

funding to combat this disease and continue making progress. In 1955, children born with CF likely would not make it through elementary school. Today, more than half of those living with CF are older than age 18, and many are living into their thirties, forties, and beyond. Investment into new therapies for this disease and continuous focus on improvement have made promising gains for those suffering with CF.

I commend Zach and the entire Maiorana family for their strength, and I hope that my colleagues will stand up to cystic fibrosis and advocate for all those who are affected in this country.

□ 1715

JOB AND TRADE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GAETZ). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) in the beginning of our Special Order this evening.

REMEMBERING DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.,
ON THE ANNIVERSARY OF HIS DEATH

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I commend Representative KAPTUR for her outstanding leadership in this Congress and past Congresses. She has been a beacon of hope for so many of my constituents and so many poor and disenfranchised Americans. She never cowered in the face of those who restrict the rights of all.

Ms. KAPTUR has been my friend and someone whom I have shared so many conversations with about justice and fighting for justice, creating a nation where all people have the opportunity to have freedom, justice, and equality. I want to commend her for being such a stalwart battler for the people of America.

Mr. Speaker, today marks the 49th anniversary of one of the darkest days in the history of this Nation: the day that Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., America's drum major for justice, was assassinated.

Dr. King was murdered while standing on the balcony of the Lorraine Motel in Memphis, Tennessee, on April 4, 1968. He was there to advocate for the rights of Black sanitation workers who were fighting for their dignity: for equal pay, for equal treatment, and for racial justice in the American workplace.

In one of the dimmest hours in our history, a voice of reason, a voice of mercy, a voice of compassion, a voice for justice, a voice of the beloved community was silenced. Yet, Mr. Speaker, his work to hold the United States to its constitutional promises that are rooted in the very fabric of our Declaration of Independence remains largely incomplete.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, America remains a divided nation, even more so now. We are tremendously disconnected from the ideals set forth by Dr. King's monumental "I Have a Dream" speech. Today, we still live in two Americas: one white and privileged, another filled with people of color, the poor, the disabled, and those lost in the margins, where people of color—Black and Brown—continue to be judged by the color of their skin rather than the content of their character.

In the year 2017, Mr. Speaker, we find the names of countless men and women who have lost their lives at the hands of too many law enforcement officials and too many police departments all across this country. Those individuals, Mr. Speaker, are now etched in the social justice history of this Nation because they were first judged by the color of their skin and not by the content of their character.

The list is far-reaching, Mr. Speaker. I am speaking of Michael Brown, Tamir Rice, Freddie Gray, Laquan McDonald, Alton Sterling, Philando Castile, Rekia Boyd, Tanisha Anderson, Yvette Smith, Shereese Francis, and, lastly, 4-year-old Aiyana Stanley-Jones and so many, many others. I could go on and on and on, but the names of the men, women, and children victimized by errant and wayward police departments all across this Nation would keep us here for days, even months, if we were to recite them all.

These stalwart young citizens are joined also by the many martyrs who lost their lives in the struggle for American justice, just like Dr. King: Viola Liuzzo; Emmett Till; Jimmie Lee Jackson; Medgar Evers; Chaney, Goodman, and Schwerner; the four little girls in Birmingham, Alabama; Fred Hampton; and many, many others who gave their lives during the fifties and sixties.

In my hometown of Chicago, Mr. Speaker, the killing of Laquan McDonald rocked our city and the Nation by pulling the scab off a festering wound of police relations and the Black community.

McDonald's death by 16 shots from a single police weapon fired by a police officer led to multiple investigations of previous police-involved shootings and also sparked the investigation by the United States Department of Justice under then-Attorney General Loretta Lynch and the United States Attorney for the Northern District of Illinois. That investigation concluded that the Chicago Police Department officers engage "in a pattern or practice of using force, including deadly force," that is a unreasonable. This report also found the Chicago Police Department has failed to hold officers accountable when they use force contrary to Department policy or otherwise commit misconduct.

To put it bluntly, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Justice found and reported that the Chicago Police Department engages in force in violation of the United States Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I am here today because I am just beside myself. I am angry. I am so fed up, Mr. Speaker, because I learned recently that Attorney General Jefferson Sessions has issued a memorandum ordering officials at the Justice Department to review police reform consent agreements all across the country, including the agreement that is being negotiated with the City of Chicago.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation has fallen so very, very far. Dr. King's dream has not been realized in this Nation. The day before his assassination—this Attorney General has retreated so very, very far from the high ideals of American justice.

It is proven beyond a shadow of a doubt that police agencies—not all police officers, not all agencies, not all departments—but there are too many police departments, too many law enforcement officials, too many police officers who have wantonly killed innocent young men of color in this Nation, and it did not just begin in this year. It has been going on for decades. We are now at a point where some departments have been placed under a consent decree. The U.S. Attorney is now trying to retreat from that pattern.

I am here, Mr. Speaker, to ask—to demand—that Attorney General Sessions retreat from his position, that he stop this memorandum from circulating in the department, and that he see the light of day that many innocent American citizens are being killed because of the wayward actions of those police officers who think that they are above the law. They can't just continue to kill wantonly and think that they are above the American law and the American Constitution.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, Congressman RUSH is always calling the Nation to its higher principles. I thank him so very much for sharing our Special Order this evening.

