremony in Maryland for a former law clerk is the first same-sex wedding that Kagan has performed. Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg and retired Justice Sandra Day O'Connor have performed same-sex weddings in the past.

"Gay marriage," the article reads, "has been a divisive topic at the Supreme Court as it has been elsewhere in the country."

The article reads: "The Court could decide as early as this month whether to take up the issue again in the coming term, this time to consider a more sweeping ruling declaring a right to same-sex marriage across the country."

"Ginsburg said last week that, unless an appeals court allows a gay marriage ban to stand, "there is no need for us to rush" on a Supreme Court ruling."

But they took the case up, and now, we are told they are going to rule by June 30 of this month.

Clearly, Justice Kagan is disqualified. She has had a profound opinion. It reads "in which the impartiality might reasonably be questioned."

There are different standards of evidence in the law. Some States use different burdens of proof. You can have more likely than not if it is a group, like on a jury, one more than half. If there is a preponderance of the evidence that it is more likely than not, then you find that way.

Probable cause is an issue that has an evidentiary requirement. It has got to be, probably, something is likely or has occurred, a preponderance of the evidence. I mentioned that "beyond a reasonable doubt" is what most criminal courts have before you can find someone guilty. Evidence must be beyond a reasonable doubt. There are some courts that use a standard called "clear and convincing evidence."

This United States law doesn't use any of those standards. It is a very weak standard for a judge or a Justice must disqualify himself. He must disqualify himself. I hated the fact that Justice Scalia, some years back, had to disqualify himself, but he had already had an opinion expressed about, I believe it was, the Pledge of Allegiance.

He couldn't believe that it wouldn't end up as a 4-4 decision, which meant the ninth circuit decision would stand, which struck down "under God" in the pledge, as I recall, but he disqualified himself. Justice Scalia followed 28 USC 455.

He disqualified himself because his judgment—his impartiality—might reasonably be questioned. It appeared that he had an opinion in the case, so he disqualified himself. That is acting in accordance with the law.

Mr. Speaker, I keep coming back to this. It is a matter of a constitutional crisis when the Highest Court in the land not merely strikes down and says that their opinion is more important than Moses', depicted up there in the center point of this room, more important than Moses, in the many wall over the Supreme Court, holding the Ten Commandments.

The Supreme Court says theirs is more important than the opinions established and stated by Jesus Christ when he said—and he was quoting Moses—that a man shall leave his mother and father, a woman leave her home, and the two will come together and be one flesh, and what God has joined together, let no man put asunder.

That is the law of God according to Moses. It is the law of God according to Jesus. It is tough enough if you have a United States Supreme Court which, back in the 1800s, said this is clearly a Christian nation. Despite what any opinions may be, the evidence established. This country was established as a Christian nation.

The great thing is that, if a nation is established on Judeo-Christian beliefs, it allows anybody to live here and to function here and to do so without impediment to one's beliefs because one can be an atheist, an agnostic, a Buddhist, a Muslim.

You can be any of those things, as long as you are not trying to take over the country like some would like to do.

But otherwise, by basking a country on Judeo-Christian beliefs, we have provided more freedom for individuals than any nation in the history of the world. And yet we may have an ultimate crisis here when a Court says our opinion is more important than God, if there is one, more important than Moses, more important than Jesus. Our opinion is not only more important than those people, but it is the law of the land, and it is so important that our opinion count that we are going to violate the law ourselves in order to force our opinion—clearly what it is—our opinion on the United States of America.

I don't want anybody to be prejudiced against anybody else. I was sick to my stomach this morning hearing about the shooting in Charleston, South Carolina. This evil perpetrator killed my brothers and sisters. We are brothers and sisters in Christ. Skin color does not matter one bit. He killed my brothers and sisters.

I hope America joins me in mourning. I know the people on both sides of this aisle do. At our prayer breakfast this morning, we prayed and will continue to pray for the families of those who were lost. Those Christians, we as Christians believe, as Jesus told the thief beside him: This day you will be in paradise with Me. We believe they are better off than we are here in the United States or on Earth.

Because of their beliefs, we believe they are in paradise with Jesus himself, with the Lord, but it is the terrible tragedy that they have to put up with today. We have to stop having the evil perpetrators of this kind. They are more than vicious. They are vicious and wicked and they are wicked and vicious.

