

well as aid for the other areas of disaster. The original bill was put together before the Midwest so it didn't have that.

What happened? Is it that somehow our Republican friends from the Midwest and elsewhere thought Puerto Rico didn't deserve the aid? No; President Trump went to a Tuesday lunch, banged his fist on the table—figuratively, I suppose—and said: I don't think any aid should go to Puerto Rico.

Did our Republican friends, especially those from States with disasters and who needed the aid, say: No, no; we are not going to do that; we are not going to let you divide us? No; they went gamefully along with it, hurting their States.

We all know that if there is no real aid for Puerto Rico, the House will not pass the bill. We in the Senate on the Democratic side do not want to hold Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, and the other States, Florida, Texas, Alabama, that are getting the aid hostage for what we want, and our Republican friends shouldn't hold Puerto Rico hostage for what they want.

This grand tradition seems to crumble here day by day, minute by minute, of helping States that need help; that when one American is hurt in one area, Americans in every other area come together and say: We are going to help. That is why we have disaster aid because the enormity of a tornado or a wildfire or a hurricane—the taxpayers of that State can't afford to do it all themselves. So citizens throughout America have had, in effect, a compact that says, when one area is hurt, we all come together.

Look, I suffered a little from that when New York had Sandy. We had some of our Senators from the very States—from the very States—that now are requesting aid say: Don't give aid to New York for Sandy. I have never done that. I have always been for aid to States that are far away from New York and just have Republican representation. We don't do that here—until now. Until now.

So I would say to all of my friends on the other side of the aisle, there is a way out of this—provide the aid that originally Senators SHELBY, a Republican, LEAHY, a Democrat, agreed on. Don't let Donald Trump's nasty temper tantrum somehow about Puerto Rico get in the way. Do the right thing, and he will sign the bill. We know he will sign the bill. He is not going to stop aid for Texas or Florida or Iowa or any other State because this body and the House have put in aid for Puerto Rico.

Let me just mention, just as the people in the Midwest are suffering, people in Puerto Rico are suffering. That island has had a slower recovery from a storm of greater magnitude than any others we are talking about.

So we need to vote on this legislation. It is not an either-or situation. To say you are putting \$600 million in food stamps for Puerto Rico so people

will not starve, when they are not getting the same aid everybody else gets—CDBG, FEMA—that is not right, that is not fair, and that figleaf will not cover up the real motivation of President Trump, which, unfortunately, I don't think most of our Republican colleagues agree with, but they go along with. Everyone is afraid on the other side of anything President Trump does—right or wrong. Unfortunately, he is wrong far too often.

Puerto Rico needs aid so they can rebuild. They need the food aid, but they need more than that. Trump wanted to cut out all of it. Someone on this side said: Well, you have to at least do food aid. He said: Well, I will do that and nothing more. That is not right. Should we do food aid just for every State? Should we do food aid just for Texas or just for Florida or just for Iowa? No rebuilding? Let all of those houses and homes and factories and stores suffer? No. We wouldn't do it for those States. We shouldn't, and we shouldn't do it for Puerto Rico.

So then we decided to compromise even more. There is \$20 billion of aid already for Puerto Rico that hasn't been allocated. The President, in his nastiness to the people of Puerto Rico—citizens, they are American citizens—refused to allocate that money.

Well, Senator LEAHY then said: Let's just take \$8.3 billion of that and free it up. Our colleagues will not even do that.

So when the American people want to know what is holding up this bill, when the people in the flooded areas and the areas that have been hit by wildfires and hurricanes want to know what is holding it up, it is Donald Trump picking one part of the country and saying: "I don't want to give aid to them," and too many—just about every one of our colleagues, at least thus far—going along.

Elections have consequences. The House is now Democratic. It is their strong view that we ought to give aid to Puerto Rico. It is a view I share, but if we don't do the right thing in this body, where we have a tradition of coming together, and you say President Trump will not sign something, when he originally had nothing to do with putting together this bill, we are all going to be stuck for quite a while. We are all going to be stuck for quite a while. Let us in the House, in this body, the Senate, come to a compromise that satisfies the Midwest, that satisfies the hurricane States of Florida, Mississippi, Georgia, and Alabama, that satisfies Texas, and get moving. That is what we should be doing.

