and it includes a number of important updates, such as provisions to strengthen the transparency of the negotiating process and ensure that the American people stay informed.

It also contains provisions that I pushed for to require negotiators to ensure that trade agreements promote digital trade as well as trade in physical goods and services. Given the increasing importance of digitally enabled commerce in the 21st-century economy, it is essential that our trade agreements include new rules that keep digital trade free from unnecessary government interference.

This trade promotion authority bill will help ensure that any trade deals the United States enters into will be favorable to American farmers, ranchers, and manufacturers, and it will hold other countries accountable for their unfair practices. Passing this bill is essential to prevent American workers and businesses from being left behind in the global economy.

Since Republicans took control of the Senate in January, Democrats and Republicans have come together on a number of issues to pass legislation to address challenges that are facing our country. I hope this bill will be our next bipartisan achievement.

The President has made it clear that he supports this bill, and key Democratic Senators are working to make sure it passes. I hope the rest of the Democratic Party here in the Senate will come together with the President and Republicans to get this done.

As President Obama said the other day, ''We have to make sure that America writes the rules of the global economy. . . . Because if we don't write the rules for trade around the world—guess what—China will. And they'll write those rules in a way that gives Chinese workers and Chinese businesses the upper hand, and locks American-made goods out.'' Again, that is a quote from President Obama.

To put it another way, if America fails to lead on trade, other nations will step in to fill the void, and those nations will not have the best interests of American workers and American families in mind.

It is time to pass trade promotion authority so we can secure favorable new trade deals and ensure that American goods and services can compete on a level playing field around the globe and that American workers and American consumers receive the benefits that come along with that. I hope that will be the outcome of the vote today, and I hope it will be a major achievement for this Senate—a bipartisan achievement where both sides work together for the good of our economy, for the good of jobs, for the good of higher wage levels for American workers, and for the good of a more competitive economy in which our consumers benefit.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

TRADE

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, at 2:30 this afternoon, the Senate will vote on a motion to proceed to the fast-track bill which was recently approved by the Finance Committee. I will be strongly opposing that legislation.

In a nutshell, here is the reality of the American economy today: While we are certainly better off than we were 6½ years ago, the truth is that for the last 40 years the American middle class has been disappearing. The truth is that today we have some 45 million Americans living in poverty, and that is almost at the highest rate in the modern history of America.

While the middle class continues to shrink, we are seeing more income and wealth inequality than at any time in our country since 1929, and it is worse in America than any other major country on Earth. Today, 99 percent of all new income is going to the top 1 percent. Today, the top one-tenth of 1 percent owns almost as much wealth as the bottom 90 percent. In the last 2 years, the 14 wealthiest people in this country have seen an increase in their wealth of $157 billion, and that $157 billion is more wealth than is owned by the bottom 130 million Americans.

How is that happening? Why is it happening? We have seen a huge increase in technology, productivity is way up, and the reality is that most working people should be seeing an increase in their income. Yet, median family income has gone down by almost $5,000 since 1999. How does that happen? Why is it that the richest country in the history of the world has almost all of its new wealth in the hands of the few, while the vast majority of the American people are working longer hours for lower wages? How does that happen? Well, there are a lot of factors, but I will tell everyone that our disastrous trade agreements, such as NAFTA, CAFTA, and permanent normal trade relations with China, are certainly one of the major reasons why the middle class is in decline and why more and more income and wealth goes to a handful of people on the top.

The sad truth is that many of the new jobs created in this country today are part-time and low-paying jobs. Thirty or forty years ago, people who maybe had a high school degree could go out and get a job in a factory. They never got rich and it wasn't a glamorous job, but they had enough wages and benefits to make it into the middle class.

Since 2001, we have lost almost 60,000 factories in America. When young people graduate from high school today, they don't have the opportunity to work in a factory and have a union job and make middle-class wages; their options are Walmart and McDonald's, where there are low wages and minimal benefits. Those are companies which are vehemently anti-union.

The sad truth is that we are in a race to the bottom. Not only have our trade agreements cost us millions of decent-paying jobs, they have depressed wages in this country because companies—virtually every major multinational corporation in this country has outsourced jobs and shed millions of American jobs. What they say to workers is: If you don't like the cuts in health care and wages, we will go to China. We can hire people there for $1 an hour.

Sadly, the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement follows in the footsteps of the other disastrous free-trade agreements that have forced American workers to compete against desperate and low-wage workers around the world.

Over and over again—and I have heard this so many times, including on the floor this morning—supporters of fast-track have told us that unfettered free trade will increase American jobs and wages and will be just wonderful for the American economy. Sadly, however, these folks have been proven wrong and wrong and wrong time after time after time. I hear the same language, and what they say proves not to be true every time.

