These are not just students or lawyers or intellectuals who have taken to the streets but a broad cross-section of Hong Kong's diverse society—all age groups, all professions, all walks of life—all committed to preserving the personal freedoms and judicial independence that have made Hong Kong such a special and prosperous city.

The Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992, which I sponsored, has, for nearly three decades, enshrined America's commitment to preserving Hong Kong's special status and its freedoms. This draft law is inconsistent with the Hong Kong Policy Act and puts Hong Kong on the path of becoming just another one of China's cities subject to Beijing's whims.

As the Vice President stated last autumn, ''For a time, Beijing inched toward greater liberty and respect for human rights. But in recent years, China has taken a sharp U-turn toward control and oppression of its own people.''

I regret that reports from Guangdong to Xinjiang continue to prove him right as Beijing's grip on its own people grows tighter, even as the rest of the world marks its 30th anniversary of the violence in Tiananmen Square.

I encourage the administration to stay engaged and express our concerns with the authorities in Hong Kong before this proposal becomes law and the Chinese Communist Party further extends its control over the people of Hong Kong.

TARIFFS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, on one final matter, last week's announcement of progress in negotiations with Mexico was a welcome development. It staved off the threat that tariffs would disrupt an important trading relationship and secured a promise that Mexican authorities will take more responsibility for their own borders, but, as I said yesterday, while this was a critical step, it does not absolve Congress of our duty to finally act—not even close.

It was May 1 when the administration first transmitted to Congress its urgent request for supplemental border funding. That will be 6 weeks ago tomorrow that the administration set up a request for supplemental funding for the crisis at the border—6 weeks—and this emergency request is essentially falling on deaf ears among our Democratic colleagues.

In the meantime, we should note that the month of May marks a third straight month with more than 100,000 individuals apprehended at the southern border. In fact, last month's total of more than 140,000 was the largest in the last 13 years of CBP data.

By the way, that includes more than 84,000 family units and more than 11,000 unaccompanied children. These are enormous numbers of people showing up at our border. The American personnel who are charged with securing our Nation and looking after these individuals are simply overwhelmed. The agencies are overwhelmed. The facilities are overwhelmed. It is a true humanitarian crisis, totally unsustainable for these individuals for whom our national security and rule of law dictate that we need to detain.

At overcrowded facilities, beds are in short supply, medical care is wearing thin, money and personnel from across the Department of Homeland Security are being diverted from other important missions on an emergency basis to cover shortfalls, but even that cannot go on much longer.

This is from John Sanders, the Acting Commissioner of Customs and Border Control. He said: ''We are at a full-blown emergency . . . the system is broken.'' The system is broken—that from the head of Customs and Border Patrol.

The professionals whom our Nation has entrusted to keep America safe and care for these people have been begging—literally begging—for more resources for 6 weeks. Their calls have solidified a national consensus that spans the entire political spectrum.

More than 1 month ago, the editorial board of the New York Times—not what you call devoted admirers of the Trump administration—wrote an editorial they titled—listen to this headline: ''Congress, Give Trump His Border Money.''

That is the New York Times. They wrote:

> Something needs to be done. Soon. [But] unfortunately, political gamesmanship once again threatens to hold up desperately needed resources.

That was the New York Times in early May, at the time both Houses of Congress were negotiating the supplemental funding bill for recent natural disasters, but Democrats chose to come down to the left of the New York Times' editorial pages—that is pretty hard to do—and decided to deny the White House this border money.

One Member of the House Democratic conference complained that the need for border money was ''political.'' Political.

Another House Democrat admitted to reporters that his own side was the problem. This is what he said: ''In my opinion, we do have to come up with some money. But we've got to convince our more progressive friends.''

Again, these are not resources for any remotely controversial cause. We are talking about humanitarian funding for caring for families and children who show up at the border in need of help. That is what we are talking about. This is not a subject where the political left should need week after week of convincing, but apparently our liberal colleagues just could not get past their animosity for the President, even on something like this.

During these last 6 weeks, the House has found plenty of time and energy for purely partisan things. There has been plenty of histrionics and political theater. We have seen hearing room melodrama. We have seen some partisan messaging votes. We have seen plenty of political theater, opposing the President for the sake of opposing him. They have had time for all of that but nothing—nothing—for the urgent border crisis.

So, May 5, the New York Times: ''Congress, Give Trump His Border Money.''

May 23, ''Democrats balked at allocating billions of dollars more toward border security.''

June 9, very recently: ''When Will Congress Get Serious About the Suffering at the Border?'' Two New York Times editorials say: Give Trump the money for the border crisis. This is breathtaking—the alliance between the New York Times editorial board and the Trump administration being ignored by our Democratic colleagues.

So look, the question we have been asking ourselves every day as the House continues to ignore this crisis is, What is the problem here?

I suspect it is the question men and women we ask to secure the border are asking one another every day. When will our Democratic colleagues get serious about this?

Believe me, we know that our Democratic counterparts are not charter members of Donald Trump's personal fan club. We get that. They have made that abundantly clear over and over again. Their entire political agenda these days seems to be repeating that fact nice and loud, over and over again in case we hadn't already heard it.

We are all plenty familiar with ''the resistance.'' We have seen that here in the Senate. That is why we have had so many nominations clogged up. But, look, ''the resistance'' doesn't pay the bills. ''The resistance'' doesn't produce the funding that the border facilities desperately need. ''The resistance'' doesn't plug the holes in our Nation's border security or improve humanitarian conditions down on the border.

There is only one way to fix this—bipartisan legislation with supplemental border funding. That is what we need to do.

So for everyone's sake, I think the entire country is hoping that Democrats remember their job is governing, not resisting. It is far past time to get serious about this and solve this problem.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

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 bill clerk read the nomination of Sarah Daggett Morrison, of Ohio, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Ohio.

