

The last of the four freedoms is the freedom from fear. This illustration shows a mother and father looking at their sleeping children tucked safely into bed.

In the coming struggle, President Roosevelt said, America would defend itself not just with arms but also with “the stamina and courage which comes from unshakeable belief in the manner of life that we are defending.” That is exactly what they did.

During World War II, 16 million Americans—one out of every eight—put on a uniform and fought for the promise of the four freedoms. Tens of millions more Americans back home joined the fight by planting victory gardens, recycling everything from bacon grease to tin cans, serving as “soil soldiers” in the Civilian Conservation Corps, and working in war munitions factories as Rosie the Riveters.

After the war, the “greatest generation,” as Tom Brokaw characterized them, may have given up their uniforms, but they continued their fight for FDR’s four freedoms. From the earliest days of the Roosevelt administration, Franklin and Eleanor had worked to rewrite the rules of America’s economy to give average workers and families a fighting chance against powerful corporations and entrenched wealthy special interests. They strengthened labor unions to improve workers’ pay, working conditions, safety in the workplace, health care, retirement—things we take for granted today.

After the war, the same Americans who had endured the hardships of the Depression and who had saved the world from tyranny went to work and laid the foundation for the creation of the largest middle class and the strongest economy in the history of the world. They built new schools, new homes, new towns, an interstate highway system. At the same time, more Americans began to challenge longstanding injustices based on race, creed, gender, and other distinctions.

As the historian and author Harvey Kaye writes, under the leadership of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, America greatly “expanded the ‘we’ in ‘we the people.’”

Under the leadership of Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt, Americans saved our Nation’s economy from ruin, saved the world from tyranny, and they did all this while making America freer, more equal, and more democratic than it had ever been.

The promise of the four freedoms would inspire not only Americans, but it inspired the world. The four freedoms became part of the preamble to the United Nations “Universal Declaration of Human Rights.” That declaration, drafted by a committee chaired by the great stateswoman Eleanor Roosevelt, represents the first time in history that nations around the world agreed to a list of human rights to be universally protected.

My wife Loretta and I are honored to include among our friends Anna Elea-

nor Roosevelt, FDR and Eleanor’s granddaughter. She lives in Maine now, but she spent most of her life living in my home State of Illinois. Similar to her grandparents, Anna Eleanor Roosevelt is full of optimism, energy, and a fierce love for this Nation. She has done so much to advance her grandparents’ efforts to make America freer and fairer. I want to say to my friend Anna, America remembers and honors your grandparents’ legacy. We are a better Nation because of what their leadership and sacrifice meant to us.

As we celebrate the 75th anniversary of FDR’s “Four Freedoms” speech, it is clear that we still have a lot of work to do to make the promise of the four freedoms real. Income inequality in America is greater today than at any time since just before the Great Depression. There are many reasons for America’s growing economic inequality, including globalization and technology, but the biggest reason is nearly 40 years of deliberate political decisions to undo the progress of FDR’s New Deal and concentrate more and more income and wealth in the hands of the few. FDR was right when he said that “economic laws are not made by nature [but] by human beings.”

I hope this year we can work together to pass laws that will increase economic opportunity for all Americans, rebuild America’s middle class, and free more Americans from the fear of want.

FDR said that we Americans believe in the four freedoms not just for ourselves but for our families, for those who vote as we do or look like we do, who live in our neighborhoods and attend our same houses of worship, but we believe in the four freedoms for everyone everywhere.

An America that believes in freedom of worship doesn’t allow one religious group to deny basic rights to others. Think about our Constitution, which each of us in the Senate is sworn to uphold and defend. There are only three references in that great document to the issue of religion. The first is in the Bill of Rights to guarantee to each of us the right to believe as we wish or not to believe; second, that our government will never establish a religion; and, third, that there will never be a test for qualification for public office involving one’s religious beliefs.

Making a religious test for public office or even a religious test for immigration is inconsistent with those basic values—inconsistent with those four freedoms. Yet even in this Presidential campaign today, we hear candidates making that proposal.

Freedom of speech means allowing others to speak, too, not shouting down those who think differently than we do. Democracy works better with dialogue, not monologues.

Years ago when Loretta and I had our first baby, we faced some terrific medical challenges. Sadly, we had no health insurance. Let me state that as a new father, I was never more fright-

ened in my life. Thanks to the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, 17 million Americans and many millions of American parents are now free from that fear, and they know that if this act is eliminated, as has been proposed by some politicians, there is no alternative, there is no protection, and they will face the kind of fear no family should ever face.

This year, instead of voting over and over to kill the Affordable Care Act, I am calling the other party to work to strengthen the law. This law isn’t perfect, but together we can make the Affordable Care Act work better for all American families.

