

auto parts that go into an automobile. As an example, USMCA requires that 70 percent of the steel going into cars come from North America. There is no provision like that in the status quo, in the NAFTA agreement. So this is a big improvement for us to drive more jobs here in America with regard to the steel production that goes into automobiles.

But, second, it says that 75 percent of the overall content in USMCA automobiles that are sold through this agreement have to be from North America. That is a big jump. In the current agreement, instead of 75 percent, NAFTA has 62.5 percent.

What does that mean? It means that if you make a car, say, in Mexico, and it has a bunch of parts in it that come from other countries, say, Japan or China or Germany, they can't take advantage of the USMCA's lower tariffs unless they have at least 75 percent North American content. So that is a big difference.

Now, there are some, including on my side of the aisle, that have criticized this provision and said that somehow this is a protectionist provision. Let me just make this point. We are agreeing with Canada and Mexico that we are going to have a new agreement with them that lowers barriers, tariffs, and non-tariff barriers on our borders with Canada and Mexico. We are taking advantage of that, with each other trading back and forth. That is why we will have more trade. That is why we will have more jobs.

If other countries want to take advantage of that by coming into Mexico or Canada and adding parts to the cars, they are free riders because they are not giving us the reciprocal access to their markets as Canada and Mexico are. That is why I think this agreement makes sense.

Now, I think it will incentivize two things. One, it will incentivize more jobs here—auto jobs, manufacturing jobs, steel jobs. But, second, it will incentivize those other countries to enter into a trade agreement with us.

We have talked about this with Japan. We have taken the first step in starting to put together what is considered a broader free trade agreement. I hope we get to one. It would be important.

But if they can simply free ride on existing agreements by having their stuff be transshipped from another country into the United States to take advantage of the lower tariffs that we are providing to Canada and Mexico, they wouldn't have that incentive to trade with us with their own agreement. So I think this is a good thing for encouraging more trade agreements and more trade openness.

The International Trade Commission also tells us that the USMCA is going to grow our economy. In fact, they say it is going to grow our economy by double the gross domestic product of that which was projected under the Trans-Pacific Partnership. Some may remember that agreement, the TPP.

Many of my colleagues, particularly on the other side of the aisle, held that agreement up as one that would have been great for America and that we should be part of it. I think it is important that we trade with our neighbors in Latin America and in the Pacific Rim, but, frankly, that agreement that was touted as being so great had less than half of the economic growth that we are talking about here. So this has more than doubled the economic growth we saw in the TPP.

Second, the USMCA means new rules of the road for online sales. This is really important. So much of our economy today and our commerce takes place online, and yet there is nothing in NAFTA on it. If you think about it, 25 years ago there was no significant online commerce, and so there is nothing in the agreement. Whereas, in this agreement, there are a few things that are very important.

For my State of Ohio and, really, for our entire country, a lot of our commerce is done online now. We have a lot of small businesses engaged in it. They want to do business with Mexico and Canada, but they have no protections—no protections from tariffs. They can be assessed on that trade. This says no tariffs.

Also, data localization is something some countries are doing to American online companies. So if you are in online commerce in America, another country may say: Do you know what? You can do business in our country only if you localize your data, meaning the servers have to be in our country—in Mexico or in Canada, as an example.

This agreement says no. It prohibits that data localization requirement, which allows us to sell more to those countries without having to place our servers there.

It also says that the *de minimis* level on customs duties for sales online is increased. This saves money because people can now be involved in commerce with Canada and Mexico and not pay as much in terms of the customs duties and the tariffs, but there are also incredible administrative burdens being lifted by not having to worry about that. So this is good for us because we do a lot of online commerce here.

Third, I would say that American farmers are strongly behind this agreement for a good reason, which is that it opens up more markets for them and adds more certainty for them. Again, the NAFTA accord is 25 years old, and we had hoped during the last 25 years that we would get at some of the protectionist policies, particularly with regard to Canada and with regard to dairy and wheat and other issues, but we didn't have much success until now. Now, with the USMCA, we have the ability to send more of our stuff to these countries, and that is why the ag community is so excited about it. Between bad weather, low prices, and a shrinking China market, our farmers have been hit hard, and this is a light at the end of the tunnel. That is why,

by the way, over 1,000 farm groups have come out in support of USMCA.

