

Cardin	Klobuchar	Reid
Casey	Leahy	Reid
Coons	Manchin	Sanders
Donnelly	Markey	Schatz
Durbin	McCaskill	Schumer
Feinstein	McConnell	Shaheen
Franken	Menendez	Stabenow
Gillibrand	Merkley	Tester
Heinrich	Mikulski	Udall
Heitkamp	Murphy	Warner
Hirono	Murray	Warren
Kaine	Nelson	Whitehouse
King	Peters	Wyden

NOT VOTING—3

Booker	Graham	Rubio
--------	--------	-------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 52, the nays are 45.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to H.R. 1314.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

ENSURING TAX EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS THE RIGHT TO APPEAL ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 58, H.R. 1314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, well, what we just saw here is pretty shocking. There are always limits to what can be accomplished when the American people choose divided government, but of course it does not mean Washington should not work toward bipartisan solutions that make sense for our country. Trade offers a perfect opportunity to do just that. We on this side believe strongly in lifting up the middle class and knocking down unfair barriers that discriminate against American workers and American products in the 21st century.

On this issue, the President agrees. So we worked in good faith all year—all year long—to formulate a package that both parties could support. The top Republican on the Finance Committee, Senator HATCH, engaged in months of good-faith negotiations with the top Democrat on the committee, Senator WYDEN. They consulted closely with colleagues over in the House such as Chairman RYAN. They consulted

closely with President Obama, with Democrats, with Republicans.

The issues they had to work through were tough. Difficult concessions had to be made. Many believed an agreement would never emerge, but in the end a strong bipartisan trade package came together that was able to pass through the committee by an overwhelming margin of 20 to 6—20 to 6. It was a significant win for the people we represent. It was a win for the Americans who look to us to secure economic growth and good jobs for them, not give in to the special interests who, apparently, would rather see those jobs end up in countries like China.

It was a win for the security of our country and for our leadership around the world. The Secretary of Defense, for example, was at lunch with Republicans today talking about the importance to our repositioning to the Pacific, from a defense and foreign policy point of view, to get TPP. He was accompanied by seven—not at our lunch, but seven former Defense Secretaries of both parties said this just last week, “The stakes are clear and America’s prestige, influence and leadership are on the line.”

So the rationale for voting yes today, a vote that would have simply allowed the Senate to debate the issue, was overwhelming. It was supported by the facts, and yet voices in the President’s party who rail against the future won out today. I do not routinely quote President Obama, but today is no ordinary day. So when the President said, “The hard left is just making stuff up,” when the President said their increasingly bizarre arguments didn’t “stand the test of fact and scrutiny,” it was hard to argue with him.

“You don’t make change through slogans,” the President reminded his adversaries on this issue. “You don’t make change through ignoring realities.”

I think that is something worth reflecting on.

Now this doesn’t have to be the end of the story. Trade has traditionally been a bipartisan issue that cuts across the partisan divide. I suspect we have colleagues on the other side who aren’t that comfortable filibustering economic benefits for their constituents or a President who leads their party.

What we have just witnessed is that the Democratic Senate shut down the opportunity to debate the top economic priority of the Democratic President of the United States.

I suspect some may be parking their vote, rather than buying the outlandish rhetoric we have heard from the left. Certainly, that is my hope.

But to get the best outcome for the country, we have to be realistic. For instance, the idea that any Senator can make a guarantee that a particular bill will be enacted into law is simply impossible.

I assure you that we would have had a different outcome on today’s cloture motion if Senators actually wielded

the power to force things through by sheer will alone. Obviously, we don’t. What we can guarantee is that Senators receive a fair shake once we proceed to the debate our country deserves on a 21st century American trade agenda.

We will have an open and fair amendment process. How many times have I said that this year? That is what we intend to do when we get on TPA. For my part, I can restate my commitment to processing TPA, TAA, and other policies that Chairman HATCH and Senator WYDEN can agree to.

The Senate has historically been a place where our country debates and considers big issues. This is an issue worthy of our consideration. Yet today we have voted to not even consider it. It doesn’t mean we can predetermine outcomes. It doesn’t mean we can even guarantee the successful passage of legislation once we proceed to debate it. We can’t make those kinds of guarantees that the other side was saying are preconditions to even considering the President’s No. 1 domestic priority.

