

Just one study found that 83 percent of victims represented by an attorney were able to obtain a protective order versus almost 30 percent of victims without an attorney.

But here is the problem: There was a recent report by a national group that focuses on these issues. In 2014, in 1 day, there were over 10,000 victims who went without services, like legal services. So there is a desperate need. Christine and Nikole have been the ones leading the charge. I talk about an army of attorneys to do this kind of pro bono legal work in Alaska—they are the captains leading this charge.

Christine likes to quote one of the advocates she works with when she talks about her work. She says: “It is so satisfying to see the relief wash over a person’s face when they realize that there’s an end in sight and they don’t have to live like that in a cycle of violence anymore because they have an attorney representing them.”

Nikole has been traveling the globe with her daughter the past month thanks to a much needed sabbatical grant from Alaska’s Rasmuson Foundation.

Nikole, I hope you are having a much needed rest.

Let me end with a quote written by her about the work Alaska Legal Services does, the work she leads in our great State. She said: “In any given day, the people who come seeking our services may be moms that have been abused by their spouse, oftentimes in front of their children, and they come to us because they do not have the financial means to leave that abuse.” They help them with that. “We may have a grandfather who is struggling to care for his grandchildren and he fears he is going to lose his home. . . . For all of these problems, there is a civil legal solution. But unlike in criminal cases where a defendant is guaranteed a court-appointed attorney if they cannot afford one, in civil cases”—in these kinds of domestic violence and civil action cases—“there is no [right to an attorney].” And what they do is they provide it, particularly to victims of these heinous crimes.

Christine and Nikole lead organizations that are doing great work not only in Alaska, but nationwide, Legal Services Corporation does this work, and I am a big supporter of them here in the Senate.

Christine and Nikole, thank you for all the great work you have done over the years. Thanks for your tremendous spirit of generosity and kindness. I know I can thank you on behalf of so many survivors of these crimes whom you have helped, and their families. Thanks for being our joint Alaskans of the week this week in the U.S. Senate.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

TRADE SECURITY ACT

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, today I want to talk about an issue that has

gotten a lot of attention recently, and that is our U.S. trade policy. It is an important topic that affects every one of us. It affects our economy, it affects jobs, and it certainly affects our foreign policy.

I have followed it pretty closely over the years. I was a trade lawyer when I first started practicing law. I was U.S. Trade Representative, or USTR, under the George W. Bush administration, and now I am a member of the Senate Finance Committee, which has jurisdiction over these trade issues.

Most importantly, of course, I am a Senator from Ohio, which is a State that has a big manufacturing sector, a big agriculture sector, and a State where a lot of jobs depend on having a good trade policy. In fact, in Ohio, about 25 percent of our State’s factory workers are export workers. In other words, they make products that get exported. Today in Ohio, about one of every three acres that are planted gets exported—soybeans, corn, and wheat. These are good jobs too. Trade jobs, on average, pay about 16 percent more than other jobs and provide better benefits. So it is very important to our economy in Ohio to have these export jobs.

In America, we are about 5 percent of the world’s population. Yet we have about 25 percent of the world’s economy. So it is very important for us to have access to the 95 percent of consumers who live outside of our borders. We want to sell them more. We want to open up markets for our farmers, our workers, and our service providers.

While promoting exports, we also need to ensure that we protect American jobs from unfair trade, from imports that would unfairly undercut our farmers, our workers, and our service providers. Simply put, what we want is a level playing field where it is fair and where we have reciprocal treatment between countries.

If we have a level playing field, by the way, I believe American workers will be just fine. Our workers and businesses can compete and can win if we have a truly level playing field.

We want a balanced approach. We want to open up new markets for U.S. products, while being tougher on trade enforcement, so we can compete.

With my colleagues over the past couple of years, I coauthored a number of laws in this area. One is actually called the Level the Playing Field Act. It does just that. The other is called the ENFORCE Act. These are bipartisan laws that are helping to crack down on unfair trade that hurts U.S. jobs.

The Level the Playing Field Act helps on the front-end by making it easier for workers and businesses to win cases when foreign companies send us products that are unfairly traded because they are sold below their cost or dumped or because they are subsidized illegally. This makes it easier to put anti-dumping or countervailing duties, also known as tariffs, on those unfairly

traded products. That is a good idea. By the way, it is sanctioned by the international trade enforcer called the World Trade Organization. This law has worked over the last couple of years to raise tariffs on those unfair imports.