Freedom fear also means that Americans shouldn’t have to worry about getting shot when they are playing in a park, sitting in a movie theater, or attending a Bible study class. Even in an election year, we ought to be able to find commonsense ways to protect Americans from the fear and reality of gun violence. We ought to be able to find a way to keep guns out of the wrong hands without undermining basic Second Amendment rights. We owe it to America’s families to try.

Seventy-five years ago President Roosevelt saw that America would soon be drawn into war. While he didn’t live long enough to see America’s ultimate victory in World War II, his promise of the four freedoms helped achieve that victory.

As we know, the war ended officially with Japan’s unconditional surrender aboard the USS *Missouri* in Tokyo Bay. A member of Japan’s delegation who attended the surrender went to the ceremony fully expecting to hear how the allies intended to take their vengeance on the defeated Japanese people. Instead, he heard General MacArthur speak about the future of freedom for Japan. Years later, he wrote that it was at that ceremony that he understood that “we weren’t beaten on the battlefield by the dint of superior arms; we were defeated in the spiritual conquest by virtue of a nobler idea.” That idea—the inherent human dignity of every person—is the belief at the heart of the four freedoms. Those freedoms remain as powerful a weapon for peace and progress today as they were 75 years ago. I hope we will remember that this year.

GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the issue of gun violence and to commend the President for announcing last week a set of commonsense steps to make our country safer.

The need for action to reduce gun violence in America is urgent. About 32,000 Americans are killed by guns each year. Every day on average 297 men, women, and children are shot, 89 of them fatally. Last year, by one count, there were at least 372 mass shooting incidents where 4 or more people were shot—more than one a day in America. In the city of Chicago

alone last year, 2,939 people were injured by gunfire, and at least 88 people have been shot so far this year, 2016. The 468 homicides in Chicago last year sadly led the Nation—a number larger than the number of fatalities in the cities of New York or Los Angeles, which are much larger cities. There is an epidemic of gun violence in America.

Can you imagine if 32,000 Americans were dying each year from Ebola or from tainted drugs or at the hands of terrorists? Lawmakers would pull out all the stops to bring down those deaths. Compare the death toll from gun violence to the death toll from terrorism in the United States. According to the New America Foundation, since 9/11 a total of 93 people have been killed by terrorist incidents in America—48 have been killed by rightwing extremists and 45 have been killed by Islamic terrorists. Americans are rightly concerned about the threat of ISIS terrorism, but we cannot ignore the threat posed by gun violence to the citizens of our Nation.

Sadly, for years Members of Congress have just shrugged their shoulders as each day we hear another heart-breaking story of the victims of gun violence. It is baffling to me that Congress refuses to do anything about gun violence, especially since the American people overwhelmingly on a bipartisan basis agree on commonsense steps that we should take.

For example, about 90 percent of Americans agree that a background check should be conducted before a gun is sold. Background checks through what is known as the FBI NICS system help ensure that the buyer is not a convicted felon, a domestic abuser, or a person with a history of serious mental instability or who is otherwise prohibited from buying a gun.

Background checks work. Over 2 million gun sales have been denied to prohibited purchasers over the years. You think to yourself, why would a convicted felon be so stupid as to go in and try to buy a gun when he faces a background check? He does it anyway. They do it over and over, and 2 million times we have denied them weapons because they were prohibited by law because of their records.

There are still loopholes that would allow many sales to take place without this basic background check, especially at gun shows and over the Internet. Think about how people made Christmas and holiday purchases this year. Many of us went to the Internet. That is exactly where people are going to buy firearms without background checks. When you have loopholes like these, it is easy to understand how dangerous people can get their hands on guns.

Look at the way these loopholes have affected the city of Chicago. There is a flood of illegal guns coming into Chicago from Indiana, especially from Lake County, IN, which is right across the border from my State. Last Friday,

the Chicago Tribune newspaper quoted Sheriff John Buncich of Lake County, IN, saying:

Individuals are skirting federal law, especially at these gun shows, whether they want to admit it or not. There's a lot of illegal gun sales.

The Tribune article went on to say:

Buncich stressed he supports Second Amendment rights and doesn't want to take guns from people. He noted, however, that hundreds of guns from Lake County show up in Chicago crimes every year. "We need to do something to stem the violence," Buncich said. "It's not going to hurt the law-abiding citizen."

Last year I met with the head of the Chicago Field Division of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, the Federal agency charged with enforcing our gun laws. He told me that in the highest crime neighborhoods of Chicago, when they confiscated the crime guns after the act, they found that as much as 40 percent of those crime guns were coming in from Indiana.

