



## Rep. Tom Emmer on House Committee Hearing

Broadcast: March 04, 2015 • Duration: 4:35

---

**\*\*REP. TOM EMMER:**

\*\* Mr. Barfield, if you don't mind, and I appreciate it, maybe you can filter it in some of the others. I have just a couple of minutes left, and I thank the Chair for letting me ask a couple of questions. I am from the State of Minnesota, and in 2013, Minnesota goods exported were \$20.8 billion. Nationally and this is not just Minnesota, jobs supported by exports reached more than \$11 million in 2013, and every billion dollars of United States exports of goods supported an estimated 5,400 jobs in that same year. By the way, jobs supported by exports, goods that were exported, paid an estimated 13 to 18 percent above the national average. It is important to my State because 47 percent of Minnesota's exports, again, in that year, almost \$10 billion went to countries that are currently part of this negotiation. Mr. Barfield, very quickly, I want to cover a couple of areas if I have time. First, I hear a lot of people, and I see some T-shirts here about fast track authority. Under the Constitution, it is my understanding, Article I, Section 8, that Congress has the sole authority to enter into agreements with foreign nations, whether they be treaties or trade agreements, and that the executive has only authority to negotiate. Is my understanding correct?

**\*\*MR. BARFIELD:**

\*\* Yes.

**\*\*REP. GOWDY:**

\*\* Now, the idea that this is going to be sight unseen, and I am going to move to Ms. Overberry, there was a statement made, I think by Ms. Drake, that Congress, if it passes trade promotion authority, which is nothing more than legislation that tells the executive branch, this is what the expectations are, this is what we can do, what we can't do, this is what we will accept, what we won't, this is what Congress is doing to exercise its constitutional authority over trade. The testimony was made that this will somehow come to Congress sight unseen. In fact, the TPA legislation that would be part of this, if this is going to go forward, would require that you have full transparency. Isn't that right, Ms. Overberry? And could you please explain what that would mean?

**\*\*MS. OVERBERRY:**

\*\* Thank you. Yes, you are absolutely correct. I also find it somewhat ironic that critics of the TPP negotiations and specific chapters or provisions always criticize the lack of transparency in the negotiations. But in the very next breath, they say it is a bad agreement. If it is not transparent, I am not sure how one knows whether it is good or bad. Also, calls to make confidential negotiating text public are, in my view, misguided. Disclosure of negotiating text would risk giving foreign governments a road map to U.S. sensitivities and red lines that could be used to our disadvantage. I was actually in Korea working for the American Chamber of Commerce in Korea when the U.S. and Korea were negotiating the KORUS FTA. And an opponent of the KORUS FTA from the Korean National Assembly leaked some text. And I saw firsthand that it provided our negotiators a clear picture of their strategy. And, frankly, it helped us. We got a better deal from our perspective because of that.



**\*\*MR. MCHENRY:**

\*\* Quickly, can you address the other claim that this is somehow going to affect jobs in this country? Because my understanding is the tariffs, in other words, the barriers to products coming into our country, are among the lowest in the world. And, actually, we want to make sure that our labor, our greatest workers on the face of the planet, are able to produce and sell their products fairly in markets outside of our country.

**\*\*MS. SCHAPIRO:**

\*\* You are exactly right. The U.S. already has one of the lowest tariffs in the world, and most of Asia has very high. In fact, in Southeast Asia, five times the tariff level to Americans. So our market is already open. If we do nothing, what that means is they keep selling to the U.S. and we can't sell to them.

**\*\*MR. MCHENRY:**

\*\* Would that affect the trade deficit?

**\*\*MS. SCHAPIRO:**

\*\* In a very negative way, exactly. And your point about jobs, you are absolutely right. It will have an impact. This agreement is a job creating agreement because it is going to allow us to sell more. And when we sell more, we have to hire more people to do it. Thank you.

**\*\*MR. MCHENRY:**

\*\* Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**\*\*MS. GABBARD:**

\*\*

---

This transcript was independently produced by MN-06 Watch for accountability and archival purposes.

Source: (March 04, 2015)

Archived: February 06, 2026

Source URL: <https://youtu.be/kpD4bPVZr-4>

For questions or corrections: [mn06watch@gmail.com](mailto:mn06watch@gmail.com)