number of chairs. There was a little TV screen, and I just pushed the button to see what was there. What came on was a little film about life and about birth and about this little baby. They referred to the baby time and again: the baby is a week old, the baby is 2 weeks old, the baby is 3 weeks old.

Here is a chart, Mr. Speaker, that says that baby at 4 weeks has the eyes and the heart, 5 weeks greater development with the limbs, 6 weeks having the teeth and the palate and the ears. You will see there, Mr. Speaker, about the 16th week the brain is fully formed; and, at that point, at fully formed, the nervous system is in. That baby can feel pain.

So I want those who can see us today and feel the heart and commitment, that this is a baby, and this is the life of that baby as it is processed. The Lord said: ''I knew you even when you were in your mother's womb.'' This is something that we cannot remove ourselves from.

As you think of this baby and the loss of these babies, some 56 million, your mind's eye looks through all of recorded history and what has happened in the period of history that those babies were born and what would happen with their lives. Did we eliminate the life of one who would have helped to cure cancer or diabetes or any other disease? Was that life taken that God had put in that little baby's mind and heart the knowledge to do what was needed to be done to cure a major disease today? We will never know that until eternity.

For that, I think it is a very sober thought to know that the Lord watches over us day and night, and his thoughts toward us are good and not of evil, to give us a future and a hope. He has hope to all. We need to respect the fact and know the fact that that loving God provided this life to be a blessing on this Earth. It is something that we should consider very seriously, the impact of what has happened in God's plan for this Earth by what we have taken away from the life that he has given.

So I share this time with you and I am grateful for your leadership. As I join with you next week, this will be a moment to continue to ask God to help preserve these lives.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thank you, Mr. PITTENGER.

May I inquire of the Chair how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has about 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK).

Mr. BENISHEK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the rights of the unborn and to urge my colleagues to do everything within their legal power to help protect the most innocent and defenseless citizens of our great Nation.

I served as a doctor for nearly 30 years in northern Michigan, and I know that life begins at conception and that protection for that life must start at conception. As a father and grandfather, I have been blessed to experience this miracle on my own family.

I think everyone believes the government should protect children—we ensure their health, their safety, their well-being. I, along with many in northern Michigan, believe that life inside the womb is just as precious as life outside the womb and that it must be protected.

Because of this belief that the lives of the unborn deserve protection, I have worked hard to prevent taxpayer funding of abortion. I joined with a majority of my Republican colleagues in the House of Representatives supporting H.R. 7, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act. Your hard-earned tax dollars should not pay for abortions, especially when such highly controversial practices are opposed by most taxpayers.

January 22, next Wednesday, marks the 41st anniversary of the *ROE* v. *WADE* Supreme Court decision. After 41 years of passionate engagement, I would like to commend the grassroots efforts of our local communities. Thank you for the hard work that you do to educate our communities about this important debate.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thank you very much, Dr. BENISHEK.

Just to close, Mr. Speaker, 41 years ago next week—January 22—marks the U.S. Supreme Court's infamous, reckless, and inhumane abandonment of women and babies to abortionists. Forty-one years of victims—dead babies, wounded women, shattered families. Forty-one years of government-sanctioned violence against women and children.

Since 1973, more than 56 million children have been killed by abortion—a staggering loss of children's precious lives—a death toll that equates to the entire population of England.

The passage of time hasn't changed the fact that abortion is a serious, lethal violation of fundamental human rights, and that women and children deserve better, and that the demands of justice, generosity, and compassion require that the right to life be guaranteed to everyone.

Rather than dull our consciences to the unmitigated violence of abortion, the passage of time has only enabled us to see and, frankly, better understand the innate cruelty of abortion and its horrific legacy—victims—while making us more determined than ever to protect the weakest and the most vulnerable.

All life is sacred, Mr. Speaker. No one, regardless of sex, race, religion, disability, or condition of dependency, is a ''throwaway.'' All of us, especially lawmakers and policymakers everywhere in this town and throughout the country, have a profound moral duty to protect the innocent and the inconvenient.

I yield back the balance of my time.

PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS: OPPOSITION TO THE TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to be here on behalf of the Progressive Caucus and lead this Special Order hour.

Last week, we were here as a Progressive Caucus with a number of our members talking about the need to extend unemployment benefits for the 1.3 million Americans that lost them at the end of December. We filled the entire hour with people talking about the need to extend the benefits and real personal stories of people who have been affected by us in this House not extending those benefits.

It looked for a while last week like the Senate might do the right thing in a bipartisan way and extend those benefits. Unfortunately, this week, we saw the Republicans in the Senate refuse to go along and extend benefits to needy Americans, people who are without work, simply trying to pay their rent, pay for their groceries, and pay for things like gas so they can go and get a job. It has been a very unfortunate week.

Yet in this House, we have tried time after time this week to get a vote so that we could get unemployment benefits extended for those 1.3 million Americans and the 72,000 Americans each and every week who are going to lose those benefits. Unfortunately, we have had no success. The leadership in this House has not allowed us to have that vote.

So we are here again today to talk about not only the need to extend unemployment benefits but also to talk about a fast track deal that is going through this House, a fast track deal on trade that many of us see as a fast track to losing even more jobs and having an even more detrimental effect on the very same people we are talking about right now who are becoming more and more long-term unemployed.

I am joined by a number of my colleagues today. I would like to right off the bat yield to a colleague of mine who has served in the California Legislature and now proudly serves the Long Beach area here in Congress, my good friend and colleague from California, Representative ALAN LOWENTHAL.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise too in support of the 1.3 million Americans who have lost or will be losing their benefits by the callous efforts of this Congress not to extend unemployment benefits, especially for the long-term unemployed.

As you pointed out, Congressman POCAN, as of December 28, over 1.3 million Americans have been kicked off

unemployment insurance. We are talking about—and I am going to speak in a few minutes about the personal impacts of this—we are talking about family members, we are talking about friends, we are talking about people in each and every community of every Member, regardless of political affiliation in this Congress.