Here is an example of how it happens. In 2014 a man named David Lewisbey of South Holland, IL, was sentenced for illegally trafficking hundreds of guns from Indiana to Chicago. The U.S. attorney's office said that over a 4-year period, Lewisbey "routinely traveled to various gun shows in Indiana and purchased duffle bags full of guns that he brought back to Chicago." Lewisbey used a forged signature to procure an Indiana driver's license, and that was all he needed to fill up the trunk of his car with ammunition and guns and to drive that Skyway over into the State of Illinois and to sell those guns in Chicago to kill innocent people.

During just one 48-hour period in 2012, Lewisbey bought 43 guns in Indiana and delivered them to a convicted felon on Chicago's South Side. Does anyone believe he had a Second Amendment right to buy 43 guns with an illegal ID and sell them to a convicted felon in Chicago? I hope not.

If everyone who sells guns for profit at Indiana gun shows had conducted background checks, it is highly unlikely that a trafficker like this would be able to get away with this for years. The system would have caught him. But because of the loopholes in the system, the weaknesses in the law, this individual was able to avoid detection and literally supply hundreds of crime guns in Chicago. Of course we know what happened to those guns—they turned into tragedy and havoc in the neighborhoods around that great city.

I listened so many times when critics said: Well, look at Chicago, which has the toughest gun laws in the Nation, and look at all that gun violence.

Here it is: in some parts of Chicago up to 40 percent of those crime guns are coming across the border with no background checks and sold in alleyways and dark corridors of our city. That isn't because of weak or ineffective Illinois and Chicago laws; it is because of our inability to make the Federal law stronger.

Let's be clear. Background checks are not a heavy burden for law-abiding gun owners. At most, they would cause a short delay in buying a gun. But when we have gaping holes in the background check system, we are basically handing guns to criminals on a silver platter.

Sadly, this Congress has so far failed to even address this problem. We weren't able to overcome a Republican filibuster of the Manchin-Toomey legislation in 2013. We tried again last month and fell short again.

The President decided to do what he can within his lawful authority to close gaps in the system. Last week the President put forth guidance that makes clear that you can be engaged in the business of selling firearms even if you aren't a storefront operation. For too long people who sell guns for profit at gun shows or online have been able to avoid the requirement to conduct background checks. They were claiming they were just selling guns as a hobby. This man bought 43 guns at a gun show as a hobby and sold them to convicted felons in Chicago. The President's guidance makes clear that if you are repetitively buying or selling guns for profit, you need to get a gun dealer license and do background checks or you are breaking the law.

Of course, the President's actions won't close the gun show and Internet loopholes altogether. That would take an act of Congress. But the President has made a move in the right direction, and it will help.

The President took other important steps last week—clearly within his constitutional authority—that will help save lives. He is working to make the background check system faster by adding more FBI examiners and improving the system's technology. A faster system could have stopped the Charleston church shooter who killed nine worshippers last year in a horrific terrorist attack. This person was able to buy a gun under another loophole in the law because the background check hadn't been finished in 3 days. The default position, if you haven't cleared a background check, is that the gun is sold to you. That meant that this man picked up the gun when the background check wasn't completed and went out and caused this mayhem and took so many innocent lives.

The President is also strengthening the reporting requirements so law enforcement will know when guns are lost or stolen during shipment.

The administration is redoubling its efforts to improve mental health services and to make sure the background check system has complete records on those found to be mentally unstable.

Finally, the President has sponsored research on gun safety technology. This is critical. Right now we have security features on our phones, computers, and cars to prevent thieves and unauthorized people from using them. Similar technology is available today so that an unauthorized user will not

be able to fire a gun. That means a person can't steal a gun and resell it and a kid can't play with a gun and hurt himself or someone else.

For reasons that cannot be explained, the gun lobby opposes gun safety technology, even calling for a boycott of any company that uses it. Now this administration is going to use its research dollars and purchasing power to promote safer gun technology. This could be a game changer when it comes to preventing gun accidents and deterring illegal trafficking.

I commend the President for the reasonable, commonsense steps he has taken to combat the epidemic of gun violence. The steps he announced will not prevent all gun deaths—no single measure can—but they will help.

I hope my colleagues in Congress will not take a step backward and try to undermine these basic, commonsense reforms with riders or appropriations restrictions. I am going to fight hard against the gun lobby if they try. I hope Congress will instead move forward, finish the job on background checks, and do all we can to reduce the high toll of gun violence in our communities.

Over the weekend, I was visiting with friends and former colleague Mark Pryor of Arkansas. I went down to Stuttgart, AR. Anyone who is a duck hunter in the Midwest or in America knows the name of that town. Stuttgart, AR, is probably the capital of duck hunting in the Midwest or in the United States. The local radio station there is KWAK, giving an idea of their commitment to duck season 60 days of the year when Stuttgart comes to life with hunters from all over the United States and all over the world.

Saturday afternoon I went to the largest sporting goods store, Mac's, and watched hundreds of men and some women in camouflage clothes getting ready to go out for the duck hunt. For them, it is not only a rite of passage, it is a way of life. They love it. You see the camouflage on everything in sight.

