

through our legislative and oversight authority. As I stated in the past, Members should share their concerns and discuss these matters directly with members of our administration or with Saudi officials.

If Senators are upset about the State Department's recent invocation of a national emergency to advance arms sales to Saudi Arabia, they will have an opportunity to vote on that matter later. So the Senate has ample opportunity to make our voice heard about Riyadh's behavior, but the two resolutions we vote on today are not that opportunity. It is something else.

Whatever frustrations my colleagues may feel with the course of the conflict in Yemen, taking swipes at our relationships with Bahrain and Qatar is certainly not the response. Bahrain's involvement in the Yemen conflict has been limited to defensive border security operations and, for the past 2 years, Qatar has been completely uninvolved. Moreover, both Bahrain and Qatar provide absolutely essential support to our military operations in the region, without which our ability to project power and protect U.S. interests would be severely challenged.

I assume everyone knows Qatar is home to the U.S. Central Command's forward headquarters in the region, with 10,000 U.S. personnel and upward of 100 aircraft. It is the hub for many of our ongoing efforts against ISIS and other regional threats.

In Bahrain, you will find the headquarters of the U.S. Navy's Fifth Fleet. That is another 7,000 U.S. personnel, plus assets, responsible for command and control of over 3 million square miles of international waters.

So I would remind our colleagues of the briefing we received recently about the growing Iranian threat in the region. I would encourage them to reflect on recent attacks, probably by Iran or its proxies, against civilian vessels in UAE, against civilian airports in Saudi Arabia and UAE, and near our Embassy in Baghdad. In fact, literally just hours ago, two more commercial shipping vessels were apparently attacked off the coast of Oman. These attacks may appear directed at the countries that use them to export petrochemicals or at the international owners of the vessels, but the fact is, they threaten the very underpinnings of the global trading system and customary Law of the Sea that ensures freedom of transit on the seas.

We don't know who is responsible for these latest attacks—not yet, anyway—but it is not unreasonable to suspect an Iranian hand in them. I hope, in coming days, we have clarity about who is responsible, but what is clear is the growing tension and instability in that region.

So at a time of growing threats to U.S. personnel, interests, and partners posed by Iran, do we really want to send this kind of signal to our partners?

If we turn our back on them, can we continue to count on the significant

support they provide us or the freedom of maneuver our large presence in their countries affords us?

As the State Department has announced, the proposed sales that are at issue today would provide each of these host nations with important enhanced security capabilities, including anti-aircraft systems and support equipment. They will also tie these nations closer to the United States at a time when our adversaries would happily—happily—sell comparable weapons at less cost and with fewer restrictions.

In recent years, we have seen both Republican and Democratic administrations seek to reduce the U.S. military footprint in the region and have our partners assume more responsibility for their own security. So it is curious that Senators would want to not only sever security ties with these partners but also limit their ability to defend themselves.

In each of these cases, the U.S. arms sales in question have followed normal procedures; they have been properly screened and vetted; and they have been reviewed and approved by both the chairmen and ranking members of the Foreign Relations Committee and House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Let me say that again: The chairman and ranking members of these committees reviewed and approved these arms sales. That is bipartisan, bicameral support.

So in sum, I would ask my colleagues who support these resolutions whether they have even spoken to the Bahraini or Qatari Ambassadors to discuss any concerns. I would encourage them to visit Doha and Manama to confer with the leaders of these countries and speak with thousands of American sailors and airmen based there.

I would encourage my colleagues to ask our own senior military officials whether we will be better off if our partners purchase Russian or Chinese military systems instead of ours. I would encourage them to ask our diplomats whether America will have more or less influence with our partners if we capriciously block their purchase of American weapons.

I strongly urge each of our colleagues to reject these resolutions.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, all this week, I have been calling attention to the fact that the Democrats over in the House spent 6 weeks ignoring the urgent need for more funding on the crisis on our southern border. I have recited one quotation after another from the administration leaders who are responsible for securing our Nation and caring for individuals while they are detained. They are pleading with us to act.

