

have a bill that has been introduced by the ranking member of the Intelligence Committee that would make it a campaign's legal duty to report to the FBI when a foreign power offers its assistance.

It is very simple. If a foreign power comes to your campaign and offers assistance, you tell the FBI. This would say you are required to by law. It is Senator WARNER's bill. Are our Republican colleagues going to be with us on that? We will find out shortly because later this afternoon, my friend Senator WARNER will ask our colleagues for the unanimous consent to pass his bill that says: If Russia, Iran, North Korea, or anyone else offers campaign help, you must report it to the FBI ASAP.

My Republican friends should take a few hours to decide if they really want to block that bill, because if they do, it would be a disgrace and another step in defining deviancy down in this grand democracy that is becoming more and more at risk.

The Republican blockade of elections security thus far, led by Leader MCCONNELL, has to come to an end. Bipartisan elections security bills are languishing because Leader MCCONNELL will not bring them to the floor. One of his own colleagues, the chairman of the Rules and Administration Committee, said we are not bringing them to the floor because Leader MCCONNELL doesn't want to. He stands in the way, with his graveyard, on an issue that is vital to American integrity, American democracy. Leader MCCONNELL needs to bring these bills to the floor.

Again, I ask our Republicans to think hard as Senator WARNER asks for his unanimous consent request later this morning or this afternoon. Are you going to say it is OK when a foreign power goes to you or to any other candidate or a sitting President and says, "We will help you win the election—shhh—and we will help you to be quiet about it and not to tell law enforcement"? I hope not.

The embrace of our Republican colleagues of everything Donald Trump does, including things they know are wrong, has become stunning and appalling. Let's see, in this instance, if it gets even worse.

TAXES

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, on taxes, a year and a half ago, as the Senate debated the Republican tax bill, the Democrats predicted that giving enormous tax breaks to big corporations and the superrich would not trickle down to working Americans. We predicted then, as usual, that corporations would find a way to direct those newfound profits to themselves, not to their workers, not to their communities, and not for the good of the country.

Our Republican colleagues protested. They said trickle-down works. They talked about tax cuts. They tried to de-

liberately avoid who they were designing the tax cuts to benefit, but it was largely the very wealthy and the very powerful corporations. They said it was going to benefit everybody.

Well, here we go. The analyses keep pouring in of what a sham—a disgrace—this tax bill was, especially for middle-class, average Americans.

An analysis by JUST Capital showed yesterday that 56 percent of the tax savings from the Trump tax bill have gone to shareholders in the form of stock buybacks and direct distributions—56 percent, a majority. Do you know how much workers got? While the shareholders—most of them wealthy—got 56 percent, workers got 6 percent of the whole benefit of the tax bill. This was by JUST Capital, which is not a leftwing group; it is a group that is composed of people who know all about and participate in corporations and finance.

If you don't believe that one, this morning, the Business Roundtable, which is made up of the 200 largest CEOs in America—hardly a leftwing, radical group—reported that America's CEOs expect to spend less on capital investments now than before the tax bill was passed.

So this idea of giving these companies big tax breaks so they will reinvest them is not happening. They are going to buybacks. This is not dealing with the No. 1 problem that America faces—the maldistribution of wealth and income as it agglomerates to the top and the middle class and those trying to get into the middle class being left out.

I remember when President Trump promised his tax bill would be a "middle class miracle"—his words—and that the average American family would see a \$4,000 raise. I remember when many of my Republican friends came to the floor to tout workers' bonuses in the wake of their tax bill even though many of them were merely your typical annual bonuses. It turns out, as to yesterday's report, that 2 percent—just 2 percent—of the tax bill's overall windfall went to workers' bonuses, which is an average of a measly \$28 per worker, while their corporate parents and their larger shareholders got hundreds of thousands and millions.

Several of my Republican colleagues still laud the tax bill. They try to link it to positive economic news, but you will never hear them mention that most of the bill's benefits flowed to multinational corporations and to the top 1 percent of America. You won't hear them mention that it did very little to raise wages for average Americans. Alas, the Republicans are giving themselves credit for building a theme park for everyone when all they have done is renovate the exclusive country club.