There are a lot of folks I hear talking who say one side won or one side lost in the negotiations over USMCA. I don't think that is it. I think because of the hard work of U.S. Trade Representative Bob Lighthizer and the Trump administration and President Trump himself supporting this and pushing it, I think neither side won but the American people won. And isn't that nice to see? I think that is why you saw today on the floor of the House of Representatives a vote of 385 to 41.

I think now more people are going to be able to benefit from trade with these two countries. For Ohio, Canada is, by far, our largest trading partner. Mexico is No. 2. So this is a big deal. It is more modernized trade. We have replaced an agreement that has shown its age with unenforceable labor standards and environmental standards, non-existent digital economy provisions, and outdated rules-of-origin provisions. This changes all that.

We waited long enough. It is time, now that the House has voted—as I said, this evening, which was great news—to get that legislation over here to ensure that we do have great victory for American farmers, for small businesses, for our manufacturers, for our online businesses, and so many others.

I look forward to the opportunity to be able to vote for it over here.

COMBATING METH AND COCAINE ACT

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I would also like to talk for a moment about the legislation we just passed on the appropriations side.

There were two bills. One focused more on the national security and defense side. There are a lot of good things in there for Ohio, including the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, and also for the Lima Tank Plant. Also, much more importantly, it is good for our military—for our men and women in uniform, who are on the frontlines every day, sacrificing for us.

We have shown through this legislation we just passed that we appreciate them. There is not only a pay raise, but also we are providing them the equipment and the modern technology they need to be able to be successful.

But I also noticed in the agreement that just passed, the first appropriations bill, that there is really important language with regard to the drug crisis that we face in this country.

I see my colleague SHELTON WHITEHOUSE is on the floor. I have worked with him over the years on the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act. Now we have a CARA 2.0 bill that we would like to see passed.

But the bottom line is that this House and Senate and President Obama and now President Trump have begun to address this problem in different ways over the last 3 or 4 years, and it is beginning to work. We are finally beginning to see, with regard to the opioid crisis, some success.

Recall that the opioid crisis is the worst drug epidemic we have ever faced in this country. In 2017, 72,000 Americans lost their lives to overdoses. That is more than we lost in the entire Vietnam war. Last year, we had a little better number. After 12 years of increases every year in overdose deaths, finally, last year, we had a slight decrease, and I think it is because of a lot of good work that has been done here, particularly with regard to the opioid crisis.

In Ohio, unfortunately, we have been in the center of the storm. We have been one of the top two or three States in the country in terms of overdose deaths.

Last year, in 2018, because of all the hard work we have done here at the Federal level, at the State level, and at the local level, we actually saw a decrease. We led the country with a 22-percent decrease in overdose deaths. So that is the good news, and it is because of the Comprehensive Addiction Recovery Act, which is bipartisan and which is working to provide more treatment and recovery services, to provide better prevention, and to provide more Narcan to reverse the effects of overdoses. It is also because of the 21st Century Cures Act, which provides funding for evidence-based programs to the States and the States decide how it is spent.

I was back home just this past week meeting with people who are getting the benefit of those programs. On Monday, I was at a home in Dayton, OH, that provides residential treatment for women who are addicted and pregnant and helps their children to be able to overcome the neonatal abstinence syndrome when they are born to a mother who is using. It is beginning to work.

I met two mothers who have turned their lives around, and I saw a beautiful baby who, at 5 weeks old, is going into the world brighter, cheerier, and with more opportunity because of the work that we have done here to provide funding to help.

But I will say we have found, having made progress on opioids, that other drugs are starting to come into our communities. This is not just an opioid problem. This is an addiction problem, and addiction is a disease that must be treated like other diseases.

Although we have made progress, we can't rest on our laurels. When I talk to those on the frontlines, as I did on Monday in Dayton with law enforcement—the sheriff was there for Montgomery County—but also to treatment providers, to those who are in the trenches, and talking to those who are recovering addicts who were there, they tell me about what is happening, which is that, increasingly, other drugs, including psychostimulants like crystal meth and cocaine, are making a horrible comeback in those communities.

