



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JUNE 3, 2019

No. 92

Senate

The Senate met at 3 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty God, the center of our joy, give our lawmakers this day wisdom, guidance, and peace as they do Your will on Earth.

Remind them that they are stewards of the talents and influence You have given them. May they never forget their accountability to You.

Let Your presence steady them, whether they walk on life's mountains or in the valley of shadows.

Lord, propel them onward into the accomplishments of today and tomorrow with renewed faith as they seek to please You in all they think, say, and do.

Lord, thank You for the life and legacy of Senator Thad Cochran.

We pray in Your loving Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAWLEY). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

SETTING FORTH THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET FOR THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020 AND SETTING FORTH THE APPROPRIATE BUDGETARY LEVELS FOR FISCAL YEARS 2021 THROUGH 2029—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 1332, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 78, S. 1332, a bill to set forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2020 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2021 through 2029.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

REMEMBERING THAD COCHRAN

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, it is with great sadness that last week we learned of the death of our friend and former colleague, Thad Cochran from Mississippi.

In nearly 40 years in office, Thad served with a fierceness and loyalty to Mississippi matched only by his sense of dignity and respect for his colleagues.

When his issues were on the line, Senator Cochran fought for Mississippi as hard as any Senator. He nurtured Mississippi's universities, schools, farms, hospitals, ports, and fishing industry. He was a champion of the poor and gave a voice to rural communities by expanding assistance for southern farmers. Perhaps it is fitting that he was first bitten by the political bug in his run for head cheerleader at Ole Miss because throughout his career and throughout his life, Thad never stopped being a cheerleader for Mississippi.

One thing I will never forget was Senator Cochran's graciousness after my State was hit by Hurricane Sandy. He knew, from his experience after

Hurricane Katrina, just how devastating the damage can be and how difficult the recovery process can seem in the aftermath of a disaster. At a time when many of his colleagues who always voted for their regions but opposed Sandy because it was New York, Senator Cochran not only supported it but even made sure his team was available to give us guidance. I will never forget that. That is the kind of gentleman and fair-minded individual he was—something missing a lot around here.

In many ways, Thad Cochran was a model Senator. He understood this body's preference for cooperation, compromise, and congeniality almost intuitively. Even as the Senate has gone further away from those values, Senator Cochran held them close. That is just who he was. It made him a better Senator and a better man. We will miss him. I think all of us will. Our prayers go out today to his wife, Kay, his children, his loved ones, and his many friends.

BACKGROUND CHECKS

Mr. President, on background checks, last Friday, another horrible mass shooting transformed a peaceful community in America into a place of tragedy. In Virginia Beach, a dozen people were killed, several others critically wounded, and thousands of Virginians left to mourn and pick up the pieces.

Today we grieve with the people of Virginia Beach, and we send our thanks to the brave police men and women who risked their lives to protect their neighbors. These tragedies leave scars that never go away on community after community that has suffered from it.

It has been less than a month since I spoke on the Senate floor after a shooting. That is the tragedy. It is less than 1 month that I had to come to the floor and speak on the tragedy of one shooting, and now we have another. The list of national tragedies is already too long. The names and places of mass

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S3145

shootings and the victims of everyday gun violence are already too many—far too many to count.

So it is time, long past time to bring a bill to improve gun safety to the floor of the Senate. The House has already passed a bill to close loopholes in our background check system. It is common sense. It is bipartisan. More than 90 percent of Americans support closing these loopholes, including a majority of Republicans and a majority of gun owners. It is hard to defend the desire of felons, spousal abusers, and those adjudicated mentally ill to get firearms. In fact, those who oppose this kind of legislation don't defend it. They sort of slink away and hide figuratively, if not literally, under their desks on the Senate floor.

Why will Leader MCCONNELL not allow background checks to get a vote or even a debate in the Senate? Why has Leader MCCONNELL added this bipartisan legislation, that has already passed the House, to his legislative graveyard?

For too long, the gun lobby has reflexively opposed any gun safety reforms—the most benign and common-sense reforms like closing loopholes in our background checks—and for too long the Republican majority has marched in lockstep with them against the will of the American people and against the safety of the American people.

It is time for that to change. Leader MCCONNELL should call a vote on universal background checks now. Nobody pretends it will stop every shooting, but if it could prevent even one more from happening, it deserves our consideration. Let's not delay any longer. Let's not cower before the NRA. Let's do the right thing that 90 percent of Americans want us to do.

ELECTION SECURITY

Mr. President, there is no principle more essential to democracy than the principle of free and fair elections. It is the very wellspring of our democracy. It is what the people at Bunker Hill, the farmers, put down their plows and took up muskets for—no taxation without representation, voting. Over the past 3 years, we have been reminded again and again how that very sacred wellspring of democracy, voting and fair elections, were attacked by a foreign power.

Mr. Mueller's press conference last week was only the latest reminder of the concerted campaign by Moscow to influence our elections in 2016. It was also a reminder of how much we have yet to do to secure our elections in the future. We included some—some only—but some funding for election security in last year's budget, but we have been blocked so far from providing much needed additional support in this year's budget.

We have bipartisan legislation to harden election infrastructure and sanction any foreign power that tries to interfere in our elections. That legislation is ready to go, but, once again,

MITCH MCCONNELL, self-described Grim Reaper, has refused to take it up—another tombstone in his legislative graveyard.

At the very least, the Senate should be briefed by our intelligence and law enforcement chiefs about the threat of election interference in the 2020 election so we can all be aware of the danger that FBI Director Wray already has pointed out.

On that front, I have some positive news. I have spoken to the Republican leader about that request. He has assured me we will have a briefing. We are still trying to sort out the timing of the briefing, but I urge that it take place as soon as possible during this work period so we can prepare new legislation that will go into effect at least a year before election day of 2020. By no means does a briefing replace all the other things we must do to protect our elections. It is necessary but not nearly sufficient. I hope when people go to this briefing, Members, Democrats and Republicans, they will see the danger and act.

How can we sit by? We are a great power. To sit by with our arms folded, while Russia or China or Iran or some other country, North Korea, tries to interfere in our elections—that is not what a great power does. It protects itself and its people, especially when it comes to something so vital as elections.

I hope we have this briefing quickly. I hope it reignites a desire on both sides of the aisle to move legislation, increase funding, and do what is necessary to protect our democracy.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. President, on the border, since the outset, the Trump administration's policy at our southern border has been chaotic, ineffective and, in many cases, inhumane. One of the most fundamentally misguided elements of the Trump administration's policy is how it has approached the root causes of the migration because, while the President complains loudly about the number of refugees and migrants at our border, his administration has made a few of the root causes of this migration more severe.

