

Coming down to Florida was quite a break, it was different. But at the same time, that changed over time too. From a small, sleepy sheriff's office of about 40 individuals to, when I left, we had over 500 folks that served this great Nation in that community.

You hear a lot on the news about law enforcement in that they want to make it sound like we are not human. In reality, I have been to those scenes where a law enforcement officer has been involved in a shooting where he has had to take somebody's life. And that officer was so emotionally distraught, because that is not why they got into the business. It is not why I ever got into the business. You got into the business because you wanted to help people, you wanted to be there to protect people. That is what law enforcement is about.

And, unfortunately, sometimes bad things happen to good people. Sheriff REICHERT mentioned the fact that sometimes police officers and deputies can make a mistake. We are only human. But when things are moving fast as the speed of light, you have got to think back as to what and why that officer did or didn't do what he did at the time.

And I worry about when elected officials see it as a political expedience to condemn police officers for something that occurred before they ever get the facts. DAVE REICHERT and I sit on the floor and we talk about that, about maybe, just maybe people should wait until the investigation is complete before you condemn somebody, until you walk in their shoes. The sheriff talked about the fact that I can remember back as a rookie having to work, and I took the shifts of guys that had families because I wasn't married when it came down to holidays. I didn't have a family, so I would take the shifts so they could be with their families. But it didn't always work out that way. There was many a time that I missed Christmas, missed birthdays, missed wedding anniversaries because of service, and that is just not me. That is all the men and women that serve this country in local law enforcement and other law enforcement agencies throughout the United States.

Most of the men and women that I served with, I guarantee you could go out and make more money doing something else. They were bright, bright people. But their calling was to be a law enforcement officer. To go out there in the dead of night, climb up in an attic—remember that—you climb up in an attic and you don't know what is up there, except you know there is a bad guy who is up there, and somebody has to go there and do it. At the end of the day, these men and women do it because they love the community they serve.

Congressman REICHERT talked about what police officers do with their own money in regards to buying turkeys for Thanksgiving for families, buying Christmas presents for children that would not have a Christmas, doing

summer camps for free for children because these children don't have or didn't have the ability to go to one of those paid summer camps—that is pretty neat. And we would, in our sheriff's office, without using taxpayer money, with donations from clubs like Kiwanis and Rotary and others, pay for that so that these young men and these girls and boys could have the opportunity to interact with law enforcement, to actually see that, do you know what? We are human. That when we do these little games out there in the field and we have the things, water balloons or whatever it may be, that we are real people, because a lot of times, the only time they see a law enforcement officer is possibly during a domestic situation where they are arresting their mom or their dad. And that can jade anybody.

But it can also jade law enforcement, because the things that they see no one here would want to see. There were times when I went home, getting off the midnight shift, and walked in my house at 6 o'clock in the morning. And what I had just seen the night before, you would have a hard time going to sleep, where you would grab your child—I can remember my youngest child at the time, my only child at the time—grabbing him and hugging him because of what I just saw some other parent do to their child that was unspeakable.

Our three sons, they all serve in the military. Our middle son is a Black Hawk pilot in the Florida Army National Guard. He is also a deputy sheriff in one of the major counties in Florida. He wasn't sure if that was the right job because, when they went through the class on child abuse, it struck a chord as a new dad: How could anyone do that to them? But do you know what? He has turned out to be a pretty good cop. And we say that with reverence; it is not a derogatory term.

But the men and women that put on the uniform and that badge do it because they love people, not because they hate them. They do it because they really want to make a difference in their community. Their families are the ones that suffer the most.

When I have had to go to scenes where I have had an officer killed in the line of duty, it breaks your heart. When I was a rookie officer outside of Chicago, right out of the academy, one of my academy mates was killed, shot and killed by a 12-year-old in our first year on the job. You never know when it is going to hit.

When Officer Kondek down in Tarpon Springs went to work on the 21st of December, he kissed his wife and his kids good-bye, expecting to be there for Christmas. Little did he know that that was the last day of his life. The person who killed him shot him and then ran him over with a car. This is not what we want.

