

malign influence that has put at risk and in jeopardy not only American lives but lives of countless people throughout that region.

Mr. Soleimani, who was removed in the last few days, of course, was responsible for hundreds of American deaths. His loss is something that I think people not only in this country but certainly people in that region of the world benefit from because he will no longer be able to conduct and operate and commit terrorist attacks and bring about death to people all over that region of the world.

IMPEACHMENT

Mr. President, I would also like to point out, as I think most know, and most of the reporting has reflected this, that Republicans in the Senate—and yesterday Leader MCCONNELL made the statement—are prepared to take up the Articles of Impeachment when they are delivered to us by the House of Representatives. For whatever reason—and it appears that the House Democrats under Speaker PELOSI have determined that it is to their political advantage for some reason to hang on to those articles and to perhaps game this out a little bit. We, of course, don't know what that gains them. But in any event, they have not yet, after now several weeks, decided to proceed and to bring those over here to the Senate.

I would point out that it can't be because there isn't a process in place to deal with those articles when they arrive. Obviously, what Republicans in the Senate have agreed to adopt is the Clinton precedent—in other words, the precedent that was used when President Clinton went through impeachment 21 years ago. At that time, it was good enough for all of the Democrats in the U.S. Senate—by a vote of 100 to 0, a unanimous vote in the U.S. Senate—to proceed to those articles.

All Senate Republicans are simply saying is that is a good precedent. It was good enough for Democrats and Republicans back then, and it ought to be good enough for Republicans and Democrats today.

What that simply provides for is to allow both sides—the managers in the House to come over and make their argument; the President and his team to be able to put up their defense; Senators to have an opportunity to listen to those arguments and then to propound questions, to ask questions through the Chair that could be responded to, and then, at that time, to determine whether additional information, evidence, witnesses, et cetera, could be brought forward. But as a very straightforward process—one, as I said, that met with the approval of all 100 Senators, both Democrats and Republicans, back in 1999—the Clinton precedent seems to me, at least, to be a fair way in which to proceed and one that Senate Republicans have agreed to move forward with.

If and when the House Democrats under Speaker PELOSI determine they

are ready to send those articles over here—it seems like maybe they are waiting for something to rescue what I think is an otherwise fairly weak argument they have to make, but when those articles arrive here, we will have a process in place in which to move forward and get this trial underway in the Senate and hopefully hear the arguments and at some point—I hope in the not too distant future—conclude this and get it behind us and move on to the work the American people sent us here to do.

Obviously, there is an election coming up in November. The first votes will start being cast just a few weeks from now in the States of Iowa, New Hampshire, and other States, followed very closely on by Super Tuesday. The election process is already underway, and I think that is the means by which most Americans believe we ought to deal with our leadership. In a democratic system of government, we have the opportunity as people to express our opinions and to voice our views in that manner. I hope that is where we can settle these political differences and disputes we have.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. President, while the House continues to be bogged down and stalled out over impeachment, the Senate is moving forward with the business that I think is important to the daily lives of the American people.

Yesterday, the Senate Finance Committee passed the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement out of our committee. I serve as a member of that committee. I was pleased to vote to move this agreement one step closer to final approval by the full Senate.

The United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement will benefit almost every sector of our economy, from manufacturing, to digital services, to the automotive industry. It will create hundreds of thousands of new jobs, boost our economic output, and increase wages for workers.

The agreement breaks new ground by including a chapter specifically focused on small and medium-sized businesses. This is the first time a U.S. trade agreement has ever included a dedicated chapter on this topic. Roughly 120,000 small and medium-sized businesses around our country export goods and services to Mexico and Canada, including a number of businesses in my home State of South Dakota. USMCA will make it easier for these businesses to successfully export their product.

South Dakota businesses and consumers will also benefit from the fact that the agreement maintains the current U.S. de minimis threshold—something I fought hard to protect.

I am also particularly excited about the benefits the USMCA will bring to farmers and ranchers. Farmers and ranchers have had a tough time over the past few years. Low commodity and livestock prices, natural disasters, and protracted trade disputes have left

farmers and ranchers in my home State of South Dakota and around the country struggling.

I spend a lot of time at home talking to farmers and ranchers. Again and again, they have emphasized to me that the most important thing Washington can do to boost our Nation's farm economy is to conclude favorable trade deals. That is why I have spent a lot of time this past year pushing for adoption of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement and why I am so pleased that after a long year waiting for the House under Speaker PELOSI to take it up and act on it, we are finally going to have the opportunity to approve that trade deal in the Senate.

Canada and Mexico are the No. 1 and No. 2 markets for American agricultural products. The United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement will preserve and expand farmers' access to these two critical export markets, and it will give farmers certainty about what these markets will look like long term.

