

passed. So that was a big bipartisan accomplishment.

We also made great progress in reforming our public education system by passing, again, on a bipartisan basis, the Every Student Succeeds Act, which went a long way to devolving power from here in Washington, DC, back to the States, back to local school districts, back to parents and teachers—something that, fortunately, we were able to agree upon on a bipartisan basis. That change was applauded by my constituents back home, and, I believe, people around the country.

We also made great headway in making our country safer and our government more just by taking up and passing legislation to support victims of abuse and violence and to craft laws to better equip our law enforcement to handle growing threats.

For example, we passed the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act 99 to 0. Some people say that nothing ever gets done in Washington; well, 99 to 0—it is hard to beat that, except by maybe 100 to 0, but we will take it.

That law was signed into law by President Obama 2 years ago, and it is helping victims of human trafficking get the healing and recovery they need, while also providing help to law enforcement to help root out the people who patronize modern day slavery, which is what human trafficking amounts to.

We also, on a bipartisan basis, reauthorized the Justice for All Act to strengthen victims' rights in court and increase access to restitution and services that can help them recover. It helps reduce the national backlog in untested rape kits, forensic evidence collected after a sexual assault that is necessary to identify the assailant through the use of DNA testing. That was really important, after we heard the horror stories of as many as 400,000 untested rape kits in laboratories or evidence lockers—evidence which was critical to identifying the assailant; many times they were serial assailants. In other words, they didn't just attack one time, they attacked multiple times over the years—and to get them off the streets. That type of evidence is also very important in exonerating the innocent because if we can exclude someone from one of these terrible assaults, that means a person who is innocent of the crime will be free.

We also passed a bill called the POLICE Act, signed into law last summer, so our first responders and law enforcement officers can learn the latest techniques to deal with violence so they are ready to face the unimaginable or previously unimaginable threats in our communities.

I could go on and on, but I will just mention a few more. We passed bipartisan legislation to combat opioid abuse and heroin addiction, the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act. We passed laws to make our government more transparent so it is more accountable to the public and to vot-

ers. We helped capitalize on our God-given natural resources by lifting the crude oil export ban, for example—something important not only to domestic producers and job creation here but also to our friends and allies around the world who frequently depend on a single source for their energy. Unfortunately, people like Vladimir Putin in Russia have discovered you can use that sole source of energy as a weapon by threatening to cut it off.

The reason I mention some of these accomplishments is to make the point that nothing happens in Congress, nothing happens in the Federal Government, unless it is bipartisan.

It is one thing to fight hard in an election and try to win the election so you can gain the privilege of actually being in the majority or having the White House, but after the election is over, our responsibilities shift to governing. Right now, our friends across the aisle are continuing to obstruct and drag their feet and make it impossible for the President to get the Cabinet he needs in order to get the government up and running.

We need to return to the pattern we established in the last Congress, to work together, to build consensus, to help make America stronger, our citizens safer, and our laws a better service to all the people. I would plead with our colleagues across the aisle to stop the dysfunction, stop wanting to relitigate the outcome of the election. You can't. It is over. We know what the outcome was. They need to move on, and we need to move on—not just for the political parties we are members of, not just for the benefit of those elected here in Washington but for the benefit of 320-some-odd million people whom we have the responsibility of representing. Instead of foot-dragging, obstruction, and dysfunction, let us fight, as we always have, for those people we represent and work together to find common ground where we can to put forward legislation that serves them well.

I hope our colleagues across the aisle would remember those lessons they learned in the 2014 election; that dysfunction is bad politics. It does not help their political cause. I understand the temptation of wanting to yield to the most radical elements in a political party, but we are elected to the Senate for 6-year terms to be that cooling saucer, to try to have debate and deliberation, to try to work out the hard problems. That is our responsibility, and just to blindly obstruct when you know you can't change the outcome—particularly when it comes to the President getting the Cabinet he has chosen and he deserves—makes no sense whatsoever.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

#### AGRICULTURE

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, there are few things that I enjoy more than

bragging about my hometown. I live in a little town called Yuma, CO, out in the Eastern Plains. It is a town of about 3,500 people. If maybe you over-exaggerate a little bit, it reaches 4,000. It is out in the middle of the High Plains of Colorado, 4,000 feet in elevation, 40 miles or so from the Kansas-Nebraska border. It is a farming community, 100 percent farming. Everything related to the town is farming. Even the clothing stores are related to farming because if you don't have a strong agriculture economy, nobody is buying blue jeans, nobody is going up to the car dealership to buy a pickup if the bushel of corn isn't priced right. So everything we do in that town is related to agriculture and farming.

