

We must never go back, as Jean said. So, as we celebrate the ADA's 29th anniversary, I promise—and I know it is the promise of many Members of Congress—to never forget that struggle. I also promise to stand side by side with the disability community to fully accomplish the ADA's goals.

Mr. BROWN. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CASEY. I yield to Senator BROWN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I appreciate Senator CASEY's advocacy for disabled Americans and for children especially.

I just want to make a brief comment, for I know he has some other comments to make, on his support for Medicaid and on the efforts that we have made together on the Finance Committee in fighting against President Trump's attacks on Medicaid and the Affordable Care Act.

I know, in my State, the expansion of Medicaid and what came out of that meant that 900,000 more people had insurance, including a whole lot of people who were disabled. I know that Pennsylvania is the same way. So I thank Senator CASEY.

Mr. CASEY. I thank the senior Senator from Ohio, who makes the point broadly about the importance of Medicaid in the context of healthcare but especially with regard to Americans with disabilities. I thank him for his comments, and I thank him for his advocacy.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. President, my second topic involves a visit that I and a delegation of Senators made just a week ago—it will be a week ago on Friday—to McAllen, TX. I guess there were 13 of us in total. During that visit and throughout the course of the day, we toured DHS detention facilities—DHS is the Department of Homeland Security—including the Border Patrol facility in McAllen, TX, and the processing centers in both Donna and Ursula, TX.

I saw children who needed better care. I saw the overcrowding of adults, who were packed into cages or glass-enclosed rooms, and you couldn't hear the voices of those behind the glass. I saw the need for hygiene products and better access to showers. At the same time, we also saw Catholic Charities—the Respite Center, run by Sister Norma Pimentel, known to so many as just “Sister Norma”—where migrants were welcomed, where migrants were cared for, and where migrants were treated with compassion.

I believe the White House's policies take the opposite approach—that of not welcoming migrants but of pushing them away. I believe several of those policies make it bad not only for the migrants or immigrants but also for the DHS personnel who have to do the work every day. It is also bad for the security of our Nation.

I know, last Friday, that our delegation met a number of dedicated per-

sonnel who work hard and who care about the families, but I cannot say that about all of those who work there. So, when there is mistreatment or when there is abuse, we need to make sure there is full accountability. At the same time, there are folks who work in our government who may not agree with the White House's policy on immigration or asylum or on its migration policy in general but who have difficult work to do. To those who are doing good work and showing compassion and respect, I commend them for that.

Instead of closing the door on asylum seekers who flee terrible violence and persecution, we should adopt policies that are more humane and that will help alleviate instead of exacerbate the humanitarian crisis. We should utilize effective alternatives to detention, like the Family Case Management Program—a pilot program that began in the last administration and pretty much ended in this administration. It had a 99-percent attendance rate—or success rate—at immigration court proceedings. The Family Case Management Program also had 99-percent compliance with ICE's monitoring requirements.

We should ensure that migrant children are cared for by child welfare workers and have their medical needs fully met. We should also work to address the violence, poverty, and persecution that are causing so many to flee. I am a cosponsor of the Central American Reform and Enhancement Act, which is legislation that would address the root causes of migration by increasing aid to the Northern Triangle, creating new options for refugees to apply for entry from Mexico and Central America, and, of course, increasing the number of immigration judges to reduce court backlogs and creating new criminal penalties for the smuggling and defrauding of immigrants.

We know that some of the dollars recently appropriated will help on some of these priorities, but we have to make sure the dollars are spent wisely and appropriately and in full compliance with the law.

We are indeed a nation of laws, and we are also a nation of immigrants. These two principles are intertwined in our values, and they are not—they are not—competing values.

We should be trying over and over again—both parties, both Chambers, and the administration—to pass something comparable to the comprehensive immigration reform bill that this body passed in 2013 that did not get a vote in the House.

Let me conclude this part of my remarks with this: The problem is not that we must choose between principles like being a rule-of-law country and being a nation of immigrants; the problem is that our immigration system is badly broken. If there are suggestions to be made to improve the asylum process, we should be open to that, but pushing immigrants away

and ending or short-circuiting or undermining the asylum process is not in the interest of the country.

