

CONCLUSION OF MORNING
BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2019

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of H.R. 3877, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3877) to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, to establish a congressional budget for fiscal years 2020 and 2021, to temporarily suspend the debt limit, and for other purposes.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. 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 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 Calendar No. 165, H.R. 3877, a bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, to establish a congressional budget for fiscal years 2020 and 2021, to temporarily suspend the debt limit, and for other purposes.

Lamar Alexander, Thom Tillis, Martha McSally, John Cornyn, Pat Roberts, Mike Rounds, Susan M. Collins, Tom Cotton, Roy Blunt, Roger F. Wicker, Bill Cassidy, John Thune, Richard Burr, John Barrasso, Rob Portman, Lisa Murkowski, Mitch McConnell.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call be waived.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

ELECTION SECURITY

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, later today, the Senate will move to consider the measure on the floor, probably pass it, and then leave town. There will be efforts to describe what we have done as a reason for satisfaction and pride. There have been accomplishments, but on one critical issue—really a range of issues—involving our national security, we have only abject failure to show for the months we have been here.

I am proud to come to the floor of the Senate today to advocate for that cause—election security—with colleagues like Senator AMY KLOBUCHAR of Minnesota and Senator MARK WARNER of Virginia, who have been tireless champions, articulate, and eloquent advocates for this cause.

Election security is national security. The testimony from Robert Mueller, whatever you think about his verdict on the President, clearly called for action.

Robert Mueller is a modern-day Paul Revere, sounding the alarm about the

Russians and many other nations—as he put it—who are mounting a renewed attack on this country.

In the next election, this attack will make 2016 look like child's play, a dress rehearsal, because the tools and techniques they will bring to bear in attacking our democracy are so much more sophisticated. Already, in 2016, Robert Mueller called that attack sweeping and systematic. It was the reason he first spoke about it in his statement and in May closed that statement with a severe and dire warning about the ongoing interference in our democracy.

Those many other nations already include Iran, which just last week the Washington Post reported to be mounting its own disinformation campaign using social media and misinformation—disinformation—to distract, divide, and sow discord here and in other democracies around the world.

There is nothing unknown to many of us about the Russians' intent and the designs of these other nations. It is hiding in plain sight.

From all of the classified briefings that we have received over these months, the Russians know what they are doing, we know what the Russians are doing, and we know what we are failing to do. The ones in the dark are the American people, and that is why Senator KLOBUCHAR, Senator WARNER, and I are on the floor today—to make sure that when we leave today, it is not the end of this topic. It is the beginning of a drumbeat, a cry of outrage, and unhappiness around the Nation.

There are a number of measures that we have championed that involve more funding for the States to do election security, paper ballots by the States to provide backups, auditing standards, and cyber security criteria. These measures are a matter of common sense. That word “common sense” is overused these days, especially in a city where it is on display so infrequently, but common sense is the reason we are here.

I want to talk specifically about the Duty to Report Act. It is based on a very simple idea: If you see something, say something. The Duty to Report Act would require all campaigns, all candidates, and family members to immediately report to the FBI and the Federal Election Commission any offers of foreign assistance. It would codify in the law what is already a matter of moral duty, patriotic duty, and common sense. It is already illegal to accept foreign assistance during a campaign. It is already illegal to solicit foreign assistance during a campaign. All this bill would do is require individuals and campaigns and family members to report those illegal foreign assistance efforts to the FBI.

When Robert Mueller came before Congress, he outlined the most serious attack on our democracy by a foreign power in our history. It includes 140 contacts between the Trump campaign and Russian agents—Russian covert

and overt efforts to influence the outcome of our election by helping one candidate and hurting another. But the Russians and those many other nations that will engage in similar attacks on our democracy have no particular partisan preference. They are doing what is in their interest to disrupt our democracy, and the victim in one election may be the one preferred in the next. So we have a common cause here.

Indeed, Robert Mueller testified:

Over the course of my career, I've seen a number of challenges to our democracy. The Russian government's efforts to interfere in our election is among the most serious.

This deserves the attention of every American. We have an obligation, above all, as Members of this body, where there has been so much history of bipartisan action, to come together in this cause.

Christopher Wray, the Director of the FBI, recently came before the Senate Judiciary Committee, and he warned that the Russians are still actively trying to interfere in our elections. Again and again, our intelligence community has warned severely, repeatedly, powerfully about this threat.

Yet when asked whether he would accept foreign help in 2020, the President of the United States said: “I'd take it.” It is much like his son Donald Junior said during this last campaign in response to an offer of assistance from the Russians: “I love it.”

When Robert Mueller was asked about this point during his testimony, he said: “I hope this is not the new normal. But I fear it is.”

That is the reason we need this measure. That is the reason we need the measures that my colleagues, Senator KLOBUCHAR of Minnesota and Senator WARNER of Virginia, have helped to lead, and that is why I have been proud to join them in this effort.

To my Republican colleagues in the leadership, I say: Lead or get out of the way. To the President of the United States: Lead or get out of the way. Our national security is too important to make a partisan issue. We ought to join together, as we did after 9/11, to prevent more disaster and to join in this common cause.

This legislation is a matter of moral duty, patriotic duty, and common sense. With the 2020 election literally on the horizon before us, we must act now. Time is not on our side. It is only on our adversary's side.

As much as we take pride in the National Defense Authorization Act, the threat to our national security is not only from the planes and the submarines and the aircraft carriers. It is also from the cyber attacks and the social media campaigns to disrupt and destroy our democracy.

I am proud to be joined today by a great colleague who has been a wonderful champion on this issue, Senator AMY KLOBUCHAR from Minnesota.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I first thank my colleague from Connecticut, Senator BLUMENTHAL, for his incredible work and leadership on this important bill, the Duty to Report Act, as well as for all of the other work that he has done.

