

By the way, people with behavioral health problems are more often the victims of violence than they are the perpetrators of violence. So often this is part of what we ask police to respond to. We expect police to be psychiatrists and psychologists and first responders and experts at protecting others. Then, we can easily begin to want to question what equipment they used, what uniform they were told they needed to have on for the exercise that they were about to participate in, the public safety moment they were about to be part of.

These are hard jobs. They are difficult jobs that often come into the moment of difficulty in other people's lives—people who for whatever reason do something that they would normally not do, react in a way that they might normally not react or react out of incredible frustration because of the situation they found themselves in. But we expect the police to step forward and immediately be able to respond to that situation in a way that protects others. Does every police officer do the right thing every time? Probably not. Does almost every police officer do their very best to do the right thing ever time? Absolutely, they do. It is the exceptions that get attention, as they should. But for those of us who every day benefit and benefit in this building from the work they do—I remember on 9/11. One of my memories of 9/11 is that I am one of the last people to leave the Capitol Building and the police officer who is there telling me to get out as quickly as I could. As she says that to me, I realize, as I am leaving the door to try to get to a safer place, she—the police officer who says that I need to get out of here right now—is still standing at the place where she told me: You need to get out of here right now. Whoever else might have been left in the building, she was trying to be sure that they got out of the building, too.

That is what we expect the police to do. That is what their families know every day when they go to work, that they may be called on to do extraordinary things. For those who serve, we are grateful. This is an important week to be grateful to police officers whom we see and police who are helping us whom we do not see. So I am pleased to be here to thank them for their service.

TRADE

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, on another topic, I would just like to say that I hope we can move forward with the ability to have trade agreements. I was disappointed yesterday that we were not able to move forward and not vote on a trade agreement but to vote on the framework that at some point in the future would allow us to negotiate a trade agreement.

You cannot get the final negotiation on a trade agreement unless the people with whom you are negotiating know that the trade agreement is going to be

voted on—yes or no—by the Congress. It cannot be an agreement that the Congress can go back and look at and say: Well, we do not really like that provision. We do not like this provision. Let's send it back, but let's not do what they said they were willing to do as part of this negotiation.

Trade is good for us. Trade is in almost all cases about tearing down barriers to our products, because we have very few barriers to those that we trade with. So trade is almost always an opportunity to sell more American products in other countries, particularly as it relates to the most likely first agreement we would get if we would get trade promotion authority. That agreement, the Trans-Pacific Partnership, will make a huge difference in the way that part of the world develops, if they develop based on a trade relationship where the rule of law matters, a trade relationship where everyone is treated in a way where you are looking for a way to come back and have more ability to work together in the future, where you are working on trade relationships where not every ounce of profit has to be made on any one deal, because you are always thinking about what happens next.

We have great opportunities there and they do too. That part of the world will be dramatically different 10 years from now and even more different 20 years from now, if our system becomes a system that becomes the basis for how they move into their economic future and create economic opportunity for them and for us—as opposed to the other alternatives, which are much more colonial in nature, much more cynical in nature, much more likely to be one big trading partner, and there is one little trading partner in every deal.

That is not the way this works. That is not the way it should work, but we can't get to that final opportunity for American workers unless we have an agreement where we understand what happens to that agreement once it has been negotiated.

The best thing, the best offer does not come until the people on the other side of the negotiating table know they are doing this under trade promotion authority, an authority that every President since Franklin Roosevelt has had, and every President since Franklin Roosevelt asked for, until this President, who didn't ask for it until his second term and then clearly didn't do anything to push for it until after the congressional elections last year.

But this is a 6-year ability to create more opportunities for American workers and jobs that provide good take-home pay for American workers. I hope the unfortunate decision not to move forward and get this done is a decision the Senate quickly has a chance to rethink, revoke on, and move forward.

With that, I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). Morning business is closed.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to H.R. 1314, which the clerk will report.

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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

OUR COUNTRY'S WORD ON THE INTERNATIONAL STAGE

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, it has been nearly 2 years since the Syrian tyrant Bashar al-Assad attacked his own people with sarin gas, crossing President Obama's so-called red line. At the time, President Obama grudgingly called for airstrikes against Assad but hesitated at the moment of decision. When Secretary of State Kerry opened the door to a negotiated solution, Vladimir Putin barged in, allowing Assad the pretext of turning over his chemical weapons to avoid U.S. airstrikes. The amen chorus proclaimed a strategic master stroke.

But it wasn't so. Street-smart observers were onto Assad's game. He only needed to keep a tiny fraction of his chemical stockpile to retain his military utility. Syria thus could open most—but not all—of its facilities at no cost to the regime.

In fact, because most of Syria's chemical agents were old, potentially unreliable yet still dangerous, the regime actually benefitted by getting the West to pay for the removal of the old stockpiles.

And where are we now? Exactly where a few of my colleagues and I warned we would be. News reports just this week indicate that the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons has discovered new evidence of sarin gas and VX nerve agent—9 months after the organization declared Syria had disposed of all of its chemical weapons. In the meantime, Assad has simply shifted to chlorine gas for chemical attacks against his own people, which is also prohibited by the Chemical Weapons Convention, even though Syria signed that convention as part of President Obama's deal in 2013.

I am appalled by these reports that the Syrian regime has obtained stocks of chemical weapons, but I cannot say I am surprised. Anyone with eyes to see knew the message President Obama had sent. When he flinched in 2013 in the face of Assad's brazen and brutal