



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JANUARY 16, 2020

No. 10

Senate

The Senate met at 9:45 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal King, ruler of all nature, thank you for the opportunity to serve You and country. Help us to give government what belongs to government as we render to You our faithful stewardship.

Lord, guide our lawmakers to make right choices in challenging times. Enable them to feel Your presence and become lights to a dark world. Open their eyes to see Your daily gifts and blessings, infusing them with a spirit of gratitude.

Protect our Nation from sea to shining sea, as You empower us to live for Your glory.

We pray in Your wonderful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for 1 minute in morning business.

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

NATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM DAY

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, today is a very important day that we recognize once a year—National Religious Freedom Day. It is a day when

we celebrate America's longstanding commitment to religious freedom.

The First Amendment to the Constitution protects that right for Americans. Unfortunately, this fundamental right we have great respect for in the United States is under attack internationally in many autocratic countries.

Around the world, people are being persecuted for their faith by authoritarian dictatorships and terrorist groups. Countries like China, North Korea, and Russia restrict their citizens' rights to practice their own religion.

China, for example, plans to enforce additional restrictions on religious groups starting February 1. That is already on top of a very bad record they have for religious freedom. That is in regard to China, but it would apply to all countries.

I have legislation to require the United States to work to block World Bank projects in wealthy countries like China and Russia that abuse religious freedoms.

I yield the floor.

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. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

IMPEACHMENT

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, it took 4 weeks—4 weeks, but the Democratic majority in the House of Representatives is finally ready—fi-

nally ready—to defend their impeachment of the President of the United States.

After weeks of delay, the Speaker of the House decided yesterday that a trial could finally go forward. She signed the impeachment papers. That took place at a table with a political slogan stuck onto it. And they posed—they posed—afterward for smiling photos. And the Speaker distributed souvenir pens—souvenir pens—to her own colleagues, emblazoned with her golden signature that literally came in on silver platters. The pens literally came in on silver platters. There were golden pens on silver platters, a souvenir to celebrate the moment.

I seem to remember Democrats falling over themselves to say they did not see impeachment as a long-sought political win. House Democrats said over and over that they recognized the gravity and the seriousness of this action, and, of course, they had only come to it reluctantly. Well, nothing says seriousness and sobriety like handing out souvenirs, as though this were a happy bill-signing instead of the gravest process in our Constitution.

This final display neatly distilled the House's partisan process into one perfect visual. It was a transparently partisan performance from beginning to end.

That is why they sped through a slapdash inquiry in 12 weeks, when previous Presidential impeachments came after months, if not years, of investigations and hearings. That is why the House cut short their own inquiry, declined to pursue their own subpoenas, and denied the President due process, but now—now they want the Senate to redo their homework and rerun the investigation.

That is why our colleague the Democratic leader told the press that whatever happens next, as long as he can weaponize the trial to hurt the Republicans in the 2020 election, “it’s a win-win.” That is what the Democratic leader of the Senate said.

- This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

That is why the Speaker of the House apparently saw nothing strange about celebrating the third Presidential impeachment in American history with souvenirs and posed for photographs—souvenirs and posed photographs.

That pretty well sums it up. That is what the process has been thus far, but it is not what this process will be going forward.

The Founding Fathers who crafted and ratified our Constitution knew that our Nation might sometimes fall prey to the kind of dangerous factualism and partisanship that has consumed—literally consumed the House of Representatives.

The Framers set up the Senate specifically to act as a check against the short-termism and the runaway passions to which the House of Representatives might fall victim.

Alexander Hamilton worried that “the demon of faction” would “extend his scepter” over the House majorities “at certain seasons.” That is what Alexander Hamilton said. He feared for the viability of the government established by the Constitution if, blinded by factualism, the House of Representatives would abuse the power of impeachment to serve nakedly partisan goals rather than long-term interests of the American people and their Republic, but, fortunately, they did something about it.

They did not give both the power to impeach and the power to remove to the House. They divided the power and placed the final decision on removal over here in the Senate.

This body, this Chamber, exists precisely—precisely so we can look past the daily dramas and understand how our actions will reverberate for generations; so we can put aside animal reflexes and animosity and coolly consider how to best serve our country in the long run; so we can break factional fevers before they jeopardize the core institutions of our government.

As Hamilton put it, only the Senate, with “confidence enough in its own situation,” can “preserve, unawed and uninfluenced, the necessary impartiality between an individual accused, and the representatives of the people, his accusers.”

The House’s hour is over. The Senate’s time is at hand. It is time for this proud body to honor our founding purpose.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, on an entirely different matter, before we turn to the trial in earnest, the Senate has one more major accomplishment to deliver to the American people.

Yesterday we began floor consideration of the most significant update to the North American trade policy in

nearly 30 years. In just a couple of hours, we are going to pass the USMCA and send it to President Trump for his signature.

It was back in 2018 when the Trump administration finalized its talks with the Governments of Mexico and Canada. This has been a major priority for the President and for many of us in both Houses of Congress.

That is because American livelihoods in every corner of every State depend on these critical trading relationships. Farmers, growers, cattlemen, manufacturers, small businesses, big businesses—this is a major step for our whole country.

In the 26 years since the ratification of NAFTA, trade with Mexico and Canada has come to directly support 12 million American jobs—12 million workers and their families who depend on robust trade with our North American neighbors. Our neighbors to the north and south purchase half a trillion dollars in American goods and services every single year. That includes more than a quarter of all the food and agricultural products we export. Take my home State of Kentucky as an example. Mexico and Canada buy \$300 million of agricultural exports from Kentucky growers and producers every year. They buy \$9.9 billion of our State’s manufacturing exports—and on and on. Commerce with our neighbors is essential across the board.

No wonder experts estimate that USMCA would create 176,000 new American jobs. No wonder they predict it will yield tens of billions of dollars in economic growth. No wonder farmers, ranchers, steelworkers, and manufacturers across our country have been so eager to see the USMCA signed, sealed, and delivered. In one recent letter, Kentucky farmers told me: “We need the agreement ratified, and we need it to happen now.”

I know my colleagues have been hearing the same thing from their home States. Republicans, Democrats, Senators, Representatives—our incoming has been the same: Get this deal passed. Failure is not an option.

Of course, for far too long, our counterparts in the House kept all these Americans waiting. It took more than a year and a lot of pressure from Senate Republicans to get the Speaker of the House to stop blocking the trade deal and finally let the House vote on it. Late last year, she finally relented. It passed by a big bipartisan margin, of course, and I now expect that kind of vote will repeat itself here in the Senate.

I am especially grateful to our colleagues and counterparts who got this across the finish line: to the U.S. Trade Representative, Bob Lighthizer, and his hard-working team, led by his chief of staff, Jamieson Greer; to Chairman GRASSLEY for leading the bipartisan effort in the Senate Finance Committee and his trade team, led by Nasim Fussell; to Ranking Member WYDEN and his trade counsel, Jayme White,

and all of our Finance Committee colleagues and staff; and to the chairmen of our other committees of jurisdiction who worked nimbly to get this done.

I want to thank the exceptional Cloakroom staff—in particular, Christopher Tuck.

I would like to thank members of my own team whose efforts were invaluable, most especially my chief economic policy council, Jay Khosla, whose role in securing this agreement has been absolutely essential; Ali Nepola in my personal office; Erica Suares and my leadership policy advisers; and, of course, their fearless leaders, Sharon Soderstrom, my chief of staff, and my deputy chief of staff for policy, Scott Raab.

Of course, I am most grateful to President Trump for prioritizing, negotiating, and delivering on this major promise. Today the Senate will send this landmark agreement to the President’s desk—a big bipartisan win. It comes the very same week as President Trump also signed phase one of his administration’s trade agreement with China—quite a week of substantive accomplishments for the Nation, for the President, and for our international trade. Both of these measures will only add to all the other Republican policies of the past 3 years that have helped generate this historically strong economic moment for working Americans and for their families.

I would urge every one of our colleagues to join me in voting to pass the USMCA.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 5430, which the clerk will report by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 5430) to implement the Agreement between the United States of America, the United Mexican States, and Canada attached as an Annex to the Protocol Replacing the North American Free Trade Agreement.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

IMPEACHMENT

MR. SCHUMER. Madam President, this is a serious, solemn, and historic day. The events that will take place this afternoon have happened only twice before in our grand Nation's 250-year history. The Chief Justice will swear in every U.S. Senator to participate as a court of impeachment in a trial of the President of the United States.

Yesterday, the Senate received notice that the House of Representatives has two Articles of Impeachment to present. The House managers will exhibit those two articles today at noon. The first article charges the President with abuse of power: coercing a foreign leader into interfering in our elections, thereby using the powers of the Presidency, the most powerful public office in the Nation, to benefit himself rather than the public interest. The second charges the President with obstruction of Congress for an unprecedented blockade of the legislature's ability to investigate those very matters. Let me talk about each one.

The first is so serious. Some of our Republican colleagues have said—some of the President's own men have said: Yeah, he did it, but it doesn't matter; it is not impeachable. Some of them even failed to say—many of my Republican colleagues, amazingly—it is wrong.

Let me ask the American people: Do we want foreign leaders helping determine who is our President, our Senators, our Congressmen, our Governors, our legislators? That is what President Trump's argument will be: that it is OK to do that, that there is nothing wrong with it, that it is perfect.

Hardly anything is more serious than powers outside the borders of the United States determining, influencing elections inside the United States. It is bad enough to do it but even worse to blackmail a country of aid that was legally allocated to get them to do it. It is low. It is not what America has been all about.

The second charge as well. The President says he wants the truth, but he blocks every attempt to get the facts. All the witnesses we are asking for—he could have allowed them to testify in the House. They wanted them. The President is blocking.

Again, the American people—just about all of them—are asking the question: What is the President hiding? What is he afraid of? If he did nothing wrong, why didn't he let the witnesses and the documents come forward in the House of Representatives?

Put another way, the House of Representatives has accused the President of trying to shake down a foreign leader for personal gain, deliberately soliciting foreign interference in our elections—something the Founding Fa-

thers greatly feared—and then doing everything he could to cover it up.

The gravity of these charges is self-evident to anyone who is not self-interested. If proved, they are not petty crimes or politics as usual but a deep, wounding injury to democracy itself, precisely the conduct most feared by the Founders of our Constitution.

We as Senators, Democrats and Republicans, must rise to the occasion, realizing the seriousness of the charges and the solemnity of an impeachment proceeding. The beginning of the impeachment trial today will be largely ceremonial, but soon our duty will be constitutional. The constitutional duty is to conduct a fair trial, and then, as our oaths this afternoon command, Senators must "do impartial justice." Senators must "do impartial justice." The weight of that oath will fall on our shoulders. Our ability to honor it will be preserved in history.

Yesterday evening, I was gratified to hear the Republican leader, at least in part of his speech, ask the Senate to rise to the occasion. I was glad to hear him say so. For somebody who has been partisan—deeply, strongly, and almost unrelentingly partisan—for 2 months, he said something that could bring us together: The Senate should rise to the occasion.

Far more important than saying it is doing it. What does "doing it" mean? The best way for the Senate to rise to the occasion would be to retire partisan considerations and to have everyone agree on the parameters of a fair trial. The best way for the Senate to rise to the occasion would be for Democrats and Republicans to agree on relevant witnesses and relevant documents, not run the trial with votes of a slim majority, not jam procedures through, not define "rising to the occasion" as "doing things my way," which is what the majority leader has done thus far, but, rather, a real and honest and bipartisan agreement on a point we all know must be confronted: that we must—we must—have witnesses and documents in order to have a fair trial.

A trial without witnesses is not a trial. A trial without documents is not a trial. That is why every completed impeachment trial in our Nation's history—every single one that has gone to completion—15, have all included witnesses. The majority leader claims to believe in precedent. That is the precedent: witnesses. There is no deviation. Let us hope we don't have one this time.

Over the centuries, Senators have stood where we stand today, confronted with the responsibility of judging the removal of the President. They rightly concluded they were obligated to seek the truth. They were under a solemn obligation to hear the facts before rendering a final judgment.

The leader—incorrectly, in my judgment—complained the House was doing short-termism and rush. The leader is trying to do the exact same thing in the Senate. The very things he con-

demns the House Democrats for, he seems bent on doing. Condemning short-termism? Are we going to have a full trial? Condemning the rush? Are we going to allow the time for witnesses and documents or is the leader going to try to rush it through? At the very same time, out of the other side of his mouth, he condemns the House—incorrectly, in my judgment—for doing it.

Another thing about the importance of witnesses and documents, the leader has still not given a good argument about why we shouldn't have witnesses and documents. He complains about process and pens and signing ceremonies but still does not address the charges against the President and why we shouldn't have witnesses and documents.

We are waiting. Rise to the occasion. Remember the history. That is what the leader said he would do last night, and I was glad to hear it, but he must act, not talk about rising to the occasion and then doing the very same things he condemns the House for.

If my colleagues have any doubts about the case for witnesses and documents in a Senate trial, the stunning revelations this week should put those to rest. We have new information about a plot by the President's attorney and his associates to oust an American ambassador and potentially with the "knowledge and consent" of the President, pressure Ukrainian President Zelensky to announce an investigation of one of the President's political rivals. The effort to remove Ambassador Yovanovitch by Lev Parnas and Mr. Giuliani is now the subject of an official probe by the Government of Ukraine.

My friends, this information is not extraneous; it is central to the charges against the President. We have a responsibility to call witnesses and subpoena documents that will shed light on the truth here. God forbid we rush through this trial and only afterward the truth comes out.

How will my colleagues on the other side of the aisle feel if they rushed it through and then even more evidence comes out? We have seen lots come out. There has barely been a week where significant new evidence, further making the House case, hasn't come out as strong as the House case was to begin with.

Here is what Alexander Hamilton warned of in the Federalist 65. He said: "The greatest danger is that the decision [in an impeachment trial] will be regulated more by the comparative strength of parties than by the real demonstration of innocence or guilt."

Alexander Hamilton, even before the day political parties were as strong as they are today, wanted us to come together. The leader wants to do things on his own, without any Democratic input, but, fortunately, we have the right to demand votes and to work as hard as we can for a fair trial, a full trial, a trial with witnesses, a trial with documents.

The Founders anticipated that impeachment trials would always be buffeted by the winds of politics, but they gave the power to the Senate anyway because they believed the Chamber was the only place where impartial justice of the President could truly be sought.

In the coming days, these eventful and important coming days, each of us—each of us will face a choice about whether to begin this trial in search of the truth or in the service of the President's desire to cover up and rush things through. The Senate can either rise to the occasion or demonstrate that the faith of our Founders was misplaced in what they considered a grand institution. As each of us swears an oath this afternoon, let every Senator—every Senator reflect on these questions.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I come to the floor of the Senate today at a moment that will be remembered in history. In just a few hours, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court will come to this Chamber and will be sworn in as the Presiding Officer in the impeachment trial of President Donald John Trump. He will then administer an oath to each Member of the U.S. Senate. It is an oath that is included in our Senate manual. It is very brief, only 35 words, and it bears repeating for the record at this moment.

Each Senator will be asked to make the following oath and affirmation: "I solemnly swear that in all things appertaining to the trial of the impeachment of Donald John Trump, now pending, I will do impartial justice according to the Constitution and laws: so help me God."

In just 35 words, that oath binds all of us—Republicans and Democrats—who swear by that oath to do impartial justice. The Founding Fathers, and others, could have been much more elaborate in describing the process we face, but in its simplicity, this oath really tells us what we will face in the coming days.