As many Democrats predicted, a year and a half after its passage, the Republican tax bill has overwhelmingly benefited shareholders and corporate executives but not workers and their families.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

SENIOR CHIEF PETTY OFFICER SHANNON KENT

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, now, on a very important topic that affects New York and America, there is the renaming of a ship.

The men and women who wear this Nation's uniform are some of the most inspiring people you will ever meet. There is no shortage of stories of their valor, of their courage under fire, or of their sacrifices made voluntarily on behalf of a grateful nation. Yet I have the responsibility and the honor this morning of sharing the story of a particularly exceptional servicemember from my State of New York, SCPO Shannon Kent.

Shannon Kent was from Upstate New York. She was born in Oswego and was raised in Pine Plains. She graduated from Stissing Mountain High School and left college to join the Navy, following in the footsteps of her father and her uncle—a police commander and a firefighter—both of whom were first responders on September 11. Duty ran in the veins of the Kent family.

Shannon was a pioneer in the special operations community. She was one of the first, if not the first woman to pass the course required to join Navy SEALs on missions. That is amazing in itself. Shannon was an outstanding linguist and a seasoned cryptologist, whose work "contributed directly to the capture of hundreds of enemy insurgents and severely degraded enemy combat capability," which earned her a slew of accolades, including multiple commendation medals—the Purple Heart and the Bronze Star.

What an amazing woman—brave, strong, brilliant, and with a large body of knowledge. Amazing. Her courageous efforts and groundbreaking achievements have inspired numerous programs for integrating women into the special operations forces, with there being combat jobs and special operations training now open to female servicemembers. Senior Chief Kent was living proof that women could not only keep up with but lead our Nation's most highly trained and capable servicemembers.

Of course, Shannon was more than just a sailor; she was a loving wife to her husband, Joe, a caring mother to her two children, a cancer survivor, a scholar, and an unstoppable athlete who stayed true to her New York roots, often going out for runs in her faded New York Yankees cap.

On January 16 of this year, SCPO Shannon Kent was among four Americans and more than a dozen others who were killed in a suicide bombing in northern Syria.

Senior Chief Kent was on her fifth combat deployment, once again conducting some of the Nation's most classified and dangerous missions. After her tragic death, one of her commanding officers said: "Senior Chief

Petty Officer Shannon Kent deserves to be honored in a manner befitting of her noble service to our country and enduring contributions to the United States Navy."

I could not agree more. So, today, I am proud to introduce an amendment to the annual Defense authorization bill urging the U.S. Navy to name a ship after New York native and American hero, SCPO Shannon Kent.

Of the 289 Active-Duty ships in the Navy, only five—only five—are named in honor of women. Of the 53 named vessels currently under construction, only one—just one—is named in honor of a woman. And no Navy ship has ever been named for a woman who fought and died in combat as Shannon Kent did.

It is time to address this disparity, recognizing the integral role that female servicemembers play in protecting our great Nation. RADM Grace Hopper, the namesake of the USS *Hopper*, once said:

A ship in port is safe; but that is not what ships are built for. Sail out to sea and do new things.

That is what RADM Grace Hopper said.

Well, SCPO Shannon Kent was built to set out to sea to do good things. So should we. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment to name the first naval vessel after a woman who has fought and died in combat, the brave, patriotic, wonderful Shannon Kent.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I have heard from other sources about Shannon Kent, to whom he is referring, and she is in fact an American hero. Everything he said about her is very true; however, everything he said about our President is not very true. Here we are, with probably the best economy we have had in my life—

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, will my colleague kindly yield the floor before I leave?

I agree with the first half of his sentence.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I just want to comment that every time I hear things about the President—you have to keep in mind that we have the best economy we have had. Unemployment is at 4 percent. We are better than we have ever been.

We went through 8 years with the Obama administration taking down our military to the point where we allowed Russia and China to get ahead of us in many areas, such as hypersonics, and now we are going into this thing with a Defense authorization bill. But it is this President who is changing—trying to overcome the problems.