Where we want to see the America that I love is, the same respect that we give our soldiers returning from war,

that we give that to our police officers. That when you see them in a restaurant or you see them on the street or you see them on a call, thank them for what they do. They will be absolutely surprised and amazed, but grateful.

When my sons are in uniform and people come up to them in the military and thank them for their service, there is no reason we can't do the same for our law enforcement officers.

Congressman REICHERT is probably the most humble guy I know in the stories, and he would never brag about himself, but he is a consummate professional. His bravery is unmatched, and his leadership, I am sure, at that sheriff's office in Washington State is better for him being sheriff than not.

Mr. REICHERT. I thank the sheriff. There might be some people back in Washington State that might disagree with you.

Mr. NUGENT. Well, I guarantee there are some.

Mr. REICHERT. Absolutely.

But I think that what you and I, and everyone who has spoken here tonight, have tried to do is to bring the personality, the humanness in the human heart, of a police officer to America tonight. And I think with two sheriffs here, it is a powerful way from the floor of the House of Representatives to share with people across this Nation through this media our thanks and gratitude to each and every man and woman who wears the uniform, who puts their life on the line, who knows that some day when they leave they know there is a possibility that they may not come home, and the families live with that too.

One quick story. I was stabbed in 1973 or '74. I had my throat slit with a butcher knife at a domestic violence call that we talked about a little earlier. My wife actually found out that I had my throat slit. She was sitting home watching the news, and they showed me being wheeled into the hospital out of the ambulance. She finally got a phone call, but she didn't know if I was going to live or die.

That happens every day in this country, ladies and gentlemen. Mr. Speaker, that happens every day here. An officer is injured, hurt, or killed somewhere across this Nation. And we need to be there, Mr. Speaker, to support them, we need to be there to pray for them and their families, and we need to be there to pray for our communities that they come together and be true partners in protecting our children and our families.

I yield back the balance of my time.

#### FREE TRADE AGREEMENTS

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, we thank you for the opportunity to gather as

Democrats in this 30-minute Special Order opportunity to discuss our Nation's recent free trade agreements. And I will note that nomenclature: free trade. There are concerns about fair trade being the outcome, and we will be talking about that here in this format.

This is more important now than ever before as our United States Trade Representative Ambassador Michael Froman testified before the House and Senate today. The Trans-Pacific Partnership negotiations are being held as we speak this week in New York City. And some Members of Congress have suggested a trade promotion authority bill, better referenced as a "fast track," that may be introduced in the near future, a fast track that would deny the checks and balances of Congress, one that would not allow us to actively overview the impact of these negotiated settlements, these contracts, and would require a simple thumbs up-thumbs down vote without, again, that interactive quality that serves that responsibility to the Members of Congress.

But before we give away Congress' ability to conduct proper oversight and review these trade agreements that are currently being negotiated, including the Trans-Pacific Partnership, we need to discuss how free trade agreements from the past two decades have not delivered on their promises.

These trade deals will have far-reaching impacts on American life. They could include impacts on food safety or perhaps affordable medicine or perhaps regulations with the banking industry, the financial industry.

Let's not be reckless and allow these deals to move forward without thorough and proper consideration by Congress. Frankly, these deals have not lived up to the hype. President Obama indicated as much in his recent State of the Union message: "I'm the first one to admit that past trade deals haven't always lived up to the hype."

So whether it was NAFTA—the North America Free Trade Agreement—or the Korean Free Trade Agreement, supporters of our past FTAs have promised these deals would create a good outcome, create United States jobs, create a lesser trade deficit, and improve global labor and global environmental standards.

□ 1845

Tragically, sadly, this has not been the outcome.

TPP supporters have said this one will be different. The Trans-Pacific Partnership, which could cover a great majority of the international economy, has its supporters saying that this will be a 21st century agreement, far different from those that have preceded it.

Leaked information from the TPP negotiators shows that it is being modeled by the negotiations, themselves, not by the negotiators, showing that it has been modeled on trade policies that

have proven to offshore good-paying jobs in our economy and to force wages down for America's working families. That is why respected economists, including many who have previously supported free trade, such as Jeffrey Sachs, as well as Nobel Prize winners Joseph Stiglitz and Paul Krugman, have expressed skepticism about the Trans-Pacific Partnership negotiation. They are coming to realize what many of our constituents have long known: these trade agreements do not respond favorably to the American middle class.