Of course, when you go into Mac's, there are plenty of firearms for sale and other equipment that is needed so that you can hunt effectively and safely. You go in the store, and if you want to be a duck hunter in Arkansas, you first have to buy a license, which I did. Then you go through the ritual of making sure you have all the right equipment and getting ready to go out to hunt for ducks.

There is not a single thing proposed by President Obama that will in any way slow down or stop those men and women who want to legally use their firearms for that sport—nothing. What the President is trying to do is to stop convicted felons and people who are so mentally unstable that they shouldn't be able to buy a firearm from having that opportunity.

It turns out an overwhelming majority of firearm owners agree with the President. You would never know it, would you, as you hear every single Re-

publican Presidential candidate condemn President Obama's actions.

What a chasm there is in the culture between the people who are firearm owners and who enjoy that opportunity and responsibility and those who are on the political scene and ignore the fact that to preserve that right we should pass commonsense changes in the law to make them even more effective and make certain that people who misuse firearms do not have that opportunity.

I hope to work with my colleagues in the Senate and both political parties to achieve the goal of protecting the rights of those who use firearms legally, safely, and responsibly within the confines of the law and to stop the illicit trafficking of guns that are taking over 30,000 lives each and every year.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The Senator from Ohio.

TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, after months of delay, last fall we finally were able to see the text of the Trans-Pacific Partnership, text that corporate lobbyists had access to long before the American people and Members of Congress and their staffs did. After examining the provisions in this deal, it is clear that far too many of these provisions sell out American workers and American jobs.

In the months leading up to the release of this deal, I warned that too often our trade agreements as far back as NAFTA and the Permanent Normal Trade Relations with China—not a trade agreement per se, but it had the same effect in many ways—the Central American Free Trade Agreement, the South Korea Free Trade Agreement—these trade agreements amounted to corporate handouts and worker sellouts. I warned our negotiators that they needed to do more to ensure that the deal created a truly level playing field for American workers and American businesses. Unfortunately, that is not what happened, particularly when it comes to standing up for the American auto industry.

We hear often about the supposed opportunities that trade agreements will create: opportunities for more jobs, opportunities for small business, opportunities for more exports, and for economic growth. But when I look at the Trans-Pacific Partnership, I don't see these actual—let's call them offensive opportunities—and by "offensive opportunities" I mean opportunities for American products to break into new markets. This is not just playing defense, but playing offense so that we can export into these new markets.

Cheerleaders for this agreement—whether it is the Wall Street Journal editorial page, most Republicans in the Senate, or whether it is Republican leadership in the House, whether it is corporate CEOs or whether it is the

White House—say that new markets will be opened for American cars, but we have heard these empty promises before.

Under TPP, many of these new markets will not be opened day one—as in the case of Malaysia and Vietnam. They won't be open in day two or year one or year two. It will be more than a decade until American automakers have full access to these closed markets.

The TPP will do nothing to level the playing field with our top competitor, Japan, or to change Japan's distinction as the most closed auto market in the world. We know it has been that in the past. We know it is that today. There is nothing in here that would change or open Japan's market, to sell into the Japanese auto market.

Carmakers in Ohio and carmakers across the country will compete with huge numbers of Japanese imports. We don't have it today, and under TPP we won't have the same opportunity to export to Japan. That is because for decades Japan has used barriers other than tariffs to keep their markets closed. Tariffs are one way. They charge huge tariffs, causing the price of the product that you import—let's say into Japan—to be too high for the Japanese to afford, but that is not what Japan does. Their tariffs are already at zero, so an agreement on tariffs will do nothing to create a level playing field. Japan keeps our products out in much more creative ways than tariffs.

We have seen this in the wake of the Korean Free Trade Agreement. Even after our trading partners promised to remove these barriers to allow American cars into their market, they often don't. Opening up Japan's market didn't work in the 1980s, it didn't work in the 1990s, and it didn't seem that it will be any different under the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

If there aren't new offensives—offensives in the sense of selling into those countries—then I would expect our negotiations at least make sure this trade agreement protected American carmakers and workers from a flood of cheap foreign competition. I would hope they made sure the benefits of the agreement would only go toward its members who have been part of the negotiating process and made concessions, but it is not. It is not just the TPP countries.

That is now how I read the text, particularly when it comes to something called the rules of origin for autos. These rules of origin provide provisions to determine how much of a car is made in the TPP region, and TPP rules are weaker than NAFTA's. That means how much of the car is actually made in the TPP countries, how much of the car must be made in the TPP countries to count as a TPP product.

That means 62.5 percent of a vehicle must be made in the NAFTA region in order for it to qualify for the benefits of the NAFTA agreement. But only 45