

If that weren't already obvious, our colleague the Senate Democratic leader helpfully removed any shred of doubt just this past weekend. Here is what he said: He told reporters that as long as he can try to use the trial to hurt some Republican Senators' reelection chances, then whatever happens, "it's a win-win." That is what the Democratic leader said. This is a stunning statement.

Presidential impeachment may be the gravest process our Constitution contemplates. It undoes the people's decision in a national election. Going about it in this subjective, unfair, and rushed way is corrosive to our institutions. It hurts national unity, and it virtually guarantees—guarantees—that future Houses of either party will feel free—free—to impeach any future President because they don't like him. If you don't like him, impeach him. That is the message coming out of this.

But as long as our colleague the Democratic leader can weaponize this process in the next election, he thinks "it's a win-win." That really says it all; doesn't it? That really sums it up.

This partisanship led House Democrats to cross a rubicon that every other House of Representatives had avoided for 230 years. They passed the first Presidential impeachment that does not even allege an actual crime under our laws. We had a 230-year tradition of rejecting purely political impeachments, and it died last month in this House of Representatives.

So Speaker PELOSI and the House have taken our Nation down a dangerous road. If the Senate blesses this unprecedented and dangerous House process by agreeing that an incomplete case and a subjective basis are enough to impeach a President, we will almost guarantee the impeachment of every future President of either party when the House doesn't like that President.

This grave process of last constitutional resort will be watered down into the kind of anti-democratic recall measure that the Founding Fathers explicitly—explicitly—did not want.

The Senate was designed to stabilize our institutions, to break partisan fevers, and to stop short-term passions from destroying our long-term future. House Democrats may have descended into pure factionalism, but the U.S. Senate must not.

This is the only body that can consider all factors presented by the House, decide what has or has not been proven, and choose what outcome best serves the Nation. This is what we must do.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, with the House signaling that they will move forward later today, Members can expect to receive further guidance about the logistics and practicalities of the next several session days in short order.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on an entirely different matter, before the Senate shifts into the trial, we hope to complete an enormous accomplishment for this administration and, most importantly, for American families. It has now been more than 1 year—1 year—since President Trump hammered out the USMCA with the Governments of Mexico and Canada.

These two neighbors buy more than \$5 billion of American goods and services every single year. They buy nearly 30 percent of all the food and agricultural products we export to the entire world, and for 90 percent of our manufacturing sectors, Mexico or Canada rank as the No. 1 or No. 2 export destination.

Over the past quarter of a century, 12 million U.S. jobs have come to depend on U.S. trade with Mexico and Canada. That includes many livelihoods in my home State of Kentucky, from agriculture to manufacturing, to aerospace and motor vehicles, to our signature industries, like distilled spirits.

That is why workers, families, and small businesses in Kentucky and around the Nation have been clamoring to get this deal done for a year now. In addition to all the American livelihoods that this commerce already supports, experts predict the USMCA will create 176,000 new jobs as well.

On behalf of all of these Americans, we were troubled to see Speaker PELOSI slow walk this agreement for the better part of a year. But, finally, late last year, the overwhelming bipartisan pressure to move forward made an impact on the House. So we are finally on the threshold of approving this agreement and sending it to President Trump's desk to become law.

Our colleagues on the Finance Committee have already approved it by an overwhelming margin. Other committees of jurisdiction are wrapping up their consideration as we speak. Very soon, we hope the Senate will be able to vote on the floor and put this landmark accomplishment right on the President's desk.

It will be a major win for Kentucky and for all 50 States, a major win for our country, a major win for the Trump administration, and a major win for those of us who are already ready to move past this season of toxic political noise and get back to doing even more of the American people's business.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 3193

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand that there is a bill at the desk that is due for a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the title of the bill for the second time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3193) to amend the Controlled Substances Act to list fentanyl-related substances as schedule I controlled substances, and for other purposes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. In order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to further proceedings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

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

IMPEACHMENT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, before I make remarks on a different issue, I would like to address comments made this morning by the majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky. The first related, as most of his comments recently, to the pending impeachment trial in the U.S. Senate.

I listened carefully to his arguments that the House and the Senate have moved too quickly on this matter. It is true that they moved with dispatch, and I think it reflects the fact that the charges that have been made were timely, important, and relevant to the election campaign cycle which we now face.

The charges in the Articles of Impeachment suggest the President, in conversation with the President of Ukraine, asked for help in the campaign that is about to ensue, asking specifically for investigative material on the son of former Vice President Joseph Biden. At the same time, the President was withholding military assistance voted by the Appropriations Committee in Congress to Ukraine as they continue to battle with Russia. These are serious charges, and they were based on a telephone conversation last July.

It is true that the effort by the House of Representatives has been timely and, by measurement of previous impeachment investigations, much faster, but I believe that the timeliness is one of the important elements here because we are facing this campaign.

Secondly, there was an argument made by the majority leader that the Articles of Impeachment which we are about to receive in the Senate do not state that a crime was committed. I would refer the majority leader to the Constitution as well as to precedent in the U.S. Senate. The actual allegation of a crime is not required for an impeachment. I think the Senator from Kentucky knows that.

The last point he makes is one that I think is very important, and that is that there has been some delay by Speaker PELOSI in sending the Articles of Impeachment to the U.S. Senate. I would say, during the course of the period since they were first voted on last December in the House and their arrival in the Senate this week, we have seen several things of importance unfold, not the least of which was a recent disclosure of new witnesses and new evidence that has been collected since the House voted on the Articles of Impeachment. In the eyes of many, it is relevant evidence, and the fact that that information is now available to the Senate means we have a better chance of arriving at the truth after deliberation.

