

is a fear of war in the region, it will be fueled by Iran and its proxies and exacerbated by an agreement that allows Iran to possess an industrial-sized nuclear program and enough money in sanctions relief to significantly continue to fund its hegemonic intentions throughout the region." Senator MENENDEZ.

So many of our Democratic colleagues understood all this quite clearly when a Democrat occupied the White House, and it came true. It came true. Iran's aggression only accelerated after the Obama administration's deal. The question for us is not whom to blame. That much is clear. The question is what to do about it.

As Iran's aggression became focused on the United States, as the risk to our personnel and interests grew, after months of repeated warnings, President Trump took action. I am glad the strike against Soleimani has provided some justice—some justice—to his countless victims, hundreds of Americans and many more across the Middle East.

We don't yet know if Soleimani will prove irreplaceable, but his death will significantly disrupt Iran's death machine and will change Iran's long-held misconception that they could literally get away with the murder of Americans without a meaningful response. President Trump's strategy seems to have reestablished deterrence.

The Senate risks jeopardizing what we have gained with this strike if it ties the military's hands and tells Iran that we have no stomach for this. America can hardly be defeated on the battlefield, but we can be defeated at home on the political front. We can allow ourselves to become divided and play into the hands of our adversaries. Our divisions at home are significant. Let us not allow them to pollute our judgment on foreign affairs. Let's not make our adversaries' lives easier by tying our military's hands.

#### 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.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Peter Gaynor, of Rhode Island, to be Administrator of

the Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security.

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, the House of Representatives has impeached the President for a very serious offense: coercing a foreign leader into interfering in our elections, using the powers of the Presidency, the most powerful public office in the Nation, to benefit himself—to actually influence the election, which should be decided by American citizens, not by a foreign power. When debating the impeachment clause of the Constitution, the Founders worried about foreign capitals having undue influence over our country. Hamilton, writing in the *Federalist Papers*, described impeachable offenses as abuses or violations of some public trust.

In the impeachment of President Trump, the question the Senate will be asked to answer is whether the President did, in fact, abuse his public trust and, by doing so, invite the very foreign influence the Founders feared would be a corruption of our democracy. To answer that question, to decide whether the President merits acquittal and removal from office, the Senate must conduct a fair trial. A fair trial has witnesses. A fair trial has relevant documents as a part of the record. A fair trial seeks the truth—no more, no less.

That is why Democrats have asked to call four fact witnesses and subpoena three specific sets of relevant documents related to the President's misconduct with Ukraine. At the moment, my Republican colleagues are opposing these witnesses and documents, but they can't seem to find a real reason why. Most are unwilling to argue that witnesses shouldn't come before the Senate. They can only support delaying the decision until most of the trial is over, like a magic eight ball that keeps saying: Ask again later.

The most the Republican leader can do is smear our request as some partisan fishing expedition intended to damage the President, but the leader himself has warned that the witnesses we have requested might not help the House managers' case against the President. He is right about that. These are the President's top advisers. They are appointed by him, vetted by him. They work with him.

We don't know what those witnesses will say or what the documents will re-

veal. They could hurt the President's case or they could help the President's case. We don't know.

We know one thing. We want the truth on something as weighty and profound as an impeachment trial. Does Leader MCCONNELL want the truth? Do Senate Republicans want the truth?

I would remind the leader that our request for witnesses and documents is very much in line with the Senate's history. The Republican leader keeps citing precedent. Well, here is precedent, Mr. Leader. There have been two Presidential impeachment trials in history. Both—both—had witnesses. The trial of Andrew Johnson had 41 witnesses. There have been 16 completed impeachment trials in the Senate's entire history. In every one, except one, the trial in 1799 of Senator William Blount, which was dismissed on jurisdictional grounds, every Senate impeachment trial in history has included witnesses.

You want precedent? Precedent says witnesses overwhelmingly.

The long arc of history casts a shadow on the proceedings we are about to undertake. It suggests something obvious—that the Senate has always believed trials were about evidence and getting the truth. Of the 16 impeachment trials, 15 had witnesses and 1 was dismissed early. Do Senate Republicans want to break that lengthy historical precedent by conducting the first impeachment trial of a President in history with no witnesses? Let me ask that question again. This is weighty. This is vital. This is about the Republic. Do Senate Republicans want to break the lengthy historical precedent that said witnesses should be at in impeachment trial by conducting the first impeachment trial of the President in history—in history, since 1789—with no witnesses?

I ask that question because that seems to be where the Republican leader wants us to be headed. The Republican leader has designed a schedule for a Senate trial that might—might—have us vote on witnesses and documents after the presentations from both sides have been concluded—the judicial equivalent of putting the cart before the horse. Of course, Leader MCCONNELL has made no guarantee that he will support voting on witnesses and documents at that time—only that supposedly he will be open to the idea.

I want my Republican colleagues to bear in mind that if we consider witnesses at a later date, it could extend the trial by several days, maybe several weeks, as witnesses did during the Clinton trial.

Leader MCCONNELL has said that after the arguments are made, we should vote and move on. Do my Republican colleagues really believe Leader MCCONNELL will have an open mind about witnesses at a later date when they might extend the trial much longer than he wants? I am not in the prediction business, but I can bet that

when the time comes, Leader McCONNELL will say that we have heard enough, that the trial shouldn't drag on any longer, that the Senate doesn't need witnesses and documents, and that we should, just as he once said "vote and move on."

Before Senate Republicans are so quick to reject the Democratic proposal for a limited list of relevant witnesses and documents, I want them to consider that our proposal would save the Senate time. We want to confront the issue now, not be forced to extend the trial later. We want both the House managers and the White House defense counsel to have time to incorporate the testimony of witnesses into their presentations. That is the proper way to proceed. That is what happens at trials—collect all the evidence at the beginning, not at the end.