He gets it. He gets that we are about to adjourn this day without passing election security legislation. We had bipartisan election security legislation. We have had that for years. Yet it has been stopped in every step of the way.

Russia invaded our democracy. Let's be clear about that. I don't like it when we use the word "meddle" because that is what I do when I call my daughter on a Saturday night to ask her what she is doing. This foreign country didn't just meddle in our election. They invaded it. They didn't use missiles or tanks. They used a new kind of modern warfare, which is cyber warfare, and they did it to invade our democracy.

Think about this. Our Founders literally set up a country and a Constitution because they wanted to be independent of a foreign country. In this case, it was England. Hundreds of thousands of Americans have lost their lives on the battlefield fighting for our democracy and democracies across the world. That is what World War I and World War II were about. They were fighting for democracies across the world and fighting for the simple right that people should be able to determine their own destiny and vote.

Yet, in 2016, we know for a fact—we know it from President Trump's own intelligence advisers. Dan Coats, who was once a Senator in this very Chamber and who is someone we are going to miss, is leaving his position. Dan Coats made it clear. He said they are getting bolder. So this is something right in front of us right now, and we must respond to it.

Yet we haven't passed a bill to address it. Yes, Senator LANKFORD and I, along with Senators LEAHY, COONS, SHELBY, and others have worked to get some money, over \$200 million, into the States, which is important. We got that done, but it doesn't really end there because, actually, there were no strings attached to that in terms of what we want to have done in this country, and I will get to that in a minute.

So let's first go back over the facts, because some people in this Chamber seem to have trouble with facts. Let's go over those. Special Counsel Mueller, under oath, just last week and in his report, concluded that Russian interference in our democracy was sweeping and systematic. Those were his words and not my words. We know that they are actively working again to undermine our democracy. In his words, when he was testifying under oath, "they're doing it as we sit here." That is what he said under oath.

The day before Special Counsel Mueller testified in the House, the FBI Director testified in front of the com-

mittee that I am on, the Senate Judiciary Committee. I was there and asked him questions. I asked him whether he thinks having things like paper ballots makes sense in the event that the Russian hacking happens again. He said: Yes, they would be a good thing. This is the FBI Director for the United States of America who was appointed by Donald Trump. Again, he was under oath.

We have multiple pieces of legislation that would require backup paper ballots. There are different versions, but they all really do the same thing. Some of them have different kinds of audits, but the one thing they have in common is the paper ballots.

I am leading one of these bills with Senator WARNER and a number of my colleagues. One of them is a bill we have with Senator WYDEN that is important, and then there is the work that Senator LANKFORD and I have done across the aisle, which is a bipartisan bill, which we continue to work on today.

But what has happened? What do all of these bills have in common? They have been blocked by the leadership on the Republican side and opposed by the White House. That is right. They weren't vetoed because they never got to the White House but because the White House made the move of stopping them in their tracks before they could get to the White House. I know because I am the ranking member of the Senate Rules Committee, and our jurisdiction is elections. Our job was to get that bill through the committee to the Senate floor. It was actually scheduled for a markup, which means you get the bill all done, and you send it to the Senate floor, where I predict it would have gotten at least three-fourths of the Members working and voting for that bipartisan bill.

What happened? The White House made calls. They made calls. The White House counsel actually called Senators on the committee and said that they didn't want it to advance. That is what we call "smoking gun" evidence. That happened. That happened. We know why this bill was blocked. In addition to that, Republican leadership, including the leader, made very clear that they did not want that bill to advance in the Senate.

Our top intelligence officials and law enforcement officers are sounding the alarm about the fact that our elections are a target. Look at what they have done. They have blocked this, despite the best advice from the intelligence officials in the United States of America.

And it doesn't stop there. It doesn't stop there. As to other bills that they will not allow to advance, one of them involves social media. You all know what it is like, when you have your Facebook page or your Twitter feed or you are searching something on Google, something comes up, and an ad pops up. Sometimes it is scarily related to something you were searching for, but, yes, ads pop up.

Well, you know what other kinds of ads pop up? Political ads pop up. Those ads are paid for by some kind of political entity. I see my friend Senator WARNER is here on this floor. He is an expert on this, as the ranking member of the Intelligence Committee.

As to the fact that actually some of these ads in 2016 were paid for in rubles, this is illegal. A foreign country cannot pay for ads on the internet, but they were doing that because there are no checks and balances.

So what kind of ads are on there? Well, what would you do if you were on a campaign or an issue group and you want to put a bunch of dirty ads out there? Would you do it on TV? No, you wouldn't do it on TV. If you are a foreign country, would you do that? No, because there are rules in place for TV and newspaper and radio that they have to check those ads out, and they have to keep them so people can see them, and they have to show who has paid for them. There are no rules like that on social media.

That is why I have formally introduced, with my friend Senator McCain and now with Senator GRAHAM and Senator WARNER, the Honest Ads Act, which simply puts those rules in place. Literally, if we pass that bill right now, today, before we left for the recess, well, they can get this done in the large platforms. Some of them are voluntarily doing it, but it is a mishmash, and some of them aren't doing it at all. We cannot go into this next election when last time over a billion was spent on them and next time it is \$3 billion to \$4 billion without any rules of the road.

I go back to the same argument I made. Hundreds of thousands of people risked their lives and died on battlefields to protect that right to vote and to not be influenced by foreign countries. Why aren't we doing things to protect that democracy now in this modern age?

Four little girls in a church in Birmingham lost their lives at the height of the civil rights movement. Why? Because people were trying to take away people's rights and because they didn't want them in on this democracy. That is the American history. And yes, these things we are talking about sound newfangled—cyber attacks and ads on social media—but it is actually the same version of what our Founders fought for in the very beginning, and that is why we are making such a big deal out of protecting our democracy.