But blocking the Senate from even having a debate of such an important issue is not the answer. Senators who do so are choosing to stand with special interests and against the American jobs that knocking down more unfair trade barriers could support.

So I sure hope that some of our colleagues across the aisle will heed the words of President Obama and rethink their choice. I hope they will vote with us to open debate on this issue.

Let me reiterate. We will continue to engage with both sides. We will continue to engage with both sides. We will have an open amendment process. We will continue to cooperate in the same spirit that got us through so many impossible hurdles already in getting this bill to the floor.

This was no small accomplishment to get it as far as it has come, given the various points of view on the Finance Committee. Chairman HATCH and Senator WYDEN deserve a lot of credit for that. But they didn’t go through all of that to stall out on the floor before we have the chance to do something important for the American people.

So I hope that folks on the other side who are preventing this debate will seriously consider the implications. Other countries are taking a look at us. They are wondering whether we can deliver. We hear TPP is close to being finalized, and here is the headline they see—that every single one—with one exception, I believe—of the President’s own party in the Senate prevented the mechanism for having trade considered, prevented it from even coming to the Senate floor. That is not the kind of headline that we want to send around the world—that America cannot be depended upon, that America cannot deliver trade agreements. To our allies in the Pacific that are apprehensive about the Chinese—and who thought this was not only good for

their commerce but good for their security—what kind of message does that send?

So I moved to reconsider. Hopefully, it will be an opportunity for people to think this over, and we will be able to come together and go forward on a bipartisan basis to achieve an important accomplishment for the American people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). The Democratic leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, my friend, the majority leader, has one person to blame for our not being on the floor now debating this important piece of legislation, and that person is the majority leader. The next time he looks in the mirror, he can understand who is responsible for not having debate, as he said, with robust amendments. It is he.

The reason for this situation we are in today is very simple. The Finance Committee reported four bills out by a large, bipartisan vote of the Finance Committee. The majority leader decided, on his own, that he would consider two of those and that the others would have to figure out some other way to get done.

As the Republican leader said this morning in his opening statement, let's move to those two bills, and then we will start the amendment process. Do all four and start the amendment process. It is very logical.

It is illogical what he is saying. Why should we only do two of the four reported out of the Finance Committee? It doesn't make sense.

Now, my friend the Republican leader is very aware of motions to proceed. During the last 4 years, because of the Republicans' cynical approach to government, they basically defeated everything we tried to do while not allowing us to proceed on legislation. However, we are saying we are willing to work with you on this legislation. We don't want to stop moving forward on this bill. We think, though, the bill should be what was reported out of the Finance Committee. That seems the fair thing to do.

That is all we ask—a path forward, a realistic path for all of us to proceed on this legislation. If we are stuck here, it is too bad. We shouldn't be.

I say to my friend the Republican leader, I am always available to speak with him—here, telephone, my office, his office—to figure a way forward on this legislation.

I have stated the last week or so that the way we should go forward is to have all four of the measures that came out of the Finance Committee lumped together and start legislating on those—to have, in the words of the Republican leader, a robust amendment process on those bills as lumped together.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader of the Senate.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, obviously the most sensitive political issue surrounding this is the currency issue. I want to make sure everybody

has a clear understanding of where we are on that.

In committee a Senator stated: I explicitly did not offer the currency amendment to the TPA bill. We were told that it would not be a part—if it were a part of TPA, we all know it would kill it, the President wouldn't sign the bill. So my goal is not to use currency to kill the TPA bill and not to kill the TPA bill, it is to get currency passed. That is why we offered it to the Customs bill, a separate bill, on the strong view that no one disputed in committee—no one disputed this in committee—that we would get a vote separately—separately, I repeat—on the Customs bill on the floor and that it would come to the floor just like the other bills.

As for currency, in the committee they agreed they would deal with it on the Customs bill and not on TPA. And now our friends on the other side are trying to bunch it all together.

But look, we need to be clear. The currency issue on TPA is a killer. The President would veto the bill. It would defeat the bill. That is why in committee they sensibly reached the conclusion to deal with currency on the Customs bill. So I want to be clear about that. So when we get on the bill, everybody will understand the significance of that issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, one word before my friend from Oregon is recognized—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, that is exactly what Senator SCHUMER said in committee, what I just read. That was what Senator SCHUMER said in committee. It was not clear from my notes who said it, but that is exactly what Senator SCHUMER said in committee:

And, explicitly I did not offer the currency amendment to the TPA bill. We were told that it would not be part—if it were part of TPA it might kill it.

