

man and a woman, we are not going to help you, and we are going to let Boko Haram continue to terrorize you and rape your women.

You talk about a war against women.

When I asked these mothers of the girls that were kidnapped there, Did they initially attack your daughters' school because it was a girls' school? they said, No, no. They hate girls. They consider them nothing. But they attacked the school because it is Christian.

There is a report from Investor's Business Daily, March 13, that says Islamic State recruits could enter the United States via the Caribbean. Well, that is not really a news flash.

Another story, written by Thomas D. Williams, Ph.D., March 17: "ISIS Kidnaps 20 Doctors and Nurses in Libya."

A story from Charles Spiering, 17 March: "President Obama Blames Bush for Rise of ISIS."

Well, actually, if you want to talk about class, despite my disagreement with some of George W. Bush's policies and despite what some have said, he had enough class that after 9/11 he never pointed the finger at the Clinton administration. He knew that even though 9/11 was being plotted and planned during the Clinton administration and there was an opportunity in the Clinton administration to take out Osama bin Laden that was not seized upon, that there were so many things that might have been stopped along the way, he didn't blame President Clinton because he had enough class to know that it was an attack by terrorists, and they should be made to pay.

If you really want to point the finger, it would go clear back to the late seventies during the days I was in the United States Army and we had what was considered, under most everybody's version of international law, an act of war against the United States in Iran when our Embassy was attacked and our people were taken hostage. And we didn't help.

You go back before that, to the Carter administration turning its back upon the shah of Iran—not a great guy, not a good man, from what we understand, but he was able to keep radical Islam contained. But after the Carter administration turned its back on the shah and encouraged his overthrow, you had the coming from exile of Ayatollah Khomeini, and President Carter welcomed him as a man of peace. As a result, radical Islam, once again, raised its ugly head, as it does from time to time.

And it is only all-out war against radical Islam that puts it in a box—sometimes for 50 years, sometimes for 100 years. It depends on how staunch the fight is against them.

But President Bush did not blame President Carter. There were mistakes all along the way.

When the marine barracks in Beirut was hit, the Democrat-controlled Congress made clear that they were not going to fund any more U.S. peace-

keeping troops in Beirut. Reagan brought them home. He should have taken them out and done whatever it took, but he didn't.

Now this administration, in order to get any deal that is a terrible deal, is willing to turn its back on the fact that Iran and Hezbollah have terrorists in their lead, and they should not be recognized as anything but terrorists.

I yield back the balance of my time.

FAST-TRACKING THE TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) for 30 minutes.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, we are going to use these 30 minutes to speak to fast track and a process on trade agreements that are developed. I believe it is so important for the American public to understand exactly what fast track is all about.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TONKO. I also ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TONKO. Tonight we are here to discuss, as I indicated, Trade Promotion Authority, most commonly known as fast track. Free trade agreements that would be accompanied by a fast-track process are a way to bring about devastating outcomes, if not done correctly, to the American economy and, most importantly, to the American worker.

Of late, most notably, the free trade agreement of which there is much concern expressed is the Trans-Pacific Partnership, the TPP, which, by the way, would speak to a great number of nations which encompass about 40 percent of the international GDP. So it is no small compact here of which we speak.

Fast track, as a concept, would constrain Congress' ability to conduct oversight, restrain oversight that Congress should provide so as to be the voice of the people who elect them, to place their given concerns in the discussions here in the House.

It would delegate Congress' constitutional authority over trade policy in a way that would provide for no solid debate, no sharply restricting debate, and it would prohibit amendments. Basically, Congress would be limited to a simple up-or-down vote—thumbs up, thumbs down—on what could be a devastating outcome for the American economy and, most importantly, the American worker.

These so-called free trade agreements have far-reaching impacts on American life. They may address dynamics like

food safety or affordable medicine or financial regulations. So we cannot be reckless in our attempt, and we must make certain that we move forward deliberately to make certain that it is a good outcome for trade.

We are not against trade. Free trade, as it has been described in the past and agreed to in the past, has hurt the economy, but we want fair trade.