I believe more than ever, starting on Tuesday, when the impeachment trial begins in earnest on the floor of the Senate, America will be watching. Many Americans have busy lives—personal, private, family, and professional—and don't tune in to the political events of the moment as many of us do, but I think more and more will be watching come Tuesday. They are going to see a historic moment, only the third time in history when a President of the United States faces impeachment. What will they find? Will they find an effort to do impartial justice? Will they find partisanship? Will they find a real trial?

I think it is important for us to realize that a real trial includes evidence. As a lawyer, I brought many cases to trial, a few of them to verdict. I had to prepare my case, not just my theory of the law or statement of facts but proof,

real proof that came from documents and witnesses. That is what a real trial is about. Unfortunately, on the other side, the majority leader has suggested we don't need witnesses and that it is only evidence of the weakness of the impeachment charges. I think he is wrong.

As the Democratic leader said this morning, history will prove him wrong because in impeachment trial after impeachment trial, evidence and witnesses have been presented. That is the tradition and the precedent of the U.S. Senate.

If there is an effort to short circuit that, to eliminate the witnesses and the evidence, I think it will be obvious to the American people who are following this what is underway.

In this morning's newspapers, it was reported that the President's defense team has been ready, anxious, if you will, for this impeachment trial to begin and equally anxious to end it as quickly as possible. I hope they don't prevail in that sentiment because a race to judgment may not serve the cause of impartial justice. We believe that the House managers should be allowed to make their presentation, and they will, and the President's defense team, as well. We believe that Members of the Senate should hear those arguments and then proceed to consider any additional evidence.

What kind of evidence may be relevant? As Senator SCHUMER, of New York, mentioned just a few minutes ago, it seems that every day there unfolds another chapter in this story. Every day we learn of the efforts of the President's self-described personal attorney, Rudolph Giuliani, to appeal directly to the leadership of Ukraine to initiate a political investigation of the Biden family, to serve President Trump's political interest in the 2020 Presidential campaign.

We have also heard repeatedly on the floor that there have been no allegations of anything that was illegal or criminal on the part of the President. The standard in the Constitution for impeachment does not require the violation of a Federal crime. Our Constitution was written before any statutes creating Federal crimes had been created. Rather, the phrase "high crimes and misdemeanors" was used as a standard to be imposed on the President.

But we just received information in the last 24 hours from the General Accountability Office, which does raise very serious concern about illegality of the President's action in withholding the funds appropriated by Congress to support the Ukrainian defense efforts against the invasion of Russian troops by Vladimir Putin and their country.

As a Member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, ranking member of the Defense Subcommittee, I can recall when we, on a bipartisan basis, decided to provide additional assistance to Ukraine in the form of hundreds of millions of U.S. tax dollars so that

they could defend themselves against the invasion of Vladimir Putin. That money was appropriated and we believed would be sent in a timely way to the Ukrainians to defend their own country. Little did we know that money would become part of the bargaining between President Trump and the President of Ukraine as to this political investigation. It turns out that money was withheld until the very last moment. In fact, as I was offering an amendment in the Senate Appropriations Committee, and I was told that the night before—late the night before—the President finally released the funds.

Questions were raised by Senator VAN HOLLEN to the Government Accountability Office as to whether or not it was legal or illegal for the administration to withhold those funds. We have now received the statement from the General Accountability Office. They have held that the President's withholding of funds to Ukraine violated Federal law. The Government Accountability Office has a sterling reputation as a nonpartisan watchdog with taxpayers' dollars. GAO's legal opinion today concludes that President Trump and his administration violated the law by putting a hold on military aid to Ukraine while that country was trying to defend itself against an invasion ordered by Vladimir Putin.

This is an important ruling that deserves a thorough hearing in the impeachment trial. It should be part of the evidence of wrongdoing by the President, especially as it relates to the alleged abuse of power. I also hope this ruling will convince the administration to speed the additional delivery of \$250 million in military aid, which the Congress has also sent to Ukraine.

I am going to yield the floor because I know one of my colleagues is coming to speak.

In just a few hours, this Chamber will be transformed. As we noted yesterday, at about 5:38 p.m., when the clerk of the House arrived with the Articles of Impeachment, there was a change in the atmosphere and environment of this Chamber, and I can sense it even today. We realize we are only moments away from a historic meeting of this Chamber on the issue of Presidential impeachment. When we take that oath of office, each and every one of us, swearing impartial justice, we need to remember that not only is America watching but history will hold us accountable.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, soon the Senate will vote on the final passage of the new North American Free Trade Agreement. I am going to make just a few remarks. I know Senator TOOMEY is here to make remarks. Later, he is going to offer, I believe, some procedural requests.

The new NAFTA is a good deal for American workers because Democrats in this body and Democrats in the other body stopped the Trump administration from going ahead with business as usual on trade enforcement. There has even been an effort by several Members on the other side in the Senate to actually block enforcement dollars. With Chairman GRASSLEY's help, we were able to prevent that.

If you write a trade agreement with weak enforcement, particularly on labor and environmental issues, my view is you sell out American workers and key industries, whether it is automobiles, whether it is technology, or whether it is manufacturing. Basically, you set up a race to the bottom on cheap wages and the treatment of labor.

I particularly want to thank Senator BROWN, my colleague from Ohio, who for decades has led the fight for tough trade enforcement. We spoke yesterday on the floor about our effort. We worked on this side of the aisle, but we reached out to a lot of Senators on the other side of the aisle as well.

I just want to give an example of what the Brown-Wyden trade enforcement package does. In the past, it would take almost to eternity to bring trade enforcement action. I spelled out yesterday how the Brown-Wyden enforcement package speeds up the timeline for tough trade enforcement by more than 300 percent. That, in my view, throws a real lifeline—an actual lifeline to communities that are worried about whether they are going to have an economic heartbeat in the days ahead.

I also wanted to mention—and I am then going to yield to my colleague, and we are going to use this time so that everybody gets a chance to make some remarks—that this is the first-ever trade agreement in which the United States locks in strong rules on digital trade and technology. Back when the first NAFTA came about, you didn't have Senators with smartphones in their pocket. You didn't have the internet as the shipping lane of the 21st century. What we did in this part of the bill, which was really bipartisan, is we protected intellectual property. We prohibited shakedowns of data belonging to innovative American companies, and I was especially involved in making sure that we drew on established U.S. law to defend the small technology entrepreneurs working to build successful companies in a field dominated by a small number of Goliaths.

These rules on technology and trade ought to be the cornerstones of our trade policy in the years ahead because those rules on technology protect every single American industry—healthcare, manufacturing, agriculture, you name it. It is how the United States also is going to fight back against authoritarian governments that use the internet as a tool to repress their own people, bully American businesses and workers, and med-

dle with the free speech rights of American citizens.

The bottom line here is that my colleague who sits right behind me, Senator BROWN, was key to producing a bill that had the provisions and the prerequisite to getting a law, frankly, with tough trade law enforcement that brought, literally, dozens of Members of both the Senate and the House over to support this. I want to thank him and wrap up by saying—I am not sure that he is with us today here in the Senate Gallery—that Ambassador Bob Lighthizer deserves a special thanks today. He may be off around the world somewhere talking to additional trade ministers, looking for other opportunities to come up with tough future-oriented trade agreements. Ambassador Lighthizer is the hardest working man in the trade agreement business. I want to thank him for all his work. I have a difference of opinion with my colleague from Pennsylvania on these issues. We may have some procedure, but I think you are going to see Senators handle these issues over the next 20 minutes in a way that reflects the seriousness of this issue.

I yield the floor.

I know the Senator from Pennsylvania will speak next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Madam President, I want to thank the ranking member of our committee for all of the work that he has put into this effort, even though I disagree in some important respects.

One thing I want to talk about this morning is the process under which we are going to consider and probably pass this legislation. We are considering this legislation under trade promotion authority. That refers to another bill—a law, actually—that we passed some time ago that expedites the process, forbids Senators from offering amendments, and allows passage of the legislation to occur with a simple majority vote—51 out of 100 instead of the usual 60-vote threshold. That is what trade promotion authority makes possible.

It seems to me that it is very important that any legislation we consider under trade promotion authority be compliant with trade promotion authority, because, if it is not, if we allow extraneous provisions, for instance, then, we are circumventing the normal legislative process, we are circumventing the 60-vote threshold, and we are abusing trade promotion authority.

One of the reasons that is so important is that this is a delegated authority. I remind my colleagues that trade policy is clearly, unambiguously assigned to Congress in the Constitution. It is our responsibility to manage trade, and legislation is obviously and undoubtedly exclusively granted to Congress in the Constitution. So our branch of government has exclusive responsibility for trade and legislating.

What do we have here? We have a piece of legislation that deals with trade. When we choose to delegate our

responsibility to the executive branch, it is very important to me that we insist that delegated authority be exercised properly and that the legislation that follows from it comply with the law.

What I want to raise is a concern about one of several—but one respect, in particular—in which the legislation we are considering today does not, in fact, comply with the trade promotion authority under which this legislation is being considered. Specifically, I am going to zero in on a certain aspect of some of the spending that occurs in this bill.

By way of background, I think it is important to know that the Senate has never passed a spending bill with a simple majority vote. I don't think that has ever happened in modern times since we established the 60-vote threshold on any piece of legislation.

We don't do discretionary appropriations with a simple majority vote because it has been the collective will of this body for decades that responsibility should occur at a 60-vote threshold and should be subject to amendments.

Not only that, but we have discretionary spending in this bill and this is the first time that any trade implementing legislation has ever spent money. Of the 17 trade bills that we have considered in recent decades under fast-track authority, none of them have ever contained any kind of appropriations, any kind of government spending. It is not that there is no spending necessary for the implementation of these other agreements. There was. Yet that spending always ran separately in a different bill, in a different piece of legislation, and that piece of legislation was subject to amendment and a 60-vote threshold.

Now, why is that?

It is in order to comply with the trade promotion authority. It is in order to comply with the conditions of granting an expedited process.

What the trade promotion authority reads, among other things, is that any provision in this implementing legislation must be strictly necessary or appropriate for the implementation of the trade agreement. Well, spending is not strictly necessary for this purpose because it can occur in a separate bill, and that is the way it has always been done.

If we allow this to proceed on this basis—exactly as is contemplated—we are really going to dramatically undermine the 60-vote threshold for spending, and there is spending in this bill. There is \$843 million—almost \$1 billion—and it gets worse. It gets worse because this spending has an emergency spending designation. So it is not only that we are spending money in a way that has never been done before, and it is not only that we are spending money in a trade implementing bill, which we have never done before, but now we have decided to call it emergency spending.

Why is it that it gets an emergency spending designation? Why did someone bother to give this spending an emergency designation? There is a simple reason.

Under our budget rules, if you label spending as an emergency, then you don't have to offset that spending if you exceed our agreed-upon statutory spending caps. We are at the caps, and I gather that the folks who wrote this don't want to have to offset this new spending with a reduction anywhere else in the enormous budget of our Federal Government. So they have designated it as emergency spending.

This is clearly an abuse of the use of an emergency designation. I mean, we designate emergency spending when we have to respond to a tornado or to a flood or to an outbreak of Ebola. These sorts of things are unpredictable, sudden, devastating. Those are actual emergencies. This is what that provision is there for. Yet here we are, using it for things like doubling the staffing salary budget for the U.S. trade office. That is not an emergency. It is not even close.

So I am going to offer a point of order. It is very, very simple, and it is very, very narrow. It is a very, very small thing. What I am going to do is to raise a point of order against the emergency designation of one of the spending lines in this appropriation. I could do it for all of them. I could raise an issue about the fact that there is spending in the first place, but I am not going to do that. I am going to take a very, very modest and narrow approach.

I suggest that we raise a point of order against the emergency designation—against \$50 million of the hundreds of millions of dollars altogether—that clearly is not an emergency, and that clearly, in my view, is inconsistent with the trade promotion authority.

What would be the consequences if my budget point of order were to succeed?

First of all, not a dime of spending would be reduced. This is not an attempt to cut spending. Eliminating an emergency designation does not cut any spending in this bill. What it would mean is that Congress would have until the end of the year to find an offset for this \$50 million, which, by the way, is about one one-thousandth of one penny for every dollar the Federal Government spends. It is a tiny, tiny amount of money. It means the bill will still pass because there will easily be more than 60 votes for this bill. Then it will go to the House, where it will pass because it already has passed.

The point isn't to save money per se, for it is too small to really matter in that regard. The point is, are we willing to enforce our own law that governs the proceedings of this body?

I think one of my colleagues is likely to respond by offering a point of order or a provision that will preclude the possibility of my offering this point of

order. Not only that, I think it is going to preclude the possibility of any Senator's offering any budgetary point of order, which will be a way of saying it will be forbidden to enforce compliance with the TPA's budgetary rules in this legislation.

To my colleagues, I think this is a very, very bad idea. I think to suggest that we are going to have this bill that is not compliant with the trade promotion authority and that we are going to preclude the possibility of raising a point of order about that non-compliance would be a big mistake.

I will soon have the exact language that we will be using for this purpose, and we will have this discussion. Then we will have a vote on whether or not to preclude the possibility of enforcing our budget rules with respect to this implementing legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, this is a very serious claim being made by Senator TOOMEY, and I don't take this lightly because the privilege afforded by the trade promotion authority is a very important matter.

The appropriations language that Senator TOOMEY takes issue with is, indeed, trade promotion authority-compliant. The appropriations ensure that the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement's commitments are fulfilled and enforceable by providing adequate resources to do so. The commitments cover bipartisan priorities, including the monitoring, enforcement, and recapitalization of the North American Development Bank.

If funds were only authorized, as Senator TOOMEY has suggested, there would be no guarantee that we would be able to fulfill the commitments made in the USMCA, and the credibility of our good-faith negotiations with Mexico and Canada is the presumption that we will carry out this agreement and carry it out year after year after year. Besides, historically, all trade bills result in changes to Federal spending and revenue.

This bill has the benefit of reducing the deficit even with the funds discussed by Senator TOOMEY. Striking the emergency designations could lead to a sequestration of discretionary funding as regular appropriations for fiscal year 2020 have already been enacted. The emergency designation is, in this precise context—and in a very precise context—considered strictly necessary or appropriate under section 103 of the trade promotion authority 2015.

Here is the oddity of the Senator's argument: If Senator TOOMEY is suggesting funds be authorized, I think he inherently agrees that enforcement funding is either strictly necessary or appropriate to implement the USMCA. This is a very important clarification to make; that the trade promotion authority language is "strictly necessary or appropriate."

It is for Congress, then, to decide what is strictly necessary or appro-

priate. The Committee on Finance, with jurisdiction over the entire bill, and the Committees on the Budget and Appropriations, with jurisdiction over the language at issue, voted overwhelmingly to support the bill. It is important to note that the final appropriation was significantly reduced in consideration of concerns about spending, including my own concerns.

Finally, I emphasize this was a negotiated outcome, which was necessary in order to achieve the broad bipartisan support that this bill is going to get—particularly to get it through the House of Representatives.

I am satisfied with the final outcome, so I will make a motion to waive the point of order, if it is made, and I urge my colleagues to support waiving the point of order and to vote yes for the USMCA so we can deliver a victory to the American people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 1 minute and then for Senator TOOMEY to proceed with the procedural question.

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

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, first, I want to make sure that we can enter into the RECORD a thanks that is deserved to the bipartisan team here in the Senate that has made this day possible.

Second, on one substantive point, because I associate myself with the remarks of Chairman GRASSLEY, I think we need to understand that what the Toomey procedural issue is all about is really that of a Trojan horse for rolling back an aggressive effort to enforce the rights that workers care about and that we all care about with respect to our land, air, and water. I know the Senator from Pennsylvania disagrees with it, but I just wanted to make that point.