I will mention some quotes from the supporters of NAFTA. These are people who were telling us how great the NAFTA free-trade agreement would be.

President Bill Clinton was pushing NAFTA in the same way that President Obama is pushing TPP today. On September 19, 1993, President Clinton said:

> I believe NAFTA will create 200,000 American jobs in the first two years of its effect. . . . I believe that NAFTA will create a million jobs in the first five years of its impact.

It wasn't just liberals, such as Bill Clinton, who supported NAFTA. I have a quote from the very conservative Heritage Foundation in 1993: ''Virtually all economists agree that NAFTA will produce a net increase of U.S. jobs over the next decade.''

In 1993, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, our majority leader MITCH MCCONNELL, said: ''American firms will not move to Mexico just for lower wages.''

Were President Clinton, the Heritage Foundation, and MITCH MCCONNELL correct? Well, of course they were not. In fact, what happened was exactly the opposite of what they said.

According to the well-respected economists at the Economic Policy Institute, NAFTA has led to the loss of more than 680,000 jobs. In 1993, the year before NAFTA was implemented, the United States had a trade surplus with Mexico of more than $1.6 billion. Last year, the trade deficit with Mexico was $53 billion. So all of the verbiage we heard about NAFTA being so good for American workers turned out to be dead wrong.

What about China? We were told: Oh my God, China will open up the Chinese market, and there are billions of people. What an opportunity to create good-paying jobs in America.

Here is what President Clinton, one of the proponents of permanent normal trade relations with China, had to say in 1999:

In opening the economy of China, the agreement will create unprecedented opportunities for American farmers, workers and companies to compete successfully in China's market . . . This is a hundred-to-nothing deal for America when it comes to the economic consequences.

In 1999, conservative economists at the Cato Institute said:

The silliest argument against PNTR is that Chinese imports would overwhelm U.S. industry. In fact, American workers are far more productive than their Chinese counterparts . . . PNTR would create far more export opportunities for America than the Chinese.

Wow, were they wrong.

The Economic Policy Institute has estimated that PNTR with China has led to the net loss of over 2.7 million Americans jobs.

Go to any department store in America and walk in the door. Where are the products made? China, China, China. They are made in Vietnam and in other low-wage countries. In fact, it is harder and harder to buy a product not made in China.

So all of those people who told us what a great deal PNTR with China would be turned out to be dead wrong. In fact, our trade agreement with China has cost us almost 3 million jobs.

In 2001, the trade deficit with China was $83 billion. Today, it is $342 billion. In 2011, on another trade agreement, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce—a big proponent of unfettered free trade—strongly supported TPP. The Chamber of Commerce told us we had to pass a free-trade agreement with South Korea because it would create some 280,000 jobs in America. That is a lot of jobs. It turns out they were wrong again. In reality, the Economic Policy Institute recently found that the Korea Free Trade Agreement has led to the loss of some 75,000 jobs.

Now, the Obama administration says, trust us. Forget what they said about NAFTA. Forget what they said about Korea. Forget what they said about China. This one is different. Really, really, cross our fingers, hope to die, this one is really, really different. Yes, it may be true that every corporation in America—corporations that have shut down factories in this country and moved to China—they are supporting this agreement. Yes, it is true Wall Street, whose greed and recklessness have almost destroyed the American economy, is supporting this agreement. Yes, it is true the pharmaceutical industry, which charges us the highest prices in the world for prescription drugs, is supporting this agreement—but not to worry, we should trust these guys. They really are thinking of the American middle class and working families. Trust us when they tell us a trade agreement will be good for working people. Yes, we should really trust them. Meanwhile, every trade union in America and the vast majority of environmental groups in this country are saying be careful about TPP; vote no on fast-track.

Here is the reality of the American economy. Since 2001, we have lost 60,000 factories in this country and we have lost over 4.7 million manufacturing jobs. In 1970, 25 percent of all the jobs in this country were in manufacturing. Today, that figure is down to 9 percent.

The point is that, by and large, especially if there were unions, those manufacturing jobs paid working people a living wage, not a Walmart wage, not a McDonald's wage.

Our demand must be to corporate America—which tells us every night on TV to buy this product, to buy this pair of sneakers, to buy this television, to buy whatever it is—that maybe, just maybe, they might want to start manufacturing those products here in the United States of America and pay our workers a decent wage, rather than looking all over the world for the lowest possible wages in which they can exploit workers who are desperate.