In exchange for fast-tracking bills, Congress is supposed to set these negotiating objectives. But let's face it: sadly, these objectives are nonbinding, so they could be rendered meaningless. And in the case of the TPP, which is nearly completed, setting them at this point is somewhat late in the process.

We know also that the TPP is going to model itself after NAFTA, the North American Free Trade Agreement that dealt with Canada and Mexico, and also the Korean agreement. And the bottom line is, those deals have not been good for the American middle class, for working families.

Certainly we would be giving up a golden opportunity to exercise our responsibilities here in Congress to make certain it is the best outcome for America.

Promises of new jobs here in the U.S. are one of those promises for which we take great concern.

Decreased trade deficits—it can be said that trade deficits have provided the greatest dent in the American economy. There are huge deficits that have staggered the efforts to grow American jobs and improve labor and environmental standards. These are promises that have failed: jobs to be produced, environmental standards and labor standards never really come to be. Even if they are written on paper with the enforcement requirements, they have not reached their potential. And certainly the job count is not what it should be.

As we lost manufacturing jobs, millions of manufacturing jobs, one in every four manufacturing jobs, it was a devastating outcome. Three of every five American workers who lost those manufacturing jobs ended up with pay cuts, and one of three of those in the three-out-of-five category ended up with more than 20 percent of a paycheck reduction.

This is not what we want in the order of progressive policies that will speak to a stronger economy. So I have grave concern for the fast-track process.

Those joining us tonight and those like the gentlewoman from New York, Representative SLAUGHTER, who will share her thoughts in writing, which will be incorporated in the annals of these proceedings, for this Special Order, these are Members who are very concerned.

And chief amongst them, the one who has led us in this effort to draw public awareness and political attention to this issue, is none other than Representative ROSA DELAURO, our colleague from Connecticut, who has done a solid job in bringing to everyone's

awareness, attention, that the fast-track process is the first step in a process that could be devastating, as we authorize this Trans-Pacific Partnership, with the potential for job loss that we can ill afford, with the potential for abuse of children in the labor force, and beckoning us to bring about a situation that finds Vietnamese workers, for instance, working for 50 to 55 cents, 56 cents, perhaps, an hour. It is dumbing down, it is weakening the workforce across the world as we lose these American jobs.

So Representative DELAURO, it is great to have you on the floor. It is great to have you join us in this Special Order. Please share with us your passion, your concern for what could happen here to the American worker.

Ms. DELAURO. Thank you so much. I want to thank my colleague from New York for leading this effort tonight and for being shoulder-to-shoulder with so many of us, both inside the House of Representatives and in the large, vast coalition that is outside of the House of Representatives that says “no” to fast track; we are not going to do this.

So I applaud you and all of your efforts, and for standing up here on the floor most nights and talking about this issue so that the American public knows what is going on here because it is our responsibility to let them know.

They are not following fast-track Trade Promotion Authority or the Trans-Pacific Partnership every single day the way we are. But it is our responsibility to know how, in fact, it is going to affect their lives.

I would also say to you that I know you and I know so many of our other colleagues, we are not opposed to trade. We are not. We are in favor of fair trade. That is what we are about.

I believe you are—and I am—a strong proponent of the Export-Import Bank. It helped American business to compete around the world for 70 years. That is the kind of trade policy that we need. Reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank for another 7 years before its charter expires in June.

What we must not do is to sign up to yet another bad free trade agreement, a deal that subjects American workers to competition that is neither free nor fair. And far too many of these trade agreements—particularly, as you pointed out, in the last 20 years—have done nothing but deepen our trade deficit, lower our wages, and send American jobs overseas.

An example: 3 years ago, we signed the U.S.-Korea free trade agreement with the bells and ruffles, the ruffle of drums and all of this effort that we are going to create jobs, increase wages. Yes, we are going to have more exports.

□ 1900

Well, you have got to know how to add and you have to know how to subtract. We have got exports, but look at the flow of imports which is hurting American workers.