They are just wonderful people. They are wrong on issues, but I love them. They are great folks. There is no animosity.

But when it comes to the foundation of this Nation, the home, a mother and a father, regardless of what other relationships may exist between siblings, between anybody else, what matters is you don't destroy the central building block.

I was intrigued when the Iowa Supreme Court back in 2009 didn't use these words, but basically said there is no evidence in nature to indicate a preference of a marriage being between a man and a woman. It was clear the people of Iowa spoke—I love those folks. They were awesome. They came out, and for the first time since the up-or-down retention vote started, I unrelated, in 1960 when it was a huge rush on a Supreme Court ruling."

But they took the case up, and now, we are told they are going to rule by June 30 of this month.

Clearly, Justice Kagan is disqualified. She has had a profound opinion. It reads "in which the impartiality might reasonably be questioned."

There are different standards of evidence in the law. Some States use different burdens of proof. You can have more likely than not if it is a group, like on a jury, one more than half. If there is a preponderance of the evidence that it is more likely than not, then you find that way.

Probable cause is an issue that has an evidentiary requirement. It has got to be, probably, something is likely or has occurred, a preponderance of the evidence. I mentioned that "beyond a reasonable doubt" is what most criminal courts have before you can find someone guilty. Evidence must be beyond a reasonable doubt. There are some courts that use a standard called "clear and convincing evidence."

This United States law doesn't use any of those standards. It is a very weak standard for a judge or a Justice must disqualify himself. He must disqualify himself. I hated the fact that Justice Scalia, some years back, had to disqualify himself, but he had already had an opinion expressed about, I believe it was, the Pledge of Allegiance.

He couldn't believe that it wouldn't end up as a 4-4 decision, which meant the ninth circuit decision would stand, which struck down "under God" in the
going to maintain viability for a long time into the future rather than show
we just crossed another milestone on our way to the dustbin of history. This
is something that is important to our society, to our foundation. Let’s love
everybody. Let’s use law enforcement to stop those like the evil perpetrator
in Charleston, like the leftwinger I think it was in North Carolina that
killed the Muslims. There is no call for that.

But again, when it comes to the optimi-

It is probably sufficient grounds for
impeachment for a Supreme Court Jus-
tice to violate the law so that they can
force their will upon the American peo-
ple to push through their legislative agenda even though they are not legis-
lators. Probably impeachment would
be in order. If they change the law in
order to change dramatically the law,
they shouldn’t be on the Supreme
Court.

It is my hope and prayer they will do
the legal thing, recuse themselves be-
fore this case was decided. So, Mr.
Mr. Speaker, I hope Americans will
be in order. If they break the law in
order to change the law so that it would be the
way they wanted, not with a constitu-
tional amendment, not through a legis-
lative process, not by a constitutional
convention that article V provides for.

They just had the feeling that they
wanted to tinker with over 200 years of
traditional societal structure and
force America to abide by their legisla-
tive agenda. Again, I just can’t
got over that.

If they don’t disqualify themselves,
they will violate the law to try to
change the law with the agenda they
have made clear that they have. So,
Mr. Speaker, I hope Americans will
join me in not only hoping, but praying
that their hearts will be touched, that
they will decide not to act illegally,
that they will be moved toward acting
lawfully, disqualify themselves, and let
us get a proper opinion from the Su-
preme Court.

I yield back the balance of my time.

**LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

By unanimous consent, leave of ab-
sence was granted to:

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (at the
request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on
account of family medical reasons.

Mr. JOLLY (at the request of Mr.
CLYBURN) for today on account of
a family emergency.

Mr. CLYBURN (at the request of Ms.
PELOSI) for today on account of official
business in district.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move
that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accord-
ingly (at 2 o’clock and 58 minutes
p.m.), under its previous order, the
House adjourned until tomorrow, Fri-
day, June 19, 2015, at noon.

**EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.**

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive
communications were taken from the
Speaker’s table and referred as follows:

1863. A letter from the Secretary, Office
of the Executive Director, Commodity Futures
Trading Commission, transmitting the Com-
mision’s final rule — Proceedings before the
Commodity Futures Trading Commission;
Rules Relating to Suspension or Disbarment
from Appearance and Practice (RIN: 3038-
FV16) received June 16, 2015, pursuant to 5
U.S.C. 801(a)(1); to the Committee on Agri-
culture.