It is entirely possible to have an immigration system that both respects the rule of law and treats all individuals with human dignity. I will continue to press the administration and the House and the Senate to work on bipartisan solutions so our immigration system again reflects those American values.

MUELLER REPORT

Mr. President, I will conclude my remarks by raising the third topic, and it is timely for today. I want to do two things with regard to the service and the work of former Special Counsel Robert Mueller but also talk about the report he issued.

There is a reference in a narrative about Robert Mueller's service in Vietnam that I won't add to the RECORD because it is very long, but I will quote from it for just a couple of minutes. This is an account by the publication *Wired*. It is a long account, but I will just briefly read the beginning of it about his service.

Just imagine this: someone who grew up with probably not too many concerns about economic security; someone who had the benefit of a great education and then volunteered to serve in Vietnam.

This particular vignette says:

After [serving] nine months at war, he was finally due—

“He” meaning Robert Mueller—

—for a few short days of R&R outside the battle zone. Mueller had seen intense combat since he last said goodbye to his wife. He'd received the Bronze Star with a distinction for valor for his actions in one battle, and he'd been airlifted out of the jungle during another firefight after being shot in the thigh. [Robert Mueller] and [his wife] Ann had spoken only twice since he had left for South Vietnam.

Then it goes on to say why he wanted to keep serving in the Marine Corps:

I didn't relish the US Marine Corps absent combat.

Then it goes on to talk about his decision to go to law school after being in Vietnam, with the goal of serving his country as a prosecutor. He went on to lead the Criminal Division of the Justice Department and to prosecute a lot of bad guys—my words, not words from the publication—and then “became director of the FBI one week before September 11, 2001, and stayed on to become the bureau's longest-serving director since J. Edgar Hoover. And yet, throughout his five-decade career, that year of combat experience with the Marines has loomed large in Mueller's mind. ‘I'm most proud the Marine Corps deemed me worthy of leading other Marines,’ he [said] in . . . 2009.”

So that is his background—just some of his background: service to his country in Vietnam, service as a Federal prosecutor for many, many years, and then called upon to serve his country again. He is the embodiment of public service. He gives integrity and meaning

and value to what President Kennedy called us all to do—to not ask what our country can do for us but what we can do for our country. Robert Mueller has answered that call over and over again. He is a person of integrity and ability.

For just a few minutes before I yield the floor, I want to talk about some of his work.

One of the points then-Special Counsel Mueller made in a statement I guess back in May was—he first of all outlined how the Russian Federation interfered with our election and pointed to the serious consequences of that, but then he also talked about how—when the second volume of the report deals with obstruction, he reminded us in that statement—at least I took from it, my impression of the statement—of not just the seriousness of what Russia did but the seriousness and the gravity of obstructing that kind of an investigation.

So if someone wanted to read just a portion of the report—the almost 500 pages—if you wanted to just zero in on some key parts of volume II about obstruction, you could start on page 77. That is a section titled “The President’s Efforts to Remove the Special Counsel.” Then there are other instances—several instances of obstruction—alleged obstruction there. So if you read between pages 77 and 120 of volume II, you are going to learn a lot about obstruction. Let me read a couple of the lines that the report sets forth.

When the special counsel walks through the factual predicate of what happened in the first instance where the President calls the White House Counsel, Mr. McGahn, and says some things that the special counsel concluded were a directive to fire or have fired the special counsel, they say in the report on page—this is volume II, page 88:

Substantial evidence, however, supports the conclusion that the President went further and in fact directed McGahn to call Rosenstein to have the Special Counsel removed.

Page 89:

Substantial evidence indicates that by June 17, 2017, the President knew his conduct was under investigation by a federal prosecutor who could present evidence of federal crimes to a grand jury.

It goes on from there in the “Intent” section, where the special counsel has to lay out the evidence to prove intent because if you can’t prove intent, you can’t go much further.

Substantial evidence indicates that the President’s attempts to remove the Special Counsel were linked to the Special Counsel’s oversight on investigations that involved the President’s conduct and, most immediately, to reports that the President was being investigated for potential obstruction of justice.

