

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.