

unanimously provided a nation after the worst genocide in history. Secretary Kerry is both ignorant of history and of the offense of apartheid. Our Secretary of State has effectively cursed Israel.

It is not Israel who sent suicide bombers against Palestinians, nor denied the right of Palestinians to work in Israel, nor advocated for completely wiping them off the map, nor taught their children in their textbooks to hate others like vermin or rats, nor named landmarks and holidays for murderers with suicide bombs, nor launched rockets every day, hoping to terrorize and kill innocent people. It is Israel that has fought against such racism and hatred.

Secretary Kerry stands for those who support the destruction of Israel. He should not be speaking for this Nation. He needs to stand down before he brings judgment upon us all.

CLIMATE CHANGE

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

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the state of knowledge about climate change and the impact it will have on our Nation.

Secretary of State John Kerry called climate change “the greatest challenge of our generation.” Al Gore was the first to call us to action more than 30 years ago. Even with his courageous leadership, we still have not taken the necessary actions.

The number of Americans who do not believe in climate change has increased since last year, and this is unacceptable. Our citizens need to be informed about climate change and the very real consequences it holds for all of us. This is why I introduced the Climate Change Education Act of 2014.

The Climate Change Education Act will create formal and informal education opportunities for all age groups. It will ensure people understand the complexity and seriousness of the problems we are facing. It will also give them ways to start fighting climate change. Climate change impacts every ecosystem on Earth—our oceans, forests, rivers, lakes, and everything that lives in them.

IMPORTANCE OF TRADE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WENSTRUP). Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, tonight Republicans from the Ways and Means Committee, from the Agriculture Committee, and from the Rules Committee intend to speak with the American people and to you, Mr. Speaker, about the importance of trade and trade policies, the implications of growing jobs in not

just America, but also our world role where we work with other Nations to ensure that the benefits and the great things that we not only create here in the United States but also use as trading elements around the world, that each of these issues will be thoughtfully discussed and appropriately given an item of what I believe is encouragement as this United States Congress moves forward into its last few months of this second session.

We believe that trade is important. We believe that as the United States continues to grow in its respect for others, that we share intellectual property, but expect the same back from others. We trade with our partners around the globe with an expectation of not only a good product but also an even playing field as we deal with others around the world.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this important topic of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight because we want and need to understand more about the implications of trade, a pro-trade growth agenda, and the opportunities that lie before not just the American people but the United States House of Representatives to further understand this key and critical issue that is a part of job creation for the American people.

Expanding trade throughout the globe creates economic growth and good-paying jobs here at home. Trade works because it allows America to be globally efficient and to compete all around the globe trading our products for others. And when America competes, I believe America wins, and the world is a better place. History shows that allowing greater access to a global marketplace for American exports has always been a powerful engine for economic growth and job creation.

□ 1930

Trade provides new opportunities for businesses and spurs innovation and entrepreneurs.

Opening our market to world imports also helps increase the purchasing power of American consumers. I believe there is a balance here, and it is part of this balance and the miracle of having a pro-growth trade agreement which we Republicans wish to speak about tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I would first like to welcome a young man who sits on the Ways and Means Committee, a relatively new Member, a second term Member, from Indiana.

TODD YOUNG represents not only an opportunity for him to bring forth ideas from the heartland of America, but also his expertise as a member of

the United States military, ideas about world affairs, and most of all about jobs in America. I would defer to the gentleman at this time, Mr. YOUNG.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the chairman from Texas, for his leadership on this and so many other issues.

I am a passionate proponent of free trade because we have the most productive workers in the world, the most productive businesses in the world. Frankly, we need to open up new markets for our commodities, for our manufactured items, for our services. That is what this initiative is all about.

Trade promotion authority, or TPA as it is popularly known, reflects decades of debate, cooperation, and compromise between Congress and the executive branch in finding a pragmatic accommodation to the exercise of each branch’s respective constitutional authorities over trade policy.

I applaud our Ways and Means Committee Chairman CAMP, as well as Chairman SESSIONS and Chairman NUNES, for all of their hard work pushing renewal of trade promotion authority. In January, they together introduced the bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities Act, which updates and expands negotiation and consultation requirements.

For me, supporting trade is a no-brainer. It is important back home in Indiana, where over 8,000 companies exported from locations within the State in 2011. Eighty-five percent of these companies were small and medium-sized enterprises with fewer than 500 employees.

Indiana’s export shipments of merchandise in 2013 totaled a whopping \$34 billion. Fifty-four percent of Indiana’s exports go to countries with whom the U.S. currently has a free-trade agreement.

Trade is important for the strength of our entire country’s economy. Trade supports in total more than 38 million jobs across America. U.S. exports accounted for 14 percent of America’s gross domestic product in 2012 alone.

TPA is the only way we can successfully bring international trade negotiations to a close and unlock job creating opportunities for these U.S. exports.

The administration has laid out a bold 2014 trade agenda and is currently negotiating a regional free-trade agreement, TPP, with 11 Asia-Pacific countries; another regional trade agreement, TTIP, with 28 member countries of the European Union; and TISA, a trade and services agreement with 22 other countries.