□ 1745

In my own community in the State of California, if we continue this callous effort not to extend unemployment benefits, we are looking at over 325,000 Californians losing their benefits in the next 6 months. Let's talk about jobs. People say that people should be working. If we do not extend unemployment insurance in my State, we are talking about the impact of the loss of over 240,000 jobs. This is a tragedy for our country.

We are just coming out of the holiday season. It is really interesting, in the holiday season, at Christmastime, that there was a lack of compassion by the majority party in the House, which did not put up a bill to extend unemployment insurance. Congressman POCAN and I have looked at this.

Coming up, the President of the United States is going to be talking about the state of the Union. There is nothing more important in the Union than having people be able to buy their food, to be able to feed their children, to be able to hold their heads up with dignity. So, last year, the House Democrats invited as their one guest people who were victims of gun violence.

This year, Congressman, I applaud you for taking the lead, and I am so pleased to have joined you in a letter to ask Republicans and Democrats to use their one additional seat in order to bring them to Congress to let the President and the rest of the Nation hear about the stories and then put faces to those people who have lost their unemployment insurance, to see that these are people like our neighbors. That is who we are talking about. I urge all Members of Congress to bring a person who doesn't normally have a chance to impact our government, a person who has lost his unemployment insurance.

I want to talk a little bit about some of the people in my community—letters, people I have met, people I have gone and talked to. I will just give two examples:

I have a constituent who recently spoke to me about being 76 years of age and widowed. Her daughter is 52 and is a civil engineer, who has worked for many years at good jobs in the construction industry, building water treatment plants around the State of California. She was laid off 3 years ago and has not been able to find work since, even for jobs that pay much less; and she would be willing to take jobs that pay up to less than a third of her previous salary. After her unemployment checks ran out, she moved in with her mother, who wrote to me and spoke to me.

She says:

> Luckily, when she and I were both employed, we bought this small house, and we worked diligently to pay it off. She—her daughter—has pretty much given up hope for another job, and I am somewhat crippled now. Between my Social Security and my savings, we survive. My point is that I am writing to you not to help us.

She did not ask for any help. She said they are doing okay, but she knows that so many people in her community are not doing well, who are going through the same thing that she and her daughter have gone through, but they now don't have insurance to do that. She asked me—she pleaded with me—to extend the benefits and to extend their unemployment checks;

Another constituent wrote to me recently and said:

> I am 58 years of age. I am a telecommunication analyst. I was laid off in January of 2013. I have worked for over 30 years in this field. Now I need the government to help me through this rough time, and you and your peers are letting me down. I am running out of savings. I am soon to be homeless by the end of March if you don't do something. I am at a point that I would take any job available, but all I hear is either I am overqualified or I don't fit well into the job.

I think we have to really hear this. This person pleaded:

> I am not a lazy person. I am out there, trying every single day to find a job. I would give up one of my fingers for a job just to take care of my family. Please keep fighting to help us out.

Both of these stories tell us how we have a responsibility to help the women and the men and the families in our communities who are the foundations of our society and who are raising the next generation, who really are saying, I have worked hard. Please, at this tough time, don't abandon me. If we cannot provide adequate support for our families to make it through difficult times, they are asking us, if you are not here to help us, why are you in Congress?

When we extend unemployment insurance, UI, the U.S. economy goes up, poverty goes down, and working families are protected. Now is not the time to turn our backs on the most vulnerable in our society.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you, Representative LOWENTHAL, not only for helping share those stories but for putting personal faces on the people who are affected when we don't extend these benefits and do our jobs.

I am glad to be joining you and others who will bring someone to the state of the Union, someone who will be that personal face here in Washington, D.C., in order to tell his story. When the President talks about things like income inequality and the need to pass a minimum wage increase and the need to extend unemployment benefits, I will be glad to have someone from Wisconsin as you will have someone from California, and, hopefully, we will have a lot of other people who can share their stories. So thank you so much for that.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Thank you for that leadership.

Mr. POCAN. I now would like to yield to a colleague of mine who has done an outstanding job in representing people across not just her State of California but this country. She is the chair of our Democratic whip's Task Force on Poverty and Opportunity and has done a tremendous job in speaking out about what we need to do to make sure that those who are living in poverty have equal access to opportunity like every American should.

It is my honor to yield some time to Representative BARBARA LEE from California.

Ms. LEE of California. Let me thank the gentleman for yielding and for his kind remarks.

Let me thank you for your tremendous leadership on so many issues which address and affect the American people across the board. I also thank you for being here every week during these Special Orders. It is really raising the level of awareness on the critical issues of our day. It takes a lot to do this, but thank you for giving us a voice and an opportunity to be with you.

I join you and our colleagues tonight in the Congressional Progressive Caucus, really, in strong opposition to the Trans-Pacific Partnership. We are talking about trying to ensure that people do not fall into the ranks of the poor but also that people have pathways out of poverty and into prosperity.

Now here we are, looking at another bill, H.R. 3080, which is called the Bipartisan Trade Priorities Act of 2014, which would provide the administration with Fast Track authority for the TPP. Once again, this is not a progressive trade policy. It will not allow for people to be employed and get good-paying jobs but, rather, just the opposite. So, unfortunately, looking at this really worries many of us that we will fall backwards in terms of more people becoming unemployed.

Let me just be clear up front, though, in that I do not oppose all trade agreements. I support fair and free trade. However, the notion that Congress should provide a rubber stamp for a complex free trade agreement is simply irresponsible and dangerous to our economy and to our constituents. They elected us to provide a voice in all of these policies, so to shut the Congress out of having that seat at the table, to me, is downright undemocratic.

The TPP will have a devastating effect on the working class families and communities of color that I represent and that many of us represent. It would sacrifice the well-being of working Americans for the wealth of multinational corporations, not to mention that, in its current form, the TPP would lock in higher prices for popular drugs, threatening access to life-saving medicines, including HIV/AIDS drugs, for millions of poor and low-income individuals and families around the world.

By exporting American jobs to countries where the minimum wage is just 28 cents an hour, CEOs will continue to get richer while working Americans will lose their only sources of income. We have seen this happen before. Past trade agreements have already cost us 3.4 million service sector jobs. Many of those jobs were in California. We simply cannot afford to lose more. NAFTA alone resulted in the net loss of 1 million U.S. jobs. It led to a trade deficit of $181 billion, and it devastated the manufacturing sector.

