

We can do something about this sad, violent reality. Let's do something. We can expand, for example, background checks for people who want to buy guns to prevent the mentally ill and criminals from buying guns. Is that asking too much—the mentally ill and criminals? More than 80 percent of the American people support this. Why can't we in Congress support it? The American people support it. It has bipartisan support. I say it over and over again. The American community is overwhelmingly in support of not giving guns to people who are mentally ill or felons. They shouldn't be able to buy guns. We should act to save lives by expanding these background checks. Isn't that the least we can do?

I know people will come and say: Well, he wasn't a felon. Maybe so. But couldn't we do something? Couldn't we at least do this minimal thing to stop people who are sick in the head and people who are criminals from purchasing guns? Couldn't we at least do that?

Einstein's definition of insanity is continuing the same thing over and over while expecting a different result, and that is what we are doing. For the future of our country, we have to change. In the face of racism and bigotry, we must act. We can't do nothing. We must prevent felons and the mentally ill from gunning down even more Americans in broad daylight. If we do not, we will be here again. Our hearts will be broken again. Again we will have to ask ourselves how we allowed another senseless tragedy to take place while we stood by doing nothing to prevent other deaths.

Mr. President, what is the business before the Senate today?

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 11 a.m. will be equally divided.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, later today the Senate will once again have an opportunity to vote on whether to renew trade promotion authority. The Senate has already considered this issue once and the House has voted on it twice, each time demonstrating strong bipartisan support for TPA. My hope is that we can get to a similar result with today's vote in the Senate.

We need to be clear about what is at stake. The United States is currently negotiating a number of trade agreements with some of our most important trading partners in the world. If the Senate fails to approve this bill, neither Congress nor the American people will have a strong voice during these negotiations. As a result, our Nation will not be able to get the best trade agreements possible, if we are able to advance any trade agreements

at all. Some people, including some of our colleagues, may be fine with that result. They do not think we need trade agreements to promote a healthy economy. But nothing could be further from the truth.

As we all know, most of the world's consumers live outside our borders—95 percent of them. In addition, the vast majority of economic growth in the world is likely to occur outside of the United States over the next decade. If our workers, farmers, ranchers, and service providers are going to be able to compete in these growing markets, we must have open access to these markets and fair trade rules to boot. Without strong trade agreements, neither of these is possible.

When it comes to international trade, we cannot stand still. If we don't lead and set the rules of the game, other nations will and our economy will be left behind.

The United States continues to be a leader in agricultural exports throughout the world. In fact, we still export more agricultural goods than any other country. In addition, the United States continues to boast an enormous manufacturing base that supplies consumers in every corner of the globe.

We also lead the world in technology, digital services, and innovation. Indeed, not only do we lead the world in creation of intellectual property, America essentially created the modern digital landscape.

The United States also continues to lead in trade in services, exporting more than \$700 billion in services in 2014 alone. That is more than twice as much as the United Kingdom, the world's second highest services exporter.

I ask that the Parliamentarian let me know when my 10 minutes has expired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will be so notified.

Mr. HATCH. In other words, we know we can compete on the world stage when the rules are fair and the playing field is level. That is why I am such a strong proponent of this TPA legislation. This bill, which is the product of a great deal of work and a lot of bipartisan cooperation, will have a powerful and positive impact on industries throughout our economy, on consumers, and, of course, on American workers as well.

In an America that embraces international trade, I believe even those individuals who encounter a temporary setback can find new opportunities, can out-work, out-produce, out-think, and out-innovate our global competition so long as the groundwork has been laid to give them those opportunities. That is why we need strong trade agreements, and that is why we need TPA.

As you can surely tell, I feel very passionately about free trade, and I know many of my colleagues are just as passionate in their opposition. But as Congress has considered this legisla-

tion, I think we have had a full and fair debate on these issues. We have been transparent on the substance of the bill and in the way things have moved forward. Both sides have been able to make their case to the American people.

It is at times such as these when working in Congress is the most rewarding. We have the opportunity to hear so many different accounts, sift through mountains of data and research, meet with hundreds of interested parties representing thousands of our constituents, and work through hotly contested differences. Then, after all of that work, when circumstances are right, we are able to come up with bipartisan legislation that addresses the needs of our country, our constituents, and our economy. That is what we have been able to do with this TPA debate, which is a debate that has been going on for many years now.

