

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 the-

ater. 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—bi-partisan 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.