I don't criticize President Obama because he was really feeling where his priorities should be, and they have not been to defend America. He set up this system that says for every dollar that you put into the military, you have to

put a dollar into nonmilitary, and that is just not what we are supposed to be doing in this country.

So we are going to get to the point at which the American people are going to be very proud that we are going to have systems, we are going to have weaponry, we are going to be back to where we used to be and we have been since World War II—having the best equipment, treating our people the best, having the best troops. We already have the best troops in the field. We need to do for them what they are doing for us. That is what this bill is all about.

Again, this President has been very supportive in rebuilding the military.

Look at the court system. Right now we have great new jurists. We are up to over 40 appellate judges who now have been confirmed.

So good things are happening. This President is accountable for these good things, and I can assure you that the American people know better than some of the stuff they hear about President Trump. It is just not true.

I want to get on record here because we have some votes coming up having to do with the joint resolution of disapproval regarding arms sales to Bahrain and Qatar.

These two Arabian Peninsula states are important to the American partners in countering Iran and combating ISIS and other terrorist groups. We depend on them. They are our friends.

Bahrain actually hosts about 7,000 U.S. personnel, and that would be in the U.S. Fifth Fleet.

Qatar hosts about 10,000 U.S. personnel, as well as the Combined Air Operations Center at Al Udeid Air Base.

Through these arms sales, we can improve cooperation, enhance interoperability, and help our partners defend themselves and our American troops in the region. They are defending themselves. They are defending our American troops who are over there right now. I really get concerned when things like this come up. What is the rest of the world to say when we treat our allies this way and we renege on a commitment that we made?

Through these arms sales, we can improve cooperation and we can improve our relationships in that whole part of the world, but, more importantly, if we renege on these arms sales, we will undermine the national defense strategy. The "National Defense Strategy" is a book. I should have brought it down to hold it up. I normally do when we talk about it. It is something in which Democrats and Republicans agree to get America back on top; this is what we need to do. Part of this and the recommendations of the national defense strategy made up of top Democratic and Republican leaders in the field of defending America—they are all in agreement that we can't renege on the commitments that we have made on these arms sales.

I recall that the top NDS priority is competing with Russia and China. That

is one of the things that happened during the last administration. All of a sudden we find we have peer competitors. We have China and Russia doing things right now where they actually are exhibiting better equipment and better resources than we are. So we have to stand by our partners.

Make no mistake about it. If something happens and they can't rely on us for their defensive needs, they are going to go someplace else. Where will they go? Will they go to Russia? Will they go to China? I can assure you, the main thing that people overlook is they are going to get the arms from someplace. They will either get them from us or they will get them from Russia and China.

I have to ask my colleagues who support this resolution, do you expect Russia and China to ensure the freedom of navigation in the Middle East against Iranian threats? Will Russia and China lead a coalition to defeat ISIS? No. You know better than that.

Will Russia and China deter Iran from attacking our partners and troops in this region?

I understand that my colleagues have concerns about Saudi Arabia's terrible human rights record. I agree. I am offended by that. This is a different issue altogether. This is an issue of whether we are going to keep our commitment to our allies in that very sensitive region where we need more allies. Or are we going to renege on our commitments to them? Keep in mind, they are going to get them anyway.

I know that some of my colleagues disagree with the administration's recent emergency declaration regarding arms sales to Saudi Arabia, but the leadership has assured me that we will have a vote on Saudi Arabia, so I urge my colleagues to raise their concerns about this at that time. That is the appropriate time to bring this up.

More to the point, I urge them not to punish Bahrain and Qatar inappropriately and not to undermine U.S. national security interests in that region. The bottom line is everyone understands that Bahrain and Qatar are going to get arms anyway. They are going to get them either from us or from those who are our adversaries. That is why this is so important. I strongly urge that we defeat these efforts that are out there right now to try to stop the arms sales that are taking place now.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA AGREEMENT

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, last week I came to the floor to discuss the agriculture economy.

While the broader economy is thriving, our Nation's farmers and ranchers are struggling. A combination of low commodity prices, protracted trade disputes, natural disasters, and weather-related issues have meant a tough few years for farmers. Nationwide, net farm income is about half of what it was in 2013.