I still want to work with those who may not share all my views on all these issues. One way we have agreed to do that is to help ensure that trade adjustment assistance, or TAA, will be extended. As you know, TAA has been included in the trade preferences bill the Senate will hopefully vote on later this week after we pass TPA.

I have said many times that I am not a fan of TAA. Personally, I think the program is redundant and ineffective. However, after 38 years here in the Senate, believe me, I am well aware that everything is not about me. I understand TAA is a priority for a number of my colleagues and that it continues to be the price of admission for many who want to support TPA. The Senate majority leader recognizes this as well, which is why he has committed to ensuring that TAA gets a fair vote here in the Senate and a fair opportunity to pass.

Throughout this process, we have done all we can, within reason, to accommodate the concerns of Senators. I am very appreciative of all the support we have received from Members on both sides of the aisle. We couldn't have gotten this far without that support.

Now it is time to finish the work—to pass this bill and get it to the President's desk. We need this bill to ensure that our constituents' voices are heard in the trade negotiating process. We need this bill to give our trade negotiators the tools they need to get a good deal. And we need this bill to expand access to foreign markets so that we can grow our economy and create new and high-paying jobs here at home. That is what this bill is all about and why we have been working on this process for so long. We are very close to the finish line, and we need just one more burst of energy and a few more steps to get us there.

I urge all my colleagues who support free trade, open markets, and the advancement of American values and interests abroad to join me once again in supporting TPA and working with me

and with my colleague Senator WYDEN to get all the pending trade bills passed in the Senate and signed into law.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, over the last several weeks on the floor of both this body and the House, we have heard Members, colleagues, say they are tired of the old 1990s North American Free Trade Agreement playbook on trade. They are concerned that the package which is once again before the Senate is more of the same.

Here is my message on why this legislation needs to move forward. If you believe those policies of the 1990s failed to protect American workers and strengthen our economy, this is our chance to set a new course. This is our chance to put in place higher standards in global trade on matters such as labor rights and environmental protection, to shine some real sunlight on trade agreements and ensure that our country writes the rules of the road.

The fact is, in 2015, globalization is a reality. The choice is whether to sit back and allow globalization to push and pull on our economy until in ways dictated by countries in China. So our choice is either to move now and get into the center of the ring and fight for a stronger economic future, protect our workers and promote our values, or remain tethered to many of those old policies of the 1990s.

I say to the Senate today: If you believe, like me, that it is time once and for all to close the books on the North American free-trade era in trade, this legislation deserves your support.

In my hometown paper recently, there was an opinion article, and it stated that this trade bill lays out “a hard-and-fast checklist for the TPP, holding the Obama administration accountable for meeting its goals and conditions.” The article goes on to say that this legislation “will reorient priorities and improve the process for the TPP and other trade agreements in the future.” I completely agree with that view, but the Senate doesn’t have to take my word for it. Those are the words of Tim Nesbitt, the past president of the Oregon AFL-CIO, who has disagreed with me on trade often over the years. Yet now he states that this legislation we will vote on today provides a fresh opportunity for trade done right.

When it comes to core American values—labor rights, environmental protection, and human rights—this legislation raises the bar and demands more from our trade negotiators than ever before.

We have talked a lot about a race to the bottom. My view is that if our country doesn’t fight to protect worker rights and the environment with tough, enforceable trade agreements, those priorities are going to wither away. China is certainly not going to take up the banner for American values in trade. So if you believe America

should stop a race to the bottom on labor rights, environmental safeguards, and human rights, this legislation is our chance to lift up global standards.

I want to talk for a moment about the economic potential of this legislation. What we all understand we need to do is make things here, grow things here, add value to them here, and then ship them somewhere. My State knows how to make this happen, and so do many others. About one out of five jobs in Oregon depends on international trade. Almost 90 percent of them are small and medium sized. And what we know is that in many instances those jobs pay better.