Since this trade agreement 3 years ago, our trade deficit with South Korea has gone up 71 percent; and given the administration and the way they calculate the job loss, using their metrics, we are talking about 74,000 American jobs. The Trans-Pacific Partnership is built on that template of the U.S.-Korea free trade agreement, so it follows the same failed model, but it is on a much, much larger scale. It forces our manufacturing and technology base into unfair and unequal competition with other nations throughout the Asia Pacific region.

There are 11 countries. So as you pointed out, it pits good-paying American jobs against Vietnamese workers who make 56 cents an hour. It asks American exporters to compete against Japanese producers who are propped up by currency manipulation, an abuse that has cost our economy almost 6 million jobs in 2013 alone.

What happened? These countries—Japan, Singapore, and China—devalue their currency. Their goods become cheaper; ours are more expensive. It puts us at a serious disadvantage. As you know, my colleague, this trade agreement contains nothing that would disallow currency manipulation. We have been told by the administration that there will not be a currency chapter in this bill. So we are going to go down the road where these countries can continue to put our workers and our products at a disadvantage.

You have a predictable pattern here: cheap, foreign products flow in, American jobs flow out, and our wages are on a downward spiral. The ill effects don't stop there. Most of the TPP's 29 chapters are not about trade at all. They are about rolling back laws in a way that plays directly into the hands of Big Business.

The former director of the National Economic Council, Larry Summers, has highlighted corporate efforts to use the Trans-Pacific Partnership to “change health and safety regulations, extend and strengthen patent protections, and deregulate financial services.” We know that Larry Summers, former Secretary of the Treasury, National Economic Council, is no leftwing radical. That is the way they would like to portray those of us who oppose TPP. He is a thoughtful individual. That is the conclusion he comes to: it changes health and safety regulations, extends and strengthens patent protections, and deregulates financial services.

A Nobel-Prize winning economist, Joseph Stiglitz, points out:

The overall thrust of the intellectual property section of the TPP is for less competition and higher drug prices.

TPP can weaken our environmental protection. It opens the door to unsafe food. It could raise the cost of medicines. It can make it harder to defend against financial risks.

The truth is proponents of the TPP know that their economic case has failed, and lately we have heard them

try another tack. They tell us that TPP is going to help America counter the rise of Chinese power in the Asia Pacific region, and if we pass TPP, we will be able to set the rules. It is absurd. It really is absurd. Quite frankly, if you want to do something about China, do something about currency manipulation and what China has been doing as regular policy in buying up our reserves. Currency manipulation is their policy.

Rules that encourage offshoring, gut our manufacturing and our technology base, and compromise the health and safety of our consumers are not American rules, but rules that favor big corporations at the expense of everyone else.

You know as well as I do, Congressman TONKO, who is in the room and who is out of the room, who is in the negotiations and who is out of the negotiations. There is room at the table for a long list of multinational corporations: Walmart, Verizon, Halliburton, Dow, General Electric, Caterpillar, Hershey, Boeing, AdvaMed, Dupont, Intel, Lockheed Martin, and many others. But do you know who is not at the table? The American workers are not at the table who are going to be forced to pay the price in lost jobs and low wages. And there is no room for Members of Congress. We have been systematically frozen out of the process.

For months, I pressed to get a copy of the negotiating draft, and I was told it was classified, but now I have seen pieces of the text. When I got into the room with a small part of the text, I discovered that it was not classified at all, that they said it was classified, but it is classified as a confidential document. It is not secret. It doesn't have a top-secret classification. They just don't want us to see it. They have placed every single restriction on our ability to read this agreement front to back, to ask questions, to know who said what, what country said what, and what the U.S. position is about all of this.

They have been working at this for 4½ years, and now they have come because they know that fast track is in jeopardy. They know that this treaty is in jeopardy, and they say: Oh, we would like to have you read the text but it is classified, and you can't have any staff there except for someone who has a security clearance. They are holding us to a standard that the treaty does not impose.