Senator SCHUMER:

My goal is not to use currency to kill the TPA bill and not to kill the TPA bill, it's to get currency passed.

Senator SCHUMER, further:

And that's why we offered it to the customs bill, on the view, strong view, that no one disputed in committee that we'd get a vote separately on the customs bill on the floor, that it would come to the floor just like the other bills.

That is Senator SCHUMER in committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, Senator SCHUMER has been involved in the currency issue from basically the time he came to the Senate. It has been an important issue for him, and he can speak for himself.

I am not an expert on the bill, and I don't intend to debate anyone here on the merits of the bill. People know how

I feel about the legislation generally, but I am kind of an expert on the procedural aspect of what goes on around here.

I suggest the best way to move forward is to come up with a program to have all of these bills discussed at the same time, and that is why we have felt the way we did and we indicated that in the vote we just took. So I think everybody should just take a deep breath, and I think there are probably ways we can move forward with this without disparaging either side.

I think the vote was important, procedurally. We, as a minority—as the Republican leader certainly can understand, having been in the minority for a number of years—I think we would be better off with the minority having a say in what goes on in this body.

That is the way we spoke today. We believe that, and we look forward to continuing the process of moving forward on this bill. We cannot be debating the merits of this legislation unless we figure out some way to move forward, and right now that process is not looking very good.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, will the Senator briefly yield for a unanimous consent request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield?

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the bill manager, the ranking member of the Finance Committee is recognized to speak, that I be recognized to speak, and that following me, the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee be recognized to speak.

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

The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, the majority leader has entered a motion to reconsider the trade legislation. I want to be clear, both for the majority leader and all our colleagues here, that I am very interested in working with the majority leader and our colleague from the other side of the aisle to find a bipartisan path to get back to the trade legislation at the earliest possible time.

This morning, 14 protrade Democrats met, and I can assure all the Senators here that these are Senators who are committed—strongly committed—to ensuring that this bill passes.

Now, with respect to just another brief description about where we are, all the hard work that the majority leader correctly described as going on in connection with this legislation has been about four bills: the trade promotion act, Customs—which is really trade enforcement to help displaced workers—and then trade preferences for developing countries.

Just briefly, I want to describe why it was so important for Senators on a bipartisan basis in the Finance Committee to tackle these issues.

The first, trade promotion authority, helps strip the secrecy out of trade policy. The second is the support system for American workers. This is known as trade adjustment assistance, which has been expanded. The third finally puts our trade enforcement policies into high gear so America can crack down on the trade cheats. The fourth renews trade programs that are crucial to American manufacturers. Together, these bills would form a legislative package that throws out the 1990s NAFTA playbook on trade. It is an opportunity to enact fresh, middle-class trade policies that will create high-skill, high-wage jobs in Oregon and across our land. That opportunity is lost if this package of four bills gets winnowed down to two.

In particular, dropping the enforcement bill in my view is legislative malpractice. The calculation is quite simple. The Finance Committee gave the Senate a bipartisan trade enforcement bill that will protect American jobs and promote American exports, which are two propositions that I believe every Member of this body supports. The enforcement legislation closes a shameful loophole that allows for products made with forced and child labor to be sold in our country. This is 2015, and there is absolutely no room for a loophole that allows slavery in American trade policies. If the decision is made to drop this bipartisan legislation, that shameful loophole would live on.

Now, any Senator who goes home and speaks, as I do, about the virtues of job-creating trade policies has, in my view, a special obligation to ensure that American trade enforcement is tough, effective, and built on American values. That is what the Finance Committee's bipartisan enforcement bill is all about. Without proper enforcement, no trade deal can ever live up to the hype. This enforcement bill is a jobs bill, plain and simple, and it needs to get to the President's desk.

Some elements of this package represent priorities that have traditionally belonged to Republicans. Other elements are traditionally Democratic. But taken as a whole, this is a bipartisan package that both sides of the Finance Committee supported strongly, with the understanding that its component parts would be linked together. You can't make this stool stand up with just two legs.

The Senate should not begin debate until there is a clear path forward for each of these four bills, and I use that word specifically because I have talked with colleagues about it. We are going to work together in a bipartisan fashion. That is what Chairman HATCH and I have done since he became chairman, and I have been grateful to him because that is the way he sought to carry out his responsibilities when I was chairman. We are going to work together, but the challenge has always been to find a clear path forward for each of these four bills.

