

ALZHEIMER'S AND BRAIN  
AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to add my voice in support of Alzheimer's and Brain Awareness Month.

Today, 5.3 million Americans are living with Alzheimer's, including 200,000 who are younger than 65. When you include dementia and other brain diseases with Alzheimer's, the number of diagnoses is nearly on par with cancer diagnoses.

In fact, Alzheimer's, itself, is the sixth leading cause of death in the United States, and of the top 10 causes of death, Alzheimer's is the only one that today cannot be prevented, cannot be cured, and cannot be slowed.

This week, Congress is taking action. Yesterday, the House Appropriations Committee approved an initial funding bill for the Department of Health and Human Services that provides a \$300 million increase over last year's level for Alzheimer's research at the National Institute on Aging.

Additionally, the committee continues its support for the Peer Reviewed Alzheimer's Research Program at the Department of Defense.

These programs, coupled with several bills pending in the House, including the HOPE for Alzheimer's Act, are a testament to the strong advocacy that we have been witnessing on Capitol Hill and throughout the country, but we must continue to do more.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in this fight and join me in raising awareness of this most critical national health concern.

□ 0915

RETURNING TO THE SENATE H.R.  
1735, NATIONAL DEFENSE AU-  
THORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL  
YEAR 2016

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution constituting a question of the privileges of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 340

*Resolved*, That the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 1735) entitled "To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes", in the opinion of this House, contravenes the first clause of the seventh section of the first article of the Constitution of the United States and is an infringement of the privileges of this House and that such bill, with the Senate amendment thereto, shall be respectfully returned to the Senate with a message communicating this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution presents a question of the privileges of the House.

Without objection, the resolution is agreed to.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Michigan seek recognition?

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, only to say I do not object.

Mr. BOUSTANY. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan withdraws his reservation.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION  
OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO  
THE HOUSE AMENDMENT TO THE  
SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R.  
1295, TRADE PREFERENCES EX-  
TENSION ACT OF 2015

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 338 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 338

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1295) to extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Ways and Means or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment. 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 adoption without intervening motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas 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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise this morning in support of a rule which would allow for an up-or-down vote in the House on the Senate amendment to H.R. 1295, the Trade

Preferences Extension Act, so that it can be considered by the full House; and, if the bill passes, it will head to the President's desk along with the trade promotion authority for the President's signature.

This bill that would be considered after passage of this rule renews the Generalized System of Preferences program, extending the African Growth and Opportunity Act, and reauthorizes Trade Adjustment Assistance, known as TAA.

The activity on the floor of the House today represents a promise to Congress made by Speaker BOEHNER and Senate Majority Leader MCCONNELL. After House Democrats voted down TAA last week, the House considered and passed TPA, with a bipartisan majority, and sent it to the Senate. In the meantime, the Speaker and the Senate majority leader promised that they would ensure that both TPA and TAA receive votes in the House and the Senate.

As promised, here we are today. The Senate yesterday delivered it, when it passed TPA 60-38, which is now headed to the President's desk for his signature. The Senate also passed the Senate amendment to H.R. 1295, which will be considered today under the rule which we are speaking about. The final legislative step is for the House to consider the Trade Preferences Extension Act, and that is exactly what the rule will do.

This rule and the underlying bill represents the end of a long process to deliver trade promotion authority on behalf of the American people. Mr. Speaker, it is a Republican agenda about jobs. By passing TPA, the House and the Senate proved to the world that America is willing to lead and to stand for jobs and interaction between great countries to help lead in the 21st century. We believe in the rule of law, we believe in intellectual property, and we believe in an opportunity for consumers to have the best products, wherever they are around the world, at a great price.

The world has responded, and our partner nations have indicated that they are now ready to begin the negotiation to bring their best deals to the table. As these negotiations heat up, it is vital that the administration follow the requirements of TPA, some 160 separate, specific items which this House and the legislation very clearly talks about. It will lead negotiation to a deal that is good for the American people. If the administration violates that promise, the House can turn off TPA and stop the process.

Once a trade agreement is completed, the President is required to make public the text of an agreement for 60 days before the President seeks approval to it. The President must then submit the final text of any trade agreement to Congress 30 days before it gets a vote. Because of this important transparency feature of TPA, the American people have seen a better process than

what existed today. We will have months to read the text of any deal before Congress votes on it.