One of the biggest things we can do in Washington to help our Nation's farmers and ranchers is to negotiate favorable trade deals that expand existing and open new foreign markets for American agricultural products. That is why I have been pushing for a speedy conclusion to the various trade agreements that our country is currently negotiating.

I strongly support the effort the administration has been making to secure more favorable export markets for American products. We have made real progress in negotiations. Now we need to wrap up the various agreements we are discussing as soon as possible so that we can get farmers and ranchers certainty about what international markets are going to look like.

Of course, there is one agreement that has already been wrapped up—the United States-Mexico-Canada Free Trade Agreement. This is a hugely important agreement that will boost almost every sector of the American economy, from automotive manufacturing to digital services, to dairy farming. It will create 176,000 new jobs and increase wages for workers.

Passing this agreement is a big priority for the ag industry. Mexico and Canada are huge importers of American agricultural products. The United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement will preserve and expand American farmers' access to these key markets.

More than 950 food and agriculture companies and groups sent a letter to Congress, urging its passage. In my home State of South Dakota, Mexico and Canada are the No. 1 and No. 2 customers for our agriculture exports. Maintaining and expanding South Dakota farmers' access to these markets are critical.

I am particularly pleased with the improvement that the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement makes for U.S. dairy producers. Dairy is an important and rapidly growing industry in South Dakota. If you drive the I-29 corridor north of Brookings, you can see firsthand the massive dairy expansion that we have experienced in South Dakota over the past few years.

The United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement will preserve the U.S. dairy farmers' role as a key dairy supplier to Mexico, and it will substantially expand market access in Canada, where U.S. dairy sales have been restricted.

The U.S. International Trade Commission estimates the agreement will boost U.S. dairy exports by more than \$277 million.

The United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement also makes targeted improvements for U.S. poultry, egg, and wheat producers. Wheat is another important South Dakota product, and I look forward to the boost this agreement will give South Dakota wheat growers.

As I said earlier, one of the most important things we can do to help the struggling agriculture economy is to negotiate favorable trade agreements

for U.S. producers and open new markets for American agricultural products. The U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement is ready to go, and Republicans in Congress are ready to pass it. Now Speaker PELOSI needs to indicate her willingness to take up this agreement in the near future.

This agreement will provide certainty for American producers and expand market access for a vast array of American goods and services. It is a win for our economy and a win for American workers. We should pass this agreement as soon as possible.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, I wanted to speak today about the proposed disapproval of arms sales to our Gulf partners, Bahrain and Qatar. Last month, the administration notified Congress of its intention to sell Apache helicopters to Qatar. Those helicopters will help with security and counterterrorism patrols, especially ahead of the 2020 World Cup, which, of course, will be a prime target for terrorists.

We are also scheduled to sell air-defense missiles to Bahrain, where we have more than 8,500 Americans stationed in Manama at U.S. Naval Forces Central Command and the Fifth Fleet. These sales would also yield more than \$3 billion for America, while making Americans safer overseas—what you might call a win-win. By contrast, rejecting these arms sales in a fit of pique would endanger Americans and weaken American influence in the Persian Gulf at precisely the moment when we as a Nation are being severely tested.

Right now, the Iranian regime is engaged in a bloody campaign of terror, testing our resolve. Earlier this week, Iran's proxy on the Arabian Peninsula, the Houthi rebels in Yemen, launched a missile attack on a civilian airport in Saudi Arabia, wounding more than two dozen civilians, including women and children. Where did the Houthis get that missile? Yemen isn't known for its defense-industrial base. That missile came from Iran, as surely as if it were launched from Iranian soil itself.

In recent weeks, four oil tankers near the Strait of Hormuz, flying the flags of our allies and partners—Norway, Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Emirates—were attacked with explosives, in effect, terrorizing all traffic through that strategic chokepoint. Public reports indicate that the Iranians perpetrated these attacks. Let's just say I am confident it wasn't the Swedes settling old grudges against their Nordic rival.

