

There is a sufficient second.

There is 2 minutes of debate, equally divided.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I yield back.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 109 Leg.]

YEAS—46

Barrasso	Gardner	Portman
Blunt	Grassley	Risch
Boozman	Hatch	Roberts
Burr	Heller	Rounds
Capito	Hoeven	Rubio
Cassidy	Inhofe	Sasse
Cochran	Isakson	Scott
Corker	Johnson	Sessions
Cornyn	Lankford	Shelby
Cotton	Lee	Sullivan
Crapo	McCain	Thune
Cruz	McConnell	Tillis
Daines	Moran	Vitter
Enzi	Murkowski	Paul
Ernst	Paul	Wicker
Fischer	Perdue	

NAYS—52

Alexander	Franken	Murray
Ayotte	Gillibrand	Nelson
Baldwin	Graham	Peters
Bennet	Heinrich	Reed
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Reid
Booker	Hirono	Schatz
Boxer	Kaine	Schumer
Brown	King	Shaheen
Cantwell	Kirk	Stabenow
Cardin	Klobuchar	Tester
Carper	Leahy	Toomey
Casey	Manchin	Udall
Coats	Markey	Warner
Collins	McCaskill	Warren
Coons	Menendez	Whitehouse
Donnelly	Merkley	Wyden
Durbin	Mikulski	
Flake	Murphy	

NOT VOTING—2

Feinstein Sanders

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

AMENDMENT NO. 4859

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to table the Johnson amendment No. 4859 to the instructions of the motion to commit, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 2 minutes, equally divided, for debate.

The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I would like to ask all of my colleagues a simple question: How many more constitutional rights are we going to give up in response to Islamic terror?

Coming from a business background, I certainly found out the way to reach agreement is to try to find areas of agreement. Here is something we can all agree on. Nobody in this Chamber,

no American wants to see weapons transferred into the hands of terrorists or would-be terrorists. We can agree on that. We are so close. I applaud SUSAN COLLINS and our other colleagues for trying to work to a bipartisan agreement to try to accomplish that goal.

My amendment simply adds due process on the front end. Otherwise, it is pretty much identical to what the other Senators on a bipartisan basis were trying to achieve. Please, let's continue to work together. Let's try to find those areas of agreement to accomplish the goal of keeping weapons out of the hands of terrorists, would-be terrorists, while not giving up our constitutional rights.

I ask my colleagues to please vote to not table my amendment so we can continue this discussion and find areas of agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I want the Senator to know our side does support the Second Amendment, but we support all of the amendments of the Constitution—not just one. One of those is the right to speech, and implicit in that is maybe to get a real vote on real substance.

I yield to the Senator from North Dakota to far more articulate the substance. Let's not only support the Constitution but the oath we took to defend all people against enemies, foreign and domestic, and that is what we want to do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, we have been asked to vote on this. It is 20 pages—20 pages that we were just handed. We asked DOJ to help us analyze this so we can best evaluate whether that is a good vote. According to the DOJ, this would not stop them from denying one person a gun.

We are here to say no-fly, no-buy. This doesn't do it. As we work through the Collins amendment, I suggest we continue to have those discussions, but we have a vehicle on the floor where we can have further discussions with any Senator who wants to continue to have a conversation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The yeas and nays have been previously ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 67, nays 31, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 110 Leg.]

YEAS—67

Ayotte	Flake	Paul
Baldwin	Franken	Peters
Barrasso	Gardner	Reed
Bennet	Gillibrand	Reid
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Risch
Booker	Heitkamp	Roberts
Boozman	Hirono	Sasse
Boxer	Hoeven	Schatz
Brown	Kaine	Schumer
Cantwell	King	Sessions
Cardin	Kirk	Shaheen
Carper	Klobuchar	Shelby
Casey	Leahy	Stabenow
Collins	Lee	Sullivan
Coons	Markey	Tester
Cotton	McCaskill	Thune
Crapo	Menendez	Udall
Cruz	Merkley	Warner
Daines	Mikulski	Warren
Donnelly	Moran	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murphy	Wyden
Enzi	Murray	
Fischer	Nelson	

NAYS—31

Alexander	Grassley	Perdue
Blunt	Hatch	Portman
Burr	Heller	Rounds
Capito	Inhofe	Rubio
Cassidy	Isakson	Scott
Coats	Johnson	Tillis
Cochran	Lankford	Toomey
Corker	Manchin	Vitter
Cornyn	McCain	Wicker
Ernst	McConnell	
Graham	Murkowski	

NOT VOTING—2

Feinstein Sanders

The motion was agreed to.

TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the conference report accompanying H.R. 2577.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the conference report to accompany H.R. 2577, which will be stated by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2577), making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, having met, have agreed that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment and the House agree to the same, signed by a majority of the conferees on the part of both Houses.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the conference report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of June 22, 2016.)