1864. A letter from the Associate Admini-
strator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit
and Vegetable Programs, Department of
Agriculture, transmitting the Depart-
ment’s final rule — Grapes Grown in a Des-
erted Area of Southeastern California; In-
creased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-
FV-14-0106; FV15-925-2 FR] received June 16,
2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1); to the
Committee on Agriculture.

1865. A letter from the Acting Under Sec-
retary, Personnel and Readiness, Depart-
ment of Defense, transmitting a letter au-
thorizing ten officers on the enclosed list
to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admir-
al or rear admiral (lower half), as indicated,
pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee
on Armed Services.

1866. A letter from the Secretary, Depart-
ment of Defense, transmitting a letter on
the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Bruce
E. Grooms, United States Navy, and his ad-
vancement to the grade of vice admiral on
the retired list; to the Committee on Armed
Services.

1867. A letter from the Deputy Director,
ODRM, Department of Health and Human
Services, transmitting the Department’s di-
rect final rule — Removal of Obsolete Provi-
sions received June 17, 2015, pursuant to 5
U.S.C. 801(a)(1); to the Committee on En-
ergy and Commerce.

1868. A letter from the Assistant Director,
Senior Executive Management Office, De-
partment of Defense, transmitting a report
pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform
Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee
on Oversight and Government Reform.

1869. A letter from the Assistant Director,
Senior Executive Management Office, De-
partment of Defense, transmitting a report
pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform
Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Commit-
tee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1870. A letter from the Associate General
Counsel for General Law, Office of the
General Counsel, Department of Homeland Secu-
ritv, transmitting two reports pursuant to the
105-277; to the Committee on Over-
sight and Government Reform.

1871. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor,
Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Ad-
ministration, Department of Transportation,
transmitting a report pursuant to the Fed-
eral Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; Pub. L.
105-277; to the Committee on Oversight
and Government Reform.

1872. A letter from the Director, Office of
Personnel Management, transmitting the Of-
fice’s final rule — Designation of National
Security Positions in the Competitive Serv-
cice, and Related Matters (RIN: 3038-
C300) received June 15, 2015, pursuant to 5
U.S.C. 801(a)(1); to the Committee on Over-
sight and Government Reform.

**REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS**

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports
of committees were delivered to the Clerk
for printing and reference to the proper
calendar, as follows:

Mr. MCCAUL. Committee on Homeland Se-
curity. H.R. 2390. A bill to require a review
of university-based centers for homeland secu-
rity and for other purposes [H. Rept. 114-168, Pt.
1]. Referred to the Committee of the
Whole House on the state of the Union.
H.R. 2834. A bill to enact certain laws relating to the environment as title 55, United States Code, “Environment”; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself, Ms. TITUS, Mr. HUDNUT of Texas, Mr. GALLIANO, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. ZINK, Mr. CUNY, Mr. DONOVAN, and Mr. KNIGHT): H.R. 2835. A bill to actively recruit members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service to serve as Customs and Border Protection Officers; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. MCCLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. FILANKEI of Florida, Ms. SWALWELL of California, Ms. LEE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. O'Rourke, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mrs. TORRES): H.R. 2836. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide for a reasonable time and place for employees to express milk at the workplace; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. NORTON: H.R. 2837. A bill to direct the Joint Committee on the Library to accept a statue depicting Pierre L'Enfant from the District of Columbia and to provide for the permanent display of the statue in the United States Capitol; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. NUNES (for himself, Mr. KING, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. LUCAS, Mrs. NORM, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. VALADARO, Mr. BLUMENTHAUER, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. JENKINS of Kansas, and Mr. MARCHANT): H.R. 2838. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the deductibility of charitable contributions to agricultural research organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PASSIELLO: H.R. 2839. A bill to reform and modernize domestic refugee resettlement programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALMON: H.R. 2840. A bill to prohibit any appropriation of funds for the Science and Technology account of the Environmental Protection Agency; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. SCHRAKOWSKY, Mr. RENACCI, and Mr. TIBERI): H.R. 2841. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, so that eligible product developers have competitive access to approved drugs and licensed biological products, so as to enable eligible product developers to develop and test new products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: H.R. 2842. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify individual income tax rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr.
H. Res. 328. A resolution recognizing the three-year anniversary of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, which permits young people who were brought to the United States by their parents as children to remain temporarily in the United States and to seek legal status in our country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas (for himself, Mr. BHOJNOWSKE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CARDENAS, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BEN RAY LAHUE, Mr. LOVEL, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. VELA, Mr. SQUIRES, Mr. COSTA, Ms. LORETTA LUCINDA SANCHEZ of California, and Ms. MATTIE LUKAN GRISHAM of New Mexico):