"We are at a full-blown emergency. . . . The system is broken." That is the Acting Commissioner of Customs and Border Protection. It couldn't be more clear.

"We are running out of money. We are functionally out of space." That one is from the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

I have also run down the underlying statistics. The flood of people attempting to cross the U.S.-Mexico border has continued at historic levels. Our border agents are overwhelmed. Our facilities are filled beyond capacity—in some cases, with more than seven times more men, women, and children than their intended capacity.

This is a full-fledged crisis, and everybody knows it. The status quo cannot hold. Already, the Department of Homeland Security is having to move people and money away from other important efforts to triage more help toward the border.

The administration has been saying this is a crisis. The officials on the ground have been saying this is a crisis. My Republican colleagues and I have been saying repeatedly this is a crisis. And lest anyone think this is some partisan exercise, the New York Times editorial board has been saying it is a crisis. There were two editorials over the last several weeks. The first headline says: "Congress, Give Trump His Border Money," and "When Will Congress Get Serious About the Suffering at the Border?"

Those are headlines in the New York Times, not frequently allied with this administration. Everybody seems to understand that, except Democrats over in the House.

It is not as if our House colleagues are too busy working on pragmatic, bipartisan legislation with any shot at becoming law. No, here is what they are up to. One House committee spent yesterday holding a hearing on pathways to single-payer health insurance—in other words, barking up the tree of Medicare for None, their big proposal to take away every American's private health insurance, to take away Medicare as we know it, and force everyone into a new, untested, one-size-fits-all government system. That is what they are up to over there. That is the score. They have no time for the border crisis but plenty of time for socialist daydreams.

Even my colleague the Democratic leader has admitted the Democratic-controlled House is the problem here. We have even heard it from House Democrats themselves. One told reporters that his progressive colleagues weren't convinced the emergency funding was necessary. One Democratic Congressman says progressive colleagues were not convinced that emergency funding was necessary.

So it seems "the resistance" has convinced Washington Democrats that they need to come down to the left of the New York Times editorial page. There is not much space over there to the left of the New York Times editorial page.

But Senate Republicans are not going to be deterred. The crisis at the border hasn't gone anywhere, and neither has our resolve to address it. Next

week, the Senate is going to move forward. The Appropriations Committee will vote again. I hope Democrats in the House of Representatives will finally realize “the resistance” doesn’t pay the bills. No more political posturing, no more automatic knee-jerk opposition to absolutely everything the administration asks for—it is way past time for action.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, let me express my appreciation to the majority leader for highlighting this crisis at the border. There is no State more directly impacted in our United States than the State of Texas.

We, obviously, share 1,200 miles of common border with Mexico, and this is a humanitarian crisis. As the majority leader said, not only the New York Times editorial page, but Barack Obama in 2014 called far fewer numbers than are coming across today a humanitarian and security crisis then, and it has gotten nothing but worse.

I appreciate the leader’s bringing this to a head and holding Members accountable. We know that people talk a good game sometimes, but there is nowhere to hide when it comes to an up-or-down vote on this emergency appropriations bill.

I would add that there are other measures taking place. The chairman of the Judiciary Committee, as the Presiding Officer knows, is working on a bill that would address the underlying asylum laws, which are being exploited by the human smugglers who are getting rich moving people across Mexico from Central America into the United States and charging them between \$5,000 and \$10,000 a head—sometimes more. It has been the unwillingness of the Democrats to engage on that underlying asylum law and a fix there that has precipitated or contributed to this humanitarian crisis.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Will the Senator from Texas yield for a question?

Mr. CORNYN. I will.

Mr. MCCONNELL. As a member of the Judiciary Committee involved in this, is there any indication there might be bipartisan support for authorizing this legislation that you all are working on in committee?

Mr. CORNYN. We hope to see. And we will see one way or the other when we vote on this legislation next week.