Combined, U.S. negotiations related to the Asia-Pacific and EU agreements would open markets with nearly 1 billion consumers, covering nearly two-thirds of the global economy and 65 percent of global trade. TISA covers about 50 percent of the global economy and over 70 percent of global services trade.

As a cochair of the House TTIP Caucus, the ongoing U.S.-EU negotiations

are a particular interest to me. The transatlantic economy is the largest and most integrated in the world, comprising 50 percent of global GDP and generating approximately \$5 trillion in total commercial sales each year.

The EU and U.S. account for 30 percent of world trade, and \$2.7 billion of goods and services are traded bilaterally each day. There are a lot of numbers, but all these things speak to the power of trade and its importance, not just to my home State of Indiana, but the United States of America.

I want to further emphasize that Europe is, by far, the largest market for U.S.-outbound investment, so I continue to work hard there in conjunction with my colleagues.

By one estimate, approximately 15 million workers are employed as a result of transatlantic trade. As for my home State of Indiana, in 2012, the EU purchased goods worth \$9.1 billion or 25 percent of our overall Indiana exports.

In 2011, Hoosier services worth \$2.4 billion went to the EU. That is 32 percent of Hoosier services exports. So successful implementation of TTIP is estimated to increase Indiana exports to the EU by roughly 33 percent and could boost net employment by up to 13,780 Hoosier jobs.

Currently, major Indiana exports to the EU include pharmaceuticals, aerospace products and parts, and medical equipment and supplies.

Again, I am a strong advocate of free trade, free markets. I think that trade agreements have the opportunity to strengthen our economy by creating new global markets and supporting existing ones.

I encourage all of my colleagues to support the bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities Act, so we can further and hopefully finalize many of these ongoing negotiations and bring final trade agreements before Congress for approval.

I once again thank the chairman.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for discussing not only the impact in Indiana, but with the knowledge that Indiana, in fact, is really a microcosm of what this country really looks like, where you come from a strong manufacturing base, you come from a strong base of agriculture, you come from a strong base of the heartland of this country that wants and needs to be economically viable; and by growing jobs, which means that you can continue to pay for your schools, you can continue to pay for your roads and bridges, but more importantly, I believe, an innovative opportunity where you are allowed to compete around the globe with your ideas, your products, and your services.

I applaud the gentleman not only for his service to the United States military, but I applaud you for your service to the people of Indiana, as you have served us so ably during your tenure here in Congress, and a hearty congratulations. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Speaker, we continue to have Republicans who have not only a background in agriculture, in understanding the United States military, which is the world, the world we live in, how America has neighbors and partners all around the world; but also, we continue to have people who come, once again, from the heartland of this country who see firsthand how important trade is.

They come from agricultural areas, they come from areas that have strong natural resources and reserves that are, I am sure, God-given, but an opportunity for us as Americans to benefit by virtue of living in the greatest Nation in the world.

One of those people that sits on our trade team and is perhaps one of the most active and thoughtful members is a young woman from South Dakota.

Congresswoman KRISTI NOEM has just returned from a trip that she took representing the United States Congress. I would defer to the gentlewoman now for her discussion on not only TPP Japan, but also agriculture and the things which she represents so well.

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding, and I want to thank him for the honor of being a part of this group today that is talking about TPP and the importance of trade in the region.

I did have a chance to get back this morning from a weeklong trip in Asia discussing trade and the importance of the TPP—Trans-Pacific Partnership—the European Union trade negotiations, and the ways that we can expand trade that would benefit our economy.

The first step to seeing these benefits in these agreements is renewing trade promotion authority, and then we set our goals and our priorities in these agreements. This was a big topic of conversation throughout the week as we met with leaders from Japan—including Prime Minister Abe—South Korea, and then also with the leaders in China and the People's Congress.

Time and time again, America has reaped the benefits of completed trade agreements in our country. For me, the profound impacts that we have seen in agriculture are particularly interesting.

We have seen an 18 percent increase in ag exports since we have signed the agreement with Panama. There has been a 68 percent increase in agriculture exports to Colombia since passing trade agreements with those countries.

We have also generated new business in other sectors of the economy, like manufacturing and the service industry. We have created jobs here at home, while benefiting those people across our country and economies abroad and built relationships with them that we certainly reap the benefits for when it comes to foreign policy and security issues as well.

In my home State of South Dakota, we have seen export support and create jobs and higher wages for our economy,

including our State's number one industry: agriculture.

Currently, South Dakota agriculture exports total more than \$3 billion annually, and they support over 20,000 jobs on and off the farm. It is estimated that more than one in five jobs in South Dakota depend on international trade.

Those plants that do export goods pay higher wages, they hire more people, and they do it a lot faster than those who don't. Soybeans, corn, wheat, feed grains, and livestock grown in South Dakota are already shipped to countries around the world. We can increase that by growing our access to markets through free-trade agreements.

As we are working towards trade promotion authority and negotiating the trade agreements, I think of the enormous benefits that it can have for our country. Especially as our economy struggles to recover, increasing exports in trade and markets across the Asia-Pacific and Europe is essential.

