

such as combatting the opioid crisis, improving healthcare for veterans, and building rural infrastructure. We must extend the FISA program and shore up pensions for over 1 million Americans. We still need to reauthorize CHIP and end the sabotage of our healthcare markets. We have had a bipartisan deal on a stabilization package for months now. It is a product that should have been easy to include in the end-year deal. After all, it is the product of bipartisan negotiations between Chairman ALEXANDER and Ranking Member MURRAY, two of our most effective Senators. But now, because the Republicans are repealing the individual mandate in their tax bill, the Alexander-Murray deal will not have its intended effect. Even worse, Speaker RYAN has just said the agreement will not pass the House unless the Hyde language is attached to it—another eleventh hour partisan demand on a bill that has already been negotiated in the Senate. What should have been an easy addition to the year-end package is getting more difficult by the hour because of Republican demands.

We still need to pass disaster supplemental funding to aid storm-stricken parts of our country—California, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, as well as Texas, Louisiana, and Florida. The disaster supplemental bill coming out of the House, while it has much better funding levels than the administration's proposal, still does not treat Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands fairly. It does not provide for cost-sharing waivers, and it doesn't include enough funding for resiliency, mitigation, Medicaid, or drinking water infrastructure. It is a step in the right direction but not good enough.

I would reiterate my plea. Texas and the Texas delegation have constantly criticized government funding. All of a sudden, now that there is a disaster, they want money. Fine. Yet what about that \$10 billion rainy day fund? Let Texas spend that. I guarantee you that if it were in a blue State, some of our friends from Texas would be calling for it—the very same people who opposed aid to Sandy, the very same people who have relished putting State and local deductibility in the bill. Well, what is good for the goose is good for the gander. Let Texas dip into its \$10 billion fund before it gets FEMA money. That is what seems fair and right, particularly for those who don't want to see Federal Government spending increase.

Of course, last, but certainly not least, we still need to protect the Dreamers—young people brought into this country through no fault of their own, many of them who know no other country but ours. These are people who are in our Armed Forces—over 800—who are going to our schools, who are working in our factories and offices and stores. They, like everybody else—like our ancestors—want to be Americans. They contribute to America. They help America.

Yet there are people on the other side of the aisle who have this nasty immigration attitude that affects the Dreamers and everybody else. It is so un-American. It is so against the statue with the torch in the harbor in the city in which I live. It is so against what the American people believe. Eighty percent want to help the Dreamers. Yet we are stymied so far, and 1,000 Dreamers are losing their status each week.

On all of these things, the time to act is now. Bipartisan negotiations continue to seek a compromise to ensure DACA protections as well as to provide additional border security. We Democrats are all for that—real border security that makes a difference. We should strive to reach a deal as soon as is humanly possible.

If we are not able to reach a global deal by this Friday on these many issues, there will be a temptation to do a short-term funding bill with some of these items but not others. That won't work. We should be doing all of these things together instead of in a piecemeal, week-by-week fashion. Our Republican friends cannot pick and choose what they want and do what they did on the tax bill and do what they did on the healthcare bill in saying that Democrats are not welcome to be part of the deal—because this one ain't under reconciliation.

We want to work in a bipartisan way, but a bipartisan way means just that, not Republicans deciding on their own and telling us that we should just be for it. The best way to get a good, bipartisan result, which by the Senate rules is necessary for spending bills, is for us to work together.

TAX CUTS AND JOBS BILL

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I will have further comments on the tax bill that I will deliver on the Senate floor late tonight after the conference report, but I just want to say that this bill will be an anchor around the ankles of every Republican. It so helps the wealthy and the powerful corporations, and it does so little and even hurts many in the middle class. It is a loser.

In a CNN new poll, a majority of Americans oppose the tax bill. When did you ever hear that Americans are against a tax cut bill? Well, you are hearing it now.

It is because our Republican friends are listening to the thousands of really greedy multibillionaires who want their taxes cut, even though they are doing great, and don't want to share those benefits with the middle class even if they make millions of middle-class people pay more.

The Republicans will rue the day that they passed this tax bill—will rue the day—because it is so unfair to the middle class. It so blows a hole in our deficit. It so threatens Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. They will rue the day.

SPECIAL COUNSEL MUELLER

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, we have a lot of business to get to this week, but because the topic is so important, I would like to address Special Counsel Mueller's investigation into Russian interference in our elections and the Trump campaign's potential involvement.

Over the past several months, the investigation and the FBI have been the target of a smear campaign by Republicans, in the media primarily—in a media outlet that is hardly regarded as down the middle, in a media outlet that just seems to ask "how high" when President Trump says to jump.

Now it has been joined, quite naturally, by several Republicans here in Congress. Their intent is not to push back on the special counsel's findings or to introduce exculpatory evidence on behalf of Manafort, Gates, Papadopoulos, or Flynn, who have been indicted or convicted. Their intent is not to make an argument about the substance of the investigation at all. Their intent is to discredit the investigator and the investigation itself, by falsely painting it as biased or partisan. That way, whatever its findings are at the end of the day, they have created a permission structure to dismiss them.

When you are afraid of the result, you attack the process. When you are afraid of the message, you shoot the messenger. That is what is happening right now with the escalating rhetoric in the rightwing echo media chambers. The commentators at FOX News have actually called Mr. Mueller's investigation a coup—an outrageous charge that has been repeated by a Republican Congressman on the floor of the House. That is how overblown this rhetoric has gotten.