Let's stop playing the games. Jobs are at stake. Workers have a right to know what is being done in their name. We Representatives in Congress are their representatives. We have that responsibility to ensure that TPP either protects jobs or does not happen at all.

Now, you talked about Trade Promotion Authority fast track. What is it? It is a rubber stamp. It says: Okay, trust us. You can't see the document. You can only see bits and pieces of it. It is classified, but give us fast track

where there is no public scrutiny of the document, limited congressional debate, and no ability to amend the document at all. Just vote for us, and we will take care of your interests.

President Reagan said trust, but verify. We are trying to verify. To give them that fast track authority, in my view, your view, this coalition's view, would be a big mistake. The potential consequences of the TPP are simply too great. We cannot surrender our constitutional authority, our ability to scrutinize this agreement and to amend it.

Working Americans are in trouble today. Their paychecks have been stagnant or in decline for over 30 years. They are struggling to put food on the table and to heat their homes, let alone take a vacation or send their kids to college. Bad trade deals have played a leading role in creating this situation, bad public policy, and these trade agreements have been bad public policy.

Good, stable manufacturing jobs used to be a bridge to the middle class until they were sent overseas to places where labor is cheap, only to be replaced with poorly paid service sector jobs. Workers who are laid off face an uphill battle to get rehired. If they find new jobs, three out of five are forced to work for lower wages. That is the reality of what happens when we sign these ill-considered free trade agreements.

Why would we volunteer America and American workers for yet more punishment? Why would we do that? If we want to help the middle class, if we are for middle class economics, why would we do this? Why would we make it easier for Big Business to send their jobs overseas?

The time has come. Enough is enough. No more low wages. No more lost jobs. No more bad trade deals. And that is where we are now. The Congress, the House of Representatives, has woken up. They are stirred up. They believe this is a bad deal. They haven't been allowed to investigate it, to read it, to read the bill as the public asked us to do with the Affordable Care Act those years ago, and then they want us to put our imprimatur on this effort. That is why there is so much consternation. That is why the Members of Congress, the Members of the House of Representatives, are saying no.

I believe we will defeat fast track because the American public doesn't want this treaty. The American public doesn't want to see their representatives unable to talk to them about it, and the Members of Congress are reasserting their responsibility and saying, unless we see it, unless we read it, unless we ask the questions, unless we know who the negotiating partners are, and unless we say yes, then our answer to the administration is no.

I thank you for organizing this.

Mr. TONKO. Well, Representative DELAURO, let me just state that the

people of Connecticut are so fortunate to have you bring your voice to this Chamber to speak so effectively and so nobly for the workers of this country. People of this country beyond Connecticut prosper from your advocacy and your passion. We respect that. All people who are tuned into this discussion, those who have heard about it in other dialogue, need to call their Representatives: Where are you on fast track?

Ms. DELAURO. Bingo.

Mr. TONKO. A great number of us Democrats in this House have come together saying we are for growing paychecks and we want to strengthen that paycheck. We have stood for increasing the minimum wage, but we talk about the median wage. Let's strengthen that. Let's make certain there is an opportunity to say: Here is how it could be better; here is what you are skipping. You are walking past the currency manipulation issue, which is one of the biggest concerns right now.

Ms. DELAURO. Amen.

Mr. TONKO. As you pointed out, trade deficits have put the biggest dent into the American economy, and if we continue this, those who don't learn from history are bound to repeat it. And what we have here is an opportunity to learn from history that there have been all these negative outcomes. We have flattened if not gone south with the middle class income all because we have sent out of our country's borders these sound manufacturing jobs.

You talked about all these impacts, and I know where your heart is on social and economic justice. What are we doing to people with the four TPP negotiating partners in Vietnam, Malaysia, Mexico, and Peru? We are using forced labor or child labor in violation of international standards as reported by the United States Department of Labor in their report of List of Goods Produced by Child Labor or Forced Labor. We have situations where there are not unions allowed in Vietnam, a communist country. If it is allowed, they can't speak outside of these given standards. If they do, they are persecuted or jailed.

