

(2) the State and local law enforcement community; and

(3) the civil rights and criminal justice reform communities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

AMENDING TITLE 38, UNITED STATES CODE, TO MODIFY THE LIMITATION ON PAY FOR CERTAIN HIGH-LEVEL EMPLOYEES AND OFFICERS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of S. 3084 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3084) to amend title 38, United States Code, to modify the limitation on pay for certain high-level employees and officers of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MORAN. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (S. 3084) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 3084

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

**SECTION 1. MODIFICATION OF PAY LIMITATION FOR CERTAIN HIGH-LEVEL EMPLOYEES AND OFFICERS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.**

(a) MODIFICATION.—Section 7404(d) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting “and except for individuals appointed under 7401(4) and 7306 of this title,” after “section 7457 of this title.”

(b) WAIVERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may waive the limitation described in section 7404(d) of such title, as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, on the amount of basic pay payable to individuals appointed under section 7401(4) or 7306 of such title for basic pay payable during the period—

(A) beginning on November 1, 2010; and

(B) ending on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) FORM.—The Secretary shall prescribe the form for requesting a waiver under paragraph (1).

(3) TREATMENT OF WAIVER.—A decision not to grant a waiver under paragraph (1) shall not be treated as an adverse action and is not subject to further appeal, third-party review, or judicial review.

**VETERAN TREATMENT COURT COORDINATION ACT OF 2019**

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 886

and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 886) to direct the Attorney General to establish and carry out a Veteran Treatment Court Program.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MORAN. I ask unanimous consent that the McSally amendment at the desk be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The amendment (No. 1283) in the nature of a substitute was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the “Veteran Treatment Court Coordination Act of 2019”.

**SEC. 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS.**

It is the sense of Congress that veterans treatment courts are a successful program aimed at helping veterans charged with non-violent crimes receive the help and the benefits for which the veterans are entitled.

**SEC. 3. VETERAN TREATMENT COURT PROGRAM.**

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Subject to the availability of appropriations, in coordination with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, the Attorney General shall establish and carry out a Veteran Treatment Court Program to provide grants and technical assistance to court systems that—

(1) have adopted a Veterans Treatment Court Program; or

(2) have filed a notice of intent to establish a Veterans Treatment Court Program with the Secretary.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the Veterans Treatment Court Program established under subsection (a) is to ensure the Department of Justice has a single office to coordinate the provision of grants, training, and technical assistance to help State, local, and Tribal governments to develop and maintain veteran treatment courts.

(c) PROGRAMS INCLUDED.—The Veterans Treatment Court Program established under subsection (a) shall include the grant programs relating to veterans treatment courts carried out by the Attorney General pursuant to sections 2991 and 3021 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10651, 10701) or any other provision of law.

(d) REGULATIONS.—The Attorney General shall promulgate regulations to carry out this section.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The bill (H.R. 886), as amended, was passed.

H.R. 5430

Mr. CRAWLEY. Mr. President, it is no secret around here that staff work is key to any Senator's success. It often goes unnoticed and unthanked, but today, as the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act passes Congress, I would like to ex-

press my appreciation to the many Senate staff who work for the people of Iowa and the entire country.

Foremost among them are Kolan Davis, my Finance Committee staff director and longtime advisor of 35 years; Jeff Wrase, my deputy staff director; and Nasim Fussell, my chief international trade counsel on the committee. Their thoughtful, prudent advice, and hard work were crucial to helping create the conditions that allow for nearly-unanimous passage today.

Nasim led my trade staff on the Finance Committee. Her leadership of several other key staff, including Mayur Patel, Brian Bombassaro, Andrew Brandt, Rory Heslington, Grace Kim, and Michael Pinkerton, and all of their many late nights working at the office, are among the top reasons why this modernized trade agreement wasn't just negotiated with Canada and Mexico but will actually become law and soon take effect. Their diligent work with their Democratic counterparts, as well as the administration, is evidenced in the overwhelming vote USMCA received.