Everyone remembers the 2000 election. We saw the hanging chads displayed on TVs across the country. That experience taught us that our election systems were outdated. What did Congress do back then? We passed the Help America Vote Act, landmark legislation that provided more than \$3 billion to the States, helping them to update their election structure. That was 17 years ago, before the iPhone existed, and the Federal Government has not made a big investment to update our voting technology since.

The Russians knew that when they attacked us in 2016. Well, we can't do it this way. We are not going to be able to use battleships. What way would work today? What is their big vulnerability? Let's go for the soft spot where they haven't been putting the money in to protect themselves.

They conducted sophisticated influence operations, hacked political committees and campaigns, revealed the emails of the chairman of the Democratic candidate, targeted election administrators and even private technology firms responsible for manufacturing and administering election systems. In Illinois, the names, addresses, birth dates, and partial Social Security numbers of thousands of registered voters were exposed.

Just recently, we learned that the election systems in two Florida counties were hacked by the Russians. The Department of Homeland Security is conducting forensic analysis on computers used in North Carolina after it was revealed in the Mueller report that a voting software company was hacked by Russia.

So we have a common set of facts about what has happened. What we need to do now is to address these facts with purpose. There must be an outcry about this from the American people. This must be done now, not after 2020. It has to be done now. We have a long way to go to make sure our election systems are resilient against attacks.

Here are some more facts to consider. Forty States rely on electronic voting systems that are at least 10 years old. Eleven States have either no or partial backup paper ballots. Sixteen States have no statewide audit requirement.

These are alarming statistics. I am not stating anything secret; the Russians know this today. That is why I have worked with my Democratic colleagues in the House and Senate on legislation that would provide critical election security funding in the coming years, and mostly it would be tied to a requirement that they have backup paper ballots. Otherwise, what are we going to do if we don't have those backup paper ballots if there is a hack? It doesn't even matter if three counties in a swing State were hacked if we can't figure out the results. If it were just their State elections, that would be embarrassing or pathetic, but it is going to be a national Presidential election, and we cannot risk having counties or States hacked into because then we would have chaos and not know the results.

Last week, my bill was offered by Senator SCHUMER on the floor. It could have gone to the President's desk that day. Instead, Leader MCCONNELL objected. During his objection, he said that election legislation must be drafted with "great care" and on a bipartisan basis. We did that.

Senator WARNER is here. He worked on it. We did that with Senator LANKFORD, but we were blocked at the Rules Committee. We were blocked.

That is a documented fact. The markup had been scheduled. It was ready to go. Senator BLUNT had been willing to hold a markup on the bill, and it was stopped.

I am going to tell that story every day until we advance this. I have an opportunity to do that, and I am going to do it because people need to know what is going on. This should not be about partisanship or about what benefits which party.

What were the Founders thinking when they decided to declare independence from a foreign country? They were thinking of our country as one. A ramshackle group of those early Founders, farmers and small business people, came together and said: We love this land, and we don't want to have another country influencing us.

That is exactly what this is about. Election security is national security. It is time we started acting like it. The Federal Government spends more money on military bands every year than it does on election security assistance to the States. I love military bands, but let's get real.

In 2018, we fought to get \$380 million in election funding. That was a first step. That is 3 percent of the cost of one aircraft carrier. Recently, 22 State attorneys general sent a letter asking us to take action to protect the integrity of our election structure, including the attorneys general from States such as Iowa and Mississippi. These are not blue States. They did not see this as a partisan issue. This is not about one election or one party; this is about our democracy and our national security. We need to be a united front, I say to my colleagues, a united front in fighting against those who interfere with our democracy.

I am glad to see Senator WARNER, someone who is on the frontlines every day in his very important position on the Intelligence Committee.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, first of all, I want to thank my friend, the Senator from Minnesota, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, for her leadership and passion on this issue.

This shouldn't be that hard. I know we addressed some of the legislation she has talked about, and also earlier Senator BLUMENTHAL came to the floor as well. I think the theme you are going to hear from all three of us is that while we may have made some progress, the truth is, we are simply not doing enough to secure our election infrastructure.

There is a series of bills that I think are common sense and, if they got to the floor, would get 75 votes and maybe even more.

Over the past few weeks, I have come to the floor a couple of times to try to move by unanimous consent my legislation known as the FIRE Act. I am not going to do that this morning, but I do want to highlight this bill as one

more example of commonsense, bipartisan election security legislation that unfortunately is not getting its chance to be debated on the floor of the Senate.

The FIRE Act would simply require Presidential campaigns to do the right thing and report offers of foreign assistance—offers which are already spelled out as illegal—to the FBI. Anyone who says it does anything else, such as limiting contacts with the foreign press or limiting contact with foreign diplomats—somebody said it might eliminate communications with Dreamers—is just flat wrong.

If there are ways to improve the bipartisan legislation, I am wide open to that. I don't know how anyone could be against the idea of putting our country over narrow interests or putting our national security concerns over political advantage. In fact, a new poll last week found that 87 percent of Americans support this idea. The same poll found that an extraordinarily large majority of Americans believe that it is wrong for campaigns to accept foreign assistance and that Congress should pass legislation to secure our elections.

Unfortunately, in the nearly 3 years since we uncovered Russia's attack on our democracy, this body has not held a single vote on stand-alone legislation to protect our election security. It is true that we did approve some additional funding to secure the 2018 midterm elections, and I commend the folks at DHS for the job they did. I am proud of that. But we would be making an enormous mistake if we simply patted ourselves on the back and said that because the Russians or others didn't launch a full-frontal attack in 2018, we are safe on a going-forward basis.

