

Of course, we know there are legitimate families who cross our border, and we must take additional steps to confirm these biological relationships and enable them to remain together in custody. No one is advocating for separating these families from their children. The HUMANE Act that Congressman CUELLAR and I have introduced requires all children to undergo biometric and DNA screening—something the Department of Homeland Security has recently been testing. This was in order to defeat the fraudulent claim of biological or familial relationship with a minor child in order to gain entry into the United States. I believe we have a responsibility to ensure that children are actual family members and not being used as a pawn by the smugglers.

Our legislation also provides safeguards to prevent children from being placed in the custody of dangerous individuals, such as sex offenders or human traffickers. The last thing we should want to do is welcome these unaccompanied children here to America, only to place them, by action of the Federal Government, in the hands of sex offenders or human traffickers because of our failure to take all necessary caution to prevent it.

Consistent with the recommendations from the bipartisan Department of Homeland Security Homeland Security Advisory Council, the HUMANE Act would require DHS to establish at least four regional processing centers along the southern border to house and process these families. It is important that we provide them humane and compassionate housing while they await their asylum hearing in front of an immigration judge.

By not doing so, by engaging in what has come to be known as catch-and-release, we essentially help facilitate the entry of these individuals into the United States and encourage this pull factor that would only encourage not only 76,000 migrants, like we saw come across the border in February, not 103,000, like we saw come across the border in March, but we are going to see those numbers continue to go up and up and up and up, because, if you think about it, there is simply no reason for them not to come. The smugglers are getting rich, and people who want to come into the United States by falsely claiming grounds for asylum have found a way to exploit our system. When we look in the mirror, the only ones we can blame are ourselves for failing to act.

We know these regional processing centers could serve as a one-stop shop, with DHS personnel, including asylum officers, on site to adjudicate claims and expedite the entire process. We want to make sure that if somebody does have a bona fide claim for asylum, they get to be heard by an immigration judge and they get that immigration benefit to which the law entitles them. But if they are not entitled to asylum, if they can't make their case to an im-

migration judge, they should not be able to do an end run around the system and enter the country under false pretenses.

These central processing centers would also provide families with better living conditions that can be provided at a CBP detention facility meant to hold strictly single adults.

To prevent this humanitarian crisis from having a deeper impact on legitimate trade and travel, this bill mandates the hiring of additional Homeland Security personnel and upgrades our ports of entry to expedite the legal movement of people and goods.

Just the binational trade with Mexico supports about 5 million jobs in America; with Canada, another 8 million. That is why the North American Free Trade Agreement, or NAFTA, is so important, and now that it has been supplanted by the U.S.-Mexico-Canada agreement that we will be taking up soon, it is very important for us to keep legitimate commerce and trade flowing between Mexico, Canada, and the United States because 13 million jobs or more in America depend on that binational trade. That is another collateral piece of damage as a result of this humanitarian crisis as well.

This is an opportunity for us to consider a bipartisan and bicameral piece of legislation to solve a real and growing problem, and I hope both of our Chambers will take seriously our responsibility to act and to act soon.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. ERNST). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

#### TRIBUTE TO MIKE ENZI

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, over the weekend, our friend the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, Mr. ENZI, announced that he wouldn't seek reelection. It is no secret that Senator ENZI and I approach legislation from two very different standpoints, but I have always found him to be thoughtful and decent—qualities that have made him a good Senator and a respected voice for the people of Wyoming.

When Senator ENZI was elected, he was this Chamber's only accountant by trade. Perhaps it is destiny, then, that he will end his tenure at the top of the Budget Committee. Despite his prominent perch and decades in Washington's corridors of power, Senator ENZI still retains the accountant's distaste for the flashy. He eschewed the lime-light and the television cameras—something the two of us have in common. If Senator ENZI will forgive me

that joke, I would like to wish him and his family the best in all his future endeavors—that is, of course, after he concludes his final year and a half in Washington as one of Wyoming's longest serving Senators.