My chief of staff, Aaron Cummings, legislative director, James Rice, and director of scheduling, Jennifer Heins, provided consistent guidance and helpful input on USMCA throughout negotiations that helped me do the job I needed to do for us to get to this point. I am grateful for their standing by my side this past year and going above and beyond for the people of Iowa.

I would also like to thank my communications and press staff, including Michael Zona, Taylor Foy, George Hartmann, Nicole Tieman, Melissa Kearney, and Katelyn Schultz, for helping me communicate the many benefits of this trade deal to Iowans and all Americans. Their work to deliver that message to the grassroots of this country helped create the public pressure needed to encourage Congress to act and ratify USMCA.

We all know that no legislating happens in the Senate without bipartisanship. That is why today I say congratulations and thank you to Ranking Member WYDEN and his staff for all their hard work. They are Joshua Sheinkman, staff director; Mike Evans, deputy staff director; Jayme White, chief advisor on international competitiveness and innovation; and Greta Peisch, Sally Laing, Virginia Lenahan, and Rachel Lang.

Of course, also critical to the bill's passage were Ambassador Bob Lighthizer and his hard-working team at the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative, particularly John Melle and Maria Pagan.

Getting the Chamber of Commerce and the AFL-CIO to both endorse this trade deal was no easy feat, and it took both sides' good faith efforts to get us here.

You have heard me extol all the good that USMCA will do for this Nation's

farmers, ranchers, manufacturers and workers of all stripes—hundreds of thousands jobs, billions of dollars added to the economy, new market access, and a framework for the future of international trade. It is these staff members who also deserve to share in the Nation's gratitude and celebration.

Thank you all.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today, the Senate considers the "new NAFTA", a bill now reviewed by seven Senate committees on which more than 85 Senators serve. Surely the vote count is clear: This implementing legislation will be adopted today and sent to the President. In Vermont, that will mean important wins for our State's economy and, in particular, our dairy farmers. I will support this bill.

Vermont is a border State, and the commercial and cultural exchanges with Canada are woven into the fabric of the State. Vermont's largest export destination is Canada. In 2018, Vermont exported \$1.3 billion—billion—in goods to Canada. That is 43 percent of Vermont's exports. Trade with our neighbors to the north is essential to Vermont, just as trade throughout North America is important to our national economy.

This agreement is far from perfect, but reflects a compromise that results when parties come together with a desire to make progress. It makes important updates to the more than 25-year-old North American Free Trade Agreement to reflect the advances in digital trade and intellectual property. The agreement will protect our ability domestically to increase the availability of affordable drugs. Importantly, to Vermont and the struggling dairy industry across the country, the agreement will increase U.S. access to markets in Canada and Mexico for our high-quality dairy products.

The new NAFTA also includes funding to promote clean water infrastructure on the U.S.-Mexico border, and to improve environmental infrastructure on both sides of the southern border. It also includes funding to support reforms to the labor justice system in Mexico, to reduce the use of child labor and forced labor, to reduce human trafficking, and for international labor activities. These are important aspects of the deal that we should all strongly support.

This agreement is a compromise. For all its gains, it lacks important accountability measures to address the escalating threat of climate change. No one surprised that an administration that announced from the start its intention to remove the United States from the landmark Paris agreement would not agree to binding limits on pollution. It should not surprise us that the Trump administration would not agree to any system to enforce environmental regulations. It is the greatest flaw of this agreement and a startling missed opportunity. We can no longer deny that climate change is real. The United States has a real op-

portunity to be a world leader in developing the green jobs and green economies that must drive our future. So while I am grateful that House Democrats were able to secure some concessions from the administration that will ensure that at least consider environmental impacts in terms of trade, the new NAFTA, unfortunately, misses that chance.

I have heard from Vermont businesses concerned about our trade future, particularly with our neighbors to the north. They support this deal, and I ask unanimous consent to place a letter of support from the Vermont Chamber of Commerce and Vermont employers in the RECORD. It is because our trading relationships throughout North America are so vitally important to our national economy, and to local economies like those in Vermont, that I will support this agreement.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VERMONT CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,  
Montpelier, VT, January 14, 2020.