These agreements have allowed corporations to ship good American jobs overseas while wages, benefits and workplace protections and environmental protections are really declining and are denied. Rather than focusing on trade agreements that will hurt the middle class, we really should be focusing on job creation, eradicating poverty, income inequality, and improving economic mobility.

In 1980, CEOs were paid an average of 42 times the salary of a blue collar worker. In 2012, that number exploded to 354 times more than the average worker. This is unacceptable. It is really unconscionable that, rather than building pathways to prosperity, we are debating measures to make, yes, the 1 percent richer while holding working families down. So I stand in firm opposition to Fast Track authority and to any final deal that sacrifices American jobs and environmental protections in the name of international corporate profits. This must be defeated.

Finally, as many of us are talking about tonight, we have 1.4 million people who did not receive their unemployment compensation checks this week. The Republican Tea Party House has totally abandoned these people who are living on the edge. They want to work, so it is incumbent upon us to do the right thing on behalf of these people and immediately extend unemployment compensation.

First of all, it is the correct thing to do. It is the American thing to do. It is the moral thing to do, but it is also economically wise to do this. So we hope, during the district work period next week, that Republicans hear from their constituents because it is not only Democrats who have people who have lost their unemployment compensation but Republican constituents. All Americans who are seeking to work and who want to work and who need that bridge over troubled waters have lost their unemployment checks also.

I hope, for those who are people of faith, they really draw from their faith and understand that this is the moment, that now is the time to think about the least of these and to remember that we are our brothers' and that we are our sisters' keepers and that we need to pass unemployment compensation right away and then move forward and increase the minimum wage and, hopefully, one day, increase the minimum wage to really a living wage because that is what the American people deserve.

Thank you again for your leadership, and thank you for giving me the chance to be with you tonight.

Mr. POCAN. Absolutely, Representative LEE. Thank you so much, not only for talking about the Fast Track and the wage erosion that is going to come out of that for the American people, but for all of the words as we talk about Fast Track and the need to stop it because, if that goes forward, we are going to lose our voice, which means the people lose their voice in trade agreements that are going to have such widespread ramifications. So thank you so much.

I would now love to yield some time to my colleague, someone who has been an outstanding Member of this body on so many issues. This is my 1 year here; and every time there has been a major issue, there has been someone at the forefront of it, and so often it has been Representative ROSA DELAURO. She is leading our efforts to make sure that we expose what Fast Track is really about. I would love to yield some time to Representative ROSA DELAURO from the State of Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. I want to thank my colleague and just say that we really owe you a debt of gratitude. I know what it means as this is my 24th year that I have served in this body. Years ago, I would spend my days in 1-minute speeches and my evenings in Special Orders, and I know what it means and the kind of time and effort it takes. It is about your values and who you are, and a number of people that you attract come down and talk about these very critical issues, so we owe you a debt of gratitude for spearheading this effort.

Every generation of leaders in this institution has faced its own time of testing. Whether it is an economic panic, the Great Depression, slavery, Jim Crow, the Civil War, world war, the Cold War, there are times when our country is confronted with a crisis that poses an existential threat to our Nation and to our way of life, and Congress needs to stand up and act. The test of our time is inequality. It is not too much to say that inequality threatens the continued existence of the middle class in America and even the American Dream, itself.

The question before us now is: Are we going to continue to be the land of opportunity and social mobility and the Nation that forged the largest middle class in human history during the 20th century, or are we going to become a Nation of very few haves and millions of have-nots?

□ 1800

As Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis once said:

> We can either have democracy in this country or we can have great wealth concentrated in the hands of a few, but we can't have both.

The current trend lines on inequality should serve as a wake-up call to everyone in this institution. According to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office in 2011, while the top 1 percent of Americans have seen their income triple over the past 30 years and now make 23 percent of the total, middle and working class Americans have seen their wages stagnate and median income fall. The year after that report, 2012, shows the highest corporate profits, after taxes, and the lowest salaries and wages as a percentage of our gross domestic product in our history.

The inequality we see in America today is not a crisis because some are rich and many are not. It is a crisis because the compact has been broken that allowed hard work to pay off and allowed future generations to do better. As a result, the middle class in America is under siege.

It used to be that, through hard work and access to opportunity and education, a working class family could move up the ladder in America. They could buy a home, send their kids to college, have money to take an occasional vacation, and know that when they reached retirement, they would be okay. That is the story of my parents—and probably yours—who worked hard all their lives so I could go to college and follow my aspirations. That is the American Dream.

For far too many families, that dream is fading away. American workers are being squeezed. Their paychecks have stagnated. Their benefits have been cut. Their homes are debt traps. Their job security has been weakened. Their wage and hour protections have been violated. And the safety net under them to help them on their feet in case they slip is being willfully shredded by some Members of this body.

So yes, inequality is the crisis of our time. History will judge this Congress terribly if we do not do everything in our power to restore the middle class in America—to create good, well-paying jobs at home; ensure steady, rising wages; and promote opportunity and upward social mobility.

There are many things that Congress can and should do to remedy this crisis. We can stop trying to savage the safety net by cutting unemployment insurance and food stamps.

My colleagues have talked about 1.3 million people without unemployment benefits. And the temerity of leaving this institution, going home for the holidays, having a wonderful time with your families—and no one denies that you should have time with your family, but to leave these people on the roadside by themselves with nothing to be able to take care of themselves or their families, that is not the United States of America. That is not the Congress. That is not who we are or what we are about.

We can pass a budget in this place that invests in our future, in our fundamental priorities—education and job training—but in this Nation of bounty, we can't talk about cutting food

stamps, $8 billion, $9 billion, $20 billion, $40 billion. It is wrong.

We can support initiatives that create jobs and grow the economy, like infrastructure, manufacturing, and biomedical research. We can pass a comprehensive economic agenda for women and families that reflects the way that Americans live today. And we can recognize, as Lyndon Johnson did 50 years ago with the war on poverty, that the Federal Government plays a hugely important role in alleviating hardship and inequality, and we should do everything that we can to support these efforts.