#### MUELLER REPORT

Madam President, on another matter, in the aftermath of Attorney General Barr's testimony before the Judiciary Committee, it is now clearer than ever that the Senate must hear from Special Counsel Mueller. We need Special Counsel Mueller to testify because, as we have seen, the Attorney General has shown us he cannot be trusted on the matter of the Russia investigation.

After the special counsel delivered his findings, the Attorney General took a 480-page document and turned it into 4 pages, producing a document so inadequate that it even prompted the special counsel to raise concerns in writing—the normally very reticent special counsel, I might add. Meanwhile, the Attorney General has speculated, without evidence, about the special counsel's reasonings, and he has done so, we have now learned, without having reviewed any of the underlying evidence. To make matters worse, Mr. Barr also refused to appear before the House Judiciary Committee, demonstrating his contempt for the oversight responsibilities of Congress.

The bottom line is this: The Attorney General's word cannot be the end of the matter. Special Counsel Mueller must testify. Unfortunately, however, the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee has thus far been far less than welcoming, and now the President has made it clear that he believes Mueller should not testify.

I want to remind this Chamber that President Trump repeatedly tried to fire the special counsel, then he called the special counsel conflicted and corrupted and refused to be interviewed by him, and now he is trying to silence the special counsel completely. For a man who constantly proclaims his innocence and the “exoneration” of the Mueller report, President Trump suspiciously objects to Special Counsel Mueller's public testimony.

Thankfully, Congress isn't subject to the will of the President. My friend Senator GRAHAM has an obligation to ask the special counsel to testify without constraints. I will continue to press him to call for a hearing.

#### PUERTO RICO

Finally, Mr. President, we have been trying for weeks now to come up with a package of disaster assistance for Americans impacted by fires and floods and typhoons and hurricanes that would be acceptable to my friends on the other side of the aisle. Meanwhile, the President continues to wage a bizarre and fact-impaired campaign against millions of American citizens living in Puerto Rico.

This morning, the President claimed incredibly that Puerto Rico has received \$91 billion in recovery funds

while other States have been left behind. That defies the facts. He also suggested that Puerto Rico should be thankful for the funding they have already received and accused Democrats of selling out other parts of the country. There is a lot to unpack there, so here it goes.

For one, Puerto Rico has not received \$91 billion—not even close. At most, Puerto Rico has received \$11 billion while billions more, already allocated by the Congress—Democrats and Republicans—are being withheld by the Trump administration itself. Just last week, the administration missed a self-imposed deadline to advance the release of \$8 billion in funding to help the island rebuild and prepare for future disasters.

Second, it is galling even by the President's standards to say that Puerto Rico should be thankful for disaster aid. The President hasn't said that Alabama should be thankful for disaster aid. He hasn't said that Texas should be thankful or Florida or the Carolinas. But for some reason, the President implies that aid to Puerto Rico is some kind of favor he is doing. I remind the President that helping parts of our country recover from natural disasters is not a favor; it is what we do as Americans and what we have always done until the President's heavy hand disrupted the legislation that Democrats and Republicans had crafted and were prepared to pass.

When a natural disaster strikes one corner of the country, Americans put politics aside and come together to help each other out. The President, however, is failing our fellow citizens in Puerto Rico and all those rebuilding their lives and communities after disaster.

For those here who say "Well, let's just pass this bill now," the House won't pass this bill. The House will not pass a bill without full aid to Puerto Rico, and neither will this Chamber.

So what are we talking about here? We are talking about a President who came in and for some reason didn't want to give aid to Puerto Rico while giving to everywhere else even though Puerto Rico's disaster probably, per capita, affected them worse than any other State. They are American citizens, I would remind the President. Now he is bolloxying the whole thing up.

Both sides here in Congress—Democrats and Republicans who believe in aid—ought to disavow the President's decision and pass relief for all Americans affected by natural disasters—all Americans. Democrats are ready to support disaster relief for every corner in this country—the west coast, the Midwest, the South, and Puerto Rico. As our negotiators continue to make progress on a disaster package, I fervently hope we come to a resolution very soon.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

#### MUELLER REPORT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, the taxpayers spent \$30 million on the special counsel's investigation. Now we know without a single doubt that there was no collusion by the Trump campaign with Russia. For more than 2 years, the Democrats screamed collusion and did so not based on fact but based on rumor, hearsay, and probably wishful thinking. They have done a huge disservice to the American people by taking that approach.