Sachs' speech at a trade forum on Capitol Hill included comments that indicated:

I don't think TPP and TTIP rise close to the standard of being 21st century trade and investment agreements, not even close. They are very much 20th century agreements which were already out of date by the time they were negotiated. This is a NAFTA treaty writ large or these are the same negotiations that we have had in many other cases.

In the New York Times, Mr. Krugman indicated:

I am, in general, a free trader, but I will be undismayed and even a bit relieved if the TPP just fades away. The first thing you need to know about trade deals in general is that they aren't what they used to be. The glory days of trade negotiations and the days of deals like the Kennedy Round of the 1960s, which sharply reduced tariffs around the world, are long behind us.

Then Mr. Stiglitz, in the New York Times, is quoted as saying:

Based on the leaks—and the history of arrangements in past trade pacts—it is easy to infer the shape of the whole TPP, and it doesn't look good. There is a real risk that it will benefit the wealthiest sliver of the American and global elite at the expense of everyone else.

Tonight, I hope we can have a thoughtful discussion about jobs, about wages, about environmental standards that could be impacted, about child labor laws that could, perhaps, be thrust upon us that have been promised for every FTA in the past two decades. Sadly, our constituents are looking for that sort of progressive outcome that has not been realized, and, certainly, our workers have been impacted. I represent a district that is tremendously impacted by these trade negotiations.

So, tonight, it is a pleasure to work with my colleagues in order to get out the message about the broken promises of our trade agreements.

I see my good friend and colleague who has been a very passionate voice on speaking out about these issues. He is TIM RYAN, our Representative from Ohio's 13th District. Let me yield to Mr. RYAN so he can share some thoughts with us.

Welcome.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Thank you so much. I want to thank the gentleman from New York. It is always fun to be here with you in the later evening hours.

As I am listening to you talk about fair trade versus free trade and about some of these agreements, you have

just got to go to the communities. I mean, this is not rocket science. Go to the communities that have been impacted over the last 20 or 30 years, going back to NAFTA and CAFTA and all of these other agreements, and look at them. Look at what has happened in places like Youngstown, Ohio, or in up-state New York or in Connecticut or up and down the east coast.

Mr. Speaker, we have, in Ohio, several companies that, after the NAFTA agreement, started moving, wholesale, their manufacturing facilities from Warren, Ohio, or Youngstown, Ohio, to just over the border in Mexico—to just over the border with cheaper labor and no environmental or labor standards to be seen—and shipping the products right back over, decimating communities across Ohio, like the ones that we represent.

There is a State route in Ohio, State Route 7. It goes from the lake all the way down the Ohio River. If you want to see what these trade agreements have done in the heartland, go take a ride down Route 7, especially the southern part. Go through Steubenville and East Liverpool, Ohio; go down to Portsmouth; go through Athens County, and you will see the erosion of what used to be the industrial might of the United States of America. They have eroded communities.

The ripple effect—the job aspect of it—is of unemployed people. Now there is no one to support the schools. Now there is no one to support the mental health levy. Now there is no one to support the libraries. Now there is no one to throw \$20 in the basket at church on Sunday. The ripple effect throughout these communities has decimated the middle class, our communities, and has reduced opportunity for our young people, whom we want to thrive in manufacturing in the United States.

I don't want to see the GDP. I don't want to see numbers. I want to see what it is doing for average Americans and middle class people—period, end of story. How does it help them? Drive through the communities, and you are going to see the evidence that we have not negotiated these agreements. If there is growth and if there are increased profits and if the stock market is going up, where is that money going? It is not going to the middle class people. There used to be middle class people in our congressional districts, and I have told this story before.

We have a \$1 billion steel mill that is located in Youngstown now. Why? The company asked us to fight to put tariffs on the dumped Chinese steel tubing that was coming in, and the President, to his credit, put the tariffs on. They built the steel mill.