The fact is, if our farmers want to sell their products in Japan—and this is true of agriculture all over America. A lot of our farmers face average tariffs of 40 percent. That is right. If you want to export some jam to Vietnam, it will be marked up by 90 percent. If you want to sell a bottle of wine—and we have wine growers with prosperous businesses all over the country—they have to fork over 50 percent of the value to the government. So if we believe other countries should open their markets to American exports, like the U.S. is open to theirs, this is our chance to break down the tariffs and other barriers.

I want to touch for a moment again on how different this is than the 1990s. In the 1990s, nobody could have imagined the right tools to protect the modern Internet. Twenty-five years ago, it was impossible to make a living by setting up a business online. A cell phone was as big as a brick. In fact, the NAFTA negotiations began a year before the first Web site was set up. Today, Internet commerce is at the heart of our economy. If we want to cement America’s leadership in the digital economy, this is our chance to vote for trade policies that will protect a free and open Internet.

Now, I wish to mention again, apropos of how different this is, that I have felt for some time that critics of past trade policy have been spot on with respect to a lot of this secrecy which is just gratuitous. If we believe deeply in trade, as Chairman HATCH and I do, and want more of it, why should we have all this unnecessary secrecy which just makes people cynical about trade?

So we have brought sunshine to this trade debate in a way that is unprecedented. For the first time, before the President can sign a deal, the full text has to be released to the public for 60 days. Before we can have votes in the other body and in the Senate, there will be no fewer than 4 months where people can open a proposed trade deal and read it for themselves.

So picture that: For 4 months, the American people will have in their hands—starting with the TPP—what the trade agreement is all about. That is simply unprecedented.

I wish to close the question of how we are going to proceed from here. This has obviously been a complicated piece

of legislation. I appreciate the Senate and House leaders have committed to moving trade adjustment assistance alongside trade promotion authority as well as a proposal that originated with Senator BROWN to strengthen our critically important trade enforcement laws. While the goal of enacting trade policies is a tool to give all Americans a chance to get ahead, trade adjustment assistance is an absolute must-pass bill, and I am confident it is going to get through Congress to the President’s desk. That bill includes the vitally important program also that creates new opportunities for impoverished nations in Africa.

The Customs enforcement bill is also moving forward on a bipartisan basis, and there is important work there to be done. The Senate must resolve differences in the enforcement bill with the other body. I wish to make it clear this morning that I expect that conference to respect Democratic priorities. My Democratic colleagues and I will be laying down markers on several of our top priorities. I discussed those priorities with Chairman RYAN last night. Those priorities include provisions in the Senate bill championed by Senator SHAHEEN to help our small businesses, provisions authored by Senator BENNET to address enforcement environmental laws, and Senator CANTWELL’s important trade enforcement trust fund.

In my view, the Congress has an opportunity in this legislation to show it can work in a bipartisan way to take on one of the premier economic challenges of our time. Our job is to get past the policies of the 1990s and move toward getting trade done right.

Colleagues, let’s pry open foreign markets and send more of our exports abroad. Let’s fight for the American brand and the Oregon brand against the trade chiefs and the bad actors who are blocking our way, and let’s raise the bar for American values and open our trade policies to sunlight.

I urge all in the Senate to vote yes on cloture today and to support this package as it advances this week. In effect, we get three important bills done this week and set in motion.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the motion to invoke cloture on TPA, the so-called fast-track legislation. I am still incredulous, as I have watched this trade nondebate, if you will, at the speed at which, time after time, the majority leader has tried to shut down debate. It has happened again and again, and that is compounded by the secrecy of this whole process.

I can't count the number of times in my State of Ohio and in meetings in Washington, with people from all over the country, that people have said we have little or no access to the Trans-Pacific Partnership. TPA, in the past—fast-track—has actually been sort of a rule book for how we should negotiate trade agreements and, at the same time, has been a direction on how to negotiate these trade agreements and a rule book on how it is presented on the Senate floor. Yet none of the Trans-Pacific Partnership negotiations by Ambassador Froman have been informed at all by a TPA because we haven't had a TPA yet. We haven't even had an instruction booklet in the past. At the same time, we have gotten the worst of both worlds because we are voting on TPA, and we really haven't been able to see what is in TPP. I know supporters of TPP will say we are going to have 60 days now, but Members are casting their votes now—where 60 votes are required and they have maximum leverage—to put no final point on it, just giving up the leverage they have as we are still kept in the dark on what is happening.