Japan is one of those countries that is included in the Trans-Pacific Partnership talks and is already one of the largest purchasers of U.S. corn and soybeans. With a good TPP agreement, we could see an increase in grain and livestock exports to Japan and the entire region. That would spark economic activity throughout our country as well.

Of course, we need to ensure that we get it right. I have asked for assurances from our U.S. trade representative that we won't close the TPP negotiations with Japan unless they agree to eliminate trade barriers to agriculture.

I appreciate that the bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities Act outlines trade negotiation objectives. It includes prioritizing agriculture. We need to ensure that food safety and animal and plant health measures are restrictions justified based on sound science. Ultimately, we need to ensure that we have an agreement that is fair to our agriculture producers.

When I had the opportunity to travel to Asia last week and discuss some of the ways that our country and Japan and China and others in the region can mutually benefit from trade agreements, I made it very clear how important the ag industry is in finalizing any final trade deal and some of my concerns that we already had with existing barriers.

We are making progress. We need to give those who are negotiating some of the agreements in the region the tools that they need to get this job done. This is one of the main topics I heard from leaders involved in these discussions. It is something these leaders see as key to coming to an agreement on these free-trade agreements, and it is key to agreeing on how a final deal will impact the agriculture sector.

I think a lot of folks don't realize that Japan has the number three economy in the world, behind the United

States and China. If we can finalize an agreement with them, it will set the table for TPP and also for the region on how our discussions go forward with China as well.

It will open up new opportunities in China where 1.3 billion people call home. There is no way that China can continue to feed its own people and will rely on outside sources for their proteins, for their grains, to make sure their people are well fed into the future.

In fact, some of the discussions I had with businesses and government officials was the difference between USDA beef and United States beef and South Dakota beef than what they are currently enjoying today.

As incomes have risen in China and people are making more money, they have a desire for more proteins in their diet. Today, their main source from that protein is from Australian beef; but yet, every day, they ask: When can we get USDA beef?

That is what these agreements would bring, not only open markets for us and increase our exports, but bring the Chinese people the kind of goods, food, and services that they want to enjoy as well. Fifty percent of the people in this world live in that region. It is a market that we can't ignore and that we need to prioritize into the future.

We need to take this first step, so that we can continue reaping the benefits of trade in South Dakota, in the United States, and across the world. It is imperative for job growth here at home and for prosperity for all of the countries involved.

Historically, when you have looked at free-trade agreements with other countries, the prosperity of all the countries involved have risen after those agreements have come forward and been done and completed.

I believe that as we focus on this issue, as we approve TPP, as we negotiate agreements that work for all of our countries involved and we finalize with TPA authority, we will certainly get an agreement that is good for all of our countries and beneficial to create jobs here in the United States.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for holding this discussion tonight.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman NOEM very much for not only taking time to come here and speak with us, but in particular the references that you make to your home State, a State which you represent so proudly and which you not only carry the flag of South Dakota with you, but really on behalf of all Americans that live not just in rural areas, but who, every single day, get up and go to work to make this country stronger, to take our products and services and goods overseas to make sure that the agriculture products are clean and the very best products available.

I think one of the most interesting things that you said was really the point which we do understand, and that is the world thirsts for American-made products.

The world understands firsthand how important your industry—your agricultural industry is in South Dakota and throughout the Midwest, the very best of not only beef—I did include Texas in there, I hope—but the very best of agricultural products that go around the world and then, as you travel to see people, thirst for those products.

□ 1945

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Chairman, if I may, I would just like to expand on that a little bit because a lot of our discussions that we had with the Prime Minister of Japan and also with the leadership in China was the fact that, not only as we negotiate these trade agreements our economies are linked in creating jobs and prosperity for both of us, but then it helps our foreign policy as well. We recognize how much we need our allies in the region to come alongside us. We recognize that it sets the table for agreements that we have with China and for keeping peace throughout a region that, right now, the United States is very focused on, where we have had to be a leader of strength in order to keep peace and to keep presence. By having trade and interactions with their leadership and their people dependent upon us for their food and their protein sources, it certainly is going to be beneficial for us today, tomorrow, and long into the future if we can continue to do that and to make these trade agreements finalized.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the gentleman.

Perhaps more important than that is that you build a friendship between groups of people who really not only share cities, where we have sister cities that grow up and are born of each other, but it is a merging together of America to make us closer with the rest of the world and then our values of not only the rule of law, of intellectual property, but also, I think, of the thing of which we know most—trade policies. A tariff is a tax, and we are reducing taxes, or tariffs, and taxes—costs—on people for products, goods and services and food. That is where I believe agricultural products from America will be king around the world.

Mrs. NOEM. Very true. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SESSIONS. I want to thank the gentlewoman for taking the time to join us tonight.

We are also joined by a young man who, from the very beginning of his time here, was described by his Governor as one of the brightest young men in Minnesota. ERIK PAULSEN is a young man who came to the United States Congress as a seasoned and experienced thoughtmaker but also as a person who understood the global implications of Minnesota, whether it be with medical products and devices that are made or whether it be with other agricultural products.