Mr. Mueller is one of the most trusted and respected public servants in America. He has served administrations of both parties. He was first appointed by a Republican and was installed as a special counsel by President Trump's pick for Deputy Attorney General, Republican Rod Rosenstein. As everyone in America knows, he is as straight a shooter as one comes. Impugning his motives and calling his investigation a witch hunt or a coup is, frankly, hysterical.

I regret even repeating those ridiculous comments because there is not a shred of evidence to back them up—not a shred. If any of these critics had evidence, they would pursue their claims in court, but, of course, there is no evidence. So, instead, they wage a warped campaign in the press, fueled by an avalanche of trumped-up allegations and disinformation.

What are they so afraid of?

We all know why. The special counsel's investigation is an important one for our democracy. We have to get to the bottom of what happened in last year's election no matter who ends up on the short end of the stick when those results are announced: How was

Russia able to wage a successful information campaign to influence our election? To what extent were any members of Trump's Presidential campaign coordinating with that foreign attack on our democracy for political benefit?

These are vital questions that every American should know, and it is an outright disgrace that our Republican colleagues have not joined in in asking for this—so many of them—being as partisan as can be and putting their party over country. If Russia continues in these types of investigations, woe is America—woe is America.

Rather than this concerted campaign to sully the investigation and the FBI, President Trump and his allies should be encouraging them to do their job, to do it right, and to do it thoroughly. The stakes are too high and the topic too serious.

I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Jennifer Gillian Newstead, of New York, to be Legal Adviser of the Department of State.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays, and I yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, all time is yielded back.

Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Newstead nomination?

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 88, nays 11, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 320 Ex.]

YEAS—88

Alexander	Burr	Coons
Baldwin	Cantwell	Corker
Barrasso	Capito	Cornyn
Bennet	Cardin	Cortez Masto
Blumenthal	Carper	Cotton
Blunt	Casey	Crapo
Booker	Cassidy	Cruz
Boozman	Cochran	Daines
Brown	Collins	Donnelly

Duckworth	King	Rubio
Durbin	Klobuchar	Sasse
Enzi	Lankford	Schumer
Ernst	Leahy	Scott
Feinstein	Lee	Shaheen
Fischer	Manchin	Shelby
Flake	McCaskill	Stabenow
Gardner	McConnell	Strange
Graham	Menendez	Sullivan
Grassley	Moran	Tester
Hassan	Murkowski	Thune
Hatch	Murphy	Tillis
Heitkamp	Murray	Toomey
Heller	Nelson	Udall
Hirono	Perdue	Van Hollen
Hoeven	Peters	Warner
Inhofe	Portman	Whitehouse
Isakson	Reed	Wicker
Johnson	Risch	Young
Kaine	Roberts	
Kennedy	Rounds	

NAYS—11

Franken	Markey	Schatz
Gillibrand	Merkley	Warren
Harris	Paul	Wyden
Heinrich	Sanders	

NOT VOTING—1

McCain

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for up to 5 minutes.

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

REPUBLICAN TAX BILL

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, there are many reasons to vote against the tax bill. A new one has come to light in examining these 1,100 pages, and that is with regard to Puerto Rico and what it does to Puerto Rico.

It ought to be enough that \$1.5 trillion is borrowed in order to finance a huge tax cut for multinational corporations, with incentives to send American jobs overseas. That ought to be enough, and it ought to be enough that compared to that, there are just crumbs for the hard-working, middle-class families, but there is more.

In this tax bill, indeed, CBO has said that 13 million people will lose health insurance as a result of something that was done to the Affordable Care Act.

Now, if all of that were not enough, and if you care about the people on the island of Puerto Rico who are reeling from two storms that hit them—a good part of the island still doesn't have electricity and still does not have potable water—and who were already in economic straits to begin with and wanting to keep jobs on the island so people don't have to flee—lo and behold, in the tax bill, what is given to American mainlanders is an increase in the child tax credit from \$1,000 to \$2,000 per child and making that refundable for low-income people up to \$1,400 per child—that increase to help poor, working families with children was not given to Puerto Rico.

That doesn't make sense, and it is just another reason why we should vote against the tax bill.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:52 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein, equally divided, until 3 p.m.

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

Mr. INHOFE. I also ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Virginia, I be recognized for such time as I may consume.

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

The Senator from Virginia.

REPUBLICAN TAX BILL

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I thank my colleague, the Senator from Oklahoma.

I rise to talk about the tax debate that the Senate is currently having. I wish to highlight some of the reasons why I think this bill is bad and, frankly, focus on the missed opportunity that we are about to embark on when we could have found a much better project.

Let me tell you a story from when I was mayor. I was mayor of Richmond. I know my colleague from Oklahoma was mayor as well. I had a city council colleague who introduced a seemingly benign bill. It was a bill to limit the number of dogs and cats that anybody could have at their residence.

Now, pursuant to the city rules, we had to post this resolution in the newspaper for a couple of weeks so that citizens could read it, and we had a public hearing where any citizen who wanted to speak for or against the resolution had the opportunity to do so. Then, the city council members debated, and then we had a vote. It turned out to be a little more controversial than the council member originally contemplated.

When I was mayor, the minor little debate in the Richmond City Council about the number of pets you could have at your residence received more openness and transparency and discussion and debate than the vote that we