This idea that we are holding up this bill, when the House wouldn't pass it anyway; the idea that we are holding up this bill, when we know the history that President Trump went into that lunch and changed everything around in the nasty way that he can't even explain—uh-uh; that is not going to fly. That is not going to fly.

RESIGNATION OF KIRSTJEN NIELSEN

Madam President, on Secretary Nielsen, Kirstjen Nielsen submitted her resignation as the Secretary of Homeland Security. When we look back at this moment, I think we are going to remember Secretary Nielsen's tenure as a cruel chapter, in which the Agency followed through on President Trump's worst impulses. Those include advocacy for Trump's ineffective and expensive wall; her support for the longest government shutdown in history that didn't produce anything for President Trump; most regrettably, her full embrace of the child separation policy, leading to thousands of children being ripped away from their families.

Some say Secretary Nielsen argued inwardly against some of these. Well, she should have left a long time ago. She shouldn't be advocating for policies that are so, so wrong. Maybe it is better, maybe it is worse if she knew they were wrong, but it is not good, no matter what.

Through it all, in fact, she continuously misled the American public, even insisting once that "we do not have a policy of separating families at the border. Period."

Well, that was just absolutely false, and Americans from every part of the country were just appalled by that. In fact, some people say one of the reasons the House went Democratic is a lot of suburban Republican women didn't like that policy, as they shouldn't have. So it wasn't even politically as smart as maybe President Trump thought it was.

Despite Secretary Nielsen's advocacy for the wall, for her support of the shutdown, her embrace of the child separation policy, which she always misled Americans about, she still wasn't radical enough for President Trump.

As NBC News reported this morning, President Trump has urged for months that his administration reauthorize the awful practice of separating little, tiny children and babies from their parents.

This is further proof that the President is kowtowing to the worst instincts of people and to the conservative, hard-right, and extreme voices in the Republican Party, with no or little regard for our national security or the ability to function efficiently.

What he has done by these constant firings, the constant change of policy, has simply created chaos at the border. Nobody knows what the policy will be from day to day and week to week and month to month. He doesn't tell the top people in his departments that he has changed his plans.

He fired, evidently, Mr. Vitiello, without even Secretary Nielsen knowing about it.

This erratic, nasty style of governing is not solving any problems at the border, and the more problems and chaos there is, the more people are going to see it is President Trump, as President, can't solve this problem, despite his rhetoric, where he appears tough but doesn't solve the problem.

DISMISSAL OF SECRET SERVICE DIRECTOR
RANDOLPH ALLES

Madam President, on the Secret Service Director's dismissal, this brings me to my final point.

Just a few hours ago, the White House confirmed that it has now also asked that Secret Service Director Randolph Alles step aside. His departure comes in the midst of recent reports about potentially serious security vulnerabilities surrounding President Trump, particularly at Mar-a-Lago. That is why the outgoing Secret Service Director must testify before Congress as soon as possible about the potential security vulnerabilities at Mar-a-Lago, vulnerabilities that involve a Chinese national arrested with malware on her person and other threats.

The public and Congress need to know the extent to which adversarial governments like China are attempting to infiltrate and conduct electronic surveillance on classified conversations or other information regarding national security at President Trump's properties. The President and the White House staff may like to treat hiring and firing in the administration as some kind of reality TV show or parlor game, but to the American people, this has real-life consequences.

This is about national security, security at our airports, responding to national disasters, including our efforts to fight international cargo carrying drugs like fentanyl. That is why it is urgent to get to the bottom of this and why the outgoing Secret Service Director must testify as soon as possible.

Now, all three of these comments—what is happening in Puerto Rico, what is happening with the Department of Homeland Security, and now the Secret Service—indicate just the chaos that seems to be overwhelming this administration.

President Trump's policies, if he has them, switch from day to day. He is erratic. He seems to get emotional. He pushes out whatever is on his mind that day no matter its consequences, and this country is floundering. There is a lot of rhetoric and not much else.

All these people leaving in very important positions—the President undercutting them, not calling them into the office and having a discussion, but tweeting and ranting. I have never seen America governed like this—never.