Hon. PATRICK LEAHY,  
Senator, U.S. Senate.  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR LEAHY: We, the undersigned, urge you to vote in support of S. 3052, the "United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement (USMCA) Implementation Act." Passage of this bill would provide much needed updates to the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), which took effect over a quarter of a century ago.

As you are aware, Vermont depends heavily on trade with our North American neighbors, particularly Canada. USMCA provides a path forward that strengthens these trade relationships and protects the interests of Vermont workers and industry. The proposed agreement promotes job stability and growth, while also providing tariff-free access to sell U.S. products in Canada and Mexico. A fully implemented USMCA also prevents the steep increases in consumer goods prices that would result from inaction. Further, USMCA grows digital trade, including by guaranteeing freedom to move data across borders, while protecting intellectual property.

Passage of USMCA relieves much of the uncertainty our business community has faced in relation to trade over the last several years. Businesses across Vermont have made clear that the unpredictable imposition of tariffs and the threat of tariffs have added significant, often unsustainable costs to doing business. These added costs have harmed industry and limited growth by discouraging the long-term investments that would have otherwise occurred had it not been for unprecedented levels of volatility in our trade dependent markets.

Implementation of USMCA would greatly benefit Vermont businesses and their employees by providing the mechanisms necessary for Vermont to continue a prosperous and competitive relationship with our top trade partner. Please promptly approve USMCA.

Sincerely,

VERMONT CHAMBER OF  
COMMERCE.  
BURTON SNOWBOARDS.  
CABOT CREAMERY  
COOPERATIVE.  
AGRI-MARK INCORPORATED.  
MBF BIOSCIENCE.  
LIQUID MEASUREMENT

SYSTEMS.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, in 1993, I voted against the North American Free Trade Agreement, or NAFTA. At the time, I was concerned about a number of issues, including that NAFTA would not adequately protect American jobs—manufacturing jobs in particular—and also lacked sufficient environmental protections.

Today, I voted yes on the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement that will replace NAFTA because it will substantially improve upon NAFTA, and in the process benefit California and the United States.

There are several provisions in the agreement that will help California, including greater access to Canadian agricultural markets, including dairy; labor provisions that go far beyond past trade agreements; and \$300 million to help address pollution from the Tijuana River. It also includes \$215 million and renewed authorization for the North American Development Bank to address pollution along the U.S.-Mexico border, a provision that comes from legislation I introduced with Senator CORNYN.

The agreement sets new standards for labor protections in a trade agreement. The agreement will require Mexico to make major improvements to its labor laws, including collective bargaining reforms, establishing independent labor courts and union dispute-resolution bodies, and eliminating compulsory labor. It will substantially improve monitoring and enforcement of these labor reforms in Mexico, and make the enforcement process easier. For example, the agreement will establish benchmarks for Mexico's compliance with its labor obligations that will trigger a new labor-specific enforcement mechanism if those obligations are not met.

The updates to NAFTA include several provisions that will help California's agricultural producers, including increasing access to Canada's dairy market. The agreement also puts wine, beer, and spirit products from each country on a more level playing field.

I recognize that some critics think we can do more to protect the environment and fight climate change, and I agree. But we can't make the perfect the enemy of the good, and this agreement takes important steps in that area. In addition to fighting pollution along the southern border, the agreement provides increased funding for environmental compliance monitoring and enforcement, helps prevent illegal and unregulated fishing and trafficking of wildlife, protects marine species, affirms each country's commitments to international environmental agreements, and makes it easier for countries to issue regulations in the public interest.

This agreement is a step in the right direction, in large part due to important improvements made by House Democrats. Those improvements helped secure many of the strong labor

and environmental provisions I have just mentioned.

These updates to NAFTA will also go a long way toward stabilizing our trade relationships with Mexico and Canada—two of the most important trading partners for California and the Nation. Canada and Mexico are two of the largest trading partners with the United States, each accounting for more than \$600 billion in trade. The two countries are California's two largest export markets, buying nearly \$50 billion of California's exports each year.