One of the principal ways we could address the surge on migrants is by helping improve conditions in their own countries. Most of them are fleeing violence or a huge economic hardship, so they feel it is better to travel thousands of miles of dangers, maybe in the hands of coyotes, than stay home. By cracking down on gang violence and drug trafficking back in their home countries, we could reduce the flow of immigrants at our southern border.

No one can understand—so confounded—why, in late March, the President announced he would be cutting off security assistance to Central American countries to address these very issues. The President cut his nose to spite his face. He made the problem worse by cutting off these dollars.

The administration has provided virtually no information about the rationale for these cuts—\$450 million. It is a completely self-inflicted wound to our national security that makes the problem the President complains about worse, not better. It is almost as if the President is intentionally trying to add fuel to the fire, to fabricate a crisis, and to create, post hoc, a justification for a baseless emergency declaration he made months ago.

I don't think many Americans would say cutting funding to help Central American countries stop migration is a responsible policy, and that is why we Democrats have proposed just the opposite. We propose to actually get at the root cause of migration by allowing asylum seekers to apply for asylum in their home countries, not at our southern border, by increasing the number of judges to process the cases at the border, and by helping Central American countries crack down on gang violence in the city's drug cartels. In fact, our bill authorizes \$1.5 billion in security assistance to the Northern Triangle to do just that, far and above what the administration has just cut.

The policies the administration pursues make no sense whatsoever. They seem vindictive, they seem done at the moment, and they seem totally not thought through. We are proposing policies that will address the real issues here, and Democrats will push for them in any legislation that deals with border policy.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

VIRGINIA BEACH SHOOTING

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, as millions looked forward to an early summer weekend, Virginia Beach, VA, became the latest community where lives were shattered by violence. Twelve workers at the Virginia Beach Municipal Center were shot and killed when a lone gunman—a fellow employee—opened fire on Friday afternoon. Some of the victims had worked for the city for decades, one for just under a year. All of them leave behind a grieving community that must now try to make sense of the senseless. And several more of their colleagues were injured.

As the community rallies behind those in grief and shock, the Nation is also learning about the selfless heroism of the law enforcement officers who bravely brought the violence to an end. Four officers moved quickly through the municipal building that housed 400 workers. They quickly located the

shooter, hemmed him in to prevent further innocent casualties, and engaged him in a firefight. Reportedly, one officer was actually shot but was spared serious injury due to his bulletproof vest.

Thanks to their bravery, about 45 minutes after the shooting began, the suspect was in police custody.

Such stories of courage strike us as remarkable. They inspire gratitude and remind us of humanity's best, just as we are faced with its worst. They should also be occasions to remember just how many men and women across America put on their uniforms every day and report to work, knowing they might be called on for heroism just like this. Hundreds of thousands of police officers and other first responders across our Nation protect and serve every day.

I know that all of my colleagues join me in prayer and solidarity for the victims of this evil violence, for their families, and for all of the first responders who stand ready to jump between their neighbors and harm's way.

REMEMBERING THAD COCHRAN

Mr. President, on Thursday morning, we received sad news out of Oxford, MS. Our friend and distinguished former colleague, Senator Thad Cochran, had passed away.

Thad took retirement a little more than a year ago to focus on his health and his family. That day concluded a truly remarkable career in the history of the Senate: seven terms; nearly four decades; the second longest serving Senator from Mississippi; and the tenth longest serving Senator, period, in American history.

To put it all another way, when Senator Cochran first arrived in 1978, only one of our current colleagues was here to witness it. The other 99 of us are all newer at this club than Thad was.

Such a storied career was far from guaranteed when Thad decided to give politics a try back in the early 1970s. I have always enjoyed the story about his very first run for Congress.

Remember, Mississippi had only had one other Republican Congressman since Reconstruction. So when this young rising-star lawyer asked Rose how she might like being married to a Congressman, here was her response: "I don't know, which one?"

If Thad's presence here in Congress at one point seemed improbable, it quickly became difficult to imagine Capitol Hill without him. His fruitful career produced a huge number of legislative accomplishments and a sterling reputation as a thoughtful, measured, and effective leader. He chaired the Appropriations Committee, the Agriculture Committee, and the Republican conference. He was at once a powerful force within our ranks and a trusted friend and partner to many of our friends across the aisle as well.

In just the past few days, the authors of eulogies and tributes have enjoyed noting all the ways that Thad seemed to embody a whole region and era, as

though he had come right out of central casting. One obituary talked up the "traditional catfish fries," "home-spun politics," and "Southern charm." Another newspaper described his "Southern gentility" as a "courtly" and "understated style," seeming to suggest that approach was at odds with his impressive and powerful perch.

It is true that over seven terms in this body, Chairman Cochran appeared on "Meet the Press" only twice. To say he did not crave a national spotlight would certainly be an understatement. He was just too busy racking up progress for the people of Mississippi and for the country—busy managing the appropriations process; busy finding new ways to elevate historically Black colleges and universities with scholarship opportunities, research grant funding, and new initiatives; busy working across the aisle on matters of national security, like the bipartisan Cochran-Inouye National Missile Defense Act; busy using his voice to champion the concerns of farmers and rural communities, clearing obstacles on commodity pricing and wetlands conservation.

Thad was so confident in American agriculture that he used it as a tool for international development. Now overseas farm delegations learn U.S. techniques firsthand through the Cochran Fellowship Program.

As much as the long list of achievements continued to grow, Thad Cochran's character and his values stayed steady. Thad may not have followed his schoolteacher parents into the education business, but he sure did take us all to school. His colleagues learned firsthand that a dogged work ethic and compassionate friendship are not incompatible here. His constituents learned that their "quiet persuader" kept his promises. And the Nation learned from a first-rate example of humility and grace in public service.

So while we mourn that we no longer have our friend Thad in this life, we should also celebrate all of those lessons he taught us and celebrate the fact that they aren't going anywhere.

On Thad's last day in the Senate, he left us with a remarkable farewell statement. In it, he noted that John Stennis, another long-tenured Mississippian, had previously used Thad's desk and had signed it, per Senate custom. But while Senator Stennis had noted his start date in 1947, he never wrote down any end date on the other side of the dash. "Perhaps there is symbolism there," Thad wrote in his farewell, "that our service does not end when we depart this Chamber."

Isn't that the truth? When it comes to Thad Cochran, his legacy and his example are part of this place for good. His impact continues. His service still inspires all of us.