So I urge my colleagues to continue down the Finance Committee's bipartisan route and find a path that moves all four of these bills forward.

In closing, I want to reiterate that with the majority leader having entered into a motion to have the trade bill reconsidered, I want to express to my colleagues—and I see several Finance members here, Chairman HATCH and Senator CORNYN, a senior member of the committee, a member of the leadership—that I am very interested in working closely with both of them to find a bipartisan path and get back to this legislation just as soon as possible.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the chairman of the Finance Committee be recognized and then I be recognized following his remarks.

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

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for his kindness in doing that.

I listened to the debate, and I have to say I am very disappointed.

Everybody knew that Senator SCHUMER accommodated us—the ranking member and myself—in putting the language on the Customs bill. In fact, here is what Senator SCHUMER said:

And, explicitly I did not offer the currency amendment to the TPA bill. We were told that it would not be part—if it were part of TPA it might kill it. My goal is not to use currency to kill the TPA bill and not to kill the TPA bill, it's to get currency passed. And that's why we offered it to the customs bill, on the view, strong view, that no one disputed in committee that we'd get a vote separately on the customs bill on the floor, that it would come to the floor just like the other bills.

That was the agreement. The distinguished Senator from Oregon knows that was the agreement; that we were going to lump the two together, the TPA and TAA—although I would have preferred to have those voted on separately, but we agreed to do that because there was a concern on the Democratic side that maybe we wouldn't put TAA out. That was a ridiculous concern because we know TPA can't pass unless you give the unions what they want on TAA. So we grit our teeth and we were willing to do that. We put them together so we could accommodate again. And it was completely understood that the AGOA bill, the next two bills, would be voted on separately. Senator SCHUMER knew, and said so; that he realized it would give the House a very, very bad stomachache because they probably couldn't put this bill through with that language on it.

I even agreed with Senator SCHUMER that we could have hearings later. He could bring up a bill. We would have hearings. We would have a markup on the currency matters because there are a lot of people who would like to see

something done on currency—but not to destroy the TPA bill or, should I say, all of the negotiations that this administration has been conducting with regard to TPP—the Trans-Pacific Partnership—with 11 nations, including Japan, which has always been difficult to get to the table because they have very great concerns there, but they were willing to come to the table. And it might ruin TTIP, which is 28 nations in Europe.

Forty to sixty percent of all trade in the world would come through these two agreements that would be done by the Trade Representative, subject to the review by Congress provided in TPA, which happens to be the procedural mechanism pursuant to which we can assert congressional control over these foreign policy agreements, these trade agreements.

So there was no agreement to bring these up all at one time. The first time I heard that was, I think, yesterday or the day before, and I was flabbergasted. To have our colleagues vote against cloture on a bill the President wants more than any other bill, after he talked to them, is astounding to me.

So I am going to take a moment to talk about what transpired this afternoon because I think it warrants further discussion.

As I stated this morning, with today's vote, we were trying to do something good for the American people, to advance our Nation's trade agenda and to provide good jobs for American workers, all of which would happen should we get this through both Houses of Congress and the President signs it into law.

Now, to do that, we can't have killer amendments put on bills that everybody knows will kill it and that the President can't sign. I know people disagree with us on how we intended to get there. That much was clear from the outset. Sadly, these colleagues—who have always been against TPA—were unwilling to have a discussion about their disagreements in a fair and open debate, and, I have to say, that was all of them on the other side today. Instead, they voted this afternoon to prevent any such debate from taking place.

We are willing to debate, we are willing to have amendments, but I am also only willing to abide by the agreement we have with Senator SCHUMER with regard to the Customs bill. That was the agreement, and I compliment Senator SCHUMER for being willing to put it on there because he knew it would kill TPA.

Needless to say, I am disappointed by this outcome.

While we are talking about trade policy at large, the bill receiving the most attention was, of course, the TPA bill, which is bipartisan. I made sure it was bipartisan—that we could work together, that we could come together, that we could all basically feel good about it—and it passed 20 to 6, which is astounding to even me. I didn't know

we would get seven Democrats on the bill, and I compliment the distinguished ranking member for working hard to get seven Democrats on the bill. But still, that doesn't take away the fact that the minority leader and others don't want any bill at all.