The chairman is right with respect to the procedure. I just want people to understand what the substantive issue is. This is just a policy disagreement, and that is what the Senate is all about.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Madam President, I will make two quick points and then get to the point of order.

First of all, I disagree with the chairman. I do think the spending in this bill is neither strictly necessary nor appropriate, but that is not what the point of order is about. If my point of order is sustained and if the motion that is going to be made by the chairman is to be rejected, not a penny will be reduced in the spending of this bill, which is why I couldn't disagree more with my colleague from Oregon in his suggesting it is a Trojan horse for something. It doesn't cut spending by a dime from this bill. It simply means that by the end of the fiscal year, Congress will have to find an offset for this

very, very modest amount of money. It is an attempt to try to enforce some kind of compliance.

POINT OF ORDER

Madam President, pursuant to section 314(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I raise a point of order against the emergency designation on page No. 233, lines 4 through 8, of H.R. 5430.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the waiver provisions of applicable budget resolutions, I move to waive all applicable sections of that act and applicable budget resolutions for purposes of H.R. 5430, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

The Senator from Kansas.

AUTHORIZING REPRESENTATION BY THE SENATE LEGAL COUNSEL IN THE CASE OF MARTIN F. MCMAHON V. SENATOR TED CRUZ, ET AL.

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 474, submitted earlier today.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 474) to authorize representation by the Senate Legal Counsel in the case of Martin F. McMahon v. Senator TED CRUZ, et al.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MORAN. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 474) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

TEMPORARY REAUTHORIZATION AND STUDY OF THE EMERGENCY SCHEDULING OF FENTANYL ANALOGUES ACT

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 3201, introduced earlier today.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3201) to extend the temporary scheduling order for fentanyl-related substances, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, 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. 3201) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 3201

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Temporary Reauthorization and Study of the Emergency Scheduling of Fentanyl Analogues Act".

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF TEMPORARY ORDER FOR FENTANYL-RELATED SUBSTANCES.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, section 1308.11(h)(30) of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations, shall remain in effect until May 6, 2021.

SEC. 3. STUDY AND REPORT ON IMPACTS OF CLASSWIDE SCHEDULING.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term "fentanyl-related substance" has the meaning given the term in section 1308.11(h)(30)(i) of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations.

(b) GAO REPORT.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(1) conduct a study of the classification of fentanyl-related substances as schedule I controlled substances under the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.), research on fentanyl-related substances, and the importation of fentanyl-related substances into the United States; and

(2) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, submit a report on the results of the study conducted under paragraph (1) to—

(A) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate;

(C) the Caucus on International Narcotics Control of the Senate;

(D) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives; and

(E) the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives.

(c) REQUIREMENTS.—The Comptroller General, in conducting the study and developing the report required under subsection (b), shall—

(1) evaluate class control of fentanyl-related substances, including—

(A) the definition of the class of fentanyl-related substances in section 1308.11(h)(30)(i) of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations, including the process by which the definition was formulated;

(B) the potential for classifying fentanyl-related substances with no, or low, abuse potential, or potential accepted medical use, as schedule I controlled substances when scheduled as a class; and

(C) any known classification of fentanyl-related substances with no, or low, abuse potential, or potential accepted medical use, as schedule I controlled substances that has resulted from the scheduling action of the

Drug Enforcement Administration that added paragraph (h)(30) to section 1308.11 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations;

(2) review the impact or potential impact of controls on fentanyl-related substances on public health and safety, including on—

(A) diversion risks, overdose deaths, and law enforcement encounters with fentanyl-related substances; and

(B) Federal law enforcement investigations and prosecutions of offenses relating to fentanyl-related substances;

(3) review the impact of international regulatory controls on fentanyl-related substances on the supply of such substances to the United States, including by the Government of the People's Republic of China;

(4) review the impact or potential impact of screening and other interdiction efforts at points of entry into the United States on the importation of fentanyl-related substances into the United States;

(5) recommend best practices for accurate, swift, and permanent control of fentanyl-related substances, including—

(A) how to quickly remove from the schedules under the Controlled Substances Act substances that are determined, upon discovery, to have no abuse potential; and

(B) how to reschedule substances that are determined, upon discovery, to have a low abuse potential or potential accepted medical use;

(6) review the impact or potential impact of fentanyl-related controls by class on scientific and biomedical research; and

(7) evaluate the processes used to obtain or modify Federal authorization to conduct research with fentanyl-related substances, including by—

(A) identifying opportunities to reduce unnecessary burdens on persons seeking to research fentanyl-related substances;

(B) identifying opportunities to reduce any redundancies in the responsibilities of Federal agencies;

(C) identifying opportunities to reduce any inefficiencies related to the processes used to obtain or modify Federal authorization to conduct research with fentanyl-related substances;

(D) identifying opportunities to improve the protocol review and approval process conducted by Federal agencies; and

(E) evaluating the degree, if any, to which establishing processes to obtain or modify a Federal authorization to conduct research with a fentanyl-related substance that are separate from the applicable processes for other schedule I controlled substances could exacerbate burdens or lead to confusion among persons seeking to research fentanyl-related substances or other schedule I controlled substances.

(d) INPUT FROM CERTAIN FEDERAL AGENCIES.—In conducting the study and developing the report under subsection (b), the Comptroller General shall consider the views of the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Justice.

(e) INFORMATION FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.—Each Federal department or agency shall, in accordance with applicable procedures for the appropriate handling of classified information, promptly provide reasonable access to documents, statistical data, and any other information that the Comptroller General determines is necessary to conduct the study and develop the report required under subsection (b).

(f) INPUT FROM CERTAIN NON-FEDERAL ENTITIES.—In conducting the study and developing the report under subsection (b), the Comptroller General shall consider the views of experts from certain non-Federal entities, including experts from—

(1) the scientific and medical research community;

(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 of 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 tax-payers.

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, rebrand 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	Hoover	Sanders
Cantwell	Hyde-Smith	Schatz
Capito	Jones	Schumer
Cardin	Kaine	Shaheen
Carper	King	Shelby
Casey	Klobuchar	Sinema
Collins	Leahy	Smith
Coons	Loeffer	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

original version of this proposal, it was stunning to see how weak it was in terms of trade enforcement. When you write a proposal with weak trade enforcement, particularly on labor and environmental issues, you sell out American workers and you launch a corporate race to the bottom of cheap wages and the treatment of labor.

Senator BROWN and I decided that was unacceptable, and we were going to create a trade enforcement regime with real teeth. We worked with Senators here; we worked with Senators on the other side of the aisle and in the other body. To give you an example of what this means with respect to enforcing trade law, we sped up the timeline by more than 300 percent.

The second point—just very quickly—what this proposal does is bring technology and trade policy into the 21st century. When the last North American Free Trade Agreement was considered, nobody had a smartphone. So what we did is protect intellectual property; we prohibited shakedowns of data belonging to innovative companies; and on something I care deeply about, we drew on established U.S. law to defend small tech entrepreneurs working to build successful companies in a field dominated by Goliaths.

I urge my colleagues to support this proposal and once again thank Bob Lighthizer, the hardest working man in the trade agreement business.

I urge a “yes” vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

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 Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE).

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 89, nays 10, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 14 Leg.]

YEAS—89

Alexander	Crapo	Klobuchar
Baldwin	Cruz	Lankford
Barrasso	Daines	Leahy
Bennet	Duckworth	Lee
Blackburn	Durbin	Loeffler
Blumenthal	Enzi	Manchin
Blunt	Ernst	McConnell
Boozman	Feinstein	McSally
Braun	Fischer	Menendez
Brown	Gardner	Merkley
Burr	Graham	Moran
Cantwell	Grassley	Murkowski
Capito	Hassan	Murphy
Cardin	Hawley	Murray
Carper	Heinrich	Paul
Casey	Hirono	Perdue
Cassidy	Hoeven	Peters
Collins	Hyde-Smith	Portman
Coons	Johnson	Risch
Cornyn	Jones	Roberts
Cortez Masto	Kaine	Romney
Cotton	Kennedy	Rosen
Cramer	King	Rounds

Rubio	Smith	Van Hollen
Sasse	Stabenow	Warner
Scott (FL)	Sullivan	Warren
Scott (SC)	Tester	Wicker
Shaheen	Thune	Wyden
Shelby	Tillis	Young
Sinema	Udall	

NAYS—10

Booker	Reed	Toomey
Gillibrand	Sanders	Whitehouse
Harris	Schatz	
Markey	Schumer	

NOT VOTING—1

Inhofe

The bill (H.R. 5430) was passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

PROGRAM

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, under the previous order, at 12 noon the Senate will receive the managers of the House of Representatives to exhibit the Articles of Impeachment against Donald John Trump, President of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The hour of 12 noon having arrived and a quorum being present, the Sergeant at Arms will present the managers on the part of the House of Representatives.

EXHIBITION OF ARTICLES OF IMPEACHMENT AGAINST DONALD JOHN TRUMP, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

At noon, the managers on the part of the House of Representatives of the impeachment of Donald John Trump appeared below the bar of the Senate, and the Sergeant at Arms, Michael C. Stenger, announced their presence, as follows:

Mr. President and Members of the Senate, I announce the presence of the managers on the part of the House of Representatives to conduct the proceedings on behalf of the House concerning the impeachment of Donald John Trump, President of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The managers on the part of the House will be received and escorted to the well of the Senate.

The managers were thereupon escorted by the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, Michael C. Stenger, to the well of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Sergeant at Arms will make the proclamation.

The Sergeant at Arms, Michael C. Stenger, made the proclamation, as follows:

Hear ye! Hear ye! Hear ye! All persons are commanded to keep silent, on pain of imprisonment, while the Senate of the United States is sitting for the trial of the articles of impeachment exhibited by the House of Representatives against Donald John Trump, President of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The managers on the part of the House will now proceed.

Mr. Manager SCHIFF. Mr. President, the managers on the part of the House

of Representatives are present and ready to present the Articles of Impeachment which have been preferred by the House of Representatives against Donald John Trump, President of the United States.

The House adopted the following resolution, which with permission of the Senate I will read.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 798

APPOINTING AND AUTHORIZING MANAGERS FOR THE IMPEACHMENT TRIAL OF DONALD JOHN TRUMP, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Resolved, That Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. NADLER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. CROW, and Ms. GARCIA of Texas are appointed managers to conduct the impeachment trial against Donald John Trump, President of the United States, that a message be sent to the Senate to inform the Senate of these appointments, and that the managers so appointed may, in connection with the preparation and the conduct of the trial, exhibit the articles of impeachment to the Senate and take all other actions necessary, which may include the following:

(1) Employing legal, clerical, and other necessary assistants and incurring such other expenses as may be necessary, to be paid from amounts available to the Committee on the Judiciary under applicable expense resolutions or from the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives.

(2) Sending for persons and papers, and filing with the Secretary of the Senate, on the part of the House of Representatives, any pleadings, in conjunction with or subsequent to, the exhibition of the articles of impeachment that the managers consider necessary.

NANCY PELOSI,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Attest:

CHERYL L. JOHNSON,
Clerk.

[Seal Affixed]

With the permission of the Senate, I will now read the Articles of Impeachment, House Resolution 755.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 755

IMPEACHING DONALD JOHN TRUMP, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, FOR HIGH CRIMES AND MISDEMEANORS

Resolved, That Donald John Trump, President of the United States, is impeached for high crimes and misdemeanors and that the following articles of impeachment be exhibited to the United States Senate:

Articles of impeachment exhibited by the House of Representatives of the United States of America in the name of itself and of the people of the United States of America, against Donald John Trump, President of the United States of America, in maintenance and support of its impeachment against him for high crimes and misdemeanors.

ARTICLE I: ABUSE OF POWER

The Constitution provides that the House of Representatives “shall have the sole Power of Impeachment” and that the President “shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for, and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors”. In his conduct of the office of President of the United States—and in violation of his constitutional oath faithfully to execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty to take care that the laws be faithfully executed—Donald J. Trump has abused the powers of the Presidency, in that:

Using the powers of his high office, President Trump solicited the interference of a foreign government, Ukraine, in the 2020 United States Presidential election. He did so through a scheme or course of conduct that included soliciting the Government of Ukraine to publicly announce investigations that would benefit his reelection, harm the election prospects of a political opponent, and influence the 2020 United States Presidential election to his advantage. President Trump also sought to pressure the Government of Ukraine to take these steps by conditioning official United States Government acts of significant value to Ukraine on its public announcement of the investigations. President Trump engaged in this scheme or course of conduct for corrupt purposes in pursuit of personal political benefit. In so doing, President Trump used the powers of the Presidency in a manner that compromised the national security of the United States and undermined the integrity of the United States democratic process. He thus ignored and injured the interests of the Nation.

President Trump engaged in this scheme or course of conduct through the following means:

(1) President Trump—acting both directly and through his agents within and outside the United States Government—corruptly solicited the Government of Ukraine to publicly announce investigations into—

(A) a political opponent, former Vice President Joseph R. Biden, Jr.; and

(B) a discredited theory promoted by Russia alleging that Ukraine—rather than Russia—interfered in the 2016 United States Presidential election.

(2) With the same corrupt motives, President Trump—acting both directly and through his agents within and outside the United States Government—conditioned two official acts on the public announcements that he had requested—

(A) the release of \$391 million of United States taxpayer funds that Congress had appropriated on a bipartisan basis for the purpose of providing vital military and security assistance to Ukraine to oppose Russian aggression and which President Trump had ordered suspended; and

(B) a head of state meeting at the White House, which the President of Ukraine sought to demonstrate continued United States support for the Government of Ukraine in the face of Russian aggression.

(3) Faced with the public revelation of his actions, President Trump ultimately released the military and security assistance to the Government of Ukraine, but has persisted in openly and corruptly urging and soliciting Ukraine to undertake investigations for his personal political benefit.

These actions were consistent with President Trump's previous invitations of foreign interference in United States elections.

In all of this, President Trump abused the powers of the Presidency by ignoring and injuring national security and other vital national interests to obtain an improper personal political benefit. He has also betrayed the Nation by abusing his high office to enlist a foreign power in corrupting democratic elections.

Wherefore President Trump, by such conduct, has demonstrated that he will remain a threat to national security and the Constitution if allowed to remain in office, and has acted in a manner grossly incompatible with self-governance and the rule of law. President Trump thus warrants impeachment and trial, removal from office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor, trust, or profit under the United States.

ARTICLE II: OBSTRUCTION OF CONGRESS

The Constitution provides that the House of Representatives “shall have the sole

Power of Impeachment” and that the President “shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for, and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors”. In his conduct of the office of President of the United States—and in violation of his constitutional oath faithfully to execute the office of President of the United States and, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and in violation of his constitutional duty to take care that the laws be faithfully executed—Donald J. Trump has directed the unprecedented, categorical, and indiscriminate defiance of subpoenas issued by the House of Representatives pursuant to its “sole Power of Impeachment”. President Trump has abused the powers of the Presidency in a manner offensive to, and subversive of, the Constitution, in that:

The House of Representatives has engaged in an impeachment inquiry focused on President Trump's corrupt solicitation of the Government of Ukraine to interfere in the 2020 United States Presidential election. As part of this impeachment inquiry, the Committees undertaking the investigation served subpoenas seeking documents and testimony deemed vital to the inquiry from various Executive Branch agencies and offices, and current and former officials.