I want to close with a reference to one more part of Thad's farewell. Here are his very last words in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the capstone to 45 years of statesmanship. This is what he said:

I will now return to my beloved Mississippi and my family and my friends there. I will miss this stately Chamber and this city. I will not miss the power or politics. I will miss people: you, my colleagues. . . . I trust, if your travels bring you to Oxford, MS, you will not hesitate to visit and join me for a refreshment on the porch. We can listen to the mockingbirds together.

That was our colleague—gracious, generous, always with his home State and his fellow Mississippians at the top of his mind and deep in his heart.

Today, at the State capitol in Jackson, Mississippians gathered to return the favor. Thad Cochran is at the top of their minds. He is deep in their hearts, and, most importantly, our friend is on his way to a just reward in his Father's house.

So the Senate today sends our condolences and our prayers to Thad's wife Kay; his two children, Clayton and Kate; his grandchildren; and many, many friends. We stand together in remembering our good friend.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

OPIOID EPIDEMIC

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, during the last week, I spent some time traveling through Texas, meeting with constituents, and talking about some of the legislation we have been working on here in Washington and, perhaps most importantly, spent a little time listening to what was on their minds.

One of the things we talked about was the fact that in 2017, more than 70,000 Americans died of drug overdoses. That is according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. The opioid epidemic, which contributed mightily to that number, has affected every State, every city, and every community. My constituents, like all of our constituents, are in search of real solutions to try to support those leading the fight on the ground.

I had the chance to spend a little bit of time in Tyler, TX, which is in East Texas, which we affectionately call "behind the Pine Curtain." I learned from some of the folks in Tyler about how substance abuse has affected that area and what we can do better to serve the people who are impacted. I heard from pharmacists, healthcare providers, law enforcements officers, community leaders, and other experts about their efforts. We talked about the need for a holistic approach that focused on reducing supply and also reducing demand, helping those with substance abuse problems, and preventing drug abuse from occurring and spreading into the future.

We talked about some of the legislation we have passed here in Congress to try to help equip them with the tools they would need in order to fight this fight—a bill we call the SUPPORT for Patients and Communities Act. This legislation provides critical tools to those communities in the fight against substance abuse. It reauthorizes programs to reduce demand for narcotics and provides tools for pharmacists, prescribers, and law enforcement so that

they can work together more seamlessly to combat opioid addiction. It also provides support for those recovering from substance abuse disorders by providing expanded treatment options and recovery services. It takes unprecedented steps to combat the opioid crisis, and it received overwhelming bipartisan support in both Chambers.

Now, I don't blame people who may listen to this and say: Well, I never heard about that before. That is what happens when we pass overwhelmingly bipartisan legislation here in Congress. If there is not a big fight about it, if it is not on the cable news, if it is not on social media, then it happens without people paying much notice. Yet it is important work that happens every day here in Washington, DC—Republicans and Democrats working together, trying to solve problems, trying to equip those on the frontlines with the tools they need in order to fight that fight.

Folks in East Texas told me about how the new grants under the SUPPORT for Patients and Communities Act may help to strengthen their efforts and help ease the pain of the opioid epidemic.

Then I took a trip over to Lufkin High School in Lufkin, TX, which is also in East Texas, to meet with students, educators, and administrators to talk about the GEAR UP program. This is a competitive grant program that helps historically underrepresented students to achieve college and career readiness through academic, social, and planning support.

For example, if you come from a family in which no one has previously gone to college, well, you may not really know what it is you need to do, starting even in the seventh grade, to begin to prepare—what courses you need to take, what prerequisites are going to be required for you to be considered by the college of your choice. If you decide to take a career path that doesn't involve a 4-year college—through one of our community colleges—and get a certificate so you can qualify for a good-paying job, let's say, as a certified welder, you need to prepare early.

The folks in East Texas told me how these grants under the GEAR UP program help one to do exactly that. The GEAR UP program recognizes that college and career readiness begin early. That is why it is so important that the cohort that is first helped by these GEAR UP grants is of those in the seventh grade—pretty early. I don't remember having a plan in the seventh grade, to be sure. If I had had a plan, I am not sure exactly what it would have been. I came from a family in which going to college was expected. As a matter of fact, I never entertained any other idea. Yet we have to recognize that many young students don't have that sort of example in their own households and that they need some additional help in order to pursue their educations and prepare for good, well-paying jobs.

The good thing about the GEAR UP program is that it doesn't use a blanket approach to support students because we know what works well in one State and in one region of the country may not work as well in another. Instead, the GEAR UP program gives local leaders the flexibility to cater to their students' needs.

The best part about GEAR UP is that it is actually a government program that works. GEAR UP students graduate from high school at a higher rate than their peers, regardless of ethnicity or income, and they attend college at a higher rate.

In Lufkin, 3,000 students have benefited from more than \$10 million in Federal GEAR UP grants over the last two decades, and last week, I had the opportunity to hear what it meant to them personally. Statewide, Texas students have benefited from \$885 million in GEAR UP grants over the last 20 years, and we have seen incredible results.

I believe there are additional steps we can take to ensure that local leaders have the flexibility they need in order to tailor their programs appropriately, so earlier this year, I introduced the GEAR UP for Success Act, which will provide more flexibility to school districts on how they may use those funds so that local jurisdictions can better tailor these programs to their students' specific needs. It would reduce the local cost share significantly—by half—that is required to receive a GEAR UP grant, which means more students will benefit from these funds and these programs.

I appreciate the folks in Tyler, in Lufkin, and in the many other cities I visited in Texas last week for taking the time to share with me their thoughts and ideas so that we can bring more Texas common sense to Washington, DC.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. President, on another matter, we know that Central American migrants continue to make their way to our southern border in record numbers and that law enforcement, city officials, and nongovernmental organizations are struggling to manage this influx of humanity. We are seeing people arrive en masse, and it is not uncommon to see multiple groups, each with hundreds of people, arrive in a single day.

My State has 1,200 miles of a common border with Mexico, and I believe that border security is one of the Federal Government's most important responsibilities. These are people who are showing up at our border and literally turning themselves in to the Border Patrol because they know that by exploiting gaps in our asylum laws, they are virtually guaranteed entry into the United States. As well, the human smugglers who get rich by smuggling this human cargo from Central America, across Mexico, and into the United States are making untold millions of dollars in this very profitable business.

Last week, one of the large groups who came to El Paso broke a record.