My family comes from a background of farm equipment business and started a business—101 years old this year—by my great-grandfather. My time working in the dealership started roughly when I was in seventh, eighth grade. They let me do some very complicated tasks, high-skill tasks they let me perform: cleaning the bathroom, sweeping the floors. I did that throughout my time in eighth grade, high school, and college. If I go back today, I am sure they would let me do the same job, clean the bathrooms and sweep the floors. Part of that is because I was selling the wrong parts to a lot of farmers who would come into the dealership. Maybe they were just keeping me off the parts counter for the time being. In fact, maybe that is why people voted for me, to get me off the parts counter and quit selling the wrong parts.

Over my time working at the dealership, we witnessed a lot of good times in agriculture. I can remember one time going into my dad's and granddad's office and saying: You know what, the economy is really good. The price of corn is really high right now. We ought to order a whole bunch of farm equipment—a whole bunch of pieces of implements, tillage equipment, tractors, combines—and have them on the lot so we can take advantage of the good times in agriculture.

My granddad paused and looked at my dad and said: No, I don't think we should do that because I don't think times are going to be good next year.

They were right. This was back in probably the mid-1990s. They had seen it coming because of their experience in the business, the ebbs and flows of agriculture, the good times and the bad times. They were able to recognize, through their own experience, what different economic indicators meant to them and how they could forecast, using their experience, what was going to happen in the farm world the next year. So they decided not to order all that brandnew equipment. They decided not to order the tractors, the combines, and the tillage equipment. It was a good thing because the next year wasn't that great. If this 18-year-old, 19-year-old kid would have had his way, we would have had a whole lot of iron

we were paying interest on that year without being able to sell it.

Colorado is pretty blessed, with 4,000 companies involved in agriculture, 173,000 jobs in Colorado directly involved in agriculture. The State has more than 35,000 farms and 31 million acres used for farming and ranching. If we look at the Colorado business economic outlook, the net farm income of ranchers and farmers in 2016 is estimated this year to be the lowest it has been since 1986, and the projections for 2017 are even lower.

I grew up as a kid in the 1980s, watching perhaps the hardest times agriculture in the United States had faced in decades, watching a lot of people I knew my whole life going out of business, people having to sell the farm because of what was happening in the 1980s, leading to a banking crisis in agriculture in the 1980s, watching banks I had grown up with close.

I am concerned in this country that we are going to see the same thing again, beginning in 2016, into 2017, and then into 2018 next year. I am very worried that those tough times we saw in the 1980s, and some of the tough with the good times we saw in the 1990s, and some really good years a few years ago are going to seem like distant memories come later this summer and into next year if we don't do something.

I had the opportunity to visit with the Colorado commissioner of agriculture in my office last week, a gentleman by the name of Don Brown. Don Brown is from my hometown of Yuma, CO. It has done pretty well for itself, 3,000 people. The State commissioner of agriculture is from my hometown. The previous commissioner of agriculture, a gentleman by the name of John Stoltz, was from my hometown of Yuma. Both of them grew up in agriculture in that area, understanding what it is like on the High Plains, understanding what it is like to live through good times and bad times. Both of them today I think would tell you, they are very concerned as well about what happens over the next year, the next 2 years.

It wasn't that long ago when we saw some of the highest priced commodities this country has ever seen, at least in a very long time—the golden years of agriculture, some people said—where corn and wheat were priced high. People were able to pay their bills and buy new equipment. Commodity prices don't always stay that high though. The one thing a farmer will tell you is, the price of a piece of farm equipment stays high, the price of fertilizer seems to stay high. When prices come down on their commodities, the other prices—the inputs—stay high, and they find themselves in significant trouble.

