

demonstrate that ATDs work and save money.

People are frightened, and they are returning to the shadows. It is weakening the safety of our communities, and it is an affront to the ideals of the United States. I will not support funding which further endangers the lives of immigrants who have every right to remain in this country and those fleeing violence and seeking shelter in our country. Those of us in positions of power have an obligation to stand up for all people and stand against abuses especially at the hands of our government. Instead of rubberstamping additional funding, I will continue to do this and hold this administration accountable. Thank you.

FOREIGN ELECTION INTERFERENCE

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I want to discuss Russia's sustained campaign of attacks on our democracy and how the President's inability to take these threats seriously harms our national security and the integrity of our elections.

In the run up to his meeting with Russian President Vladimir Putin this week at the G20 Summit, the President showed no signs that he planned to warn Russia against interfering in our democratic elections in 2020. In press interviews, he said that he "may" ask Putin not interfere in 2020 and told another group of reporters, "I will have a very good conversation with him . . . what I say is none of your business."

Following today's meeting with Putin, an autocrat who continues to conduct hybrid warfare operations against our democracy, President Trump made light of this threat in a joking manner. In response to a reporter's question, he apparently grinned as he told Putin, "don't meddle in our election."

This is not a joke. This is about deterring the Kremlin from continuing to attack our democracy. He should be using every tool at his disposal to direct a whole of government and whole of society effort to counter these attacks, not emboldening Putin to escalate his aggression. It is exactly the business of the American people to know that our elections are free from interference and that we can trust the President of the United States to deliver tough messages to deter foreign adversaries.

Relatedly the President can't seem to grasp what's wrong with accepting "dirt" on his political opponents from foreign adversaries. In a recent interview with ABC News, the President made it clear that he sees nothing wrong with compromising our national security if it advances his own political interests. When asked if his campaign would accept information on his opponents from Russia, China, or other countries during the 2020 campaign, the President responded: "I think you might want to listen . . . there's nothing wrong with listening."

He denied that this type of assistance from a foreign adversary was interference, adding: "They have information. I think I'd take it." It was only after being heavily criticized that President Trump reversed course, telling Fox and Friends "Of course, you give it to the FBI or report it to the attorney general or somebody like that . . . You couldn't have that happen in our country." But, of course, it already happened. President Trump's inability or unwillingness to recognize it is both completely wrong-headed and dangerous.

The President's response belies the undeniable fact that Russia attacked our democracy in the 2016 election with an information warfare campaign, and tried to do it again in the 2018 midterms.

Trump initially made Russia's interference sound like run of the mill, opposition research—"oppo research" he called it—and claimed everyone does it, but this is not about politics as usual. This is about Russia advancing its strategic interests and using tools from its hybrid arsenal, including information warfare and malign influence operation, to do so. Russia seeks to inject itself into our political process to achieve its goals of promoting the candidates favorable to Russia and discrediting those that are not, weakening the American public's faith in the integrity of democracy, and undermining the United States' standing globally.

President Trump's failure to grasp that there is a problem with someone in his high office—or any candidate for public office for that matter—accepting dirt on political opponents from a foreign government or national is troubling on many levels, but importantly, it harms our national security. It undermines our ability as a nation to counter Russia and other adversaries and our ability to protect our elections. The President should be leading a comprehensive, meaningful approach to deter Russia and others who seek to target our democracy. Instead, he is announcing to the world that our elections are open to manipulation.

Some would have you believe that, with the release of the Mueller report, the case of Russian interference in the 2016 election is closed, that our work is done, and that Congress can stop caring about the attack on our democracy and the integrity of our political system. The White House, the Attorney General, and congressional Republican leaders are sending a coordinated message that there is nothing to see here, folks.

But no matter how they try, we can't forget that Russia attacked our democracy in 2016, that Russia tried to do it again in 2018, and that it continues to deploy hybrid operations against us, our allies, and our partners. Just recently, a report issued by the European Union concluded that Russia conducted "continued and sustained" information warfare campaigns against the EU Par-

liamentary elections this spring. We must continue to work to highlight these types of findings including those made by the special counsel and their implications going forward. As Special Counsel Mueller's powerful press statement from his investigation underscored: "there were multiple, systematic efforts to interfere in our election." Mueller added, "And that allegation deserves the attention of every American."

