

week, the Senate is going to move forward. The Appropriations Committee will vote again. I hope Democrats in the House of Representatives will finally realize “the resistance” doesn’t pay the bills. No more political posturing, no more automatic knee-jerk opposition to absolutely everything the administration asks for—it is way past time for action.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, let me express my appreciation to the majority leader for highlighting this crisis at the border. There is no State more directly impacted in our United States than the State of Texas.

We, obviously, share 1,200 miles of common border with Mexico, and this is a humanitarian crisis. As the majority leader said, not only the New York Times editorial page, but Barack Obama in 2014 called far fewer numbers than are coming across today a humanitarian and security crisis then, and it has gotten nothing but worse.

I appreciate the leader’s bringing this to a head and holding Members accountable. We know that people talk a good game sometimes, but there is nowhere to hide when it comes to an up-or-down vote on this emergency appropriations bill.

I would add that there are other measures taking place. The chairman of the Judiciary Committee, as the Presiding Officer knows, is working on a bill that would address the underlying asylum laws, which are being exploited by the human smugglers who are getting rich moving people across Mexico from Central America into the United States and charging them between \$5,000 and \$10,000 a head—sometimes more. It has been the unwillingness of the Democrats to engage on that underlying asylum law and a fix there that has precipitated or contributed to this humanitarian crisis.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Will the Senator from Texas yield for a question?

Mr. CORNYN. I will.

Mr. MCCONNELL. As a member of the Judiciary Committee involved in this, is there any indication there might be bipartisan support for authorizing this legislation that you all are working on in committee?

Mr. CORNYN. We hope to see. And we will see one way or the other when we vote on this legislation next week.

I am happy to say that my Democratic colleague HENRY CUELLAR from Laredo, TX, which is more directly impacted probably than any place on the border, joined me in one proposal we call the HUMANE Act, which would deal with this underlying asylum issue.

We have been working with the chairman, Senator GRAHAM, to come up with a consensus piece of legislation that will really plug the dike that has been breached now, which has caused this humanitarian crisis.

There are a number of ways we can deal with this.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I would say to my friend that the answer here is not just

the money but an actual adjustment of U.S. law to more directly affect the crisis that we have. We need to do both, correct?

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I agree with the majority leader. We do need to do both.

I would also add, for those who were disturbed by the President’s invocation of his tariff authority to try to bring the Mexican Government to the table to negotiate some changes in the way the Mexican Government deals with this flow of Central Americans coming across its country, none of that would have been necessary if our Democratic colleagues had simply worked with us both on the underlying legislation and on this appropriations bill.

Frankly, the President was put in a corner, and there was not much else he could do. I am grateful he was able to get a result. Only time will tell whether those numbers actually go down from the 144,000 last month.

But while the Democrats are sitting on their hands and maybe talking a good game, I am glad to know we at least have leadership in the White House and here in the Senate.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Would it be safe to characterize this as a situation in which we are actually getting more cooperation from the Mexicans than we are from the Democrats in Congress?

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, that is a sad but true statement. It is unbelievable to me that the Mexican Government, under President Lopez Obrador, is doing more than congressional Democrats to try to solve this humanitarian and security crisis, but that is where we are.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I would just add that I hope there is success in the Judiciary Committee to achieve some kind of bipartisan consensus so that we can solve the entire problem, not just the humanitarian crisis.

I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader again for his leadership and for his comments today.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

ELECTIONS

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, last night, President Donald Trump, in an interview with ABC News, said that if he were offered information about an

opponent from a foreign source in the next election, he would take a look at it and might not go to the FBI.

I think you might want to listen. There isn’t anything wrong with listening. If someone called from a country . . . [and said] “we have information on your opponent”—oh, I think I’d want to hear it.

That is shocking, shocking—yet, sadly, is par for the course for this President.

My predecessor, Senator Moynihan, said, “We are defining deviancy down.” No President has defined deviancy down more than Donald Trump, and his remarks last night defined deviancy down to a new low.

To say that it is OK for foreign countries to interfere in our elections, with their motives not being what are in the interests of the American people, is disgraceful, shocking. It is as if the President has learned absolutely nothing from the past 2 years of investigations into Russia’s interference of the 2016 elections. This is precisely how the whole thing started. A foreign power reached out to establish connections with a Presidential campaign by dangling the promise of information about an opponent, and President Trump said he would welcome it. He asked Russia to interfere.

When he wonders why people think there might be collusion, well, this is why. This is a President who says: Russia, come help. That doesn’t prove collusion, but it sure proves that he doesn’t mind foreign powers interfering with an election.

Again, the President’s comments are undemocratic, un-American, and disgraceful. The President’s comments suggest he believes winning an election is more important than the integrity of an election. That idea is flat-out wrong. The President’s idea that winning an election is everything and the integrity of an election is nothing is one small step away from dictators and autocrats, who manipulate the results of an election because they care more about staying in power than they care about democratic principles. Donald Trump seems to fall into that category in which winning is everything and integrity is nothing.

It is simple. When a foreign power tries to give a campaign information on an opponent, that is foreign interference in our elections. It is exactly what the Framers worried about at the very founding of our Republic.

It is up to us in Congress to protect that legacy, the wellspring of democracy—free and fair elections. It is up to all of us in Congress—Democrats and Republicans. When a foreign power interferes in our elections, the Democrats shouldn’t say “If it helps our side, we are OK with it,” and the Republicans shouldn’t say “If it helps our side, we are OK with it.”

Where are the Republicans going to be with this latest step over the line by Donald Trump? Are they going to sit and cower and do nothing?

We have multiple bipartisan elections security bills that are just languishing here in the Senate. We even

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