And given the deep hole we are in, one of the most important things we can do is stop digging. Namely, we can think twice, again, about extending unemployment benefits. But further, we think twice before signing off on another free trade pact—the Trans-Pacific Partnership—that threatens to aggressively accelerate the inequality and job insecurity that Americans are already experiencing. We have seen this movie. We know how it ends.

This year marks the 20th anniversary of the North American Free Trade Agreement, or NAFTA, and we know how that affected our economy and hurt our workers. So many of us were here during that debate. We cried the night of that vote because of what we knew it was going to mean to workers in the United States.

One recent study estimated that as much as 39 percent of the observed growth in U.S. wage inequality since NAFTA is attributable to trade trends. Since NAFTA went into effect two decades ago, the share of national income collected by the top 10 percent of Americans has risen by 24 percent. The top 1 percent's share has increased by 58 percent. Meanwhile, the manufacturing jobs that helped forge America's middle class have been aggressively offshored. Millions of manufacturing jobs have disappeared in our country. They have been replaced by low-wage service sector work.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, two out of every three displaced manufacturing workers who were rehired in 2012 experienced a wage reduction, most of them more than 20 percent. Despite the trend, we are now being urged to pass fast track legislation introduced by Senator BAUCUS and Representative CAMP to grease the wheels of the Trans-Pacific Partnership. This agreement with 11 nations in the Pacific is unprecedented in scope and threatens to be NAFTA on steroids.

Even the agreement is being negotiated in secret. Members of Congress have been left out of the loop, even though the agreement will create binding policies on the future Congresses in countless areas. We have the evidence that suggests that this agreement will only accelerate economic inequality and job insecurity for American workers.

We are being told that we need to rubber-stamp it, that it is vital. Nine out of 11 nations in this agreement have wage levels significantly lower than ours. If there is pressure in any direction on already stagnant wages, it will be down.

And I wind up with this. Harold Meyerson wrote in a very poignant column in today's Washington Post:

> When the case for free trade is coupled with the case for raising U.S. workers' incomes, it enters a zone where real numbers, and real Americans' lives, matter.
>
> In that zone, the argument for the kind of free trade deal embodied by NAFTA, permanent normal trade relations with China and the Trans-Pacific Partnership completely blows up. Such deals increase the incomes of Americans investing abroad even as they diminish the income of Americans working at home. They worsen the very inequality against which the President rightly campaigns.

NAFTA has had a deep and lasting impact on our community. It has depressed wages. It has led to offshore jobs. It has meant more economic insecurity and less mobility for American workers. It has fed a rising tide of inequality that threatens to engulf the middle class in America for good.

We cannot continue down this path that pushes the American Dream into oblivion. And I want to say to my colleagues and others—and I apologize for taking so much time—that we need to understand it is not one program here, one program there. This is a pattern that is overwhelming middle class America. Unless this institution has done what it has done in the past to change that direction, we will have a Nation that no longer has the economic advantages that it has had in the past, and people will no longer enjoy economic security, nor will their families.

I thank the gentleman for doing what he does and for inspiring us to come down and talk with you.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you so much, Representative DELAURO, for your absolutely tireless advocacy on behalf of the middle class and people aspiring to be in the middle class. Thank you so much for being here tonight.

I now yield to another colleague of mine who is tireless in her efforts. She is the seniormost woman in the House and the longest-serving woman in the Ohio delegation in history. To me, the most important thing is she is a graduate of the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Coming from Wisconsin, you can't go wrong with that. It is a real honor to have Representative MARCY KAPTUR joining us tonight.

Ms. KAPTUR. Thank you.

Congressman MARK POCAN, you are such a breath of fresh intelligence and fresh energy in this Congress of the United States. I am so proud of the people of the Badger State for sending you here and for the hard fight that you have exhibited from day one of your swearing in for the improvement in our economy, for the creation of jobs in this country, for the reemployment of all of those who, coast-to-coast, are looking for work but can't find it. Thank you very much for your service to our country and for bringing us together here tonight.

I would like to say that trade policy is the major reason that America can't employ all of the people seeking work. Our trade policies are the major reason that we can't balance our budget.

If we take a look at the additional pressure on outsourcing more U.S. jobs that is going to come because of the recent introduction of the TPP, the Trans-Pacific Partnership—or fast track, as it is called—it is employing the same old failed trade model. And that model is, when you have more imports coming in here than exports going out, you are in the negative. And when you are in the negative on trade policy, you lose jobs. In fact, we are losing jobs by the container load.

On average, every day, because of fast track agreements that have already been passed, we are losing about 15 American manufacturing establishments that are closing every day. You can go into any town in Madison, Wisconsin, and Cleveland, Ohio, and Parma and Toledo, Ohio, and see shuttered companies.

And what is amazing is, if you go to Newton, Iowa, and go see where Maytag used to be located and then go down to Monterrey, Mexico, you will see Maytag operating down there. But all the workers in Newton lost their jobs. That was a great product. And we can look in industry after industry and see the same thing.

I have got Bridget helping me hold this chart up—I am going to refer to this in a second—and I want to thank her very much. She is a Member of Congressman POCAN's staff.

The fast track model was established in the 1970s, before any of us ever got here, as a way for the executive branch to exclude Congress from trade negotiations. How about that? It is just another overreach by the executive branch here inside this Congress and our ability to exert our legislative authority under the Constitution of this country.

Since that fast track process was adopted, this failed trade model of executive branch control over our country has racked up over $9 trillion in trade deficits.

People say, Why do we have a budget deficit? Well, a budget deficit is only a reflection of our economy not being able to produce enough income to pay the bills because we have lost so many jobs. This trade deficit has gotten worse every year since the mid-1970s and racked up $9 trillion—more imports coming in here than exports going out. Indeed, through this period, America has lost nearly—just in the manufacturing sector—7 million jobs, a third of the manufacturing jobs of this country, because of the fast track process.

What fast track means is, when the executive branch sends one of these trade deals up to Congress, they tie our hands. We can't amend it. The Rules

Committee shuts it down. They bring it to floor and we can't do anything about it because they have negotiated in secret and we can't know what it is.

What kind of crazy process is that for the people of the United States of America?