While we are talking about trade policy at large, I would just say the bill receiving the most attention was, of course, the TPA bill, which is bipartisan, supported by Republicans and Democrats in both the House and the Senate, by the way, not to mention the President of the United States and his administration.

On April 22, the bill was voted out of the Senate Finance Committee by a historic vote of 20 to 6, with seven Democrats on the committee voting to report the bill. The bill which was President Obama's top legislative priority, by the way, was riding a wave of amendments headed to the floor. Yet, today, the mere thought of even debating this bill was apparently too much for my Democratic colleagues to bear. Nothing changed. It is the same bill we reported out of committee. I can remember the happy time we had talking about how wonderful it was to finally get this bill out of the committee, after going to 10 p.m. one night and actually beyond that for staff.

This is the same bill we have been talking about for months. The only thing that was different today than just a few days ago was the strategy being employed by the opposition.

As we all know, the TPA bill wasn't the only trade bill reported out of the Finance Committee in April. We also reported a bill to reauthorize Trade Adjustment Assistance, a bill to reauthorize some trade preference programs and a Customs and Enforcement bill.

A few days before we were to begin the floor debate on trade policy, we heard rumblings from our colleagues on the other side, and we started hearing statements from some Senators, including some who had generally been supportive of TPA, that they would only support the pending motion to proceed if they had assurances that all four bills—TPA, TAA, preferences, and Customs—would be debated and passed at the same time. That never was the agreement, and everybody understood that. These new demands brought forward at the eleventh hour were problematic for a number of reasons, most notably because, as reported out of the Finance Committee, the Customs bill faces a number of problems both with the White House and the House of Representatives, and my friends on the other side realized that in this bipartisan effort that we were making together. They recognized that there were problems for both the White House and House of Representatives that would prevent it from being enacted into law any time soon. I will not detail all the problems, but I think most of my colleagues know what they are. But I will say that those problems existed from the beginning and we

knew about them at the outset. We had people on the committee who were totally opposed to this bill. I made sure they had a right to bring up their amendments. I respect them. I don't agree with them. I can't even agree on how they ever reached the positions that they do. But the fact is they have a right to do that, and we protected that right.

Now, I might say these problems existed from the beginning. We knew about them from the onset. That is why the ranking member of the Finance Committee and I agreed at our markup to move our four trade bills separately.

As one of the principal authors of three of the four trade bills, I want to be very clear because there has apparently been some confusion on this point. There was never a plan to move all four of these bills together or as part of TPA.

While we agreed that TPA and TAA would have to move on parallel tracks—we did agree to that—there was no such agreement with regard to the other bills, only a commitment that we would do our best to try to get all four enacted into law, with no guarantees that they would be but to do our very best.

The agreement with TPA and TAA was honored. Both the majority leader and I made clear today that if cloture was invoked on the motion to proceed, we would file a substitute amendment that included both of these bills—TPA and TAA.

We also made commitments—commitments I had already made—to work with our colleagues to find a path forward on the Customs and the preferences legislation. But that was not enough, apparently. We have had numerous discussions regarding alternative paths for other trade bills. That was not enough, either. The only thing they would accept was full inclusion of all the trade bills at the outset of the debate. We could not agree to that, and they knew it.

Of course, to be fair, some of the Democrats were not necessarily insisting that the four bills be part of the same package. Instead, they just wanted guarantees that all of them would be enacted into law. That is not the way it works around here.

I do not even know how to comment on that. It is, to put it bluntly, simply absurd to think that a Senate leader can guarantee any bill will become law before a debate even begins. Yet those were the demands we faced over the last few days. Although they were obviously impossible, we worked in good faith to try to reach an accommodation with those who—in my opinion—were not working in good faith. And I am willing to forgive that. Even then, there was no path to yes.

Of course, as we all know that the idea for demanding a “four bills or no bills” strategy did not originate in the Finance Committee. This demand materialized last week and came directly

from the Senate Democratic leadership, virtually all of whom oppose TPA and their President on this bill, outright. Sadly, it seems they were able to sell this idea to other Members of their caucus, including more than a few who should know better.

We were never talking about reaching an agreement with people who wanted a path forward on good trade legislation. We have been talking about an idea devised for the sole purpose of stopping progress on TPA. At least for today, it appears they have been successful.

