

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.

Previous tax treaties were more focused on information specific to suspicions of fraud and required serious allegations of tax wrongdoing to be supported by evidence. The new bulk collection provisions, however, demand Americans' records under a vague standard that allows the government to access personal financial information that may be "relevant" through information exchanges between the U.S. and foreign governments. This new, lower, and ambiguous threshold would allow government access to bank records for hardly any reason at all. I do not condone tax cheats, but I cannot support an effort that punishes every American in pursuit of those that have actually broken the law.

Accordingly, I will object to any unanimous consent request, motion, or waiver or any rule in relation to Treaty Doc. 111-8.

TREATY DOCUMENT 112-1

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. 112-1.

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.

Previous tax treaties were more focused on information specific to suspicions of fraud and required serious allegations of tax wrongdoing to be supported by evidence. The new bulk collection provisions, however, demand Americans' records under a vague standard that allows the government to access personal financial information that may be "relevant" through information exchanges between the U.S. and foreign governments. This new, lower, and ambiguous threshold would allow government access to bank records for hardly any reason at all. I do not condone tax cheats, but I cannot support an effort that punishes every American in pursuit of those that have actually broken the law.

Accordingly, I will object to any unanimous consent request, motion, or waiver or any rule in relation to Treaty Doc. 112-1.

TREATY DOCUMENT 113-4

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. 113-4.

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.

Previous tax treaties were more focused on information specific to suspicions of fraud and required serious allegations of tax wrongdoing to be supported by evidence. The new bulk collection provisions, however, demand Americans' records under a vague standard that allows the government to access personal financial information that may be "relevant" through information exchanges between the U.S. and foreign governments. This new, lower, and ambiguous threshold would allow government access to bank records for hardly any reason at all. I do not condone tax cheats, but I cannot support an effort that punishes every American in pursuit of those that have actually broken the law.

Accordingly, I will object to any unanimous consent request, motion, or waiver or any rule in relation to Treaty Doc. 113-4.

TREATY DOCUMENT 114-1

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. 114-1.

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.

Previous tax treaties were more focused on information specific to suspicions of fraud and required serious allegations of tax wrongdoing to be supported by evidence. The new bulk collection provisions, however, demand Americans' records under a vague standard that allows the government to access personal financial information that may be "relevant" through information exchanges between the U.S. and foreign governments. This new, lower, and ambiguous threshold would allow government access to bank records for hardly any reason at all. I do not condone tax cheats, but I cannot support an effort that punishes every American in pursuit of those that have actually broken the law.

Accordingly, I will object to any unanimous consent request, motion, or waiver or any rule in relation to Treaty Doc. 114-1.

REMEMBERING BRUCE EDWARD MCNABB

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the life of Bruce Edward McNabb, a lifelong Montanan and decorated veteran of Vietnam.

While Bruce is no longer with us, his legacy lives on. On behalf of myself,

my fellow Montanans, and my fellow Americans, I would like extend our deepest gratitude for his service to this Nation.

Bruce was born on August 23, 1947, in Butte, MT, to Dallas and Catherine McNabb. His father was a World War II veteran who fought with General George Patton in the Mediterranean theatre. His mother worked for the National Forest Service. In addition to their son, the couple had a daughter, Bruce's younger sister, Kathi.

After graduating from Butte Central High School in 1965, Bruce moved to Seattle, WA, where he worked for Boeing. However, his plans quickly changed at the age of 19 when he received a draft letter from the U.S. Army. He started basic training shortly thereafter.

Bruce served our country in Vietnam from 1967 to 1968. In March of 1968, during a search and clear mission, his unit became heavily engaged with the enemy. In an act of great bravery, Bruce rushed to the aid of his fallen platoon leader, helping him back to safety. Without a moment's pause, he immediately rushed back out and pulled an additional comrade out of harm's way, saving both men's lives.

Upon his return home to Montana, Bruce attended Carroll College in Helena. It was during this time he met the love of his life, Linda Skiles, whom he married on June 30, 1973. Together, they raised two wonderful children, their daughter, Kimberly, a certified patient care technician in Billings, MT, and their son, Rick, a teacher in Beaverton, OR.

Like many Vietnam veterans who returned home from service, Bruce fell victim to the sinister effects of Agent Orange, but he never let it slow him down.

Known by many for his hard work and determination, Bruce led a long career as a store/plans coordinator for Buttrey Food Stores, Super Yalu, and Associated Food Stores. After many years, he started a new career at ExxonMobil, retiring in 2015.

Bruce and his wife Linda were married for almost 46 years before he passed away in November 2018. He was a devoted family man and caring grandfather to his two granddaughters, Mariah and Ashlee.

He was passionate about a number of sports teams, including the Green Bay Packers, Notre Dame, Portland Trail Blazers, the Cubbies, and took great care of his truck "Sweetness."

I now have the profound honor of presenting Bruce with his own set of military honors. For his bravery in the line of duty, Bruce Edward McNabb received the: Bronze Star Medal with bronze oakleaf cluster, Purple Heart Medal, Air Medal, Good Conduct Medal, National Defense Service Medal, Vietnam Service Medal with two Bronze Service Stars, Republic of Vietnam Campaign Ribbon with 1960 Device, Expert Badge with Machine Gun Bar, and Marksman Badge with Rifle Bar.