In response, without lawful cause or excuse, President Trump directed Executive Branch agencies, offices, and officials not to comply with those subpoenas. President Trump thus interposed the powers of the Presidency against the lawful subpoenas of the House of Representatives, and assumed to himself functions and judgments necessary to the exercise of the “sole Power of Impeachment” vested by the Constitution in the House of Representatives.

President Trump abused the powers of his high office through the following means:

(1) Directing the White House to defy a lawful subpoena by withholding the production of documents sought therein by the Committees.

(2) Directing other Executive Branch agencies and offices to defy lawful subpoenas and withhold the production of documents and records from the Committees—in response to which the Department of State, Office of Management and Budget, Department of Energy, and Department of Defense refused to produce a single document or record.

(3) Directing current and former Executive Branch officials not to cooperate with the Committees—in response to which nine Administration officials defied subpoenas for testimony, namely John Michael “Mick” Mulvaney, Robert B. Blair, John A. Eisenberg, Michael Ellis, Preston Wells Griffith, Russell T. Vought, Michael Duffey, Brian McCormack, and T. Ulrich Brechbuhl.

These actions were consistent with President Trump's previous efforts to undermine United States Government investigations into foreign interference in United States elections.

Through these actions, President Trump sought to arrogate to himself the right to determine the propriety, scope, and nature of an impeachment inquiry into his own conduct, as well as the unilateral prerogative to deny any and all information to the House of Representatives in the exercise of its “sole Power of Impeachment”. In the history of the Republic, no President has ever ordered the complete defiance of an impeachment inquiry or sought to obstruct and impede so comprehensively the ability of the House of Representatives to investigate “high Crimes and Misdemeanors”. This abuse of office served to cover up the President's own repeated misconduct and to seize and control the power of impeachment and thus to nullify

a vital constitutional safeguard vested solely in the House of Representatives.

In all of this, President Trump has acted in a manner contrary to his trust as President and subversive of constitutional government, to the great prejudice of the cause of law and justice, and to the manifest injury of the people of the United States.

Wherefore, President Trump, by such conduct, has demonstrated that he will remain a threat to the Constitution if allowed to remain in office, and has acted in a manner grossly incompatible with self-governance and the rule of law. President Trump thus warrants impeachment and trial, removal from office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor, trust, or profit under the United States.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Attest:

CHERYL L. JOHNSON,
Clerk.

[Seal Affixed]

Mr. President, that completes the exhibition of the Articles of Impeachment against Donald John Trump, President of the United States.

The managers request that the Senate take order for the trial, and the managers now request leave to withdraw.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Thank you, Mr. SCHIFF.

The Senate will duly notify the House of Representatives when it is ready to proceed to trial.

The majority leader.

PROGRAM

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, pursuant to yesterday's order, at 2 o'clock today, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the Articles of Impeachment. The Chief Justice of the United States will preside over the trial, as required in article I, section 3, clause 6, of the United States Constitution.

APPOINTMENT OF ESCORT COMMITTEE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, also, under the previous order, the Presiding Officer has been authorized to appoint a committee of four Senators, two upon the recommendation of the majority leader and two upon the recommendation of the Democratic leader, to escort the Chief Justice into the Senate Chamber. I ask that the Presiding Officer do so now.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair, pursuant to order of January 15, 2020, on behalf of the majority leader and the Democratic leader, appoints Mr. BLUNT of Missouri, Mr. LEAHY of Vermont, Mr. GRAHAM of South Carolina, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN of California to escort the Chief Justice of the United States into the Senate Chamber.

PROGRAM

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, there will

be a live quorum call prior to the arrival of the Chief Justice at 2 p.m. today.

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senate stands in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:21 p.m., recessed subject to the call of the Chair and reassembled at 2 p.m. when called to order by the President pro tempore.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I would like to ask all of our colleagues to take a seat.

Mr. President, I am about to suggest the absence of a quorum. For the information of all of our colleagues, this will be a live quorum. Following that, we will consider the Articles of Impeachment, which will commence with the swearing in of the Chief Justice of the United States and all Senators.

QUORUM CALL

Mr. McCONNELL. Accordingly, then, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their name:

[Quorum No. 1]

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

TRIAL OF DONALD JOHN TRUMP, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

Under the previous order, the hour of 2 p.m. having arrived and a quorum having been established, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the Articles of Impeachment against Donald John Trump, President of the United States.

The majority leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, at this time, pursuant to rule IV of the Senate Rules on Impeachment and the United States Constitution, the Presiding Officer will now administer the oath to John G. Roberts, Chief Justice of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the escort committee will now conduct the Chief Justice of the United States to the dais to be administered the oath.

(Senators rising.)

The Chief Justice was thereupon escorted into the Chamber by Senators BLUNT, LEAHY, GRAHAM, and FEINSTEIN.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Senators, I attend the Senate in conformity with your notice, for the purpose of joining with you for the trial of the President of the United States. I am now prepared to take the oath.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will you place your left hand on the Bible and raise your right hand.

Do you solemnly swear that in all things appertaining to the trial of the impeachment of Donald John Trump, President of the United States, now pending, you will do impartial justice according to the Constitution and the laws, so help you God?

The CHIEF JUSTICE. I do.

At this time I will administer the oath to all Senators in the Chamber in conformance with article I, section 3, clause 6 of the Constitution and the Senate's impeachment rules.

Will all Senators now stand, remain standing, and raise their right hand.

Do you solemnly swear that in all things appertaining to the trial of the impeachment of Donald J. Trump, President of the United States, now pending, you will do impartial justice according to the Constitution and laws, so help you God?

SENATORS. I do.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The clerk will call the names in groups of four. The Senators will present themselves at the desk to sign the Oath Book.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the Senators present answered "I do" and signed the Official Oath Book.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chief Justice, any Senator who was not in the Senate Chamber at the time the oath was administered to the other Senators will make that fact known to the Chair so that the oath may be administered as soon as possible.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The Sergeant at Arms will make the proclamation.

The Sergeant at Arms, Michael C. Stenger, made proclamation as follows:

Hear ye! Hear ye! Hear ye! All persons are commanded to keep silent, on

pain of imprisonment, while the House of Representatives is exhibiting to the Senate of the United States Articles of Impeachment against Donald John Trump, President of the United States.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The majority leader is recognized.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chief Justice, for the information of the Senate, on my behalf and that of the distinguished Democratic leader, I am about to propose several unanimous consent requests that will assist with the organization of the next steps of these proceedings. They deal largely with necessary paperwork incident to the trial.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—PROVIDING ISSUANCE OF A SUMMONS AND FOR RELATED PROCEDURES CONCERNING THE ARTICLES OF IMPEACHMENT AGAINST DONALD JOHN TRUMP, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chief Justice, I ask unanimous consent that the summons be issued in the usual form provided that the President may have until 6 p.m. on Saturday, January 18, 2020, to file his answer with the Secretary of the Senate, which will be spread upon the Journal, and the House of Representatives have until 12 noon on Monday, January 20, 2020, to file its replication with the Secretary of the Senate; finally, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to print as a Senate document those documents filed by the parties together, to be available to all parties.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—FILING TRIAL BRIEFS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chief Justice, I ask unanimous consent that if the House of Representatives wishes to file a trial brief, it be filed with the Secretary of the Senate by 5 p.m. on Saturday, January 18, 2020; further, that if the President wishes to file a trial brief, it be filed with the Secretary of the Senate by 12 noon on Monday, January 20, 2020; further, that if the House wishes to file a rebuttal brief, it be filed with the Secretary of the Senate by 12 noon on Tuesday, January 21, 2020. Finally, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to print as a Senate document all documents filed by the parties together, to be available for all parties.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—AUTHORIZATION FOR EQUIPMENT AND FURNITURE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chief Justice, I ask unanimous consent that in recognition of the unique requirements raised by the impeachment trial of Donald John Trump, President of the United States, the Sergeant at Arms shall install appropriate equipment and furniture in the Senate Chamber during all times that the Senate is sitting for trial with the Chief Justice of the United States presiding, the appropriate equipment, furniture, and computer equipment in accordance with the allocations and provisions I now send to the desk, and I ask that they be printed in the RECORD.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The documents follow:

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION FOR EQUIPMENT AND FURNITURE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In recognition of the unique requirements raised by the impeachment trial of a President of the United States, the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate shall install appropriate equipment and furniture in the Senate chamber for use by the managers from the House of Representatives and counsel to the President in their presentations to the Senate during all times that the Senate is sitting for trial with the Chief Justice of the United States presiding.

(b) **SCOPE.**—The appropriate equipment and furniture referred to in subsection (a) is as follows:

(1) A lectern, a witness table and chair if required, and tables and chairs to accommodate an equal number of managers from the House of Representatives and counsel for the President, which shall be placed in the well of the Senate.

(2) Such equipment as may be required to permit the display of video or audio evidence, including video monitors and microphones, which may be placed in the chamber for use by the managers from the House of Representatives or the counsel to the President.

(c) **MANNER.**—All equipment and furniture authorized by this resolution shall be placed in the chamber in a manner that provides the least practicable disruption to Senate proceedings.

SECTION 1. LAPTOP COMPUTER ACCESS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—During impeachment proceedings against the President of the United States, laptop computers may be used on the floor of the Senate Chamber only in accordance with the following:

(1) Two laptop computers may be used by the impeachment managers and their assistants.

(2) Two laptop computers may be used by the counsel for the President of the United States and their assistants.

(3) Two laptop computer may be used by the Chief Justice of the United States and the assistants of the Chief Justice.

(4) Laptop computers available to employees and officers of the Senate on the floor of the Senate Chamber during a regular session of the Senate may be used by such employees and officers as necessary.

(b) **USE OF LAPTOP COMPUTERS IN OTHER ROOMS OF THE SENATE FLOOR.**—During impeachment proceedings against the President of the United States, laptop computers may be used in other areas of the floor of the Senate (not including the Senate Chamber)

by individuals described in paragraphs (1) through (4) of subsection (a) and, as determined necessary, other employees and officers of the Senate.

(c) **ENFORCEMENT BY THE SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER.**—The Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate shall take such actions as are necessary to enforce this resolution.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY, JANUARY 21, 2020, AT 1 P.M.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chief Justice, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate, sitting as a Court of Impeachment, adjourn until Tuesday, January 21, 2020, at 1 p.m.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 2:33 p.m., sitting as Court of Impeachment, adjourned until Tuesday, January 21, at 1 p.m.

Mr. McCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRAUN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, the Senate has remained in session this afternoon following the first meeting of our impeachment trial. History will not only remember today for the first steps of the trial, but today was also a tremendous bipartisan legislative accomplishment for the American people.

The Senate passed USMCA, President Trump's historic new trade agreement with Canada and Mexico, by a vote of 89 to 10. Now this landmark deal, which experts estimate will add tens of billions of dollars to the U.S. economy and create 176,000 new jobs, is on its way to the White House to be signed into law by the President.

This was a major priority for farmers, ranchers, manufacturers, small businesses, and working families across the entire country, and, today, the Senate got it done.

We also passed another important bill that will keep analogues of the dangerous drug fentanyl designated as schedule I narcotics. It will keep them appropriately listed among the most dangerous illegal drugs and keep this important tool in the hands of law enforcement. The legislation also preserves mandatory minimum sentences for the criminals who unleash these dangerous poisons on our streets.

Law enforcement officials from Kentucky and across the Nation have been pleading with Congress for months to keep these tools in place. But our Democratic colleagues have resisted Republican efforts to make these temporary measures permanent.

Finally, this week, thanks to Chairman GRAHAM and the Judiciary Committee, we were at least able to get an agreement to prevent these measures from expiring for now.

There is a lot of work to do. Fentanyl and these analogues are a plague—a plague. They kill more Kentuckians than any other illegal drug—nearly 800 overdose deaths in 2018 alone, just in my State. The problem, of course, is nationwide. We are going to stay in the fight and keep working, but today's victory was an important step.

The Senate will next convene on Tuesday. As I discussed this morning, an impeachment trial is just about the most serious business in which the U.S. Senate can engage. The Founding Fathers gave us this task for a reason. They had confidence in the Senate for a reason. They knew this institution could do what was right for our Nation, so I am confident that we can prove our Framers right in the days that lie ahead.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

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

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. JAMES E. RISCH,
*Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 19-66 concerning the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Australia for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$1.50 billion. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan

installation support material, special purpose test equipment, initial logistics outfitting, spares and other ancillary equipment to support the installation and integration of AEGIS Combat System equipment in the Hunter and Hobart class ship platforms; development of technical documentation to support both programs; provision of logistics and other support services to support the Hobart and Hunter Class ships; procurement, staging, delivery and installation support for AEGIS Combat System equipment for the Hobart and Hunter Class ships; provision of training support for curriculum development, training tool development, front-end analysis, and crew training for the Hobart and Hunter Class ships; U.S. Government and contractor representative engineering, logistics, and technical support services; and other related elements of logistics and program support for the Hobart and Hunter Class ships. The total estimated cost is \$1.50 billion.

This proposed sale will support the foreign policy and national security objectives of the United States. Australia is one of our most important allies in the Western Pacific. The strategic location of this political and economic power contributes significantly to ensuring peace and economic stability in the region.

The proposed sale will enhance Australia's Surface Combatant capability by modernizing their existing three AEGIS capable Hobart Class Destroyers with the latest technology and capability, and delivering the first three (of nine) AEGIS capable Hunter Class Future Frigates. This sale enhances Australia's self-defense capability, while significantly improving interoperability with U.S. Navy AEGIS combatants in the region. By deploying a surface combatant fleet that will incorporate Cooperative Engagement Capability (CEC), Australia will significantly improve network-centric warfare capability for US forces operating in the region. Australia will have no difficulty absorbing this equipment into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

There are a significant number of companies under contract with the U.S. Navy that will provide components and systems as well as engineering services during the execution of this effort, with a significant portion of the effort to be performed by Lockheed Martin, Rotary and Mission Systems, Moorestown, NJ. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale will require travel of U.S. Government and/or contractor representatives to Australia on a temporary basis for program support and management oversight. No extended (long-term) visits to Australia will be required as part of this effort.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 19-66

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. This sale involves the procurement of long lead material and services to support the Australian Surface Combatant Program. The AEGIS Combat System (ACS) to be procured to support the modernization of the Hobart Class Destroyers is a multi-mission combat system providing Integrated Air and Missile Defense (IAMD) and a growth path to Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) capability, derived from USN AEGIS Weapon System

Baseline 9 capability. In addition to shipboard AEGIS equipment, this proposed sale will provide software, documentation (including combat system capabilities and limitations), training devices and services, and other technical support to ensure the proper installation, testing and operation of the provided equipment.

2. AEGIS Weapon System simulation software, documentation, training and study material will be provided a classification levels up to and including SECRET. Delivery of sensitive technological information, up to and including SECRET, will be limited to the minimum level of information required to progress activities associated with the integration of indigenous combat system systems into the AEGIS Combat System. This consists primarily of AEGIS Combat System requirements and integration information to support early combat system development activities, in the form of documentation, simulation software, and technical specifications. This information is sensitive as it provides limited insight into AEGIS Combat System capabilities and requirements—as tailored to the Australian AEGIS Combat System configurations.

3. The Cooperative Engagement Capability (CEC) is a system that fuses tracking data from shipboard sensors and distributes radar measurement data to other platforms with CEC capability. This data is filtered and combined to create a common tactical picture, based on available sensor data from all platforms netted through the CEC system. The hardware is unclassified with the exception of a Communications Security (COMSEC) card which is classified SECRET. The software and documentation are classified SECRET. All manuals and technical documentation disclosure will be limited to those necessary for operational use and organizational maintenance.

4. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures, which might reduce weapon system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

5. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the enclosed Policy Justification. A determination has been made that Australia can provide the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government.

