

the Midwest. That is why cities such as Youngstown, Toledo, Dayton, Cincinnati, Cleveland—cities that may not have been the Nation's largest, especially when you look at Dayton, Youngstown, and Toledo, but cities that were prosperous—created great products, created great wealth, and made huge contributions to start these cultural centers.

Ohio is one of the leading States in the Nation as far as locations of good art museums in pretty much all of our major cities. Art museums were status symbols. In many ways, they were the sports arenas of the early 20th century.

It was in this climate that the Cleveland Museum of Art was established 99 years ago, opening in June 1916. We mark, last year and the next couple of years, the 100th anniversary of the Cleveland City Club and the 100th anniversary of the Cleveland Orchestra also. So much happened in that decade in Cleveland, OH, and cities like it across the country.

The original marble neoclassic building was an instant icon, a signal to the world that Cleveland would take its place as a world-class city and a center for the arts. And 100 years later, the Cleveland Museum of Art is thriving. It has a permanent collection that is world-renowned and possesses a deep commitment to the local community.

Under the leadership of Director William Griswold and Steven Kestner, chair of the board of trustees, the museum is expanding in every direction, working to engage the community and using new technology to educate visitors. I had the privilege of visiting the art museum just in the last week or so, talking with Dr. Griswold, and looking at the new Africa exhibit that is on tour that has been collected for Cleveland, and I got a chance to see a good bit of this beautiful museum. I have been many times. Each time I go, I come away with an even greater appreciation for the institution, the art, the curators, the collectors, and the people who work there. Dr. Griswold shared with me that day he was appointed as director, he was with some European friends who told him the Cleveland Museum of Art was their favorite art museum in the entire world.

The museum recently completed a \$350 million expansion and renovation that will better integrate the museum with the surrounding community. It has transformed the museum's spaces and has prepared this institution to inspire and educate Ohioans for the next 100 years. It beckons young people and students—many low-income students in the immediate area, within a few square miles around the museum—to come visit and learn about our cultural heritage and look to the future.

When I met with Dr. Griswold—let me back up for a moment. This capital improvement was the largest capital improvement of any museum in Ohio history and supported some 1,100 local jobs. The project injected more than \$360 million directly into our State's

economy. The impact will be felt for years to come.

As it approaches its centennial celebration next year, the Cleveland Museum of Art will continue to attract visitors from Cuyahoga County, from northeast Ohio, and from around the world. In 2013, 600,000 people visited that museum. More than one-third of them were from outside of Ohio. More than half a million visitors were responsible for \$80 million in consumer spending in the city.

The museum's first director, Frederick Allen Whiting, believed the museum should serve not as an ivory tower but as an educational institution engaged in the community. He wanted to bring art to people, not just people into the museum.

The museum established its first education department. In 1919, they held the first annual exhibition of Cleveland artists and craftsmen. It became known as the May Show and showcased local artists for the next 73 years. Dr. Griswold continues that tradition of community engagement.

When I met with him, he told me that leaders of cultural institutions have a responsibility to participate in my city's transformation. He is committed and the museum's staff is committed to making our city a better place. They have elevated the museum's education and interpretation department and are committed to the value of interpretive excellence. Education in the museum is aimed at a general audience, not just art buffs and historians.

Parenthetically, my sister-in-law teaches in the art history department at Case Western Reserve University. Catherine talks to me about how integrated Case is in the art history department with that museum. It is a classroom for students. It is a classroom for the whole community beyond Case.

Studies show that a high concentration of the arts in communities leads to higher civic engagement. Students who take art classes, play musical instruments, take dance lessons generally do better in school.

Dr. Griswold and his team are in the forefront of the use of technology to educate and to connect visitors with the museum's collections. The Cleveland Art Museum is also home to the country's largest multitouch screen, a collection wall. This huge, interactive wall stands at 40 square feet and features more than 4,100 works of art from the museum's collection.

To get a feel for the reach and the breadth of a museum of this stature in one of our Nation's great cities, the museum has 20 curators on staff. It recruits for these positions around the world.

In Cleveland, we have the Cleveland Institute of Art, and we have great universities. However, when it comes time to look for a new curator, the Cleveland Art Museum looks worldwide.

The museum's collection includes 45,000 objects and spans nearly 6,000

years of history. This February, the museum's "Senufo: Art and Identity in West Africa" special exhibit opened after 5 years of work by curators. It features 170 objects from more than 60 collections around the world.

We know that strong communities require strong cultural institutions. From the Cleveland Institute of Music, to the Fine Arts Garden, to the Botanical Garden, to the Cleveland Museum of Art, Cleveland continues to cultivate the vibrant arts community that enriches our city and enriches our State.

Thanks to the art museum, the Cleveland Museum of Art, and Dr. Griswold, who is relatively still new on the job, for their contributions to our community.

TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY AND THE TRANS-PACIFIC PART- NERSHIP

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, let me start with a story. More than 15 years ago, a friend and I—I met with friends, and I flew to South Texas at my own expense. I wanted to see how the North American Free Trade Agreement was working.

During my first year in Congress 20-plus years ago, in the House of Representatives, I helped to lead the opposition to the North American Free Trade Agreement. I stood up to a President of my own party, President Clinton, who I think was wrong on the North American Free Trade Agreement. Since then, I disagreed with President Bush—a President not of my party—on his trade policy.

I wanted to see, 4, 5 years after NAFTA was implemented, what it looked like, what went on along the U.S.-Mexican border. As I said, at my own expense I rented a car with a couple friends and went to Mexico. Here is what I found. I walked into a neighborhood where thousands of workers lived, workers who were working in formerly U.S. plants that, because of NAFTA, had crossed the river and were relocated in Mexico in some areas called maquiladoras. These were American plants that relocated to Mexico, producing with very low-income workers, no environmental labor standards, and selling those products back into the United States. It is a 20th-century, 21st-century way of doing business for far too many companies. Unknown in human history, to my knowledge, have so many companies, as they have in the United States, incorporated their business plans where they shut down production in Sandusky or Mansfield, OH, and move production to Wuhan or Shiyan, China, and sell those products back into the United States.

I wanted to see what it looked like. I walked through this neighborhood where thousands of workers lived in very abject, poor conditions. These were workers working for in most cases American companies south of the border in Mexico, for very low wages.

I walked through these neighborhoods. I saw people living in shacks. These shacks were often made of packing materials, maybe wooden crates from products that had been shipped in for assembly at these plants, cardboard boxes often with the names of the companies on them. They were living in conditions like that.

I walked through the neighborhood, and I saw kind of meandering through the neighborhood these ditches filled with industrial and human waste. Who knows what was in those ditches. Children were playing nearby, walking across and jumping across the ditches, sometimes playing far too close to these ditches filled with toxic waste. The American Medical Association in those days called that area in Mexico across from the United States, across from the Rio Grande River, the most toxic place in North America.

Then I went to an auto plant. Nearby was an auto plant. It was a new auto plant. It looked a lot like a U.S. auto plant. It was new and modern. In fact, it was newer than many auto plants in the United States. The workers were working hard. The machines were new. The workers were productive. The floors were clean. There was one difference between a U.S. auto plant—a plant in Avon Lake or Lorain, OH—there was one difference between a U.S. auto plant and a Mexican auto plant. Do you know what the difference was? The difference was the Mexican auto plant had no parking lot because the workers in Mexico weren't paid enough to buy the cars they make.

Go halfway around the world. Go to China and go to an Apple plant—actually, it is a Foxconn plant. Apple has hired a Chinese contractor. Go to an Apple plant in China. The workers don't make enough in those plants to buy the iPhone they make.

Go to Bangladesh and go to a designer clothing factory, an apparel factory, and the workers don't make enough to buy the apparel they make.

Go back to this side of the globe and go to Colombia and go to a farm where they are growing cut flowers. The workers don't make enough to buy flowers for their girlfriends and wives for Valentine's Day. They don't make enough to buy the cut flowers they are growing for Americans.

That is what has happened around the world with these trade agreements. You see the same things—a race to the bottom. Almost anywhere the United States passes trade agreements, we see workers overseas making products they cannot afford for themselves. These trade agreements would be different if workers were paid enough that they began to make products made in Dayton, OH, or Gallipolis, OH, or Troy, OH. Instead, these workers cannot afford to buy the products they are making.

That is what our trade deals force American workers to compete with—jobs that pay pennies an hour. They lead to a downward wage spiral across

the globe. Why do most people sitting in this gallery, why do most people in this country, unless they are in the top 5 or 10 percent, why have they not gotten a raise in the last 10 years? The middle class in this country has not seen their incomes go up even though the wealthy get wealthier, even though companies are more profitable, even though executives pay themselves higher bonuses. The middle-class wages have been stagnant, partly because of these trade agreements and partly because my friends on the other side of the aisle won't let us fix the Tax Code, where if you shut down production in Lima or in Ravenna, OH, and move it to Wuhan or Shiyan, China, and sell it back into the United States, you get a tax break. American companies get a tax break for shutting down production in this country and moving it overseas and partly because of trade policy.

The reason people don't get raises in this country—a big reason—is because of a trade policy and a tax policy that far too many politicians in this body have allowed to happen. That is why we can't afford another agreement like the Trans-Pacific Partnership. We can't allow a fast track of the Trans-Pacific Partnership. The last thing we need is another NAFTA, another Northern American Freed Trade Agreement. We do not need a deal negotiated in secret and rushed—hence the term “fast track”—rushed with no amendments, with no real oversight, with no access even to reading the text.