Congressman DAVID CICILLINE of Rhode Island is here on the floor. I also want to thank Congressman JOHN GARAMENDI for sharing his hour with us.

The focus tonight really is on jobs and trade, an issue on the mind of millions and millions of Americans. We have been joined by Congressman BRENDAN BOYLE of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, as well.

I will place this up for the Nation to see. It is a chart showing just U.S. trade relations with Mexico and Canada and what has happened since the deal was negotiated back in the early 1990s. It was also prepared before that, during the 1980s, when the United States actually had some trade surpluses on this continent with both Canada and Mexico.

This shows, in 1994, when NAFTA was actually enacted. You could see the United States begin to kind of fall into deficit. Then we had just a precipitous trade deficit, including the collapse of the peso after the NAFTA trade agreement was signed.

This is serious business for our country because this red ink represents lost jobs, lost productive power, and communities in disrepair across this country, where production units were just picked up and put either north or south of the border.

Tonight, we want to focus on President Trump's Manufacturing Jobs Initiative, which he announced during the campaign and afterwards. Here were his words:

Everything is going to be based on bringing our jobs back, the good jobs, the real jobs. They have to come back.

Well, after all we have lost, we certainly do need job creation in this country.

□ 1730

We are now into the third month of Mr. Trump's Presidency and closing in on his first 100 days in office, a period when most Presidents are able to pass something through this Congress that really matters to the American people. I remember when we were able to save Social Security back during the 1980s and when a Congress was elected in response to Ronald Reagan's excesses, and it was in the first quarter of the year that that was done. So we are waiting. It is 100 days now, and nothing significant has been done on the jobs and trade front.

Candidate Donald Trump's campaign for President in my region of America was actually founded on the principle of fixing jobs and trade. People listened. But if we look at this first 100 days, we see that he has really taken a back seat to his billionaire donors and their interests and a staff that seems to be more and more peopled with individuals who spent a whole lot of time at Goldman Sachs, which is a company that has been notorious in helping to outsource jobs.

Throughout the campaign, Mr. Trump touted his trade policies, assuring voters he would renegotiate NAFTA. Well, we have been waiting. During a debate, he said: "NAFTA is the worst trade deal maybe ever signed anywhere, but certainly ever signed in this country."

I would say that that agreement is the foundational agreement, the precepts on which all subsequent trade deals have been negotiated that have placed America in a red ink position: many more imports coming into this country, many more of our jobs being outsourced elsewhere than our exports going out.

So I ask: Are the strong planks for a new NAFTA part of what the Trump administration is proposing?

Well, no. A leaked draft notice last week revealed a tepid agenda on trade that is little more than a rehash of what the President said in his campaign rhetoric. It is not a real plan. The one action item identified in the Trump trade agenda is the announcement of a study to find out why the United States is losing in global trade. It actually doesn't focus completely on

NAFTA itself, and we need healing in this hemisphere before we start looking around the world.

The reality is we know why the deficit is so bad. Bad trade deals have led to a loss of nearly 4 million American jobs and a deficit just last month of \$43.6 billion. President Trump promised a trade deal that would get Americans back to work and reduce our deficit. Instead, our deficit with NAFTA and Mexico and Canada is 31 percent higher. It got worse than a year ago. So I hope the President understands the real urgency of stopping U.S. job outsourcing, especially in the manufacturing sector. He should do more than pay lip service. He should really take a look at how thin his administration proposals have been on renegotiating this agreement. He should establish real goals and timetables for U.S. trade to drive policy that will fix these job-killing trade agreements and deliver real benefits for the American people.

Now, we have Members who have been very active on this trade issue since being sworn in here in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to Congressman DAVID CICILLINE, former mayor of Providence, Rhode Island, and a very strong leader for working men and women across this country.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I want to begin by thanking her for her extraordinary leadership on this issue. From the very day that I arrived in Congress, she has been a passionate, articulate, effective voice for working men and women and for the impact that bad trade agreements have had on the economy of this country and on her region, but on working families all across America. She has done it consistently and relentlessly. It has been a privilege to work with her, but I really do want to acknowledge her extraordinary leadership and thank her for convening this Special Order hour tonight.

As Ms. KAPTUR mentioned, the consequences of bad trade agreements have been felt by many regions throughout the country, but in my home State of Rhode Island, as an example, we lost more than 41,000 jobs since NAFTA was enacted. These are good wages. These are jobs that pay, on average, above nonmanufacturing jobs—jobs that really help build the economy of our State and of this country.

When President Trump was elected, as Ms. KAPTUR mentioned, during the course of his campaign he promised that he would do something different with our trade deals. He promised hardworking Americans that he would deliver results, but we are now 10 weeks into his Presidency, and we have seen a lot of talk and no action on fair trade.

The President promised to label China a currency manipulator on day one. He hasn't done that.

The President promised to use American steel for the pipelines. He hasn't done that.

The President promised to make NAFTA work for American workers, but as Congresswoman KAPTUR mentioned, there is a leaked letter from the White House that shows he is already looking to implement the same failed policies that are good for corporate America and bad for American workers.

The executive orders that President Trump signed failed to address the real challenges that are facing hardworking Rhode Islanders and hardworking Americans.