I yield at this time to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN), the

gentleman from the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. PAULSEN. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Let me just thank the chairman for his leadership not only on the Rules Committee but for leading the bipartisan free-trade caucus and leading that effort in knowing and understanding the value of trade and the value of exports.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important issue to Members. It is good to take time on the floor to talk about this because international trade, I will tell you, is a vital part of my economy, to Minnesota's Third Congressional District. The chairman just alluded to that. Statewide in Minnesota, global trade supports almost 750,000 jobs. That is a pretty big number. It is all about exports. It is about selling where 95 percent of the world's consumers are living outside of the United States. Despite our successful economic relationships with a lot of countries around the world—we have good agreements with Korea and Colombia and Panama—there is no doubt that a lot more can be done now. It really begins with passing this bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities Act, which will renew and update Trade Promotion Authority.

Why is that important?

It is important so we can make headway and get forward momentum on the TPP and the TTIP negotiations. This ensures that we will accomplish several very, very important goals as a part of increasing transparency in trade negotiations and of empowering Congress, of empowering ourselves. This is why there is bipartisan support. It will specifically direct the administration to pursue congressional prerogatives through congressionally mandated negotiating objectives. It will establish very robust consultation and access to information requirements before, during, and after the negotiations so that we have a very open and transparent process with all Members of Congress and the public. More importantly, it also preserves the congressional prerogatives that are there, giving Congress the ability to vote and giving Congress the final approval to any trade agreements through procedures and providing an up-or-down vote, which is really critical. Our trading partners are certainly looking for that authority to move forward.

I want to commend the chairman, who has had a role in that legislation, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, as well as in the Senate, with bipartisan support in making sure the administration will be negotiating a deal that covers the issues that are most important in today's economy. The reason it is important, Mr. Speaker and others, is that this is not simply about focusing on tariffs. We always know that trade negotiations and agreements focus on tariffs. This is about import quotas and other non-traditional barriers to trade because the regular, traditional barriers are no

longer enough. This is about finding 21st century solutions to streamline trade and end these nontariff barriers so we can interconnect regulations across our borders and reduce foreign regulatory barriers to our exports.

You have got the Trans-Pacific Partnership, which, of course, my colleague from South Dakota spoke so eloquently on, in which we have got 11 countries participating with emerging markets. Yet the area of negotiation that I am most interested in right now is TTIP, the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership, with our Atlantic friends. This is one of those opportunities, I think, as cochair of the TTIP Caucus, along with Congressmen NEAL and KEATING and YOUNG, in which I want to make sure that the ongoing negotiations are going to move forward, because the transatlantic economy is our largest in the world. It is the most integrated in the world. It is 50 percent of the world's GDP. It is generating about \$5 trillion in total commercial sales each year—30 percent of global trade. Mr. Speaker, those are big numbers as well, and we have known for years that a trade agreement between the United States and the European Union is the right thing to do.

I remember, back in the summer of 2012, I authored a bipartisan letter with 50 different Members of Congress bipartisanly supporting such an agreement. Then, last year, we had the launch of the Business Coalition for Transatlantic Trade. We had a chance to meet with our Ways and Means counterparts and introduce the resolution calling for swift action on TTIP. Then as I mentioned, earlier this month, we launched that TTIP Caucus, which is the chance to move forward, I think, significantly. I will tell you what it means to Minnesota: \$4.5 billion in Minnesota goods are purchased by European countries right now; 42,200 Minnesota jobs are supported by European investment annually; if we pass TTIP, it is estimated that another 3,000 jobs are going to come on hand. This is about higher wages and a healthier economy, and that direct investment is absolutely going to be helping us right here at home.

These TTIP negotiations present a huge opportunity to tackle these nontariff barriers, as I mentioned earlier, such as regulations that will needlessly impact and increase the cost of trade between the U.S. and Europe right now. Yet everyone knows getting to this agreement is not going to be easy. There are some real differences between our economies and our continents, such as the way we approach regulation, but all indications are, it seems—and I think the chairman would agree—that the negotiators are moving full speed ahead. They want to continue to make progress towards a final agreement. The next round of negotiations is actually set to take place this next month, but we can't get there unless we pass the TPA.

Passing this Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities Act is going to make sure we are protecting intellectual property and that we are setting high standards. Other countries around the world are going to be forced to look at what the United States and the EU are doing, and then we can make sure that the bad actors are following our lead by setting those high standards.

So, Mr. Speaker and Mr. Chairman, I just want to commend you for hosting the time today, and I want to thank the chairman again for the opportunity to discuss trade and the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities Act as well as the importance of trade to both of our States and to the entire country. I know it is important to Minnesota and to my economy back home.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. PAULSEN, I want you to stick around for just another minute because I really want to engage you in speaking about exactly what you just said.

We know TPA is that process—Trade Promotion Authority—whereby Congress gives authority to the President of the United States. Then, once that is done, the President and the trade ambassador go to the world, and there are two different processes which have been started now: one in Asia and one, essentially, that is in Europe. These really offer America a chance to become a better and a bigger player in the world and to even get a better deal in working so that the consumers of the world get a better opportunity.

Is that really the way you see this working?