Secondly, I might add it is encouraging that some Republican Members of the U.S. Senate have made it clear that they oppose the notion of a motion to dismiss the impeachment charges as soon as they arrive. That might have been the dream of some in the White House—and perhaps even some in the U.S. Senate—but cooler heads have prevailed, and I salute my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who believe we have a special responsibility to treat this constitutional assignment with independence and dignity. That means we don't prejudge by coming to the floor and announcing, in some critical terms, that the Articles of Impeachment should not be taken seriously. We should take them seriously. It is a serious matter. I hope colleagues on both sides of the aisle will do that.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, the majority leader, Senator MCCONNELL, also addressed the USMCA. This is characterized as the NAFTA-2 or "the new trade agreement" between the United States, Canada, and Mexico. As he noted, trade among our three countries is critically important to all of us and, certainly, to the American economy and to my home State of Illinois. Our trade with Mexico and Canada eclipses all the other trade around the world and is important, especially, to our agricultural sector.

Just last weekend, in my hometown of Springfield, IL, I held a historic press conference. I brought together the President of the Illinois State AFL-CIO, Tim Drea of Christian County in Central Illinois, and Dick Guebert, who is the president of the Il-

linois Farm Bureau, both of whom, through their organizations, support the USMCA trade agreement that is about to come before Congress. There were a lot of smiles and laughter in the room as these two friends of mine noted that it is the very first time they have ever come together at a press conference: organized labor and the farmers of the State of Illinois. They both agree that this USMCA trade agreement is a step forward, an improvement over the original NAFTA. They both endorse it, and I do too.

I also want to add that the suggestion that somehow Speaker PELOSI, in the words of the majority leader, slow-walked the USMCA really, in a way, ignores the obvious. In the period of time between the original submission of the USMCA and the vote that will take place soon in the U.S. Senate, changes have been made to the trade agreement which the President submitted to Congress—important changes. For example, there was a provision in the trade agreement submitted by the President to Congress that was a dream come true for the pharmaceutical industry of the United States. It extended the period of time of exclusivity for certain biological drugs in that treaty. What it meant was that these pharmaceutical companies could continue to charge the highest prices on Earth to American consumers while delaying any competition from generic drugs.

That was a deal-breaker, as far as I was concerned. I told everyone involved I would not support the President's original USMCA with that sweetheart deal for the pharmaceutical industry. Thank goodness, because of Speaker PELOSI; our leader on the Senate side, Senator SCHUMER; and many others, we had that provision removed. Now the majority leader is criticizing Speaker PELOSI for slow-walking. I don't see it as slow-walking. I see it as bargaining, negotiating, and coming up with the result which made this trade agreement more acceptable to people on both sides of the aisle.

There was also language which the Democrats insisted on ultimately included in the USMCA, which provides additional protection for workers in the United States when it comes to the competition with workers in Mexico and Canada, which provides for additional inspections of production facilities in those other countries if there is a suspicion that they are engaging in the treatment of workers in an unacceptable manner. In other words, we put more enforcement provisions in the treaty over the last year while it has been before Congress, as we should—exactly what the American people want. For the Senator to come to the floor and criticize this as somehow negative and political and slow-walking—I think those two things I have just mentioned are substantive and important and go to the heart of why this agreement now has strong bipartisan support, which it should have had. I think we have added to this process by making it truly bipartisan.

FOR-PROFIT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this week the House of Representatives will have the opportunity to stand up for student borrowers who have been defrauded by the schools they attended. The House of Representatives will be voting on a resolution introduced by Representative SUSIE LEE of Nevada which will allow defrauded student loan borrowers relief from their student debt.

Under the Higher Education Act, currently the law of the land, when a student borrower is defrauded by their school, they are entitled to have their Federal student loans to attend that school discharged. That is what Congress intended. Why? The logic behind it is very straightforward.

Consider the following: The Federal Government recognizes the accreditation of these schools, colleges, and universities. That accreditation authorizes these schools to offer loans from the Federal Government to pay for the cost of attending. It is a very straightforward process. The schools are accredited. The U.S. Government recognizes the accreditation which authorizes the school to offer courses to students, and then it goes on to say that students attending those colleges and universities will qualify for Federal student loans. Now, that is where this particular statement I am about to make becomes particularly relevant.

The school makes promises about the education they are going to offer to the students to entice them to attend and to borrow money to attend. For example, the school may tell the students that the credits they earn at this school can be transferred to other schools, but sometimes that turns out to be untrue and false. These schools may tell the students there are jobs waiting for them in the fields that they want them to study at the schools. They tell them that, after graduation, there are plenty of employment opportunities, and oftentimes that turns out to be untrue. In fact, in the case of some of these schools, they have deliberately misrepresented the job placement of graduates to create the impression of success if you complete a course. The schools are lying to the students.

The school may also promise that, if you complete a course at the school, you will automatically be qualified for certain certifications under State law. Sometimes that turns out to be a lie. They may also tell the students there are certain teachers and courses available to them if they pay their tuition, and that may turn out to be untrue as well.

The law I referred to earlier is intended, when these types of lies and misrepresentations occur and the student is misled into borrowing Federal student loans based on these misrepresentations, to give the defrauded student the right to be relieved of the student loan responsibility under the law.