

to do that is to include meaningful resources in the bill to fund our Federal Government and key programs when we deal with this again before January 19 of next year.

I implore my colleagues to make this a priority, to provide the robust and meaningful funding our communities need to seriously address this problem. We are in the midst of a crisis. We must do more in 2018. We have families all across our Nation with broken hearts tonight for the ones they love and the ones they miss. Let's make sure there are no more in 2018; that this ends today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes and that after I speak, Senator WYDEN be recognized.

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

#### EXTREME RHETORIC

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, 6 months ago, on a beautiful June morning, just a few miles from here in Alexandria, VA, a man with a gun opened fire on me and several of my Republican colleagues.

In the chaotic aftermath of that awful morning, the gunman's purpose slowly became clear. Because of our beliefs and our political affiliation, this individual believed my colleagues and I should die. Since that day, I struggled to understand this thinking. How could any American look onto a field that June morning, where a bunch of middle-aged men were playing baseball, and see the enemy?

Some of the bombastic rhetoric being offered this week in response to the tax reform bill has given me pause. If you listen to some of the hyperbolic vitriol that opponents of this bill are producing, the attitude that nearly killed my friend STEVE SCALISE and threatened many more lives begins to make a perverse kind of sense.

When respectable public figures go on television or take to Twitter and announce that thousands, if not millions, of Americans are going to die as a direct result of the passage of a tax reform bill, what impact do we expect this to have on the thinking of many Americans? If a person takes such outlandish statements as true, attacking Members of Congress in support of the measure almost appears to be a moral action. This could lead someone to believe that killing a few legislators might save the lives of millions of Americans.

Beyond the physical danger of promoting such misinformation, these claims do grave harm to the legislative process. How are we expected to work together to achieve anything if one side's position is viewed as the end of America as we know it? One of my colleagues called this tax reform bill "the worst bill in the history of Congress."

Upon the bill's passage, one media pundit went so far as to encourage

young Americans to flee their country and declared "America died tonight."

Full-throated and passionate debate should always be encouraged. We all love arguing the merits of supply-side economics, but this is not that. This is demonizing of the worst kind. It leaves us all in this body unable to engage in the kind of negotiations and compromise that Congress was created to foster.

To be clear, this is not a problem with one party or of one moment. During the public debate over the Affordable Care Act, Members of my party engaged in similar tactics. I was in the House Chamber when one of my Republican colleagues stood and yelled "You lie" at the President of the United States. The accusation that passage of healthcare reform legislation would result in so-called death panels was promoted far and wide by many Republicans. One conservative commentator suggested the government would begin educating seniors on how to end their own lives.

A Republican legislator claimed that the bill would put seniors in a position of being "put to death by their government." This rhetoric was wrong then, and it is wrong now.

The threat posed to all of us and to the democratic process for giving in to extreme rhetoric is not theoretical. Some of us faced it on that baseball field in Alexandria in June, and all of us have witnessed its corrosive effect on Congress. I urge my colleagues, all of us, let's end this practice where raw politics drowns out the supplications of the better angels of our nature. Let us all be more humble as to our predictive powers when it comes to placing a value on the work we do here. In reality, this legislation will probably not turn out to be as good as the proponents assert, nor as bad as the opponents contend.

The country is watching. It is my hope that we—all of us—can eschew contempt and vitriol in our speech and be more measured in our tone.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

#### RUSSIA INVESTIGATION

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I come to the floor tonight to discuss the Senate's investigation into Russia in the 2016 election. Specifically, I have been reviewing for months documents in the possession of the Senate's Intelligence Committee. I regret to say, the depth of the committee's investigation is completely unsatisfactory into the crucial issues of what I call following the money.