The second law, which is called the ENFORCE Act, helps on the back-end by ensuring that once workers win trade enforcement cases, the new duties on foreign imports are actually enforced. It is designed to keep countries from circumventing new tariffs by selling the product to a third country, a third party that then sells it to the United States to get around our tariffs. We don’t want people to evade our tariffs, and that is the purpose of the ENFORCE Act. It needs a little work, honestly, on its implementation. We need to strengthen it.

Together, the Level the Playing Field Act and the ENFORCE Act are working.

Since I came to the Senate in 2011, I have been involved in nearly 40 trade cases where American workers and producers were seeking relief from unfair foreign competition. I am proud to have received the American Iron and Steel Institute’s Congressional Steel Champion Award in 2015 for my ongoing work to allow steelworkers to compete on a level playing field.

In 2016, the Level the Playing Field Act was used to secure three big wins against China and several more against other countries in the sector of steel, particularly rolled steel—hot-rolled steel, cold-rolled steel, and corrosion-resistant steel. This is the kind of steel that is used to make cars and trucks and other things. Those products from China—rolled steel—now face tariffs of up to 265 percent thanks to our legislation and thanks to bringing these cases and winning them.

This is how trade enforcement should work. It shouldn’t just be about saying that we are going to raise tariffs just because we can because then other countries will do the same thing to us—raising tariffs, which are like taxes, and risking a trade war with escalating tariffs that would make everyone worse off. Enforcement actions should be focused on those countries that are engaging in unfair trade practices and violating our trade laws or the commitments that are required under the World Trade Organization.

We want a level playing field and reciprocity so we can open up more markets for our workers, and we want other countries to send us products that are fairly traded. It is pretty simple.

We need to be careful about taking action that increases barriers to trade. If we impose higher tariffs without justification, we invite retaliation and higher tariffs on our exports. My concern is that we are beginning to do just that, and it threatens the impressive economic gains we have seen this year.

Since the tax cuts and tax reform were enacted and since important new

regulatory relief has been implemented by the Trump administration, we have seen the economy grow. After a couple of decades of stagnant growth and flat wages, our economy is actually increasing, wages are starting to increase, and American workers and businesses are benefitting.

Just last week, the Commerce Department released the economic numbers for the past 3 months, and our economy grew by 4.1 percent in the second quarter of this year. Pro-growth Federal policies have resulted in this kind of a strong and growing economy that is creating more jobs and higher wages. We want to continue building on that momentum that we already started this year with these good fiscal policies.

I am concerned that some of our decisions on trade policy provide a real headwind to that growing economy. That is why, when I see the Commerce Department putting tariffs on automobiles and auto parts, I become concerned. According to one estimate, a 25-percent tariff on autos and auto parts could cost 624,000 American jobs.

Right now, the administration is doing a lot on the trade front. They have a lot of balls in the air. As far as our trade policy is concerned, I think it is causing a lot of uncertainty out there in the economy.

First, the administration is still renegotiating the North American Free Trade Agreement, or NAFTA, with Mexico and Canada, which are, by the way, our biggest trading partners in Ohio—Canada is No. 1, and Mexico is No. 2.

I support updating NAFTA. I think that is a good idea. I support what USTR Robert Lighthizer is trying to do. But after 15 months of talks and uncertainty, I am concerned. We need to see some light at the end of the tunnel. I hope we will soon, particularly as it relates to Mexico.

Second, the United States is raising tariffs on Chinese imports using section 301 of our trade law after conducting a thorough investigation demonstrating the number of anti-competitive ways—from administrative approval processes, to joint venture requirements, to outright cyber theft—that China uses to effectively steal American intellectual property.

Third, the administration is using a national security waiver to our trade rules—called section 232—to raise tariffs as a matter of national security on steel and aluminum imports from all but four countries. That means those tariffs are being imposed on a number of our strong allies. Because of that and the retaliation it has invited, this section 232 has been the focus of a lot of attention recently.

I agree with President Trump that we need to crack down on countries that cheat on trade—like China—and we need to make sure we do it in a smart and targeted way. China does steal our intellectual property, and they have been doing that for years.

China tilts the playing field against American firms, innovators, and workers and gets the technology they need to leapfrog the competition. I support action against this kind of unfair Chinese trade and investment practice, and I was glad to hear that serious talks with China might start soon.

As we go into these talks, we need to be clear about our objectives and clear about what we are looking for as Americans. Is it just trying to address the trade deficit and have them try to buy more of our exports, like soybeans or LNG—liquefied natural gas—or is it asking China to make some changes structurally so that we can have a more fair trading relationship as two mature trading partners? We also need to be sure, as we make clear our objectives, that we don't continue to raise tariffs without having these negotiations and direct talks.