YEAR-ROUND SALE OF E15

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I came to the floor last week to talk about the challenges facing farmers right now. While the broader economy is thriving, a combination of low commodity prices, protracted trade disputes, and natural disasters and weather-related issues have left many farmers and ranchers struggling.

In my home State of South Dakota, farmers and ranchers are dealing with the aftermath of severe winter storms, heavy rainfall, bomb cyclones, and spring flooding. Planting is behind schedule, and many farmers will not be able to plant at all this year. Yet, while the news has generally been tough for farmers and ranchers lately, there are a couple of recent happenings that are worth celebrating.

Japan's announcement that it was lifting age limits on U.S. beef imports is a win for America's ranchers, who will be able to substantially increase their sales to Japan. Also, the administration's move to lift the ban on the year-round sale of E15—15-percent ethanol-blended fuel—went live in the Federal Register yesterday. This is great news for corn producers in South Dakota and around the Nation.

I have been advocating for higher blends of ethanol for more than a decade, and I have spent a lot of time advocating for the year-round sale of E15. Year-round E15 is a win-win-win-win situation. It is a win for consumers and for our economy. It is a win for the environment. It is a win for our Nation's energy security. It is also a big win for our Nation's agriculture industry.

Year-round E15 will not only provide consumers with a cheaper alternative at the pump, but it will keep gas prices lower. Plus, the year-round sale of E15 means more ethanol can be sold each year, for gas stations will have a greater incentive to sell E15 now that they will no longer have to go through the costly process of reworking and relabeling E15 pumps at the start of the summer's driving season and then of converting them back in the fall. Increased demand will fuel further growth in the ethanol industry, which already supports hundreds of thousands of U.S. jobs and contributes tens of billions of dollars to our economy.

Year-round sales of E15 are also a win for our environment in that ethanol is a cleaner burning fuel than is regular gasoline, which means fewer greenhouse gas emissions. In fact, ethanol reduces greenhouse gas emissions by more than one-third. Biofuels like ethanol are key to there being a lower carbon energy future, and the next generation of advanced biofuels will further lower emissions.

Another major advantage to ethanol is that it diminishes our dependence on foreign oil. Ethanol is a homegrown fuel, and the more we are producing here at home the less we have to rely on unstable countries or far-off sources to meet our fuel needs.

Finally, of course, the year-round sale of E15 is a big win for our Nation's corn producers. America's farmers don't just feed our country. They help fuel it, too. Roughly half of the corn produced in my home State of South Dakota goes into ethanol production.

Increased demand for ethanol as a result of the administration's decision could boost demand for corn by up to 2 billion bushels. That would be a significant boost to U.S. corn producers at any point, but it is an especially big deal given the challenges the agriculture sector has faced over the past several years.

U.S. corn producers are one of the main reasons I have been a relentless advocate for higher blends of ethanol, and I am very happy the President has delivered on his commitment to year-round sales of E15. As we move forward, I will continue to advocate for biofuels and the environmental and economic benefits they bring. Conventional ethanol has laid the foundation for advanced biofuels, which will have even lower life cycle emissions.

American ingenuity has turned the corner to create ethanol from other parts of plants like corn kernel fiber, boosting yields, but we need the Environmental Protection Agency to end the yearlong delays and approve registrations.

I will also continue to urge the Environmental Protection Agency to stop its practice of granting small refiner exemptions to the renewable fuel standard that discourage demand for ethanol. These so-called hardship waivers should be limited only to instances where small refiners would no longer be profitable or competitive if they comply with their blending obligation. They should not be granted to refiners who are posting billion-dollar profits and seeking to game the system. We need to make sure the EPA is granting waivers appropriately and in a transparent manner.

That said, the year-round sale of E15 will actually help refiners because it will incentivize higher ethanol blending and drive down compliance costs.

I am thankful that President Trump made good on his commitment to our farmers to get the E15 rule done, and I am glad he is back in the heartland today so he can hear firsthand about the difference this will make in farm country.

While we have a long way to go to get the agricultural economy thriving again, I am heartened by this victory for our corn producers, and I will continue to make our Nation's farmers and ranchers a priority here in Washington.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill 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 (Mr. SCOTT of Florida). Without objection, it is so ordered.

EQUAL PAY

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, later this afternoon, the U.S. women's soccer team will begin its quest for another World Cup title with its opening match against Thailand. As the entire Nation cheers them on as they take the field, I want to shine a light today on an issue the women's national team has been fighting for off the field: pay equity. The women make just as much of a sacrifice, put in just as much mental and physical energy, absorb just as much risk of injury as the men who play for the national team. Yet when you break it down, a women's national soccer team player earns a base salary of $3,600 per game while a men's player earns $5,000. Over the course of a season, if both the men's and women's teams have the same record, a male player could earn $30,000 more than his female counterpart.

Female soccer players who earn the privilege of representing their country on the world stage get a much smaller bonus, $15,000, than male soccer players who earn the same privilege, $55,000. When a woman's national team wins a World Cup, something the U.S. women have done three times—with some New York State players helping—it wins a percentage of what a men's team gets if it wins at all, something the U.S. men have never done.

For the sake of comparison, U.S. soccer awarded the men's national team a $5.4 million performance bonus for losing in the round of 16 in the 2014 World Cup. It awarded the women $1.7 million for winning the World Cup.

Let me repeat that so you get the contrast. The women won the Cup and were given $1.7 million. The men got into the final 16 and got $5.4 million. That is discrimination staring us all in the face.

This is an issue of basic fairness. Performances aside—and the women have been excellent and often dominant over the past two decades—we shouldn't reward women less for doing the same work as men. We shouldn't say to generations of girls and boys who look up to these talented stars that women's