Let me give one example before I get to where I think we are making a mistake by moving so quickly today, in essence, fast-tracking fast-track.

One example, my office and I personally have repeatedly spoken to the President of the United States and the U.S. Trade Representative, Ambassador Froman, repeatedly asking them to fix some of the language on tobacco. Because one of the things that apparently—we really don't know for sure—the Trans-Pacific Partnership does is it gives even more power to American tobacco companies—more power to American tobacco companies to have influence over laws in particularly small countries which don't have the wherewithal and can't afford the huge legal bills a large tobacco company can afford to write public health law.

If a small country wants to write a law to protect their children from marketing of tobacco products—which is what we have done in this country—the U.S. tobacco company or British tobacco company can—let's keep it here. The U.S. tobacco company can threaten a lawsuit against those countries, and those countries are probably going to back off because they probably can't afford to go to court with the big American tobacco company. Even something as clearly violative of the public interest and of public health as what damage Big Tobacco inflicts on children has not, to our knowledge, been addressed. Again, so much of this is secretive that we don't even know that.

That is why there is anger in this country and why there is—so many people in this country tell me, so many in my State: Why are you moving so fast? Why is this coming up right now? Why don't we know more about this whole process?

Yet again, the majority leader is shutting down debate. He will be

joined, I assume, by a small number, a distinct, small number of minority Democrats, getting up over the 60-vote margin so they can shut down debate, so they can move the TPA—the fast-track—forward, so they can get the Trans-Pacific Partnership down the road.

No matter which side of the TPP debate, no matter which side of the trade promotion authority, TPA, fast-track—no matter which side you are on, it is clear that our trade policy creates winners and losers. It is clear. Even the most vigorous cheerleaders for free trade—the Wall Street Journal editorial board, for instance—even the strongest free-traders, even though people who reflectively support these free-trade agreements acknowledge there are winners and losers.

They will argue that these trade agreements create more jobs than they lose. I don't agree with that. They argue that. Put that aside. But they also acknowledge that people lose jobs because of decisions we make.

We are about to pass fast-track here. We are about to pass trade promotion authority, leading probably to the Trans-Pacific Partnership having a reasonable chance of passage. We are about to do that. We are making that decision here. Members of Congress, people who are well paid, with government-financed retirements and health care—we are about to make those decisions, and we know—we are knowingly making that decision, acknowledging that some people will lose their jobs because of a decision we make, but we are not going to take care of those workers. We are going to pass today the TPA, the trade promotion authority, fast-track. We are going to pass that and ignore those workers. How shameful is that that we know the decisions we are making in this body—we are making the decisions, the President of the United States makes this decision, the House of Representatives has made this decision, the Senate is about to make this decision, we are making this decision, knowing people will lose their jobs because of our actions. Yet we are unwilling to provide for those workers who lose their jobs.

Let me give a little history, a special message to Congress. In January of 1962, President Kennedy said:

When considerations of national policy make it desirable to avoid higher tariffs, those injured by that competition should not be required to bear the full brunt of the impact. Rather, the burden of economic adjustment should be borne in part by the Federal Government.

That is President Kennedy at the advent, at the beginning, at the creation of the trade adjustment assistance, the support for workers who lose their jobs because of—again, I repeat—decisions we make in this body, in the House of Representatives, in the White House. We make decisions on trade. We know people will lose their jobs. We should help them. It should be our moral responsibility to help them.

Senator Vance Hartke of Indiana said: "No small group of firms and workers should be made to bear the full burden of the costs of a program whose great benefits enrich the Nation as a whole."

This is as true today as it was 53 years ago. It is not a Democratic idea. It is not a Republican idea. Everyone from the Cato Institute—a libertarian-oriented think tank in Washington, a bunch of well-paid scholars who make pronouncements from on high about various kinds of public policy issues—to the Wall Street Journal—a similar body but one with greater ability to disseminate information—even those two venerable institutions admit the trade agreements do not create winners everywhere.

A Cato Institute trade briefing says, "All of those job losses are a painful but necessary part of the larger process of innovation and productivity increases."