Crystal meth coming in from Mexico is more pure and less expensive than ever. In fact, law enforcement tells me

that on the streets of Columbus, Dayton, Cleveland, or Cincinnati, crystal meth is sometimes less expensive than marijuana and yet much more powerful and much more dangerous.

So it is important that here in Congress we focus on how to respond to that. Although we have some great legislation out there with regard to opioid addiction, treatment, recovery, and how to deal with this, we have not done as well with regard to these new drugs coming in.

Part of the solution, of course, is to build up our security at our southern border, where we have seen larger and larger quantities of crystal meth, manufactured in Mexico, being brought into our country by these cartels from super labs, as they call them, in Mexico.

By the way, there were crystal meth labs over the years, but the volume was not nearly as high, and the cost was much higher. Now that it is cheaper and there is higher volume, you see the meth labs in our communities closing down, but for the wrong reason. It is not being made here anymore because the stuff coming from Mexico is so much more pure, more powerful, more deadly, and less expensive.

So for the people already struggling with methamphetamine or cocaine addiction, it is important that they have access to treatment, too, so they can get help.

What I have heard at the local level is this: We appreciate the funding on opioids, but we want more flexibility now to be able to use this funding to combat what is, in many of our communities, in Ohio, even a bigger problem, which is crystal meth and sometimes cocaine.

So I am pleased to say that in the legislation that we just passed here this evening, legislation that provides appropriations to deal with this addiction issue, we have provided that flexibility. We have said: Yes, we are going to continue to provide grants to help with regard to prevention and treatment and recovery and help with regard to getting people back on their feet and helping law enforcement, but we are going to allow local communities to use this funding both for opioids and for crystal meth and other drugs.

So my hope is that what we will see is some of the same progress we have made in opioids now happen with regard to some of these other substances.

I have introduced a bill called the Combating Meth and Cocaine Act—I introduced it in June of this year—to allow this kind of flexibility. That is an authorization bill that has already been introduced, and we have good bipartisan support for that.

But we went ahead today in these appropriations bill and did it for this year. So for this fiscal year, essentially, that legislation will be in effect. So for 2020 we are going to provide that flexibility.

I applaud the Senate appropriators for doing that. Again, I am proud of

Congress showing that we can be flexible and continue to fight a many-front war on this issue. It is not just about opioids. It is about addiction.

We also need to pass the authorization bill, the Combating Meth and Cocaine Act, and I hope that we will be able to do that after the first of the year to ensure that we can continue to address these public health threats and we can continue to provide for those whose future is so dim because of the addiction, and instead they be able to achieve their God-given purpose in life.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

SIGNING AUTHORITY

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills and joint resolutions during today's session of Congress.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT of Florida). The Majority Leader.

IMPEACHMENT

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, for the information of all of our colleagues, earlier this afternoon, my friend the Democratic leader and I had a cordial conversation. We discussed a potential path forward following the House Democrats' precedent-breaking impeachment of President Trump. Our conversation was cordial, but my friend from New York continues to insist on departing from the unanimous bipartisan precedent that 100 Senators approved before the beginning of President Clinton's trial.

Back in 1999, Senators recognized that there might well be disagreements about questions that would arise at the middle and end of the trial, such as witnesses. Here is what happened: All 100 Senators endorsed a commonsense solution. We divided the process into two stages. The first resolution passed unanimously before the trial began. It laid the groundwork, such as scheduling and structured early steps like opening arguments. Mid-trial questions such as witnesses were left until the middle of the trial when Senators could make a more informed judgment about that more contentious issue. All 100 Senators, including me, including Mr. SCHUMER, and a number of our colleagues on both sides who were here in 1999 endorsed the first resolution as a bipartisan, minimalist first step.

As of today, however, we remain at an impasse because my friend the Democratic leader continues to demand a new and different set of rules for President Trump. He wants to break from that unanimous bipartisan precedent and force an all-or-nothing approach. My colleague wants a special pretrial guarantee of certain witnesses whom the House Democrats themselves