The price of corn today is estimated to be about \$3.15 per bushel. That is what it was in 2016, less than half of the 10-year high price of corn of \$6.86 in 2012, just a few years ago. To put that in historical context, the price of corn in 2016 at \$3.15 is lower than the price

of corn in 1974, the year I was born, when it was \$3.20. The price of corn in 2016 was 5 cents lower than it was the year I was born, 1974. It is the same story across the board for Colorado. Wheat prices are down more than \$1 from 2015 to 2016 alone and down more than 50 percent since 2012. I can guarantee, even though I may have sold a lot of wrong parts at the implement dealership, those wrong parts didn't come down in price 50 percent.

The livestock industry has seen similar trends, with cattle prices at their lowest level since 2010. In farming and agriculture, a lot of times we might see a year where the price of corn is high, but the price of cattle is low or the price of other commodities are high where the price of cattle is low, but when cattle are high, maybe other commodities are low. Farmers who have a diverse operation are able to offset the lows and the highs with a diverse operation—but not this year, and it looks like that may be the case next year.

Declines in States' agriculture economy are not unique to Colorado. According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Economic Research Service, revenues have decreased for agriculture nationwide by more than 10 percent since 2014.

Recently, the Wall Street Journal wrote this, and I will show the headline of the Wall Street Journal piece just a couple of weeks ago. The Wall Street Journal has an article entitled "The Next American Farm Bust Is Upon Us."

We have had a lot of debates on this floor. We have had debates about Cabinet members. We have had debates about resolutions of disapprovals. We are talking about a lot of things, but there is a lot of suffering beginning in the heartland of America right now. A lot of farmers and ranchers are suffering. They are worried about how they are going to survive, not just into the next year but how they are going to survive into the next couple of months. The telltale signs of difficult times are all around us in agriculture. This article, "The Next American Farm Bust Is Upon Us," begins to tell the story. Here is what the Wall Street Journal said:

The Farm Belt is hurtling toward a milestone: Soon there will be fewer than two million farms in America for the first time since pioneers moved westward after the Louisiana Purchase.

Across the heartland, a multiyear slump in prices for corn, wheat and other farm commodities brought on by a glut of grain worldwide is pushing many farmers further into debt. Some are shutting down, raising concerns that the next few years could bring the biggest wave of farm closures since the 1980s.

The article highlights the story of a fifth-generation farmer from Western Kansas. I mentioned my hometown is 40 miles away from Kansas. It looks very similar to the Eastern Plains of Colorado where I live. Here is his story:

From his father's porch, the 56-year-old can see the windswept spot where his great-grandparents' sod house stood in 1902 when

they planted the first of the 1,200 acres on which his family farms alfalfa, sorghum and wheat today. Even after harvesting one of their best wheat crops ever last year, thanks to plentiful rain and a mild winter, Mr. Scott isn't sure how long they can afford to keep farming that ground.

There is a lot of work we need to do to make sure Mr. Scott and farmers who live in my community around the Eastern and Western Slope of Colorado will be able to survive over the next year—steps so we can help to make sure we are addressing this crisis head-on, before it begins and develops into a full-blown farm crisis like we saw in the 1980s. We must have serious regulatory reform.

In a letter I received from the Colorado Farm Bureau, the letter read:

Colorado Farm Bureau recognizes that a major impediment to the success of American agricultural industries and the national economy is rampant federal regulation and the associated cost of compliance.

We have to allow U.S. agriculture to flow to markets around the world, so in addition to that regulatory reform—some of which we are undertaking now through resolutions of disapproval by peeling back the overreach of government, we have to allow farmers access to more markets. That is a concern we all should share: What is going to happen with our trade policy in this country? Because if we decide to shut off trade in this country, if we decide to close access and avenues to new markets, the first people who are going to be hurt are those farmers and ranchers in Colorado and Kansas and throughout the Midwest of the United States. We have to have the opportunity to be able to send that bushel of wheat to Asia, that bushel of corn around the globe to make sure we are providing value-added opportunities for the world's best farmers and ranchers. Opening up new markets for Colorado and American agriculture is a clear way we can support rural economies.

Let's be clear. What I said at the beginning of these comments—there are farm communities that have diversity in their economic opportunities. A farm economy may not be 100 percent dependent on farms or ranches. Maybe they have tourism. Maybe they have some recreational opportunities. Maybe they are close to a big city where people can live there and commute. But there are a lot of towns across the United States that are solely, 100 percent committed to agriculture. They don't have access to anything but farming and ranching. When the price is down, the town is down. When the town is down, Main Street erodes. When Main Street erodes, it affects our schools and our hospitals and our relationships and our families. And somebody has to be looking out for our farmers and ranchers because the next American farm bust is upon us.

