

crimes of past generations; yet we often become staggeringly blind when it comes to facing and rejecting the worst of atrocities in our own time. It is a heartbreaking thought.

I would submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that the winds of change are indeed now beginning to blow and that the tide of blindness and blood is finally turning in America because today—today—we are poised to pass the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act in this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, no matter how it is shouted down or what distortions, deceptive what-ifs, distractions, diversions, gotchas, twisting of words, changing the subject, or blatant falsehoods the abortion industry hurls at this bill and its supporters, this bill is a deeply sincere effort, beginning at their sixth month of pregnancy, to protect both mothers and their little, pain-capable unborn babies from the atrocity of late-term abortion on demand. Ultimately, it is one all humane Americans can support if they truly understand it for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, this is a vote all of us will remember the rest of our lives, and it will be considered in the annals of history and, I believe, in the councils of eternity itself. It shouldn't be such a hard vote.

Protecting little, pain-capable unborn children and their mothers is not a Republican issue or a Democrat issue; it is a test of our basic humanity and who we are as a human family.

It is time to open our eyes and allow our consciences to catch up with our technology. It is time for the Members of the United States Congress to open our eyes and our souls, to remember that protecting those who cannot protect themselves is why we are all here.

It is time for all Americans, Mr. Speaker, to open our eyes and our hearts to the humanity of these little, pain-capable unborn children of God and the inhumanity of what is being done to them.

TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the President came to Oregon last week, and he has taken to insults and misstatements of fact in order to get his trade promotion authority bill done, the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

He said, "Number four, critics warn that parts of this deal would undermine American regulation, food safety, worker safety, even financial regulations. They are making this stuff up"—great applause from his audience. "This is not true. No trade agreement is going to force us to change our laws."

Well, the President has sort of a technical point there. He is a lawyer. They can't force us to change our laws. They can just make us pay to have them, and it has happened.

Mexican fishermen were paid by the U.S. Government to not kill dolphins because we had adopted a dolphin-safe label for tuna. We had to pay damages to Mexico because of their foregone profit because we wouldn't let them kill the dolphins.

Mexican trucks wanted to come into the U.S. Well, they don't meet our standards—kind of a problem, Mexican trucks rumbling around the U.S. with drivers that don't meet our standards, but they won a judgment under these same provisions.

Nope, he is right. They couldn't make us change the laws. They just imposed a whole range of punitive tariffs, politically targeted against people like me who had imposed the Mexican trucks, then-Speaker PELOSI, and others; and the U.S. relented.

Now, they didn't make us change our laws. We volunteered to do it after they imposed massive and unfair tariffs on Mexican goods.

But it works both ways. It has been great for America. There is a U.S. mining company that just won a judgment against Nova Scotia. They wanted to put a huge pit mine on the Bay of Fundy, destroy the fisheries' resource for their pit mine. They were denied. They won a judgment against the government of Nova Scotia and Canada.

Now, Nova Scotia and Canada don't have to change their laws. They can pay this country \$300 million of damages because they can't destroy the fishery with their pit mine.

Now, the President is a smart guy, went to Harvard, but I consulted a little bit higher and smarter authority. Last night, I was at a dinner with Joseph Stiglitz, Nobel Prize winning economist. He was on the Obama economic team when NAFTA was adopted.

He said we made a huge mistake. We did not understand that this ISDS was creating a regulatory taking in a special court available only to corporations. We didn't know that, and it opened the door on chapter 11 in NAFTA. He says Obama is opening the door all the way and putting full force behind those provisions in this legislation.

Bottom line, what he said? People will die. People will die because of this provision in the TPP. It is a huge win for the pharmaceutical industry. They get to wipe out the formularies in those countries, both developing and developed countries who are part of the TPP, which lowers drug prices. They will not be allowed under this agreement, and they can go to a secret tribunal to get damages if those countries won't revoke them.

It will wipe out access to generics in developing countries who are part of this agreement. That means AIDS drugs and other things that they can't afford, no longer generic—people will die.

□ 1030

Now, these are people overseas. Maybe we shouldn't care so much. I do.

But others might not; it is all about profits.

But ultimately, it is going to come home because a U.S.-based pharmaceutical company can open a subsidiary in any one of those countries, and it can go to a secret trade tribunal and it can challenge our reduced drug prices for veterans, which the pharmaceutical industry would really love to undo. That is billions of dollars of profits foregone every year because our veterans get the lowest price for drugs. Under this trade agreement, ultimately, that will be challenged, and in all probability, we will lose.

Now, the President is right: we won't have to repeal the law that gets the lowest-priced drugs for our veterans. We will just have to pay the pharmaceutical industry billions of dollars a year to continue to give our vets the drugs at a lower price so we can provide more care for more veterans.

This trade agreement, unfortunately, is what those of us who are critics say it is. It is built upon the faulty foundation of past trade agreements, including Korea.

The special trade representative to the President—also dissembling a little bit—comes to caucuses: "It is unbelievable. We have got 20,000 more cars into Korea last year. This thing is a success."

I said, "Oh, Mr. Ambassador, how many more Korean cars came in last year as a result of the agreement?"

"Oh, I don't have that number."

Well, of course he didn't have the number. Well, he knows the number. It is 461,000.

So we got 20,000 cars into Korea; they got 461,000 more into the U.S. That means a net loss of 441,000 cars. That is a heck of a lot of jobs lost in the auto industry.

This was a great day yesterday when the Senate slowed them down a little bit, and as the American people learn more, we will stop them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President of the United States.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, this week we celebrate National Police Week, when we recognize the service and sacrifice of the brave men and women who have lost their lives in the line of duty while serving to protect us.

National Police Week began in 1962, when President John F. Kennedy signed a proclamation designating May 15 as Peace Officers Memorial Day and the week in which that falls as Police Week.

The memorial service began in 1982 as a gathering in Senate Park of approximately 120 survivors and supporters of law enforcement. Decades later, National Police Week has grown