The special counsel's report and related indictments described these operations in great detail. Let's look specifically at key aspects of the Russian information warfare campaign that the report laid out.

First, Mueller makes clear that Kremlin-linked operators sought to help the candidate the Kremlin favored and whose election would serve Russia's interests. The report describes how "A Russian entity carried out a social media campaign that favored presidential candidate Donald J. Trump and disparaged presidential candidate Hillary Clinton." It also found that "[a]s early as 2014, the [Kremlin-linked Internet Research Agency] instructed its employees to target U.S. persons who could be used to advance its operational goals."

Second, Mueller describes in detail the Russian spying operation to steal "dirt" on the opposition candidate and then use that stolen information against her. The report states unequivocally, "[a] Russian intelligence service conducted computer intrusion operations against entities, employees and volunteers working on the Clinton Campaign and then released stolen documents."

Third, the Mueller established multiple contacts by Russian Government officials or their proxies with the Trump campaign to establish relationships. The report states: "[t]he investigation also established numerous links between the Russian government and the Trump campaign."

Finally, the Mueller report definitively concludes that Russia saw its interests as aligned with and served by a Trump Presidency, that Russia conducted a campaign to interfere in the 2016 election for the purpose of helping the Trump campaign, and that the Trump campaign hoped to benefit from the fruits of that foreign election interference. Ultimately, however, the Mueller investigation could not prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the Trump campaign or its associates conspired with the Russian Government in its election interference.

As the report states: "[a]lthough the investigation established that the Russian government perceived it would benefit from a Trump presidency and worked to secure that outcome, and that the Campaign expected it would benefit electorally from information stolen and released through Russian efforts, the investigation did not establish that members of the Trump Campaign conspired or coordinated with

the Russian government in its election interference activities.”

As the special counsel’s report details, Trump did not shy away and, in fact, sought to benefit from help from Russia in the 2016 election. Trump campaign associates, including his son, son-in law, and campaign manager, met with Russian agents to hear potential dirt about Secretary Clinton, which was presented to the Donald Trump, Jr. as “part of Russia and its government’s support for Mr. Trump.” Even in hindsight, Trump said he most likely wouldn’t have contacted the FBI about that meeting, telling ABC News, “I have seen a lot of things over my life. I don’t think in my whole life I’ve ever called the FBI. In my whole life. You don’t call the FBI.”

Think about that statement for a moment. Here is the President of the United States, who has taken an oath to faithfully execute the laws of the United States, declaring that people should not go to law enforcement with evidence of foreign interference in our political process.

But, of course, candidate Trump went further than simply not reporting foreign attempts to influence our elections. The special counsel detailed how Trump embraced the support of a foreign adversary by calling on Russia to hack his political opponent and disseminate the stolen information. On July 27, 2016, Trump announced publicly during a press conference, “Russia, if you are listening, I hope you’re able to find the 30,000 emails that are missing. I think you will be rewarded mightily by our press.” The Mueller report confirmed that a Russian military intelligence unit, commonly referred to as the GRU, tried to assist Trump with those efforts, finding, “within approximately five hours of Trump’s statement, GRU officers targeted for the first time Clinton’s personal office.”

The special counsel also detailed how the Trump campaign “showed interest in WikiLeaks’s releases of documents and welcomed their potential to damage candidate Clinton.” Furthermore, the Trump campaign continued to promote WikiLeaks after it was apparent that WikiLeaks was being used by the GRU to disseminate information stolen by the Russians. On October 7, 2016, the Department of Homeland Security and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence issued a joint statement naming the WikiLeaks disclosures as “consistent with the Russian-directed efforts” to influence public opinion. If not prior to the release of that joint statement, certainly by that point the President and his campaign should have known better. Instead of calling the FBI, the Trump campaign strategized how to benefit from Russia’s stolen information. The Mueller report states: “by the late summer of 2016, the Trump Campaign was planning a press strategy, a communications campaign, and messaging based on the possible release of Clinton

emails by WikiLeaks.” A related indictment from the special counsel detailed how the Trump campaign applauded WikiLeaks’s release of John Podesta’s emails starting on October 7, 2016. In the last month of the campaign alone, the President publicly boasted of his love of WikiLeaks at least 124 times.