6. All defense articles and services listed on this transmittal have been authorized for release and export to the Government of Australia.

REVEREND DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. DAY

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, on January 20, we celebrate the 91st anniversary of the birth of the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. In the short 39 years that he spent on Earth, Dr. King inspired more change, touched more lives, and lifted up more voices than most of us could hope to in many lifetimes. With his message of compassion, he shepherded a civil rights movement defined by love and peacefulness, despite the violence and hatred raging all around. He bravely preached the equal value of every human soul, and he was killed for it. That day, we lost a champion for justice who can never be replaced.

Nearly 52 years after Dr. King's murder, it is important to pause and reflect on the profound impact that his dream of peace and equality has had on our Nation's character. Dr. King's legacy includes expanded voting rights, more inclusive housing policies, and the legal prohibition of discrimination on the basis of race. Not only that, but his advocacy for economic justice illuminated the ways that race and class intersect in America, inspiring future generations to demand freedom from all vectors of oppression.

But today is also an opportunity to reflect on what is still needed to make Dr. King's dream a reality. Our criminal justice system still operates as a tool with which to surveil and subjugate minority communities.

People of color, especially African Americans, are still disenfranchised at substantially higher rates and have to navigate sophisticated voter deception and intimidation practices in order to exercise their right to vote. And White supremacists are still marching in the streets while the occupant of our country's highest office proclaims that there are "good people on both sides."

It turns out that the forces of injustice that Dr. King fought to eradicate are strong and adaptable. Often, when we think we have defeated them, they have in fact taken a new, unfamiliar form, or simply hidden below the surface, waiting for an opportunity to emerge. Sadly, there are too many in power right now who offer platforms and shelter to these forces. They threaten to drag our country back to a darker time.

We can't let that happen. I appreciate how daunting that imperative is—goodness knows that I ask myself all the time how I, just one man, can possibly effect the change that I hope to see in the world. But it helps to remember that Martin Luther King was also just one man, one ordinary man called to an extraordinary mission.

So all we need to do is model ourselves in Dr. King's image. Easy, right? Maybe not. But a good way to start is to recall his lesson that "life's most persistent question is: what are you doing for others?" Dr. King taught us that justice doesn't have to be sweeping and grand—it can be quiet; it can take root in small moments. The world that he envisioned can be planted with good deeds between neighbors, helping hands offered to friends, and displays of empathy for complete strangers.

When we do these things, we recognize each other's humanity, we bond ourselves to one another, and then we come to see that none of us is striving alone for a better world. That togetherness, that solidarity, will always win out over hatred and fear.

Another thing we can do is support the systems and institutions that have the power to uphold equality. This is where I make my plug for the census. The upcoming decennial census will be used to determine congressional representation and the fair distribution of

Federal resources for things like schools, hospitals, and housing. It has the potential to ensure that all Americans get the services and political representation to which they are entitled, or it could further skew the playing field in favor of the already privileged. It all depends on whether minority communities are fully counted.

Historically, they have not been. That is why I am asking each and every American to please, please participate in the census this year. Dr. King taught us that every human being is equal, that all of us deserve to live with dignity and respect. He shined a light on the forgotten and the oppressed and demanded better for them. Help to honor his memory by making sure that no one goes uncounted. Carry on his legacy by demanding a government that serves and protects each of its citizens equally. In this way, we can continue building the world that Dr. King envisioned.

(At the request of Mr. ROUNDS, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

NATIONAL DEFENSE STRATEGY AND AFRICA

• Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, my top priority is ensuring the effective implementation of the National Defense Strategy. I rise today to speak about the importance of Africa as a key front in our global efforts under the NDS to compete with China and Russia, defend U.S. national security, and combat radical terrorist groups like al-Qaida and ISIS. The NDS says competition with China and Russia is “the central challenge to U.S. prosperity and security.” This is where DOD is rightly focusing its attention. But China’s and Russia’s growing influence isn’t restricted to Europe and the Indo-Pacific. Recent actions by China and Russia clearly demonstrate that both countries view Africa as a critical battlefield to fulfill their global ambitions and challenge U.S. interests.

Over the past 20 years, I have conducted 164 African country visits. I can tell you it is no coincidence that China established its first overseas military base in Djibouti—strategically located on one of the most important maritime transit routes in the world. I visited Djibouti last February and saw firsthand China’s military base and their encroachment on the Port of Djibouti. Elsewhere, China is using cash and debt to trap countries and force them to put their infrastructure and potentially their very sovereignty on sale. For example, 90 percent of African exports depend on ports and China is funding, building, or operating at least 46 port projects in sub-Saharan Africa. In addition to giving China a potential stranglehold on African prosperity, it also provides China access to critical maritime routes and chokepoints.

At the same time, Russia is using its armed forces, mercenaries, and the sale

of Russian arms to buy influence, exploit Africa’s natural resources, and to prop up leaders sympathetic to Russian interests and hostile to those of the West. And while the NDS states that competition with China and Russia should be DOD’s top priority, it makes clear that we cannot afford to lose sight of the continuing threat posed by radical terrorist groups like al-Qaida and ISIS.

Africa has been and must remain a key theater for our counterterrorism efforts. Today, more than a dozen terrorist groups with ties to al-Qaida and ISIS, like Al-Shabab, are operating across the continent. Many of these groups have ambition to attack Americans and our partners, as we saw last week when Al-Shabab militants in Kenya killed a U.S. servicemember and two DOD contractors. Without pressure the threat these groups pose to the United States will grow unchecked. And this isn’t a recent development—I have seen this come up time and time again on my visits to the continent. It is why I pushed the DOD for years to stand up an Africa command. People forget that we didn’t always have a dedicated military presence in Africa, despite its strategic importance. It was managed through three separate combatant commands. I worked with DOD and then-President Bush to change that, and in 2008 we officially stood up United States Africa Command AFRICOM.

Despite the breadth of security challenges we face on the African continent every day, AFRICOM has consistently suffered resource shortfalls. On any given day, there are about 7,000 DOD personnel serving in Africa. Africa is home to 1.3 billion people and is larger geographically than China, India, the United States, and most of Europe—combined. In light of these significant resource and geographical challenges, the men and women of AFRICOM perform critical missions every day to check Chinese and Russian influence, combat terrorism, and strengthen the capabilities of our partners. AFRICOM provides an enormous value to the Nation for an extremely modest level of investment—the very definition of “economy of force.” Despite this, I understand that DOD is reviewing our military presence in Africa and is considering significant cuts.

Given what is at stake for both U.S. national security and effective implementation of NDS, we must have a meaningful, albeit limited, U.S. presence in Africa. Any drawdown of our troops would be shortsighted, could cripple AFRICOM’s ability to execute its mission and, as a result, would harm national security. Rather than talking about drawing down troops in Africa, we should finally assign forces to AFRICOM on an enduring basis—including an SFAB—in order to provide the command with predictable resourcing so it can be most effective in defending U.S. national security.

I urge the Secretary of Defense to keep this in mind as he makes deci-

sions on the future of our presence and role in Africa.●

REMEMBERING CHRIS ALLEN

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the life of Chris Allen, who worked as my senior economic policy adviser. It is fitting that I do so on the Senate floor because Chris Allen would be the first one to tell you he loved his job.

This statement was delivered so frequently and with such sincerity that one was compelled to look inward and remind one’s self of what a privilege it is to work in the U.S. Senate on behalf of the American people.

Chris Allen was a student of history and a lover of politics. Ladies and gentlemen, Chris Allen loved tax policy. If that doesn’t tell you what a special person he was, I don’t know what does.

Chris’s attitude about his job extended to his coworkers. He loved his coworkers. When he was on my staff, Chris was always willing to help junior staff, senior staff, or interns. It didn’t matter—he had time for you. He rolled up his sleeves and pitched in. He gave you advice. He truly cared.

When it came time for my 2014 campaign, Chris spent his vacation days with me in Kansas—knocking on doors, walking in parades, and being a force of positive energy no matter what we faced. Normally these are grueling tasks but not for Chris. He had fun. He loved it.

As a matter of fact, posted on the wall of our little Hart kitchen, we have a selfie on election night of my crew at the victory party. The picture is entitled “This is what victory looks like.” And right smack-dab in the middle is one smiling Chris Allen. Now, when I am heating up my coffee, I look at Chris in the picture, and I can feel his joy as he is surrounded by our family of staffers.

Elections weren’t his only love. Chris Allen loved a cold beer. He loved a natty jacket. He loved loud pants. Sometimes he loved wearing them together. He loved his lacrosse. He loved his Baltimore neighborhood. He loved all things English and French. He loved researching his ancestry.

Chris Allen loved his parents, his in-laws, his brothers, his nieces and nephews, but nothing compared to his love for Lynda, Lucie, and Sophie. He was not just a proud dad who boasted of his daughters’ accomplishments big and small; he was better. He was a father who took delight in the things his daughters said and did, big and small. They were cherished. May they understand today and always that we loved Chris, and he loved them.

I always looked forward to my briefings with Chris. For one, he got my jokes. He understood my references to radio and television shows and personalities that my other staff would have to research and look up. But he was also understanding of the history of the issues, even those not in his portfolio.

He was an excellent steward of my priorities on the Finance Committee, so much so they stole him from me. At the time I told him, “Listen, you still work for me, you are just sitting down the hall.”

To illustrate Chris’ popularity, I would like to share this story.

There is an annual, all-day legislative meeting held in Washington for a Kansas group that requires a lot of preparation. My staff must be able to speak about a variety of topics and difficult issues before an audience of at least 100 Kansans. At one of these such meetings, Chris had just left my office to work at tax nerd nirvana, the Senate Finance Committee. I called him back to answer a few tax questions while my new staffer transitioned into the role. Before Chris was scheduled to arrive, a number of questions about taxes came up and my staff deferred to him, mentioning they would wait for the “real tax guy” to show up. Their repeated deference to him built up a feeling of anticipation in the room. At long last, Chris strolls in, and heads swivel around to the back of the room to see the great tax man cometh. It was like Elvis had entered the building. The audience got to their feet and gave him a standing ovation. One man was even moved to testify how Chris had helped his community on a rural tax issue and it had made all of the difference. And at the front of the room on the panel, there sat Chris in his dapper jacket, his head tilted back and his beaming smile. He loved to help and they loved him.

Whether it was the tax reform bill or pension legislation, Chris’ brilliant mind made the measure better—every time. And his work will have a long lasting influence on our Nation and literally millions of Americans. What a career Chris Allen had.

Everyone in this room will probably agree that Chris’s best stories were about himself, and he was usually his own punchline. Something had happened to him. He had messed something up, or he had gleefully embarrassed his daughters. You can hear him now. I was a bit player in one of his favorite tales. It was his first Finance Committee hearing working for me. Chris had prepped for days—weeks probably. He was both nervous and excited. As we walked over to the committee room, he told me he was calling Lynda, hoping she could watch the hearing on CSPAN and catch him sitting behind the dais.

So I decided to have a little fun with Chris. As the time for questions got to the Senator next to me, I very dramatically motioned to Chris. Chris looked shocked—I am sure he was thinking, “Oh no, what could I have forgotten to tell him.” Chris leaned in, and I put my hand to the side of my mouth: “Chris, this is your moment. Look very serious. Nod your head a few times. Now point at the paper I am holding—now tell me something very crucial . . . we are going to make sure Lynda sees you!”

Chris got the biggest kick out of it, and we met the goal—he was on CSPAN. So while we take the issues and the policy very seriously, and we negotiate very intensely—and Chris could sure do that—we can also stop for a minute to appreciate where we are and what a privilege it is to do these jobs. As I said, Chris never forgot or took it for granted. He appreciated every minute in the Senate.

I understand Lucie has shared a link to a Google doc for Chris’s friends and loved ones to share their “short but interesting stories about Chris.” I encourage everyone to do so. These stories will be a treasure trove for Lynda, Sophie, and Lucie. I hope you can preserve them in some way with his genealogy work. I know he would like that.

I will conclude with a note to Lynda and the girls: I always say you are only as good as your staff; it is your friends and family who make you what you are. In my office, staff are family. Chris was family; you will always be family. Besides, Chris still works for me. He is just sitting and smiling a few floors up.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING OXFORD-BELLEVUE FERRY

• Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I am proud to name Oxford-Bellevue Ferry, believed to be our Nation’s oldest privately owned ferry, as the U.S. Senate Small Business of the Week.

Currently owned and operated by Judy and Tom Bixler, the ferry has transported residents and tourists between the towns of Oxford and Bellevue across the Tred Avon River since 1683—more than 90 years before the Colonies came together to form the United States, making it one of the oldest companies in the country.

Over the past three centuries, the ferry has become a part of the fabric of the community, with some residents calling it “the pulse of the river.” Residents have also come to associate the sound of the ferry’s engine with the turning of the seasons: the first sounds mark the beginning of spring, while the ferry’s final rumble of the year lets them know that fall has arrived.

Tom and Judy purchased the ferry route and moved to Maryland in 2001. Since then, they have not only been good stewards of the ferry’s history, but they have become pillars in the Oxford community and leaders in Maryland’s tourism industry.

Last year, Judy was appointed chair of the Maryland Tourism Development Board, where she advocates for Maryland’s tourism industry and helps market Maryland as a tourist destination. In 2018, Tom and Judy were awarded the Community Impact Award by the Talbot County Department of Economic Development and Tourism for their commitment to serving Talbot County, its visitors, and its residents.

I was proud to stand with Tom and Judy for the Oxford-Bellevue Ferry’s 325th anniversary celebration in 2008 and am proud to recognize their continued success today. I hope the ferry will still be transporting Marylanders and tourists across the Tred Avon River for many years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO LINDA ROST

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week I have the honor of recognizing Linda Rost of Fallon County for being named Montana’s 2020 Teacher of the Year.

Linda is a highly qualified science teacher at Baker High School with a master’s degree in science education from Montana State University. Linda has been inspiring students and motivating them to dig deeper when it comes to science education. The folks in Fallon County are very proud of Linda’s prestigious recognition.

Because of the size of Baker High School, Linda teaches multiple age groups. While it is a joy, it is also one of the many challenges that comes from teaching at a small rural school. Linda goes above and beyond to find a variety of ways to connect with each student ensuring they understand the course material in a fun and engaging way.

The Montana Teacher of the Year award is a long and competitive process. After interacting with several selection committees made up of top education leaders from across Montana, Linda was selected as the 2020 winner. Linda will now go on to represent Montana in the 2020 National Teacher of the Year competition.

It is my honor to recognize Linda for her dedication to teaching young Montanans. Fallon County and Montana are very fortunate to have a teacher like Linda to ensure that our rural students are getting the highest quality education possible.●

TRIBUTE TO KARTHIK AND RAHUL CHALUMURI

• Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I am proud to recognize Karthik and Rahul Chalumuri of Keene as January 2020’s Granite Staters of the Month for their efforts to organize donation drives at their school to support patients at a local cancer center.

Karthik and Rahul, fraternal twins attending Keene High School, have been involved in their local community from a young age. When they were 5 years old, their parents brought them to volunteer at their local soup kitchen, and helped instill in them the importance of giving back to their community.

As they headed into their senior year at Keene High School, these two young men decided that they wanted to give back in a big way before they headed off to college. They founded a club at their school, Students for Hope, to organize donation drives with the intent

of sending care packages to Cheshire Medical Center's Norris Cotton Cancer Center-Kingsbury Pavilion, which would distribute the care packages to their patients. Rahul, who plans to study computer science in college, designed the group's website from scratch to provide resources on how to donate.