Early in 2017, I began asking the committee leadership to look into any and all financial relationships between Russia and Donald Trump and his associates. In an open hearing the committee held in March, I noted a number of public facts. First, there is an extraordinary history of money laun-

dering in Russia. Billions of dollars from corruption and other illegal activities have been moved out of the country. Second, the President's son said in 2008: "Russians make up a pretty disproportionate cross-section of a lot of our assets." Third, entities associated with the President had already been the subject of millions of dollars of fines for willful, repeated, and longstanding violations of anti-money laundering laws. Fourth, the Congress and the American people still haven't seen the President's tax returns.

Since then, there have been numerous additional press stories about associates of the President and their financial connections to Russia. In my view, these stories require thorough, detailed investigation. It is not just by the press. The special counsel's indictment against former Trump campaign manager Paul Manafort included extensive detailed allegations of laundering of millions of dollars from pro-Russia-Ukrainian interests. This indictment provided a clear example of how a foreign-influenced campaign can be financed through illicit means and why the importance of following the money is so crucial.

There have been others, acknowledged financial connections, such as former National Security Adviser Michael Flynn and his payment from RT, the television station that is part of Russia's state-run propaganda apparatus.

Then there are the strange denials, such as when Jared Kushner wrote in his statement in July, "I have not relied on Russian funds to finance my business activities in the private sector."

I can state, that is some kind of good lawyering because the word "rely" is subjective. Mr. Kushner did not deny financial ties to Russia. He said he hadn't relied on those funds, not whether he had any, not whether he ever had any, but he hadn't relied on them. That is about as lawyerly and subjective a statement as you can imagine.

My bottom line is, these financial ties need to be a central focus of the Intelligence Committee's inquiry. The reason I say this, I want to spell out what the connection here is. Our inquiry covered counterintelligence concerns related to Russia and the election, including any intelligence regarding links between Russia and individuals associated with political campaigns. Following the money is counterintelligence 101.

If you want to compromise somebody, money is one of the best ways to do it. Well, let me repeat that. That is the connection. That is the connection between the counterintelligence work that is so important and part of the committee's charge. That counterintelligence work involves following the money because that is key to really getting into the question of whether somebody's been compromised because one of the best ways to do it is through funds.

Tonight, based on this review of documents, I call again on the committee to follow the money aspects of this inquiry, including by holding public hearings specifically on this topic.

In addition, it is not just the Intelligence Committee that ought to focus on these issues. As I have been saying since March, the Senate Finance Committee, of which I am the ranking Democrat, has a crucial role to play on follow-the-money issues as well. Relevant documents produced by elements of the Treasury Department which are outside the intelligence community, such as the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, ought to be reviewed. There is a need to review these documents by the Finance Committee staff because we have specific experience and expertise in financial investigation.

In addition, the Finance Committee specifically has oversight responsibilities for tax matters. The Manafort indictment, which included tax evasion, demonstrated clearly that taxes, tax evasion, offshore accounts, and suspicious real estate transactions are all connected. They are all connected, and they ought to be part of any serious investigation into ties between Russia, the President, and his associates. Unfortunately, I and our committee have gotten no cooperation from the Treasury Department. Despite my repeated requests as the ranking Democrat on the Finance Committee, the Treasury Department has just stonewalled—plain old stonewalling—the lead committee with jurisdiction for the agency.

For that reason, I want to announce tonight that I will hold indefinitely the nomination of the individual to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Intelligence and Analysis until the Department cooperates with the Finance Committee and provides the committee with documents it needs to do its job.

Again, I regret that I have to take this step. By the way, many of these documents are unclassified in nature, so the Treasury Department is denying the Finance Committee access to unclassified documents. That is just completely unacceptable.

We all understand that we are in the midst of extraordinary and dangerous times. As our own intelligence community assessed in January, Russia interfered in our election with a clear preference for Donald Trump. No one, other than Donald Trump, has apparently called this assessment into question. For the sake of our national security and the future of our country, it is important to get to the bottom of every aspect of this attack on our democracy. The American people have clearly stated the urgency behind this.