So those are just three vignettes from pages 88 and 89, operative words there being “substantial evidence.” In other parts of the report, evidence is laid out. Sometimes they say there is not enough evidence, but I think “sub-

stantial evidence” is a compelling part of what we saw.

Let me just quickly—because I know I am over time. I will now move to page 113. This is a separate section. This section is titled “The President Orders McGahn”—White House Counsel McGahn—“to Deny that the President Tried to Fire the Special Counsel,” so referring back to the earlier section, and then, when they go through the evidence, they again get back to the consideration or the weighing of the evidence.

I am looking at volume II, page 118—again, those words:

Substantial evidence supports McGahn’s account that the President had directed him to have the Special Counsel removed, including the timing and context of the President’s directive; the manner in which McGahn reacted; and the fact that the President had been told conflicts were substantial, were being considered by the Department of Justice, and should be raised with the President’s personal counsel rather than brought to McGahn.

So you get the message I am sending. And the last one is on page 120—“Substantial evidence indicates” the following facts.

So I raise all that because there is a lot of discussion about volume II and what the conclusion might have been. The reason I refer to those areas of substantial evidence is that in May of this year, there was a statement by former Federal prosecutors. We were told that as many as 1,000 bipartisan prosecutors from both parties signed a letter, and I will read just one sentence from the letter: “Each of us”—meaning these Republican and Democratic former prosecutors—“believes that the conduct of President Trump described in Special Counsel Robert Mueller’s report would, in the case of any other person not covered by the Office of Legal Counsel’s policy against indicting a sitting President, result in multiple felony charges for obstruction of justice.”

I think those prosecutors—I believe those prosecutors are resting that determination that they each made individually on those areas of the report that begin with the words “substantial evidence indicates.”

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROMNEY). The Senator from Iowa.

EB-5 PROGRAM

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I come to the Senate floor to advise my colleagues about a new rule that the Department of Homeland Security published in the Federal Register this very day to finally bring some needed reform to the EB-5 green card program.

As I mentioned in my remarks on this topic last week, this rule was first proposed in January 2017. Those of us who want to reform the EB-5 program have been waiting 2½ years for this rule to become final, and we have been waiting much, much longer than that for some meaningful reforms to this fraudulent-laden program that we tried to get enacted into law in previous

Congresses and couldn’t get done because of being up against these very powerful, moneyed interests. I think the President and his team deserve a lot of credit for pushing these reforms across the finish line and getting a big win for rural America.

As I have said on numerous occasions, Congress intended for the EB-5 program to help spur investment in rural and high-unemployment areas when this program was established in 1990. Unfortunately, over the last 30 years, big-moneyed interests have been able to gerrymander EB-5 targeted employment areas in a way that redirected investment away from our rural and economically deprived communities and towards major development projects in Manhattan and other big cities. Therefore, instead of providing much needed investment for rural America, as originally intended, EB-5 has become a source of cheap foreign capital for development projects in already prosperous areas of America.

For the first time, this rule will bring much needed change so that condition cannot continue. Under the rule, States will no longer be allowed to game and gerrymander targeted employment areas. Instead, the Department of Homeland Security will make targeted employment area designations directly based on revised requirements that will help to ensure rural and high-unemployment areas get more of the investment they have been deprived of for far too long under this program, as it has been misdirected.

Again, this is a major win for rural America and high-unemployment areas, and I want to sincerely thank President Trump and the people in the administration who worked on this rule for making this happen and looking out for the interests of my constituents in Iowa and other rural States and for areas of high unemployment.

This rule also addresses the minimum investment threshold amounts that are required for the EB-5 projects around the country.

This is the very first time the investment thresholds have been adjusted since the program was created in 1990. Think of the inflation since that time.

For projects that are outside of targeted employment areas, the threshold will be raised from \$1 million to \$1.8 million. For projects in targeted employment areas, the threshold will be raised from \$500,000 to \$900,000. The minimum investment amount will be automatically adjusted for inflation every 5 years.

It is ridiculous that our country’s major green card program for investors has been operating with investment amounts that haven’t been adjusted a single time in 30 years. That makes no sense, and I am glad the President and his team have taken necessary action to restore a little common sense to the EB-5 program.

There is more work that needs to be done on the EB-5 program, and we will