Let's be very clear, Mr. Speaker, we don't need another report on trade policy. We need concrete actions that create good-paying jobs, that honor hard work with good wages and grow our economy. We need to end incentives that encourage corporations to ship jobs overseas and raise the Federal minimum wage. And while we should collect unpaid penalties, that is only going to happen if the President takes real action to clamp down on cheating, end job-killing trade deals, and create new standards that benefit working Americans.

It already seems that President Trump's campaign promises to get tough on trade were all bark and no bite. If President Trump does indeed deliver on his promise to renegotiate NAFTA, any new agreement must include strong labor and environmental standards, strong Buy America provisions, prescription drug cost reductions, enforceable currency manipulation standards, and other pro-worker, pro-consumer requirements.

Mr. Speaker, there is a terrific publication that I know you are aware of entitled "The New Rules of the Road: A Progressive Approach to Globalization," prepared by Jared Bernstein, who is a senior fellow at the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, a former chief economist and economic adviser to Vice President Biden; and Lori Wallach, a lawyer and someone who has been director of Public Citizen's Global Trade Watch since 1995.

It really sets forth the kind of principles that should guide a new trade deal: that we need to ensure that, first of all, the way it is negotiated ensures that it is going to benefit working men and women. We cannot allow corporate elites to dictate how NAFTA is renegotiated. The agreement could potentially become more damaging for working families and for our environment in the countries that we work with. If done wrong, it could increase job offshoring, push down wages, and expand the special power and protections that NAFTA provides to corporate interests that are reflected in the original deal.

What we have to ensure is that what President Trump doesn't do is make a bad trade deal worse and pander to corporate and multinational corporations and his sort of crony friends, and the process by which this will be renegotiated will help to determine that. The provisions that are in it need to be

guided by what is good for American workers and what is good to help grow American jobs.

So not unlike so many other areas, it is disappointing because there has been a lot of good rhetoric about this, but very little action by the administration. I think we are all here tonight to participate in this Special Order led by the gentlewoman from Ohio to let the administration know that we are not going anywhere, that we are going to demand that NAFTA be renegotiated, that it be a trade deal that works for American jobs and American workers, and we are not going to allow the President to simply use rhetoric but actually not do the hard work to strike a better deal for American jobs and American workers.

I want to just end where I began, by thanking the gentlewoman for yielding. This is an issue of tremendous importance to my home State, where manufacturing is so important, the birthplace of the American industrial revolution, and one of the reasons I continue to work hard on the whole Make It In America agenda. We need to start creating conditions for the creation of good manufacturing jobs here in America so we can export American-made goods, not American jobs. I thank again the gentlewoman for yielding.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank Congressman CICILLINE. He hit it right on the head. We ought to be exporting goods, not importing this many more than we export, and we ought to be creating jobs right here. I am sure he has seen companies from his community, from his State, literally picked up and then magically transported to some other environment, like Mexico, in one of the maquiladoras, and maybe windshield wipers or plastic parts or auto parts that used to be made in the United States then are made down there. I certainly have seen it.

Mr. CICILLINE. Absolutely.

Ms. KAPTUR. If we look at this chart, just for those who are listening to us this evening, if you go back to the mid-1970s, as Congressman CICILLINE pointed out, you will see the United States was pretty buoyant. We were actually exporting more than we were importing.

But then when China Most Favored Nation passed in 1979, 1994 NAFTA passed, and all of a sudden what was happening is the reverse flow started. We started importing more than we were exporting, and every time you get a billion dollars of red ink, you lose 5,000 more jobs in this country.

Well, my gosh, as NAFTA actually took full bore and then China permanent normal trade relations took effect here, CAFTA, which was the Central American Free Trade Agreement, here was the Colombian Free Trade Agreement, here was the Korean Free Trade Agreement, every single agreement that happened, we ended up getting more imports into our country than exports out, and promises were not kept.

Our focus tonight is mainly on NAFTA, but if we look at Korea, they were supposed to be taking 50,000 cars from us. We were supposed to have more balanced trade. Well, guess what, they didn't keep up their end of the bargain. Other markets around the world, such as Japan, remain closed to this day to cars from other places in the world.

You say: Congresswoman, that can't be possible.

I have seen it with my own eyes. I have visited there many times. When I first began my career, Japan had about—oh, 3 percent of the cars on their streets were from anyplace else in the world. Today maybe it is 4 percent, maybe it is 3.5 percent, but there are all kinds of nontariff barriers where they keep cars out. Yet you look at our country, they have put manufacturing plants here, they send product over here. It simply isn't a two-way street, and Japan is the second largest market in the world for automobiles. So the trade isn't fair. The American people know this. They are trying to fix this. It really requires the President's leadership to do it.

Congressman CICILLINE talked about steel trade—I just want to put on the Record—with China, and we see what a big player she is in the market and doesn't play fair. I just want to put some numbers on the Record. China's expansion of steel since 2000 has grown to over 2,300 million metric tons. That is a big number to imagine. But only 1,500 million metric tons are needed to actually serve the global marketplace. So what you have got is over 800 million metric tons of steel just floating around the world in warehouses and stored up in provinces in China, and they are dumping the steel.

Why does that matter?

Because in places like I represent, Lorain, Ohio, U.S. Steel just pink-slipped hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of more workers. Republic Steel, which sits next door to U.S. Steel, has shuttered their plant because of imported steel.