Finally, it is notable that this agreement has broad bipartisan support, which I think is a sign that Congress can still work together to get important things done.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today we consider these amendments to NAFTA. I opposed the original NAFTA in 1993 because I believed it would kill American jobs and failed to protect the environment. I oppose this version now, because it does not substantially improve on what was a bad deal all those years ago.

I appreciate the concessions my colleagues were able to force President Trump to accept that strengthen protections for workers, but at the end of the day, these changes don't go far enough. I am concerned that this trade agreement could continue NAFTA's suppression of wages here at home instead of lifting them. This agreement also doesn't prioritize protecting our environment and will contribute to environmental damage and degradation, and it will continue President Trump's failed economic priorities that primarily benefit the wealthy and well-connected at the expense of hard-working, middle-class, and blue collar taxpayers.

A well-crafted free trade deal should provide reciprocal benefits, contain sufficient labor standards that preserve and create jobs here at home, and include environmental and other protections to ensure that trade is conducted fairly.

If well-crafted, trade policy can be a vital part of our economic and security efforts. Ideally, it would serve to achieve our Nation's policy objectives. The simple fact is that there are winners and there are losers in any trade agreement. The loss of economic security as a result of trade agreement after trade agreement over decades stems from a frequent failure to provide guaranteed and significant assistance to dislocated workers and small businesses that are negatively impacted by increased trade. A little money for training in a massive economy just hasn't cut it.

In 1993, I thought that NAFTA failed this test and as a result would be bad for Rhode Island's workers, manufacturers, and small businesses. I outlined a number of concerns at the time.

I believed that NAFTA would increase incentives for companies to move factories and outsource jobs to

Mexico—depressing wages for American workers. I also worried that the conditions on the ground in Mexico and the disposition of its government were not conducive to a free-trade agreement. Sadly, many of these concerns were later realized. NAFTA, along with increased globalization, certainly contributed to stagnating wages, loss of jobs, and a diminishing manufacturing base. Businesses outsourced jobs and moved factories to Mexico where costs and wages were lower. Labor standards were not adequate or enforced and workers were taken advantage of. Additionally, there were lax environmental standards, further incentivizing businesses to move jobs to Mexico, and which have proven harmful to our environment.

Alternating between threatening to withdraw from NAFTA and imposing tariffs on dubious national security grounds, President Trump damaged critical relationships for, at best, marginal gains. That is what is so confounding. Out of the very chaos that President Trump has sown, we could have emerged with a much better, stronger NAFTA but that is not where we find ourselves.

According to a report conducted by the U.S. International Trade Commission, USITC, released in April, the USITC forecasts that the new NAFTA “would raise U.S. real GDP by \$68.2 billion (0.35 percent) and U.S. employment by 176,000 jobs (0.12 percent)” once implemented, years in the future. While each new job is critically important, these projections in no way match the rhetoric that President Trump spins and demonstrate that the new NAFTA is essentially the same as the old NAFTA from an economic perspective. It is also not clear that jobs lost as a result of NAFTA will be recovered, as has been claimed by some of the new NAFTA's proponents.

Similarly, I believe that many of the concerns that I had with NAFTA and other trade agreements remain, particularly with respect to the protection of workers and our environment and ensuring tough enforcement mechanisms. I note the absence of a specific and robust Trade Adjustment Assistance Program to assist workers negatively impacted by increased trade in the implementing legislation—such assistance was at least included in 1993. The implementing legislation contains \$843 million dollars in new spending. This includes resources to enforce environmental and labor standards in Mexico. Yet it does not include funding to assist American workers and small businesses who are negatively impacted by trade. As a result of any trade agreement, there are those who benefit and those who are hurt. We should always insist that there are sufficient provisions to assist workers who will lose out.