My biggest concern is the administration's broad use of a powerful national security tool known as section 232. Section 232 comes from a trade act that was passed back in 1962 that was intended to be used purely for national security purposes. Thus, it has been invoked only rarely, only a few times, the last being in 1986, 32 years ago. Section 232 is really an exception to our trade laws because you neither have to show injury to a domestic industry nor any surge or unfair trade with regard to the targeted imports, as you would under these other trade laws. In other words, under the other laws, you have to show that there is material injury to a domestic company or that there is a surge coming in of imports or often that there actually is unfair trade, like the dumping we talked about earlier—selling below cost or subsidizing illegally. You don't have to show that under section 232.

One reason it has hardly ever been used is precisely because it doesn't require any negative impact or unfair influence or unfair trade. This means that when we use this tool, if it is not used for national security reasons, other countries are likely to respond in kind, simply putting tariffs on our exports for no reason. That is exactly what is happening.

Using section 232, we put a 25-percent tariff on steel and 10 percent on aluminum imports from nearly every country in the world across the board, most of which are our allies. The only exemptions are Argentina, Brazil, Australia, and South Korea. We negotiated quotas with them. For all the other countries in the world, we have these tariffs in place, including our close ally Canada, for example. They are a stalwart ally. They have had troops in Iraq with us. They had troops in Afghanistan with us. They are a good neighbor. They are Ohio's biggest trading partner and No. 1 export destination for the workers and farmers I represent. As a country, we actually send more steel to them than they send to us. Remember, this is about steel and aluminum national security tariffs. We actually ex-

port more steel to them than they send to us, but they are targeted by this section 232 as a national security threat for steel.

They have responded, as you would expect, with tariffs of their own on our exports—all kinds of exports across the board. According to one publication, Business Insider, Ohio is their No. 1 targeted State. That is the State I represent. They slapped tariffs on Ohio workers and farmers of more than \$1.7 billion.

Now let's back up for a second and talk about steel and aluminum. Is there an issue with unfair imports? Yes, there is, I think, particularly with regard to steel. We have a global glut of steel, and China is the reason.

About 15 years ago, China had about 15 percent of the global production of steel. Today, they have about 50 percent of the global production of steel, and they don't need it, so they are subsidizing it, and they are sending it out below its cost, which, again, is called dumping. That is why we have been using our other trade laws to go after these unfair exports, and we need to do more of that to stop the shipments, where they send the product to another country and then process it and then send it to us.

For certain countries and certain products, I believe there is a national security issue with steel. An example of that is electrical steel—something that is critical to our electric grid. Electrical steel is something we absolutely need. Yet there is only one U.S. manufacturer left of electrical steel. Imports have increased in the last year alone by about 100 percent. This is an example of how I believe section 232 could be used in a very targeted way that relates directly to our national security.

Again, we have other trade enforcement tools at our disposal, including the Level the Playing Field Act we talked about and the ENFORCE Act. We went after countries that subsidize or dump their products. These are more precise tools to hold our trading partners accountable that should be strengthened and used before section 232, where appropriate.

Misusing the 232 statute and its national security rationale not only leads to other countries increasing tariffs on all our exports to them, but it also risks the World Trade Organization stepping in and our actually losing what I think is an important national security tool. In other words, by misusing this, my fear is that we will be taken to the WTO by other countries. It has already happened. They have filed cases against us. The WTO could indeed rule—which they never have before—that we cannot use 232 in the way we have and take away that tool. That would be a big problem because I think it is a tool we should have in our toolbox.

I believe we run an even greater risk of losing this tool when the administration suggests that imports of cars

threaten our national security. That is the most recent case that is now working through the system. I want to see more cars made in America, but tariffs like the Commerce Department is suggesting would make it even more expensive to make a car here. We are told by the auto industry—and the big 3 automakers oppose this 232 on automobiles—we are told it would increase the cost of a car by about \$2,000.

That is why I believe we have to reform the section 232 statute and ensure that any 232 actions are based on a legitimate national security justification and that Congress has a larger role to play in its oversight. A few hours ago, my colleagues, Senators DOUG JONES and JONI ERNST, and I introduced bipartisan legislation that would help do just that. Our bipartisan bill, called the Trade Security Act, will reform section 232 to better align the statute with its original intent.