Once again, I am disappointed. A lot of work has gone into this effort in both the Senate and the House of Representatives—not to mention the administration. I, personally, have been at this from the very moment I took over as the lead Republican on the Senate Finance Committee in January 2011.

In January 2014—more than a year ago—I introduced legislation with the former chairmen, Max Baucus and Dave Camp, that formed the basis of the bill that we had hoped to start debating this week. Both Baucus and Camp were committed to this effort. Sadly, Chairman Camp retired and Chairman Baucus was sent off to China.

When Senator WYDEN took over the committee, I worked with him to address his concerns about the bill, and that work continued after I took over as chairman this year. Even though I thought some of his proposals were unworkable, I bent over backwards to accommodate his desires, because in the end, I thought it would broaden support for TPA, and I wanted to please him, as my partner on the committee.

Chairman RYAN joined us in this effort, and we did all we could to put together a bill and a path forward that both parties could support. We met with Chairman RYAN regularly. Until the last few days and the advent of these new demands materializing out of whole cloth, I thought we had been successful. Even after these new demands came up, I did my best to find an agreement, working right up to the vote to find a reasonable path forward. But, apparently, something reasonable was not in the cards.

Everyone here knows I am an optimist. I still believe we can get something done, that we can work something out. I have told the President the same. I am still willing to do what it takes to pass these bills. I hope my colleagues will see the light here and come to the table with some realistic alternatives for a path forward. Until that happens, the President is going to have to wait on these trade agreements, as will all the farmers, ranchers, manufacturers, and other job creators in our country who desperately need market access and a level international playing field in order to compete.

In the future, if we see a sharp decline in U.S. agriculture and manufacturing and if the United States retreats

from the world, ceding the Asia-Pacific region, in particular, to China's overwhelming economic influence, people may very well look back at today's events and wonder why we could not get our act together. I am already thinking that. Why couldn't we get our act together?

I certainly hope that does not happen—that these other nations—particularly China—take advantage of our not getting our act together. Perhaps, in my frustration, I am being a little dramatic. Still, I have no doubt that some will come to regret what went on here today—one way or another.

As for me, I have no regrets. I have done all I can to get these important bills across the finish line. I am going to continue to do all I can in the future to get these bills across the finish line.

Unfortunately, after today, it is very unclear how many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are willing to do the same. I believe there are honest, good people on that side of the aisle who want to make this right, who want to make up for what happened here today. I feel confident that is so. I am going to proceed on the basis that that is so. I sure hope it is so because, my gosh, to put this Nation's foreign policy—especially in the Asia-Pacific region, in particular—on hold when we could be building relationships in these countries as never before and at the same time spurring on international trade as never before is a matter of grave concern to me.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I want to congratulate the chairman of the Finance Committee, who I know has labored long and hard to get this bill where it is today. I know how disappointed he is at the filibuster by our friends across the aisle on the President's No. 1 domestic priority.

I have heard it said that the U.S. economy is just one or two steps away—a few policy choices away—from awakening that slumbering giant known as the U.S. economy and growing it for the benefit of all Americans. Unfortunately, the filibuster that occurred today is a backwards step.

I know there are some people that say to Republicans: Why would you want to work with President Obama? The truth of the matter is that is what we are here for, if we agree on the principle. We are not here to agree with him just to agree with him. As a matter of fact, sometimes it is easier to go back home and say: Well, I disagreed with the President.

But this is one area where the President of the United States is absolutely correct. We are here not to do what he wants us to do, but we are here to do what our constituents—what the American people—want us to do. What they want is the better jobs, the improved wages, the sort of robust economic growth that comes along with trade agreements.

It has been said numerous times, but I will say it again: 95 percent of the world lies out beyond our borders; 80 percent of the purchasing power in the world lies beyond the borders of the United States. Why in the world would we not want to open markets to the things that we grow, that our ranchers raise, and that our manufacturers make? Why in the world would we not want to do it?

You will have to ask our colleagues across the aisle, who today, with the exception of one Democrat, chose to filibuster this bill. I am intrigued to hear the numbers that were mentioned earlier: 14 protrade Democrats—14. I guess that means there are at least 32 antitrade Democrats. But I must say, on this side of the aisle, we are by and large a protrade party—for the very reasons that I mentioned earlier. We would like to work with anybody—including the President of the United States—to try to get our economy growing again, to open markets to the things that we make and grow and manufacture here in the United States, because it benefits the entire country, including hard-working families.