Ms. DELAURO. Or killed.

Mr. TONKO. Or killed. We have got documentation of how many union activists have been murdered and how many of those issues have been resolved, how many of those reviews by the judicial process or whatever system in their country would prosecute. None of these—very few have been resolved.

So it is not just the economic consequences. It is the social injustice that we can allow with these contracts.

So I thank you. I know we have been joined by Ms. KAPTUR.

Ms. DELAURO. Let me make one more point. Ms. KAPTUR is here, and she has really been in the forefront of these debates and these issues for so many years, because the other side tries to portray us as, well, if you don't want this fast track authority, what

would you want? Over the years, and particularly over the last several months, the last year and a half, Democratic Members of the House of Representatives have written to the administration, to the USTR, that is the U.S. Trade Representative, and we have made suggestions of how we could increase congressional input into this process by looking at who the negotiating partners are, what the objectives are, the enforcement of those objectives, and how we have a chance to certify that the objectives have been met and say yes, and then we move forward, the administration moves forward.

We have been said no to over and over and over again. So, in fact, there has been no congressional input, though we have tried for a very, very long time to do that. The public needs to know that, because we just cannot have our head in the sand and just say no.

Mr. TONKO. Absolutely. You use that technical term, I have used it, "currency manipulation," over and over. Let's just throw an example out there. It is a \$6,000 edge for a competing automobile imported into this Nation against what is produced by our home-driven auto industry.

□ 1915

Well, that is going to upset the whole economy. It is going to impact consumers.

So currency manipulation is given a \$6,000 edge. It is like giving them a check saying: Put more conditions or more opportunities into the consumer's pocket to buy more features on a car.

Of course, \$6,000 is going to speak to their senses, so we need currency manipulation to provide for fair trade. As you indicated, we are all for trade but not this manipulation that has hurt the American working families.

We have Representative KAPTUR here, and I believe we have about 5 minutes remaining.

Representative KAPTUR, I yield to you to share your thoughts because this is so important an issue.

Again, I thank both of my colleagues for joining us here this evening and Representative SLAUGHTER for sending in written comment that can be incorporated. Thank you, Representative DELAURO.

Representative KAPTUR, please share with us your thoughts.

Ms. KAPTUR. Thank you very much, Congressman TONKO. Thank you for your leadership and bringing us to the floor. As Congresswoman DELAURO completes her remarks, I just want to thank her for leading all of us in this great quest to move toward trade agreements that create jobs in our country and trade balances rather than trade deficits.

I thought that if I could contribute anything to the conversation when this administration or any administration says, Well, what do you want, I can tell you what we don't want.

We don't want agreements like this. This was the agreement with Korea

where they said that the United States would be getting the ability to ship all these cars over to Korea.

What actually happened was the reverse. We get a trickle in there; they get a deluge in here. Our trade deficit with Korea has gone up 84 percent since the agreement was signed.

We say to the administration: Give us a trade agreement that gives America not just a trade balance, which would mean we wouldn't lose any jobs, but a trade surplus, not a trade deficit, which costs us 5,000 jobs for every billion dollars of trade deficit.

We want balanced agreements; we want agreements in surplus, not in deficit. Every American knows what I am talking about. They have experienced it in their own communities.

The other thing we want is we, as a Congress, want the ability, when an agreement deals with so many different aspects, to treat trade like a treaty, not an agreement that is sent up here and we are told, You can't amend it, you can't read it actually, everything is in secret, the administration is coming up here this week, and everything is in secret, but we don't get to see the whole agreement.

I guess we look through a keyhole, and we can see 10 words or something. That isn't the way this country should conduct business. My own feeling is: Until we fix what is wrong with past agreements like the Korea agreement, why should we sign any more?

I have many stories I am going to put in the RECORD tonight, Congressman TONKO, about people in Ohio who have lost their jobs due to these backward trade agreements that ship our jobs out, not our products.