My view is that the Congress has an obligation to follow the money wherever the evidence leads and to conduct a thorough investigation that leaves no stones unturned and presents to the public what we find. I will close by way of saying that I don't see how you can

do the essential counterintelligence work that is so important to our committee—and I note that the distinguished Presiding Officer of the Senate, the Senator from Missouri, is a member of the committee and a valued one—I don't see how the committee can do its counterintelligence work without following the money, because we know that those financial issues are absolutely key—that money is the key to compromising an individual—it is obviously so important in trying to ensure that we have policies in this country that protect our security and our role in the world.

I yield the floor.

#### REPUBLICAN GOVERNMENT FUNDING BILL

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the Republican continuing resolution.

In addition to the many, many problems I have with how this bill was secretly written without any attempt to work with Democrats, I also cannot support it because of the absence of the Dream Act and long-term funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program.

On four occasions, Republicans tried to repeal the Affordable Care Act with bills they drafted in secret. These bills had no input from Democrats—or really anyone who would have actually been affected by repeal.

Then they drafted a so-called tax reform bill, again entirely in secret, not consulting anyone outside a small group of Republican lawmakers.

So it is not a surprise that the bill they jammed through is actually nothing more than a tax cut for the richest Americans and large corporations, and all at the expense of American families, who will actually pay higher taxes.

Now, doubling down on their failed strategy of secrecy, Republicans came up with a government funding bill at the very last minute that ignores many of our highest priority needs, including passing the Dream Act and coming up with a long-term solution for CHIP.

I hope that Republicans will finally realize that this isn't the right way to govern. You are not representing the country when you govern 1 month at a time and rush through poorly written bills that only benefit certain special interests.

It is time to return to regular order.

Now I would like to speak about the absence of the Dream Act in this bill, a negligent decision that even the majority of Republicans in this country disagree with.

To say that Republicans have sent mixed signals on DACA is an understatement.

During his campaign, Donald Trump said he supported deporting all undocumented immigrants, including those who had registered for the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program.

Later, he said DACA recipients had nothing to worry about. Then, in Sep-

tember, the Justice Department canceled the DACA program. I can't even imagine the uncertainty that DACA recipients have felt since Donald Trump's election.

DACA was put in place in 2012 by President Obama to remove the crushing fear of deportation experienced by hundreds of thousands of young people. These are outstanding individuals who were brought into the country through no choice of their own, at very young ages, and who know no other country than the United States.

In fact, the average DACA recipient was brought into the United States at the age of 6.

Now, there are nearly 700,000 individuals with DACA in the United States, approximately 220,000 of whom live in California. Each day, more than 100 lose their DACA protection, plunging them back into the uncertainty that President Obama relieved.

These young people study, they work, they pay their taxes. They are patriotic. They are American in every way that counts, and to leave them in such uncertainty is nothing less than cruel.

One family in particular has really brought this issue home for me, and that is the Sanchez family from Oakland.

Maria and Eusebio Sanchez lived in the United States for more than 20 years before they were deported in August.

Maria was an oncology nurse, and Eusebio was a truck driver.

They had no criminal records, they paid their taxes, they owned a home, and they contributed to their community.

They also had four children, three of whom are U.S. citizens.

Little Jesus is just 12.

Elizabeth is 16 and currently enrolled in a community learning center.

Melin is 21 and is currently enrolled at UC Santa Cruz, studying molecular cell and developmental biology. She wants to be a pediatrician.

Their oldest daughter, Vianney, is 23, and she is not a citizen.

She is, however, protected under DACA. She graduated from UC Santa Cruz with a degree in psychology, and today Vianney is taking care of her three siblings.

Imagine being thrust into the role of caregiver to your three siblings after your parents are kicked out of the country, but your own ability to remain here also remains uncertain.

Vianney will lose her DACA status in August. Imagine the fear and stress she carries with her every day.

All DACA recipients have to register with the government, so immigration officials know where Vianney lives and works. They could show up any day and deport her, leaving her three younger citizen siblings behind with no one to care for them.

Sadly, the experience of this family isn't rare. There are families like this across the country, people who came to