TOP REASONS TO OPPOSE FAST TRACKING THE TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP

- New investor protections would incentivize **offshoring of American jobs and drive down wages**
- **Exposes American consumers to unsafe food and products**
- **Increases the cost of medicines here and in TPP partner nations**
- **Sneaks in SOPA-like threats to Internet freedom**
- **Empowers corporations to attack our environmental and health safeguards in extrajudicial tribunals**
- **Rolls back Wall Street reforms**
- **Repeats Bush's inadequate environmental terms, as well as Bush labor rules that the GAO found ineffective in a November 2014 report**
- **Includes countries cited for human rights violations, human trafficking and child labor by U.S. State Department and U.S. Department of Labor**
- **Bans Buy American, buy local policies**
- Text of deal kept secret until the negotiations are done and the text is locked
- Doesn't address currency manipulation so the deck is stacked against America, potential new market access erased
- Fast Track benefits apply whether or not president meets congressional objectives, and there is no useable mechanism to take an agreement off of Fast Track

The TPP includes special protections for corporations that offshore American jobs to low-wage countries, such as Vietnam where minimum wages are less than 60 cents an hour. The TPP would expand NAFTA's extraordinary privileges for firms that relocate abroad.

The U.S. trade deficit will balloon, while wages for American workers will be pushed down. The TPP is based on the 2012 U.S.-Korea free trade agreement. Instead of the "more exports, more jobs" we were promised, our goods trade deficit with Korea has ballooned more than 80 percent. According to the trade-jobs ratio the Obama administration used to promise job *gains* from the deal, this trade deficit surge with Korea implies the loss of nearly 85,000 American jobs in its first three years. When the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) conducted a study of the TPP's likely effects, it made the unreasonable assumption that the TPP would eliminate ALL tariffs on all products in all sectors and still the USDA found that the TPP would result in 0.00 % growth. Prominent economists that supported past agreements, like Paul Krugman, have scoffed at the notion the TPP would deliver gains.

Only five of the TPP's 29 chapters focus on traditional trade issues. The TPP would require us to limit food labeling and to import meat, seafood and poultry that do not meet U.S. food safety standards. This is especially dangerous as high levels of contaminants have been found in Vietnam and Malaysia's seafood.

Foreign corporations and investors operating in the U.S. would be granted new powers to attack the laws we rely on for a clean environment, essential services, and healthy communities. Foreign corporations would be empowered to bypass domestic courts and directly "sue" the U.S. government for alleged future profits lost before a tribunal of private lawyers that often rotate between serving as a judge and representing corporate interests. Just under the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and the Central America Free Trade Agreement (CAFTA), more than $400 million has been paid out to corporations over attacks on environmental and health laws. These tribunals have been used under other trade agreements to challenge domestic policies on tobacco, climate, financial regulations, mining, medicine, energy, pollution, drinking water, labor, toxic chemicals and development. The TPP includes countries with many investments here – 9000 new firms could use this system against U.S. policies if the TPP were enacted.

The United States would be required to conform domestic policy on many non-trade issues to the TPP terms. Failure to do so would subject the United States to trade sanctions until laws were brought into conformity with TPP terms. Such action could be instigated by other TPP signatory nations in addition to the rights foreign investors would be granted to privately enforce their new investor rights.

Big banks would get a backdoor means of watering down policies to re-regulate Wall Street. TPP rules, written under the advisement of banks before the financial crisis, would require domestic law to conform to the now-rejected model of deregulation that led to financial ruin, bank bailouts, foreclosed homes and lost jobs.

Large pharmaceutical firms would get new rights and powers to increase medicine prices and limit consumers' access to cheaper generic drugs. This would include extensions of monopoly drug patents that would allow drug companies to raise prices for more medicines and extended periods of exclusivity for cutting edge “biologic’ drugs used to treat cancer. Even Medicare and Medicaid reimbursement formulary decisions could be challenged. For people in developing countries involved in the TPP, these rules could be deadly – denying consumers’ access to HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis and cancer drugs.

The U.S. Trade Representative is pursuing a TPP agreement that will require signatory counties to adopt heightened copyright protection that advances the agenda of the U.S. entertainment industry agendas, but omits the flexibilities and exceptions that protect Internet users and technology innovators.

The United States would agree to waive the federal government's "Buy American" procurement policies for all firms operating in TPP countries, offshoring our tax dollars to create jobs abroad. “Buy American” is supported by 4 out of 5 voters – Democrats, Republicans and independents alike.

There’s never been such diverse opposition to Fast Tracking a “trade” deal before with more than 2000 U.S. groups (including environmental, union, small business, consumer, faith, family farm, civil rights, seniors and LGBT groups), most Democrats in the U.S. House of Representatives and a bloc of GOP members opposed.

Additional information on the Trans-Pacific Partnership can be found at www.citizen.org/TPP and www.citizen.org/trade.