First, it ensures that proper experts in government determine at the outset whether there is a national security threat. Our bill requires the Department of Defense, not the Secretary of Commerce, to assess the potential threat posed by imports of certain products to justify the national security basis for new tariffs under section 232. If the Department of Defense says a threat is found, the Department of Defense would send its report to the President. The President would then direct the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with Congress, the Secretary of Defense, and USTR, to develop recommendations for how to respond to the threat. After receiving the remedy recommendations from the Secretary of Commerce, the President would then decide whether to take action.

So it creates a two-step process. The first step is determining whether there is a national security threat, done by the appropriate office and the appropriate experts in the Federal Government, and then the second step would be the Commerce Department coming up with the remedy, as opposed to now, where the Commerce Department makes that national security recommendation.

The bill will also expand the role of Congress by giving Congress the opportunity to disapprove of 232 action by passing a joint resolution. Currently, Congress can disapprove of section 232 actions through a joint resolution but only when it results in something covering oil or petroleum products. So it is interesting—under the current 232 statute, the disapproval process works but only as to oil or other petroleum products.

Our bill, the Trade Security Act, which we introduced today, would expand that process to include all products. By the way, the oil and petroleum production exception is a vestige from the last time section 232 was used, about 40 years ago, because it was used with regard to oil from Libya and from Iran.

Misusing our trade tools not only hurts our exporters, workers, and farmers, but also our consumers. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation to increase congressional oversight on one of our most important national security tools. When he signed the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 into law, which included section 232, President Kennedy said:

This act recognizes, fully and completely, that we cannot protect our economy by stagnating behind tariff walls, but that the best protection possible is a mutual lowering of tariff barriers among friendly nations so that all may benefit from a free flow of goods. Increased economic activity resulting from increased trade will provide more job opportunities for our workers.

So that was the context within which section 232 was passed—in other words, saying we don't want to put up more barriers. We want trade to be fair and reciprocal. Neither the President nor the Congress intended that section 232 would be used to put up more barriers. The Senate Finance Committee chairman in the Congress who passed this legislation said that in order for section 232 to apply, “the products must be involved in our national security.”

Whether it is the President or whether it is the Congress, the intent was clearly to tie this closely to national security.

Let's restore this powerful and important tool to Congress' original intentions when it crafted the law and ensure that section 232 is used appropriately for national security purposes.

This legislation will help to guide our trade policy and ensure that we keep national security and trade issues separate. The strength of America's economy comes from hard-working and innovative Americans in our shops, plants, and farms across this country that send products around the globe. We want more of that. They deserve a level playing field and the chance to compete.

Let's be sure our trade policy gives them that and not escalating tariffs for their exports and higher costs for their families. Let's find that right balance, including restoring an important national security tool by not misusing it.

I urge my colleagues to join us in support of the Trade Security Act to help do just that.

I yield back my time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNITED STATES-ISRAEL SECURITY ASSISTANCE AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2018

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate

proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 519, S. 2497.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2497) to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms Export Control Act to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriations of funds to Israel, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) *SHORT TITLE.*—This Act may be cited as the “United States-Israel Security Assistance Authorization Act of 2018”.

(b) *TABLE OF CONTENTS.*—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Appropriate congressional committees defined.

TITLE I—SECURITY ASSISTANCE FOR ISRAEL

Sec. 101. Findings.

Sec. 102. Statement of policy regarding Israel's defense systems.

Sec. 103. Assistance for Israel.

Sec. 104. Extension of war reserves stockpile authority.

Sec. 105. Extension of loan guarantees to Israel.

Sec. 106. Joint assessment of quantity of precision guided munitions for use by Israel.

Sec. 107. Transfer of precision guided munitions to Israel.

Sec. 108. Modification of rapid acquisition and deployment procedures.

Sec. 109. Eligibility of Israel for the strategic trade authorization exception to certain export control licensing requirements.

TITLE II—ENHANCED UNITED STATES-ISRAEL COOPERATION

Sec. 201. United States-Israel space cooperation.

Sec. 202. United States Agency for International Development-Israel enhanced partnership for development cooperation in developing nations.

Sec. 203. Authority to enter into a cooperative project agreement with Israel to counter unmanned aerial vehicles that threaten the United States or Israel.

TITLE III—ENSURING ISRAEL'S QUALITATIVE MILITARY EDGE

Sec. 301. Statement of policy.

SEC. 2. APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.

In this Act, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

TITLE I—SECURITY ASSISTANCE FOR ISRAEL

SEC. 101. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) In February 1987, the United States granted Israel major non-NATO ally status.

(2) On August 16, 2007, the United States and Israel signed a ten-year Memorandum of Understanding on United States military assistance to