We have to take the necessary steps to pass a farm bill that gets our policies right when the new one expires. The current one expires in 2016, and these discussions are just now underway. If we have regulatory reform, if

we open up new trade opportunities for agriculture and we give farmers certainty—those are three things we can do to help address this crisis before it becomes a full-blown crisis.

We have to make sure that we support our farmers and ranchers, that we have their backs in good times and in bad times. Giving farmers certainty through a farm bill, through a regulatory landscape that provides certainty and relief, is important.

I talked to a family member of mine the other day who talks about his fear that he sees conditions similar to what we saw in the 1980s. The final relief we can provide is relief from financial regulations that are stifling the ability of banks to provide workout opportunities for farmers and ranchers when they need it.

Four things we ought to be doing for our farmers and ranchers: provide them certainty, regulatory relief, new trade opportunities, and targeted financial relief on regulations that are preventing workouts through our banks and our communities.

We have the opportunity now to prevent this country from seeing what it saw in the 1980s, but let's not be reactionary. Let's do what we can to get ahead of this before we start seeing what Secretary-designee Perdue told me the other day. One of the customers of his agricultural business took his life because he didn't know what was going to happen to his farm, and his three kids are now left wondering what they are going to do.

I hope this country understands how supportive we are of American agriculture and the actions we need to take to stand with them when times get tough.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I take this time to explain to my colleagues why I will be opposing the nomination of Scott Pruitt, the attorney general of Oklahoma, to be the next Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

I first want to start by saying I had an opportunity to visit with Attorney General Pruitt. He is a person who wants to serve our country, and we very much appreciate that. He has a distinguished career in public service, and we appreciate his willingness to continue to serve at the national level.

My reason for opposing his nomination is that he has opposed most of the missions of the Environmental Protection Agency as the attorney general of Oklahoma. He has filed numerous lawsuits that would compromise the ability of the Environmental Protection Agency to protect our environment.

I come to this debate acknowledging that there are national responsibilities to protect our environment. The United States must also be engaged in global leadership as it relates to our environment. The people of Maryland want clean air. The people of Maryland

want clean water. No State can guarantee to its citizens that its air will be clean or that its water will be safe. These issues go well beyond State boundaries. They go beyond national boundaries. It is for that reason that we need an Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency who will lead our Nation both in the appropriate controls and regulations to protect our air and water but also work for our country in regard to the global efforts to protect our environment for future generations.

Let me talk about the issue of climate change. Climate change is one of the greatest threats of our times. We know that this year, according to NASA—they looked at the temperature rise in 2016 and found it to be the hottest year ever recorded. We know something is happening in regard to global climate change. It is affecting so many different areas. We have eroding shorelines that our constituents see. We have major military installations located along our coast that are at risk as a result of rising sea levels from ice melt. We have populations that are at risk in the United States.

Let me give one example, if I might. Smith Island, MD, is a very proud community. It is a community that historically has been one of the strongest in regard to watermen and dealing with the fruits of the Chesapeake Bay. It is a proud community, and it is in danger of disappearing because we have sea level rises resulting from ice melting from climate change. We know there is a problem developing that we need to deal with. It is affecting our economy.

In my State of Maryland, the seafood industry is concerned about the future of the blue crab crop. They know that juvenile crabs need sea grass in order to be able to be protected and mature into full-blown blue crabs. With water becoming warmer, the future of sea grass is challenged, putting the blue crab at risk.

That is just one example. There are many more examples I can give about how it is affecting the economy of my State. It is affecting our ability to enjoy our environment, the recreation itself, and it is certainly providing a real risk in regard to the real estate. We have some very nice real estate located right on the coast or on barrier islands that is at risk of being lost as a result of climate change. We see more and more major weather events occur on a much more regular basis, causing billions of dollars of damage and putting lives at risk.

We know climate change is here. It is happening. The science is pretty clear. When we asked Attorney General Pruitt his view about the science of climate change, his answer was “far from settled.”

