

REMEMBERING SEPTEMBER 11TH

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, as we all know, today we commemorate the solemn anniversary of the attacks on 9/11/2001.

If you ask anybody who is old enough to remember where they were that day, I bet they can tell you. It is one of those rare moments that defines an entire generation.

I have always said that it is etched in my memory like the only other event in my lifetime that might rise to that level of shock and horror, and that is the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

Eighteen years ago today, I was in Austin, talking on the phone to then-Governor Rick Perry. When I hung up the phone, my wife said, "You need to see this," pointing to the TV set. That was just as the second plane hit the World Trade Center, and we all know what came after.

It was the same image that millions of Americans struggled to understand on that morning and still struggle to comprehend today—how someone could be so evil and so determined to take innocent lives.

September 11 serves as a dividing line in American history. For people like me, there is before and there is after, but for an entire generation of younger people, there is really only after. I believe this 18th anniversary carries special weight because those young people who have only lived in a post-9/11 world will now be able to vote in our elections, serve in our military, and help shape the future of our country.

It is a reminder of our commitment as a nation to carry out the promise we made in the wake of the attack to "never forget"—never forget.

As Americans, we must remain vigilant, and we must remain with a strong sense of purpose and a strong moral clarity regarding confronting evil in all its forms. We vow to carry the memory of the nearly 3,000 lives lost that day in our hearts, the sense of patriotism that welled up inside of each of us, and the determination never to be intimidated, and never to back down.

Today, we remember the families who lost loved ones that day, the first responders who ran not away from but toward the danger, and the commitment of our Armed Forces, who fight to eradicate terrorism around the globe each and every day.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA AGREEMENT

Mr. President, on another matter, for a quarter of a century, the North American Free Trade Agreement has guided our trade relationship with Mexico and Canada. When NAFTA was created, it sought to remove the barriers that impeded free and fair trade to provide benefits to all three countries. While this agreement has certainly had its share of critics and champions, I think there is no doubt—certainly, in my mind—that NAFTA has been a benefit to the United States.

Last year, U.S. goods and services trade with Mexico and Canada totaled

nearly \$1.4 trillion. Across every industry, from major companies to small businesses, an estimated 12 million American jobs rely on trade with our NAFTA partners—12 million.

The importance of maintaining strong trade ties is certainly understood in my home State of Texas, and that is in large part because—and this will not surprise you—last year, Texas exported nearly \$110 billion in goods to Mexico, our next-door neighbor, 35 percent of our State's total exports.

We also imported more than \$107 billion in goods from Mexico, including everything from motor vehicle parts to computer equipment, to tractors and avocados. It is not uncommon to see certain products, like automobile parts, crossing the border multiple times during the manufacturing process before eventually making their way to the customer.

NAFTA has fueled the economies of every State across the country, but a lot has changed since NAFTA was ratified in 1993. At that time, the internet was in its infancy, smartphones didn't exist, and shopping at brick-and-mortar stores was the norm. Countless economic advancements and our digitized marketplace have fundamentally changed the global trade landscape. So it is clearly time to modernize NAFTA and bring it up to current needs.

I was glad when the heads of all three countries signed the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement last November and took major steps just to get that far, but the new NAFTA—or, as we call it, the USMCA—takes into account businesses and practices that didn't even exist when NAFTA existed, things like 2-day shipping, online micro-retailers, and digital products like e-books and music.

The USMCA will require Mexico and Canada to raise their de minimis shipment value levels, which will allow certain classes of shipments to enter all three countries with expedited entry procedures. That is a big win for small and medium-sized businesses, which often lack the resources to pay customs duties and taxes.

Overall, the USMCA takes steps to advance the digital economy, which accounted for nearly 7 percent of our total economy in 2017.

A few months ago, the International Trade Commission publicly released its analysis of the economic impact of the USMCA, which shows some positive indicators. The ITC concluded that, within 6 years, the USMCA will raise real GDP in the United States by \$68.2 billion and lead to the creation of 176,000 new jobs.