Most importantly, though, Congress retains its right to vote up or down on any agreement. So if the President brings us a bad trade deal, we can and we would vote that down. This ensures that Congress, and only the U.S. Congress, can change and agree to any law or agreement that is made that becomes U.S. law.

We have also proved that Washington has learned from some States, like my home State of Texas, which benefit greatly from trade. Trade supports over 3 million jobs in Texas, and last year Texas exported \$289 billion worth of goods and services to trading partners around the globe. Because of the process Congress has gone through the past few weeks, we can ensure that the growth, the availability of better jobs, and high-paying opportunities lie ahead for the American people.

At a time when it has become very difficult to create jobs in this country, we will, through trade promotion authority and these trade deals, offer new and great opportunities for more jobs and to build more American products and to sell more products around the globe.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman very much for yielding me the time, but the procedural jockeying that has unfolded before us does a disservice to our Chamber, to our economy, and to our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, without opportunity for Members to offer amendments, without clear consideration, and without, certainly, robust debate, the bills have bounced from one Chamber to another, jumped back and forth between in every iteration that can be cooked up.

The procedural machinations do deep disservice not only to the bills, but to the people it will impact, and I think even to the House of Representatives. Thomas Jefferson, who authored the legislative manual that guides our procedure, would be pained to see the path by which these trade packages have come to the floor.

From beginning to end, Members of this body have been shut out, shut out from reading the text of the Trans-Pacific Partnership that has now been fast-tracked, and we are not being able to discuss it with our constituents.

It is not just the American Representatives that have been silenced, either. The trade deal is upending legislative bodies across the world, and particularly in another great democracy involved in this agreement—Australia. The people's representatives in Australia could not look at this bill, even though they had great concern that PhRMA was going to do great harm to their own health system in Australia as well as in New Zealand. They couldn't even go to see about

that unless they signed a paper that they would not discuss it for 4 years. So, two of the great democracies on the planet working on this trade bill, the United States and Australia, basically shut out the people's representatives from knowing what it is that we are even talking about today.

Mr. Speaker, I insert for the RECORD the text of an article about the Australians, an article from *The Guardian* from June 11, titled, "Leaked Trade Deal Terms Prompt Fears for Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme."

[From the *Guardian*, June 11, 2015]

(Gabrielle Chan)

The leak of new information on the Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement (TPP) shows the mega-trade deal could provide more ways for multinational corporations to influence Australia's control of its pharmaceutical regulations.

Revealed via Wikileaks, the annexe on "transparency and procedural fairness for pharmaceutical products and medical devices" uncovered the draft agreements regarding medicines between the 12 TPPA member countries.

The leak comes as US Republican leaders announced a vote on Friday that may provide Barack Obama a fast-track authority to complete the agreement with Australia, Brunei, Canada, Chile, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore and Vietnam. The countries represent 40% of the world's economy.

The leaked text, dated December 2014, laid out the draft rules for member countries regarding medicines under national health care programs, in Australia's case, the Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme (PBS). The TPP has yet to be signed off.

The Abbott government has argued the trade deal will provide access for Australian products to other markets. But it requires Australia to trade off regulations that stop access by other countries and particularly multinational companies to the Australian market.

Critics have suggested the deal, which is likely to include Investor State Dispute Settlement (ISDS) clauses, will allow big corporations to sue Australian governments. Philip Morris International is currently challenging the former Labor government's tobacco plain packaging laws under a Hong Kong trade treaty ISDS.

Trade experts leaped on the rare information release regarding the secret but wide-ranging trade deal. Deborah Gleeson, a lecturer at the school of psychology and public health at La Trobe University, said the inclusion of an annexe on health "serves no useful public interest purpose".

"It sets a terrible precedent for using regional trade deals to tamper with other countries' health systems and could circumscribe the options available to developing countries seeking to introduce pharmaceutical coverage programs in future," Gleeson said.

Jane Kelsey of the faculty of law of the University of Auckland described the annexe as one of the most controversial parts of the TPP in her analysis. She said the US pharmaceutical industry was using the trade agreement to target New Zealand's Pharmaceutical Management Agency (Pharmac), equivalent to the PBS.

"This 'transparency' annexe seeks to erode the processes and decisions of agencies that decide which medicines and medical devices to subsidise the public money and by how much," Kelsey said.

"This leaked text shows the TPP will severely erode Pharmac's ability to continue

to deliver affordable medicines and medical devices as it has for the past two decades.