Please, don't take my word for it. Let's look at what Special Prosecutor Bob Mueller said last week. He said that the Russians are continuing to attack virtually every day. The bipartisan Intelligence Committee election security report said that we have made progress, but there is more that needs to be done. Christopher Wray, the Director of the FBI, in recent testimony said this is an ongoing challenge. Dan Coats, for whom I have enormous respect and feel it is unfortunate that he left the position of Director of National Intelligence—and maybe he left because he was willing to continue to speak truth to power—said that our election security system is not secure enough. Even Gina Haspel, the Director of the CIA, has continued to point out that Russia and other foreign influences are trying to attack our democracy.

Candidly, it has been a little bit disappointing that some of my colleagues are trying to turn this into a partisan issue. Securing our democracy is not a Democratic or Republican issue. The absurdity of that is like saying: Well, maybe we should think about protecting our power grid as a partisan issue. We know and have seen evidence

of foreign efforts to try to interfere with our power grid. Well, the country steps up and puts security measures in place. Shouldn't we expect the same kind of attention and commonsense approach when we see those same foreign adversaries attack our election infrastructure? I think we do need to take that kind of step and move forward.

Senator KLOBUCHAR already made mention of some of this legislation, and I know my friend the Senator from Georgia is here, so I will try to wrap up.

There was a broad bipartisan group of Senators in the last Congress who introduced the Secure Elections Act—something I was proud to be part of. That bipartisan bill would have provided the additional resources for State and local election officials while still preserving local control of elections. What that legislation would have done was simply say that if local or State election officials want additional help from the Federal Government, they have to meet some basic, de minimis standards. We have to make sure that every polling station in America has a paper ballot backup. We have to make sure that there is appropriate auditing of how we do in our election systems.

I wish the bill would have done more and gone up the food chain to the three private companies that control 90 percent of all of our voter files. Maybe that could be action we could take in the future. If those voter files were hacked into, they wouldn't have to change the vote totals; they simply would have to move people from one voting precinct to another to create chaos on election day.

Senator KLOBUCHAR also mentioned legislation that she, Senator GRAHAM, and I worked on, a bipartisan bill to prevent disinformation—particularly on the internet—called the Honest Ads Act. It would require the same disclosure rules for political ads on Facebook that are already in place for television, radio, and newsprint.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of another bipartisan bill called the DETER Act, sponsored by Senator RUBIO and Senator VAN HOLLEN. They are absolutely right in saying that we need to put in place automatic consequences if Russia or other nations use their 2016 playbook once again to try to interfere in our 2020 elections. Let's warn our adversaries that there will be consequences if they once again try to interfere in our election process.

These are just a few of the largely bipartisan ideas with regard to protecting the United States against foreign attacks on our election systems. I am sure there would be suggestions on how we can improve this legislation. That is fine. That is what we are here to do. Let's debate, vote, and add amendments.

What we should not do is simply pretend this threat is going away. We should not simply assume that because we improved in 2018, we are safe in 2020. We should recognize that local and

State election officials need the kind of assistance, paper ballot backup, and the same responsibility that Federal campaign officials in Presidential campaigns ought to have—an affirmative duty to report. Political ads that pop up on Facebook ought to have the same kind of legal requirements that ads on television have. I don't think this is too much to ask. I think the overwhelming majority of Americans expect us to do our job on this issue.

I hope when the Senate reconvenes in September that maybe people can be refreshed by their voters back in their home States, because I am sure that when you go to whatever State and visit with folks and talk about election security, they will say to the Congress and Senate: Do your job and pass commonsense legislation.

Let's make sure our election security is absolutely as safe as it can be as we move into the 2020 elections.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. PERDUE. Madam President, in 1974, Congress passed a new Budget Act. It was revolutionary and comprehensive. It was supposed to streamline how Congress appropriates money to fund the business of the Federal Government every year.

Unfortunately, now 45 years later, we know that bill was an unmitigated disaster. Only four times in the last 45 years since that Budget Act was passed has Congress funded the government through the appropriations process before the end of the prior fiscal year—four times.

Today is the end of July. We are about to leave Congress today, hopefully—if our Senate today gets these bills passed. Then we will go back to our States, and we will work in August. We heard a lot of people talking yesterday about what they were planning to do in their States. It is a busy month. I wish it were a vacation month, but it is not—nor should it be—given the things we have to do today.

When we come back in September, there will be 10 working days left before the end of this fiscal year, September 30—10 working days.

As I stand before this body today, this is not a partisan observation. As I stand here today, we have not appropriated \$1 for next year's budget to run the Federal Government of the United States of America. That is an indictment. It is an indictment of the process, an indictment of the Members, and an indictment of the fact that we have no consequences by not funding the government by September 30—not one.

So today we are about to do something that could cause us to actually use a continuing resolution for the 187th time, potentially, since the 1974 Budget Act passed. We now know how draconian these continuing resolutions are. I will talk about that in a minute.

Hopefully, we will vote today on a bill that is a compromise bill that actually sets the stage. It sets the upper

limit. It doesn't do the appropriating at the detail level. It sets the topline number for the fiscal year 2020, which starts October 1, 2019. That number is roughly \$1.375 trillion. I have a debt clock in my office. I can watch the national debt spin about \$100,000 a second—going up every single minute of every single day. This bill actually begins to address that. President Trump had a couple of priorities here.

Before I talk about that, I want to put in perspective what this bill actually does. We talked before about mandatory spending and discretionary spending. Again, the problem is in our Federal Government. This whole budget drama we have seen this year and every year for the last 45 years only deals with the discretionary budget, which is \$1.375 trillion for 2021.

The dotted line here is where we are for the 2019 discretionary budget. Discretionary budget is 30 percent. That is the blue line here.

The green line is the total spending of the Federal Government. Today we spend \$1.3 trillion in discretionary spending. We spend \$3.3 trillion in mandatory spending. That is a total of \$4.6 trillion.