I am particularly excited about the improvements the agreement makes for dairy farmers. If you drive the I-29 corridor north of Brookings, SD, you will see firsthand the major dairy expansion South Dakota has experienced over the past several decades—I should say, over the past several years.

The U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement will preserve U.S. dairy farmers' role as a key dairy supplier to Mexico, and it will substantially expand market access in Canada. In fact, the U.S. International Trade Commission estimates that the agreement will boost U.S. dairy exports by more than \$277 million. The agreement will also expand market access for U.S. poultry and egg producers. It will make it easier for U.S. producers to export wheat to Canada.

There is so much more in this agreement.

Yesterday's Finance Committee vote was a long time coming for South Dakota farmers and ranchers. Months of delay by House Democrats left agriculture producers wondering if they would ever see the benefits of this agreement. But we have at last been able to move forward, and I look forward to full Senate passage of the United States-Mexico-Canada trade agreement in the very near future.

I yield the floor.

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

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

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant 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 nomination of Matthew H. Solomson, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for a term of fifteen years.

Mitch McConnell, Mike Crapo, Thom Tillis, Mike Rounds, Lamar Alexander, John Hoeven, Roger F. Wicker, Pat Roberts, John Thune, Cindy Hyde-Smith, John Boozman, Tom Cotton, Chuck Grassley, Kevin Cramer, Steve Daines, Todd Young, John Cornyn.

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 nomination of Matthew H. Solomson, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for a term of fifteen years, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE).

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

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 88, nays 7, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 3 Ex.]

YEAS—88

Baldwin	Fischer	Portman
Barrasso	Gardner	Reed
Bennet	Graham	Risch
Blackburn	Grassley	Roberts
Blumenthal	Hassan	Romney
Blunt	Hawley	Rosen
Boozman	Heinrich	Rounds
Braun	Hoeven	Rubio
Brown	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Burr	Inhofe	Schatz
Cantwell	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Capito	Jones	Scott (SC)
Cardin	Kaine	Shaheen
Carper	Kennedy	Shelby
Casey	King	Sinema
Cassidy	Lankford	Smith
Collins	Leahy	Stabenow
Coons	Lee	Sullivan
Cornyn	Loeffler	Tester
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Thune
Cotton	McConnell	Tillis
Cramer	McSally	Toomey
Crapo	Menendez	Udall
Cruz	Merkley	Van Hollen
Daines	Moran	Warner
Duckworth	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murphy	Wicker
Enzi	Murray	Young
Ernst	Paul	
Feinstein	Peters	

NAYS—7

Gillibrand	Klobuchar	Wyden
Harris	Markey	
Hirono	Schumer	

NOT VOTING—5

Alexander	Perdue	Warren
Booker	Sanders	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 88, the nays are 7.

The motion is agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant bill 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 nomination of Eleni Maria Roumel, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for a term of fifteen years.

Mitch McConnell, Mike Crapo, Thom Tillis, Mike Rounds, Lamar Alexander, John Hoeven, Roger F. Wicker, Pat Roberts, John Thune, Cindy Hyde-Smith, John Boozman, Tom Cotton, Chuck Grassley, Kevin Cramer, Steve Daines, Todd Young, John Cornyn.

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 nomination of Eleni Maria Roumel, of Maryland, to be a Judge of United States Court of Federal Claims for a term of fifteen years, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE).

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

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 4 Ex.]

YEAS—51

Barrasso	Crapo	Inhofe
Blackburn	Cruz	Johnson
Blunt	Daines	Kennedy
Boozman	Enzi	Lankford
Braun	Ernst	Lee
Burr	Fischer	Loeffler
Capito	Gardner	McConnell
Cassidy	Graham	McSally
Collins	Grassley	Moran
Cornyn	Hawley	Murkowski
Cotton	Hoeven	Paul
Cramer	Hyde-Smith	Portman

Risch	Sasse	Thune
Roberts	Scott (FL)	Tillis
Romney	Scott (SC)	Toomey
Rounds	Shelby	Wicker
Rubio	Sullivan	Young

NAYS—44

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

NOT VOTING—5

Alexander	Perdue	Warren
Booker	Sanders	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 51, the nays are 44.

The motion is agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant 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 nomination of Michael George DeSombre, of Illinois, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Thailand.

Mitch McConnell, John Boozman, James M. Inhofe, John Barrasso, Roy Blunt, Todd Young, Shelley Moore Capito, Michael B. Enzi, Lisa Murkowski, John Cornyn, Steve Daines, Lindsey Graham, Chuck Grassley, Josh Hawley, Roger F. Wicker, Marsha Blackburn.

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 nomination of Michael George DeSombre, of Illinois, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Thailand, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE).

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

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.