H. Res. 327. A resolution recognizing the inaugural “International Yoga Day” on June 21, to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself, Ms. SINEA, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. FOLIS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. POCAN, Mr. TAKANO, and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H. Res. 330. A resolution expressing the sense of the Representatives that Members of Congress should support and promote the respectful and dignified disposal of worn American flags; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUCIANA GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H. Res. 331. A resolution expressing support for States to adopt “Racheal’s Law”; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PITTS (for himself, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HURLSKAMP, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana):

H. Res. 332. A resolution recognizing the immeasurable contributions of fathers in the healthy development of children, supporting responsible fatherhood, and encouraging the involvement of fathers in the lives of their children, especially on Father’s Day; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

57. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 4, urging Congress to enact legislation allowing individual states to establish daylight saving time as the standard time in their respective states throughout the calendar year; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

58. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, relative to Senate Joint Resolution 4, urging Congress to enact legislation that would alter 42 C.F.R. part 2, with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

59. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Colorado, relative to Senate Resolution 15-001, supporting pregnancy resource centers in their unique contributions to the individual lives of women and men and of babies--both born and unborn; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

60. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, relative to Senate Memorial 1422, urging the Congress and the President to pass and enact new economic sanctions against Iran should that nation be found to be in violation of the Joint Plan of Action or fail to reach an acceptable agreement by the dates set forth in the November 2014 extension of the Joint Plan of Action; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

61. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 21, Urging Congress to enact comprehensive immigration reform; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

62. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, relative to House Joint Memorial 19, urging the Secretary of Energy and Congress to support siting of United States Department of Energy’s Pacific Northwest Laboratory pursuant to the following:

63. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, relative to Senate Resolution 15-019, declaring March 23, 2015, to be “Colorado Day”; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

64. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, relative to Senate Joint Memorial 11, urging the Congress to support the mission of the Veterans Health Administration Office of Rural Health and efforts to improve access to health care for veterans in rural areas; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

65. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, relative to House Joint Memorial 9, urging the Congress to recognize the presumption of a service connection for Agent Orange exposure for United States veterans who served in the waters defined by the combat zone in Vietnam, and in the air space over the combat zone; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

66. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Resolution No. 141, urging the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to designate Grambling State University as a United States Department of Agriculture 1890 land-grant institution; jointly to the Committees on Agriculture and Education and the Workforce.

67. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 109, commending the United States Congress on the passage of bipartisan legislation to permanently set the payment amounts that Medicare pays for physician services, known as the doc fix; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. HARTZLER:
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Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. GOODLATTE:
H.R. 2831. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution. Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution confers on Congress the authority to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution the powers vested by the Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof. This legislation makes technical amendments to update statutory references to provisions classified to chapters 44, 45, 46, and 47 of title 50, United States Code, necessary to keep the Code current and make technical corrections and improvements. Making revisions to the United States Code is a necessary role of Congress with respect to executing the powers vested by the Constitution in the government of the United States.

By Ms. NORTON:
H.R. 2837. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 2 of section 3 of Article IV of the Constitution.

By Mr. NUNES:
H.R. 2838. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 1 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. PASCARELLI:
H.R. 2839. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SALMON:
H.R. 2840. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. Congress shall have the Power. . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . ” Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. CARDÉNAS:
H.R. 2823. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article IV, section 3, clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. DeSAULNIER:
H.R. 2824. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. GOODLATTE:
H.R. 2832. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Ms. MENG:
H.R. 2836. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

By Mr. SALMON:
H.R. 2840. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than Two Years; Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
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