Environmental standards and protections were inadequately accounted for in 1993, and the fact that they are not sufficiently stringent here is very dis-

appointing. Climate change is having a serious impact on our environment and our economy. Safeguarding the environment is the right thing to do. It also helps ensure our workers can compete on an even playing field. Jobs are typically outsourced because it is cheaper to do business somewhere else. The absence of stringent and enforceable environmental standards in NAFTA contributed to a rush to move the production of goods to Mexico. It also hurt our environment. As we consider the new NAFTA, Australia is being ravaged by wildfires that many scientists argue are exacerbated by climate change. Our trade policy should intentionally include efforts to recognize and combat climate change. The new NAFTA fails to tackle this challenge that today's and every succeeding generation for the foreseeable future will have to confront, and my colleague from Rhode Island has made this point in greater and granular detail.

In 1993, conditions in Mexico and the disposition of its government were not conducive to a free-trade agreement. Mexico's democratic institutions and law enforcement agencies were weak and susceptible to corruption. As is frequently reported in the news, this remains a challenge for Mexico. If Mexico cannot arrest certain of its citizens for fear of cartel violence, it seems unreasonable to believe that it will be able to effectively inspect factories for alleged labor violations in territory controlled by cartels or factories in which cartels have an interest.

In order to revitalize manufacturing in America, we need a commitment to workers. We need to make national investments in infrastructure and innovation. But, instead, what President Trump is offering is a repackaging and rebranding of NAFTA.

President Trump may not be an expert on a lot of things, but he knows the importance of branding. He thinks he can call NAFTA terrible, fiddle around the edges, re brand it as the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement, NAFTA 2.0, or whatever name he wants to come up with, and then call it great, big, and beautiful, when in reality, he hasn't solved a problem.

Further, the new NAFTA fits neatly into President Trump's habit of creating a problem, sowing chaos, and then seeking credit when he provides a “solution” that is marginally better than where he began or worse.

Many proponents of the new NAFTA explain that an important reason to vote in favor of this deal is that if ratified, it will remove “uncertainty” from the economy and our relationship with our NAFTA partners. However, the main cause of uncertainty from our relationship with Canada and Mexico was created by President Trump through his erratic threats to our neighbors and trading partners. The arsonist is not a hero for putting out the blaze he intentionally set.

The President's pattern of behavior is prevalent throughout his trade policy. The President's tariffs and tweets are having a damaging effect. Indeed, while President Trump continues to assert that China is paying the cost, economists, including those from the Federal Reserve, have instead proven that these tariffs are being paid by American families, workers, farmers, small businesses, and manufacturers.

These NAFTA amendments are just another example of an economic policy that provides crumbs to the middle-class. It goes hand in hand with the President and Republicans in Congress choosing to spend \$1.9 trillion on tax cuts for the biggest companies and the wealthiest one percent of Americans who were recently estimated to already control more than a third of America's wealth. It is no wonder the President's tax law is unpopular. People can read the paper and see the list of those now paying little to nothing in taxes, while their taxes remain more or less the same and investment in roads and other infrastructure, education, or healthcare facilities goes unmet.

We should be focusing our attention on lifting up working families and small businesses and ensuring that our Nation is on sound financial footing. While some of my Democratic colleagues had a hand in improving the initial agreement, it still fails to provide adequately for Rhode Island's workers and small businesses or the environment. Just like the old NAFTA, I cannot support this new one.

**STATEMENT ON THE UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT**

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, trade with Canada and Mexico is vitally important to Maine's economy, supporting numerous small businesses and more than 53,000 jobs in our State.

In reviewing the text of the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement, the replacement for the deeply flawed NAFTA, my paramount concern was ensuring that Maine workers will be protected. After careful assessment of the benefits USMCA will have for those employed in Maine's manufacturing industry, agriculture sector, and small businesses, I will vote in support of the USMCA.

According to the U.S. International Trade Commission, USMCA is projected to have a positive impact on all broad industry sectors, increasing employment by 176,000 jobs and increasing real GDP by \$68.2 billion. This agreement also makes important improvements to labor and environmental standards and brings these issues into the core of the agreement. This is a step in the right direction for modernizing trade agreements.