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the conference report to accompany H.R. 2577, an act making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Mike Rounds, Thad Cochran, Roy Blunt, John Barrasso, Marco Rubio, Lamar Alexander, Tom Cotton, Bill Cassidy, John Hoeven, Thom Tillis, Jeff Flake, James M. Inhofe, Tim Scott, Shelley Moore Capito, Steve Daines.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call be waived with respect to the cloture motion.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

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

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

COMPROMISE GUN LEGISLATION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the Collins vote, which just took place a few minutes ago, was a vote that was, for lack of a better description, just a show vote. The Collins supporters won. That was their victory, and it is the first time since the historic vote of Senator FEINSTEIN in 1993 dealing with assault weapons that the NRA has been in a situation where they can't declare a victory. They lost this one.

But I would hope now the Republican leader will bring the Collins compromise to a vote here on the floor—a real vote. Today's vote was kind of like heads I win, tails you lose, because for the supporters of the Collins amendment, that was it with them because it guaranteed that even if Collins supporters won the vote, it wouldn't advance. But we did. We won the vote. Collins won that vote.

It is really too bad that the Republican leader worked so hard to defeat the bipartisan compromise put forward by the brave senior Senator from Maine. But despite the efforts of the majority, now the Republican leadership has a responsibility to bring the Collins bill to this floor for a real vote, not a fake vote—a vote that provides

the bill a real chance to advance. I sure hope we have that opportunity. It is the right thing for the country. The country agrees that something has to be done.

Even though it wasn't a big victory, it was a victory. I hope the NRA will step back and do what they have said they would do 15 years ago, and that is work to close loopholes, especially the gun show loophole. It is disappointing that they have taken a new tack and are against anything for more gun safety.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

VOTING IN THE SENATE AND HOUSE

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, it looks like this week is coming to an end in terms of legislative efforts—or the lack thereof—in the House and in the Senate. I want everyone to know what this week was. It seemed like the week of disruption. We had a filibuster in the U.S. Senate, and we had a sit-in—an unprecedented sit-in—in the House of Representatives. What was that all about? It wasn't only over the substance—it goes to the struggle to find the best way for gun control, which really we want to be violence control. And what did we filibuster about? Yes, we wanted to take up the no-fly, no-buy issue, which says that if you are on a terrorist list, you shouldn't be able to buy a gun, and to extend background checks to Internet sales and gun shows, but it was also about the right to vote. The filibuster was to get a vote. We didn't say how people would vote. We knew that would be a subject of debate, further amendment, further amendment, and then a vote. Votes are called yes or no. But the filibuster was about getting the opportunity to offer the amendments, to even be able to vote at all.

Let's go over to the House of Representatives. What did they sit in about? This was not just a spontaneous spout or pout. One of the most distinguished Americans, the Congressman from Georgia, JOHN LEWIS, led a sit-in. He led a sit-in, once again, about getting a vote. This is a man who marched across the Pettus Bridge from Selma, AL, faced being beaten, faced dogs, and bears the permanent legacy and wounds of that civil rights struggle, but he wanted to march for the right to vote and was willing to bear any burden. Then why did this man at a certain age and stage literally sit down on his hands and knees again? And what was that for? That was for the right to vote. That wasn't taking on some authoritarian Governor; that was simply in the House of Representatives: Give us a vote.

People will say: Well, why did they do that? Those votes lost in the Senate. But there were actually two compromises here—a Collins amendment and, at the last minute, a Johnson amendment.

I want people to know what is going on here. There is the substantive debate on how we can curb violence in our country and violence perpetrated where we are just awash in guns in our country. That is the subject of debate and discussion. I welcome all ideas. I recognize and support the Second Amendment of the Constitution. As I said earlier in the discussion, I support not only the Second Amendment, I support all of the amendments, and I really take seriously my oath to defend the Constitution and to defend the American people against all enemies, foreign and domestic. We took that oath.

So I am saying here, can we get rid of the obstructionism to get to votes and to get to real votes, not only votes that are some kind of parliamentary procedure linguistic thing going on. We vote on the motion to proceed. We vote to table the motion. Those are really legitimate parliamentary processes, but they are the fog. They are the fog of parliamentary procedure.

The American people have a right—I think the Congress and Members of it should have a right to offer solutions to national problems. I think that should come in the form of legislation and the amendment process following the rules. Follow the rules. Put out the bill. But when it comes time to vote, we should be able to have a vote and we should be able to vote clearly yes or no. That is all we are asking for here.

We are going to go through yet one more week, and I hope that next week we can actually face our responsibilities and try to come up with real solutions to a very real national problem, which is how to curb violence in our country; to come up with a variety of ideas, and from those ideas, offer them through legislation and amendment and have very clear votes.

People would like us, first of all, to act like Senators and Congresspeople. They would also like us to act with civility. We have seen it time and time again here. But they would also like for us to speak in plain English and have rules that we should follow and that they can understand.

So as this week comes to an end—this has been an unprecedented week in our country of a lot of turmoil and tumult. There has been a lot within our mutual institutions. I hope calmer heads prevail when we come back. Let's really get back to the legislative process that has been established by Senate rule and tradition. Let's have civil debate. Let's approach it with intellectual rigor. Let's approach it with the sincerity I feel is known on both sides of the aisle. But, please, let's seek solutions to our national problems and not seek solutions to solve our party problems.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENZI). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.