The irony is that last week the Senate overwhelmingly voted on a bill that would guarantee Congress the time and opportunity to review a potential agreement between President Obama and Iran. That bill passed 98 to 1 and will prevent implementation by the President until the American people, through their elected representatives, are given the chance to scrutinize, study, and debate that particular agreement and vote on it up or down. So far, the so-called deal or framework has been incredibly vague, and I think it is important that we understand what is in it.

You can imagine that if we voted 98 to 1 to require the President to lay before the American people this important negotiation with Iran, why it is so strange that our Democratic friends do not want us to participate in the same process by which to vote up or down on trade agreements.

Trade promotion authority, historically, has had bipartisan support here in the Chamber. By the way, this is not just something that will be extended for the next 20 months of President Obama's administration. This will be extended 6 years into the Presidency of the next President of the United States.

The Chairman mentioned that this legislation sailed through the Finance Committee by a wide margin of 20 to 6. And, of course, as I said—and I will say it again—it is supported by the administration, by President Obama's administration.

It is very strange to see Democrats blocking a bill supported by the leader of their political party, the President of the United States. The excuses they gave here today are that all of a sudden they woke up and decided that the deal that Senator WYDEN and Senator HATCH agreed to—which is to combine

trade promotion authority with trade adjustment assistance—was not good enough and they wanted to renegotiate the deal.

I think, from my perspective, there are really two types of folks in the camp across the aisle. There are those who, perhaps, would like to get to yes, and that means that you can have a negotiation and try to find a way to get to yes. But I can only gather from what was said earlier that there are probably 32 Senators on that side of the aisle who are antitrade. They are not interested in getting to yes. What they do is they throw up phony barriers, such as this attempt to renegotiate the package that was brought here to the floor. This is sort of typical obstructionism.

We saw this happen in the antitrafficking legislation as well, when a piece of legislation passed out of the Senate Judiciary Committee unanimously and came to the floor. And then all of a sudden, someone woke up and said: Well, we did not read the bill, and now we object.

This trade tool will give Congress the opportunity to examine any upcoming deal that the President is trying to cut and make sure—we make sure; we do not take the President's word for it. We make sure the American people get a fair shake.

Many of the provisions in trade promotion authority are common sense and they are nonpartisan. For example, if passed, TPA would give Congress the authority to read the full text of the trade agreement. It is hard to argue that this is a bad thing. It is hard to get more straightforward than that, but we have no guarantee without this provision.

Trade promotion authority would promote greater transparency and accountability in the negotiations process. Some, understandably, have complained that up to this point the Obama administration has relayed very little information about this unfolding trade agreement—known as the Trans-Pacific Partnership—or the affected industries—that it has relayed very little information about the negotiations taking place with countries along the Pacific Rim and in Europe.

This bill prioritizes transparency and accountability front and center and will require the administration to brief Members of Congress regularly on the progress of the negotiations. It will actually allow Members of Congress to attend the negotiations. How more transparent can you get than that? That way Congress can work directly with those who are finalizing this agreement to ensure, again, that the American people are getting a good deal.

So through the trade promotion authority, the bill that has been filibustered today, Congress would have been able to get to know important details regarding the actual implementation of the trade deal.

I am disappointed our Democratic colleagues were not able to see how important this legislation is, not to us,

not to the President but to the people they represent and to the economy and wages we need to see grow.

Well, as we heard from Secretary Ash Carter today at lunch, this is important for national security reasons as well. It is important America thoroughly engage in Asia with our trading partners because there is a strange but simple phenomenon that occurs when two countries trade with each other. They are sure a lot less likely to go to war with each other if they are doing business and talking to each other.

From a national security perspective, we want to make sure we make the rules with regard to trading in Asia and that we don't default and let China fill the void, which they will be happy if we don't take care of our business.

Trade is important to my State, and as I said, it is important to the United States. In the 20th century all we needed back in Texas were farm-to-market roads to find customers for our goods. But in the 21st century, our customers are not just in the next town over, they are all around the world. As I said, 95 percent of our potential customers live outside of the United States.

This legislation would help connect American farmers, ranchers, and small businesses to the markets around the world which would help our economy. As the country's largest exporter, we in Texas know the value of trade firsthand because we depend on it. I know a lot of people think, well, Texas is just about oil and gas. Well, that is not actually true. We have a very diversified economy. But part of what we have done, which has set us apart from the rest of the country in terms of economic growth and job creation, is trade.