The President could do something about that. He could have done something about that the second day he was in office. Nothing has been done. All these workers, some of whom have worked in these plants for 28 years, in modernized plants where hundreds of millions of dollars of investment have been made to upgrade the capacity of these plants, rather than save that capacity for our country for the years ahead and to try to deal with this Chinese dumping, they are allowing more workers and more companies to go belly up in this country. It is wrong. It is wrong. This needs to be fixed. This is big time for jobs and economic growth in our country.

I want to thank Congressman BRENDAN F. BOYLE, who understands this problem full well. As a younger Member of Congress and one who really speaks on behalf of working men and women in Pennsylvania and coast to

coast, I thank him so much for taking time and joining us tonight. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I have to say that the working people of not just Ohio but this country are very lucky to have MARCY KAPTUR fighting for them and for her years of service. There is not a more passionate champion for working Americans in this House than the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, I come here not with a prepared text, but really to speak from my heart. As the son of two hard-working parents who were working in industries that were supported by organized labor, and it depresses me to see the great decline in our workforce today that is in a union.

Now, the subject that we are speaking about tonight is about the trade deficit, and I just started talking about unions. To some that might seem as if I am off topic, but there is no question the two are absolutely related.

□ 1745

Mr. Speaker, I want to correct a fallacy that sometimes is out there about those of us who may be critical about NAFTA and other trade deals. I am not antitrade. I recognize that the United States of America, despite being a large country of over 320 million people, we are only 5 percent of the world's population. We must engage in trade with the rest of the world. I also look at those economic statistics that tell us, without question, the most productive workforce in the world today is the American worker.

So if the grounds of trade are fair and if the rules of the game are fair, we can compete with anyone. Our workers can compete and outcompete anyone in the world. But, Mr. Speaker, they have not been fighting on a fair playing field.

Now, let's not forget that over the last 20 to 23 years or so since NAFTA was passed, that happens to also coincide with this point in American history in which most wages have been stagnant. Indeed, for middle class people and lower middle class folks, their real wages have declined, not to mention the most lower income quintile, which has seen a dramatic drop in real wages.

I think that it would be unfair for any of us to say that this is because of NAFTA or that this is because of any specific trade deal. But it is also very fair for us to point out that none of these trade deals did anything to raise the living standards and wages of American workers. Here we are in an environment in Congress in which, recently, we were talking about the TPP and moving forward with other trade deals and talking about nothing really to raise wages and living standards for our own workers here at home.

Look at the example of NAFTA, something that was promised to raise wage standards in Mexico, that we would benefit from having on our

southern border a country with a rising middle class population. There is no question that would be in the best interest of the United States and, obviously, in the best interest of Mexico.

However, Mr. Speaker, here we are in the last few years with more jobs going to Mexico, including the closing of the Nabisco plant in my district that I stood on the well of the House floor and protested against. It goes to a nice new facility in Monterrey, Mexico. Is that helping to raise wages in Mexico? Actually, wages are lower today in Mexico than they were 3 years ago. That is an economic fact.

Under the letter of the law of NAFTA, that is something that our administration could take up with our Mexican counterparts, but they don't. Instead, we see Nabisco. And I am taking one specific example because it affected my district. We see them closing a plant that had existed in Philadelphia since before my parents were born lay off 325 workers, lay off double that in Chicago, and move to Monterrey, Mexico, which they can do in accordance with NAFTA.

If we are going to move forward with new trade deals, which inevitably at some point in years moving forward we will, I would simply ask—and strongly suggest—that we look out not just for the corporate interest, not just for what is in the best interest of consumers, but also what is in the best interest of American workers.

We should not be surprised that we see this tumult in the United States politically at the same time that we are seeing stagnant wages and stagnant benefits for decades. Those two are inextricably linked.

Mr. Speaker, finally, let me say to all those who are interested in working on this trade issue on both sides of the aisle: You have committed and passionate public servants on this side of the aisle who want to get it right, who want to ensure that we finally have trade deals that put American workers first and foremost.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman BOYLE. He has raised so many important issues tonight on jobs and trade and how we fix this problem for the people of our country and, frankly, the world.

One of the issues is which banks are actually financing this outsourcing. I can tell you, they are not banks in the communities that I represent. They are not big enough to put all that money, to actually take these big companies and move them out of the United States and plunk them down in a Third World environment. It is largely Wall Street banks that do that. So they fly over the heads of people that live in communities across this country.

The gentleman talked about Nabisco moving. I had an experience. I went out to Newton, Iowa, a few years ago when Maytag was closing. I felt so bad as an American that a gold star label company that had manufactured reliable, high-quality products in our country

was closing. I learned what was happening. What I didn't realize was that the production that closed in Newton, Iowa, large parts of it were moved south of the border.

I was traveling down to Monterrey, Mexico. I was going down there, actually, to find out what had happened to someone who was murdered, who had been a student in our community and was murdered in Monterrey, Mexico. We went by this big complex that said Maytag, Amana, all of these American companies that had been outsourced to Monterrey. I said: Stop the cab. I am taking a picture. This is exactly what I am talking about.

I said: Let me ask a question to some of the people that were walking by and living in the area. I said: Can the people who work in that Maytag plant in Monterrey, can they afford to buy the washers they make?

Guess what? No. In fact, where they lived, there was no running water. There was no decent water to drink.