Fast track has changed America's way of life. This amount of trade deficit—$9 trillion—translates into lost jobs. It translates into poor-quality goods.

I tried to buy a coat over the holiday season. Go find quality material. Go find it. I would be real interested if you can. I was just interested in how sleazy the fabric has become and how poor the craftsmanship and craftswomanship. And I know the people making that, whatever country the label says, I know they are paid almost nothing for the work that they do. And we see our middle class shrinking.

And who is making the money off that transaction? Surely not the person making it in some other country, and surely not the person who is buying it here in our country.

Free trade agreements such as NAFTA, which was passed back in the mid-1970s—the China PNTR, which was then passed in the late 1990s; and then Korea, which was just passed a couple of years ago—were passed under the fast track procedure. We were promised these agreements would create jobs and help balance our trade deficits in an effort to strengthen our economy.

It is so interesting to go back and read what the proponents said. You would think if we hadn't passed those agreements, the entire Western world would collapse. Well, guess what? It is. Parts of it inside this country are collapsing.

□ 1815

Let me go through some of the promises that were broken. They said NAFTA, which was passed back in the early 1990s, was supposed to create 200,000 jobs in our country. Find them, because what actually happened was, we have lost nearly a million jobs.

If you look at this chart, the hole that just got deeper, in terms of trade deficit, related to our trade with Mexico and Canada. The United States ended up being the loser. One million Americans lost their jobs because of NAFTA.

If you go to these other countries, you can actually find the plants. I saw Trico Manufacturing, that used to make windshield wipers in Buffalo, down south of the border. The workers at that company couldn't afford to buy cars, much less the windshield wipers that have to go on them, and the quality of the Trico products deteriorated.

Interesting. It is a pattern that is repeated and repeated and repeated.

Now, they said that Korea, which was passed just a couple of years ago, was supposed to create 70,000 new American jobs under the Korean Free Trade Agreement.

Guess what?

America has already lost 40,000 jobs to Korea, and all those cars they were supposed to buy from us, 50,000 cars, for the millions they send in here? They are not buying them. They are not buying them. There is a huge additional trade deficit now being racked up with Korea because of that agreement.

So NAFTA had the exact opposite effect on our trade deficits than they were promised. Instead of helping to balance our trade deficit, NAFTA helped to dramatically increase it. The same was true with Korea.

NAFTA and China, those two countries, if we look at the Mexico-Canada trade agreement called NAFTA, we have accumulated $1.5 trillion of red ink; $1.5 trillion.

The same can be said for the Korea deal, and in the year after the Korean Fair Trade Agreement, America's trade deficit with Korea increased by $5.8 billion.

Every billion translates into lost jobs of between 4,500 American workers and 10,000, depending on whether it was the industrial sector or the retail sector.

Enough is enough. America doesn't need anymore so-called free trade fast track agreements because the model is wrong. It is destroying our middle class.

What this country needs is investment in key industry such as manufacturing, to create jobs and grow our economy.

I wanted to say a word about this big dip right here, which represents what happened after we signed the agreement with China. If you look at the amount of goods that are coming over our borders now, 99.5 percent of the shoes coming into this country come from there, come from countries that have no ability to stand where citizens like us can speak freely, and have added to the angst facing our middle class in this country.

We need investment in key industries, and we know that manufacturing, if there is investment there, at least 2.91 more jobs are created in other sectors, almost three jobs for every single job created in a manufacturing plant.

So Congressman POCAN, thank you for bringing us together tonight. We need a new trade model for America, a pro-American trade policy that begins to result in trade surpluses like we used to have after World War II up until the mid 1970s, when America had a strong and growing middle class.

This is the wrong trade model. We need a new trade model. Thank you so much for fighting for this and for the defeat of fast track on the TPP.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you, Representative KAPTUR, for all the work that you have done, and I know you are going to continue to do in the months ahead to make sure that we stand up for the middle class in this country. I really appreciate your efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield some time to another colleague of mine whose background really is as a manager. He was a mayor of Providence, Rhode Island. He is an expert when it comes to budgets and knows how to make sure that we properly finance government. He serves on the Budget Committee here in Congress.

I would love to yield some time to my colleague from the great State of Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentleman for yielding and thank you for organizing this Special Order hour and for the power of your voice on this very important issue and for the work that you have done in your early days here in Congress.

I thank your constituents for sending you here to fight, particularly to fight on behalf of the middle class and for the families who are really struggling in this still-recovering economy.

I want to just spend a few moments tonight to speak about the expired unemployment insurance issue and the unwillingness of our friends on the other side of the aisle to address this issue, and the notion that we are going to leave tomorrow and go back home for a week, take another recess, without addressing this urgent issue which is impacting my State, the State of Rhode Island, but impacting Americans all across this country.

What is so frustrating about the refusal to extend emergency unemployment benefits is that, first, it puts families in a very, very difficult position. These are folks who are looking for work, who are struggling to make ends meet as they navigate a difficult job market, who have relied on unemployment compensation, modest assistance to help put food on the table, to pay their bills, to keep a roof over their head, and have now seen their unemployment insurance cut off.

This is impacting 1.5 million Americans, so far, and it will impact about 72,000 additional Americans every single week. 72,000 Americans will lose their unemployment insurance, according to analysis by the Ways and Means Committee.

Tens of thousands of Americans living on the edge, relying on unemployment insurance to help get them through as they actively look for work, and they are being cut off.

It is not only painful for the families, an incredible hardship and really devastating; it is also bad public policy. It hurts our economy because, as you know, Congressman POCAN, folks who are receiving unemployment insurance take that money and they inject it back into the economy. They buy goods that they need to survive—food, groceries, pay expenses, but they inject that back into the economy.

In fact, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that our failure to extend unemployment insurance will cost the economy 200,000 jobs. The Economic Policy Institute predicts that the failure to extend unemployment benefits will cost 300,000 jobs.

So this is not only devastating to families and really imposing terrible

hardships, but it is also bad public policy. It is costing us jobs.

It was reported today that 2 million children in America were living in families who were relying on long-term unemployment benefits, Federal unemployment benefits, in 2012—2 million children. So this has a real impact.