I am happy to say that my Democratic colleague HENRY CUELLAR from Laredo, TX, which is more directly impacted probably than any place on the border, joined me in one proposal we call the HUMANE Act, which would deal with this underlying asylum issue.

We have been working with the chairman, Senator GRAHAM, to come up with a consensus piece of legislation that will really plug the dike that has been breached now, which has caused this humanitarian crisis.

There are a number of ways we can deal with this.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I would say to my friend that the answer here is not just

the money but an actual adjustment of U.S. law to more directly affect the crisis that we have. We need to do both, correct?

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I agree with the majority leader. We do need to do both.

I would also add, for those who were disturbed by the President’s invocation of his tariff authority to try to bring the Mexican Government to the table to negotiate some changes in the way the Mexican Government deals with this flow of Central Americans coming across its country, none of that would have been necessary if our Democratic colleagues had simply worked with us both on the underlying legislation and on this appropriations bill.

Frankly, the President was put in a corner, and there was not much else he could do. I am grateful he was able to get a result. Only time will tell whether those numbers actually go down from the 144,000 last month.

But while the Democrats are sitting on their hands and maybe talking a good game, I am glad to know we at least have leadership in the White House and here in the Senate.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Would it be safe to characterize this as a situation in which we are actually getting more cooperation from the Mexicans than we are from the Democrats in Congress?

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, that is a sad but true statement. It is unbelievable to me that the Mexican Government, under President Lopez Obrador, is doing more than congressional Democrats to try to solve this humanitarian and security crisis, but that is where we are.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I would just add that I hope there is success in the Judiciary Committee to achieve some kind of bipartisan consensus so that we can solve the entire problem, not just the humanitarian crisis.

I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader again for his leadership and for his comments today.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The 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 (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

ELECTIONS

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, last night, President Donald Trump, in an interview with ABC News, said that if he were offered information about an

opponent from a foreign source in the next election, he would take a look at it and might not go to the FBI.

I think you might want to listen. There isn’t anything wrong with listening. If someone called from a country . . . [and said] “we have information on your opponent”—oh, I think I’d want to hear it.

That is shocking, shocking—yet, sadly, is par for the course for this President.

My predecessor, Senator Moynihan, said, “We are defining deviancy down.” No President has defined deviancy down more than Donald Trump, and his remarks last night defined deviancy down to a new low.

To say that it is OK for foreign countries to interfere in our elections, with their motives not being what are in the interests of the American people, is disgraceful, shocking. It is as if the President has learned absolutely nothing from the past 2 years of investigations into Russia’s interference of the 2016 elections. This is precisely how the whole thing started. A foreign power reached out to establish connections with a Presidential campaign by dangling the promise of information about an opponent, and President Trump said he would welcome it. He asked Russia to interfere.

When he wonders why people think there might be collusion, well, this is why. This is a President who says: Russia, come help. That doesn’t prove collusion, but it sure proves that he doesn’t mind foreign powers interfering with an election.

Again, the President’s comments are undemocratic, un-American, and disgraceful. The President’s comments suggest he believes winning an election is more important than the integrity of an election. That idea is flat-out wrong. The President’s idea that winning an election is everything and the integrity of an election is nothing is one small step away from dictators and autocrats, who manipulate the results of an election because they care more about staying in power than they care about democratic principles. Donald Trump seems to fall into that category in which winning is everything and integrity is nothing.

It is simple. When a foreign power tries to give a campaign information on an opponent, that is foreign interference in our elections. It is exactly what the Framers worried about at the very founding of our Republic.

It is up to us in Congress to protect that legacy, the wellspring of democracy—free and fair elections. It is up to all of us in Congress—Democrats and Republicans. When a foreign power interferes in our elections, the Democrats shouldn’t say “If it helps our side, we are OK with it,” and the Republicans shouldn’t say “If it helps our side, we are OK with it.”

Where are the Republicans going to be with this latest step over the line by Donald Trump? Are they going to sit and cower and do nothing?

We have multiple bipartisan elections security bills that are just languishing here in the Senate. We even