

Last week, rather than even consider a path forward that includes spending reductions, our Democratic counterparts, at the urging of their leadership here in the Senate, effectively walked away from the negotiating table. As a result, it appears that the only immediate path forward is to extend contracting authority until the end of July, when the funding runs out, setting us up for another deadline and potential cliff in just a few short weeks.

Let me be clear, I do not fault Republican leaders in either Chamber for taking this route. It was, given the short timetable, the only option left after Democrats failed to engage in meeting us halfway with a balanced package of compliance revenue and spending reductions.

But make no mistake, we are going to be here again in 2 months, facing the same problem, because unless someone has \$90 billion just lying around, a long-term highway solution is not going to simply materialize between now and July. Don't get me wrong, fixing it in December was going to be difficult as well, but in the end it will likely take at least that long to find a solution that has a chance of passing through both Chambers.

The other side's strategy appears pretty transparent. They clearly have two goals in mind. First, they think that if they make Republicans vote on highway funding over and over again, we can be cajoled into accepting their preferred solution, which is a large tax hike. Second, they think that by maintaining a constant state of chaos and uncertainty, they can make the Republican-led Congress look bad or look ineffectual.

That first goal is pretty predictable. After all, a tax hike is their answer to pretty much every question that arises here. I hope I am wrong on the apparent second goal. If I am right, it is just sad. Apparently, after spending years in the majority trying to make sure the Senate never did anything productive, their goals have not changed now that they are in the minority.

But things are different now. These days, we are getting things done in the Senate, much to the consternation of some of my friends on the other side of the aisle. Despite this most recent shift on highway funding, I am confident we can work together to find a workable path forward. It just may take a few more votes to get us there.

Today, though I am frustrated, I am undeterred. I am committed to finding a long-term solution to our highway problems. I plan to keep working with my colleagues on finding a way to get us there, particularly Chairman INHOFE, whose committee deals with much of the highway policy, as well as those who serve on the Finance and Ways and Means Committees.

The highway bill should be a bipartisan effort. It used to be. Hopefully, after we get this latest episode behind us, it will be again.

PROTECTING STATES' RIGHTS TO PROMOTE AMERICAN ENERGY SECURITY ACT

Mr. HATCH. Finally, Mr. President, I would also like to briefly talk about legislation I introduced earlier this year, the Protecting States' Rights to Promote American Energy Security Act, which reinforces States' already effective regulatory practices relating to hydraulic fracturing.

This important piece of legislation recognizes States' demonstrated ability to properly address hydraulic fracturing and allows them to continue regulating on this issue. Importantly, this legislation does not prevent the Bureau of Land Management from promulgating baseline standards where none exist.

As background, for over 60 years, States have safely and successfully regulated hydraulic fracturing in a way that protects the environment. When I was in the oil business back in the early 1970s, hydraulic fracturing was being used then, although it has been brought clearly into a much more safe and responsible way since. Even the Obama administration has admitted there has never been an example of harm to human health or groundwater contamination caused by hydraulic fracturing under existing State regulations and oversight.

States should be able to continue to regulate hydraulic fracturing, and swift passage of this bill will afford needed certainty and future security for emerging U.S. energy development companies.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

ENSURING TAX EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS THE RIGHT TO APPEAL ACT

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1314) 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.

Pending:

Hatch amendment No. 1221, in the nature of a substitute.

Hatch (for Flake) amendment No. 1243 (to amendment No. 1221), to strike the extension of the trade adjustment assistance program.

Hatch (for Lankford) amendment No. 1237 (to amendment No. 1221), to establish consideration of the conditions relating to religious freedom of parties to trade negotiations as an overall negotiating objective of the United States.

Brown amendment No. 1242 (to amendment No. 1221), to restore funding for the trade adjustment assistance program to the level established by the Trade Adjustment Assistance Extension Act of 2011.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 5:30 p.m. will be equally divided between the two managers or their designees.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Thank you, Madam President.

Finally, at long last, the Senate has begun its debate on the Bipartisan Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015, a bipartisan and bicameral bill to renew trade promotion authority or TPA. As one of the authors of this legislation, I am glad we have gotten to this point and look forward to a spirited and fulsome debate on the floor.

This legislation has been in the works for a long time. As we all know, the previous iteration of TPA expired in 2007. The original version was originally enacted in 2002. In other words, it has been 13 years since Congress seriously considered legislation to renew trade promotion authority. I think it is safe to say that at least for those who focus on trade policy, the debate and discussion surrounding what would go into the next TPA bill has been going on that entire time.

For me, while I have long been a supporter of free trade and TPA, the real work on this bill began in earnest in the spring of 2013. I worked for the better part of a year with former Chairman Max Baucus and Dave Camp on legislation to renew TPA for a 21st century economy. We introduced our bill—which, in many ways, formed the basis for the legislation we are debating now—in January of last year.

This year, when I became chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, I sought to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to make improvements to the bill in order to broaden its support. Most notably, I worked closely with my colleagues on the Finance Committee and with chairman PAUL RYAN of the House Ways and Means Committee to craft an improved TPA bill. Senator WYDEN and I work well together, and we were able to bring this bill to fruition. I think we were successful.

Indeed, we were able to build upon the efforts of last Congress to make important changes that will enhance Congress's role in crafting our trade policy and improve overall transparency and accountability. We introduced our bill on April 16, and on April 22, the Finance Committee reported