In my home State, there are 4,900 Rhode Islanders who have lost their unemployment benefits, put out in the cold because Congress failed to act.

To just give you some examples, I had the opportunity to speak with constituents who either wrote to me or called me or I met with in person.

I just want to give you examples because we have heard a lot of conversation on the other side about who these folks are who are looking for work, and some of it has been unfair in describing who these individuals are. So I want my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to understand who we are talking about here.

One is a constituent of mine, Erica, from North Providence. She is a graphic designer. She has been looking for work, has been laid off and looking for work, and it has been very difficult for her to find work.

She wrote to me, and we met afterwards, and she said: 1 month of help can be the difference between someone getting a job and getting back on their feet or falling further into debt and hopelessness.

So she talked about how unemployment has helped her continue her job search, and whether or not it was going to be that and, hopefully, landing a job, or whether it was going to be falling further behind into greater debt and a greater sense of hopelessness.

I met with a constituent of mine, Rhonda, from Rumford, Rhode Island. She is 54 years old. She worked her whole life, sometimes two or three jobs at the same time, just to make ends meet and to take care of herself and her family. She has two children. She has lost her unemployment benefits and is worried about how she is going to take care of her family.

I spoke just the day before yesterday with Margaret, mother of four, suffering from Parkinson's Disease, who has worked her whole life. She said: I have never asked for help from anybody, but this is the time I need it—and she lost her unemployment.

So these are examples of individuals, and I know, Congressman, you have examples in your own district. All of our colleagues do.

We saw today repeated efforts—we tried everything, unanimous consent consideration, previous question, we tried every tactical move we could to force our friends on the other side of the aisle to bring an extension of unemployment benefits to the House floor for a vote, and they blocked us every single time.

They are not hurting the Democrats. They are hurting the American people.

I am very proud, on the Senate side, my senior Senator, Senator JACK REED, has led the fight in the Senate, relentlessly making the case of what this impact is for individuals, for families and for our economy.

It is difficult to understand how, seeing the hardship that this expiration of unemployment benefits causes to families, and what it will mean to people who literally are wondering, Am I going to get to stay in my apartment? Am I going to be able to pay my mortgage? Am I going to be able to put food on the table?

These are people who have exhausted their State benefits, and as a condition of these benefits, they have to continue to actively look for work. So this notion that they would rather get this modest check than have a job is absurd.

Every single person I have met with says, I want a job. I want the dignity that comes from having work and being able to support myself and my family.

For every job that exists, there are two or three people for that job, so we have got to do more to create jobs.

When I hear my friends on the other side of the aisle say we need jobs bills, we have jobs bills. Bring them to the floor for a vote.

Invest in science and research. Invest in rebuilding our country. Invest in the Make It In America agenda to help support the rebirth of American manufacturing.

There are jobs that we can bring to the floor. We ought to do that. At the same time, we ought to protect people who are particularly hard hit.

This is part of the American tradition. You know, on the one hand, we have this self-determination and this strong American individualism. We also have a collective sense of taking care of each other and looking after each other. That is what the extension of unemployment benefits means.

I thank you for continuing to raise this issue, for giving us an opportunity to make the case to the American people and, hopefully, to our colleagues on the other side of the aisle who will hear from their constituents and will really demand that, before we leave tomorrow, that we take action to extend unemployment benefits.

I thank the gentleman for yielding some time, and again, thank you for you leadership.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you, Representative CICILLINE. You talked about the 72,000 people every single week. If you think about it, as we tried to talk to our colleagues on the other side of the aisle trying to get this vote this week, when you think, in Speaker BOEHNER's district, the largest two communities in his district, Hamilton, Ohio, and Springfield, Ohio, 60,000 and 62,000 people, that is like that entire town losing their unemployment benefits in a single week.

In my State, that is like Lambeau Field, almost the entire Lambeau Field, every week losing unemployment benefits. That is why we need to act. Thank you so much for your efforts in that behalf.

It is now my pleasure to yield some time to my colleague from the great State of Minnesota. Although those of us from Wisconsin aren't always Gopher fans, we certainly appreciate our neighboring State.

Representative RICK NOLAN has not only been an outstanding Representative in this Congress, but he also was elected, I believe, first in 1974, and served three terms when he was first here representing the State of Minnesota. He came back to serve the public again because he wanted to make sure that he fought for the middle class and the State of Minnesota.

It is my honor to yield some time to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

Mr. NOLAN. Thank you, Mr. POCAN. I want to commend you for the tremendous service that you have been providing, bringing to the attention the important issues that relate to the working men and women in this country.

In particular, I want to address the failure to renew emergency unemployment benefits. Clearly, it is unconscionable. It is unforgivable.

As you and our other colleagues have pointed out, it is bad economics, and the characterization of these people as somehow being scofflaws that don't want to work is the cruelest and most unfair part of all of this.

We need to remind ourselves that, in order to be eligible for unemployment compensation, you have to have been a worker. You have to have gone to work every day, and you could not have left your job voluntarily. You could not have been removed from your job for fault.

You were a good worker who, by virtue of facts that you had no control over, lost your job, but you were someone who was willing to go to work every day.

In the 32 years in my little hiatus between when I served and when I came back, I engaged all that in business, and I employed anywhere from 25 to 50 people at all times.

We paid unemployment insurance because we know, in business, the cycles that flow, and from time to time, layoffs are necessary, and I was always happy to pay that unemployment insurance, knowing that these good people who showed up for work for me every day had some protection in the event of circumstances that were beyond my control and their control.

To deny these benefits is so unconscionable. It is such bad public policy. It is so unforgivable.

We are leaving 4.9 million people out there, and I remind everyone again, workers, that they are going to lose the benefits that they earned, that they insured themselves against, together with their fellow workers and employers.

□ 1830

Here they are. Maybe they are going to lose their home because maybe they

can't make their mortgage payments. They may be thrown into a diabetic coma because they can't buy their medicine, have to watch their children go hungry because they can't afford to buy food. That is not us. That is not America. We know better than that.