It would intrigue people if they knew that it is harder for a Senator or a Senator's staff to get the opportunity to read the Trans-Pacific Partnership—this newly negotiated trade deal—it is harder for us to get access to read that than it is to read about the Iran sanctions or to read a CIA report or to read a classified document from the Department of Defense. It is actually harder to get access to the Trans-Pacific Partnership, to this trade agreement, to study it, than it is to national defense, national security concerns. What are they trying to hide? Why would that be?

I have spent much of the last couple of weeks talking with workers and businesses around Ohio. I met with workers like Darryl Parker, a former worker at R.G. Steel's Warren, OH, plant and former president of the Steelworkers Local 1375. The plant has a proud history dating back to 1912. Close to 3 years ago, it was the fourth largest flat-rolled steel maker in America. It didn't close because of poor performance. These are some of the most productive workers in the world. There is one reason 1,300 workers like Darryl lost their jobs: unfair trade.

I met with Vinny Gaietto in Toledo, a former American Standard worker—actually, in Tiffin. I met him in Toledo. Vinny lost his job in 2007 when the plant closed down and moved to Mexico.

We cannot allow this to continue. We have no business passing fast track to

fast track jobs out of this country, to fast track weaker environmental rules and worker safety rules.

Trade policy should ensure a level playing field for all companies competing in a global economy. Instead, our trade policy is unfair to small businesses, to workers, and to those communities where plants shut down one after another. The communities then have to lay off teachers, firefighters, police officers, and municipal garbage collection workers because their tax base has shrunk because their jobs have gone overseas.

Although worker productivity is higher, they face stagnating wages, increased middle-class insecurity, and rising inequality at home. Yet corporate profits are up and CEO pay has reached record levels. Fundamentally the workers are not sharing in the wealth they have created for their employers.

The reason our economy worked so well after World War II is because productivity went up, profits went up, wages went up, but since the assault on organized labor and trade unions and the decline of unionization in this country, productivity continues to go up, profits continue to go up, and executives' compensation and bonuses continue to skyrocket, yet wages have stayed flat and most Americans have not had a wage increase.

Last year Wall Street bonuses—just the bonuses on Wall Street—were double what all minimum-wage workers earned in the country combined. I will say that again. Wall Street bonuses—mostly their Christmas bonuses, or whenever they are given—were double what all the minimum-wage workers in the country made combined.

We need to invest in supporting workers with a living wage, paid sick and family leave, and equal pay for equal work. We need to invest in infrastructure. When the State government is cut, we know what happens—particularly in my State. When the State government is cut, it cuts support for local communities. We know what happens to our highways, our streets, and our bridges.

We fundamentally know that trade, done right, creates prosperity. I want trade, and I want more of it. I think Ohioans want trade, but we want trade that builds an on-ramp to the middle class here at home and lifts workers from poverty in America and around the world. We do not want another NAFTA.

Earlier this month, I visited the Ford plant near Cleveland in Brook Park, OH. Ford brought its manufacturing of EcoBoost engines back from Valencia, Spain. They invested \$200 million and brought 450 new jobs to Cleveland. Some companies, such as Ford, are beginning to reshore manufacturing jobs because they know our workers are skilled and efficient. But auto companies need protections from foreign governments' unfair trade practices.

While I disagree with President Obama on the trade promotion authority fast track and on the Trans-Pacific partnership agreement, I give him credit for being more aggressive than President Bush or President Clinton on enforcing trade rules and trade laws. It makes a difference in helping to create jobs.

Trade agreements must include provisions protecting our workers and our companies from foreign governments that artificially manipulate their currency. For example, Japan has a history of shutting out American auto companies and manipulating their currency to benefit their own manufacturers. That policy has worked for Japan, but it has not worked for us. In 2013, for every 1 car the United States sold to Japan, we imported 99 cars from Japan. That doesn't sound like a level playing field, where cars that were made by American workers get an opportunity to sell in Japan. It is not much different with Korea. Too much is at stake. Our capacity to outcompete and outinnovate our competitors depends on our capacity to outmanufacture them. That means we need trade policies that will create opportunities for workers and small businesses so they can earn a living wage and join the middle class.

I urge my colleagues to demand increased transparency in this process. I urge everyone to say no to a deal that shortchanges our workers and companies and does not ensure a level playing field.

We cannot allow another trade deal—we had NAFTA, PNTR with China, CAFTA, South Korea, and Colombia, one after another—that sells out our workers and ships jobs overseas. It is time for a very different trade policy.

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

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

THE JIM OBERGEFELL STORY

Mr. BOOKER. Madam President, I rise with some excitement as I get to tell a story that is an American story. This story is, in fact, a love story.