"That will mean fewer medicines are subsidised, or people will pay more as co-payments or more of the health budget will go to pay for medicines instead of other activities or the health budget will have to expand beyond the cap.

"Whatever the outcome, the big global pharmaceutical companies will win and the poorest and most vulnerable New Zealanders will lose."

AMA president Brian Owler said while doctors were very concerned at the possible effects on Australia's healthcare systems, they were constantly dismissed by the trade minister Andrew Robb.

"When we have raised concerns about the effects on health, the only response is 'we are not going to undermine the Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme'," said Owler.

"We are worried about the Investor State Dispute Settlement (ISDS) mechanism and there are issues in terms of patents that would affect pharmaceutical prices.

"The problem is our concerns have been dismissed by the trade minister but we do not know what is in the text."

However, Robb said on Thursday that the government would not accept anything that would adversely affect the PBS, the health system more generally, or increase the price of medicines for Australians.

"It's perhaps time to look at the enormous benefits that will flow from a more seamless trade and investment environment across 12 countries representing 40 percent of global GDP," Robb said.

"New levels of market access and common sets of trading rules will help support growth, create new jobs and result in higher living standards."

Parliamentarians were offered the chance to see the TPP draft by Robb if they agreed to a four year non-disclosure agreement.

A cross-party parliamentary working group has formed, including Greens senator Peter Whish-Wilson, Labor MP Melissa Parke and independent senator Nick Xenophon.

Whish-Wilson, who has not seen the draft as he refused to agree to the terms of the agreement, said the latest leak suggested the Australian PBS could be undermined.

"These negotiations are happening behind closed doors, without the scrutiny of the parliament," he said.

"At the very least, the Australian people deserve to be reassured that the government won't allow any deal which drives up the public health costs for Australian taxpayers such as further subsidising important new medicines including biologics."

During the most recent senate estimates in the past fortnight, Whish-Wilson questioned officials from the department of foreign affairs and trade about the strategic importance of the TPP to the United States.

The secretary of Dfat, Peter Varghese, said the whole purpose was to indicate a "ramped up US presence in Asia".

"The conclusion of the TPP is important to the United States in terms of its rebalance, because it is an important step in relation to the economic engagement of the United States with the region, and the whole purpose of the re-balance was to indicate a ramped up US presence in Asia, and a recognition of the importance of Asia in broader US geostrategic thinking," Varghese said.

"We in Australia have never seen the TPP as an instrument for locking anybody out—in fact, quite the contrary."

The trade minister's office was contacted for comment.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. So the two great democracies are now being cut out, and

the 750,000 people that I represent in western New York have been silenced because I don't go see a trade bill if I can't discuss it with them.

There has been no regular order and absolutely no Member input, with the exception of the Committee on Ways and Means. Now, the Senate had plenty of opportunity for amendments, and they were plentiful. Many of them were accepted. They also had robust debate, but not the House of Representatives. The opportunity in the Committee on Ways and Means to offer amendments did not result in acceptance of any Democratic amendments.

Over the last 3 weeks, the Democrats and Republicans, alike, came to the Committee on Rules with ideas to try to make the trade package better. They ranged from currency manipulation to labor standards to environmental fixes to the investor-state dispute settlement, but one by one they were shut out.

Perhaps one of the most critical is the investor-state dispute settlement, where three lawyers will be allowed to adjudicate all cases brought against any of the participating countries, in many cases resulting against change in their laws. I should note that the House of Representatives, in fear of all this, has already voted to do away with country of origin labeling.

What is more, on the third rule that we have had in so many weeks on trade, we are being asked to vote on two separate bills packaged into one vote. On one hand, we have Trade Adjustment Assistance, or TAA; on the other hand, we have the African Growth and Opportunity Act, or AGOA, which most of us have supported. The other part of this is a bill that was trounced in the House of Representatives. We find ourselves in the position of supporting the African Growth and Opportunity Act at the same time of a vote that most of us have voted against, the TAA.

Linking these two bills together is untenable and goes against the mores of the Chamber. And as we see, when the process is strained, the bills suffer, but most of all, the people we represent suffer.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman brings up a lot of good issues. We have been on the floor talking about this bill for a long, long time: hours of debate up in the Committee on Rules; hours of debate not only in the Committee on Ways and Means, but also watching the United States Senate for weeks work through this issue.

I think the gentlewoman knows and understands that any final trade deal will result in our ability to see in writing—and the public—this document; and the gentlewoman knows and understands it is simply not true if we try and say that we can't see what is in the bill, we don't know what is in the bill.