The Border Patrol encountered a group of more than 1,000 illegal immigrants—more than double the previous record of 421 that was set last month. Only 39 of the people who were traveling in that group were single adults. The rest were either families or children who were traveling alone, and that was no mistake. The smugglers know that if they send unaccompanied children or families, they can exploit those vulnerabilities in our immigration and asylum laws and successfully place those individuals in the United States, only to be told to show up at later dates for court hearings that are maybe months or even years into the future. Surprise, surprise—most do not show up, and they successfully make their way into the United States without complying with our immigration laws. We simply don't have the facilities, the funding, or the resources to detain and properly care for many of these individuals, let alone these children and families.

Regardless of where each individual Member of Congress stands on immigration generally, I hope everyone in this Chamber can agree that there is a problem and that it must be addressed urgently.

In the short term, I hope appropriators can come to an agreement soon to provide desperately needed funding to those who are working to manage this humanitarian crisis in Texas and in other border States. Without the Federal Government's assistance, funding to support these migrants may soon dry up, and conditions in these facilities will rapidly deteriorate.

Additional funding is a much needed bandaid to help manage this crisis right now, but we need to continue working on longer term solutions so that we can stop the flow of migrants without hurting our country economically or doing it in a way that is inconsistent with our values and our laws.

Our country relies, for example, on a strong trading relationship with Mexico. Goods and services that were traded between our countries in 2018 totaled more than \$670 billion. Much of the trade we have is between Texas and Mexico. Mexico is by far and away my State's top trading partner. In 2018, Texas exported nearly \$110 billion in goods to Mexico. That is roughly four times the number of exports to our No. 2 trading partner—Canada. We also imported more than \$107 billion from our southern neighbor. That includes everything from motor vehicle parts, to computer equipment, to tractors, to avocados. It is not uncommon to see certain products, like automobiles, cross the border multiple times throughout the production process before they eventually make their way to consumers. It is a fact of life that businesses and jobs in our communities in Texas and literally around the country rely on a strong trading relationship between the United States and Mexico—something I have always supported and for which I will continue to advocate.

I appreciate President Trump's unwavering commitment to securing our southern border and enforcing our immigration laws, and I will continue to support his efforts to stop the flow of illegal immigration, to improve physical security, to close dangerous loopholes in the law, and to provide our frontline officers and agents the tools and resources they need to carry out their sworn mission.

It is important to remember that with any actions that we take to secure our southern border, we must also keep in mind the important role that Mexico plays in the economy of the United States. My State enjoys a strong relationship economically with Mexico because of that 1,200-mile common border and because of the sort of trading and commercial relationships I described a moment ago. Any decisions that would disrupt that relationship need to be closely examined and debated and be subject to a cost-benefit analysis.

I believe there are solutions that can secure our border, that can fix this mass influx of humanity that is coming across as a result of the exploitation of our asylum laws, and that can also deliver a secure economy not just for Texas but for the entire United States. In Laredo, TX, 14,000 to 16,000 trucks a day cross the international border between Laredo, TX, and Nuevo Laredo, and that is an important part of the Texas and local economies. They understand the importance of that cross-border trade, and they are interested in working with us to try to make sure we deal with what is broken when it comes to our asylum laws.

My friend and colleague HENRY CUELLAR, who is a Democrat from Laredo and represents that part of the State, has joined with me in a bipartisan, bicameral bill to fix what the Border Patrol and the Department of Homeland Security say needs fixing in our asylum laws because there is basically now a superhighway leading from Central America, through Mexico, into the United States, and we are seeing more and more people being drawn to the opportunities they have when they enter the United States and exploit those broken laws.

My plea to all of our colleagues here on a bipartisan basis is this: We need to get serious about fixing these problems. I think the American people look at us and wonder why it is we have let partisan politics overcome our willingness to do the things we said we would do when we ran for office to benefit the American people. This is one of those issues that require a congressional solution. Nobody else can fix it. We need to get serious about finding solutions and getting this fixed as soon as we possibly can.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. ERNST). The Senator from Kentucky.

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

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

BUDGET PROPOSAL

Mr. PAUL. Madam President, I rise today to let the American people know that there are some of us left in Washington—some of your representatives—who actually do care about the mounting debt.

We now have over \$22 trillion worth of debt, and you ask yourself: Whose fault is this? How did it get so out of control? How did we accumulate so much debt that we are accumulating debt at \$1.5 million every minute?

Under George W. Bush, the debt went from about \$5 trillion to \$10 trillion. Under President Obama, it went from \$10 trillion to \$20 trillion. Under President Trump, it will go from \$20 trillion to about \$30 trillion.

So the debt is out of control, and you ask yourself: Why is no one doing anything about it? Whose fault is it?

Well, really, I think you can see that it is a bipartisan problem. Both parties are at fault. We have a debt now that exceeds \$22 trillion. If you have ever seen usdebtclock.org, you can see the numbers spinning out of control.

Now, how would that apply to an individual? Each individual American in the country owes about \$70,000 of that debt. Some people say: Well, it is so enormous; do deficits really matter?

In fact, I think it was one of the changes, when Republicans way back said that deficits don't matter. Well, it actually does matter. It matters to your budget each year because what happens is that as interest grows, it crowds out everything else.

In fact, interest right now is the fourth leading item in the budget, only behind Medicare and Social Security and defense. But if you look at interest on the debt, what is going to happen over the next decade or so is that interest is in the red, and you can see interest is climbing and will exceed, over time, both defense and also Social Security. So it is a real problem. As interest on the debt rises, it sort of crowds out all other spending.

So what are people doing about it? What are your Senators doing about it, and what are your Congressmen doing about it? Nothing. Absolutely nothing.

The Democrats control the House. Will they have a budget this year? So far, goose egg, no budget.

How about the Republicans in the Senate? Do they have a budget? Well, they did pass one out, but there is no plan of ever voting on it on the floor.

So what we will get to vote on today is my budget. My budget is called the Penny Plan Budget. What my budget does is that it cuts one penny out of every dollar.

(Mr. BOOZMAN assumed the Chair.)

It is interesting because as I see people come to Washington—and almost

everybody who comes to Washington wants money—and I tell them: First of all, I have to tell you, we have no money. We are \$1 trillion short this year.

People have such good causes. They say: Well, we want money for this disease or that disease.

I say: Well, wait a minute. What if we said that we will give you 99 percent of what you had last year? We will give you one penny less. So if your charity or disease or the thing you are concerned about got \$100 million, next year you get \$99 million.