As I mentioned, the special counsel did not find sufficient evidence to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the Trump campaign’s embracing of the benefits of Kremlin or Kremlin-linked operations constituted a crime. But is it okay for a candidate to get elected President, or elected to any public office, by capitalizing on information stolen by a foreign adversary? Will that be acceptable the next time around? Will foreign information warfare campaigns targeting our elections be accepted as normal from now on?

Based on his public remarks, it certainly seems acceptable to President Trump and his defenders. This is not theoretical. It happened in 2016. Now the President put it out there that he would meet with foreign adversaries again in the 2020 campaign to hear what information they have on his opponents. He is emboldened to do it again. While, as I mentioned, he later changed his position, it still leaves room for doubt about his true intentions and invites our adversaries to try and compromise our election. Trump publicly undermined his own FBI Director, Christopher Wray, who testified in front of the Senate that, “If any public official or member of any campaign is contacted by any nation-state or anybody acting on behalf of a nation-state about influencing or interfering with our election, then that’s something that the FBI would want to know about it.”

When asked about Wray’s testimony, President Trump bluntly said “The FBI Director is wrong.” Trump’s statements were so disturbing that the FEC Commissioner responded by saying “Let me make something 100% clear to the American public and anyone running for public office: It is illegal for any person to solicit, accept, or receive anything of value from a foreign national in connection with a U.S. election. This is not a novel concept.”

The President’s actions also clearly aided ongoing Russian information warfare operations. This is not the standard of conduct and the public trust that goes with political office. The willingness to embrace a foreign adversary in this fashion is unpatriotic and defies the basic norms of this Nation.

The Trump campaign’s series of foreign contacts in the 2016 election and the President’s continued willingness to accept assistance from a foreign government make it clear that Congress must act to prevent future interference efforts. That is why I am a co-sponsor of the Foreign Influence Reporting in Elections Act, or FIRE Act, introduced by Senator WARNER. The

FIRE Act would require all campaign officials to report, within 1 week, any contacts with foreign nationals attempting to make campaign donations or otherwise collaborate with the campaign to the Federal Election Commission. The FEC would in turn have to notify the FBI within 1 week. It is in all our interest to ensure that we can defend against foreign attacks on our democratic institutions and reporting these kinds of contacts to the appropriate authorities is our first line of defense. I am disappointed that my Republican colleagues blocked Senator WARNER’s attempt to pass the FIRE Act, even after many of them insisted that politicians should contact the FBI if ever contacted or offered help by a foreign government.

This is not a Democratic or a Republican issue. This is an issue of our national security and the integrity of our free and fair elections. Russia exploited vulnerabilities in our open society to advance its own interests and the Russian tactics were encouraged and amplified by a candidate who was seeking our nation’s highest office. We have every indication that the Russians are poised to do it again, and the President has shown time and again—including today for the world to see—that he doesn’t see anything wrong with foreign interference if it works to his advantage.

We cannot let this moment pass without speaking up for the integrity of our democracy and our values. Congress, as a body, and we, as a country, must speak out and say this is not acceptable. It is not acceptable for our candidates for political office to seek to engage with our adversaries or foreign authoritarian regimes to advance their political campaigns. It is not acceptable to meet with foreign agents about getting stolen information on your opponents, information acquired by foreign espionage. This is a violation of the public trust that is inherent in any political office and which any candidate for public office must uphold to be worthy of the American people’s support. I urge my colleagues to speak out in condemning this conduct for the sake of our democracy and to preserve the American people’s faith in the integrity of our electoral system.

TREATY DOCUMENT 111-8

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, due to my concerns related to violations of the Fourth Amendment, I will object to any unanimous consent request, motion, or waiver of any rule in relation to Treaty Doc. 111-8.

I cannot support action that provides for the bulk collection of the financial records of U.S. citizens. The benefits of the treaty agreement should not come at the grave expense of endangering regular foreign investment and violating the constitutionally protected right of every American to be free from unreasonable suspicionless searches.