I thought: This is what we stand for as a country? What is wrong with this picture? For our country, in districts like mine, the results of all this lopsided trade are that citizens in northern Ohio, on average, are earning \$7,000 less than they did when this century began, because of this. The playing field is simply not level.

Several years ago, I was visited by a group of United Automobile Workers from Milwaukee, Wisconsin. They told me—and I just love these wonderful, generous human beings. They had all been pink-slipped. They had just lost their jobs. They came to see me to tell me their stories on trade and what it had done to them.

They said: Marcy, we are training those who are going to replace us in Mexico. But we went down to Mexico, and we felt so sorry to see where the people lived and the conditions under which they were working that we are collecting medical items, and we are doing humanitarian shipments to that town.

I thought: Oh, my goodness, what a generous group of Americans who are facing such horror in their own lives and yet they were doing that for people who live on this continent—and were, by the way, going to be earning, like, one-twentieth of what the workers in Milwaukee earned. So it was all about cheap labor.

I really felt bad for the cheapening of the Maytag product. I am probably going to get in trouble for saying that, but it is the truth. I certainly learned a lesson by traveling to Newton, Iowa.

Now, another story, this is on plastic seals. I happened to visit a plant in the Tijuana area, and I walked through the plant in Mexico. This company had been moved from Ohio and its equipment shipped down to Mexico.

I walked through this plant. It was about 100 degrees that particular day. I turned the corner. There were no fans taking out the exhaust. It was bloody hot, and it had to be 110 degrees. These

men were working. They had T-shirts on. It was very hot that summer. They were pulling down these large levers because they were melting plastic and rubber. I witnessed this.

I thought: Boy, that really looks dangerous with that thing that they are pulling down because it was moving like this. I thought: Boy, they have got to really pay attention every time they move that steam press down so they don't catch their arm in there.

I took pictures, and I sent them back to Ohio. I got a letter from one of my constituents. This constituent said: Congresswoman, did you really take a look at the picture you took?

I thought: Well, yeah, I was looking at the workers.

He said: No. No. Look at the machine, the machine, up in the right-hand corner, the button with the tape over it.

I said: Oh, yeah.

He said: I used to do that job. Do you know what that button is?

I said: No.

He said: That is the safety button.

In other words, when the equipment was shipped and the machine started, life wasn't worth as much in Mexico, so these workers were working with much greater risk of injury to themselves because the equipment had been tinkered with in a way that told me a lot about health and safety standards and how they are really not enforced in places like Mexico.

I finally want to end with a story that relates to trade. It doesn't just have to do with goods. It has to do with human beings, with people, and why negotiating trade deals is so important for what our Constitution says we stand for: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. This is a country that believes in liberty and justice for all. It has to do with the undocumented workers in our country who are coming from south of our border.

We hear all kinds of rhetoric about that, but the truth is that I face the reality of what happened in the agricultural sector with NAFTA. What happened is we wanted two-way trade with Mexico, but what the trade agreement did is it caused great problems in Mexico in that over 2 million small farmers in Mexico were displaced by the NAFTA agreement because our country was 18 times more efficient in corn agriculture than the Mexican people. These workers and owners of these little ejidos, these little, tiny farms that were subsistence farms, they were just completely obliterated—2 million or more people.

Well, guess what? When you lose your livelihood and the trade agreement doesn't provide for readjustment, what do you think desperate people do? They run anywhere to eat, and north of the border looks pretty attractive.

As I heard all of these speeches during the campaign about what we are going to do on trade and how we are going to fix everything, I have never heard any of the major candidates talk

about: How are you going to fix the problem for the people in Mexico who lost their livelihoods, their ability to produce for themselves?

The undocumented worker problem has a big, big root in Mexico. It was an uncaring set of governments that negotiated these agreements that caused that hemorrhage that creates an endless flow of people who are desperate, who will do anything to survive. You wouldn't want this to happen to your family.

I am all for yellow corn from the United States. I eat corn. I just served it the other night to our family. But when a trade agreement wipes out the livelihoods of millions of people, it upsets an entire continent. So now the solution is not to figure out a way to have readjustment in agriculture in Mexico as part of a renegotiated NAFTA agreement; the answer is supposed to be a wall.

Do you know what? Walls don't feed people. Proper trade agreements feed people when they are done the right way and you don't obliterate people's lives. That is what really matters.

When I see what the White House is producing, I haven't seen anything yet that really gets us to balanced trade accounts in a way that people matter and the communities in which they live matter. And it isn't always a default to what Wall Street wants and cheap labor and substandard working conditions and substandard living conditions.

We have to do better than that. We have to aspire to a system where people are invited into a trade union in which we have rising standards of living, where we have balanced trade accounts again, and where people's incomes and living standards rise. If we don't get there, we are going to have even greater social problems on this continent.

Today, I met with El Salvadoran workers, talking about the conditions in that country, what has happened there with the maquiladoras and the situations that people face in their daily lives. This race to the bottom is not working. It is not working in our country. It is not working in the Latin American countries or in Canada. We simply have to aspire to the highest values that founded this country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), someone who knows all about those values. Congresswoman ROSA DELAURO is a true leader of our trade efforts to reform this really terrible trade regimen that isn't helping anyone but the wealthiest investors who have invested in the movement of these companies abroad.