All we are asking is for the President's own men, his appointees, to come forward and tell their side of the story. The American people want a fair trial in the Senate. The American people know that a trial without witnesses and documents is not a real trial; it is a sham trial. And the American people will be able to tell the difference between a fair hearing of the facts and a coverup.

#### IRAN

Madam President, on Iran, the Senate will soon consider Senator KAINE's War Powers Resolution, which would prevent further hostilities with Iran without congressional approval. It is a crucial vote that will correctly assert this body's constitutional authority over matters of war and peace, and it is certainly timely.

The past few weeks have highlighted the President's impulsive, erratic, and often reckless foreign policy, the consequences of which have made Americans less safe and unnecessarily put our Armed Forces in harm's way. From North Korea, to Syria, to Russia, it is impossible to say the world is a safer place today than when President Trump took office, and it is very possible to say that President Trump, by his impulsive, erratic, and ego-driven actions, has made things worse.

With respect to Iran, the President's recent actions have increased the risk of further hostilities in the Middle East. The President campaigned on getting the United States out of "endless wars" in the Middle East, but the President has deployed thousands more U.S. troops in the Middle East with hardly an explanation to Congress or to the American people.

I have long been concerned that the President's chaotic, impulsive decisionmaking might stumble us into war. With Iran, like with many other places around the globe, the President's policy has brought us closer to the kind of endless war the President promised we would avoid.

It is past time for Congress to place a check on this President. On matters of war and peace, congressional oversight and congressional prerogatives

are not optional. I urge my colleagues on both sides to vote in favor of the Kaine resolution.

Senator SANDERS also has a bill that would deny funding for a war with Iran, of which I am a proud cosponsor. The Senate should consider that legislation as well. As the situation with Iran continues to evolve, the administration must come back and brief Congress on all major developments, troop deployments, and long-term strategy in the region.

#### CHINA

Madam President, finally, on China, tomorrow the United States will complete a signing ceremony for the so-called phase one trade agreement with China. After 18 months of negotiations, the phase one deal is remarkable for how little it achieves at an enormous price.

President Trump has agreed to scale back some tariffs on Chinese goods in exchange for temporary assurances that China will increase its purchase of U.S. exports over the next few years, particularly in agriculture.

For all the effort and turmoil over the past few years, the deal President Trump will sign tomorrow hardly seems to advance the United States past square one. It fails to address the deep structural inequalities in the trade relationship between China and the United States.

For the past decade, China has stolen American intellectual property through forced technology transfers of our companies and through outright cyber theft. The President's phase one deal doesn't even address this issue. China has routinely subsidized its most important domestic industries. Not just labor-intensive industries but even industries like Huawei are subsidized to gain unfair advantage over American companies. China has dumped goods illegally into our markets. It has manipulated its currency to keep prices low. The President's phase one deal doesn't address any of these issues.

Not only does this deal fail to make any meaningful progress toward ending China's most flagrant abuses, what it does achieve on the agricultural side may well be a day late and a dollar short. China has already made long-term contracts with other producers of soybeans and other goods in places like Argentina and Brazil. American farmers have already lost billions over the last 2 years, watched their markets disappear, and too many American farms have gone bankrupt in the time that it took President Trump to reach this deal.

I have publicly praised the President when he is tough on China, at some political cost. I have said he has had better instincts on China than previous administrations. Few politicians have been talking about securing real reforms to China's economic policies longer than I have. But I fear that with an election around the corner, the President is taking the easy way out—

settling for a weak deal that will cost American businesses, American farmers, and American workers for years and years to come.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

#### IRAN

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, this week we expect to vote on a War Powers Resolution related to operations in Iran. I am pleased that the President's demonstration of strength has restored our position of credible deterrence. Some have challenged that the President's action was escalatory, but the reality is that Iran had become increasingly bold. The United States responded in self-defense, and, as the President has said, it appears that Iran is standing down.

Hopefully Iran's tragic error in shooting down a civilian passenger plane has served as a sobering check on the regime's activities. We have seen thousands of Iranians rallying in the streets in recent days protesting the bringing down of the passenger plane and calling for change. I hope the people of Iran are able to organize and demonstrate in safety and that their hopes and prayers for change are answered.

Soleimani's death provides an opportunity for Iran to rethink its direction, to move away from brutally oppressing its citizens and fomenting violence throughout the Middle East. We should encourage such rethinking by continuing to make it clear through the sanctions the President has imposed and other measures that we will not accept Iranian aggression against Americans or our allies.

#### IMPEACHMENT

Madam President, on an issue closer to home, at the end of last week, Speaker PELOSI announced that she was finally ready to send over the Articles of Impeachment—the next step in a saga that began 3 years ago. That is right, on January 20, 2017—Inauguration Day—the Washington Post ran an article entitled "The campaign to impeach President Trump has begun."

It is important that we not forget this. We need to remember how we got here. Democrats would like to think that this impeachment was the result of a high-minded, impartial, thoughtful procession. It wasn't. It was the result of a 3-year-long partisan crusade to damage or remove this President.

It is fair to say that the actual impeachment process was the most rushed, most biased, and least impartial impeachment process in history. For evidence, look no further than the Democrats' behavior in the wake of the impeachment vote.

Democrats rushed the Articles of Impeachment through the House because, we were told, it was urgent that the President be removed from office. One Democrat even said that the House was acting hastily because there was "a crime spree in progress." And then what did Democrats do? Instead of