So I implore my fellow colleagues and our Speaker to bring this unemployment benefit extension before the House so that we can have a vote on it. Because I have no doubt that with the heart and the goodwill that is in this House, we will extend them. We will extend those benefits because we know for a fact that the simple truth is, there is only one job for every three people that are out there, and until we put together the pro-growth, pro-jobs economy that we need to put everybody back to work, we need to provide those who are in need and who have earned the benefits and are workers in our society the benefits so that they can take care of their families and their needs. If the Speaker will allow this to come up for a vote, I predict there is enough goodwill here among both Democrats and Republicans that we will pass this.

So, Mr. POCAN, thank you for bringing this to the attention of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I hope you are watching. Let us have a vote on this. We will pass it. We will do the right thing.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you so much, Representative NOLAN. Again, you have been a tireless effort for the entire country but especially for the people of northern Minnesota. They should be very proud of you for what you are doing.

Mr. Speaker, would the Chair tell me much how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. POCAN. I thank the Chair.

I would like to try to split that time a little bit, a little bit on the unemployment extension, as we have been just talking about with the last several speakers, and a little bit about the fast track bill as well because both of those go hand-in-hand in what is going to happen to the American economy.

I just want to share a few stories, some from my district and some from across the country, again, of real people. I am not talking about the numbers, the 72,000 people a week, but just real people and their stories about what this means when we don't extend those benefits.

I am going to bring someone to the State of the Union speech from my district to talk about this personally, but let me share some stories that I have received. One is a woman from Baraboo, Wisconsin. She is a surgical nurse, and she lost her job more than 6 months ago. Since that time, she has done everything she can to look for work and apply for jobs, and unfortunately, up to this point, she hasn't been successful. Now, due to this Congress' inaction, Mr. Speaker, she has lost her unemployment benefits. Without this insurance, she is unable to afford her rent, and she is in danger of being kicked out of her house in just 2 weeks, meaning that she may have to move into a homeless shelter. She doesn't know where else to go or what else to do. That is a real person from south central Wisconsin who is affected by this Congress not acting and extending those benefits.

Let me read another letter that we got from a woman from Mount Horeb, Wisconsin. She says:

> My husband has been out of work since mid-June. He is a union steamfitter who makes a decent wage when working. There is not enough work right now. He applies for non-union jobs every day and most times doesn't even get a call back. He has now lost his unemployment benefits. We are a middle class family. I work for a community bank but can't support our family on just my wage. We are now having to apply for free and reduced lunches for our two high school students. We are applying for FoodShare.
>
> This is going to start creating a real crisis for the programs designed to help those in need. They will not be able to keep up. It's not that people don't want to work. It's that there aren't enough jobs. We will soon lose our house, as we are not able to make our payments. Grown people should be able to work together toward a common goal. My husband and I have worked hard all our lives to make ends meet. Now, when we need help, there is none.

Those are just two of the many letters I have gotten from my district, from people who are directly impacted by this Congress not acting on extending unemployment benefits, as we have so many times in the past. Under President Bush, five times we extended benefits without strings attached when the unemployment rate was even lower than it is now. We have acted so many times in this Nation's history to extend those benefits to the people who need it most, and right now, instead, we are going to somehow play politics and not be able to get that vote.

I agree with Representative NOLAN that if we had that vote, it would pass. There are enough good people in this body, Democrat and Republican, who will pass it, but it has to come to the floor for a vote. It can't continue to be blocked by the Republicans.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the need for an unemployment extension, there is an issue that really works hand-in-hand, and that is the issue that we can see in this body in the coming months.

Just introduced last week is a fast track bill to fast-track a trade agreement right now, the Trans-Pacific Partnership, that is being finalized and negotiated by this country and other countries around the Pacific Rim.

This is something that we have seen such failure from in past efforts, like NAFTA and the Korea agreement and others, that we would hate to see this happen. At a time this country is still bleeding jobs, we need to do something to help people get back to work, and while we have slowly seen the economy improve, we have also noticed that there are people being left behind. There is a dual track going on, and that is why we need to help every single person.

There are a couple of charts I want to show people, and I want to thank the Communication Workers of America, the union that, like other unions in this country, do so much on behalf of the middle class, fighting for their workers, making sure they have a say in their workplace. It is one of the reasons why I have had a union specialty printing business for 26 years. Unions do so much for the middle class. We need to do everything we can to support the average family working in America.

These are some charts that they put together, statistics from the Bureau of Labor Statistics. This shows where wages were along a continuum. If you look at the red, that is where the real average weekly earnings are. Right now, it is at about $637. Back in 1971, it was $731. It was more in 1971 than it is right now where we are at.

If we had wages tied to the same percent that we have had to productivity in this country, the wage would be at $1,183 a week, in the yellow zone. That is what we are not getting. We are still producing that in output in this country, but it hasn't gone to the average worker. Unfortunately, what we have seen in this country is something just the opposite, which is the money going to just the top in businesses and not to the average worker.

In 1980, the average CEO made 42 times what the average blue collar worker made, 42 times. Around the world, in countries like Japan and Germany, it has always been around in that 25 to 40 range. That is where a successful economy is at.

In 2012, CEO pay had grown to 354 times what the median pay is in this country, 354 times. It is this gap where workers haven't gotten that money. Instead, it has gone to that top 1 percent. So we have wage inequality. We have wage erosion happening.

Finally, let me show you something that ties directly to what we are talking about on fast track. When you look at net exports as a percentage of the gross domestic product, you will notice we have had a surplus for many years, from about 1950 to about 1974, and what happened in 1974 was this country's first use of fast track, and that is when we noticed our first dip, going into a net importing country rather than an exporting country.

Then when you look at this, the graph how it goes, there is another big dip right here. What happened around the mid-nineties? Well, in the mid-nineties, we passed NAFTA. We passed the WTO, and sure enough, we watched our exports dwindle even more.

Then in 2012, when we passed the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement, we were promised 70,000 new jobs in this country. Instead, we lost 40,000 American jobs after we passed that. So what members of the Progressive Caucus and

what Members of this Congress are trying to get across—Democrats and Republicans—is that when we do a fast track authority, as explained by Representative DELAURO and others today, we are essentially giving up our congressional oversight to the President, who has negotiated this.