Mr. PAULSEN. Absolutely. I think you just pretty much laid it out. That is the way we do see this working. This is a win-win for the opportunities for our companies to engage in a healthier economy and to employ more people, but also for consumers to benefit on the other side.

I mean, I know that, without a doubt, South Korea, Panama, and Colombia were significant trade agreements and that they had been languishing on the sidelines for a long period of time, but with bipartisan support, we were able to pass them all. Now we have got a chance to show and prove that America is back on the playing field. We know the benefits of trade. I know, when I had a chance to visit South Korea, they spoke about the Costco in South Korea and about their interest in selling American goods and how that was the number one Costco in the world, essentially, after the free trade agreement because they want to buy American. This is about exporting. It creates more jobs at home; it keeps the innovation here at home; and it sells where the customers are.

We can't get to these agreements, though, unless we get this Trade Promotion Authority, which makes sure every Member of Congress is going to have a hand in seeing the negotiations process forward to the tune where we have not had that type of involvement among individual Members of Congress

in the past. This is very important, I think, for Congress to exercise its congressional prerogative and, at the same time, to work in partnership with the administration in moving some very important initiatives forward.

Mr. SESSIONS. In continuing our dialogue here—and I appreciate the gentleman's taking time to do this—American-made products, whether they be manufacturing, whether they be medical instruments, whether they be pharmaceuticals, all have to go through a really pretty stringent viewpoint from a perspective of regulators, who look at things that we have in our marketplace and, certainly, that travel across State lines; but once these products and services are made available and become generally available in the United States and once people learn how to use them, we create a thirst for the rest of the world to be able to buy our products.

There is a figure that we deal with—and I know the gentleman is a strong, strong supporter of our trade working group. Essentially, 38 percent of what we manufacture and build—our output here in the United States—is something that gets into a trading partnership one way or another. Almost 40 percent of the output of the United States is based one way or another off trade, of our making sure the rest of the world gets a chance to get those products also, which lowers prices in our country on a per-unit basis. Perhaps more importantly, it keeps our jobs here in the United States. That has got to be good for somebody from Minnesota.

Mr. PAULSEN. Yes.

I should just mention here that the first trade agreement that really dealt with the opportunity to negotiate on medical devices specifically was the Korea free trade agreement, which recently passed. Medical devices is kind of near and dear to my heart because it is so prevalent in Minnesota. We have one of the strongest ecosystems in the medical device community in the country—in fact, in the world. These are high-valued manufactured products that are improving lives, that are saving lives, and there is a regulatory scheme that is often surrounding it, of course, making sure these devices are approved before they move forward.

We have the opportunity, I think, now, Mr. Chairman, with some of these trade agreements that are moving forward to not only negotiate the tariffs—making sure that these manufactured products are going to be available to others around the world and also lowering costs for our consumers—but also to know that the regulatory environment can be set up in a way that, if we have oversight committees—for instance, in the EU and in the United States and if we have got a device that is on track to be approved, say, by the FDA in the United States—we can make sure that, if our oversight committees agree on the other side of the continent, on the other side of the Atlantic, that they can sign off on it. So

you save a tremendous amount of time in moving forward and in having those goods be available pretty quickly to a lot of consumers around the world, which is going to help, again, the economy; it is going to grow jobs; and it is going to help patient care around the world. That is one area in particular that Minnesota will and has benefited.

Mr. SESSIONS. In continuing our dialogue, the gentleman sits on this awesome and the most powerful committee here, the Ways and Means Committee. The committee on a regular basis hears from people in the United States who do a lot of business overseas, and one of the things which they talk about is intellectual property—the rule of law and following contracts to make sure that what you agreed to is equally agreed to by the others.

Would you mind taking just a minute to talk with us tonight about the importance of intellectual property, how the world can capture this idea and how it can, in fact, increase not only the value of products but make sure that the product which is actually bought and sold is the real product as is the company that stands behind it.

Mr. PAULSEN. This is an area, I think, in which the United States really stands out and shines. If anything, we are known for our innovation. It is really part of our DNA in terms of having a patent system that protects intellectual property, the rule of law. There are many other countries around the world that don't have those same standards, and that is where the benefit of trade agreements can help bring in high-standard agreements. It is so that other countries can be forced to follow these agreements.

Intellectual property protects the ideas. That protects the innovation. That protects the invention and the dreamers who are coming up with all of these ideas, and that is critical. There are some countries that are lagging behind. We have had frustrations, I know recently, with China by which they have targeted U.S. information technology. They have targeted renewable energy, and they have targeted biopharmaceuticals and other products for the express purpose of creating local production opportunities for Indian companies, for instance, and that is a violation of intellectual property in many respects.

Having these trade negotiations is going to ensure that we can keep that conversation moving forward and having those high standards. It is going to protect our jobs here at home for the dreamers, the thinkers, and the folks who create and innovate these new ideas and these new products.

□ 2000

And so, when you have unfair and you have harmful practices that are happening in other countries—maybe it is India, maybe it is China—that is ultimately going to damage the long-term health of the economic health of both of our economies when we are having that type of a situation.