So, when you level the playing field—if you are dumping or if you are manipulating your currency, which is something that we have got to get in this agreement: real teeth into the currency manipulation issue—or the environment or labor, then people and companies will reinvest back in the United

States, and you can reinvigorate State Route 7, going north and south in Ohio. To me, that is the most important part. What are we going to do? How are we going to write agreements? How are we going to structure our trade to operate in a way that draws investment into the United States?

One last piece.

The small- and medium-sized manufacturers get hammered in this. Do you want to be pro business? Do you want to be pro middle class, small business, medium-sized businesses, tool and dye makers, mom-and-pop manufacturers that operate in communities like ours—the people who treat their employees like they are family and are the ones who sponsor the Little League team or the soccer team? They are getting wiped out in these agreements, and we are not factoring them in.

If we want a small, robust middle class, business community in the smaller and mid-sized cities in America, these are the kinds of things we need to factor in when we are operating. Yes, we have got to invest in roads and bridges. Yes, we have got to invest in infrastructure. We have got to do research. We have got to make sure that we have an educated, skilled workforce, and we should invest in manufacturing and all the rest; but the trade agreements are key. If you look at what Korea has done to our auto industry and to our trade deficit with Korea—just those two things—we have lost tens of thousands of jobs because of the Korea trade agreement, and our trade deficit with them has skyrocketed.

The proof is in the pudding. If we want to bring back the State Route 7s in the Ohios of America, then we need to do exactly what you are saying, Mr. TONKO, and what ROSA DELAUR is going to say and what others are going to say tonight. We need to reframe the way we talk about this.

I am very thankful for the invite here, and I appreciate your passion and how you believe and understand we have got to do real economic development in upstate New York and in places like my communities. Thank you for being a leader on this issue.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative RYAN, for bringing it right down to the basic, core ingredient, and that is the dignity of work for American families. You speak it so well for those you represent in Ohio.

This is about broken promises. It is about promises for jobs, promises for worker opportunity, promises for environmental standards, promises for labor standards. We need to let the American public know exactly what is happening. If you are a believer in fair trade—not necessarily in free trade. If you believe in fair trade and if you don't think of fast track, which is when we circumvent the authorities and responsibilities of Congress, then let your voice in Congress know that. Let everyone know what you are thinking, because these are critical moments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to a good friend and colleague who is a very outspoken voice for social and economic justice, who has spoken to the unfairness of these negotiated arrangements for trade, and who has led us as a Democratic Caucus in this House to speak out forcefully about the fast-track process and about fair trade versus free trade. She is none other than my good friend and colleague from the Third District of the State of Connecticut, ROSA DELAUR.

Ms. DELAUR. Thank you so much to my colleague from New York and to my colleague from Ohio, TIM RYAN, who is just leaving the floor, and we have got Wisconsin in the House with Mr. POCAN.

Mr. TONKO, thank you for taking the lead on this effort. I can't tell you how proud I am to join with men and women in this body who understand what is going on in the lives of working families today.

Mr. Speaker, they are struggling. We need to walk in their shoes. That is what our job is—to represent their interests in this body. What do we know? We know that, in fact, they are in jobs today that don't pay them enough money to survive. That is why we are organized and are taking on a process which can do nothing but harm them in the future.

All of us who are engaged in this effort have been long supporters of the President's and the administration's, and we believe genuinely that he wants to improve the lives of working Americans; but on the issue of trade, I and all of us will oppose the administration because they are following the exact same trade policy that has failed in the past.

The administration claims that the Trans-Pacific Partnership will bring jobs back to the United States, will raise our wages, but experience tells us that far too many trade agreements have done the exact opposite. The TPP is based on the same model as the Korea free trade agreement, negotiated just 2 years ago. Since that time, the United States' trade deficit with South Korea has exploded by 50 percent. That translates into 60,000 lost jobs. This is a familiar picture: Korean products flood in, and American jobs flood out. When adjusted for inflation, our wages continue to slide.