We haven't even had a chance to really see the documents yet. They are not even finalized, and they want us to give a rubberstamp authority that takes away our ability to have debate, to be able to amend these agreements.

If this agreement looks anything like we think it is going to, like NAFTA and other agreements we have had in the past, you are going to see this graph go farther and farther down, and we will be a net importer, not a net exporter, and it will cost more American jobs.

So, Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Caucus today was here for this Special Order hour to talk about two issues. One, the real need to extend Emergency Unemployment Compensation benefits to people who need it so much in this country, the 1.3 million people and 17,000 more each and every single day, every week that we don't act, but also to talk about the fast track legislation that is coming down the pike because I think the average American isn't aware of what is happening.

We need to talk about this more because when this vote happens in this House, we could be rubber-stamping an agreement that will continue to not only cost us jobs but will continue to have other impacts on everything from food safety to the financial industry and other things across the board.

So I am honored to have been joined by so many colleagues from the Progressive Caucus tonight. We are going to continue to fight for the middle class and those aspiring to be in the middle class.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank you for these minutes that we have had tonight to talk about these issues with the American people, and I yield back the balance of my time.

A SUNSET MEMORIAL IN MEMORY OF THE VICTIMS OF ROE V. WADE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAINES). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) for 30 minutes.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, in the coming days, we will have the anniversary of *ROE* v. *WADE* upon us. It will be the 41st anniversary of abortion on demand in this country. Now, Mr. Speaker, just to be clear, *ROE* v. *WADE* was a Supreme Court decision that was handed down that no one voted on except the Supreme Court, themselves. This was not something that went through the Congress. This was not something that the people supported. In fact, every State in the Union at that time protected innocent unborn children. When *ROE* v. *WADE* and *DOE* v. *BOLTON* were handed down January 22, 1973, America was plunged into the crimson tragedy of abortion on demand, and since then, 56 million little unborn Americans have lost their lives.

In fact, it was this year, Mr. Speaker, that the world learned of the gruesome acts committed by Dr. Kermit Gosnell, an abortionist in Philadelphia currently serving a life prison term for murdering three babies that survived his attempts to abort them. When these babies survived Gosnell's attempts to kill them before they were born, he would sever their spinal cords with a pair of scissors. Testimony from former Gosnell employees described the babies screaming in pain as their lives were taken moments after they were born.

Mr. Speaker, born or unborn, we now know that these babies feel pain. It is an incontrovertible scientific fact that an unborn child can feel pain by at least the start of the sixth month after fertilization, and, Mr. Speaker, very credible research shows that they feel pain much sooner than that.

The graphic accounts from Gosnell's trial remind us that abortion is a brutal, torturous tragedy, yet such gruesome acts happen daily in abortion clinics all across this country. Perhaps the most astonishing thing about learning about the torture chamber that Kermit Gosnell presided over was the tragic reality that it happens all over America, even as we speak.

Now, I know, Mr. Speaker, that historically, great intensity has surrounded debates over protecting the lives of those who, through no fault of their own, find themselves obscured in the shadows of humanity, but it encourages me greatly that in nearly all of those cases, the collective conscience of this Nation eventually shifted. When we focused on the humanity of the victim and the inhumanity of what was being done to them, our hearts began to change. Mr. Speaker, that same thing is beginning to happen in America in this debate.

I don't know what happens when we finally wake up and see something for the tragic reality that it is. I don't know what changed our mind in all of the other great genocides of the past, but it did happen, and that gives me great hope, and today in America, we are finally considering the real question, and the real question is simply this: Does abortion take the life of a child? We are finally beginning, Mr. Speaker, we are finally beginning to realize, as a Nation, that it does.

□ 1845

We are finally beginning to realize that the brutal killing of innocent, unborn children liberates no one and that 50 million little lost American lives—56 million now—Mr. Speaker, is enough.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this legislative day has come to an end, and sunset approaches fast in Washington. I stand here one more night, and I offer this House what I call a sunset memorial to remember the victims of *ROE* v. *WADE*. Because you see, Mr. Speaker, before the sun sets today in America, almost 4,000 more defenseless, unborn children will have been killed by abortion on demand in the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Mr. Speaker, that is more than the number of innocent lives lost on September 11 in this country, and it happens every day. It has now been 41 years since the tragedy called *ROE* v. *WADE* was first handed down. Since then, Mr. Speaker, the very foundation of this Nation has been stained by the blood of almost 56 million of its own unborn children. Some of them, Mr. Speaker, many of them cried and screamed as they died. But because it was amniotic fluid going over the vocal cords instead of air, we couldn't hear them.

Now, all of them, Mr. Speaker, had four things in common: first and foremost, they were just little babies that had done nothing wrong to anyone. Each of them died a tragic and profoundly lonely death. Each one of their mothers, whether she realizes it or not, will never be the same. And each one of their mothers is a victim, and this society can't see that either sometimes. All of the gifts that these children might have brought to humanity are now lost forever, Mr. Speaker. No one knows which one of them might have found a cure for cancer. Or who knows, maybe they would have just loved flowers.

Yet even in the glare of such tragedy, this generation still clings to a blind, invincible ignorance while history repeats itself over and over again, and our own silent genocide mercilessly annihilates the most helpless of all victims—those yet born.

Now, ironically, I have heard President Barack Obama speak such poignant words that whether he knows it or not apply so profoundly to this tragedy of abortion on demand in America. And if I could, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote excerpted portions of his comments, because his words move me very deeply.

He said:

> This is our first task, caring for our children. It is our first job. If we don't get that right, we don't get anything right. That is how, as a society, we will be judged.

The President went on to say:

> And by that measure can we truly say as a Nation that we are meeting our obligations. Can we honestly say that we are doing enough to keep our children—all of them—

And I'm quoting, Mr. Speaker:

> —all of them safe from harm? Can we say that we are truly doing enough to give all the children of this country the chance they deserve to live out their lives in happiness and with purpose?
>
> I have been reflecting on this the last few days, and if we are honest with ourselves, the answer is no. We are not doing enough, and we will have to change.

Oh, how true the President's words are, Mr. Speaker.

The President also said: