

U.S. dairy sales have been restricted. The U.S. International Trade Commission estimates that the agreement will boost U.S. dairy exports by more than \$277 million.

The agreement will also expand market access for U.S. poultry and egg producers, and it will make it easier for U.S. producers to export wheat to Canada, and so much more.

Above all, this agreement will provide farmers and ranchers with certainty about what the Canadian and Mexican markets are going to look like going forward. American farmers depend upon these markets to sell their products, and it is vital that farmers have a clear idea of what these markets are going to look like in the future.

Republicans in the Senate are ready to take action on the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement at any point. I hope House Democrats will quickly work out their remaining issues and indicate their willingness to vote on this deal. The administration has made addressing Democrats' concerns a priority throughout the negotiation process, and it is time for Democrats to bring this process to a swift conclusion.

As I mentioned, we are almost a year now past the time when the President signed this agreement, and it has been available for consideration by the House of Representatives for that entire time. It is high time that we act on this trade deal and get it over here to the Senate, where we can vote on it and get it to the President for his signature.

Last week, seven former U.S. Agriculture Secretaries, from both Democratic and Republican administrations, sent a letter to House and Senate leadership stating their strong support for the United States-Mexico-Canada Free Trade Agreement.

The Secretaries noted:

With farmers facing one of the lowest net farm incomes in the last decade, USMCA would create enhanced export opportunities and help fully capitalize on increased global demand for food products. Furthermore, USMCA would significantly boost farm incomes and create jobs both on and off the farm in rural communities.

Again, that is from seven former U.S. Agriculture Secretaries, serving both Republican and Democrat Presidents.

Life hasn't been easy for our Nation's farmers and ranchers over the past few years, and I can certainly attest to that, as I have looked at what the economy in South Dakota has been like in these last several years. The surest way that we can stabilize and boost farm income and help farm country is to conclude agreements like the USMCA. I urge my Democrat colleagues in the House of Representatives to make getting this deal done in the House, over to the Senate, and across the finish line their No. 1 priority.

I yield the floor.

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.

#### UKRAINE

**MR. SCHUMER.** Madam President, we continue to read reports containing additional information about the nature of President Trump's phone calls with Ukrainian President Zelensky and his administration's conduct in the weeks and months before and after those communications.

Ignoring for a moment the political reporting, we know that someone inside the intelligence community found the President's conduct alarming enough to warrant an official whistleblower complaint. The complaint was so alarming that the inspector general of the intelligence community, appointed by President Trump, said that it was credible and urgent and a complaint that by law must be submitted to Congress. This is not one of those discretionary moments; the law says this must be transmitted to Congress.

We still have not received the whistleblower complaint, and Congress has been advised in writing by the inspector general of the intelligence community that the Trump administration is preventing us from getting this report. So later today, I will request the unanimous consent of the Senate to pass a resolution calling for the whistleblower complaint to be provided to the Senate and House Intelligence Committees, as prescribed by law. Let me repeat that. Later today, I will request the unanimous consent of the Senate to pass a resolution calling for the whistleblower complaint to be provided to the Senate and House Intelligence Committees, as prescribed by law.

It is our job in the Congress to provide the necessary oversight of the executive branch, to take these matters—matters of foreign policy, national security, and constitutional integrity—with the utmost gravity, to seek the facts, and then grapple with them.

I made several requests of the majority leader yesterday in an effort to collect the facts, to which I have received no response. Today, I will seek approval for a simple resolution calling for the whistleblower complaint to be transmitted to the relevant committees in Congress. I hope the majority leader and Senate Republicans will not block it. I hope they will rise to the occasion and realize that this is their constitutional duty and realize that this involves the security of the United States.

I will have more to say on the matter before requesting my colleagues' consent to pass this resolution later today.

#### DECLARATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY

Madam President, on the national emergency—another issue that involves rule of law and the President's overreach—this week, as early as tomorrow, the Senate will vote on whether to terminate the President's national emergency declaration, which he has used to steal from our military to build the border wall—a wall President Trump promised over and over again that Mexico would pay for; not American taxpayers, not American troops, not their families—Mexico. That was the President's promise to the American people. It is a promise he broke. But that is what it has come to.

If my Republican friends choose to stand with President Trump on this vote, they will be supporting the President's taking money from our military and their families to fund a border wall. I imagine that even many of those who support the wall—and that is not a majority or close to a majority of Americans—would not want the money to come from the military.

Later this morning, Democrats will have a press conference where we will talk about this. We will remind people that the consequences of the President's emergency declaration are far-reaching. He is taking money away from military readiness, military families, and the children of servicemembers. He is taking money from military medical facilities in North Carolina and hurricane recovery projects in Florida, money from programs we use to combat Russian cyber aggression and money to upgrade storage facilities that are decrepit and pose a risk because of the munitions that are stored there.

What the heck are we doing here? Congress appropriated these funds with a specific purpose. In our Constitution, the President doesn't get to decide where the money goes; we do. He gets veto power. He tried to shut down the government and failed. If he can get around the constitutionally sanctioned balance of power—that is what a dictator does, not someone who believes in democracy and rule of law.

What he has done here far exceeds any overreach that my Republican colleagues complain about that President Obama did. But, remarkably, too many are silent. Too many are willing to go along. The fear of this President, who many of my colleagues know privately does not have the honor, morality, honesty, and actually competence to do this job—they know that, but they go along with just about everything he does.

On a policy basis, you can shrug your shoulders. That is the differences between the parties. But when it comes to defending the Constitution and rule of law and not letting the Executive overreach—the No. 1 fear of the Founding Fathers—we are above that. Where are our Republican colleagues?

I am sure if the shoe were on the other foot and a Democrat were President and declared an emergency to reappropriate funds, my Republican colleagues would be up in arms. As I mentioned, when President Obama did far less, they were screaming bloody murder. But now they are remarkably silent.

So it is about time our Senate Republicans stand up for the rule of law, stand up for our Constitution, and stand up to the President when he is wrong. It is time to reassert the powers of the legislative branch, the people's branch of government. Senate Republicans will have that opportunity this week, likely tomorrow, and the American people will clearly be able to see whose side each Republican is on—the people's side, the Constitution's side, or the President's side.

#### NOMINATION OF DANIEL HABIB JORJANI

Madam President, finally, on the Jorjani nomination, later today, the Senate will vote on the confirmation of Daniel Jorjani to serve as Solicitor of the Department of the Interior. By all rights, Leader MCCONNELL should withdraw this vote from the floor. Mr. Jorjani's career is out of step with the agency's mission, and it has come to light that Mr. Jorjani likely lied to Congress about his role in the Department's adherence to transparency laws.

Under President Trump, the Interior Department has been mired in several investigations about the ethical conduct of its political appointees, including former Secretary Zinke. It is obvious that the Interior Department sorely needs transparency and public accountability, especially when the stewardship of our public lands is at stake. But at the Department of the Interior, political appointees have instituted policies to stonewall and squash transparency. It is likely that Mr. Jorjani played a key role in shaping these policies and is at this moment one of the subjects of an Interior Department inspector general investigation.

Despite his sworn testimony claiming no role in reviewing public records requests, public documentation has shown that Mr. Jorjani was regularly made aware of FOIA requests involving high-level political appointees. If confirmed, Mr. Jorjani would play an even larger role in overseeing the Interior Department's public releases.

The President said he would clean the swamp. Nomination after nomination that he makes, makes the swamp even filthier, stinkier. He seems to have no morality. He seems to have no honor. This is a man who is loaded with conflicts of interest, ethical concerns, and is likely an ideologue opposed to the very missions of the agency to which he is nominated. Mr. Jorjani is another bright red example of the lack of honor, of decency, of morality, and of honesty in Trump appointees. I urge Senate Republicans to join Democrats in voting to reject this sordid nomination.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

#### ELECTION SECURITY

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, there are certain elements of this responsibility of serving in the Senate that have been tested from time to time in our history.

As Members of the Senate, each of us stands in the well right over in that corner, raises our right hand, and swears to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States. Those words are almost a cliche because they are used so often. Yet here today we are being called on to really reflect on that responsibility. We are called on to reflect on it because of things that have happened that have come to light in the last several days that raise serious constitutional questions.

I will say that in the 2½ to 3 years that Donald Trump has been President of the United States, I think our Nation has been rocked by this President's approach to the highest office in the land. He has said things and done things no other President has ever done.

Members of his own political party have been uncharacteristically silent when it comes to criticizing this President for his wrongdoing. The litany of things he has done is long and troubling. But there is one thing that we, as both political parties, need to maintain as the bedrock of this democracy, the bedrock of our commitment to this Constitution; that is, that in this Nation of the United States, the people govern.

Ultimately, the people of the United States have the last word—in our elections. In those elections, they make their choices, whether you like them or not. I wasn't particularly enamored with the Presidential choice in 2016, but I accepted it as the constitutional verdict of the American people. It really is the bedrock of who we are and what we are. That is why the notion that some other nation would interfere in our election is so repugnant.

The thought that the American people would not have the last word, that there would be other factors and other people, other countries engaged in our election, is as reprehensible under our Constitution as any concept I can think of.

We are sworn to defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic—an other group of words we have heard over and over again. But reflecting on those for a moment—sworn to defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic—is a nation that tries to interfere in our political process an enemy of the United States? Of course. That is obvious on its face. Those who would encourage a nation to be engaged in our political process, to try to tip the scales one way or the other, are they enemies of the United States? Well, they are certainly not acting consistent with that constitutional principle.

This seems like a pretty straightforward constitutional interpretation. You don't need a Ph.D. or a law degree to understand, if a foreign country tries to interfere in the U.S. election process, that foreign country is an enemy in that action. Those who would encourage a foreign country or foreign agents to engage in our election, they, too, have crossed the line.

As I consider the revelations that President Trump is using his office to extort Ukraine to support his political reelection campaign, I wonder why there is so much silence on the other side of the aisle. This is an outrageous development.

Months before the 2016 election, our Nation's top intelligence officials told key congressional leaders about the efforts of Russia to interfere in the 2016 election, the election where the American people were choosing the President. Our top intelligence officials were understandably concerned. At that time, President Obama asked our congressional leaders for a bipartisan message condemning Vladimir Putin's efforts on behalf of Russia. President Obama wanted to make sure it was bipartisan before that 2016 election and showed a unified resistance to the interference by any foreign country in America's election process.

What was the response of the Republican majority leader, Senator MCCONNELL, after hearing this bombshell, this threat from a former Communist KGB official, Vladimir Putin, against America's democratic process of election? He answered that he didn't want to get involved, and he didn't.

Then, for months after the election, not a single Republican Senator spoke on the Senate floor about the mounting and devastating evidence of Russia's attack on our election in 2016. I know that, personally, because the first casualty in that attack was the voter file of my State of Illinois. The Russians found a way, through their trolls, to get into the voter file of my home State, into the voting records of 70,000 or more Americans who live in Illinois. What did they do with that information? It appears little or nothing, but they could have changed it, and they could have had a dramatic impact on the right of these American citizens to make their legitimate constitutional choice in the election.

For months, the silence was deafening as well, as President Trump defended Vladimir Putin's brazen denials of these attacks. President Trump took the word of Vladimir Putin over that of his own American intelligence professionals. Senate Republicans blocked election security measure after election security measure, and despite finally relenting last week when Senator MCCONNELL said we could come up with \$250 million for election security grants, they still continue to block substantive legislation, despite ongoing attacks and U.S. vulnerability.

The country spent much of the Trump Presidency asking serious, necessary questions about Candidate