What is in discretionary spending? Military spending and all other discretionary spending is in there: health, education, agriculture, labor, the Attorney General's office, State. All the discretionary spending is in there. Some VA expenses are in there—\$1.33 trillion.

In any business, any enterprise, or your personal budget, if you only dealt with 30 percent of what you spend in your budgeting process, wouldn't we all have a good time? It wouldn't matter how much we did on discretionary spending because we could just go borrow more money. That is what the Federal Government does.

Let me remind everybody today that we are also borrowing about 30 percent of what we spend every year—a little less than that, but we are borrowing between 25 percent and 30 percent.

Mandatory is like your home mortgage, car payment, and insurance payment. It is automatically deducted. So all these mandatory expenses that today are 70 percent of what we spend, get spent with no debate in Congress—none, zero. Why? Because it is mandatory. It gets spent like your home mortgage gets automatically deducted. Once that is done, just a few pennies are left to take care of discretionary.

The point I am trying to make is, all this drama we had this year—and every year—is over a piece of the budget that is totally borrowed. Over 90 percent of what we spend in our Federal Government's military expenses today—our national defense—is borrowed money, by definition.

Right now, what we are talking about is a spending bill that actually reduces spending for discretionary items. We are not even talking about the mandatory side, the 70 percent. If you look at the 70 percent over the

next decade or the next two decades, discretionary spending is relatively flat. These are aggregate numbers—total numbers adjusted for inflation.

The orange line is the mandatory expenses. They are projected to skyrocket here, going from about 70 percent today to almost 85 percent of every dollar the Federal Government spends in the next 20 years—from 70 percent today to well over 80 percent—to almost 85 percent by 2035, 20 years from now. I argue that is the problem. Until we address the mandatory side of our spending and save Social Security and save Medicare, we will never be able to solve this debt crisis we see before us in very real terms today.

Let's move to this bill we have today. I ran for the Senate because of the debt crisis and because of the global security crisis. This debt issue is real. I have been working on it for 4½ years. Yet this bill today actually lowers spending as a percentage of our economy. This bill proposes \$54 billion increases in discretionary spending over 2 years—2 percent per year for the next 2 years. That actually lowers spending as a percentage of our economy. As a matter of fact, since 2011—the last 10 years—what we have seen, if we do this budget, is Federal spending on discretionary items goes from 8.7 percent of our total economy down to 6 percent.

When I ran a business, I looked at my overhead. That is what this is. Overhead is declining on discretionary items as a percentage of what we spend totally and a percentage of our total economy.

President Trump had two goals. One is he wanted to continue to reduce discretionary spending as a percentage of GDP. Check that box. This bill does that. All the so-called debt hawks out there and all the budget hawks who say: I am voting no to any new spending, need to recognize that this bill actually lowers spending as a percentage of the economy.

The second objective the President had—and the Senate is just now coming to realize how draconian these 186 CRs have been over the last 45 years. The Obama administration reduced spending in the military by 25 percent. So readiness had been reduced to a point by January 1, 2017, when President Trump was inaugurated—readiness in the military had been devastated. Two-thirds of our F-18 lead fighter jets could not fly. Only three of our Army brigades could go to war that night. I saw that. I am on the Armed Services Committee. You can see when you travel the world how absolutely gutted our military had been. For the last 2 years, we have been rebuilding that, getting readiness back. In the month of June, the FA-18s got back to 80 percent readiness.

The second thing this bill does is it continues, in the second and third year, to rebuild the military after it had been gutted by the prior administration. Focus of the military today is readiness and recapitalization, which

means rebuilding burned-out equipment and absolutely rationalization.

We had the first DOD audit—thanks to President Trump—in the history of the United States. Last November, President Trump, after telling the DOD we would have that—by the way, there was a law that passed in 1981 that said we would have a DOD audit. President Trump is the first President in U.S. history that provided that. We now have that and understand opportunities to rationalize our spending.

When you look at this vote, you look at making decisions in life. There are two choices—two votes—that lead to three potential outcomes today. A “yes” vote continues to support the military and defend our country at a level that meets the near-peer competitors’ level of volume. When adjusted for purchasing power parity, China, today, is actually spending the same amount on their military as we are. They can get there quicker because they don’t have the regulatory overhang that we have in the United States, but a vote yes means that we continue to do that; we continue to lower discretionary spending as a percentage of our economy; and we set the stage to, then again, begin to have the hard conversation of how we save Social Security and save Medicare. The major thing it does is it avoids the drama around not funding the government. It gives us a chance, anyway, to fund our government before October 1. Remember, September 30 ends this fiscal year.

A “no” vote has two potential outcomes. A “no” vote could lead to a sequestration. People say that cuts 10 percent out of all spending. That sounds good to me. The reality is that happened over the last decade. We see now the draconian impact that had on certain parts of our discretionary spending like military—veterans and so forth—so we had to come back and rebuild. When you come back and have to rebuild it, it costs dramatically much more. That is the point.

If we take a long-term view of this, we have to end up voting yes to this. The second outcome of a “no” vote is actually more of the same.

Well, we will avoid sequestration, but we will pass a continuing resolution and kick the can down the road again for the 187th time. It sounds easy. Everybody gets to go home. We pass a CR. Yet the military gets gutted again—devastated. It disrupts the supply chain and keeps our vendors from hiring people.

Imagine if you are a midcareer military officer or noncommissioned officer—imagine what that tells you about what we think of our military and our men and women. I hear people on both sides beat their chest: “I love our military.” “We have to support our military.” Then they vote no on a bill like this. We cannot let that happen.

Ironically, because of the two alternatives, a “no” vote is actually a vote to increase spending dramatically—not

just a little bit but dramatically—over the next decade or so.