Here is what is interesting. Most of these people are advocates for Federal money. They often advocate for the State government looking for more Federal money. I have yet to meet a person, liberal, conservative or independent, who doesn't say: Hmm, I get 99 percent of what I got last year, and everybody would get the same? We would spend 99 percent of what we spent last year, and it would be spread across every sector, every sector that the right or left wants? I say: Yes. We spend 99 percent, and if you do, guess what, the budget balances in 5 years—or at least it did until recently.

I have been proposing the penny budget for the last 6 or 7 years, and up until now it actually balanced in 5 years if you cut one penny out of every dollar, but guess what. The longer you wait, the more interest there is, the more of a burden of debt there is, and the harder it is to actually fix the problem. So this year, for the first time, we have to call it a two-penny plan. It still balances in 5 years, but we spend only 98 percent of what we spent the previous year.

What would happen? You will still have 98 percent of your government. Is there anybody in America who does not believe there is 2 percent waste? I think, if you did a survey of the American people, they would probably be more accurate than up here. There has to be 10-percent waste in these programs. We find it all the time.

I will give you two quick examples. We are spending \$50 billion a year in Afghanistan, and even for those who advocate staying in Afghanistan for another decade or more—which I don't—we are spending money on wasteful things. We spent \$90 million on a luxury hotel across from our Embassy. It was never completed. It is a shell of a building, and the Taliban can crawl into this building and shoot down into our Embassy. Now our soldiers have to risk life and limb to patrol an empty hotel that somebody ripped us off on for 90 million bucks and fled the country.

We built a \$45 million gas station in Afghanistan. It was supposed to cost a half million, but 83 cost overruns later, it cost \$45 million. Guess what kind of gas is pumped at this gas station, if you could ever get there to see if it exists—natural gas because somebody decided that the defense industry should be reducing the carbon footprint of the

world, and we weren't supposed to be killing our enemies so much as reducing the carbon footprint of the world. So we built a natural gas station in Afghanistan.

The problem? They don't have any cars. The average income in Afghanistan is about \$800 a year, and there are very few people who have cars, and of the ones who do have cars, none of them run on natural gas.

The examples go on and on.

We spent \$2 million studying whether, when someone sneezes on the food in front of you at the cafeteria, you are more or less likely to eat the food. It took them \$2 million to figure that one out.

This is throughout government. There is, at the least, 1 to 2 percent waste. There is probably 10 percent waste and just throwing the money—it would almost be better just to burn the money.

What do we do? Who is saying anything about it? The media says no one is, and this is fake news—it is a lie—because when the tax cuts came around, I insisted the tax cuts be paid for. How many people voted with me? Eight Senators, all Republicans, not one Democrat.

So you ask yourself what are the Democrats for? Are the Democrats for balancing the budget? No, they don't care at all about the deficit.

Do Republicans care? Some do, most don't. So we are going to have a vote on my budget which cuts two pennies out of every dollar, balances the budget within 5 years, and then actually lets the budget grow at 2 percent a year for the remaining 5 years, and we would be a much stronger nation.

If we were to actually balance the budget and then let the country move forward and grow, once again, we would have the greatest confidence. The world would have great confidence in us again. If we don't do it, I think there is a real problem coming for us.

There is going to be a day within the next 10 years that interest will actually exceed \$1 trillion. Right now we are spending \$400 billion on interest. So it is a real problem. It is crowding out everything else, and it is becoming one of the largest items we have in the budget.

Why can't we get there? What seems to be the problem?

The first problem is math. They have us kind of—it is fuzzy. It is called Washington math. Washington math, if you read the Washington Post, they will say: Oh, no. It is not just cutting 1 percent; your budget is going to cut \$10 trillion over the next 10 years.

Here is what the difference is. If we don't spend any more money—last year, we spent \$4 trillion. If we keep spending \$4 trillion over the next 4 years, would that be cutting any money or spending the same amount?

Be careful what you answer. The Washington Post and the liberal media will tell you we have now cut \$10 trillion if we keep spending the same

amount over 10 years. Why? Because they are anticipating the curve of spending. The baseline of spending, this red line, is going up. Spending is going like this, but most people in their normal household income would say: I made \$40,000 this year, and next year, if I make \$45,000, that is an increase. The government would say: No, we anticipated your making \$45,000 next year, so it is not an increase. They work it on a baseline that is elevated. So if we don't spend \$10 trillion more next year than we did this year, over the next 10 years, they will say we have actually cut spending. This is a real problem.

For example, it is this dotted green line. We cut 2 percent a year over a 5-year period, and then we allow government to grow at 2 percent a year. People would say: Oh, well, it doesn't look like you are really cutting spending. That is the truth of the matter. Over a 10-year period, spending will increase 18 percent over where we are today, but the fake news media will report that we cut \$10 trillion. This is not a rounding error. We say spending is going up 18 percent, and the fake news will say they cut \$10 trillion in spending and orphans and widows and the older generation will be out on the doorstep, and there will be no more government. No. We are talking about a \$4 trillion government that is still spending close to \$4 trillion. What we will not let it do is go to \$5 trillion over the next 10 years. This is eminently reasonable.

I have talked to people from the right, the left, and the center, and said: Can you live with 99 or 98 percent of what you spent last year? I have yet to have a person say that for the good of the country, why don't we do that. What would happen is, it would be a compromise.

Who drives the spending debate around here? Who drives that we need more spending? It is really both parties, but recently it has been Republicans. The Republicans say: We have to have more military spending. The Democrats say: We will give you more military spending if you give us more welfare spending. So all spending goes up. That is the compromise.

People say we don't compromise. Hey, we are spending money, and these guys compromise every day, and it is at your expense. It is why the deficit is so big.

What about a different compromise? What if the right and the left said military is important—the left said, social welfare is important, but you know what, for the good of the country, let's spend 99 percent of what we spent last year on these programs or 98 percent. It could be done, but it takes resolve, and the American people need to know that those who are in charge are not doing anything about this.

Now, some will argue, and the fake news media has argued, well, it is all about the tax cut. Republicans don't care about the deficit because they cut taxes. Well, that is actually not true. We actually had more revenue last

year than the preceding year, even though we did cut taxes. So we had \$14 billion more in taxes but \$127 billion more in spending.

So the problem is a spending problem. Of all of our spending, which is about \$4 trillion in spending or a little bit more, about two-thirds of that spending is Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and food stamps. We don't ever vote on any reforms to these programs. These are called the entitlements, and nobody has any bills. There are no bills coming forward to look at the entitlement spending.