Princeton economist Alan Blinder estimates that as many as a quarter of American jobs will be offshore in the foreseeable future, and we know from past experience that the people who are laid off will see a significant drop in their wages—that is, if they are able to find another job.

The trade agreements we have signed over the last 25 years have done nothing to ensure fair competition. Let's take one example. The deals have failed to address the problem, which our colleague Congressman RYAN mentioned, of currency manipulation. It is an unfair, artificial practice that has been devastating our automotive industry for a generation.

Morgan Stanley estimates that currency manipulation gives each imported Japanese car an effective subsidy of between \$1,500 and \$5,700. That is neither free nor fair.

Leading economist Fred Bergsten of the Peterson Institute wrote in Foreign Affairs just within the last several days:

The United States has paid a major economic price for never having established an effective currency manipulation policy.

In the last Congress, 230 Members—both Republicans and Democrats—wrote to the United States Trade Representative to demand the inclusion of a strong and an enforceable currency manipulation chapter in the Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement. So far, we have been ignored and dismissed. Put simply, if the agreement does not address currency manipulation, it will not be worth the paper that it is written on. It will be a green light to those who seek to compete unfairly with American manufacturing, and it will take away American jobs.

The administration's arguments about jobs have failed. They know that experience and the numbers are against them. So, instead, as with past trade agreements, we hear the fallback arguments based on foreign policy.

□ 1900

If you listened to the Trade Representative today in the Senate Finance Committee, Mr. Froman, he talked about the danger of China, the specter of China. In the State of the Union, the President said that the TPP would help us counter China's growing influence. This is clearly not the case.

As the economist and Reagan appointee Clyde Prestowitz pointed out in the Los Angeles Times last week, "The ever-closing linking of the U.S. economy to those of the TPP countries over the last 35 years has not prevented the rise of Chinese power."

He continued, "nor has it deterred U.S. trade partners and allies from developing ever closer ties with China."

They will not stop doing so just because we sign a trade agreement. In reality, the argument about China is nothing more than an attempt to distract the American public with scare tactics and that we are going to take on China. The administration should be above this kind of fear-mongering.

Throughout this process, the administration has chosen not to consult the Congress fully. Members of Congress have been denied access to the full text of the agreement. The American people have been cut out of the negotiation; yet in the State of the Union, the President asked the Congress for fast-track promotion authority.

A key part of granting that authority has always been the negotiating guidelines that Congress gives to the administration. That is our job—to provide the negotiating guidelines—but the Trans-Pacific Partnership has already been under negotiations for years, first under President Bush and now under President Obama.

Earlier today, the U.S. Trade Representative told our colleagues in the Senate that he expected a deal “in the next small number of months.” How can the Congress give guidance on a deal that we have never seen, a deal that is, for all intents and purposes, already done?

Once again, we see fast track for what it really is. It is an attempt to cut the Congress out of the process altogether. We should not stand for this, and when we get that fast-track bill, we should vote it down. Bitter experience tells us that bad trade deals devastate jobs, devastate wages. That is why we should say “no” to this deeply flawed Trans-Pacific Partnership.

I can’t thank you enough for taking on this job of being here at 7 at night, all of us together, to say “no.” I think what we want to convey to the American public is that we are committed to work on their behalf and to make sure that they have a decent shot at a decent job with good wages.

Thank you so much, Mr. TONKO, for listening.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative DELAURO. You strike a very encouraging cord at the end of your comments.

The American public needs to be engaged, if you believe that Congress should have overview responsibility, a checks and balances agenda, because these agreements need to be front and center about the well-being of American workers, and so call into this process, reach into this process, and share your opinion with those who speak for you in the House.

Is a fast track a thing you want to see—without the information exchange—or do you want Congress to review these contracts and understand what impact there will be on the American economy, on American jobs, on standards for the environment, for public safety, for child labor laws, a number of things?

We appreciate your comments.

Ms. DELAURO. I would just make one other point. So many years ago, when we were discussing the Affordable Care Act, the American public said: Read the bill.

That is what we are asking to do, very simply, to read the bill before we vote on it.

Mr. TONKO. Very well stated. Every bit of American style is about tethering the American Dream. The people come here to have the right to the dignity of work and to pursue that American Dream.