Plenty of time, plenty of time to do that. It is just not available yet.

So why would you put out something that has not yet been negotiated? I wouldn't do that. And whether the administration has handled this entire process well or not may be up for speculation, but I find it hard to criticize. Any Member of Congress was given an opportunity to come and read what exists today. This is not the final deal. Members of Congress have not seen the final deal because it has not been negotiated. When it is negotiated, when whoever the President is brings a trade deal back to the United States, to the United States Congress, we will be able to see it.

Secondly, very specifically, Chairman PAUL RYAN of the Committee on Ways and Means put in the law that any Member of Congress may take part in any of the trade talks as they evolve around the country. Members of Congress are allowed to do this, and I think that it is a real advantage to have more authority for Members of Congress of rules and regulations, putting us into the process to where we are a part of understanding not only what we would be voting on, but the importance of us being involved throughout the process.

Lastly, the gentlewoman is right. I do understand that the rules and regulations that have been added, not every Member of this House would like them, but I felt like they were important. I would like to just go through some of those very quickly.

One of them is that we are not going to allow any part of a trade deal to end up as an immigration deal. That is the wrong thing. This should be about trade, not about immigration.

Secondly, it shouldn't be about climate change, and we specifically said it cannot be about climate change.

Lastly, we said that for our own authority—and I think the constitutional bounds are there for us to say that—if there are any changes in this document, those changes have to come through Congress for us to approve them.

□ 0930

Of course, not every colleague that we have in the House would be for those rules, but I believe that they are in the best interest of this body.

I believe they are in the best interest of making sure that the way the world sees us is that we work together from a democracy, a republic perspective; that we work back through the things that we agree to in law, in bilateral deals, would have to involve the United States Congress. It would have to involve the United States Senate and the President and us working together.

By the authority granted within this TPA, that is exactly what we will do. I think it is well balanced. I think it is really a work of art that Chairman RYAN has crafted, along with our colleagues in the Senate, and I am proud of that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

What the gentleman said sounds wonderful, and so we are all going to have an opportunity to do it, but we have not been in on the negotiation. All we know about it is what has come through WikiLeaks, that it is being negotiated mainly by financial services and pharmaceutical companies.

Once we pass fast trade and it has passed both Houses, once that is done, the administration can do the trade bill itself in perfect secrecy, and we will not know it until it comes to the House. At that point, all we can do is vote up or down. It is my sincere hope that we vote it down.

I am now pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I want to begin this discussion by saying I have the utmost respect for the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS). I have worked with him on other issues where we have agreed. That is not the case today.

I also know that there will be Members of the majority and Members of the minority that have a different opinion than I do on this matter, and it does not mean I have less respect for them; it just means we have a difference of agreement on this one bill.

Now, when I first met my wife, I was an ironworker. I worked as an ironworker for 20 years. Then I went to law school and became an attorney. Then I ran for office and became a politician. My wife says it has been one disappointment after another.

When I was an ironworker, I had an opportunity to work at the General Motors facility, the auto plant in Framingham, Massachusetts. That was just before they made a decision to close that plant, close a couple in Michigan, and move them over the border to Mexico. I have seen the effect that that has had on local communities where that has happened.

I oppose this bill because I want a stronger America. That is why I oppose this bill. Our trade agreements negotiated under fast track have had a continual pattern of exporting American jobs overseas. That is just the fact of the matter.

Now, you might be surprised that a former union president, a Democrat, an ironworker would oppose a bill. The object of this bill is to provide public assistance to workers after we send their jobs overseas. That is the object of this bill. When their jobs are exported, we will give them public assistance and some training for a new job.

I oppose this bill; some people find that surprising, but I can only draw on my own experience. I always felt that I would rather have my Representative fighting for my job than coming up with a public assistance program to support me after I lost my job.

That is why I am here on the floor today. I think American workers want

their Representative in the fight. They want them in the fight to protect their jobs, not to give them public assistance after they ship their jobs overseas. That is as simple as I can describe.

I think I understand the American people. I think I understand the American worker. I have been there, and this does not do the job.

If you want to read this bill, you have to go to a secret location here on the Capitol Grounds. I had to give up my cell phone and my iPad. I had to give them my pen. I was not allowed to bring any paper. I can't take notes. They bring in a big box with the bill, and they sat it down in front of me, and they let me read it. They do not allow me to talk to the people who sent me here about what is in that bill.