I want to thank you for helping to be here tonight, long after hours—you don't have to be here, but you are—trying to say to the American people this is really important. We understand what the American people are saying to us; we are trying to fight for them here in Washington.

How fortunate are the people of New York who have sent you here and that you are nobly carrying their cause against very, very powerful forces on the face of the globe that really don't care what happens to the people of the United States. They have a much narrower agenda. They really don't care about liberty when it comes right down to it.

Thank you for holding to a higher standard and for trying to heal our country and to create jobs in America and opportunity in America and respect for liberty on the face of this Earth first because that is what America is supposed to be about.

I don't want to take up the remaining time. I want to make sure you have opportunity to conclude.

Mr. TONKO. You are fine, Representative KAPTUR. I thank you for contributing, as you always do in such meaningful measure.

I think you agree with me—I am certain you do—that Congress and the

American workers deserve a meaningful role in these debates to make sure that our trade policy reflects our values as a country, as a people; and those include middle class prosperity, workers' rights, consumer safety, and environmental sustainability.

When we have those rights guaranteed, when we have those ideals protected and advanced and enhanced, we are a great, great nation that comes out of trade negotiations even more powerful.

We are a great nation; we need to stay great. We can't give away all of these golden opportunities simply by trade agreements that are unfair that provide an unlevel playing field for the American worker.

It is about those values that we are meeting tonight, speaking tonight, advocating tonight, and encouraging that hope be brought to each and every worker and working family out there across this great Nation in a way that reflects a sound bit of dialogue on this House floor.

Ms. KAPTUR. This is one of the most important elements of America's economic policy, and we are at a critical moment to change what was wrong in the past.

We have an opportunity to fix these trade agreements and to reshape the way we handle trade with the world, beginning with those partners who share our value of liberty and then inviting in other nations of the world that want opportunity for their people and they want a chance for rising living standards, not to be turned into worse sweatshops with no environmental standards, with no worker standards, with no hope for a better way of life, just moving from one exploitative country to another exploitative country.

I compliment you for standing up for the highest values of this Republic. I know the American people are going to win this fight because they have suffered far too long the job devastation from coast to coast. For the sake of workers in other places in the world, we are standing up for their opportunities and their rights as well.

I am so privileged to join you this evening. Thank you for setting aside time for this Special Order tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to join my colleagues in showing why Members of Congress must have an opportunity to weigh in on provisions included in the free trade deals currently under negotiation.

SECURITY OF TRADE NEGOTIATIONS

Negotiations of the Trans Pacific Partnership and the Trans-Atlantic Trade and Investment Partnership have been notoriously secretive. Despite the calls from hundreds of Members of Congress to the US Trade Representative to protest the needless secrecy of TPP, we continue to be denied basic access to the deal. And those few who have been granted access have been restricted from sharing any part of the agreement with their constituents or expert staff

Tomorrow, the Administration will come to Capitol Hill to brief Members, but the con-

versation remains closed. Staffers without a security clearance are excluded and, again, disclosure of the terms of this deal to our constituents is prohibited under threat of federal prosecution. All this while foreign nations have the text of the provisions and know exactly what is included and what is excluded.

The American people are being left in the dark with these negotiations. They are the very same people who have suffered the most as a result of past free trade deals negotiated in the same way: in secret.

PERSONAL STORIES

Tonight, I want to share a few personal stories of people from my district, people whose lives were uprooted and thrown into turmoil as a result of past free trade deals. These deals lacked sufficient worker and labor protections and ushered in a wave of offshoring of American jobs.

MR. CHUCK HAMAIDE'S STORY

I'll begin with Mr. Chuck Hamaide, a resident of Vermilion, Ohio. In December 2000, at 50 years old, Mr. Hamaide was laid off from his job at a software company in Cleveland. He found another job at a Columbus company, which had recently outsourced a first wave of production to Mexico. Three years later, it outsourced the remainder of its domestic production to China.

Mr. Hamaide was lucky. He saw the writing on the wall and began the search for a new job before he was laid off. Many of his co-workers were not as lucky. Many who were late in their careers were laid off, losing their paychecks and their livelihoods. Many were in their fifties and faced the stigma of elder discrimination as they sought new employment.

