

the best record in this regard, so it is important the United States make clear that any agreements must be honored.

As we wait for the China deal to take effect, one piece of definite good news on the trade front is the arrival in the Senate of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement. After months of delay by House Democrats, USMCA is finally—finally—moving through Congress. Here in the Senate, it is advancing rapidly through the required committees, and I expect it will be received for final Senate consideration in the next few days.

Last week, I voted in support of this agreement in the Senate Finance Committee, and just this morning—a few minutes ago, in fact—I voted for this agreement in a meeting of the Senate Committee on Commerce. The United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement has been a big priority of mine over the past year, in particular because of the ways the agreement would benefit farmers and ranchers.

Canada and Mexico are the No. 1 and No. 2 markets for American agriculture products, and this agreement will preserve and expand farmers' access to these two critical export markets and give farmers certainty about what these markets are going to look like going forward.

I am particularly pleased about the ways that USMCA will benefit dairy farmers. If you drive the I-29 corridor north of Brookings, SD, you can see firsthand the major dairy expansion South Dakota has experienced over the past several years.

The U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement will preserve U.S. dairy farmers' role as a key dairy supplier to Mexico, and it will substantially expand market access to Canada. 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. It will make it easier for American producers to export wheat to Canada and much more.

Of course, the benefits of this agreement are not limited to farmers and ranchers. The United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement will benefit virtually every sector of the economy, from manufacturing to digital services to the automotive industry. It will create hundreds of thousands of new jobs, boost our economic output, and increase wages for workers.

The agreement also breaks new ground by including a chapter specifically focused on small and medium-sized businesses—the first time a U.S. trade agreement has ever included a dedicated chapter on this topic.

Roughly, 120,000 small and medium-sized businesses around our country export goods and services to Mexico and Canada, including a number of businesses in my home State of South Dakota. The United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement will make it easier for

these businesses to successfully export their products. South Dakota businesses and consumers will also benefit from the fact that the agreement maintains the current U.S. de minimis threshold, which is something I fought hard to protect.

It is too bad farmers and ranchers had to wait so long for the USMCA trade agreement. This agreement was concluded well over a year ago, and it could have been taken up much sooner. But House Democrats have, unfortunately, been more focused on playing political games than on working with Republicans to do the American people's business.

I am very glad we are taking up this agreement now, though, and I look forward to voting for final passage of USMCA in the very near future. We should get this agreement to the President's desk without delay.

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. Mr. 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. Mr. President, today is a momentous, historic, and solemn day in the history of the U.S. Senate and in the history of our Republic. The House of Representatives will send Articles of Impeachment against President Trump to the Senate, and the Speaker will appoint the House managers of the impeachment case.

Two articles will be delivered. The first charges the President with abuse of power—of coercing a foreign leader into interfering in our elections and of using the powers of the Presidency, the most powerful public office in the Nation, to benefit himself. The second charges the President with obstruction of Congress for an unprecedented blockade of the legislature's authority to oversee and investigate the executive branch.

Let's put it a different way.

The House of Representatives has accused the President of trying to shake down a foreign leader for personal gain to help him in his campaign, and he has done everything possible to cover it up. This administration is unprecedented in its not being open, in its desire for secrecy, in its desire to prevent the public from knowing what it is doing, and it is worst of all when it comes in an impeachment trial.

The two offenses are the types of offenses the Founders had in mind when

they designed the impeachment powers of Congress. Americans and the Founding Fathers, in particular, from the very founding day of the Republic, have feared the ability of a foreign power to interfere in our elections. Americans have never wanted a foreign power to have sway over our elections, but that is what President Trump is accused of doing—of soliciting—in these articles.

I would ask my colleagues, and I would ask the American people: Do we want a foreign power determining who our President is or do we want the American voters to determine it? It is that serious. That is the central question: Who should determine who our President and our other elected officials are?

From the early days of the Republic, foreigners have tried to interfere, and from the early days of the Republic, we have resisted. Yet, according to these articles and other things he has done, President Trump seems to aid and abet it. His view is, if it is good for him, then, that is good enough. That is not America. We are a nation of laws—of the rule of law, not of the rule of one man.

So now the Senate's job is to try the case—to conduct a fair trial on these very severe charges of letting, aiding, abetting, and encouraging a foreign power to interfere in our elections and of threatening them with the cutoff of aid—and to determine if the President's offenses merit, if they are proven, the most severe punishment our Constitution imagines.

The House has made a very strong case, but, clearly, the Senators have to see that case and watch it firsthand. A fair trial means the prosecutors who make the case and the President's counsel who provide the defense have all of the evidence available. It means that Senators have all of the facts to make an informed decision. That means relevant witnesses, and that means relevant documents. We all know that. We all know—every Member of this body, Democrat or Republican—that you can't have a fair, open trial, particularly on something as weighty as impeachment, when we don't have the evidence and the facts.

The precedents of the Senate are clear. Leader MCCONNELL is constantly citing precedent. Here is one: The Senate has always heard from witnesses in impeachment trials. There have been 15 completed impeachment trials in the history of this country. In every single one of them, the Senate has heard from witnesses. Let me repeat that for Leader MCCONNELL's benefit since he is always citing the precedent of 1999. There have been 15 completed impeachment trials, including the one in 1999. In the history of this country, in every single one of them, the Senate has heard from witnesses. It would be unprecedented not to. President Johnson's impeachment trial had witnesses—41 of them. President Clinton's

trial had witnesses. Several of my colleagues, including the Republican leader, voted for them. Conducting an impeachment trial of the President of the United States and having no witnesses would be without precedent and, frankly, a new low for the majority in this body that history will not look kindly on.