The group began their first donation drive in August. The brothers had low expectations for turnout and were shocked when local businesses and individuals in their community came together to donate a substantial amount of items for these care packages.

Since then, they have organized two more donation drives around both Thanksgiving and Christmas and plan to hold another one in February around Valentine's Day. Although Rahul and Karthik are heading to college in the fall, they have tapped younger students to lead the organization next year.

I want to commend Rahul and Karthik for their dedication to improving the lives of people who are less fortunate and recruiting others to do the same. I know I join the rest of the Keene community and all Granite Staters in thanking Rahul and Karthik for exemplifying the all-hands-on-deck spirit of New Hampshire.●

TRIBUTE TO CARL ADRIAN

• Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a close friend, ally, and devoted public servant, Mr. Carl Adrian, as he retires from a 16-year career supporting our national security, environmental cleanup, economic growth, job creation, and furthering the ever-expanding missions of the Hanford Nuclear Reservation and Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, PNNL, as well as advancements in innovation and more tied to each of these in my home State of Washington.

Mr. Adrian, retiring president and CEO of Tri-Cities Development Council—TRIDEC—began his service to the Pasco, Richland, West Richland, and Kennewick cities, also known as the TriCities, on September 1, 2003. Mr. Adrian arrived in the Tri-Cities as a transplant, being born and raised in Omaha, NE, where he graduated from Westside High School. Mr. Adrian then obtained his bachelor of arts in political science, geography, and later a masters of administration in urban and economic geography from the University of Iowa.

Prior to Mr. Adrian's tenure with TRIDEC, he spent significant time supporting economic development throughout the central region of the United States through his work with multiple organizations. He served communities in Casper, WY, the Quad-City area of both Iowa and Illinois, and Cedar Valley located in Waterloo/Cedar Falls, IA, before embarking upon his last enterprise in the Tri-Cities.

Mr. Adrian has devoted his life to supporting commerce and new innovation in the region. In his role at

TRIDEC, Mr. Adrian has been one of the Tri-Cities most effective advocates to Congress, frequently working to ensure members of Washington State's congressional delegation were abreast of the concerns and needs of the community while also helping to strengthen federal support for Central Washington priorities, including working to successfully expand Washington State's wine industry, signing vital MOUs with Hong Kong to bolster the local economy, and more. Mr. Adrian's dedication to inclusive collaboration ensures important stakeholders are never left uninformed on the needs of the Tri-Cities area, and through his robust advocacy, the region has seen significant population and economic growth as well as industry expansion, offering many Tri-Citians a new path to the American Dream.

As TRIDEC's longest-serving president, Mr. Adrian has successfully led efforts to help expand the Tri-Cities airport and offer nonstop daily flights to key regional airports; create the Manhattan Project National Historical Park in 2015; promote services to attract, retain, and improve commerce and economic development throughout the region, which led to significant job growth, population growth, and the development of several new business ventures in the Tri-Cities.

It is clear to me that Washington State has benefited greatly from Mr. Adrian's vision and passion for promoting what the Tri-Cities community, its workforce, the Hanford Site, and PNNL have to offer, as I have seen firsthand both at home and in the other Washington. His work is evident in the progress that has been made on environmental cleanup at Hanford, as well as his work to help plan a future for the Tri-Cities that looks past cleanup operations towards preserving the region's rich history through designations of the B Reactor as a National Historic Landmark and Manhattan Project National Historical Park, and seeking out new, emerging opportunities like small modular reactors to help grow additional economic opportunities in the region and boost Washington State's leadership role in cutting-edge energy technologies to combat climate change. Through all of this, he has remained as committed as they come. Last August, when I had the good fortune to get one more visit with Mr. Adrian at PNNL, I was unsurprised that he still carried the same enthusiasm and pride for his work as he did during his first visit with me in 2003.

Mr. Adrian has been critical to my work in the U.S. Senate to ensure the Federal Government is keeping its commitments to central Washington, and he has made a tremendous impact on the Tri-Cities community, Washington State, and our Nation. Today, I join with others throughout the State of Washington in thanking him for his many years of service. I congratulate Mr. Carl Adrian on his retirement and

wish him and his wife Rheta the best of luck as they write their next chapter together.●

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT LONG

• Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, would like to congratulate one of my fellow Idahoans, Robert Long, on winning first place in the Mongol Derby. This annual competition held in August brings people from around the world to race across the Mongolian Steppe on horseback. Robert finished the course without any setbacks. This is truly one of the toughest tests of skill and endurance for any horseman or woman, and I am proud that an Idahoan represented the United States with such excellence.

The Mongol Derby course follows the ancient path of Genghis Khan's horse messenger system first set up over 800 years ago. The course crosses 600 miles of some of Mongolia's harshest terrain and takes riders over a week to complete. Contestants are not only challenged by the terrain but also by the traditional methods of the race. The hundreds of horses that shoulder the journey are recruited from the local Mongolians' herds. Riders change horses every 25 miles, just as the ancient Mongols did. Thus, contestants must have the skill to adapt to each new mount and the instinct to ride within the limits of its strengths and weaknesses. Although the riders are racing towards the finish, they are also responsible for taking care of their horses' wellbeing and ensuring they are not overworked or injured during the journey. Robert's experience with animals helped him to win the race without any veterinary penalties.

Robert's victory was surely an outcome of his extensive experience working with horses on the American Western terrain. "Cowboy Bob," as he is known by his close friends, was raised in Wyoming and now lives in Boise, IA. He trained for the Mongol Derby across the American West, where the rough terrain is not so different from that of the Mongolian Steppe.

Robert not only made an impression as a master horseman but also as a gracious guest. The course covers a vast area inhabited by Mongolian nomad herders, who volunteer their horses for the competitors in the race at each stop. Robert presented each herder with a blue ribbon from his past competitions, which he brought after learning the significance of the color blue in Mongolia, the Land of Eternal Blue Sky.

In taking part in this race and performing with thoughtfulness and mastery, Robert exemplified how well Americans can relate to other peoples and cultures. U.S.-Mongolia relations have been growing stronger since our two nations established diplomatic ties over 30 years ago. That the Mongol Derby attracts riders from across the world demonstrates Mongolia's ability to build global connections through

history and culture. However, Mongolia's contributions are certainly not limited to these spheres. Mongolia is an example of a strong democracy. Mongolia currently has over 1,000 peacekeepers deployed in Africa and contributed troops to the fight against terrorism in both Afghanistan and Iraq.

Mongolia is an important friend of the United States in the Indo-Pacific region. I encourage a closer relationship between the United States and Mongolia. I thank Robert for representing his country and the State of Idaho well through fostering friendship and excellence abroad.●

RECOGNIZING TWO SISTERS NEW BEGINNINGS, LLC

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, it is my privilege to recognize a unique Florida small business for its valuable contributions to the local economy and its dedicated efforts to sustainability and dignified work. Today, I am pleased to honor Two Sisters New Beginnings, LLC of Monticello, FL, as the Senate Small Business of the Week.

Founded in 2013 by sisters Sandra Hood and Pat Marchman, Two Sisters New Beginnings is an eclectic antique and repurposed furniture shop. After purchasing and refinishing a chest, Pat and Sandra discovered a passion for repurposing vintage furniture and decided to create a place for local artists to sell their unique items. Today, Two Sisters New Beginnings has become an asset to the Monticello community, supplying locally sourced repurposed furniture, antiques, collectibles, and more to both residents and visitors. Since its establishment, the business's customer base has grown steadily, as has the number of local artists and craftsmen who seek to showcase their products in the store. The storefront has become such a popular destination that Two Sisters New Beginnings expanded into additional retail space next-door.

Two Sisters New Beginnings has been a long supporter of the Monticello community, participating in local events such as the Mainstreet Monticello Christmas Kickoff and Jefferson County Historical Association Home and Heritage Tour. It is a member of Monticello Main Street, a business development and nonprofit organization that promotes local businesses, historic preservation, and tourism within the community. Two Sisters New Beginnings consistently donates to numerous charitable events in the local community, including the Big Bend Hospice Joyful Noise Concert and the David Hobbs Memorial Barrel Race. They have served as a silver sponsor of the Teal Magnolias Ladies Golf Tournament, an event that raises awareness for ovarian cancer each year. Additionally, the vendors of Two Sisters New Beginnings share in this charitable

mindset, often donating a portion of their sales to local charities like Refuge House. Two Sisters New Beginnings is an unparalleled example of how small businesses can strengthen and support a community by giving back and creating dignified jobs.

Two Sisters New Beginnings is a prime example of the integral role small businesses play in our local communities. Its community first mindset and dedication to dignified work make it a notable and integral member of the city of Monticello. Congratulations again on being named the Senate Small Business of the Week. I look forward to watching your continued growth and success.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:23 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1230. An act to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 and other laws to clarify appropriate standards for Federal employment discrimination and retaliation claims, and for other purpose.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 11:08 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

S. 457. An act to require that \$1 coins issued during 2019 honor President George H.W. Bush and to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to issue bullion coins during 2019 in honor of Barbara Bush.

H.R. 263. An act to rename the Oyster Bay National Wildlife Refuge as the Congressman Lester Wolff Oyster Bay National Wildlife Refuge.

H.R. 434. An act to amend the National Trails System Act to provide for the study of the Emancipation National Historic Trail, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1230. An act to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 and other laws to clarify appropriate standards for Federal employment discrimination and retaliation claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, January 16, 2020, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 457. An act to require that \$1 coins issued during 2019 honor President George

H.W. Bush and to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to issue bullion coins during 2019 in honor of Barbara Bush.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-3771. A communication from the Director, Regulations Management Division, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Rural Development Advance Biofuel Producer Payment" (RIN0570-AC75) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 14, 2020; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3772. A communication from the Policy Analyst, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Agricultural Conservation Easement Program (EQIP) Interim Rule" ((7 CFR Part 1468) (RIN0578-AA66)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 14, 2020; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3773. A communication from the Policy Analyst, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP) Interim Rule" ((7 CFR Part 1466) (RIN0578-AA68)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 14, 2020; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3774. A communication from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Federal Student Loan Repayment Program Calendar Year 2018"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3775. A communication from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, the President's Pay Agent, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the extension of locality based comparability payments; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3776. A communication from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Federal Equal Opportunity Recruitment Program (FEORP) for Fiscal Year 2017"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petition or memorial was laid before the Senate and was referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-178. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of New Jersey urging the United States Congress and the President of the United States to enact legislation establishing a safe daily level of cannabidiol consumption; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 163

Whereas, Cannabidiol is a chemical that is prevalent in [marijuana and hemp] products derived from the cannabis plant; and

Whereas, [Cannabidiol] Unlike tetrahydrocannabinol (THC), which is also prevalent in products derived from the cannabis plant, the consumption of cannabidiol does not produce euphoric effects or cause an individual

to feel “high” [in contrast to the chemical tetrahydrocannabinol (THC)]; and

Whereas, The *federal* Food and Drug Administration (FDA) states that products such as food additives and dietary supplements that contain cannabidiol are illegal under federal law; and

Whereas, Within the past three years, more than 1,500 cannabidiol products have come to the market without a clear approach for regulation or any plan from the FDA to balance consumer access and protect consumer health; and

Whereas, The lack of clear policy towards cannabidiol from the FDA and the patchwork regulation of the substance by the states [create] has created a complicated legal framework [for] in which cannabidiol companies [for their operations] are attempting to operate; and

Whereas, *The lack of clear regulatory guidance includes uncertainty as to the level of cannabidiol content that is safe and appropriate for human consumption. This uncertainty can present a risk to the public health, as consumers have access to a wide variety of cannabidiol products but no clear direction as to what amount is safe to consume in a single sitting or over the course of time;* and

Whereas, As a result of this *uncertain legal framework, it has become difficult for cannabidiol companies to participate in interstate commerce* [for national cannabidiol companies is difficult] because banks, insurance companies, and merchant service companies are uneasy about providing services to cannabidiol companies, *which may be at [the] risk of [involvement from] investigation or adverse enforcement actions by the FDA;* and

Whereas, By enacting legislation that specifies a safe daily level of cannabidiol consumption, the President and Congress of the United States would [be able to] help allow individuals to experience the [medical] holistic and therapeutic benefits of cannabidiol while ensuring consumer safety and [also generate] facilitate the participation of cannabidiol companies in interstate commerce, thereby generating increased economic activity [from all interstate commerce for cannabidiol companies] nationwide, now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of New Jersey:

1. This House respectfully urges the President and Congress of the United States to [establish] enact legislation establishing a safe daily consumption level [of] for cannabidiol [consumption].

2. Copies of this resolution, as filed with the Secretary of State, shall be transmitted by the Secretary of the Senate to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Majority and Minority Leaders of the United States Senate, the Speaker and Minority Leader of the House of Representatives, and each member of the United States Congress elected from this State.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

Mr. WICKER for Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary’s desk for the information of Senators.

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

Air Force nomination of Lorelee L. Stock, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Air Force nominations beginning with Shannan L. Corbin and ending with Joshua D. Yanoviak, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 6, 2020.

Air Force nomination of Kraegen J. Bramer, to be Major.

Air Force nomination of Lisa A. Nemeth, to be Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Rozena A. Chan, to be Major.

Army nomination of Shaun J. Arredondo, to be Major.

Army nomination of Steven K. Uhlman, to be Major.

Army nomination of Christopher M. Feroli, to be Major.

Army nomination of Richard A. Malaga, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Tad T. Tsuneyoshi, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of John F. Lopez, to be Major.

Army nomination of Diego L. Becerra III, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Timothy P. Behnke, to be Major.

Army nomination of Sandra L. Molteni, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Benjamin A. Accinelli and ending with Matthew G. Wyatt, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 9, 2020.

Army nomination of Justin D. Considine, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Paul T. Agena and ending with Phillip E. Peters, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 9, 2020.

Army nominations beginning with Michael V. Domenic and ending with Christopher Gundersen, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 9, 2020.

Army nomination of Shauntill L. Baah, to be Major.

Army nomination of LaJohnne A. W. Morris, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Paul Green, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Wanda L. Horton, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Robert T. Sutter, to be Major.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Enrique Bandt and ending with Gilbert L. Woods, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 6, 2020.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Michael C. Apicella, Jr. and ending with Jeffrey A. Tranberg, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 6, 2020.

Marine Corps nomination of Jackie W. Morgan, Jr., to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Marine Corps nomination of Jacob R. Lewis, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Nathaniel W. Baker III and ending with James R. Strand, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 6, 2020.

Marine Corps nomination of Robert W. Puckett, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Marine Corps nomination of John A. Yukica, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with David S. Gersen and ending with Ambrosio V. Pantoja, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 6, 2020.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Ryan M. Cleveland and ending with Christian D. Galbraith, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 6, 2020.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Daniel P. Coultes and ending with Sean R. McMahon, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 9, 2020.

Marine Corps nomination of Matthew H. Hilton, to be Major.

Navy nomination of Adam B. Tomlinson, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Bridgette L. Riley, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Warren L. Brookes, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nominations beginning with Lara H. Spence and ending with John E. D. Yonge III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 6, 2020.

By Mr. GRAHAM for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Andrew Lynn Brasher, of Alabama, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit.

Joshua M. Kindred, of Alaska, to be United States District Judge for the District of Alaska.

Scott H. Rash, of Arizona, to be United States District Judge for the District of Arizona.

Matthew Thomas Schelp, of Missouri, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Missouri.