That is not right. That is undemocratic. There is a reason they don't let me talk about that bill to the people I represent and everybody else in this Chamber—because they would not like it. They would tell you: Do not pass this bill; it is going to cost our jobs and our kids' jobs.

The people who are drafting this bill, though, as the gentlewoman from New York spoke, are industries like the chemical industry, the pharmaceutical industry. They are all drafting sections of this bill; yet the people who represent American workers are kept out of the process.

Later on, we will be able to vote up or down, but we cannot fix this bill. Unlike every other bill that comes to this floor that we are allowed to amend, we cannot fix this bill. We have to vote it up or down, and that is not right. That is not right. If we see a problem, we should be able to fix it.

I was listening to a guy the other day talk about the fact that we shouldn't really worry about not having manufacturing jobs in America anymore, that we have a service economy. He described it as a Starbucks economy.

Now, I love Starbucks as much as the next guy; I like my grande latte, but the Starbucks economy does not work unless you have someone who can walk into that store and pay \$4 for a cup of coffee. This is not good for America.

I was watching that Roosevelt show last night on PBS, and they talked about, after the Second World War, the world called America "the arsenal of democracy" because our industrial might, our manufacturing capacity, allowed us to marshal resources and save the world.

We have continually exported millions and millions and millions of American manufacturing jobs in the industrial capacity.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. LYNCH. I am just getting wound up.

They referred to America after the Second World War as the arsenal of democracy because we did save the world. Today, when the world looks at us

after we have exported millions of manufacturing jobs and industrial capacity overseas, I think they look at America and say: You know, in America, they can make us a good cup of coffee if you can pay \$4 a cup.

This is not the direction we should be sending America. I have the utmost respect for my friends on the other side of aisle. Democrats on my side of the aisle are going to support this. We have to get America's Representatives, Members of Congress, back in this fight. We have abnegated our responsibility.

We negotiate a lot of complicated bills on this floor and over in the Senate, nuclear regulatory issues, bankruptcy—very complicated issues—war and peace; yet we can't negotiate this trade deal. We have got to leave it up to multinational corporations. That is flat wrong. America wants their Representatives back in the fight on this issue.

Let's vote this bill down; let's get rid of TPA and let the American workers have a voice on the floor of this House of Representatives on this bill.

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

The gentleman, my friend from Massachusetts, is a great man and a very dear friend, but I would respond and say to the gentleman that you are going to have an opportunity, and I can't wait to get you invited to every single round of these and have you find time to go do exactly what you think Members of Congress ought to be doing because, in fact, that is the way the TPA is written.

Now, we haven't agreed to it yet because it has not been signed by—well, that has—but this whole process. As soon as that takes place, the gentleman will have all the opportunity he wants to go and take part in every round of the discussions.

I don't believe that is what we were elected for. I don't believe we were elected to go and have to do all the work that is described that the gentleman said to get back into the fight, to go offer the trade deals, to go do the negotiating.

He will be given that chance. He will be given that chance every single day. As soon as it is signed by the President, he can go at it. He can maybe even just tell the President he wants to do this for a full-time job; I don't know, but he will have that opportunity.

Every Member of this body will have that same chance. He and every Member will have a chance to go and negotiate, be in the room, be a part of the discussion, and make sure all these big, multilateral corporations that he talks about that will be in the room—which they won't be because that would not be the right thing. There would be ethics violations. I am sure the White House, the executive branch, can notify him of that, but he will be allowed as a Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the things that are being talked about most as negative

points about this bill, there is already an answer to it. That is what Republicans did.

This is a Republican bill. This is about the authority of the House of Representatives, the United States Congress, to make sure we are involved. That has never been allowed before.

Fast track is what we used to have. That is what we did have. We now have a bill before us today which will help us complete the entire process, to make sure Members of Congress are involved, not just the United States negotiator; but all the world will know the piece parts about how we are going to negotiate the trade deal. If it doesn't come back that way, we will vote it down.

Do we need to second-guess them now today? I don't think so, but if any Member wants to be involved in this, they can just get on their plane and go wherever they want and get it done. By law, they will be allowed that opportunity.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

I have great admiration for Mr. SESSIONS. We truly are good friends, and I know that he is absolutely sincere when he says that every Member of Congress is going to have input now into this bill that has not even begun.