Why is this a problem? The remaining third of government spending is half military and half welfare. If you eliminated the military spending completely and eliminated welfare spending completely, entitlements still drive the deficit.

So what do we have to do? We have to make some tough choices. I was very honest with the people who voted for me. I told them, look, we are living longer, and we have less kids, so the demographics of Social Security and Medicare don't work. The main reason Medicare and Social Security is short is because we have smaller families. Your great-grandparents had a lot of kids, your grandparents had less kids, you had less kids, and your kids today are having less. So we have less and less young people and more and more old people. It is a demographic imbalance. That is why Social Security is short, and that is why Medicare is short, but you can fix them both easily.

You have to gradually raise the age when we begin taking Medicare and Social Security. We already did it in Social Security. We did it under Ronald Reagan and Tip O'Neill. A conservative Republican and a liberal Democrat in 1983 came together and said: We are running out of money. What do we do? They actually did raise the age from 65 for Social Security very gradually to 67. I haven't heard one person debating it since. Everybody accepted it and said: Look, in order to keep these programs intact and not bankrupt the country, we have to do this.

This is what Democrats and Republicans should do now: Come together and say Social Security is \$7 trillion short. Medicare is \$35 trillion to \$40 trillion short. If you do nothing, they are both going to implode. If you want these programs and you want them to continue, you have to do something. Very gradually raising the age at which people start Medicare and Social Security has to be done. You can either do it now and do it very gradually, a month or two a year over a 20-year period, or you can wait until they are completely bankrupt.

If you wait until Social Security is completely bankrupt in 2034, what happens is everybody has to take a 25-percent cut, but if you do it very gradually, you will never have to have these cuts. It just means that everybody will have to wait a little bit longer to get there.

It is important that we do have budgets. We have this enormous debt of \$22 trillion. We are adding \$1 trillion dollars each year. Yet the Senate will not vote on a budget this year, other than my budget, and the House, controlled by Democrats, will not vote on a budget either. So you have both Houses really not tending to their duty.

Now when we have a vote for the balanced budget amendment, everybody turns out in force and votes. In 2012, we had a vote in this body, and every Republican voted to balance the budget in 5 years—an amendment to the Constitution that would require 5 years. Yet the Republican budget that is coming out of committee never balances. So we kind of give lip service to this idea. When people are at home campaigning, they pound the table and say: We are going to stop the deficits. We are going to be the frugal party—and guess what. Neither party has been very good with your money.

It is because they are afraid. They get elected, and they become afraid that they will be unelected if you tell them the truth.

I think we live in a time where it is the opposite now. People want someone to tell the truth—the emperor has no clothes. Social Security spends more money than comes in. If we don't admit these truths and have a discussion about them and if we are so occupied yelling at each other over elections and who did what during the last election—have you heard any discussion on television, have you seen one television program talk about Social Security going bankrupt, \$7 trillion short; Medicare going bankrupt, \$35 to \$40 trillion short?

Have you heard any news program or have you seen anything on the news—right, left, or center—that actually talks about our problems? No, it is yack, yack, yack about election this and election that. People are still unhappy with the results of the election, when in reality maybe we should talk about some of the difficult problems that confront us.

I think the No. 1 threat to our national security is our debt. I am not alone. Admiral Mullin, who was Chief of Staff under President Obama, said the same thing. There are people in the military who understand that maybe our military mission is so big that our military can't keep up with it. If we are going to have troops in 50 of 54 African countries, if we are going to have troops in every Middle Eastern country, and if we are going to have large bases in Iraq and Afghanistan, yes, maybe we don't have enough money.

Our Founding Fathers said you only go to war when Congress votes on it. Recently, there has been a rattling of sabers over Iran. We are tightening the screws on Iran and not letting them sell oil to anyone. They are getting their back up and tensions are flaring. Well, the Constitution says very clearly that you don't go to war with anybody—including Iran—unless you ask Congress for permission.

The President does not have permission to take us to war. Many people don't realize this. The Founding Fathers specifically didn't want to give that power. In fact, it was Madison who said that the executive is the branch most prone to war; therefore, we have, with studied care, vested the power to go to war in Congress. Yet we live in a time in which Presidents of both parties take us to war. President Obama began and continued the war in Syria, in Libya. President Trump has continued those things on both sides of the aisle. But it is not just whether it is good or bad foreign policy; it is extraordinarily expensive. We are bankrupting the American people. We are borrowing money at a million and a half dollars every minute. Really, this is sort of a crummy gift to the next generation. It is like: Oh, by the way, you are lucky. You are going to be inheriting the national debt, and you will be paying for it.

Kids already realize they are inheriting this college debt. It is difficult to pay college debt. As you look at this and you look at the individual share, here is 2015—about \$58,000 per person with the debt. But look at what it is doing over time. It is pyramiding. The debt is beginning to explode because we are just doing nothing to rein it in.

Whenever we have a vote on trying to do something about the debt, as we did when we passed the tax cut—I introduced a budget motion that said the tax cut should be paid for with spending cuts. We got eight Republicans. I introduced another motion that said we should use budget reconciliation—fancy words for a majority vote—to actually rein in the spending and entitlements. I got four votes.

There aren't enough people up here. The people up here don't seem to care about the debt. They just think, oh, we will just pile it on, and we will be fine. But we are hollowing out the country. When people talk about hollowing out the country, the one thing is the debt.

We superficially are doing quite well at this point, but there will be a day of reckoning. There will be a day of reckoning on which the government will have to make a decision, and the decision becomes to print more money to pay for the debt, at which time the country loses the value of its currency.

It is happening in Venezuela. Do you know what the inflation is down there? It is 130,000 percent. The money is worthless as soon as they print it. You have to be paid a couple times during the day because if you start working at 8:00 in the morning, by 5:00 in the evening, the money is worth less and less. It virtually has no value.

We have to decide. Do you want something for nothing? Do you really believe we can give you free college? Do you think it is really free? Do you think nobody is going to have to pay for it? Do you think we can give you free healthcare? Do you think we can give you a free car or a free cell phone? No. Somebody pays for it. If we don't

pay for it through taxes, we just pile on the debt, and we are destroying the country with it. Most people sort of know this instinctively. There is no ability to have something for nothing. You have to work for it.

The thing is, if we go on and on and say we are just going to keep piling on the debt, the day of reckoning is coming, and when it comes, a once great country could be dragged down by this mountain of debt that we have.

Today my budget will be put forward. It is the Penny Plan budget. The Penny Plan budget is now basically the two-penny budget because it no longer balances in 5 years if we cut one penny. But if we cut two pennies, meaning that next year, we would spend 98 percent of what we spent this year—is there anybody in America who thinks the government and the people who receive stuff from the government couldn't live on 98 percent?