Mr. SESSIONS. I guess, lastly, what I would like to do is engage the gentleman on really a broader perspective, and that really is the idea of American exceptionalism; how we have the greatest military in the world, our United States military; men and women, working together all around the globe to make sure that really there is fairness; and that our friends and neighbors and allies have an opportunity to live in a free world, as part of this process, American exceptionalism, where we are able to go and compete anywhere with our goods and products and services and to let the world have that advantage.

Would you mind taking just a second and speaking specifically about American exceptionalism?

Mr. PAULSEN. Well, Mr. Chairman, I think what you are alluding to is that fact that America can compete and win at any level if we are on a level playing field. If the rules are even, if the rules of the game are set the same, Americans can compete and win. That is, again, going to help improve our economy, help grow jobs here at home.

In terms of American exceptionalism, there is no doubt that, when you have got a free flow of goods going across borders, it is going to help our foreign policy, it is going to help us lead from a position of strength. There is someone who famously said at one time:

If goods are not crossing borders, guns will.

Having that trade connection is very, very important. It helps us have diplomatic conversations. It helps us, as America, lead the rest of the world, showing that we are strong, we are leading out front.

Again, if you have two pretty significant trade agreement opportunities being negotiated right now, coming close to conclusion, I think we can wrap those up within the year, if we pass Trade Promotion Authority, both in the Trans-Pacific Partnership and with the TTIP negotiations going on in Europe; and that will cover, by and large, two-thirds of the economy in the world, and all the other countries will follow our lead.

This is a huge opportunity, as the chairman knows, for our companies and our economy back home.

Mr. SESSIONS. Well, I am just most impressed with not only your thoughtful consideration and your hard work, but really the things which I see that you bring to the table are words and ideas on a regular basis; that is you talk about we need to make sure that we have a stable environment where good decisions can be made, instead of in a vacuum, they can be made on the fly and, secondly, growth.

One of the things which I read on a regular basis, a young man named Peter Roff, who is with U.S. News and World Report, and he talks about how growth is important. You have to grow your economy. You have to go and continue in the hunt, so to speak, to make sure that more and more people not

only buy your products, but the next generation of those products come out also.

I want to thank the gentleman for his thoughtful leadership, where you come to the meetings and you have a real thoughtful handle on stability, making sure business knows what the rules are, making sure we build great neighbors and have good contracts and have great relationships, and then the generation and the next generation of goods and services where we can make things even better for the next generation.

I want to thank you very much for being here tonight. I know that you want to get back to the office and call your family and tell them the exciting Special Order that you were a part of tonight. I am sure your wife will be very, very excited about that, Congressman PAULSEN.

Mr. Speaker, we have had an opportunity tonight to speak, Members of Congress who come really from the heartland, we have had people come from Indiana, South Dakota, and Minnesota. Well, I am a Texan, so I guess I would call myself from the heartland of this great Nation also, at least from the center of the country.

As we talk about what we are attempting to do, I think that it is important for you to know, Mr. Speaker, that the things which you have led our Congress in trying to perform, the strong leadership of JOHN BOEHNER from the very top, in trying to say that we need to grow our economy, that part of that job creation comes as a result of trade agreement.

So that is why we are here tonight, to talk openly with Members of Congress and you, Mr. Speaker, about the need for America to understand why we must pass Trade Promotion Authority, TPA. TPA is a mechanism. That is all it is. It is a mechanism to begin the starting point whereby we give the administration, whether they be Republican or Democrat, but we give the President its marching orders in developing trade agreements.

We say to the President of the United States that we believe that growing our economy, we believe that having trade agreements, we believe that having agreements that make things so much easier and better for us not only to make sure that agricultural products, that other markets become available to us, but that we also understand that, as we engage in this, not only do we want to grow our own marketplace, but the world has an opportunity to reduce the taxes, the trade barriers that are on, many times, their products and services because American products weren't available.

Perhaps we could talk about receiving products that they have back into our country and the consumer being a winner. We have to worry about environmental protection. Here in the United States, we believe that we are trying to be responsible in what we do, not only in production manufacturing,

our day-to-day energy needs, but I think we also see where we could share many products that we have in the United States, notwithstanding we have seen many industries—energy industries selling our products and services overseas.

We talk about intellectual property. Intellectual property is not hard to understand. It is the opportunity to make sure that, if you have an agreement—and it might be because you have something that you have gotten as a patent, it could be a scientific citation that the world, when they are going to use that product, service, or that idea, that they give respect to not only making a payment, if that is required, or supporting the standard as required by rule of law.

Market access, market access is so important. It is important that we have an opportunity to make sure that the goods and services, which we present to another country as we enter their ports of entry or to their customs, that our products and services are to the highest standard that they would be, based upon a contract or an agreement as we enter those countries.

We would want to make sure that our products and services were not held at bay by that foreign nation because of some perception about our product or because they were trying to protect their home product, their home base. It opens up markets and gives us market access.

Physical goods, to make sure that we would be able to reduce tariffs on all sorts of products, whether it be clothing, whether it be manufacturing, whether it be pharmaceuticals, we need to make sure that the products which are passed are timely and fairly handled, not only in these two different types of trade agreements, but that it is a good deal for the American person who wishes to go sell, whether it be an agricultural good or a physical good that may be manufactured in this country.