This bill is a compromise. People back home tell us to come here and work with the other side and compromise and make decisions and get to a result. We just did that. President Trump and Speaker PELOSI just did that. That is what this is reflective of. I am here to tell you today that it is our job to back that up.

In closing, it is imperative that we get this bill passed, allow our appropriators to get busy and start appropriating, so by September 30—the end of this fiscal year—we have a chance to get the government funded. We know a “no” vote leads to more spending. It is our responsibility to be fiscally responsible, and I think a “yes” vote here does just that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I am on the floor today to talk about a crisis overseas.

Before I do, I just want to take one moment. The Senator from Georgia talked about the increases in defense spending that we have done on a bipartisan basis and suggested that it was the prior administration that had gutted defense spending. That is not true. I think we should clear the record about that.

In fact, in the first 3 years of the Obama administration, defense spending was on the rise. It was the election of a Republican Congress that led to what we call sequestration—the downward descent of discretionary spending of both defense and nondefense dollars.

To the extent that my colleagues are worried about what happened to defense spending in the last 10 years, there is only one explanation for that; that is, the election of Republicans to the House of Representatives in 2010 and their demand that in order to vote for an increase in the debt ceiling, discretionary spending had to be slashed. In the first several years of the Obama administration, defense spending was on the rise.

YEMEN

Madam President, I am on the floor to once again talk about a dire humanitarian nightmare happening on the other side of the world in a country called Yemen, the U.S. complicity in that horror, and the national security disaster that comes with staying involved in this war.

I could have brought a bunch of much more disturbing charts to the floor to talk about the world’s worst humanitarian disaster—a country in and on the brink of famine and with a cholera epidemic that the world has never ever seen before in recorded history. Instead, I chose to bring you a picture of a child with his back turned to you in order to spare you the worst of this nightmare.

Before we break, I am here to make an urgent plea to my colleagues because, as bad as the situation is today,

it is about to get much worse over the course of the summer and this fall. There are millions of Yemenis who are going to die if we don't make some decisions and pressure our allies to make some decisions in the coming days. The reason for this is simple.

At the beginning of this year, Saudi Arabia and the UAE, which are the primary military partners with the United States in Yemen, made a pledge they have made in the past, which is that while they would be dropping bombs and fighting battles on the ground in Yemen, they would be putting up money to make sure that people would be fed and that children would be immunized. They made that pledge at the beginning of this year. We are now halfway through the year, and the UAE and the Saudis have reneged on that pledge.

Saudi Arabia pledged \$750 million to the United Nations. It still owes, today, \$630 million. The UAE pledged \$750 million. It still owes, today, \$500 million. They have always been tough negotiators and have been difficult to get the money from, but this year is different. This year, 6 months in, the Saudis and the Emirates are essentially saying: We are not giving the U.N. its money.

If you meet with them, they will tell you that they are spending that money in other ways, that they are working with other partners inside Yemen to do the same kind of work. Don't let them put that argument over on you. There is no one in Yemen who can do the nutrition work, the healthcare work, or the anti-cholera work that the U.N. can and does. There are no other partners who have the capacity to keep people alive like the U.N. You can't just create and stand up that capacity outside of the United Nations.

If Saudi Arabia and the UAE were not planning on giving the U.N. the money, then they shouldn't have promised it at the beginning of the year. The U.N. went out and built infrastructure. It hired partners based on those pledges. If the Emirates and the Saudis were not planning on giving the money, then they shouldn't have promised it at the beginning of this year.

Let me tell you what is happening right now inside Yemen.

Work has been suspended on 30 new feeding centers in the most famine-stricken parts of Yemen.

Vaccinations have been suspended for 13 million people, which increases the risk for things like measles and malaria.

The procurement of new medical supplies and equipment has been suspended.

UNICEF has stopped its clean water and sanitation services for 8.4 million people, including 3 million kids, which means more cholera, and cholera is already on the rise. There have been more cholera cases reported in the first half of this year than had been reported in all of 2018. There have been half a million new cases of cholera just in the first 6 months of this year.

A U.N.-supported treatment plant that purifies water for agriculture has started to shut down as well, meaning an additional 4 million people could be eating vegetables that are irrigated with dirty water.

Starting very soon, the World Food Programme will not be able to buy vouchers for 3 million people.

Sixty more feeding centers will close in the coming weeks.

The World Food Programme has stopped providing nutrient bars to 2.6 million malnourished women and children, which will tip them now into the category of "severely malnourished," just like this child is.

The U.N. is going to have to stop providing fuel for hospital generators.

There are 35,000 cancer patients who will stop receiving treatment.

I could go on and on and on.

Why are we standing here? Why aren't we all pressing our friends—the Saudis, our allies, the Emirates—to come up with this money? While we all enjoy our August recess, there are going to be millions of children in Yemen who will look like this who don't look like this today. There will be hundreds of thousands who will either die or reach the brink of death all because of a war that the United States has perpetuated and because of funding commitments that can't keep all of these people alive, that can't save all of these children's lives but that could save tens of thousands of lives if our friends, our allies, would simply do the right thing.

I am furious about this, my colleagues, because I don't know what the Trump administration is getting for this bear hug it has put around Saudi Arabia. After the murder of Jamal Khashoggi, we transferred to it more nuclear technology and sold it more weapons. Maybe the hope was, in exchange for that, Saudi Arabia would do something about the humanitarian nightmare, but it is making it worse. Saudi Arabia is getting everything from us, and it is not even feeding the people on the ground in Yemen who are dying as we speak.

At a 2015 campaign rally in Alabama, the President said: I get along great with the Saudis. They buy apartments from me. They spend, like, \$40 million, \$50 million. Am I supposed to dislike them? I like them very much.