Many did not find jobs to replace the ones that were shipped overseas, where labor is cheap and conditions are appalling. This is the legacy of free trade deals in America. And there are many more stories like it.

GLORIA'S PERSONAL STORY

Gloria, a bright 17 year old from Huron, Ohio, wrote to tell me her family's story, a story that is not unique. Gloria's father worked for General Motor, then Delphi, and Klykos Bearing International for 41 years. He clocked 12 hour shifts, seven days a week. Despite years of dedication, his pay was recently cut and the factory where he works is under threat of closure.

His company may be able to offer him a replacement job—but it will be at another factory, 100 miles away from his home and his family. Whether or not Gloria's father takes the job, he and his family will suffer.

Gloria shared with me her concern about her own future: she will soon go to college and fears she will not be able to find a job once she graduates. She worries that she will not be able to support herself and that she will have to live on welfare, despite ample motivation and capability on her part. This is the legacy of free trade deals in America.

MIDDLE AMERICA HURT THE HARDEST BY FREE TRADE

These fears are the repercussions emanating throughout Middle America. A new generation of younger Americans, many of whom witnessed their parents being downsized and outsourced, is now entering the workforce with little hope of stability and opportunity. The American dream is looks more and more like a pipe dream to them.

These free trade deals lead to outsourced jobs and fewer opportunities for young people

like Gloria who are about to enter the labor market. And they contribute to lower wages for hardworking people like Gloria's father, who dedicated their lives to their jobs and the industries in which they worked.

From the little we know from past trade deals and the shroud of secrecy being kept around the TPP and TTIP, we have to assume that these deals will be equally devastating for American workers like Chuck and future workers like Gloria.

The fact that these deals are so veiled in secrecy is unsettling, but the real economic danger comes in the form of trade promotion authority. This so-called "fast track" authority would compel Congress to vote on these massive trade deals within just a few weeks of being allowed to read them, without any opportunity to push for important changes including improvements to environmental and labor standards. I can imagine reasons why trade supporters would want to fast track a secret trade deal, but none of them involve the benevolent treatment of American workers or increasing the market value of their labor.

KORUS ANNIVERSARY

This week the Korea-U.S. Free Trade Agreement passed its third year in effect. I would like to remind everyone that it was sold to us on a promise of "more exports, more jobs." In truth, we have seen exactly the opposite since the deal went into effect. U.S. exports to Korea have fallen and imports have surged.

Our overall trade deficit with Korea is 84 percent higher than it was the year before the agreement was signed, an increase of 12.7 billion dollars. A large portion of that increase comes from manufacturing imports, especially passenger vehicles.

Yes, auto exports to Korea are up an estimated 23,000 cars from a pre-KORUS number of around 15,000. The bad news is that the U.S. imported 450,000 more passenger cars over the same period. This works out to another 5.7 billion dollars or 36 percent alone for our auto trade deficit with Korea. That means more than lost profits for U.S. companies; it also means lost wages and lost jobs for thousands of U.S. workers.

Let me also remind everyone that the Korean trade agreement is the model for the much larger Trans Pacific Partnership that remains shrouded in secrecy.

Gloria put it perfectly in her letter: "America has seemingly given up." Is this what we want our young people to think? That we no longer care, that we are no longer committed to offering them a better future?

Lost jobs and downward pressure on wages are the legacy of trade in America, and we owe it to these young people to do better. We owe it to them to protect the American economy, to protect American jobs and to protect the middle class. We have a chance to show them that we haven't given up, and that we've learned from past mistakes, like NAFTA and KORUS. We can do this by putting an end to unfair free trade deals, and negotiating fair trade deals that work for everyone, including American workers.

