

It is wrong for any Senator, especially the chairman of the Judiciary Committee who deals with these issues day after day, to urge the selective leaking of any Federal investigation. The FBI is not in the business of disclosing information to appease political operatives, but according to press reports, that is just the sort of thing the Republican Judiciary Committee has done.

Remember, there has been a lot of speculation that under Chairman GRASSLEY's leadership the personal information of a Clinton staffer was leaked to the press, including payroll records and a Social Security number, but urging a leak of the FBI investigation for political purposes was not the only thing Senator GRASSLEY said. The Senator from Iowa was asked what he thought was the worst change in Congress during his tenure. He responded that the increasing partisanship was disappointing to him.

The audacity and even the hypocrisy of that statement is staggering. Senator GRASSLEY decries partisanship, while he denies a hearing and a vote to an eminently qualified Supreme Court nominee. For what? No one has a good answer on that. The Senator from Iowa complains of partisanship, even as he uses the Judiciary Committee to wage a political war against Secretary Clinton and her staff.

Under the guise of oversight, Senator GRASSLEY has been wasting taxpayer dollars trying to besmirch Hillary Clinton's good name. This has been going on for years. The Senator's singular focus on Secretary Clinton borders on an obsession. Senator GRASSLEY has written dozens of letters containing hundreds of requests. He has held hearings. He has issued press releases. What have he and his committee achieved? Nothing. All the chairman has done is waste taxpayer dollars.

The Judiciary Committee chairman is so desperate to legitimize his attacks against Hillary Clinton he is willing to encourage a selective leak of a Federal investigation by, of all people, the FBI.

All this in an effort to award the Presidential nomination to Donald Trump. I agree in one respect with Senator GRASSLEY. Partisanship in this Chamber is awful. It is paralyzing the Senate and is preventing us from doing our constitutional duties, but much of this is the handiwork of the Judiciary Committee and Senator GRASSLEY.

I ask the Chair to announce the business of the day.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 4

p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CHILD POISONINGS FROM LAUNDRY PODS

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to use articles as examples relevant to the subject of my speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, I rise today to speak about the rapid rise in child poisonings caused by single-use laundry products. Earlier today, we had an update on the number and severity of these poisonings from the American Academy of Pediatrics. It was in an in-depth study just published in their journal, Pediatrics.

The news is not very good, because in 2013 and 2014 that academy reports that there were over 22,000 child exposures to laundry products, resulting in the deaths of at least two children due to the chemicals in these pods, and many others have faced serious injury, with at least 17 children in that time period going into comas because of exposure to these chemicals.

What am I talking about? This is a laundry pod. It is very colorful on the outside, and it smells very good. It is quite soft. Its texture, particularly to the touch of an infant—an infant's hand and face—is very soft and reassuring. The problem is that if it gets into an infant's hand, where is it going to end up? It is going to end up in their mouth, and these packages are soluble. So, naturally, the plastic exterior is going to dissolve, and all of these chemicals are going to end up in the child's digestive system.

As a result of these pods, we have had two children die, and we had 22,000 child exposures in that 2-year period the study covers, with 17 children going into comas. Others have suffered seizures or internal burns to their lips, mouths, and the esophagus. If it gets into their esophagus and burns, then you have a problem.

Now, what we have been advocating, Senator DURBIN and I, in our legislation is to make them as safe as possible and to get the Consumer Product Safety Commission involved in these things. This Senator has met with the industry. Let me show you some of the things in which, indeed, they have made progress.

This is a detergent pod package, and in order to get in it—and this pod came in this packaging—you have to tear it open. That is one good thing. They

have designed this container so that it would be very difficult to get into. Even I am having difficulty getting into it. The pods would be in this container—something that would be child proof.

They designed this container. This has one of those slide bars, such as on a plastic sealant freezer package, where you have to push down on it and apply pressure in order to get the slide that unzips the seal. That is also a good thing.

But let me show you what the industry is resistant to doing. Children are naturally attracted to colorful candy. Here shown on this chart are a variety of candies, such as gummy bears, but among all of these are interspersed some of these pods. This is one. This is another. This is another, and this is another—not unlike the colors on this pod. So if we don't have the packaging preventing the child from getting to this pod, then we are going to have a problem, which is why we lost two children and 17 others went into comas in the last 2 years.

Now, a lot of people like these products, and so does the Nelson family. They serve a very useful purpose. At the same time, we need to make them as safe as possible. So why not just remove the color from the package and make it less attractive to the child.

Last year, Senator DURBIN and I introduced legislation that would require better labeling, more child-resistant packaging and safer chemical formulations for these single-use laundry pod products. The bill has been referred to our Commerce Committee, and as the ranking member of that committee, I am going to talk again to Senator THUNE, who is the chairman of the committee, to see if we can get the committee to take up the bill as soon as possible.

Earlier this year, we were able to get both the House and the Senate to pass legislation requiring childproof packaging for bottles of liquid nicotine, some of which had injured children and, in some cases, resulted in death as well and had poisoned thousands of others. If we could get that done in a bipartisan manner, which we did and that is now law, then there is no reason why we can't, in a bipartisan way, address the issue posed by this problem. Keeping children safe is not a partisan issue. It is just common sense.

In the interim, we want to encourage the manufacturers to keep working on new standards to reduce the poisonings. We appreciate very much the efforts at things such as this and this. That is helpful. Last week, one manufacturer announced plans to put many of the laundry pods they sell into new, more child-resistant packaging. They also announced a public education campaign urging parents to keep laundry pods away from their children. That is certainly helpful. But at the same time, we need to keep working to make these pods less attractive to children and, perhaps more

importantly, make the chemicals inside these less toxic so that when a child does get hold of one and it goes into their mouth, it is not going to turn into tragedy.