From 2016 to 2017, a lobbying firm connected to the Saudi Government paid \$270,000 to the Trump International Hotel in DC. In 2018, a 5-day visit from Saudi officials to the Trump International Hotel in New York City helped to boost the hotel's quarterly revenue by 13 percent.

Boy, I hope this isn't the reason the administration isn't pressing the Saudis harder to come up with their funding commitment, but the President has been pretty clear that the Saudis send him and his family a lot of money. He has been open about that. I hope this is not the reason for our not forcing our partners to step up. This is

life-or-death time right now. If the administration is not going to do it, then we will have to do it. Members of Congress will have to do it.

I hope, before my colleagues go home and enjoy some rest and relaxation over the month of August, they will get on the phone with their friends in the Saudi Government, that they will get on the phone with the Emirates Government, and that they will get on the phone with the Trump administration and tell them that it is time to pony up the money they have pledged.

The United States is the No. 1 donor, but we could do more. The Saudis and the Emirates have come through on a quarter of the money they have promised, and the consequences of that continuing are absolutely nightmarish. So, before we go home for our break, let's do something to make sure that a handful more of these kids are alive when we come back.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

H.R. 3877

Mr. PAUL. Madam President, some say it is irresponsible not to raise the debt ceiling. Well, true fiscal conservatives say it is irresponsible to raise the debt ceiling without any reform of our profligate spending ways. To allow the debt ceiling to go up an infinite amount—as much as Congress can possibly spend and borrow over a nearly 2-year period—is fiscally irresponsible and has never been seen in our history. This may well be the most fiscally irresponsible thing we have done in the history of the United States.

The Federal Government is currently spending nearly \$2 million every minute. Don't let anybody fool you—this is a spending problem. The annual deficit this year will exceed \$1.2 trillion. What is irresponsible is recklessly indenturing our children and our grandchildren. What is irresponsible is binding our kids to this massive burden of debt. What is irresponsible is a Congress that believes it is Santa Claus and that it can be everything to everyone and that everything is free.

At least the Democrats are honest. The Democrats don't care about deficits, and they will tell you that to your face. The Democrats, in fact, are falling all over themselves to propose more than \$50 trillion in new spending in addition to the trillion-dollar annual deficits. They want to add \$50 trillion in spending.

Yet it is not just the Democrats. The Republicans are also guilty—at least the Big Government Republicans who will vote for this monstrous addition of debt. Many of the supporters of this debt deal ran around their States for years and complained that President Obama was spending too much and borrowing too much. These same Republicans now—the whole disingenuous lot of them—will wiggle their way to the front of the spending trough to vote for as much or more debt than President Obama ever added.

Get this. All of those who said the debt was bad under President Obama will today snuggle their way up, wiggle their way up to the spending trough, and they will do exactly what they condemned under President Obama. Shame. Shame on the politicians who have campaigned as conservatives but who have governed as big spenders.

America, wake up. The two parties are often one. The two parties that ostensibly fight are in reality one party of big spenders, separated only by where they want to spend the money.

The media reports of a lack of compromise. The opposite is true. There is too much compromise, and the compromise is always more debt, more porkbarrel spending, and more burden for our kids.

Yet there is another path. There is another form of compromise. Instead of compromising to raise spending for guns and butter, we could compromise to hold the line on all spending. Just a mere 2-percent cut in spending would balance the budget over a 5-year period—1 or 2 pennies out of a dollar. You get to spend 98 percent of what you spent last year, and we balance the budget. Yet that is never enough because these people are not honest with you. They are not willing to hold the line. They want more, more, more. More spending, though, means more debt, and that is what we are getting. So what I offer today is a compromise.

The right would have to deal with less military spending. The right says: Oh, we don't have enough. Perhaps the mission is too big for the budget. It isn't a lack of money. We spend more money on the military than the next 10 countries combined. We spend more money on the military than all of Europe spends. It isn't a lack of money; it is that the mission is too large. Why do we have troops in 50 of 55 African countries? Why are we involved in every civil war on the globe? We need to question what our mission is. The left would have to accept less welfare spending or at least hold the line and get 98 percent of what it spent last year on welfare. The right would have to spend 98 percent of what it spent on the military last year. Guess what. We would balance the budget.

My amendment is called cut, cap, and balance. When the balanced budget is passed and sent to the States, when spending caps are in place and when spending has been cut, then and only then would we raise the debt ceiling. This is the only responsible way of dealing with this. It is irresponsible to give a blank check to a government that has shown itself to be so reckless and for it to so recklessly disregard any kind of sense of sanity with regard to the budget.

Today's votes, though, will be a litmus test for fiscal conservatism. Those Senators who vote for an unlimited increase in the debt ceiling are not and have no right to call themselves conservatives.

America, wake up, watch the votes today, and discover who actually gives

a damn about the future of our country.

I yield the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

AMENDMENT NO. 932

Mr. PAUL. Madam President, I call up my amendment No. 932.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. PAUL] proposes an amendment numbered 932 to H.R. 3877.

Mr. PAUL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be waived.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Cut, Cap, and Balance Act of 2019".

SEC. 2. DEBT LIMIT INCREASE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Effective on the date described in subsection (b), the limitation in effect under section 3101(b) of title 31, United States Code, shall be increased by \$500,000,000,000.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The date described in this subsection is the earliest of the date on which the Archivist of the United States transmits to the States S. J. Res. 3 (116th Congress) in the form introduced on January 4, 2019, S. J. Res. 5 (116th Congress) in the form introduced on January 24, 2019, a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States, or a similar amendment to the Constitution of the United States if the amendment requires that total outlays not exceed total receipts, contains a spending limitation as a percentage of the gross domestic product, and requires that tax increases be approved by a two-thirds vote in both Houses of Congress for their ratification.