And I don't care what your political affiliation is. I don't care if you are a liberal, moderate, or conservative. What is happening in this White House—as it fails to lead this country and does seem something like a TV reality show—is hurting us. It is hurting us and hurting us badly, and I hope we can get some bipartisan efforts to do things about this and to speak up about it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOZMAN). The senior Senator from Iowa.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA TRADE
AGREEMENT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, for 1 minute before I speak about what I came for a longer period of time to the floor to speak about, I want to address a trade issue. Congress needs to pass the United States-Mexico-Canada agreement this year to give farmers and businesses the certainty that they need and the certainty they deserve.

The past year has brought rising costs, lost markets, and uncertainty for the farmers and businesses. We need to focus on creating opportunities instead of erecting barriers. I would like to see a resolution with Canada and Mexico on steel and aluminum tariffs, one that would acknowledge that we need our allies to help us deal with the source of the overcapacity problems, and that source of the problem is China.

I urge President Trump to lift the 232 tariffs so that we can forge ahead with the U.S.-Mexico-Canada agreement and eliminate the uncertainty that is present in the American market.

MUELLER REPORT

Mr. President, now for the main purpose of my coming to the floor: After years of hearing Democrats falsely proclaim that the Trump campaign colluded with Russia, Special Counsel Mueller found no collusion existed.

The fact that there was no collusion is a very positive development, not just for this administration, but for the entire country. However, it does seem that the real collusion occurred with Democrats, and I will explain.

It was the Clinton campaign and Democratic National Committee that hired Fusion GPS to do opposition research against Candidate Trump. Fusion GPS then hired Christopher Steele, a former British intelligence officer, to compile the Steele dossier that reportedly used Russian Government sources for information.

You see, it was the Clinton campaign and the Democratic National Committee that funded the document that largely created the collusion narrative, a narrative that has been deemed false, and of course, that is the irony here.

The Democrats paid for a document created by a foreign national with reported Russian Government sources, not Trump. President Trump did not do that. The Democrats did. But apparently, it is not over yet, or so the Democrats tell us every day. Their next step is to subpoena the entire Mueller report.

Well, I agree that Congress and the public should see that information, and it sounds to me like President Trump agrees as well. The Attorney General has already said, on multiple occasions, that he is going to release as much information as the law allows and as soon as he can, and it looks like Congress—and likely the public—will get the Mueller report this month of April sometime.

But Democrats have requested more than just the report. They have asked

the Justice Department to also produce the Mueller report's underlying evidence, including all intelligence-related information.

I agree with the need to see as much information as possible. In fact, I have cosponsored a bipartisan bill that would do just that, but the Democrats' fury over Mueller's findings and their inconsistent positions makes me think all of this is more about politics than principle.

After all, the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee opposed the release of this type of information in the 1990s. To guard against that political gamesmanship, there is only one legitimate way to do this: Let's see all the documents.

But by all—I don't mean just those related to the Mueller investigation—we should see every piece of evidence, including evidence connected to how the Russia investigation started.

Now that should be a very easy ask, and do you know why? I have already requested that information. For example, I have asked documents related to Steele, his dossier, and campaign-related FISA applications.

These documents relate to actions taken by James Comey, Peter Strzok, and Bruce Ohr and are critical to Congress fully understanding the creation of the Russia investigation. If Congress is going to review the Mueller report and all underlying information, it should be able to review information relating to how the Russia investigation started.

So will the Democrats join me in that effort and support my request?

Further, to be consistent, we shouldn't stop at the Russia investigation. The Democrats want all the Mueller information, but seem to be turning a blind eye to other investigations where Congress and the public have yet to see every bit of information that is out there.

Again, that leads me to believe their request for Mueller-related documents is a political ploy. Take, for example, the Clinton investigation. Will Democrats ask the Justice Department for all the underlying information relating to the Hillary Clinton investigation?

As I have written about publicly before, the Justice Department inspector general produced to Congress a highly classified document relating to the Clinton investigation. That document makes clear the Justice Department and the FBI still ought to produce information to Congress and answer more questions.

For example, the unclassified version of the inspector general's report provides important context about the classified report, and I have a long quote here:

The FBI had considered obtaining permission from the Department to review certain classified materials that may have included information potentially relevant to the Midyear investigation. Although the Midyear team drafted a memorandum to the Deputy Attorney General in late May 2016 stating that review of the highly classified material