I am always a bit amused when people who—again, well-educated, good pay, dress like this, good benefits, good retirement, good health care—make pronouncements saying: Well, job losses are painful—not to us, of course. The same as editorial writers who make these decisions, these pronouncements on trade, they are not losing their jobs. People in my State are losing jobs on these fair trade agreements. We are going to inflict this pain. As the Cato Institute and the Wall Street Journal say, by the decisions we make, we are going to inflict pain on these workers. People are going to lose jobs in my town of Mansfield, OH. People are going to lose jobs where I grew up. People are going to lose jobs in Cleveland where I live now. People are going to lose jobs in Zanesville and Newark because of decisions we make today on fast-track, because of decisions we will make next year on the Trans-Pacific Partnership. People are going to lose their jobs, but we are going to vote today to cut off debate, and we are going to forget, at least temporarily, about helping those workers who lose jobs because of decisions we make. How immoral is that? How shameful is that? What a betrayal we are inflicting on those workers if we make this decision today.

Former Wall Street Journal economics editor David Wessel writes, "Even [free trade's] most fervent admirers concede trade creates winners and losers."

I will debate until the cows come home the net benefits of these trade agreements. I think they are net job loss. But even if you believe these trade agreements are net job-gainers—I don't think there is a lot of evidence of that—but even if you believe that, we know people lose their jobs because of decisions we make. That is why Republicans in the past have supported trade adjustment assistance in principle and in policy going back decades.

Fifteen years ago, President George W. Bush said, "I recognize that some

American workers may face adjustment challenges”—that means they get thrown out of work. It is a nice way a President might talk about people he has left behind. Put that aside. “I recognize that some American workers may face adjustment challenges as a result of trade.”

At least to President Bush’s credit—I wish his words would be followed today on this floor by the majority leader, by Republican Leader McConnell as he cuts off debate and leaves behind trade adjustment assistance. President Bush said, “I support helping these workers by reauthorizing and improving trade adjustment assistance programs that will give workers impacted by trade new skills, help them find new jobs quickly, and provide them with financial assistance.”

I can give lots of stories about people I know in Youngstown, Lima, Dayton, Hamilton, and people in Portsmouth who lost their jobs because of trade, but at least they have gotten a helping hand from a government that used to have their backs and believe in them—at least until today—from a government that actually will extend that hand and help them retrain. Maybe they can become a nurse, maybe they can work in information technology, maybe they can become a radiology technologist at the local hospital.

Earlier this year, my colleague JOHN CORNYN—Republican from Texas, the senior Senator and assistant Republican leader—told reporters that “there is no doubt that the benefits of more trade do not fall uniformly. There are some segments of the economy that don’t prosper as well.”

We know that. We have seen that acknowledgement across the board. Yet today Leader McConnell is going to cut off debate, even though decisions we have made have cost people their jobs. That is why we have a moral obligation. It is not a new idea. It is not a partisan idea. It is universally accepted. Trade deals don’t benefit everybody. That is why this moral obligation to include trade adjustment assistance in any package with TPA is so important.

We can’t send a framework for a new trade deal to the President’s desk without assistance for the workers who will be left behind, but that is not what we are doing today. Today, it is full-speed ahead, cut off debate, move ahead on fast-track, move ahead on trade promotion authority.

I assume a number of my Democratic colleagues are going along with it. I hope the wrath of people in this country—if the House and Senate refuse to do what some of their leaders say they will, that they will pass trade adjustment assistance, that they will take care of those workers—if they don’t live up to that promise—and many times in the past they haven’t lived up to similar promises—a lot of my colleagues are going to go home and face people who say: Wait. You made a decision. I got thrown out of a job because

of a decision you made, because of a decision you made as a House Member, because of a decision you made as a Senator, because of a decision you made, Mr. President. I was thrown out of work, and you passed on June 23—or whatever today is—fast-track without taking care of me, even though it was your decision that I lose my job.

What kind of government—what kind of principles do we live under here?

In March, conservative columnist Charles Krauthammer wrote in *National Review Online*:

To be sure, any trade deal, while a net plus overall, produces winners and losers. But the TPP will be accompanied by so-called Trade Adjustment Assistance, training and subsidies to help those negatively affected.