Lastly, services, services which I think America has not only excelled at, but been able to make sure that we are able to promulgate effective ways of doing business, to where people can continue to have a great product and make that product even better—the second, third, and fourth generation of products that would be sold and available with the protections under intellectual property and rule of law.

Mr. Speaker, that is what we are talking about, the marketplace of the world becoming open to American goods and services and America and its consumers gaining that benefit also.

So TPA ensures that Congress promulgates itself more fully by incorporating ahead of time discussions with the administration. You heard the gentlewoman from South Dakota say that she had a discussion with the trade negotiators, and she negotiated with them and said: Here is my understanding about what I think is in America's best interest.

She didn't say what was in South Dakota's best interest. She didn't say what was in her own personal interest. She looked at a more global perspective and said: I think, in looking at this agreement, this is a piece, a part of what should be included.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is also why this administration, when they do consult with us—and Ambassador Froman does come up on the Hill on a regular basis, and we should remember that he is an active, intelligent, thoughtful man who is not just learning his job, but learning the nuances about how he protects America and goes across the world and negotiates what is in our best interest; what was a good deal for others, our trading partners, to make sure that they will want to take up the goods and services, the exchange, the ideas, the tough things that come from these trade negotiations.

So this topic is timely because these two major trade agreements are on the horizon. The world is speaking about TTIP, and it is speaking about TPP. The United States is currently negotiating TPP, the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

The discussions that take place in Asia are all about how we can form better, longer-lasting partnerships, whereby the people of their countries and the people of the United States of America better themselves, lowering taxes, getting new products and services, and having a chance to make sure that we become friends in the process.

TPP is comprehensive, and it is ambitious, and it covers really an active and growing Asia-Pacific region. As you think about it, Mr. Speaker, you will recall from your days in the United States Army and your service as a member of the military, where you went and were a part of other countries that desperately wanted and needed not only goods and services, but really the tranquility of America and what we would bring to them, the exceptionalism that we can pass on to these other people to make their life better.

It will bring together 12 countries on both sides of the Pacific Ocean in hopes of tracking and putting traditional trade barriers away and overcoming those and giving a chance to where we can make sure that the consumer becomes king.

The TPP would cover 40 percent of all global output. It would ensure that participating countries conduct business, really just as we do, in an open, thoughtful, transparent way; and we would make sure that we reduce tariffs, regulations, while respecting intellectual property.

Meanwhile—and we have heard more about this, the European Union, through TTIP, it would create a trade agreement that literally encompasses about half of the global wealth in the world.

In other words, we would be doing business with a region that is larger than the United States of America. We

would be trying to ship our goods and services and do business with half of the world's wealth, open markets that would allow them an opportunity to have American-made products.

Currently, \$2.7 billion is traded daily between the United States and the EU, which is about 30 percent of world trade. We think creating this historic opportunity would mean that we can grow that amount of trade, grow our ability here in the United States to not only have more output and employ more people, but to pay for the next generation of products and services to where they continue to meet the needs of others, not just here in the United States.

So combined, these two agreements would give American businesses and consumers, we believe, unprecedented access to global markets. That is why the Republican Party and its members are on the floor tonight, members of the Ways and Means Committee, members of the Agriculture Committee, and at least one member of the great Rules Committee.

I, as chairman, have an opportunity, as a result of the chance to have jurisdictional elements in this, to be first-hand at these discussions where we can push and talk about how important trade is and these basic agreements to empower and work with all parts of the United States government.

Obviously, our great young chairman of the Ways and Means Committee is very much up to this task, and DAVE CAMP has been leading not only America with an understanding about what is in our best interest, but how we have growth, how we move forward, and that is exactly what TPA is all about.

□ 2015

So, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you that we have a plan. We have ideas which we not only well understand, but what we are trying to make sure is that we understand that 38 million jobs are supported by trade—38 million American workers—and that in 2012 our goods and services supported an extra 9.8 million jobs as a result of the growth.

These are all important ideas, Mr. Speaker. They are ideas that move our country, they move countries forward, but at the same time giving us new goods and services that on a per unit basis can drop because we are sharing them with the rest of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I would like for you to know that Members of this United States Congress, both Republicans and Democrats, support members of the United States military, as you served your country so ably. We give thanks and pause every single day to not only the freedoms that we have, but to know that young men like you who have served our military and come back home and married and have beautiful young babies and represent a future in this country to where we believe that there is no problem bigger than a solution, but that by working together, having stability under rule of

law, intellectual property, and growth, that we can continue to lead the world through American exceptionalism and the world can have an opportunity to have that little part of America, whether it be a great steak from Texas or South Dakota or perhaps jeans manufactured somewhere here in the United States or, if lucky enough, something from the great State of Ohio that said, "Made in America."

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

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS: WEALTH CREATION AND THE OP- PORTUNITY GAP

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a privilege to once again have this opportunity to stand on the House floor as part of the Congressional Black Caucus' Special Order hour.