We owe it to the next generation to build a new legacy for American trade. There are mutual gains to be had if the free people of the world can work together, maintaining real labor and environmental standards and showing the world a better, and freer, way to live and work. We have seen glimpses of what this can look like, but for decades, when push comes to shove, our leaders have decided to

balk and cave, letting false promises and voodoo economics drive the selling out of American workers time and again. We need to demand more of this administration and the massive global trade deals it strives to enact. We need real transparency and real standards or we need to say no more to terrible trade!

Mr. TONKO. Thank you so much, Representative KAPTUR.

Let's move forward with socio-economic environmental justice, where we can grow this Nation and job opportunities and undo those trade deficits.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank Mr. TONKO for the time to discuss the troubling issue of "fast track" trade authority.

President Obama and some of our Republican colleagues want to use this process to ensure that the massive Trans-Pacific Partnership, or TPP, trade deal is passed quickly and without input from Congress. Under this authority, we would have to vote on this far-reaching trade agreement that has been negotiated in secret without the ability to offer amendments or engage in meaningful debate.

Considering the TPP under fast track authority is simply another symptom of this closed Congress, where we have been deprived of our authority and responsibility to protect our constituents. And if past trade deals are any indication, American workers and manufacturers need our help now more than ever before. For as long as the United States has been signing free trade agreements, we have watched helplessly as quality, middle class jobs have flowed overseas. Quite frankly, over my career, I have never seen a trade agreement that benefited the American worker or the American manufacturer.

I come from a district that has been devastated by short-sighted trade agreements like NAFTA, CAFTA, and recent agreements with Korea and Colombia. It is estimated that since NAFTA went into effect, the United States has lost 5 million manufacturing jobs. In the Rochester area alone, we have only half the manufacturing jobs that we did then.

Our economy simply cannot afford another NAFTA-style, job-killing trade agreement, which is exactly what the Trans-Pacific Partnership is.

I have great confidence in the American worker and American businesses to compete and succeed in the global marketplace if given a fair and level playing field. For generations, our country has shown that hard work and ingenuity are the engines of progress and economic prosperity. Innovations that shaped the 21st century economy were conceived and produced here in the United States, many in Rochester I might add.

In return for allowing other countries to benefit from our hard work and innovation, America was rewarded with a strong middle class.

But other countries have taken advantage of us, and we have to stand strong against them. American workers should not be forced to compete against workers in countries like Vietnam where wages are as low as 50 cents per hour.

We need to level the economic playing field and stop jobs from being shipped overseas. We're not going to do that by enacting fast track and allowing more poorly conceived trade agreements like the TPP to decimate our economy.

Congress cannot afford to give this administration—or any future one—the benefit of the doubt by passing fast track authority. By now,

it should be clear that a closed legislative process isn't good for Congress or the American people. I firmly oppose fast track authority and I urge my colleagues to stand up for our constituents before it's too late.

RESIGNATIONS AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, AND COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignations as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on the Budget, and the Committee on House Administration:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 17, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER, Effective today I hereby resign from my assignments to the House Committee on Ways & Means, House Committee on the Budget and the Committee on House Administration.

Respectfully,

AARON SCHOCK,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignations are accepted.

There was no objection.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC.

MR. TOM PRICE OF GEORGIA. Mr. Speaker, section 3(h) of House Resolution 5 requires the concurrent resolution on the budget to include a section related to means-tested and non-means-tested direct spending programs. Section 3(h) of House Resolution 5 also requires the Chair of the Committee on the Budget to submit a statement in the Congressional Record defining those terms prior to the consideration of such concurrent resolution on the budget.

Enclosed please find two tables prepared in order to fulfill this requirement. I have also included a communication and associated tables from the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, with whom I have consulted in the preparation of this material. While the non-means-tested list is not exhaustive, all programs not considered means-tested can be considered non-means-tested direct spending.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, March 13, 2015.

Re Spending for Means-Tested Programs.

Hon. TOM PRICE, M.D.,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you requested, enclosed are two tables that show federal spending for each of the government's major mandatory spending programs and tax credits that are primarily means-tested (that is, spending programs and tax credits that provide cash payments or other forms of assistance to people with relatively low income or