When I ask people in my office who actually work in the private sector, they say yes. Many times in their career, there was a downturn in sales, and they had to take less money or less income—some people said significantly less—or they had to cut back on their family expenses. Do you know what government does? The opposite. If we go into a recession, there is this left-wing, egg-headed idea that we should spend more money, that we should go further into debt and start lavishing out money instead of—when you are not selling things and things aren't doing as well, you cut back on your consumption. You cut back on things.

We have a great country. We shouldn't let it get away from us. I don't think there is any way in the world we could not move on and become a stronger nation if we would try the Penny Plan. Like I said, people should pay attention to this because all these representatives—at least on the Republican side—go home and say they are for balanced budgets, but they are not really for balanced budgets if they vote for budgets that never balance.

The budget by Republicans coming out of the Senate committee never balances. The budget from the Democrats hasn't even made it out of committee. There probably will be no vote in the House or the Senate on the budget. Neither one of them ever balances. It is in the Republican rules that we are supposed to advocate for a budget that balances in at least 10 years. Now we are putting forward budgets that never balance.

Look at what the deficit has done. The red is what has already occurred, and the pink is what is to come. Most of this is driven by entitlements. You will hear that as an argument. Particularly in the Republican caucus, they will say: Yeah, it is all driven by entitlements. We need to do something about entitlements.

Then you put forward a bill. I have a bill. I have a bill to reform Social Security by gradually letting the age go

up a month or two a year over the next 20 years. I also would means test the benefits, meaning that wealthier people would receive a little bit less Social Security. People would say: Well, I don't want to do that. If you don't, the whole system is going to implode. So can't we go ahead and just do it now and do it in the least painful sort of way?

Do you know how many people I have on my bill? I think there are four people brave enough to put their names on a bill that would gradually allow the Social Security age to go up. But if you talk to people quietly, even on the other side of the aisle, they will admit to you that, yeah, we ought to do something, but nobody ever does anything. The other side says: We will do it only if you raise taxes on the wealthy. We already have a progressive Tax Code.

Interestingly—a lot of people don't know this—our Tax Code in America is more progressive than Scandinavia's. You have heard some of the clamor for socialism. They want Swedish socialism. Well, we have higher taxes on the wealthy than they do in Sweden. In fact, in Sweden, in Denmark, it is the opposite, actually—the middle class and the poor are more heavily taxed than in our country.

When you look and you hear people say "Well, Sweden and Denmark—why don't we become Denmark? Let's give everybody paid leave, free paid leave. Let's give the uncle of the baby free paid leave. Let's give everybody—the grandparents need paid leave. It is all going to be free," well, guess what, they do stuff like that in Scandinavia, but everybody pays a 25-percent sales tax. It is not free. Everybody pays a 25-percent sales tax in Scandinavia.

In addition, the income tax in Denmark—and many of the other countries are similar—is 60 percent at \$60,000. Do you want to buy a car in Scandinavia? Do you wonder why these people are freezing, riding their bike all winter long? There is a 200-percent tax to buy a car. If you want to buy a \$30,000 car, you have to have \$60,000 up front to pay the government, and then you need another \$30,000 to buy the car.

It is not free. There is no free lunch. When people say that government can provide you all these things, they can only do it by either taxing you or borrowing. Right now, we are doing it mostly through borrowing.

The reason I think it is probably destined to get worse over time is we have gradually taken people off the tax rolls. Really, below \$50,000, there is a very minimal amount of income tax being paid. In fact, those who are in the top 10 percent pay almost all of the income tax in our country. People say: We need to stick it to the rich; the rich aren't paying their fair share. Guess what. The top 10 percent pay 87 percent of the income tax. Almost all of the income tax is paid by the top 10 percent. If you go to the top 50 percent—that is \$75,000 and above—it is well over 90 per-

cent. Ninety-six or ninety-seven percent of the income tax is paid for by people who make \$75,000 and above.

There is a young socialist on the other side who says: We need a special tax on the rich, on those who make \$10 million a year. You have heard this. Even Republicans are saying: Well, yeah, let's stick it to the rich. Let's get those filthy rich people.

Let's say you do it, put a 70-percent tax on those who make \$10 million. Well, let's do the math. What does it bring in? Let's say they all continue to work, and let's say they all pay their taxes and don't move to another country. That will bring in \$50 billion. That sounds like a lot of money. How much would Medicare for All cost? Sixty trillion dollars. All right. The tax brings in \$50 billion. The spending proposal for just Medicare for All is \$60 trillion. For the Green New Deal, add another \$10 trillion. Their spending proposals are so big—no one can even define them within a few trillion dollars because they are so enormous.

Realize what I said before: The deficit is driven by what you already have. You have Medicare for senior citizens. It is \$35 trillion short. If you were \$35 trillion short, does it make sense to now expand Medicare to everyone? So what we have is Medicare for Some, Medicare for senior citizens. It is \$35 trillion short, and they want to expand it to everybody.

Also, realize they want to ban insurance. There will be no insurance companies and no insurance through your employer. Right now, there are 180 million people who have health insurance. Do you think it is going to be a very pleasant transition to having everybody on the government insurance? Where is the money going to come from?

These proposals are ludicrous on their face. We face mounting debt and deficits from what we have. This should be a no-brainer. These people should be laughed out of polite society. No one who is intellectually honest should listen to these people. There is really no reason for them to be in the discourse because they are so completely out of touch with reality. We have so much debt from what we are already trying to give you through Medicare and Social Security. These people want to double, triple, and quadruple that. It doesn't work. It is a recipe for disaster.

As you look around the world, as people get more and more in debt and there is more and more spending, look what happens. Look what happens as we approach socialism around the world. If you look at the examples of socialism from the last century, it is a history of famine and genocide—Stalin, Hitler, Mao, Pol Pot, Castro, Chavez, Maduro. It doesn't work.

We actually live in the best time ever to be alive in the history of the world. Does that sound excessive? It is absolutely true. In 1800, 80 percent of people lived in extreme poverty. When I was

born in the 1960s, it was down to a third of the people who lived in extreme poverty, \$2 a day or less. It went from 80 percent to a third. In the span of my lifetime, it is under 10 percent. I am not talking about America; I am talking about the whole world. Less than 10 percent of the people live in extreme poverty now. You have to ask yourself why. How did we get here? Was it just an accident? Was it a fluke? Were we born with oil under the ground, and all of a sudden we got rich?