Dana Connors, president & CEO of the Maine State Chamber of Commerce, said:

Our border countries are important trade partners for Maine businesses, in fact, trade

with our friends to the north is vital to many Maine businesses on a daily basis. The Maine State Chamber of Commerce thanks Senator Collins for her support of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement (USMCA). The USMCA's passage is vital for Maine businesses, will restore trade uncertainty and help our economy to continue to thrive.

One out of five Maine manufacturing firms exports to Canada and Mexico, and the majority of these are small- and medium-sized companies. Without tariff-free trade, Maine's manufactured goods exported to Canada and Mexico could face \$6.3 million to \$26 million in additional tariffs, jeopardizing Maine jobs. Companies like New Balance, which employs hundreds of Mainers at its facilities in Norridgewock, Norway, and Skowhegan, and Texas Instruments in South Portland, depend on a stable North American supply chain.

Amy Dow, director of public relations and government relations for New Balance, said:

On behalf of our company's Maine associates, New Balance supports the passage of the USMCA that will enable the continued success and future growth of our three manufacturing facilities in Maine. Senator Collins' support and leadership on this trade agreement has been vital to ensure that our factories can continue to produce thousands of pairs of shoes annually for export to the Canadian market.

Stephen Bonner, Texas Instruments vice president for worldwide government relations, said:

Texas Instruments is a long-time supporter of predictable, open-market based trade policies. We're pleased that the new USMCA includes strong digital trade and intellectual property provisions to adapt the agreement to the 21st century economy, and support its passage.

Our agricultural producers also rely on a stable and predictable trading environment. U.S. agricultural exports to Canada and Mexico more than quadrupled between 1993 and 2017. In Maine, I have heard from producers in the dairy, potato, and wild blueberry industries who have shared their support for free and fair trade agreements.

Maine has a special relationship with Canada in particular, given our shared border. While there remain frictions with Canada, including fishing rights, right whale regulations, and softwood lumber issues, Canada is our largest trading partner and has consistently been our top U.S. export market. As a native of Aroostook County, I know how many of our border communities are truly intertwined, with people and goods traveling back and forth daily. In 2019, Maine and Canada traded an average of \$350 million in goods per month.

Ambassador Robert Lighthizer deserves recognition for his tremendous work on this agreement. It is impressive to see a trade agreement receive such strong bipartisan support.

**VOTE ON MOTION TO WAIVE**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is expired.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to waive.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE).

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

The result was announced—yeas 78, nays 21, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 13 Leg.]

**YEAS—78**

Alexander	Gillibrand	Peters
Baldwin	Graham	Portman
Bennet	Grassley	Reed
Blumenthal	Harris	Risch
Blunt	Hassan	Roberts
Booker	Hawley	Rosen
Boozman	Heinrich	Rounds
Brown	Hirono	Rubio
Burr	Hoeben	Sanders
Cantwell	Hyde-Smith	Schatz
Capito	Jones	Schumer
Cardin	Kaine	Shaheen
Carper	King	Shelby
Casey	Klobuchar	Sinema
Collins	Leahy	Smith
Coons	Loeffler	Stabenow
Cornyn	Manchin	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Markey	Tester
Cotton	McConnell	Thune
Cramer	McSally	Udall
Crapo	Menendez	Van Hollen
Daines	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Moran	Warren
Durbin	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Ernst	Murphy	Wicker
Feinstein	Murray	Wyden

**NAYS—21**

Barrasso	Gardner	Romney
Blackburn	Johnson	Sasse
Braun	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Cruz	Lee	Tillis
Enzi	Paul	Toomey
Fischer	Perdue	Young

**NOT VOTING—1**

Inhofe

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 78, the nays are 21. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to, and the point of order falls.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the title of the bill for the third time.

The bill was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 30 seconds for me and 1 minute for Senator WYDEN for closing remarks.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement is a major achievement for President Trump and a very big bipartisan win for the American people. We should all take care, Republican or Democrat, that this is good. I look forward to signing this bill and sending it to the President's desk.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, when the Trump administration unveiled their