As I have said before, the real collusion was actually with the Democrats. Here is how it has evolved. It was the Clinton campaign and Democratic National Committee that hired Fusion GPS to do opposition research against Candidate Trump. Then Fusion GPS hired Christopher Steele, a former British intelligence officer, to compile what we now hear always referred to as the Steele dossier. That document was very central to the fake collusion narrative, and it reportedly used Russian Government sources for information. So the Democrats paid for a document created by a foreign national that relied on Russian Government sources—not Trump; the Democrats. That is the definition of collusion.

But Democratic collusion didn't stop there. Last week, The Hill newspaper reported that a Democratic National Committee contractor contacted the Ukrainian Government to get dirt on the Trump and Manafort during the Presidential election. Specifically, the Democratic National Committee contractor reportedly "wanted to collect evidence that Trump, his organization and Manafort were Russian assets working to hurt the U.S. and working with Putin against U.S. interests."

The Democrats were up in arms about the Trump Tower meeting when the Trump campaign was approached about dirt on Hillary Clinton. Here, the DNC proactively pounded the door of a foreign government for dirt. Where is the outrage at that? The special counsel ignored all of that in his report; thus, he didn't fulfill all of his responsibilities.

The Deputy Attorney General appointed Mueller in May of 2017 to investigate alleged collusion between the Trump campaign and Russia during the 2016 election. The Deputy Attorney General further ordered that if the special counsel believed it was necessary and appropriate, he was authorized to "prosecute federal crimes arising from the investigation of these matters." But that is not what the special counsel did on the obstruction question. Instead, the special counsel declined to make a traditional prosecutorial decision. The report said that "[t]he evidence that we obtained about the President's actions and intent presents difficult issues that prevent us from conclusively determining that no criminal conduct occurred."

As the Attorney General said when he released the report and then again in his testimony before the Senate Ju-

diciary Committee last week, the role of a prosecutor "is to make a charging decision." It isn't a prosecutor's job to exonerate a subject; it is to charge a crime or, in the alternative, not to charge a crime. But in his report, the special counsel explains his decision not to even make a decision. He says, among other things, that stating the President had committed a chargeable offense without actually charging him, under the Justice Department's guidance, would be unfair to the President because, according to the special counsel, then the President couldn't defend himself properly before a neutral factfinder. Instead, the special counsel laid out 200 or so pages of facts and hand-wringing relating to the obstruction and then dumped all of this material on the Attorney General's desk.

It reminds me of former FBI Director Comey's declaration in the summer of 2016 that Secretary Clinton was extremely careless in handling classified information but that no reasonable prosecutor would bring a case against Secretary Clinton. FBI Director Comey made a prosecutorial decision that wasn't his to make; it was up to the Attorney General to make. That was Attorney General Lynch. Comey also released derogatory information about Secretary Clinton and then refused to show all of his work.

The special counsel's report is at least equally problematic. The report lays out 200 pages of investigative product but leaves the charging decision hanging in Never Never Land. Nevertheless, the report asserts that if the special counsel team could have found the President did not commit obstruction, they would have said so. But, again, that is not what prosecutors do. That is a reversal of the innocent until proven guilty standard that is basic to American justice. If it really were a thorough investigation, it seems the inverse would be true as well. The inverse is that, after a thorough investigation, the special counsel did not have enough evidence to conclusively state obstruction actually occurred.

During the Attorney General's May 1 testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee, he noted that if the special counsel found facts sufficient to constitute obstruction, he would have stated that finding.

Curiously, the special counsel spilled a lot of ink in his report to explain why he believed the President could be charged as a matter of legal theory. So why didn't he just make that decision or at least make a very clear recommendation to the Attorney General and stand behind his own theories?

The Attorney General and the Deputy Attorney General asked Mueller whether he would have charged obstruction but for the Department's guidance on charging sitting Presidents. The special counsel said no, which means, if warranted, that there was no barrier for him to make that charge.

In the absence of a decision from the special counsel, it was then up to the