If there is no bill, then why is everybody talking about going to read something? For goodness sake, when you passed the TPA, we have passed fast track. You can't say we are not operating under fast track.

I hear that all the time, and it really grates on me because fast track is what was passed here and in the Senate that gives to the administration the ability to negotiate that.

It will come in here, and we may be reading all of it—if we have the ability to do that—before we vote; I am not even clear about that. But I do know that they negotiate it; it is brought over here, and we get to vote "yes" or "no." We don't amend it. There will be nothing that we can say about it, and we are stuck with it.

Not only do we have fast track, but it is not just until the expiration of President Obama's term; it is for years beyond, so a future President can do whatever they please because the Congress gave that authority to the executive department. Why? I don't know.

It doesn't just apply to this one trade bill. I hope everybody understands that. When they passed TPA here the other day, they were doing it for years to come.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

Mr. LYNCH. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I will try not to repeat the arguments that the gentlewoman has put forward, but I do have to say that there is about 8 pounds of bill over there at a secure location, as I spoke of before,

that I can't talk about it in public because I am precluded from doing that. I would violate the rules of the House and the classified status that has been accorded that material, so I can't really talk about it.

I can say that it is very complicated. Like I say, there is probably, I am guessing, about 8 pounds of document there that you have to read. It is largely aspirational. In other words, I will paraphrase without disclosing any classified information. It largely says the parties will aspire or engage to do blah, blah, blah. It is largely unenforceable.

Here is another part of the problem. We are negotiating the biggest multinational trade agreement in the history of the United States. You have got some countries that I think are reliable partners and that we have a history with.

Canada, even before free trade agreements, we had trade agreements with Canada. They have the rule of law there. It is not a race to the bottom with Canada or with Australia or with New Zealand.

□ 0945

I think we have rule of law established in those countries. But we also, in the same agreement, are negotiating with Vietnam.

I went to Vietnam not long ago, and when we talked issues, I sat down across the table from a bunch of Communist generals. They run the country. They have problems with prison labor. They have problems with child labor. They have serious problems with environmental standards in that country.

Malaysia, do you know what the minimum wage in Malaysia is? Zero. They do that to try to attract companies.

The situation in Chile and Peru, we have organizers that have tried to work on behalf of workers who have been killed in those countries. There is no rule of law established in those countries where we have had success in enforcing our agreements. That has been a major problem.

So we are going to ask the American worker to compete with workers in Vietnam, who get, I think it is 90 cents an hour, 97 cents an hour—I don't want to sell them short—97 cents an hour in a country that has had a history of major problems, as I have spoken about. Malaysia, the same thing.

We can't enforce our agreements. And on the issue of who has drafted this bill, it is my understanding that the chemical industry provisions in that TPP were drafted by the chemical industry. They like it. They got exactly what they wanted. The same thing with these other industries.

And again, why is it a national secret that I can't talk about a bill that is going to affect every American citizen today? And not only that, it is going to affect their sons and daughters.

There is a reason that our kids coming out of college can't get jobs. We have got to wake up.

I told this story before. I went to Korea recently, with JPAC. It was

about the Korean war and recovering our sons and daughters who fought in that country and are still there. But while I was there, I looked for American cars because we had passed a free trade agreement with Korea. We were there for days. I had two young Navy lieutenants with me. I said, Let's all look for American cars.

We saw two American cars in the time we were there in Korea. It is a big industrial country. They have got plenty of traffic. We saw hundreds of thousands of cars. I saw two American cars: the one I was driving in from the Embassy, and the one that the Navy lieutenants were driving in behind me. They have shut us out.

You go to Japan, it is pretty much the same story. I said before, you need to hire a detective to find an American car in Japan.

So we have had very little success in enforcing our trade agreements overseas. We have got a lousy deal.

So all I am asking is, look, I believe in—and you know what? I have to say, the EU did it right. The EU, when they negotiated with South Korea, they said: If you are going to sell cars into the EU from Korea, we want 30 percent of the components in that car to be made in the EU. And they created a lot of work for their auto parts industry.

Think about it. We could do that. Congress could do that. We could maintain that, if they are going to sell a foreign car here, we want 40 percent or 50 percent of the components to be manufactured here in the United States. We would create millions of jobs in the United States. There is nothing wrong with that. It is a good thing. We would restore industrial and manufacturing capacity in the United States if Congress got back in the game.