Again, Krauthammer, as he is about 95 percent of the time, is wrong. He is wrong that it is going to be accompanied by the trade adjustment assistance. The assumption all along, even among TPP proponents, has been that TPA would be passed in tandem with aid for workers. But you know, even though that is what we did first here, Republicans in the House of Representatives are unwilling to vote for them together. They are just not going to vote. Speaker BOEHNER, for some reason, acquiesced to the President of the United States, pulled them apart, and had separate votes. Think about the message we will send. If we put another huge trade deal—parenthetically, once-majority leader, Republican leader Trent Lott said: You can’t pass a trade agreement in an even-numbered year. Do you know why he said that? He said that because people don’t like trade deals in this country. People know NAFTA sold them out. They know CAFTA sold them out. They know PNTR with China sold them out. They know Korea sold them out. We heard these promises over and over.

With NAFTA, we were promised 200,000 jobs in 2 years. Thank you, President Bush 1, and thank you, President Clinton, for that. We lost 680,000 net jobs. Central America Free Trade Agreement—thank you, President Bush 2, for that. Promises were made, big promises about job increases, big promises about wages going up. It didn’t happen. Wages stayed flat. Jobs were lost. Thank you, President Bush 2, for that.

Korea, South Korea Free Trade Agreement, negotiated in part by President Bush, pushed through the Senate by President Obama—thank you, Mr. Presidents of both parties, for that. They told us 70,000 jobs would be created out of the South Korea Free Trade Agreement. No, we have lost 75,000 jobs.

Using the same formula that we have—we have seen this over and over. We know what happens. The Bureau of Labor Statistics reported that between 2009 and 2012, two-thirds of displaced manufacturing workers who did find new jobs ended up taking lower paying jobs. Most of those workers saw wage losses of more than 20 percent.

You can debate whether the gains others experienced make these losses worth it. I don’t think they do. I think if you have traveled darned near anywhere—if Members of Congress spent a little more time with people who can’t contribute to them, with people who don’t belong to a local rotary club, with people who might just work hard, play by the rules, not make a lot of money, barely make it, sometimes have their house foreclosed on, sometimes lose their job—if we would spend a little more time with people like that, I think we would see how these trade agreements are working.

There is a debate to be had. I will cede it is debatable, whether these trade agreements—whether the evidence is that they create jobs or lose jobs. I think it is pretty clear they lose jobs. But there is no debate. There is no debate on what actually happens here. Because of decisions—I will repeat—before this vote coming up in about 60 seconds, because of decisions we make in this body—the President makes, Senators make, Congress men and women make—because of decisions we make in this body, people in our States, whether it is Arkansas or Arizona, Oregon, Utah or my State of Ohio, people lose jobs because of decisions we make. There is no question people lose jobs because of decisions we make. Anything short of providing for those workers who lose their jobs today, not doing this on a promise—we are basically trusting the majority leader who doesn’t really like, I understand, the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program. We are relying on the word of Speaker BOEHNER, who doesn’t particularly like trade adjustment assistance. We know most of the Members of his party in the House of Representatives do not particularly like trade adjustment assistance. We are going to rely on their promise.

We are voting today on the fly. We are saying to workers in this country: Yes, we have made decisions that may have cost you your job. We are going to try to help you when you lose that job, but we are still going to go ahead today and do that. That is why I asked my colleagues to vote no on this motion today to invoke cloture on trade promotion authority.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the

Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2146, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Johnny Isakson, David Perdue, Chuck Grassley, Thom Tillis, Marco Rubio, Daniel Coats, John Cornyn, Michael B. Enzi, Kelly Ayotte, Orrin G. Hatch, Roger F. Wicker, Deb Fischer, Rob Portman, Cory Gardner, Richard Burr, Roy Blunt.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2146 shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 60, nays 37, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 218 Leg.]