One of our newest faces in Congress in his second term, I believe, has been an outspoken voice for the American Dream. I yield to the Representative from Wisconsin’s Second District to share his thoughts about the process here for fast track and free versus fair trade.

Mr. POCAN. Thank you, Representative TONKO, for your leadership. I really enjoyed working with you over the last several years. We are actually get-

ting to the point that it looks like this may be coming to a vote in Congress.

This is perfect timing, with another round of negotiations upon us. I am so glad we are on the floor tonight talking about this and trying to channel the energy from the gentlewoman from Connecticut. I love her passion.

This is an issue that goes far back for me. When I was 23, I started a small business in Madison, Wisconsin, a specialty printing business. One of the things we did is source American-made and union-made products. We screen-printed T-shirts and did promotional items like pens and lapel pins we wear as Members of Congress, all things that were done in the United States.

Over the last almost 28 years, trade deal after trade deal, I have watched the number of products made in the United States diminish. T-shirts, it is almost impossible to find a mill that still makes T-shirts and apparel in the United States. Almost everything is done in other countries or overseas, things like pens and our emblem pins. It is almost impossible to find American-made pens.

In my area, just 45 minutes south from Madison, is the city of Janesville, where Representative PAUL RYAN is from and represents. That town used to have a thousand good, family-supporting wages at a company called Parker Pen which made quality, American-made pens. At one point, that was a thousand jobs in that region.

With trade deal after trade deal, finally, a few years ago, we watched the last 150 of those jobs go to Mexico, those family-supporting wages that no longer exist in the company. They were then hit by GM closing down, which allowed even further job loss in that community.

As Representative DELAURO said, it is those people that used to make \$25 an hour in a manufacturing job who lost their job and, now, the best that might be available to them is a \$10-an-hour job. You can’t pay your mortgage when you go from \$25 an hour to \$10 an hour. You can’t send your kids to college when you used to make \$25 an hour and, now, you are making \$10 an hour.

Those are the jobs we have seen all too often leave because of bad trade deals; whether it be New York, Connecticut, Ohio, or Wisconsin, we have all seen the same thing happen across our communities.

As much as I do agree with the President when he said in the State of the Union, Look, I’m the first one to admit that past trade deals haven’t always lived up to the hype—I think we all agree on that. We have seen that. We have seen that the jobs promised don’t happen, and that is why we have concern.

Tonight, I want to talk specifically about fast-track authority. That is where we give up our right as Members of Congress, which means we give up our constituents’ right—a say—in these trade deals. This isn’t a Democratic

issue. It isn’t a Republican issue. It isn’t an Independent issue. It is in the Constitution. Article I, section 8 of the Constitution says the Congress has the sole power “to regulate commerce with foreign nations.”

For 200 years, that is the way it was, but President Nixon changed that when he seized those powers through a mechanism called fast track. It is a legislative technique used to kind of skid the way through for these trade deals.

The problem with that is when we do fast-track authority, we give up our rights as Members of Congress and, therefore, the public’s right to question what is in one of these trade deals, the next trade deal that can have even more jobs leave the United States.

We give up our ability to debate and to amend these agreements, and that is what fast-track authority is. That is very likely the first vote we would see on the floor of Congress, which the President asked for in the State of the Union, but that gives our sole authority to the President.

Now, I have a lot of respect and I agree with so much of what President Obama has done, but this isn’t about President Obama, and it is not about President George W. Bush and not about President Nixon or any other President who has tried to get these powers. It is about our ability as Members of Congress and the public to have a say through these trade deals.

When you look at this and you think about the history of the fast-track process, the last time we authorized fast track was in 2002, at 3:30 in the morning, right before a congressional recess, to bring this antiquated mechanism into place, and it was approved by only three votes.

Since 2007, Congress has refused this extreme procedure, even after it was getting renamed to try to make it sound a little more palatable.

There are so many reasons why we shouldn’t give up our authority. If you think about it, people say: If we don’t give the President authority, we won’t get trade expansion.