We can also expect a more than \$33 billion increase in exports and more than \$31 billion in imports. That is great news for North American workers, farmers, ranchers, and businesses that will reap the benefits of this agreement.

When I was traveling around the State during August, one of the most

frequent questions I encountered from my constituents was this: When is Congress going to pass the USMCA? I assured them that I am just as eager as they are to see Congress ratify this agreement, but we are still waiting on the House and the administration to iron out their differences.

I know that the U.S. Trade Representative, Ambassador Lighthizer, and Secretary Mnuchin are having constructive conversations with the Speaker of the House, and she has set up a process by which the House can provide its necessary input into the final product, but we are all waiting to see the Speaker turn on the green light to allow them to start the process—sooner, hopefully, rather than later. We know that, historically speaking, the closer we get to an election, the more challenging it is to get things passed, particularly in a divided Congress, like we have now. So I hope we can get this process moving soon.

Businesses, jobs, and communities in Texas rely on a strong trade relationship between the U.S., Mexico, and Canada. While NAFTA has benefited all three countries, it is not able to propel our economies into the future. That is why the USMCA is so important.

The USMCA increases goods' market access. It supports small businesses. As I said, it supports digital trade, safeguards intellectual property, supports our agriculture sector, and keeps jobs right here at home.

Free and fair trade isn't just good news for our economy. It is good news for the people behind it. This is a trade agreement built for the 21st century, and it is time for Congress to pass the USMCA and provide greater stability and more opportunities for North American workers.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

NOMINATION OF DALE CABANISS

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, just a little bit earlier today, the Senate voted to confirm President Trump's nomination of Dale Cabaniss to lead the Office of Personnel Management.

I voted against this nominee, but now that she is confirmed, it is more important than ever for the Senate and the House to fulfill our oversight duties to protect our civil servants from political interference. I know the Presiding Officer has a keen interest in this subject as well, in his capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management, overseeing Federal civil service, and I appreciate his work on that front.

In order to do their jobs for the American people, our Federal employees must be able to perform their duties free of politics. They must be judged on the merits of their work, not political favoritism or cronyism. They must be able to present factual information and analysis without fear of retribution. Yet time and again, we

have seen that this President, President Trump, views civil servants as his adversaries.

The President has sought to silence those whose work or words contradict him, even when the facts are clear. We saw that most recently when the National Weather Service tried to calm residents in the State of Alabama after President Trump falsely stated that Hurricane Dorian would put them at severe risk. Secretary of Commerce Wilbur Ross reportedly threatened to fire the agency's leadership after they corrected the President's false statements about Hurricane Dorian and Alabama. Just within the last hour, the New York Times is reporting that the order to change the statements at NOAA came directly from the White House in the form of a directive from the Acting Chief of Staff to the President, Mick Mulvaney.

We have also seen this pattern at other times. We saw President Trump standing side by side with Vladimir Putin in Helsinki, while President Trump sided with Putin's claims about noninterference in the 2016 Presidential elections, and where President Trump threw our own U.S. intelligence agency experts under the bus.

These assaults on the Federal civil service and the efforts to undermine the integrity of the Federal civil service have also included an assault on Federal employees. This administration knows that workers are stronger when they are organized and have representatives who can speak on their behalf. Many—not all, but many—of the Trump agency heads have repeatedly refused to comply with the law and to bargain in good faith with their workers. Instead of trying to negotiate, they have tried to impose contracts and terms unilaterally. This has already happened at the Social Security Administration, where agency management has shown particular hostility to the unions representing their workforce. Some of these issues are now tied up in the courts, but I would hope we could work on a bipartisan basis to address these challenges.

Now, President Trump is trying to abolish the Office of Personnel Management. That brings me to the nomination of Ms. Cabaniss, because she will be directed to preside over the dismantlement of the agency—that is, if the President has his way. I know those of us in Congress with a different view will be weighing in as well.

The Office of Personnel Management is an independent Federal agency with an absolutely vital mission—to strengthen and protect the Federal civil service system. Their role is to protect the integrity of our Federal civil service and prevent it from being hijacked by political forces.