Just this morning, hours ago, two tankers were attacked in the Gulf of Oman, with early indications that the damage is consistent with a torpedo or other projectile. While the attack hasn't been attributed yet, I think it is a safe bet that it wasn't the Omanis.

Let's not be naive about what is happening in the Middle East. As Iran's

economy staggers under the weight of new American sanctions, the ayatollahs are lashing out and raging against the world. It is essential that we support our Gulf partners during this dangerous time so they can defend themselves from Iranian aggression and its proxies.

Besides, the arms we sell to Qatar and Bahrain will also protect all those Americans and their families in Bahrain and Qatar.

But instead of helping Qatar and Bahrain to confront a common adversary, some of my colleagues want to hang them out to dry. If we snub our Gulf partners today, though, there will be consequences. Our joint efforts to fight terrorist financing could suffer. Our pressure campaign against Iran could also be jeopardized. If we back away from our partners now, their security needs will not disappear. There will just be adversaries swooping in to support them.

Qatar is already considering a major arms deal with Russia. Both Qatar and Bahrain are involved in China's Belt and Road Initiative, an attempt by the Chinese Communist Party to build a world order with itself at the top. So what we are debating today isn't only whether to help or hurt our Gulf partners. It is also whether to push them further into the Chinese and Russian spheres of influence.

I understand that a few of my colleagues have qualms about some of the countries with whom America must work as a matter of necessity to protect our security and our interests, but that is no excuse for rash actions that would weaken American influence, threaten Americans overseas, and embolden our adversaries in Tehran, Beijing, and Moscow.

Make no mistake. The ayatollahs, Vladimir Putin, and Xi Jinping are watching these votes. For those of you who are undecided, I suggest you consider how those men would want you to vote.

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

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 7 minutes.

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I rise in support of the motion to discharge Senator PAUL's joint resolution, S.J. Res. 20, from the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in the hopes of having an urgently needed discussion about these sales.

Over the past 2 weeks, Congress's legally mandated role in the arms sales process has recently garnered a lot of

attention among the Members of the body and the American people. Reviewing and approving arms sales across the world is a core function of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. It is an integral exercise of congressional oversight of the executive branch, and it is legally mandated.

So as we consider Senator PAUL's resolution today regarding arms sales to Qatar and Bahrain, I would first like to make a few points of clarification.

First, the resolutions of disapproval before us today are completely unrelated to the administration's bogus "emergency" notification of the 22 sales to Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates, as well as the 22 resolutions I filed with a bipartisan group of Senators in objection to them.

Second, the resolutions before us today have already gone through the regular committee process. As is normal procedure, the administration notified us of these sales. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee then conducted our due diligence, after which we, in fact, agreed with the administration that these sales should go forward.

However, I do support the Senator from Kentucky's right to seek full consideration of them by the Senate. Given the administration's decision last month to completely flout congressional review over arms sales, I am supporting this motion in order to once again emphasize the importance of congressional oversight and due diligence.

With that in mind, I appreciate Senator PAUL's—as well as Senator GRAMM's, Senator YOUNG's, and Senator LEE's—cosponsorship of my 22 resolutions of disapproval regarding the administration's so-called emergency arms sales to Saudi Arabia and the UAE.

I am glad to know I am not the only one in this body disturbed by the President's willingness to bypass Congress and sell this weaponry without any consideration of the recent events that have strained our relationship with Saudi Arabia, and I certainly look forward to a more robust debate and vote on those sales next week.

But let me start by saying that I placed holds on specific sales to Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates over serious, credible concerns that these weapons were being used to target civilians. Through the regular review process, I sought answers from the State Department about how these sales were promoting our interests and what steps we were taking to get guarantees from the Saudis and the Emiratis that these weapons were being used in a way consistent with our interests, with international humanitarian law, and with respect to human rights.

After the brutal murder of Jamal Khashoggi, the Department of State ceased engaging with me on these questions and did not respond to inquiries

about how these sales were furthering U.S. interests or about our relationship with Saudi Arabia. This is unacceptable. They could have engaged. They chose not to.

The bottom line is that we are a co-equal branch of government, and we cannot stay silent when any administration attempts to override or circumvent legally mandated oversight by Congress.