I am not against free trade. I think free trade works when it is balanced. I want somebody in there fighting for the American worker. We don't have that now. We don't have that now. Congress has abdicated its responsibility by agreeing to buy a pig in a poke because, when they bring that bill back on the floor here, we are going to have to vote up or down.

You won't have the ability to change the bill like you do on every other bill that is brought on the floor of Congress. You will not have that ability. Congress will have abdicated its responsibility to represent the people that sent them here.

Free trade can work. Let's have a fair deal for the American worker. That is all I am asking for.

If there were a fair deal for the American worker that I could read and talk to my constituents about—you know, I have got 727,514 bosses back in Massachusetts, and they sent me here to do my job, and I am trying to do that on their behalf. I think that every other Member of Congress is trying to do their job as well. We can't do that if TPA goes through. We need to give the American worker a voice, and we can do that today.

Let's vote this stuff down. Let's talk to the President. He is a good man, wants to create American jobs. Let's have an open debate. It should not be a secret. It should not be a national secret about these agreements we are having with multinational corporations. We should not be afraid that the American people might find out what is going on here.

We should be proud of what we are doing here. We should want it plastered all over the front pages of the newspapers in this country. We should be proud of our work here.

I can't be proud of what is going on right now, and so I urge my colleagues to vote against it. Vote this down. Let's change this system to a transparent system that the American people can be assured that their Representatives in Congress are doing the right thing.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I really, once again, appreciate the gentleman for coming to the floor and speaking directly with you and all of his colleagues about the importance of this bill and, really, the problems he has with it.

But I would also like to let you know, Mr. Speaker, that the number one selling car in Korea is an American-made car. We signed a trade agreement in 2011 with Korea. The Toyota Camry from Georgetown, Kentucky, the Toyota made in Georgetown, Kentucky, is the number one selling vehicle in Korea starting last year.

Now, there may not be a lot of them necessarily where the gentleman visited in Korea, but that is a fact; and the gentleman from Georgetown, Kentucky, ANDY BARR, who is a Member of this Congress, has talked about this for a long, long time.

The trade agreements, when the United States engages with them, we end up with surpluses, and it is better for the American worker. The trade agreement jobs pay 30 percent more than the nontrade-associated jobs in this country; and by virtue of what we are doing we are trying to get a trade deal now where Japan would be involved because we do want Japan to open up their marketplaces. But where we have these agreements, that is what happens. The American worker wins.

So TPA is already the law of the land. The question we have today is whether we are going to include in that package the last parts of this, which would be TAA, which do give, if there is a difference as a result of the trade deals where an industry, where a town, where a group of people were "harmed," then the law would be there for retraining.

I think that is the right vote. That is why Speaker BOEHNER is bringing this back, even though, by and large, this concept was turned down by the Democratic Party, from the very top of their organization to the bottom. That is why Speaker BOEHNER understood the right and fair thing to do.

Senate Majority Leader MCCONNELL said the right thing to do is to bring it back; let's see if we can repackage it. Let's see if we can take a little bit of time, measure three times, saw again, see if we can get it right. That is what we are trying to do.

Trade Promotion Authority that the gentleman has been speaking of is already the law of the land. The question is will this last piece be a part of it.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, what we have heard this morning must certainly cause great confusion in the minds of America. Let me restate what has happened here.

The Congress has passed fast-track authority, TPA, for 6 years. It goes beyond this President's term and covers 4 years of another. Why that happened, I am not really clear, but it certainly is something we have given away our right to negotiate trade agreements, which, by the way, the Constitution gives us the ability to do.

Second, there will be no input. The Congress of the United States will not be writing that trade bill. That is purely in the hands of the Trade Representative and the Executive Department of the United States.

Our next role, and the only one we have, is to vote up or down on whatever they present us. What a sad day it is.

And I want to agree with Mr. LYNCH. The very fact of passing this bill is an admission and knowing that we are going to lose jobs.

My part of the district in western New York is just now starting to regain its footing after NAFTA. You have heard me say it a million times. Eastman Kodak, one of the iconic companies in the country—in the world, actually—went from 62,000 employees down to foreign bankruptcy. What we have got, also NAFTA has put us, the losses there, as the fifth city that is under the poverty line in the United States.

For heaven's sake, it breaks my heart to think that my constituents are going to have to be facing this again, because people who have voted for all this don't seem to understand what it is that they have done.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time. I appreciate my colleagues, the gentleman from Massachusetts, the gentlewoman from New York, for their engagement today.