Stephen A. Vaden, of Tennessee, to be a Judge of the United States Court of International Trade.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 3201. A bill to extend the temporary scheduling order for fentanyl-related substances, and for other purposes; considered and passed.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO:

S. 3202. A bill to discourage speculative oil and gas leasing and to promote enhanced multiple use management of public land and National Forest System land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. Kaine (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 3203. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to codify the requirements for appointment, qualifications, and pay for therapeutic medical physicists of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 3204. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to revise the policy of the Agency to address the threats of climate change, to include considerations of climate change in the strategic plan of the Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Mr. RISCH, and Ms. ROSEN):

S. 3205. A bill to require the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to establish a program to assist small business concerns with purchasing cybersecurity products and services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 3206. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to increase voting accessibility for individuals with disabilities and older individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 3207. A bill to require the Director of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency to establish a Cybersecurity State Coordinator in each State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. PORTMAN:

S. 3208. A bill to improve agency rulemaking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

S. 3209. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to make grants to support fire safety education programs on college campuses; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 3210. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Health and Human Services, to develop a clinical practice guideline or guidelines for the treatment of serious mental illness; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 3211. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to modify certain allotments under that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 3212. A bill to authorize additional monies to the Public Housing Capital Fund of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. WARREN:

S. 3213. A bill to amend certain banking laws to establish requirements for bank mergers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. ROMNEY (for himself and Mr. BENNET):

S. 3214. A bill to amend the Agricultural Credit Act of 1978 with respect to preagreement costs of emergency watershed protection measures, and for other purpose; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Ms. WARREN:

S. 3215. A bill to establish the obligations of certain large business entities in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 3216. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to prohibit group health plans and health insurance issuers offering group or individual health insurance coverage from imposing cost-sharing requirements or treatment limitations with respect to diagnostic examinations for breast cancer that are less favorable than such re-

quirements with respect to screening examinations for breast cancer; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PETERS, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 3217. A bill to standardize the designation of National Heritage Areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. KAINA:

S.J. Res. 69. A joint resolution to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. Res. 474. A resolution to authorize representation by the Senate Legal Counsel in the case of Martin F. McMahon v. Senator Ted Cruz, et al; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. ROMNEY (for himself and Mr. LEE):

S. Res. 475. A resolution recognizing the leading role of Utahns in the fight for women's suffrage and celebrating the sesquicentennial of the first votes by women under the equal suffrage law of Utah on February 14, 1870; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Mr. CRAMER):

S. Res. 476. A resolution congratulating the North Dakota State University Bison football team for winning the 2019 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Football Championship Subdivision title; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. KING, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. Res. 477. A resolution designating the week of February 3 through 7, 2020, as "National School Counseling Week"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PERDUE, Mrs. LOEFFLER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. THUNE, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. WICKER, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. COTTON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. ENZI, Mr. ROMNEY, Mr. BURR, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. LEE, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. DAINES):

S. Res. 478. A resolution designating the week of January 26 through February 1, 2020, as "National School Choice Week"; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 74

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S.

74, a bill to prohibit paying Members of Congress during periods during which a Government shutdown is in effect, and for other purposes.

S. 182

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) were added as cosponsors of S. 182, a bill to prohibit discrimination against the unborn on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

S. 229

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 229, a bill to provide advance appropriations authority for certain accounts of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Bureau of Indian Education of the Department of the Interior and the Indian Health Service of the Department of Health and Human Services, and for other purposes.

S. 237

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 237, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit nurse practitioners and physician assistants to satisfy the documentation requirement under the Medicare program for coverage of certain shoes for individuals with diabetes.

S. 670

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 670, a bill to make daylight savings time permanent, and for other purposes.

S. 780

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 780, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for current year inclusion of net CFC tested income, and for other purposes.

S. 1374

At the request of Ms. MCSALLY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1374, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the waiting periods for disability insurance benefits and Medicare coverage for individuals with metastatic breast cancer, and for other purposes.

S. 1954

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1954, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint commemorative coins in recognition of the 75th anniversary of the integration of baseball.

S. 2001

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER), the Senator from Utah (Mr. ROMNEY), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE), the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) and the Senator from

North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2001, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Willie O'Ree, in recognition of his extraordinary contributions and commitment to hockey, inclusion, and recreational opportunity.

S. 2461

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2461, a bill to designate a portion of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge as wilderness.

S. 2741

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) were added as cosponsors of S. 2741, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand access to telehealth services, and for other purposes.

S. 2779

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2779, a bill to establish the Federal Clearinghouse on School Safety Best Practices, and for other purposes.

S. 2842

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2842, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act and the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 to expand and expedite access to cardiac rehabilitation programs and pulmonary rehabilitation programs under the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 2892

At the request of Ms. HASSAN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2892, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the distribution of additional residency positions to help combat the opioid crisis.

S. 2931

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2931, a bill to establish a process for obtaining a Federal certificate of rehabilitation, and for other purposes.

S. 2936

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2936, a bill to provide for the admission and protection of refugees, asylum seekers, and other vulnerable individuals, to provide for the processing of refugees and asylum seekers in the Western Hemisphere, and to modify certain special immigrant visa programs, and for other purposes.

S. 2989

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a co-

sponsor of S. 2989, a bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to clarify the mailing requirement relating to social security account statements.

S. 3043

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 3043, a bill to modernize training programs at aviation maintenance technician schools, and for other purposes.

S. 3173

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3173, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that amounts paid for an abortion are not taken into account for purposes of the deduction for medical expenses.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 3201. A bill to extend the temporary scheduling order for fentanyl-related substances, and for other purposes; considered and passed.

S. 3201

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Temporary Reauthorization and Study of the Emergency Scheduling of Fentanyl Analogues Act”.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF TEMPORARY ORDER FOR FENTANYL-RELATED SUBSTANCES.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, section 1308.11(h)(30) of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations, shall remain in effect until May 6, 2021.

SEC. 3. STUDY AND REPORT ON IMPACTS OF CLASSWIDE SCHEDULING.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “fentanyl-related substance” has the meaning given the term in section 1308.11(h)(30)(i) of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations.

(b) GAO REPORT.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(1) conduct a study of the classification of fentanyl-related substances as schedule I controlled substances under the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.), research on fentanyl-related substances, and the importation of fentanyl-related substances into the United States; and

(2) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, submit a report on the results of the study conducted under paragraph (1) to—

(A) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate;

(C) the Caucus on International Narcotics Control of the Senate;

(D) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives; and

(E) the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives.

(c) REQUIREMENTS.—The Comptroller General, in conducting the study and developing the report required under subsection (b), shall—

(1) evaluate class control of fentanyl-related substances, including—

(A) the definition of the class of fentanyl-related substances in section 1308.11(h)(30)(i)

of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations, including the process by which the definition was formulated;

(B) the potential for classifying fentanyl-related substances with no, or low, abuse potential, or potential accepted medical use, as schedule I controlled substances when scheduled as a class; and

(C) any known classification of fentanyl-related substances with no, or low, abuse potential, or potential accepted medical use, as schedule I controlled substances that has resulted from the scheduling action of the Drug Enforcement Administration that added paragraph (h)(30) to section 1308.11 of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations;

(2) review the impact or potential impact of controls on fentanyl-related substances on public health and safety, including on—

(A) diversion risks, overdose deaths, and law enforcement encounters with fentanyl-related substances; and

(B) Federal law enforcement investigations and prosecutions of offenses relating to fentanyl-related substances;

(3) review the impact of international regulatory controls on fentanyl-related substances on the supply of such substances to the United States, including by the Government of the People's Republic of China;

(4) review the impact or potential impact of screening and other interdiction efforts at points of entry into the United States on the importation of fentanyl-related substances into the United States;

(5) recommend best practices for accurate, swift, and permanent control of fentanyl-related substances, including—

(A) how to quickly remove from the schedules under the Controlled Substances Act substances that are determined, upon discovery, to have no abuse potential; and

(B) how to reschedule substances that are determined, upon discovery, to have a low abuse potential or potential accepted medical use;

(6) review the impact or potential impact of fentanyl-related controls by class on scientific and biomedical research; and

(7) evaluate the processes used to obtain or modify Federal authorization to conduct research with fentanyl-related substances, including by—

(A) identifying opportunities to reduce unnecessary burdens on persons seeking to research fentanyl-related substances;

(B) identifying opportunities to reduce any redundancies in the responsibilities of Federal agencies;

(C) identifying opportunities to reduce any inefficiencies related to the processes used to obtain or modify Federal authorization to conduct research with fentanyl-related substances;

(D) identifying opportunities to improve the protocol review and approval process conducted by Federal agencies; and

(E) evaluating the degree, if any, to which establishing processes to obtain or modify a Federal authorization to conduct research with a fentanyl-related substance that are separate from the applicable processes for other schedule I controlled substances could exacerbate burdens or lead to confusion among persons seeking to research fentanyl-related substances or other schedule I controlled substances.

(d) INPUT FROM CERTAIN FEDERAL AGENCIES.—In conducting the study and developing the report under subsection (b), the Comptroller General shall consider the views of the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Justice.

(e) INFORMATION FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.—Each Federal department or agency

shall, in accordance with applicable procedures for the appropriate handling of classified information, promptly provide reasonable access to documents, statistical data, and any other information that the Comptroller General determines is necessary to conduct the study and develop the report required under subsection (b).

(f) INPUT FROM CERTAIN NON-FEDERAL ENTITIES.—In conducting the study and developing the report under subsection (b), the Comptroller General shall consider the views of experts from certain non-Federal entities, including experts from—

- (1) the scientific and medical research community;
- (2) the State and local law enforcement community; and
- (3) the civil rights and criminal justice reform communities.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my Judiciary Committee colleagues, Chairman GRAHAM and Senator DURBIN, as the lead co-sponsor of the “Temporary Reauthorization and Study of the Emergency Scheduling of Fentanyl Analogues Act.”

This bill will ensure that fentanyl-related substances remain in Schedule I and will help deter the manufacture of fentanyl-related substances responsible for overdose deaths.

In 2018, the number of fentanyl-related deaths in the United States increased from 28,000 to 32,000.

This is more than double the number of heroin-related overdose deaths. It is a staggering number of lives lost that we simply cannot accept.

To address the increasing deaths, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) issued a temporary order to control fentanyl-related substances, or fentanyl analogues, as a class.

That order is set to expire on February 6th.

Based on the information my office has received from the DEA and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, it is clear that this order has been effective.

The number of law enforcement encounters of new fentanyl analogues has decreased from 8 to 2. That is significant and means that the order has reduced the supply of new fentanyl analogues by 75 percent.

This decrease in supply has reduced the need for widespread prosecutions of fentanyl-related offenses. In fact, since the DEA’s order went into effect, it is my understanding that there has only been two related prosecutions.

Additionally, although the number of fentanyl-related overdose deaths has continued to increase, the rate at which these deaths has increased has declined significantly.

For example, between the 12 month periods ending January 2017 and January 2018, fentanyl deaths increased by nearly 36 percent.

Comparatively, between the 12 month periods ending May 2018 and May 2019, which is the latest data available, the rate of fentanyl deaths only increased by just over 9 percent.

I would have preferred a long-term solution to addressing this problem that can garner strong bipartisan support, and I am eager to continue working with my colleagues on such a solution.

However, given the limited amount of time that we have before the DEA’s temporary order expires, we cannot sit idly by and do nothing.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation. Given the staggering number of overdose deaths associated with fentanyl-related substances, inaction is not an option.

By Mr. KAINES (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 3203. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to codify the requirements for appointment, qualifications, and pay for therapeutic medical physicists of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

Mr. KAINES. Mr. President. Physicians at the Department of Veterans Affairs depend on Therapeutic Medical Physicists to help plan and deliver critical radiation treatment to patients. Inadequate support from these medical professionals can place veterans at risk for radiation injury or inappropriate treatment. As radiation therapy has become more sophisticated and more common over the past fifteen years, the Department has struggled to recruit and retain Therapeutic Medical Physicists. The average salary in the private sector for a PhD board certified Therapeutic Medical Physicists with ten to fourteen years of work experience is approximately \$190,000, but current law limits salaries for these employees at the Department to \$166,500, inhibiting the Department’s ability to recruit qualified individuals to fill these positions.

When faced with Therapeutic Medical Physicist shortages, the Department outsources this work to expensive contractors. Consequently, the Department substantially overspends on these services, which could be done more reliably in-house and at a much lower cost. Furthermore, contracts for TMP services are awarded for a short period, which results in frequent turnover that can be potentially dangerous from the perspective of quality care and patient safety.

Today, I am pleased to introduce the Department of Veterans Affairs Therapeutic Medical Physicist Pay Cap Relief Act with my colleague Senator MURKOWSKI. This legislation would improve the recruitment and retention of Therapeutic Medical Physicists by allowing the Department to pay these professionals at rates competitive with the private sector. This bill would also improve the quality of care for veterans by reducing the turnover of Therapeutic Medical Physicists, and lead to lower total costs for the De-

partment by eliminating the use of expensive contractors. With these savings, the Department could raise salaries and hire more Therapeutic Medical Physicists.

This commonsense, bipartisan legislation is an opportunity to invest in professionals who treat those who have sacrificed for our nation, and improve the standard of care we provide to our veterans. I look forward to working with my colleagues to swiftly implementing the provisions of the Department of Veterans Affairs Therapeutic Medical Physicist Pay Cap Relief Act.

Thank you, Mr. President.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 474—TO AUTHORIZE REPRESENTATION BY THE SENATE LEGAL COUNSEL IN THE CASE OF MARTIN F. MCMAHON V. SENATOR TED CRUZ, ET AL

Mr. SCHUMER submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 474

Whereas, Senators Ted Cruz, Lindsey Graham, Mitch McConnell, and Rand Paul have been named as defendants in the case of *Martin F. McMahon v. Senator Ted Cruz, et al.*, Case No. 1:19-cv-03774-TSC, currently pending in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 704(a)(1) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. §§288b(a) and 288c(a)(1), the Senate may direct its counsel to defend Members of the Senate in civil actions relating to their official responsibilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate Legal Counsel is authorized to represent Senators Ted Cruz, Lindsey Graham, Mitch McConnell, and Rand Paul, and any other Member who may be named as a defendant in the case of *Martin F. McMahon v. Senator Ted Cruz, et al.*

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution authorizing representation by the Senate Legal Counsel and ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. President, this resolution concerns a pro se lawsuit recently filed in Federal court in the District of Columbia against Senators CRUZ, GRAHAM, McCONNELL, and PAUL. In this lawsuit, plaintiff seeks to obtain judicial supervision over the upcoming impeachment trial of the President under the Ninth Amendment. Plaintiffs suit is subject to dismissal on jurisdictional grounds as the Constitution grants the Senate the sole power to try impeachments, and the Judicial Branch has no power to oversee the actions and participation of Senators in an impeachment trial. This resolution would authorize the Senate Legal Counsel to represent the named defendant Senators in order to seek dismissal of the claims against them.

SENATE RESOLUTION 475—RECOGNIZING THE LEADING ROLE OF UTAHNS IN THE FIGHT FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE AND CELEBRATING THE SESQUICENTENNIAL OF THE FIRST VOTES BY WOMEN UNDER THE EQUAL SUFFRAGE LAW OF UTAH ON FEBRUARY 14, 1870

Mr. ROMNEY (for himself and Mr. LEE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 475

Whereas, on February 10, 1870, the territorial legislature of Utah passed an Act granting women the right to vote, which was signed into law on February 12, 1870, by Acting Governor Stephen Mann;

Whereas, on February 14, 1870, women voted in the Salt Lake City election, becoming the first women to vote under an equal suffrage law within what is now the United States;

Whereas, in 1887, Congress revoked the voting rights of women in Utah;

Whereas, on November 5, 1895, the new Utah Constitution was adopted with a provision stating, “The rights of citizens of the State of Utah to vote and hold office shall not be denied or abridged on account of sex. Both male and female citizens of this State shall enjoy equally all civil, political and religious rights and privileges.”;

Whereas, on November 3, 1896, Martha Maria Hughes Cannon, who will be honored by a statue in the United States Capitol in 2020, was elected to the Utah State Senate and became the first woman to serve as a State senator in the United States; and

Whereas, in 1919, women's suffrage was extended to all United States citizens with the adoption of the 19th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the leading role of Utahns in the fight for women's suffrage and the adoption of the 19th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States guaranteeing that the “right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex”; and

(2) celebrates the sesquicentennial of the first votes by women under the equal suffrage law of Utah on February 14, 1870.