The United States sells a significant amount of weapons to Gulf countries, but given the rhetoric and behavior coming out of the administration, the last thing we should be doing is weakening our scrutiny over arms sales.

Let's remember why we pursue these sales in the first place. Arms sales are one of our many tools to promote American foreign policy and military objectives. We use arms sales to bring like-minded countries in line with our goals and to promote interoperability with American defense systems.

As the ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I have always been diligent in reviewing every arms sale proposed by this administration, including these sales to Bahrain and Qatar. Through our standard process, I reviewed and cleared these sales for consideration by the Senate as part of our normal statutory procedures.

Now, let me turn to the particular sale to Bahrain, which I believe is in our interest at this moment. Make no mistake. I have serious concern about Bahrain's human rights record—concerns I have made clear to the Bahrain Government and to the State Department. I will be the first to say that Bahrain does not have a blank check for weapons systems from the United States. However, I am mindful that Bahrain hosts the U.S. Navy's Fifth Fleet. This package of upgraded F-16s and related munitions will help Bahrain effectively defend its territory, including U.S. Naval facilities, as well as participate in multinational efforts like the former coalition against ISIS in Syria.

Now, regarding the other resolution concerning Qatar, I note that Qatar has requested additional attack helicopters to fill its operational requirements, including enhancing their long-term defensive and offensive capability and the ability to protect key oil and gas infrastructure and platforms important to the United States and Western economic interests. Qatar faces threats from everywhere, not the least of which is Saudi Arabia and the UAE.

Finally, I would note that Qatar continues to host U.S. Armed Forces at Al Udeid Air Base, providing critical support to U.S. national security capabilities in the region.

So while I support the Senator from Kentucky's rights to have these resolutions considered, it is for these reasons that I will ultimately support the sale to Qatar and Bahrain, as will most of my colleagues.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

MOTION TO DISCHARGE—S.J. RES. 20 AND S.J. RES. 26

Mr. PAUL. Under the previous order, and pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act of 1976, I move to discharge the Foreign Relations Committee from further consideration of S.J. Res. 20 and S.J. Res. 26, relating to the disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the Governments of Bahrain and Qatar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motions are now pending and will be debated concurrently until the hour of 11:30 a.m., with 7 minutes each reserved for the chairman and the ranking member.

Mr. PAUL. Madam President, the Middle East is a hot caldron, continuing and continually threatening to boil over. I think it is a mistake to funnel arms into these century-old conflicts.

There is no great certainty that the arms we send into the Middle East aren't one day used against our own soldiers. In fact, there is a real threat that someday our young soldiers will be sent to fight against the very weapons we send to these so-called allies.

It has happened. In Iran, to this day, they still have some U.S. weapons that are left over from the weapons the United States supplied the Shah. In Iraq, some of the weapons we gave them to fight Iran were still there when we returned to fight Saddam Hussein. In Afghanistan, some of the weapons we gave to the mujahedin to fight the Russians were still there when we returned to fight the Taliban. These weapons have a life of their own. It is not certain that they will not be used against us and often have been. Proliferating arms in the midst of chaos is a recipe for disaster.

It is hard to argue that sending arms into Libya and Syria has, in any way, advanced liberty. Dreamers often longingly speak of a peace plan for the Middle East. Maybe we should consider a peace plan that doesn't include dumping more arms into a region aflame with civil unrest, civil war, and anarchy.

The argument goes that we must arm anyone who is not Iran. We are told that, because of Iran's threat, the United States must accept selling arms to anyone who opposes Iran, even bone saw-wielding countries brazen enough to kill a dissident in a foreign consulate.

It doesn't matter how you act, how you behave, or whom you kill, we will still give you arms. What would happen if we just said no? What would happen if we simply conditioned arms sales on behavior? Are the Saudis so weak that Iran will run over them and run over the whole Middle East without our arms? Of course not.

The Saudis now spend more on their military than the Russians. The Saudis have the third largest amount of military spending in the world, only behind the United States and China. Saudi is No. 3. Saudi Arabia is spending the