The science is well understood. What we do here on Earth—the release of carbon emissions—is causing an abnormal warming of our climate. There are activities that we can do to reduce that effect on our climate. We know that

That is what science tells us. We know we can affect the adverse impacts of climate change if we take action. That is what scientists are telling us.

The world came together on this issue in COP21. I was proud to head a delegation of 10 Members of the U.S. Senate as we went to Paris to make it clear to the international community that the United States wanted to be part of a global solution to climate change. Not any one country can reverse the trendline that we are on that is catastrophic; we need all nations to do everything they can to reduce the impact of climate change by reducing their carbon and greenhouse emissions. That is what the global community needs to do, but we have been unable to get the global community for all countries to live up to their responsibilities.

Under President Obama and our leadership, we were able to get the world community—over 190 nations—to come together in Paris, in COP21, for every nation to take responsibility to reduce their carbon emissions so that we all can benefit from that effort.

I am concerned as to whether Mr. Pruitt, if confirmed as the EPA Administrator, will continue that U.S. leadership. He has not been at all committed to U.S. programs on dealing with climate change, let alone our international responsibilities to lead other countries to do what they need to do. I will give one example. Part of our way of showing the international community that we are serious about the climate issue was the powerplant rule issued under the Obama administration. Attorney General Pruitt joined a group in opposing that powerplant rule through filing suit against the implementation of that particular law.

We need someone who is going to lead on this effort in America and understand that we have responsibilities to lead the international community. We are at great risk from the impact of climate change, and that needs to be understood and recognized by the leader of the Environmental Protection Agency. I am not convinced Attorney General Pruitt would do that.

I want to talk a little bit about clean air. Maryland has taken pretty aggressive steps to improve the air quality from emissions within the geographical boundary of the State of Maryland. That is what every State should do. But here is the challenge: Maryland is downwind from many other States' emissions, so we are seeing days in which our air quality is below what it should be, not because we haven't taken action but because we don't have a national policy to protect our clean air.

The health of Marylanders depends on the Federal Government being aggressive in guaranteeing that all citizens of this country—that steps are taken to protect the air they breathe. I can tell you the number of children who have asthma who suffer when the air quality is not what it should be. It is not only wrong from the point of

view that we have an obligation to our children to make sure we give them the healthiest air to breathe, it is also costing our economy because every day that child stays home, a parent cannot go to work. The child loses their time in school; they are being disadvantaged. If they have to take a day off from summer camp, the parent has to stay home, and it is wasting resources in this country.

For many reasons, we need an Administrator of the EPA who is committed to a national effort to make sure the air we breathe is clean and healthy.

Likewise with clean water. Some of us remember when the Cuyahoga River caught fire in 1969. We know that pollution was so bad, you literally could set our rivers afire. We took steps. And it was not partisan—Democrats and Republicans came together with the Clean Water Act. We recognized that the Federal Government has the responsibility to protect the quality of our water so that we have safe, clean water in America.

I think we have been working to improve the Clean Water Act consistently on a nonpartisan basis, but now we have Supreme Court decisions that challenge what water the Federal Government can regulate. Congress has not taken steps to clarify that. The administration took efforts to try to clarify that under the waters of the United States, only to see a Court action to put that on hold in which Mr. Pruitt joined as the attorney general of Oklahoma, once again slowing down our effort to protect the clean waters of America.

I have spoken numerous times on the floor of the Congress about the Chesapeake Bay and how proud I am to be a Senator from Maryland, one of the six States that are in the Chesapeake Bay watershed, along with the District of Columbia.

We know that the Chesapeake Bay is a national treasure. It has been so designated by many Presidents of the United States. It is the latest estuary in our hemisphere. The watershed contains 64,000 square miles, has over 11,000 miles of shoreline, and 17 million people live in the Chesapeake Bay watershed—150 major rivers, \$1 trillion to our economy. It is part of the heritage of my State and our region. We are proud that it is part of our life. It is part of why people like to live in this region. They know the Chesapeake Bay makes their life so much more enriched and so much more valuable.

The Chesapeake Bay is in trouble. I could talk about it from a technical point of view. It doesn't flush itself as quickly as other water bodies. The historic oyster population is not what it has been. We have to, therefore, make special efforts to clean up the Chesapeake Bay. Over 30 years ago, almost 40 years now, while I was in the State legislature, when I was speaker of the house, I worked with Governor Harry Hughes, and we developed a State program to deal with the Chesapeake Bay.