Well, fast track isn’t needed for that. In fact, President Bill Clinton was denied fast-track authority for 6 of his 8 years in his office, but he completed more than 100 trade investment pacts without fast track.

We are giving away our ability to actually see this document which, as you know, we haven’t seen. There are 29 chapters, only of which about five affect trade, and everything else from currency manipulation to medicines to food safety, all those things now are thrown into these deals that go way beyond what it was originally in place for, and we would have no say in that.

Fast track has been used 16 times in the history of this country, and usually, it is to enact more controversial trade pacts.

Bottom line, we know that the U.S. Trade Representative right now is redoing their Web site to make it more transparent. Here is transparency to

me: show us the text, show Members of Congress the text, show our staff the text, show the public the text.

If this deal is as good as they have promised, then show us how great it is; but if this is nothing more than warmed over fast track or something else that is going to cost us jobs and depress our wages, then that is usually when this procedure is put in place. No offense to this President or to any President, but Congress has to have its say on fast track.

I just want to commend you, again, for doing this. I just wanted to come by for a very few minutes to talk about that, but as this procedure could be coming before us in the coming month or months, we have to be ready.

We are going to work together, as we have been, to make sure we do everything possible to make sure the public knows what is in this deal, and that means Congress has to have our say, and that is why we have to oppose fast track.

Again, I thank the gentleman for this time. I continue to look forward to working with you on this issue.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative POCAN. I again urge the general public out there to engage in this process. Let your Representative know if you believe we should have overview authority and that we should have the chance to know what is in these negotiated agreements.

This affects our American economy, the American Dream. It is about jobs. It is about wages. It is about critical labor standards. It is about critical environmental standards. We can make it happen. We can work on trade issues and have fair trade out there that will grow our economy and grow the American Dream for America's working families.

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

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DEFAZIO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of illness.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 28, 2015, at 9 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

179. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's report on Foreign Policy-Based Export Controls for 2015, pursuant to the Export Administration Act of 1979, section 6, as

amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

180. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Cuba: Providing Support for the Cuban People [Docket No.: 150102002-5002-01] (RIN: 0694-AG42) received January 26, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

181. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting Pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 13637, Transmittal No. 17-14 informing of an intent to sign a Memorandum of Understanding with Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

182. A letter from the Chief Operating Officer, Armed Forces Retirement Home, transmitting a report on a real estate lease transaction for a Charter School within the Sherman Building, pursuant to 24 U.S.C. 411; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

183. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-517, "Lawrence Guyot Way Designation Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

184. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-518, "Percy Battle Way Designation Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

185. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-551, "N Street Village, Inc. Tax and TOPA Exemption Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

186. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-514, "Promoting Economic Growth and Job Creation Through Technology Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

187. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-535, "Dedication of a Public Alley in Square 752, S.O. 14-15491, Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

188. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-512, "SeVerna, LLC, Real Property Tax Exemption and Real Property Tax Relief Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

189. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-538, "Trash Compactor Tax Incentive Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

190. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-539, "Behavioral Health System of Care Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

191. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-515, "Winter Sidewalk Safety Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

192. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-519, "Uniform Certificate of Title for Vessels Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

193. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-521, "Cashell Alley Designation Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

194. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-549, "Youth Tanning Safety Regulation Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

195. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-520, "Department of Parks and Recreation Fee-based Use Permit Authority Clarification Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

196. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-501, "Paint Stewardship Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

197. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-530, "Conversion Therapy for Minors Prohibition Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

198. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-503, "Public Space Enforcement Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

199. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-559, "Insurance Holding Company and Credit for Reinsurance Modernization Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

200. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-502, "Plan for Comprehensive Services for Homeless Individuals at 425 2nd Street, N.W., Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

201. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-558, "Small and Certified Business Enterprise Waiver and Recertification Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

202. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-562, "Inspector General Qualifications Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

203. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-556, "Soccer Stadium Development Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

204. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-554, "Turkey Bowl Revenue Generation and Sponsorship Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

205. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-561, "Firefighter Retirement While Under Disciplinary Investigation Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

206. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-553, "Closing of a Portion of Manchester Lane, N.W., adjacent to Square 2742, S.O. 08-3083, Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.