YEAS—60

Alexander	Feinstein	Murkowski
Ayotte	Fischer	Murray
Barrasso	Flake	Nelson
Bennet	Gardner	Perdue
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Cantwell	Heitkamp	Rounds
Capito	Heller	Rubio
Carper	Hoeven	Sasse
Cassidy	Inhofe	Scott
Coats	Isakson	Shaheen
Cochran	Johnson	Sullivan
Coons	Kaine	Thune
Cornyn	Kirk	Tillis
Cotton	Lankford	Toomey
Crapo	McCain	Vitter
Daines	McCaskill	Warner
Enzi	McConnell	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Wyden

NAYS—37

Baldwin	Heinrich	Reid
Blumenthal	Hirono	Sanders
Booker	King	Schatz
Boxer	Klobuchar	Schumer
Brown	Leahy	Sessions
Cardin	Manchin	Shelby
Casey	Markey	Stabenow
Collins	Merkley	Tester
Cruz	Mikulski	Udall
Donnelly	Murphy	Warren
Durbin	Paul	Whitehouse
Franken	Peters	
Gillibrand	Reed	

NOT VOTING—3

Corker	Lee	Menendez
--------	-----	----------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 60, the nays are 37.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent for rollcall vote No. 218, the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2146, trade promotion authority. Had I been present, I would have voted nay. •

DEFENDING PUBLIC SAFETY EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

House message to accompany H.R. 2146, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes.

Pending:

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill.

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill, with amendment No. 2060 (to the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill), to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 2061 (to amendment No. 2060), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell motion to refer the bill to the Committee on Finance, with instructions, McConnell amendment No. 2062, to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 2063 (to (the instructions) amendment No. 2062), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell amendment No. 2064 (to amendment No. 2063), of a perfecting nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Cloture having been invoked, the motion to refer falls.

The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I would just like to announce that Senator CORKER was inadvertently detained in getting to the floor of the Senate. Had he been here, he would have voted yea on the cloture motion.

Mr. President, I also just want to say to our colleagues that this is a very important day for our country. We have demonstrated we can work together on a bipartisan basis to achieve something that is extremely important for America. Not only when we confirm this trade promotion authority will we have the mechanism in place for the President to finalize an extraordinarily important deal with a number of different Asian countries, but it will indicate that America is back in the trade business. It will also send a message to our allies that we understand that they are somewhat wary about Chinese commercial and potentially military domination and that we intend to still be deeply involved in the Pacific.

So I want to congratulate Senator HATCH and Senator WYDEN. This has been a long and rather twisted path to where we are today, but it is a very im-

portant accomplishment for the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I would like to mention that as to the other two absences, Senator MENENDEZ had voted no on cloture before, and Senator LEE had voted no on cloture before. So the vote would have been 61 to 39.

More importantly, this is a day of celebration in the corporate suites of this country, to be sure, because they have another corporate-sponsored trade agreement that will mean more money in some investors' pockets. It will mean more plant closings in Ohio, Arizona, Delaware, Rhode Island, West Virginia, Maine, and all over this country.

Most importantly, what I didn't understand about the vote today is that even though the Wall Street Journal, the CATO Institute, and others acknowledge that, as to the decisions we make here on trade agreements—while they say it is a net increase in jobs—people lose their jobs because of the decisions we make. So we make decisions here today that throw people out of work. We know that. Across the political spectrum that is acknowledged. But we today don't do anything to help those workers that lose their jobs. We make a decision to throw people in Mansfield, OH, and Cleveland, OH, out of work, but then we don't take care of those workers that lost their jobs because of our decisions. It is shameful.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, let me just concur with the Senator from Ohio. This trade agreement was supported by virtually every major corporation in this country, the vast majority of whom have outsourced millions of jobs to low-wage countries all over the world. This trade agreement is supported by Wall Street. This trade agreement is supported by the pharmaceutical industry, which wants to charge people in poor countries higher prices for the medicine they desperately need.

This agreement was opposed by every union in this country, working for the best interests of working families, and by almost every environmental group and many religious groups.

In my view, this trade agreement will continue the policies of NAFTA, CAFTA, and Permanent Normal Trade Relations with China—agreements that have cost us millions of decent-paying jobs.

We need a new trade policy in America—a policy that represents working families and not just the big money interests.

I strongly disagree with the majority leader, who called this a great day for America. It is not a great day. It is a great day for the Big Money interests, not a great day for working families.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.