Connecticut we think of as an eastern State close to New York, but Connecticut has been battered in so many corners by trade. Congresswoman ROSA DELAURO is an indefatigable Member of the House. I don't know how the people of Connecticut found her, but keep sending her here because she really

does her job with distinction. I thank her so much for joining us this evening.

□ 1800

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, what a great compliment from someone who is a tigress when it comes to making sure that the working people in her community are represented—that their interests, their families, and their economic security are represented—and who fights on a daily basis to make sure that our families have the economic wherewithal with which to succeed.

The gentlewoman from Ohio is someone who really knows that the biggest problem that we face today in this Nation is that people are in jobs that just don't pay them enough; and that they can't make it, that they are struggling.

When you lay on top of that the direction that our trade agreements have taken us, it reinforces the fact of their lack of wages and of income inequality. And you can't have a discussion about income inequality in this Nation today without starting with wages.

I am struck by those people who tell us that all of this wage stagnation and income inequality is the fault of globalization and technology. No, that is not the case. You just listen to Nobel Laureate Joseph Stiglitz, who said that this inequality and the depression of wages has come from public policy choices. And we have made the wrong public policy choices, as has been evidenced by my colleague's comments.

We support a trade policy that puts American workers before corporate interests. And although President Trump made trade a central focus of his campaign and he promised to fight for working men and women, the broken promises are piling up.

I am deeply disturbed—I know my colleague is—that President Trump's Commerce Secretary, Wilbur Ross, has suggested that the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement is a good place to start for the NAFTA renegotiations. Working men and women deserve a new North American Free Trade Agreement, not more of the same corporate-driven trade policies of the failed Trans-Pacific Partnership—an agreement, as I said, that, as a candidate, President Trump opposed. He spoke all over the country and told people that it had to go, that he was going to renegotiate NAFTA.

This is not the only about-face that this administration has taken on trade. If you listen to the Economic Policy Institute, China's past cheating to manipulate the value of their money has left over 5 million Americans without good-paying jobs. Yet, President Trump has failed to deliver on declaring China a currency manipulator. He said he was going to do that on day one. And he has yet to act on countering our massive \$347 billion trade deficit with China.

He missed his promised deadline to start NAFTA renegotiation in his first 100 days. He has already reneged on his Buy American promise that American

steel would be required for the Keystone XL pipeline. They have waived that requirement, and my colleague knows deeply what has happened to steel workers.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to mention that hundreds and hundreds of steel workers in my district are getting laid off right now, as the gentlewoman from Connecticut speaks.

We are facing complete closure of two plants. One has already been idled, Republic Steel; and the other, the U.S. Steel plant in Lorain, Ohio, will be by early June.

If the President really wanted to do something to make a statement, what he would do is put an embargo on the products that are being dumped by China and Korea on our market that are forcing this to happen at our steel companies.

There is a glut in the steel market globally. We have about 800 million metric tons of steel that are out there.

What China has been doing is building a steel company in every province to put people to work. Then, what do they do with the steel? They have been storing it because there is so much that the global market can't absorb 800 million more metric tons.

So companies like those I represent get hurt because they are trying to play by the rules; but the rules aren't being enforced properly, so they end up with the short end of the deal that is absolutely backwards. So what the gentlewoman says about steel is right on.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, this has been happening all along in so many sectors. When you talk about the various agreements and NAFTA—and actually with regard to currency—what we fought for in the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement was to do something about currency manipulation because everything that may have been negotiated in the NAFTA agreement with tariffs and lowering them and all of that, all of that was for naught when Mexico devalued the peso. Once you do that, then your goods are cheaper than our goods and we suffer. It is the same thing that has happened in Korea, and this is what we were looking at in the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement.

Despite the Oval Office fanfare last Friday, President Trump's recent executive orders are, frankly, nothing but window dressing. While initiating a new Federal report—a new Federal report, God, there must be unbelievable cavernous institutions and places where we have Federal reports which go nowhere—what they are about is a common way to avoid fixing any problems that we have. The real test is going to be whether or not the Trump administration takes action to create jobs and to reduce the trade deficit.

Improving our trade policy requires new rules, not more of the status quo. And it was Mr. Ross who, I believe, said

that: My gosh, you can't throw out the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement. You have to fiddle around the edges with it.

That is where they are going. Again, they are betraying the promises that were made to those workers in your district, those workers in my district, and workers all across the country.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, what the gentlewoman from Connecticut is saying is very important because certain States hung in the balance in this past election. Ohio was one of them. Michigan, Pennsylvania, obviously Indiana next door was constant. If you look at each one of those States, those were the ones that actually carried for President Trump in the end because of the jobs and trade issue.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, that is absolutely right. That was a central part of the election last November.

Improving our trade policy requires new rules, as I said, not more status quo. We have to push a trade agenda that will create good-paying jobs and that is going to raise wages here at home. And our coalition is going to continue to hold this administration accountable. What we need to do is to try to reshape the trajectory of modern globalization, one that doesn't exacerbate that economic problem that I spoke about people being in jobs that just don't pay them enough money. The NAFTA agreement put people at such grave risk.

I know that the gentlewoman can recall this as well: we both stood on this House floor all those years ago and we said we were going to lose jobs, that we were going to increase the trade deficit, and that this was not an agreement that would benefit the working men and women of this country.