The first time Jim Obergefell met the love of his life, John Arthur, neither of them were swept off their feet. As is the case with a lot of couples, they met at a bar through mutual friends. They met then a second time, but the sparks didn't really fly then either. It wasn't until a few months later that they met for the third time at a New Year's Eve party. This time, they fell in love. Jim and John like to joke that theirs was a story of love at third sight.

Following the New Year's Eve party, John and Jim began building their

lives together in Cincinnati, OH. The next 20 years they spent doing so many of the things that connected couples do. They said "I love you" for the first time. They had their first fight. Their bond grew and grew, and this incredible couple moved in together, buying their first home, selling that home, buying another home, and working together, building lives together. They moved from job to job, but they stayed together. Traveling, making friends, becoming involved with their community, they built a life of love together.

Jim and John's love story is a familiar one. They crossed familiar relationship milestones and faced so many of the same probing questions many couples often get: Why aren't you married? Have you thought about getting married? Hey, what about marriage?

Well, of course, they had thought about marriage. Their bond was that strong; they were so deeply in love and committed. But their response, unfortunately, was that they had thought of it, but they wanted it to actually mean something legally. They wanted it to be right and just. They wanted their marriage to be affirmed before all, and for it to have meaning under the law. They wanted it to be recognized just as it was for other American citizens. They wanted that ideal that exists deep in our country's heritage, flowing through all of our roots, that they together as a couple could have a life, could have liberty, and could pursue their happiness.

However, for them at that time, equality and freedom for all in our country was an ideal that was seemingly far off. But I will tell my colleagues this: What I love about America is that we cannot slow down the dream of freedom and equality. It marches forward. Look at history and we see all of the attempts to stop these fundamental ideals of freedom and equality under the law. People and tyrants, with brutality, try to chain our freedom, try to beat it back. They try to assassinate its advocates, but just as the Statue of Freedom sits on the Capitol dome, freedom rises, and it will come.

Jim and John watched the progress march in our country as so many of us did with encouragement. Painfully slowly but steadily it marched forward. As they watched and waited, they went on living their lives of love together. For almost 20 years, their union, their bond as committed people with unconditional love continued.

Unfortunately, though, John began having problems walking. After months of tests, doctors' appointments, prodding and probing, John was diagnosed with ALS. The typical prognosis for a patient with ALS is 2½ to 5 years. Jim became John's primary caregiver. He leapt up. He had unconditional love. There were trying times, but he said he considered it a privilege to care for his life's love.

Two years after John's diagnosis in 2013, when he was receiving hospice

care and was confined to a hospital bed in their Cincinnati home, the Supreme Court ruled in favor of Edith Windsor, declaring that the Defense of Marriage Act was unconstitutional. That decision set the stage for an even greater national movement toward marriage equality. It set the stage—after years of struggle and fights and sacrifice for equal rights—for equality under the law, for love to be affirmed in marriage between two Americans, to be affirmed and equally recognized, not condemned, not banned, not made illegal. So on a warm day in June, after 20 years of love, commitment, and building a life together, it was at this moment that Jim leaned over to John, sitting there in his hospital bed, kissed him, and proposed: "Let's get married."

Because Ohio has yet to recognize marriage equality, and with John confined to his bed, this was going to be challenging. Their options were limited. Transporting John to a State that would recognize their marriage would require a special medically equipped airplane, and it would require a lot of money they did not have. Jim asked for ideas on Facebook, and people came forward. Unprompted, Jim and John's friends raised \$13,000 to cover the entire cost of a specially chartered medical plane.

A few weeks later, Jim, John, and John's Aunt Paulette, who became ordained to perform the service, boarded a plane in Ohio that took off and landed nearby in Maryland. In this State, they recognize marriage equality. In this State, they recognized the love of two American citizens. And for 7½ minutes, on the tarmac at Baltimore-Washington International Airport, John and Jim, two Americans, had their wedding.

Sitting on the tarmac, Jim, holding the hands of his partner of 20 years—whose hands lacked dexterity and strength—said this to John:

We met for the first time, my life didn't change, your life didn't change. We met a second time, still nothing changed. Then we met a third time, and everything changed. As you recently said, it was love at third sight, and for the past twenty years, six months and eleven days, it's been love at every sight.

In a cramped medical airplane, John's aunt began the formal vows. She started to say, "Take each other's hands," but then realized they had never let go of each other's hands.

They exchanged their rings, Jim helping John place the ring on his own finger, and after the ceremony they left that Maryland tarmac to fly back. Jim and John arrived home to the realities of a disease like ALS. John was dying. And while they had taken their eternal vows together, while their marriage was affirmed by love, affirmed by this unbreakable commitment, affirmed by loving family and by friends, affirmed to be legal by the State of Maryland, their marriage was disavowed by their home State—the State John would eventually die in.