

## VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT

Mr. President, I want to take an additional moment to talk about a second issue that is about saving lives.

For almost 25 years, the Violence Against Women Act has helped prevent domestic violence and provide survivors with the things they need to build a better life for themselves and their families. This important piece of legislation is now expired.

The House passed a VAWA—Violence Against Women's Reauthorization bill 48 days ago and sent it to us. It contained important updates to protect people from violent dating partners and stalkers, and it helps restore Tribal jurisdiction over certain crimes committed on Tribal lands.

Unfortunately, just as in the case of junk insurance plans, we have seen no action on this floor—no action—by the majority leader. I think, in fact, it has been over 2 months since we have had actual legislation and votes on legislation that would solve problems and address concerns of the American people. It has been 48 days since the House of Representatives sent us a bill to continue support and funding for domestic violence shelters and other important support.

Well, people with preexisting conditions have waited long enough. Survivors of domestic violence have waited long enough. People whose lives are being threatened by violent dating partners or stalkers have waited long enough.

Here is my question for the Senate majority leader: What are you waiting for?

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BURR. 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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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. BURR. I ask unanimous consent that we start the 4:30 votes now.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Nielson nomination?

Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 123 Ex.]

## YEAS—51

Alexander	Fischer	Paul
Barrasso	Gardner	Perdue
Blackburn	Graham	Portman
Blunt	Grassley	Risch
Boozman	Hawley	Roberts
Braun	Hoeven	Romney
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Capito	Inhofe	Rubio
Cassidy	Isakson	Sasse
Cornyn	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cramer	Lankford	Shelby
Crapo	Lee	Sullivan
Cruz	McConnell	Thune
Daines	McSally	Toomey
Enzi	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	Young

## NAYS—47

Baldwin	Hassan	Rosen
Bennet	Heinrich	Sanders
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schatz
Booker	Jones	Schumer
Brown	Kaine	Shaheen
Cantwell	King	Sinema
Cardin	Klobuchar	Smith
Carper	Leahy	Stabenow
Casey	Manchin	Tester
Collins	Markey	Udall
Cooms	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Murphy	Warren
Durbin	Murray	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Peters	Wyden
Gillibrand	Reed	

## NOT VOTING—2

Harris Tillis

The nomination was confirmed.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining votes be 10 minutes in length.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Stephen R. Clark, Sr., of Missouri, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Clark nomination?

Mr. WICKER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 124 Ex.]

## YEAS—53

Alexander	Fischer	Paul
Barrasso	Gardner	Perdue
Blackburn	Graham	Portman
Blunt	Grassley	Risch
Boozman	Hawley	Roberts
Braun	Hoeven	Romney
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Capito	Inhofe	Rubio
Cassidy	Isakson	Sasse
Collins	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Lankford	Shelby
Cramer	Lee	Sullivan
Crapo	Manchin	Thune
Cruz	McConnell	Toomey
Daines	McSally	Wicker
Enzi	Moran	Young
Ernst	Murkowski	

## NAYS—45

Baldwin	Hassan	Rosen
Bennet	Heinrich	Sanders
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schatz
Booker	Jones	Schumer
Brown	Kaine	Shaheen
Cantwell	King	Sinema
Cardin	Klobuchar	Smith
Carper	Leahy	Stabenow
Casey	Markey	Tester
Cooms	Menendez	Udall
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murphy	Warner
Durbin	Murray	Warren
Feinstein	Peters	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Reed	Wyden

## NOT VOTING—2

Harris Tillis

The nomination was confirmed.

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Carl J. Nichols, of the District of Columbia, to be United States District Judge for the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Nichols nomination?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

This is a 10-minute vote.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 43, as follows:

## [Rollcall Vote No. 125 Ex.]

## YEAS—55

Alexander	Gardner	Perdue
Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Blackburn	Grassley	Risch
Blunt	Hawley	Roberts
Boozman	Hoeben	Romney
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Burr	Inhofe	Rubio
Capito	Isakson	Sasse
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Collins	Jones	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Shelby
Cotton	Lankford	Sinema
Cramer	Lee	Sullivan
Crapo	Manchin	Thune
Cruz	McConnell	Toomey
Daines	McSally	Wicker
Enzi	Moran	Young
Ernst	Murkowski	
Fischer	Paul	

## NAYS—43

Baldwin	Hassan	Sanders
Bennet	Heinrich	Schatz
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schumer
Booker	Kaine	Shaheen
Brown	King	Smith
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cardin	Leahy	Tester
Carper	Markey	Udall
Casey	Menendez	Van Hollen
Coons	Merkley	Warner
Cortez Masto	Murphy	Warren
Duckworth	Murray	Whitehouse
Durbin	Peters	Wyden
Feinstein	Reed	
Gillibrand	Rosen	

## NOT VOTING—2

Harris	Tillis
--------	--------

The nomination was confirmed.

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Kenneth D. Bell, of North Carolina, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of North Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Bell nomination?