Mr. Speaker, confirmed again, the number one car, the car of the year in Korea in 2013: Toyota Camry, made in Georgetown, Kentucky. I have had 10 people text me trying to give me more information about what a great opportunity this is for American workers.

Mr. Speaker, that is what this bill is about. It is about the jobs opportunity and a fair proposal, not just by the administration, not just by the House and

the Senate but, really, a Republican bill for jobs. This is a jobs bill, a jobs bill that will allow the American worker to have new boundaries, new opportunities to go out in.

And let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, I don't travel very much. But I will tell you that I know from the stories that come back, people want American-made products. They want American-made, everything from jeans all the way to high-tech products. They want American products because of the reliability of the American workers, because of the stability of America, and we have got a great opportunity with this final piece, part of this trade agreement to move it forward.

I think 5 years from now we are going to look back and say, Wow, what did we do great? And you can mark it just like they do this year, 2 years ago, looking back to the Toyota Camry, number one in the Korean market.

Mr. Speaker, today's rule provides for, I think, just an up-or-down vote—it is really simple—to Senate amendment H.R. 1295, the Trade Preferences Extension Act. By passing this rule today, we can move on. The House will have an opportunity to consider the bill, and it will head to the President's desk, this package of bills to the President.

I urge adoption of the rule and look forward to the debate that will follow on the real substance of the bill.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

□ 1000

#### RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I have a privileged resolution at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. \_\_\_\_\_

Whereas on December 20, 1860, South Carolina became the first State to secede from the Union;

Whereas on January 9, 1861, Mississippi seceded from the Union, stating in its "Declaration of Immediate Causes" that "[o]ur position is thoroughly identified with the institution of slavery—the greatest material interest of the world.";

Whereas on February 9, 1861, the Confederate States of America was formed with a group of 11 States as a purported sovereign nation and with Jefferson Davis of Mississippi as its president;

Whereas on March 11, 1861, the Confederate States of America adopted its own constitution;

Whereas on April 12, 1861, the Confederate States of America fired shots upon Fort Sumter in Charleston, South Carolina, effectively beginning the Civil War;

Whereas the United States did not recognize the Confederate States of America as a sovereign nation, but rather as a rebel insurrection, and took to military battle to bring the rogue states back into the Union;

Whereas on April 9, 1865, General Robert E. Lee surrendered to General Ulysses S. Grant at Appomattox Court House in Virginia, effectively, ending the Civil War and preserving the Union;

Whereas during the Civil War, the Confederate States of America used the Navy Jack, Battle Flag, and other imagery as a symbols of the Confederate armed forces;

Whereas since the end of the Civil War, the Navy Jack, Confederate battle flag, and other imagery of the Confederacy have been appropriated by groups as a symbols of hate, terror, intolerance, and as supportive of the institution of slavery;

Whereas groups such as the Ku Klux Klan and other white supremacist groups utilize Confederate imagery to frighten, terrorize, and cause harm to groups of people toward whom they have hateful intent, including African Americans, Hispanic Americans, and Jewish Americans;

Whereas many State and Federal political leaders, including United States Senators Thad Cochran and Roger Wicker, along with Mississippi House Speaker Philip Gunn and other State leaders, have spoken out and advocated for the removal of the imagery of the Confederacy on Mississippi's state flag;

Whereas many Members of Congress, including Speaker John Boehner, support the removal of the Confederate flag from the grounds of South Carolina's capitol;

Whereas Speaker John Boehner released a statement on the issue saying, "I commend Governor Nikki Haley and other South Carolina leaders in their effort to remove the Confederate flag from Statehouse grounds. In his second inaugural address 150 years ago, and a month before his assassination, President Abraham Lincoln ended his speech with these powerful words, which are as meaningful today as when they were spoken on the East Front of the Capitol on March 4, 1865: 'With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.'";

Whereas the House of Representatives has several State flags with imagery of the Confederacy throughout its main structures and House office buildings;

Whereas it is an uncontroverted fact that symbols of the Confederacy offend and insult many members of the general public who use the hallways of Congress each day;

Whereas Congress has never permanently recognized in its hallways the symbols of sovereign nations with whom it has gone to war or rogue entities such as the Confederate States of America;

Whereas continuing to display a symbol of hatred, oppression, and insurrection that nearly tore our Union apart and that is known to offend many groups throughout the country would irreparably damage the reputation of this august institution and offend the very dignity of the House of Representatives; and