At that time, quite frankly, we were told by the then-Clinton administration that we were thugs, that we did not understand what was happening, that we were protectionist, all kinds of labels against the thinking that we said that this was not going to benefit us.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, does the gentlewoman from Connecticut remember when Gary Hufbauer said we would have trade surpluses? In other words, this is upside down. It should actually be like this. We would have surpluses then. Well, it is exactly the opposite he testified back then. I will never forget that.

The Peterson Institute said we would have jobs, we would have rising incomes, we would have more benefits for workers. Wrong, wrong, wrong.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, we said it then.

What we didn't have at that time was the data, which is now right here on this floor of the House, which is why we were able to defeat the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement, because

they couldn't fool us again. They could not fool us again. Not us. They couldn't fool the American people again.

We are not going down that road, not with a reheated Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement or a tweaked North American Free Trade Agreement.

I said we have to reshape that trajectory of modern globalization. It is a trajectory that needs to benefit American workers. It has to foster inclusive growth.

This is not just about large corporations and special interests that will be the beneficiaries of trade agreements. It is about trade agreements that grow our economy, that grow the economic security of the people of this country.

Implementing a new model is not going to be easy. It isn't going to be easy; we know that. But with so much on the line, we understand that it is our obligation to put the American people first, to set those new rules for a 21st century economy and give it our all.

We are going to be absolutely vigilant with where the discussions and the negotiations go on a renegotiated NAFTA agreement and future trade agreements that we may embark on.

We are not afraid of trade. We just want it to work for the people of this country, and we don't want to do what has happened to the folks in Mexico and to other countries as well.

First and foremost, I will just say that we have to be cognizant of the repercussions on the standard of living and the quality of life that our people in the United States have. These trade agreements have worked against that, and it is not going to happen again.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congresswoman DELAURO for her stellar leadership on the trade task force and the work that it has done. The hours and hours of effort on defeating the Trans-Pacific Partnership, the great assemblage that she gathered and the persistence with which she approached that, seeking to defeat that trade model, which has now been done, and to go back to the drawing board and to fix what is wrong with these, Representative DELAURO has been extraordinary.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it has been a remarkable coalition, and it is standing strong. It stands strong.

I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio for being a central and integral part of this effort. I appreciate that.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut for coming down this evening.

As we complete our work here this evening, I wanted to reissue our invitation to Secretary of Commerce Wilbur Ross to travel to Ohio to come to U.S. Steel in Lorain to really see what is happening there to the workers; and not just Lorain—we are not selfish—but all over this country where steel companies are being harmed because of imports and the fact that China, Korea,

and Russia are dumping on the international market.

We need to have an embargo. We need to let our industry survive and get over this hump of overcapacity.

We are going to need that production in the years ahead, for example, in the natural gas industry for piping and so forth. These are modern plants. America should not lose them. We have lost so many steel plants. We can't afford to lose many more for the sake of the Nation's defense.

I also wanted to invite the President to Ohio. I hope that somebody is listening. He campaigned a great deal in Ohio. I know he likes meeting people, and it certainly would be a good way to see the immediate challenge on the trade front where real lives and livelihoods are at stake in this country.

□ 1815

I also just wanted to end by saying this: When you create a system of trade where people are exploited in our country, or in other countries, that really isn't the best face that America can put forward. And unfortunately, what happens too often in our country now, for example, in trade with Mexico, when you have undocumented workers who come here, many in desperation, many of them are being trafficked across the continent. You say: Oh, Congresswoman, what do you mean trafficked? I mean, some of them come here because they are desperate, and they end up paying sometimes as much as \$8,000 to come here and work at a very low-wage job. They never get out of debt.

We have to take that system and move it into the sunlight out of the doldrums, because we can't treat people like chattel. There are millions of agricultural workers, for example, who come to this country with no contract. They are completely indentured to whatever coyote brings them across the border. That is not the system I want for this country. That is not fair to those families. It is not fair to their children. It is not fair to the places to which they come in our country.

They always feel uncomfortable. What kind of a system, what kind of a trade system would subject them to that? We are a different kind of country. We aspire to higher values. We aspire to treating people and elevating their worth, not diminishing their worth as human beings.

We have a lot to fix in these trade agreements, and I hope that President Trump will join us. I would like to tell him about what coyotes do. I would like to tell him how they behave, how some of them have been involved in murder of individuals from my district who fight for labor rights so that no one is afraid, that people feel that they have a legal system that will defend them.

We need to get to that world. Our Constitution intends it for all of the people of our country. We should behave no differently internationally.

So in closing tonight, I agree with the President. We need good jobs. We need real jobs. They have to come back to this country, and we have to treat people in other countries with worth, with their worth as human beings. We need to get back to trade balances, not trade deficits.

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

NO TAX SUBSIDIES FOR STADIUMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, it is official: the Oakland Raiders are moving to Las Vegas. Beginning in 2020, they will play in a shiny, new 65,000-seat stadium outfitted with a retractable roof that is expected to cost \$1.9 billion.

If you are an American taxpayer, you will help pay for it, even if you live nowhere near Nevada. About \$750 million for the project will be financed through municipal bonds, which are tax exempt. The Federal tax break is projected to amount to some \$120 million, according to a study by the Brookings Institution.