Last year, Texas reported \$289 billion of exported goods, with some 41,000 businesses exporting goods from Texas to outside the country. Now, this type of trade has helped our economy grow and keep people employed, able to provide food for their families and other necessities of life. We have prospered, relatively speaking, during a time when much of the American economy has been relatively stagnant and trade has been an important part of that.

Opening up our country to greater trade through the trade promotion authority would help American businesses send their goods to even more markets. The United States is the leading exporter of agricultural products. Last year alone, America's farmers and ranchers who could benefit tremendously from this legislation exported more than \$152 billion in agricultural commodities and products to customers around the world.

In Texas, for example, in the agriculture sector, we lead the Nation in exports of beef and cotton. By opening up more international opportunities for these products, our economy would grow and our Texas commodities, such as beef and cotton, would become staples in fast-growing markets like Asia.

We also know, as I suggested earlier, that trade is not just about selling

products, it is about the jobs that are necessary to make and grow the products we sell. According to a report released last month by the International Trade Administration, as of 2014, more than 1 million jobs in Texas alone are supported by exporting, and in the entire country that figure is 11 million. So with 11 million jobs dependent on exports, why in the world wouldn't we want to improve our ability to export more abroad to other markets around the world and to create more jobs in the process?

Well, TPA is important because it would allow Congress to also have clear oversight over the pending trade agreements. I know there is a lot of skepticism about the kind of deal that is being cut behind closed doors. We would open those doors and bring it out into the open and allow all Americans to examine it. And we, as their representatives, will exam it as well and ask the hard questions, such as why is this in the best interest of the American farmer, rancher, and manufacturer.

We know that TPP—the Trans-Pacific Partnership, which is the big Asia trade agreement—alone makes up about 40 percent of the world's economy.

I admit I am a little disappointed that the Democrats, with the exception of one Senator, would choose to block this important piece of legislation. With so much of the world's purchasing power located beyond our borders, one would think that on a bipartisan basis we would all support opening up new access to consumers and markets for America's farmers, ranchers, and manufactured goods, and that should be a top priority.

Unfortunately, our colleagues across the aisle did not see our Nation's businesses and our economy as their main priority today. I hope that after today's failure of this particular legislation, we will engage in serious negotiations.

I agree with the majority leader, that after November 4, the American people gave the U.S. Senate new management. They were dissatisfied with the management of last year and previous years because all they saw was dysfunction. Well, now the U.S. Senate is starting to function again. We are starting to produce important pieces of legislation, such as the first budget since 2009. This is a great opportunity for us on a bipartisan basis—on a non-partisan basis—to do something really good.

I hope, after making the mistake of blocking this legislation, that our colleagues—the 14 so-called progrowth Democrats out of the 46 across the aisle—will see fit to work with us to try and move this legislation forward.

ORDER FOR RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 4 p.m., the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

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

Mr. CORNYN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. COLLINS. 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 SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 3:59 p.m., recessed subject to the call of the Chair and reassembled at 5:29 p.m. when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. AYOTTE).

MORNING BUSINESS

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, yesterday I missed the vote on S. Con. Res. 16, which states U.S. policy on the release of American citizens in Iran, because I was touring tornado damage in Delmont, in my home State of South Dakota. Had I been able to be here, I would have voted in support of this concurrent resolution. Iran's treatment of these detained Americans is reprehensible, and I believe we should be using every diplomatic tool at our disposal to obtain their release.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I was necessarily absent during the Senate's consideration of S. Con. Res. 16, which states that Iran should immediately release Saeed Abedini, Amir Hekmati, and Jason Rezaian, and cooperate with the U.S. Government to locate and return Robert Levinson. The resolution also states that the U.S. Government should use every diplomatic tool at its disposal to secure their immediate release. Had I been present, I would have voted in support of S. Con. Res. 16.

MEMORIAL DAY

Mrs. STABENOW. Madam President, I wish to reflect on this year's Memorial Day and the importance of this holiday in American life.

As I attend Memorial Day parades and commemorations, I am struck by our spirit of national unity. I know that across Michigan—and across our Nation—our fellow Americans are taking part in similar gatherings where we stop and reflect on our history and the sacrifice made by so many in order to bring our Nation to where we are today.