We did it the right way. We started at the local levels. We got all the stakeholders together: the farmers, the developers, the local governments, the private sector, our local governments, the State government. We worked with Pennsylvania because Pennsylvania is where the Susquehanna River flows, and that produces most of the fresh water that goes into the Chesapeake Bay. We worked with Delaware, Virginia, New York, and West Virginia, and we developed the Chesapeake Bay Program that is worked from the local level up. We get together to determine what is reasonable: What does science tell us we can do?

We have all the stakeholders sitting around the table as we develop these plans. They all sign up. Our farmers recognize that clean water will make their agriculture more profitable. They recognize that. Developers understand that we need a clean Chesapeake Bay as part of our ability to develop profitable real estate in our community. These are not inconsistent. A serene environment, clean agriculture, a strong agriculture, a strong economy are all hand in hand together.

It is not a choice between one or the other. We recognize that. That is why the Chesapeake Bay Program has never been partisan in Maryland. We have had Democratic and Republican Governors who supported the Chesapeake Bay Program. We have had legislators lead this effort from both parties. Senator Mac Mathias, who served as the U.S. Senator from Maryland, was the champion of bringing the Federal Government into the Chesapeake Bay Program. The program is working. It is making the bay safer today, but we still have a long way to go.

We enforce it through the TMDL, the Total Maximum Daily Loads, so we can monitor that we are making the progress we said we could make, based upon best science. And that is what the local stakeholders have signed up for.

When we did our TMDL's, it was challenged. It was challenged in the courts. Mr. Pruitt was one of those who brought a challenge against the TMDL Program in Maryland. I am thankful that the Third Circuit upheld the legal right of the TMDL, and the Supreme Court affirmed that decision by the Third Circuit. So we won the legal case.

But it troubles me that a program that is from the ground up, from the local governments up, in which the Federal government is a partner—why it would be challenged when it was supported by the local communities. To me, that case should never have been challenged.

We need the Federal Government to continue to participate with us. The Chesapeake Bay Program is supported through the farm bill, through the Water Resources Development Act, through the Clean Water Act, and through annual appropriations. So we need continued support at the Federal level for the Chesapeake Bay Program.

And we need a champion in the Environmental Protection Agency that will help us in that regard.

I want to talk briefly about the Safe Drinking Water Act. Safe drinking water is critically important. We know that in recent years, we have found too much lead in drinking water. We all know, of course, the story of Flint, MI. I could take you to Baltimore where our schools have to cut off their water fountains because of the unsafe levels of lead in the drinking water, if they were permitted to drink from the water fountains.

We can tell you about so many communities in the Nation that have a desperate need to clean up their safe drinking water so that we can protect our children from lead poisoning. I hope my colleagues understand that there is no safe level of lead in the blood. It robs children of their future. It poisons them. I think most people are familiar with the Freddie Gray tragedy in Baltimore. Freddie Gray was a victim of lead poisoning when he was young.

We owe it to our children to make sure we do everything we can so they are not exposed to lead. I asked questions about that during the confirmation hearing of Mr. Pruitt. The answers were less than acceptable and showed his lack of real information about the dangers of lead.

Every Congress should look at their responsibility to build on the record, to leave a cleaner and safer environment for the next generation. The EPA Administrator should be committed to that goal. I do not believe Mr. Pruitt will be that type of leader. For that reason, I will vote against his confirmation.

With that, 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.

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

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

#### IMMIGRATION

Ms. HARRIS. Mr. President, I rise today, humbled to offer my first official speech as the junior U.S. Senator from the great State of California. I rise with a deep sense of reverence for this institution, for its history, and for its unique role as the defender of our Nation's ideals.

Above all, I rise today with a sense of gratitude for all those upon whose shoulders we stand. For me, it starts with my mother Shyamala Harris. She arrived at the University of California, Berkeley, from India in 1959 with dreams of becoming a scientist. The plan, when she finished school, was to go back home to a traditional Indian marriage. But when she met my father Donald Harris, she made a different plan. She went against a practice reaching back thousands of years, and