Congress and President Trump should take the Raiders' bad example as an impetus for reform. As the President considers a \$1 trillion plan to restore America's aging roads, rail, bridges, waterways, and airports, lawmakers should ask why so many stadiums are following the Las Vegas model, fleeing one bad economic State and using your tax dollars to go to another.

The alternative is what we did in Oklahoma City in 1993. Our residents passed a temporary 1 percent increase in sales tax to fund, without incurring a debt, a building spree called the Metropolitan Area Projects, or MAPS. Over 5 years, the plan raised \$350 million for nine projects, including a stadium now called the Chesapeake Energy Arena, home to NBA basketball's Oklahoma City Thunder. This pay-as-you-go approach may sound unremarkable, but it is nothing short of exceptional.

Most professional sports stadiums these days are financed with municipal bonds, something that they were never intended to be used for. But this kind of debt wasn't intended for lavish football stadiums or basketball arenas. Municipal bonds were supposed to give communities a way to build public projects—hospitals, schools, roads—without having to pay Federal taxes on the debt's interest. The point was to ease the financial burden on cities and States that invest in expensive but essential infrastructure.

Over the past 30 years, however, stadium financiers have exploited a loophole in the Tax Code to qualify professional sports arenas for municipal

bonds. Because Federal taxes aren't incurred on the interest of this debt, stadiums essentially receive a multi-million-dollar subsidy from Washington.

Last year, a Brookings study examined 45 stadiums built or seriously renovated since 2000; 36 were funded at least in part with municipal bonds, resulting in forgone Federal tax revenue of \$3.7 billion. That is enough money to employ 88,000 military staff sergeants or give each State a \$74 million block grant, or it could help reduce the national debt.

To solve this problem, I have introduced, along with my Democratic colleague, EARL BLUMENAUER from Oregon, H.R. 811. This bipartisan No Tax Subsidies for Stadiums Act would prohibit arena financiers from using municipal bonds. Instead of building enormous, lavish sports facilities on the backs of unsuspecting taxpayers across the Nation, financiers should ask communities to buy into their vision. If residents want a stadium to be built, fine. They should be willing to pay for it like we did in Oklahoma City; or sports franchises and leagues always have the option to finance construction like most businesses do, privately.

Funding an upgrade to America's core infrastructure will be a challenge. It shouldn't require Congress to use budget gimmicks or run up the national debt.

Closing loopholes, such as requiring stadium financiers to pay Federal taxes on bond interest that was intended to improve our decaying infrastructure, would ensure taxpayers get the best return on their dollars to improve public infrastructure that all Americans use.

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

DON'T CUT INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO) for 30 minutes.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am here this evening joined by colleagues from the Foreign Affairs Committee to discuss President Trump's extreme, proposed cuts to the International Affairs Budget.

The President's budget proposal would reduce funding for the State Department and the U.S. Agency for International Development, what we know as USAID, by nearly a third. The proposal would reduce overall funding for the International Affairs Budget by \$17.4 billion, or 31 percent.

This would be a devastating reduction. U.S. diplomats and development experts work to shape a freer, more secure, and more prosperous world while advancing U.S. interests abroad. They build relationships with foreign counterparts and resolve disputes to preserve peace and reduce the need for military action.

They also provide critical services to U.S. citizens living and working overseas and screen people seeking visas to visit the United States. This work would all be compromised by the administration's funding cuts. These cuts could also undercut President Trump's purported priorities.

For example, these reductions could interrupt the Bureau of Counterterrorism and Countering Violent Extremism and U.S. efforts to disrupt money laundering and terror financing. Funding could be slashed for nonproliferation, counternarcotics, and consular affairs—efforts specifically focused on protecting Americans from foreign threats.

This work overseas is always important, but it is especially necessary now in this tumultuous time, when the United States faces complex challenges around the world:

In Asia, we see increased tensions in the South China Sea and an increasingly hostile North Korea.

In Africa, there is a devastating famine in East Africa, brutal civil wars, as well as terrorist organizations like Boko Haram and al-Shabaab.

The refugee crisis stemming from unrest in the Middle East continues, and we have just seen reports of more gas attacks on the Syrian people.

In South America, the people of Colombia have experienced devastating floods that claimed more than 270 lives, a breakdown in the rule of law in the Northern Triangle, and a government in Venezuela that has become an oppressive dictatorship.

Even in Western Europe, we continue to combat terrorist threats from organizations like ISIS, who 2 weeks ago inspired the attack in London.

These are challenging times for our world that require a fully funded International Affairs Budget. But America's unilateral diplomatic and development work is just one piece of our engagement overseas.

Following World War II, the United States helped lead the creation of several multilateral organizations to foster peace and stability in the world like the United Nations, NATO, and the World Bank. With its budget proposal and heated rhetoric, the Trump administration is threatening that architecture of peace and stability.

For example, the President recommends cutting funding for multilateral development banks by \$650 million over 3 years and capping United Nations peacekeeping contributions to 25 percent of total funding. These decisions will have a significant destabilizing impact on the global order. If America retreats from the international stage, other powers, like China, will step in to fill that void and exert their influence. We cannot afford for that to happen.

That is why my colleagues and I are here tonight, to speak out against the shortsighted, dangerous budget proposal and emphasize the importance of the United States' diplomatic and development work.