Each day that goes by, the case for witnesses and documents gains force and gains momentum. Last night, a new cache of documents, including dozens of pages of notes, text messages, and other records, shed light on the activities of the President's associates in Ukraine. The documents paint a sordid picture of the efforts by the President's personal attorney, Rudy Giuliani, and his associate, Lev Parnas, to remove a sitting U.S. Ambassador and to pressure Ukraine President Zelensky to announce an investigation of one of the President's political rivals. Part of the plot to remove Ambassador Yovanovitch involved hiring a cheap Republican operative to follow her around and monitor her movements. How low can they go?

Just when you think that President Trump and his network couldn't possibly get any more into the muck, reports suggest they are even dirtier than you could imagine. I saw a novelist on TV this morning. He said: If I had brought this plot to my publisher, he would have rejected it. He would have said it was absurd, that it could never happen, and that people will not believe it.

Well, here it is, led by President Trump, who, again, cares not for the morals, ethics, and honor of this country as much as he cares about himself.

To allegedly have some cut-rate political operative stalk an American Ambassador at the direction of the President's lawyer, potentially with the President's "knowledge and consent"—that is what one of the emails read—I mean, how much more can America take in the decline of our morals, our values, and our standing in the world?

I don't care who you are—Democrat, Republican, liberal, conservative. Doesn't this kind of thing bother you if anyone does it, let alone the President of the United States?

I don't know how any Member of this body could pick up the newspaper this morning, read this new revelation, and not conclude that the Senate needs access to relevant documents like these in the trial of President Trump. The release of this new information dramatically underscores the need for witnesses and for documents.

The Republican leader has, so far, opposed Democratic requests to call for factfinding witnesses and to subpoena three specific sets of relevant documents. Despite their having no argument against them, the Republicans' position at the moment is to punt the question of witnesses and documents until after both sides finish their presentations. Then, they say they will

consider documents and witnesses with an open mind.

The Democrats have requested four fact witnesses. They are the President's top advisers, like Mr. Mulvaney. They are not the Democrats' men. They are the President's men. They are not Democratic witnesses. They are not our witnesses. They are just witnesses, plain and simple. Each of them has firsthand information about the charges against the President.

So, as the House prepares to send the articles to the Senate today, it is time for us—all of us—to turn to the serious job of conducting a fair trial, one that the American people will accept as fair, not as a coverup and not as something that has hidden the evidence. The focus of Senators on both sides must fall on the question of witnesses and documents.

CHINA

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, on China, later this morning the President is expected to take part in the signing ceremony for the so-called phase 1 trade agreement with China.

Now, I have commended the President for his instincts when it has come to China. At one point, his instincts were to be strong and tough. I have compared his stances previously to those of previous administrations. I was rooting for the President to succeed for the sake of jobs and wealth and the economy in this country, and I told him that personally. So this phase 1 deal is an extreme disappointment to me and to millions and millions of Americans who want to see us make China play fairly. President Trump's phase 1 trade deal with China is a historic blunder. Several harmful policies and practices are reportedly unaddressed.

First, there appear to be no commitments to end China's subsidy program that continues to hurt U.S. industries and workers at all levels.

Second, there appear to be no commitments to reform the Chinese policy of state-owned enterprises, which unfairly compete with American enterprises and take American jobs away while they are allowed to freely sell here and while our best companies can't sell there.

Third, there appear to be no commitments to curtail the illegal dumping of Chinese products into our markets, which puts American firms out of business and workers out of jobs.

Fourth, glaringly, there appear to be no significant commitments to definitively end China's predatory and flagrant cyber theft of American intellectual property, which has stolen a generation of American jobs and American wealth.

Fifth, concerning what the deal achieves in terms of agricultural purchases, it appears the Trump administration has not addressed the fact that China has existing contracts with countries like Brazil and Argentina. It

doesn't need any more of our products, certainly not in the numbers that have been talked about, and the agreement does not grapple with the fact that American farmers have already lost billions, have watched their markets disappear, and have gone bankrupt in the time it has taken the President to reach the deal.

Reading the reporting of phase one of the trade deal feels like watching a bad rerun of the past 10 years of botched trade negotiations with China. I fear that President Xi is laughing at us behind our backs for having gained so much at our expense. The United States concedes our leverage, and in exchange, China makes vague, unenforceable promises it never intends to fulfill. We have seen this over and over again. China agrees to something, and they don't do it.

President Trump complained about President Obama and President Bush and others when they signed these deals and nothing happened, and he is doing the same darn thing—the same darn thing. It is no wonder they haven't made it public. They are afraid that when people actually read it, they will see that it is not good for America and that the Chinese took us hook, line, and sinker.

If I sound frustrated and angry, it is because I am. Even today, an hour before the deal is signed by the President, I have to use phrases like "appear to" and "according to reports" because the administration has shrouded the details of the agreement in secrecy and kept the text of the deal under lock and key. The Trump administration doesn't want the details of the agreement to come out before they can spin it because it knows that once the details come out, everyone will see that China has taken President Trump to the cleaners. President Trump, the great negotiator, has been totally out-negotiated by President Xi.

Just like on impeachment, the President and his team are afraid of the truth. They don't want anyone to see the facts or the truth; they just want to spin. If the Trump administration were proud of this deal, they would hold it up to the world and shout it from the mountaintops. Instead, they have kept it hidden. They want to spin it, but they can't spin away the fact that this deal is a bad deal for American workers, American companies, American jobs, and American wealth. Even today—the day the agreement will be signed—we have been told we may not get all the details.

Given the absurd secrecy surrounding President Trump's phase one trade deal, I expect that once everyone gets to take a look at it in the light of day, they will find that the administration has signed one of the most tragically one-sided agreements in recent memory.

Even the farmers—President Trump sold out the structural changes to try to help the farmers—when they look at the specifics, they are going to see that