I was very disappointed that President Obama chose the headquarters of Nike to tout the so-called benefits of the TPP. Nike epitomizes why disastrous, unfettered free-trade policies during the past four decades have failed American workers. Nike does not employ a single manufacturing worker who makes shoes in the United States of America—not one worker. One hundred percent of the shoes sold by Nike are made overseas in low-wage countries. That is the transformation of the American economy, and it is not just Nike.

When Nike was founded in 1964, just 4 percent of U.S. footwear was imported. In other words, we manufactured the vast majority of the shoes and the sneakers we wore. Today, nearly all of the shoes that are bought in the United States are manufactured overseas. Today, over 330,000 workers manufacture Nike's products in Vietnam, where the minimum wage is 56 cents an hour.

I hear President Obama and other proponents of TPP talking about a level playing field. We have to compete on a level playing field. Does anybody think competing against desperate people who make 56 cents an hour is a level playing field, is fair to American workers? Of course, we want the poor people all over the world to see an increase in their standard of living, and we have to play an important role in that, but we don't have to destroy the American middle class to help low-income workers around the world.

In Vietnam, not only is the minimum wage 56 cents an hour, independent labor unions are banned, and people are thrown in jail for expressing their political beliefs. Is that the level playing field President Obama and other proponents of unfettered free trade are talking about?

Back in 1988, Phil Knight—Phil Knight is the founder and the owner of Nike—said Nike had ''become synonymous with slave wages, forced overtime, and arbitrary abuse.'' Phil Knight was right. In fact, factories in Vietnam where Nike shoes are manufactured have been cited by the Worker Rights Consortium for excessive overtime, wage theft, and physical mistreatment of workers. Today, Mr. Knight is one of the wealthiest people on this planet, worth more than $22 billion. While Mr. Knight's net worth has more than tripled since 1999, the average Vietnamese worker who makes Nike shoes earns pennies an hour. That is pretty much synonymous with what unfettered free trade is about. A handful of people such as Phil Knight become multi-multi-multibillionaires and poor people all over the world are exploited and paid pennies an hour.

It is not just Nike and it is not just Vietnam. Another country that is part of the Trans-Pacific Partnership is Malaysia. Today, there are nearly 200 electronics factories in Malaysia where high-tech products from Apple, Dell, Intel, Motorola, and Texas Instruments are manufactured and brought back to the United States. If the TPP is approved, that number will go up substantially. What is wrong with that? It turns out that many of the workers at the electronics plants in Malaysia are being forced to work there under horrible working conditions. According to Verite, which conducted a 2-year investigation into labor abuses in Malaysia—an investigation which was commissioned by the U.S. Department of Labor—32 percent of the industry's nearly 200,000 migrant workers in Malaysia were employed in forced situations because their passports had been taken away or because they were straining to pay back illegally high recruitment fees. In other words, American workers are going to be forced to compete against people in Malaysia—immigrant workers there whose passports have been taken away and who can't leave the country and who are working under forced labor situations.

So let me conclude by saying this: All of us understand trade is good. It is a good thing. But I think most of us now have caught on to the fact that the trade agreements pushed by corporate America, pushed by Wall Street, pushed by the pharmaceutical industry are very, very good if you are the CEO of a major corporation, but they are a disaster if you are an American worker.

It is my view that we have to rebuild manufacturing in America. It is my view that we have to create millions of decent-paying jobs in America. It is my view that we need to fundamentally rewrite our trade agreements so our largest export does not become decent-paying American jobs.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on the fast-track agreement. Let us sit down and work on trade agreements that work for the American middle class, that work for our working people and not just for the CEOs of the largest corporations in this country.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:39 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 2:30 p.m. will be equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. GARDNER. Thank you, Mr. President.

In just a few minutes, we will be holding a vote on whether to invoke cloture to cut off debate and move to the trade promotion authority bill, granting trade promotion authority to the President—a very important conversation this country needs to have in terms of what we are going to do to expand our opportunities in a region of the world that represents 50 percent of the population of this world and that represents 40 percent of our trade opportunities. It is a great opportunity for this Congress, this Senate, to show how serious we are about truly rebalancing our efforts with Asian nations.

In Colorado alone, we exported nearly $8.4 billion in goods in 2014. In Colorado, 48 percent of all goods were exported in 2014.

Over 260,000 jobs are derived from trade with nations represented by the Trans-Pacific Partnership negotiating group. The TPP represents an opportunity for Colorado to create nearly 4,000 new jobs, and that is just a start.

So today's conversation is not just a vote on whether we will have more delay on an important bill; this is about something that represents far greater opportunity than that. The fact is, over the past several years we have focused our time on the Middle East, and rightfully so, but as our day-to-day attention gets grabbed by the Middle East, our long-term interests lie in Asia and the Trans-Pacific Partnership region.