For the next 60 minutes we will have an opportunity to speak directly to the American people about an issue of great significance: the growing wealth gap in America that is stratified along racial lines. It is a wealth gap that should concern all of us here in the House of Representatives, and certainly people who are concerned about the well-being of this country in its entirety should be alarmed by any segment of this country being left behind across any measure of economic status.

We will get into that throughout the duration of this CBC Special Order. Certainly, I am glad to be joined by the distinguished gentleman from Nevada, my good friend, the coanchor of this CBC Special Order, Representative HORSFORD.

I will just begin by making the observation that it has often been stated that when Wall Street catches a cold, communities of color get the flu.

We know that in 2008, when the economy collapsed and plunged us into the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression, Wall Street had a high fever; and as a result, as one might expect, communities of color all across the country have been suffering from economic pneumonia. In fact, a study that was prepared by the Center for Global Policy Solutions illustrates the point that communities of color were hurt the worst by the Great Recession and have benefited the least as a result of our recovery.

And so the wealth gap, broadly defined across measures such as home

ownership and access to good-paying jobs, retirement savings, has gotten worse, exacerbated by the shock of the Great Recession and the disproportionate lack of certain communities benefiting from the recovery that has taken place. So these are some of the topics that we are going to explore during this Special Order.

I am pleased that we have been joined by a very distinguished member of the freshman class, my good friend, the gentleman from New Jersey, one of the best-dressed Members of the House of Representatives. I am surprised today that I do not see him with his classic bow tie. He is the ranking member of the CBC freshman class, but I believe he arrived here a little bit earlier.

I am pleased to yield to my good friend, Representative PAYNE.

Mr. PAYNE. I would like to thank the gentleman from New York for that kind introduction.

I want to also say that we are here tonight on a very serious issue in tonight's Special Order. As so aptly put by the gentleman from New York, it feels like pneumonia in a lot of communities that we represent. I would dare to say that we might even need to call it an epidemic, because it has risen to epidemic proportions.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation is supposed to be the land of opportunity, the land of equality. We are a Nation that says that if you work hard and you do the things you are supposed to do and you do everything that we ask you to do, you too can be successful and provide a better life for you and yours. That is the promise of America.

Unfortunately, for too many in this country, this promise has been broken.

Generation after generation, millions continue to experience generational poverty in this country—and this is especially true for people of color.

Too many of the people in the district I represent in New Jersey have worked their entire lives. They have endured hard labor. They have worked two or three jobs. They have made minimum wage their entire lives. Yet they are still in poverty. The same is true for their parents before them and their grandparents and their great-grandparents.

Unfortunately, for too many people of color, the opportunities to succeed and move beyond circumstances of poverty are too little and far between. This leads to the wealth gap we see today. That wealth gap, Mr. Speaker, is unconscionable.

In the 21st century, African Americans own just 5 cents for every dollar of wealth Whites own. More than 62 percent of African American households do not have assets in a retirement account. The median income of an African American is just over \$33,000, barely above the poverty line. And African Americans are less likely to own homes, with just 44 percent of African Americans owning homes compared to 74 percent of Whites.

In New Jersey alone, the poverty rate has grown to a staggering 28 percent.

Many economists believe that this is an underestimate of the number of people falling into poverty in New Jersey.

How can those who are clawing just to get by even begin to think about creating wealth for their children or future generations? How can a single mother who works 40 or more hours a week still find herself in poverty? How does she begin to dream about saving for her children's college education or to save for a home or to plan for her retirement? The simple answer is they can't. And the racial wealth gap will continue to grow even wider.

Mr. Speaker, there is so much Congress can do to change the course of this country and to help those who are working hard and playing by the rules.

The priorities we place within our national budget determine whether we strengthen our economy and grow our middle class or whether we create a greater wealth gap between the haves and the have-nots.

This Nation has a clear choice, Mr. Speaker. The Ryan Republican budget cuts hundreds of millions of dollars in vital education investments, ends the Medicare guarantee for seniors, and it will cost this country more than 1 million jobs next year alone. And if that is not bad enough, the Ryan Republican budget asks working and middle-class Americans to pay for the thousands of dollars in tax breaks given to the wealthiest among us. That is why, in good conscience, I cannot support such a budget.

At a time when too many people are still desperately struggling to make ends meet, I know that the people in my home State of New Jersey deserve better. I believe that all Americans should demand better as well.

In contrast, the budgets that the Democrats and the Congressional Black Caucus have proposed recognize the dangerous course this country is on and work to move us forward rather than divide us deeper.

The Democratic budget builds ladders of opportunities to grow our middle class by investing in education, strengthening Social Security and Medicare, and protecting the 8 million people who, for the first time, now have access to affordable, lifesaving health care.

The proposals within the Democratic budget would restore the American promise that if you work hard, you can succeed. And not only can you succeed for yourself, but you can generate wealth and create a better life for your children and your grandchildren.

That is the choice that each Member in this Congress has to make, and it is a choice every American has to make. This choice will determine the direction of this country, not only for this generation, but for generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, it is not a zero-sum game. We all can be winners with the right kind of focus and investment; and in doing so, we will strengthen this country for future generations.