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 43, as follows:

## [Rollcall Vote No. 126 Ex.]

## YEAS—55

Alexander	Braun	Cornyn
Barrasso	Burr	Cotton
Blackburn	Capito	Cramer
Blunt	Cassidy	Crapo
Boozman	Collins	Cruz

Daines	Kennedy	Rounds
Enzi	Lankford	Rubio
Ernst	Lee	Sasse
Fischer	Manchin	Scott (FL)
Gardner	McConnell	Scott (SC)
Graham	McSally	Shelby
Grassley	Moran	Sinema
Hawley	Murkowski	Sullivan
Hoeben	Paul	Thune
Hyde-Smith	Perdue	Toomey
Inhofe	Portman	Wicker
Isakson	Risch	Young
Johnson	Roberts	
Jones	Romney	

## NAYS—43

Baldwin	Hassan	Sanders
Bennet	Heinrich	Schatz
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schumer
Booker	Kaine	Shaheen
Brown	King	Smith
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cardin	Leahy	Tester
Carper	Markey	Udall
Casey	Menendez	Van Hollen
Coons	Merkley	Warner
Cortez Masto	Murphy	Warren
Duckworth	Murray	Whitehouse
Durbin	Peters	Wyden
Feinstein	Reed	
Gillibrand	Rosen	

## NOT VOTING—2

Harris	Tillis
--------	--------

The nomination was confirmed.  
The Senator from Ohio.

## TRADE

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I am here on the floor today to talk about international trade. It is a very complex issue, but also a really important issue to our country. Our goal with trade should be pretty simple: It is to level the playing field for America's workers, America's farmers, and America's businesses.

One, we have got to be sure they are not hurt by unfair imports coming into our country, so that is really a fairness issue and a trade enforcement issue.

Second, we should expand our exports. Opening up more foreign markets to our products is great for America. That is the balance. As a trade lawyer and as the U.S. Trade Representative in the George W. Bush administration and as a member of the Finance Committee, which has jurisdiction over these issues, I have worked on the trade matters quite a bit. It is really important to my home State.

Ohio has products that are manufactured by workers and crops grown by our farmers that are shipped all around the world. In fact, in Ohio, 1 of every 3 acres is now planted for export. So our farmers are dependent on trade, and 25 percent of our factory workers—manufacturing workers—have their jobs because of exports. Twenty-five percent is a big part of our manufacturing economy.

These jobs aren't just good for Ohio's economy. They are great for the people that have them. Trade jobs pay, on average, 16 percent more than other jobs, and they have better benefits, so we want more of these jobs.

With 95 percent of the world's population living outside of our country, we want to sell more of our stuff to the rest of the world to continue to grow and maximize the potential of our economy. So in my State and a lot of

others, manufacturing and ag jobs that are the bedrock of our economy depend on balanced trade. That goes for our trading partners around the world, but particularly for our two biggest neighbors: Mexico and Canada. They are, by far, Ohio's biggest trading partners.

Since 1994, we have linked our economy to Mexico and Canada in the form of the North American Free Trade Agreement, or NAFTA. In 2018, Ohio shipped 39 percent of our exports to Canada, more than twice the national average. Along with our trade with Mexico, this accounted for \$20 billion in trade. In all, trade with Mexico and Canada now supports 450,000 jobs in Ohio. So it is important.

We all know that the existing agreement—again, called NAFTA—has to be updated. It is 26 years old. It needs to be modernized. It needs to be improved. We need to be sure that we are doing a better job of leveling that playing field that we talked about and be sure that we are reflecting the nature of the 21st century economy.

Think about it. Back when NAFTA was negotiated, there was no digital economy. So we need to have new rules with regard to digital economy, as we do in our more recent trade agreements.

Also, as an example, there were no biologics. So we have no protections in the NAFTA agreement for biological pharmaceuticals. Of course, we need to have that in the new agreement, but it is more than that. Labor standards and environmental standards that have been in all of the more recent trade agreements need to be incorporated into the NAFTA agreement. There are lots of reasons for us to update the North American Free Trade Agreement and to improve it. Although no trade agreement is perfect, the new USMCA does those things.

By the way, according to a recent study by the Independent Trade Commission, the new USMCA, which is used to replace NAFTA, is estimated to raise wages and add 176,000 jobs to the U.S. economy. That is good. I support this U.S.-Canada agreement, or USMCA.

Last week, President Trump and his administration took a major step toward realizing the USMCA by announcing they would be lifting the so-called section 232 steel tariffs on steel and aluminum coming from Mexico and Canada. This is really good news. It is something I had advocated for, as had others, in order for us to pass the USMCA here but also to be sure that other countries—Canada and Mexico—could ratify the USMCA.

It ends the retaliation by Mexico and Canada on Made in Ohio exports to our northern and southern neighbors. This was really starting to bite in my home State and around the country.

By the way, it also protects against import surges and transshipments, particularly with regard to steel and aluminum. We worry about transshipments coming from China into