So I hope today that Members will put aside tendencies to decide they want to play politics with the trade promotion authority and instead, indeed, pursue policies that will give us a chance to grow our economy, to make more products representative with the symbol and the label ''Made in America.'' That is the chance we have today—to give our workers a competitive advantage, to create an opportunity for increased trade in an area of the world where we face increasing competition and regional threats, to show that the United States will indeed be a part of a region in the world that represents so much opportunity.

As we have seen increases in Colorado and beyond in trade and trade opportunities, this bill represents a chance for us to continue improving our ability to grow Colorado's economy and Colorado trade.

So to our colleagues across the Senate, I indeed hope that we will invoke cloture today, that we will move forward on debate, and that we will have an opportunity to continue our work to support trade and to move toward passage of the final TPP.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Thank you, Mr. President.

The trade package we are considering today is missing important provisions that support American companies and American workers. We cannot have trade promotion without trade enforcement. Even supporters of fast-track and TPP—those cheerleaders, the most outspoken cheerleaders for free trade—even those supporters acknowledge there will be winners and losers from this agreement.

Past deals show how widespread the losses will be. Travel the State the Presiding Officer and I represent in the Senate and look at what NAFTA has done, look at what PNTR with China has done, look at what the Central America Free Trade Agreement has done, and look at what the South Korea trade agreement has done to us.

It would be a tragedy if the Senate acted and failed to help the American companies and the American workers and the communities that we acknowledge will be hurt by TPP. In other words, we take an action in this body, working with the administration, and there are losers and winners from this action. The losers are those who lose their jobs, the small businesses that go out of business, and the communities that get hurt by this. Those are the losers. How do you ignore them when it comes to these trade agreements?

By excluding two of the four bills from the initial trade package, we are excluding critical bipartisan provisions that protect workers and ensure strong trade enforcement.

We need to make sure that our steel manufacturers and other companies in our country are protected from unfair dumping. That is why I introduced—along with my colleagues, Senators PORTMAN, CASEY, BURR, BENNET, and COATS—the Leveling the Playing Field Act. We included it in the Customs and Border Protection reauthorization with bipartisan support. It would strengthen enforcement of trade laws. It would increase the ability of industries—such as the steel industry, which is so important in my State—to fight back against unfair trade practices. It passed the Senate Finance Committee, but in the majority leader's package and Senator HATCH's package, it is nowhere to be found on the floor today.

We need to make sure strong currency provisions are included. The Finance Committee overwhelmingly supported my amendment 18 to 8. We had the support of Republican colleagues: Senators PORTMAN, GRASSLEY, CRAPO, ROBERTS, BURR, ISAKSON—who is sitting in the Chamber—and SCOTT. Again, this provision, which passed the Finance Committee overwhelmingly, ensures a level playing field for American businesses. It is nowhere to be found in the majority leader's package on the floor today.

Finally, any trade package needs to ensure we are not importing products made with child labor. That is why the Finance Committee passed an amendment with overwhelming bipartisan support to close a 75-year-old loophole that allowed products made with forced labor and child labor into this country. For 75 years, that loophole stood. We passed that amendment 21 to 5. We had the support of Republican colleagues: Senators GRASSLEY, CRAPO, ROBERTS, CORNYN, THUNE, TOOMEY, PORTMAN, COATS, and HELLER. But, again, this bipartisan provision is nowhere to be found in the majority leader's package.

That is why I call on my Republican colleagues—many of whom I have named; almost every one on them on the Finance Committee—who have voted for either the currency amendment or the level the playing field amendment or the prohibition on child labor amendment. Some Republican members of the Finance Committee voted for all three of those amendments, but they are not in the package.

I am hopeful my Republican colleagues will join Democratic colleagues to vote no on cloture so we can bring a package to the floor that does trade promotion authority, that takes cares of workers, and also takes care of enforcing trade rules.

The trade package which passed out of the Finance Committee is far from perfect. I still have grave concerns about fast-track. I know what bad trade rules have done to my State. There is a reason these provisions were included in the trade package. The Senate should consider all four of them. Majority Leader MCCONNELL says he wants to respect committee work on legislation. Well, here is his chance.

The only way to get these important provisions to the President's desk is to combine all four into one. We have done it in the past. Keep in mind, every time Congress does major trade laws—2002 fast-track included provisions on enforcement, and it included provisions to help workers through trade adjustment assistance; the same thing in 1988 in the trade package; the same thing in 1974 in the trade package. Why would we bifurcate this? Why would we take out enforcement when that is a very important part of trade?

We should not move forward with any trade package that does not include all four bills. I ask my colleagues in both parties, those who supported