For some nations, sometimes that could be true. Look at Venezuela. They have more oil under the ground, more oil deposits than any other country in the world, and socialism took the richest country in the world and made it the poorest country in the world. They are eating their pets in Venezuela. They are starving. The average person has lost 20 pounds. What does that have to do with the budget? They got overextended. Their deficit became massive even in the face of oil revenue.

People say America is a rich country. Yes, we are a rich country, but we are overextended. I don't want our country to be Venezuela. When the President said America will not become a socialist nation, I took that at face value. If we don't want to be a socialist nation, we can't keep piling on the debt.

What I have today is a proposal. We will see if anybody chooses it. My prediction is that not one Democrat will vote to balance the budget. They vote to hike all your taxes a million percent, which would kill the economy, and they would say: Oh, that is how we balance the budget. But they will not vote to cut any spending. They will not vote to even control spending.

My budget over 10 years actually slowly increases spending over time. We keep it steady, and we cut it 1 or 2 percent for 5 years, and then we allow it to grow at 2 percent. We could do that and be a stronger country, but we have to examine the failures in history. We have to examine what has happened under socialism, Big Government, and debt in other countries and decide whether we want to go that way, decide whether we are going to simplistically say: Gimme, gimme, gimme. I want something for nothing, and there is no reason I should have to work for it. It is just not fair unless you give it to me.

Realize there will be a price. There is no such thing as a free lunch. There is no such thing as something for nothing.

I offer this budget to the American people, and I hope you will watch all your representatives vote. Not one Democrat will vote for it, but over half the Republicans won't vote for it either. They will say: It is too dramatic. We can't cut spending that much.

One penny out of a dollar is what I have been proposing for 5 years. I usually get 15 to 20 votes. Now we have had to go up to two pennies for every dollar because nobody is really doing anything to cut spending, and spending is still exploding. So this is called the

Two Penny Plan budget now. It would be 98 percent of last year. We would spend 98 percent next year of what we spent this year. I think the American people would support it.

I hope the American people will pay attention today to how people vote. I urge my colleagues to vote for the Penny Plan budget.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The 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 motion to proceed to Calendar No. 78, S. 1332, a bill to set forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2020 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2021 through 2029.

Mitch McConnell, John Thune, Johnny Isakson, Jerry Moran, Mike Crapo, Roger F. Wicker, Steve Daines, Roy Blunt, Richard C. Shelby, Richard Burr, Mike Lee, James Lankford, John Cornyn, James E. Risch, David Perdue, Rick Scott, Rand Paul.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S. 1332, a bill to set forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2020 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2021 through 2029, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted "nay" and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 22, nays 69, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 130 Leg.]

YEAS—22

Barrasso	Cornyn	Daines
Blackburn	Crapo	Ernst
Braun	Cruz	Fischer

Grassley
Isakson
Kennedy
Lankford
Lee

Paul
Risch
Romney
Sasse
Scott (SC)

Shelby
Tillis
Toomey

NAYS—69

Baldwin
Bennet
Blumenthal
Blunt
Boozman
Brown
Burr
Cantwell
Cardin
Carper
Casey
Cassidy
Collins
Coons
Cortez Masto
Cotton
Cramer
Duckworth
Durbin
Enzi
Feinstein
Gardner
Gillibrand

Graham
Hassan
Hawley
Heinrich
Hirono
Hoeven
Inhofe
Johnson
Jones
Kaine
King
Klobuchar
Leahy
Manchin
Markley
McConnell
McSally
Menendez
Merkley
Murkowski
Murphy
Murray
Peters

Portman
Reed
Roberts
Rosen
Rounds
Rubio
Schatz
Schumer
Scott (FL)
Shaheen
Sinema
Smith
Stabenow
Sullivan
Tester
Thune
Udall
Van Hollen
Warner
Whitehouse
Wicker
Wyden
Young

NOT VOTING—9

Alexander
Booker
Capito

Harris
Hyde-Smith
Moran

Perdue
Sanders
Warren

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 22, the nays are 69.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill 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 nomination of Andrew M. Saul, of New York, to be Commissioner of Social Security for the term expiring January 19, 2025. (Reappointment)

Mitch McConnell, Pat Roberts, Steve Daines, John Barrasso, Tim Scott, Lindsey Graham, John Boozman, Roger F. Wicker, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Richard Burr, Mike Crapo, David Perdue, John Thune, Tom Cotton, Rick Scott, Mike Rounds, John Cornyn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Andrew M. Saul, of New York, to be Commissioner of Social Security for the term expiring January 19, 2025 (Reappointment), shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted "yea" and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 74, nays 17, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 131 Ex.]

YEAS—74

Barrasso	Fischer	Portman
Bennet	Gardner	Risch
Blackburn	Graham	Roberts
Blunt	Grassley	Romney
Boozman	Hassan	Rosen
Braun	Hawley	Rounds
Brown	Hoeven	Rubio
Burr	Inhofe	Sasse
Cantwell	Isakson	Schumer
Cardin	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Carper	Jones	Scott (SC)
Casey	Kaine	Shaheen
Cassidy	Kennedy	Shelby
Collins	King	Sinema
Coons	Lankford	Stabenow
Cornyn	Leahy	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Lee	Tester
Cotton	Manchin	Thune
Cramer	McConnell	Tillis
Crapo	McSally	Toomey
Cruz	Menendez	Warner
Daines	Murkowski	Wicker
Durbin	Murphy	Wyden
Enzi	Paul	Young
Ernst	Peters	

NAYS—17

Baldwin	Hirono	Schatz
Blumenthal	Klobuchar	Smith
Duckworth	Markley	Udall
Feinstein	Merkley	Van Hollen
Gillibrand	Murray	Whitehouse
Heinrich	Reed	

NOT VOTING—9

Alexander	Harris	Perdue
Booker	Hyde-Smith	Sanders
Capito	Moran	Warren

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas are 74, the nays are 17.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Andrew M. Saul, of New York, to be Commissioner of Social Security for the term expiring January 19, 2025. (Reappointment)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). The Senator from Arkansas.

75TH ANNIVERSARY OF D-DAY

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, in the early morning hours of June 6, 1944, 75,000 members of the U.S. Armed Forces and 75,000 of their counterparts in the Allied Expeditionary Force launched Operation Overlord when they stormed ashore five landing areas on the beaches of Normandy, France, to break the Nazi stranglehold on Western Europe. This courageous fight to seize the beaches of Normandy changed the trajectory of history.