I thank the American Academy of Pediatrics for their very important study, and I look forward to working with our colleagues to put an end to the accidental deaths and poisonings that we see as a result of these attractive products.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, on Sunday, during a joint press conference in Hannover, Germany, with Chancellor Angela Merkel, the President of the United States said this:

And with respect to Congress and the Trans-Pacific Partnership—

That is the big 5,000-page trade agreement the President is trying to move through Congress—

I think after the primary season is over—

After the primary season is over—

the politics settle down a little bit in Congress, and we'll be in a position to start moving forward. Because I know that we had a majority of members in the past who were in favor of this deal. Otherwise we wouldn't have gotten the authority for me to go ahead and fast track the agreement. But I think we all know that elections can sometimes make things a little more challenging, and people take positions, in part, to protect themselves from attacks during the course of election seasons.

I would suggest the American people should be very uneasy about their President making such a statement as that. We have already heard that there are plans by a number of forces and interest groups to try to slip this TPP through after the election in a lame-duck congressional session.

Why would that be the case? Well, the President says it right here: The American people are uneasy about it. They are not for this. Support for it is sinking. Elections are turning on it. And it does not need to become law.

I am firmly opposed to this agreement. I believe it is bad for our country. It bothers me that if it is such a good deal, why don't they bring it forward? Why don't we have a debate here while elections are on? Why aren't people willing to go home and explain to their constituents how and why they voted the way they did and how and why they believe the way they do? What is wrong with that? Why wait until after, when things settle down a little bit, in the President's words, when people can't be held accountable

by their constituents for the votes they cast or they think they may be able to slide away afterward?

I don't like this. I don't think it is the right thing to do. I think it is arrogant. What the President is fundamentally saying and what a lot of these special interest groups are saying is, well, we know you in Congress are so smart, and we know the President is smart. But, the people out here, they don't understand how smart we all are, and we just need to get this done, and so we will have this trade agreement. But we understand you probably shouldn't do it right now while elections are going on because, well, you might get your clock cleaned. They might vote you out of office. So we will see if we can't work up a way to pass it sometime in the future.

The President has made it clear that he intends to continue to push through this 5,544-page trade agreement that the American people don't want. Polls show consistent disapproval of the TPP. A March poll by Americans for Limited Government found that 51 percent of Americans did not know anything about it. I would say at least 50 percent of the Members of Congress don't know much about it. It is more than 5,000 pages. I have probably spent more time on it than the vast majority have, and it is rather difficult to read. No wonder the American people say they don't know a lot about it. But of those who claim to be familiar with it, 58 percent oppose it. There are a lot of reasons for this, and we will talk about it more.

Today, U.S. Trade Representative Michael Froman announced that they are beginning the 13th round of the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership—TTIP, they call it—with the European Union in New York. So this is the second part of the fast-track. The fast-track guarantees a fast vote—without amendments, without the option to filibuster, on the floor of the Senate for less than 2 days, and you get an up-or-down vote. That is what fast-track does.

So we will have the Pacific agreement probably coming up first, and then we will have the TTIP, the Atlantic agreement, and then there is a third one, the Trade in Services Agreement. All of these are huge trade agreements, unlike anything we have seen before, creating in the Pacific an international trade union similar to the beginning of the European Union that Britain is trying to get out of. I think we should be very dubious about that.

How is the trade agreement faring in Europe? How about Germany, which is probably one of the leading trading countries in Europe? A poll by the Bertelsmann Foundation, a nonprofit organization that studies domestic and international politics, found that only 17 percent of Germans feel that TTIP—the transatlantic partnership—would be a good deal even though less than 2 years ago it had a 55-percent positive rating. This study found that the more

people learn about the agreement, the more they oppose it. The same thing is happening in the United States, in my opinion.

The President has referred to the TPP as the “most progressive trade deal in history.” Its chapters create new labor and environmental provisions that the public really knows nothing about.

Even the economic data the White House promotes as proving the validity of the TPP, if we look at it carefully, we can see that their own report and study that they cite the most—that signing the agreement will decrease the rate of American manufacturing jobs by 120,000. How is this good for America? By their own study, we are going to lose 120,000 manufacturing jobs that we would have maintained had we not signed the agreement. Another study by Tufts University said the country will lose 400,000 jobs. We are going to go into the differences in the studies, we are going to see the assumptions utilized in the model the President cites, and we are going to see that the assumptions they made are not reasonable. They are extreme assumptions—assumptions that would never occur in the next 15 years as they assume they will occur. No wonder they can justify positive numbers with those kinds of assumptions.

I think all of us have to begin to reveal—and the American people need to be more alert—how bad this international agreement really is, how it will not positively affect the lives of most Americans. It is just not going to do so.

We will look at how the Korean trade deal that I supported in 2011 came nowhere close to being beneficial to the United States. In 2011, when President Obama signed the deal, the President said that it would increase American exports by \$10 billion to South Korea. I thought that was a good thing. It sounded pretty good, but their estimates were way off.

The model that experts used to study the Korean trade deal is the same one they are using to study the TPP, and so we have a pretty good test: Did we increase exports by \$10 billion each year to South Korea, as the model suggested? Well, their imports to us increased by \$12 billion, and as of last year, we only increased our exports to Korea by less than a couple of hundred million dollars more than in 2011. So we didn't get any increase at all—virtually none. They had a huge increase to us, and our trade deficit with our allies and friends in South Korea increased 280 percent. This is a serious matter.

The same thing happened: They used this same computer model when we signed the agreement with China in 2000. We then had a little less than \$70 billion in trade deficit with China. They assumed our exports to China would grow at the same rate as China's exports to the United States would grow. Did that happen? No. What is the