I know there has been a lot of talk that this is all about civil service reform. As I look at the proposals, I don't see it that way. I see these proposals as an attack on the institution that defends our civil service system.

The Office of Personnel Management needs a strong, independent leader who will protect the Federal workforce from partisan interference and defend agencies from the administration's attacks. After looking at Ms. Cabaniss's record, she is not the right person to lead OPM. When she chaired the Federal Labor Relations Authority, morale was dead last among small Federal agencies. That is the agency that is supposed to resolve disputes between Federal workers and management, but 55 percent of their decisions were overturned under Ms. Cabaniss's jurisdiction.

OPM's mission is vital to the success of our Federal civil service and their ability to deliver services to the American people. We need a leader who is going to stand up for the integrity of that system, not one who is going to preside over the dismantlement of that agency. So I hope we can work on a bipartisan basis to ensure that this country preserves one of its vital assets, which is a nonpartisan civil service.

Presidents come and Presidents go, and Presidents, of course, give direction to the different agencies, but we will be doing a great disservice to the people of this country if we allow political cronyism to seep into this system and create an environment where people fear speaking out, telling the truth, and providing the facts.

I want to take this opportunity today, as we discuss the nomination of the Office of Personnel Management, to raise that larger issue, and I hope we will be united in that effort because lots of countries around the world suffer from political cronyism. The United States has helped shield itself from that by establishing decades and decades ago a system that tries to immunize ourselves against that kind of political infection in terms of the day-to-day work that we ask people to do and carry on, on behalf of the American people. Let's work together to accomplish what I believe is a bipartisan goal.

I yield the remainder of my time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

REMEMBERING SEPTEMBER 11TH

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, before I get into the substance of what I want to talk about, I am going to take my own personal opportunity to remember those whom we lost 18 years ago today. Like everyone else, I remember the events. I was at home with my family and young children, not knowing what was going to happen and seeing things happen. I can remember taking one of my kids to daycare when the second tower collapsed and the radio announcer simply saying, "They are both gone," and the emptiness we felt.

We remember today, we honor today, and we honor not only those whom we lost but honor those responders who were there and who still suffer the pain from having to deal with all of that.

FUTURE ACT

Mr. President, I rise today almost a year ago since I first came to the Senate floor to discuss the state of our Nation's historically Black colleges and universities and other minority-serving institutions.

As I did then, and many times since, I am again making an urgent call to colleagues to act. At the end of this month, at the end of the fiscal year, nearly half of all Federal funds these schools receive each year, and have for a long time, is going to end. That is \$255 million annually that they have had available to count on for well over a decade. That is going to come to a screeching halt if we don't act, and we need to act now.

These historic institutions serve nearly 4 million students of color. Many of our Nation's brightest minds have matriculated at these institutions. HBCUs are the leading educators for African-American PhDs in science and engineering. They are foundational to building generational wealth in communities that have long faced headwinds in doing so. They are doing amazing work. They are doing incredible work with very limited resources and with their own individual financial headwinds to contend with.

In Alabama, we are home to 14 HBCUs—more than any State in the country—so they are an integral part of my home State's higher education system. Just as important, they are integral to the economy of Alabama.

Minority-serving institutions play a central role in America's higher education system. For example, Hispanic-Serving Institutions account for 13 percent of all nonprofit colleges. Yet they enroll 62 percent of all Hispanic students.

More than 75 percent of students at HBCUs and nearly 80 percent of students at Tribal colleges and universities receive Pell grants, compared to only 32 percent of all students. These schools have a very serious purpose for these kids who otherwise might get shut out, likely would get shut out of our higher education system. They are so important, and they face such strong headwinds financially to achieve.

Last year, we held our first HBCU summit where we brought all of our HBCUs in Alabama together to talk about the challenges, to talk about what they were facing but also to talk about opportunities to work together, to work with the State, to work with the Congress, to try to meet the challenges of our workforce of the 21st century, to try to meet the challenges of our educational system in general. What I saw was an amazing group of people—an amazing group of people who were doing the work for their students and for their communities, people who