SENATE RESOLUTION 476—CONGRATULATING THE NORTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY BISON FOOTBALL TEAM FOR WINNING THE 2019 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION I FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP SUBDIVISION TITLE

Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Mr. CRAMER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 476

Whereas the North Dakota State University (referred to in this preamble as “NDSU”) Bison football team won the 2019 National Collegiate Athletic Association (referred to in this preamble as the “NCAA”) Division I Football Championship Subdivision title game in Frisco, Texas, on January 11, 2020, in a well-fought victory over the James Madison University Dukes by a score of 28 to 20;

Whereas, including the 2019 NCAA Division I Football Championship Subdivision title,

the NDSU Bison football team has won 16 NCAA football championships;

Whereas the NDSU Bison football team has won 8 of the last 9 NCAA Division I Football Championship Subdivision titles, an achievement that continues to be unmatched in modern collegiate football history;

Whereas the NDSU Bison football team completed the 2019 NCAA football season with a perfect record of 16 wins and 0 losses, becoming the first collegiate football team in any division to accomplish this feat since the Yale University Bulldogs in 1894;

Whereas the NDSU Bison football team has recorded consecutive undefeated seasons and extended its winning streak to an NCAA Football Championship Subdivision record of 37 wins in a row, displaying remarkable skill and commitment;

Whereas head coach Matt Entz and his staff led the NDSU Bison football team to a dominant season and a championship during his first year as head coach at NDSU, instilling leadership and excellence in the members of the NDSU Bison football program;

Whereas quarterback Trey Lance became the first player in the history of the NDSU Bison football team and the first freshman player in the history of the NCAA to win the Walter Payton Award, which is awarded to the top offensive player in the Division I Football Championship Subdivision;

Whereas thousands of Bison fans once again attended the championship game, reflecting the tremendous pride and dedication of Bison Nation, which has supported and helped drive the achievement of the NDSU Bison football team; and

Whereas the 2019 NCAA Division I Football Championship Subdivision title was a victory for both the NDSU Bison football team and the entire State of North Dakota: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the North Dakota State University Bison football team for winning the 2019 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Football Championship Subdivision title;

(2) commends the players, coaches, and staff of the North Dakota State University Bison football team for—

(A) their tireless work and dedication; and
(B) fostering a continued tradition of excellence; and

(3) recognizes the students, alumni, and loyal fans for supporting the North Dakota State University Bison football team during its successful quest to bring home yet another NCAA Division I Football Championship Subdivision trophy for North Dakota State University.

SENATE RESOLUTION 477—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF FEBRUARY 3 THROUGH 7, 2020, AS “NATIONAL SCHOOL COUNSELING WEEK”

Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. KING, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. HAS-SAN, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 477

Whereas the American School Counselor Association has designated February 3 through 7, 2020, as “National School Counseling Week”;

Whereas school counselors have long advocated for equitable opportunities for all students;

Whereas school counselors help develop well-rounded students by guiding students through academic learning, social and emotional development, and career exploration;

Whereas personal and social growth can help lead to increased academic achievement;

Whereas school counselors play a vital role in ensuring that students are ready for both college and careers;

Whereas school counselors play a vital role in making students aware of opportunities for financial aid and college scholarships;

Whereas school counselors assist with and coordinate efforts to foster a positive school climate, resulting in a safer learning environment for all students;

Whereas school counselors have been instrumental in helping students, teachers, and parents deal with personal trauma as well as tragedies in their communities and the United States;

Whereas students face myriad challenges every day, including peer pressure, bullying, mental health issues, the deployment of family members to serve in conflicts overseas, and school violence;

Whereas a school counselor is one of the few professionals in a school building who is trained in both education and social and emotional development;

Whereas the roles and responsibilities of school counselors are often misunderstood;

Whereas the school counselor position is often among the first to be eliminated to meet budgetary constraints;

Whereas the national average ratio of students to school counselors is 442 to 1, almost twice the 250 to 1 ratio recommended by the American School Counselor Association, the National Association for College Admission Counseling, and other organizations; and

Whereas the celebration of National School Counseling Week will increase awareness of the important and necessary role school counselors play in the lives of students in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of February 3 through 7, 2020, as “National School Counseling Week”; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States to observe National School Counseling Week with appropriate ceremonies and activities that promote awareness of the role school counselors play in schools and the community at large in preparing students for fulfilling lives as contributing members of society.

SENATE RESOLUTION 478—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF JANUARY 26 THROUGH FEBRUARY 1, 2020, AS “NATIONAL SCHOOL CHOICE WEEK”

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PERDUE, Mrs. LOEFFLER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. THUNE, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. WICKER, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. COTTON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. ENZI, Mr. ROMNEY, Mr. BURR, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. LEE, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. DAINES) submitted the

following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 478

Whereas providing a diversity of choices in K-12 education empowers parents to select education environments that meet the individual needs and strengths of their children;

Whereas high-quality K-12 education environments of all varieties are available in the United States, including traditional public schools, public charter schools, public magnet schools, private schools, online academies, and home schooling;

Whereas talented teachers and school leaders in each of the education environments prepare children to achieve their dreams;

Whereas more families than ever before in the United States actively choose the best education for their children;

Whereas more public awareness of the issue of parental choice in education can inform additional families of the benefits of proactively choosing challenging, motivating, and effective education environments for their children;

Whereas the process by which parents choose schools for their children is non-political, nonpartisan, and deserves the utmost respect; and

Whereas tens of thousands of events are planned to celebrate the benefits of educational choice during the tenth annual National School Choice Week, held the week of January 26 through February 1, 2020: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of January 26 through February 1, 2020, as “National School Choice Week”;

(2) congratulates students, parents, teachers, and school leaders from K-12 education environments of all varieties for their persistence, achievements, dedication, and contributions to society in the United States;

(3) encourages all parents, during National School Choice Week, to learn more about the education options available to them; and

(4) encourages the people of the United States to hold appropriate programs, events, and activities during National School Choice Week to raise public awareness of the benefits of opportunity in education.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1283. Mr. MORAN (for Ms. MCSALLY (for herself, Mr. COONS, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, and Ms. SMITH)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 886, to direct the Attorney General to establish and carry out a Veteran Treatment Court Program.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1283. Mr. MORAN (for Ms. MCSALLY (for herself, Mr. COONS, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, and Ms. SMITH)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 886, to direct the Attorney General to establish and carry out a Veteran Treatment Court Program; as follows:

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 coordina-

tion 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.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I have 2 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, January 16, 2020, at 9 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: James E. McPherson, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of the Army, and Charles Williams, of Missouri, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy, both of the Department of Defense.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, January 16, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Andrew Lynn Brasher, of Alabama, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit, John Charles Hinderaker, and Scott H. Rash, both to be a United States District Judge for the District of Arizona, Joshua M. Kindred, to be United States District Judge for the District of Alaska, Matthew Thomas Schelp, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Missouri, Fernando L. Aenlle-Rocha, Stanley Blumenfeld, and Mark C. Scarsi, each to be a United States District Judge for the Central District of California, Stephen A. Vaden, of Tennessee, to be a Judge of the United States Court of International Trade, and Grace Karaffa Obermann, and Stephen Sidney Schwartz, both of Virginia, both to be

a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session for the consideration of all nominations on the Secretary's desk; that the nominations be confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows:

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE

PN1351 AIR FORCE nomination of Lorelee L. Stock, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 6, 2020.

PN1352 AIR FORCE nominations (4) beginning SHANNAN L. CORBIN, and ending JOSHUA D. YANOVIAK, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 6, 2020.

PN1409 AIR FORCE nomination of Kraegen J. Bramer, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 9, 2020.

PN1410 AIR FORCE nomination of Lisa A. Nemeth, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 9, 2020.

PN1411 AIR FORCE nomination of Rozena A. Chan, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 9, 2020.

IN THE ARMY

PN1262 ARMY nomination of Shaun J. Arredondo, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of October 30, 2019.

PN1263 ARMY nomination of Steven K. Uhlman, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of October 30, 2019.

PN1292 ARMY nomination of Christopher M. Feroli, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of November 19, 2019.

PN1353 ARMY nomination of Richard A. Malaga, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 6, 2020.

PN1354 ARMY nomination of Tad T. Tsuneyoshi, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 6, 2020.

PN1355 ARMY nomination of John F. Lopez, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 6, 2020.

PN1356 ARMY nomination of Diego L. Becerra, III, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 6, 2020.

PN1357 ARMY nomination of Timothy P. Behnke, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 6, 2020.

PN1359 ARMY nomination of Sandra L. Molteni, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 6, 2020.

PN1404 ARMY nominations (91) beginning BENJAMIN A. ACCINELLI, and ending MATTHEW G. WYATT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 9, 2020.

PN1407 ARMY nomination of Justin D. Considine, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 9, 2020.

PN1412 ARMY nominations (2) beginning PAUL T. AGENA, and ending PHILLIP E. PETERS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 9, 2020.

PN1413 ARMY nominations (2) beginning MICHAEL V. DOMENIC, and ending CHRISTOPHER GUNDERSEN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 9, 2020.

PN1414 ARMY nomination of Shauntill L. Baah, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 9, 2020.

PN1415 ARMY nomination of LaJohnne A. W. Morris, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 9, 2020.

PN1416 ARMY nomination of Paul Green, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 9, 2020.

PN1417 ARMY nomination of Wanda L. Horton, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 9, 2020.

PN1418 ARMY nomination of Robert T. Sutter, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 9, 2020.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

PN1367 MARINE CORPS nominations (8) beginning ENRIQUE BANDT, and ending GILBERT L. WOODS, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 6, 2020.

PN1368 MARINE CORPS nominations (10) beginning MICHAEL C. APICELLA, JR., and ending JEFFREY A. TRANBERG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 6, 2020.

PN1369 MARINE CORPS nomination of Jackie W. Morgan, Jr., which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 6, 2020.

PN1370 MARINE CORPS nomination of Jacob R. Lewis, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 6, 2020.

PN1371 MARINE CORPS nominations (2) beginning NATHANIEL W. BAKER, III, and ending JAMES R. STRAND, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 6, 2020.

PN1372 MARINE CORPS nomination of Robert W. Puckett, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 6, 2020.

PN1373 MARINE CORPS nomination of John A. Yukica, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 6, 2020.

PN1374 MARINE CORPS nominations (3) beginning DAVID S. GERSEN, and ending AMBROSIO V. PANTOJA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 6, 2020.

PN1376 MARINE CORPS nominations (2) beginning RYAN M. CLEVELAND, and ending CHRISTIAN D. GALBRAITH, which

nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 6, 2020.

PN1405 MARINE CORPS nominations (4) beginning DANIEL P. COULTES, and ending SEAN R. MCMAHON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 9, 2020.

PN1406 MARINE CORPS nomination of Matthew H. Hilton, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 9, 2020.

IN THE NAVY

PN1360 NAVY nomination of Adam B. Tomlinson, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 6, 2020.

PN1361 NAVY nomination of Bridgette L. Riley, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 6, 2020.

PN1362 NAVY nomination of Warren L. Brookes, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 6, 2020.

PN1363 NAVY nominations (2) beginning LARA H. SPENCE, and ending JOHN E. D. YONGE, III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 6, 2020.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following Senate resolutions which were submitted earlier today: S. Res 476, S. Res. 477, and S. Res. 478.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

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

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, January 21, from 10 a.m. until 11 a.m., while the Senate is sitting as a court of impeachment and notwithstanding the Senate's adjournment, the Senate can receive House messages and executive matters, committees be authorized to report legislative and executive matters, and Senators be allowed to submit statements for the RECORD, bills and resolutions and cosponsor requests, and, where applicable, the Secretary of the Senate, on behalf of the Presiding Officer, be permitted to refer such matters.

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

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, JANUARY 17, 2020, AND TUESDAY, JANUARY 21, 2020

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 2 p.m. on Friday, January 17, for a pro forma session only, with no business being conducted; further, when the Senate adjourns on Friday, January 17, it next convene at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, January 21; further, following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day and morning business be closed; finally, following leader remarks, the Senate recess subject to the call of the Chair.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 2 P.M. TOMORROW

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 4:01 p.m., adjourned until Friday, January 17, 2020.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 16, 2020:

IN THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF LORELEE L. STOCK, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SHANNAN L. CORBIN AND ENDING WITH JOSHUA D. YANOVIAK, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 6, 2020.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF KRAEGEN J. BRAMER, TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF LISA A. NEMETH, TO BE COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF ROZENA A. CHAN, TO BE MAJOR.

IN THE ARMY

ARMY NOMINATION OF SHAUN J. ARREDONDO, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF STEVEN K. UHLMAN, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF CHRISTOPHER M. FEROLI, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF RICHARD A. MALAGA, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF TAD T. TSUNEYOSHI, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JOHN F. LOPEZ, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF DIEGO L. BECERRA III, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF TIMOTHY P. BEHNKE, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF SANDRA L. MOLTENI, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BENJAMIN A. ACCINELLI AND ENDING WITH MATTHEW G. WYATT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 9, 2020.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JUSTIN D. CONSIDINE, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH PAUL T. AGENA AND ENDING WITH PHILLIP E. PETERS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 9, 2020.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL V. DOMENIC AND ENDING WITH CHRISTOPHER GUNDERSEN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 9, 2020.

ARMY NOMINATION OF SHAUNTILL L. BAAH, TO BE MAJOR.
ARMY NOMINATION OF LAJOHNNNE A. W. MORRIS, TO BE COLONEL.
ARMY NOMINATION OF PAUL GREEN, TO BE COLONEL.
ARMY NOMINATION OF WANDA L. HORTON, TO BE COLONEL.
ARMY NOMINATION OF ROBERT T. SUTTER, TO BE MAJOR.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ENRIQUE BANDT AND ENDING WITH GILBERT L. WOODS, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 6, 2020.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL C. APICELLA, JR. AND ENDING WITH JEFFREY A. TRANBERG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 6, 2020.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF JACKIE W. MORGAN, JR., TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.
MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF JACOB R. LEWIS, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.
MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH NATHANIEL W. BAKER III AND ENDING WITH JAMES R. STRAND, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 6, 2020.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF ROBERT W. PUCKETT, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF JOHN A. YUKICA, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID S. GERSEN AND ENDING WITH AMBROSIO V. PANTOJA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 6, 2020.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RYAN M. CLEVELAND AND ENDING WITH CHRISTIAN D. GALBRAITH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE

SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 6, 2020.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DANIEL P. COULTES AND ENDING WITH SEAN R. MCMAHON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 9, 2020.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF MATTHEW H. HILTON, TO BE MAJOR.

IN THE NAVY

NAVY NOMINATION OF ADAM B. TOMLINSON, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF BRIDGETTE L. RILEY, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF WARREN L. BROOKES, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LARA H. SPENCE AND ENDING WITH JOHN E. D. YONGE III, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 6, 2020.