SEC. 3. LIMIT FOR ON-BUDGET SPENDING.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the Senate or the House of Representatives to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would cause the total amount of on-budget spending for any of fiscal years 2020 through 2029 to exceed the amount specified in paragraph (2) with respect to such fiscal year.

(2) CAPS.—The amount specified in this paragraph is the following:

(A) With respect to fiscal year 2020, \$3,435,880,000,000.

(B) With respect to fiscal year 2021, \$3,367,160,000,000.

(C) With respect to fiscal year 2022, \$3,299,820,000,000.

(D) With respect to fiscal year 2023, \$3,233,820,000,000.

(E) With respect to fiscal year 2024, \$3,169,150,000,000.

(F) With respect to fiscal year 2025, \$3,232,530,000,000.

(G) With respect to fiscal year 2026, \$3,297,180,000,000.

(H) With respect to fiscal year 2027, \$3,363,120,000,000.

(I) With respect to fiscal year 2028, \$3,430,390,000,000.

(J) With respect to fiscal year 2029, \$3,498,990,000,000.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—

(1) SENATE.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

(2) HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the House of Representatives only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(B) POINT OF ORDER PROTECTION.—In the House of Representatives, it shall not be in order to consider a rule or order that waives the application of subparagraph (A).

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT of Florida). The Democratic leader is recognized.

H.R. 3877

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, in a short time the Senate will vote on final passage of a bipartisan agreement to lift the budget caps for 2 years and extend the debt ceiling. It is an agreement that will strengthen our national security and provide our troops with the resources they need to do a very difficult and often dangerous job. Importantly, it will clear the way for critical investments in America's middle class, as well as for those struggling to get to the middle class, in healthcare, education, childcare, cancer research, our veterans, and more.

For too long, the arbitrary, draconian limits of sequester have hampered our ability to invest in working Americans and our military readiness. This deal ends the threat of sequester permanently. That is huge.

As large forces erode the financial security of the middle class—globalization, automation, technological advancement—one of the only forces large enough to push back on the side of the middle class and help them is the Federal Government.

Investing in education, healthcare, infrastructure, and childcare is how we give middle-class Americans greater security and give Americans struggling to get into the middle class a ladder up—something this government has done for decades and decades but hasn't been doing very well since the sequester has been in effect.

The sequester has hamstrung our ability to make investments in the middle class for 8 years—but no longer. Thank God.

Not only does this agreement end the sequester, it includes a significant increase in support for domestic priorities. In fact, the budget deal increases domestic budget authority \$10 billion more than defense. In the 3 years of Trump's Presidency and a Republican Senate, Democrats have secured over \$100 billion in increases for domestic programs. That means additional resources for the States to combat the opioid epidemic; support for VA hospitals caring for our veterans; cancer

research and other critical medical research that have saved the lives of literally millions; climate and clean energy technology; reducing the burden of college debt; infrastructure and transportation improvements.

So this \$100 billion is not abstract. It means jobs; it means ladders up; and it means hope for the American people, who are often pushed around by forces much larger than themselves.

Finally, this legislation lays the groundwork to avoid another government shutdown and will preserve the full faith and credit of the United States.

As my colleagues know well, the House has already passed this legislation and recessed for the State work period. The President supports it. Reportedly he is calling Members to encourage them to vote yes. The final piece to this puzzle is the Senate's stamp of approval.

I want to salute Senator LEAHY, our ranking member, all of the members of the Appropriations Committee, and all of those who came up with this bipartisan agreement.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote yes. Let's give our military, our middle class a boost before the Senate adjourns today.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

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

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

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 932

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs on agreeing to the Paul Amendment No. 932.

Mr. PAUL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), 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 or change their vote?

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 70, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 260 Leg.]

YEAS—23

Barrasso	Ernst	Risch
Blackburn	Fischer	Romney
Braun	Johnson	Rubio
Cornyn	Kennedy	Sasse
Crapo	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Cruz	Lee	Toomey
Daines	Moran	Young
Enzi	Paul	

NAYS—70

Alexander	Hassan	Reed
Baldwin	Hawley	Roberts
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Rosen
Blunt	Hirono	Rounds
Boozman	Hoeven	Schatz
Brown	Hyde-Smith	Schumer
Burr	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cantwell	Jones	Shaheen
Capito	Kaine	Shelby
Cardin	King	Sinema
Carper	Klobuchar	Smith
Casey	Leahy	Stabenow
Cassidy	Manchin	Sullivan
Collins	Markey	Tester
Coons	McConnell	Thune
Cortez Masto	McSally	Tillis
Cotton	Menendez	Udall
Cramer	Merkley	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murkowski	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murray	Wicker
Gardner	Perdue	Wyden
Graham	Peters	
Grassley	Portman	

NOT VOTING—7

Bennet	Harris	Warren
Booker	Isakson	
Gillibrand	Sanders	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 23, the nays are 70.

Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is not agreed to.

The amendment (No. 932) was rejected.

The majority leader.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining votes be 10 minutes in length.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

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 Calendar No. 165, H.R. 3877, a bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, to establish a congressional budget for fiscal years 2020 and 2021, to temporarily suspend the debt limit, and for other purposes.

Lamar Alexander, Thom Tillis, Martha McSally, John Cornyn, Pat Roberts, Mike Rounds, Susan M. Collins, Tom Cotton, Roy Blunt, Roger F. Wicker, Bill Cassidy, John Thune, Richard Burr, John Barrasso, Rob Portman, Lisa Murkowski, Mitch McConnell.

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 H.R. 3877, a bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985,

to establish a congressional budget for fiscal years 2020 and 2021, to temporarily suspend the debt limit, and for other purposes, 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 Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), 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 67, nays 27, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 261 Leg.]

YEAS—67

Alexander	Graham	Portman
Baldwin	Grassley	Reed
Barrasso	Hassan	Roberts
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Rosen
Blunt	Hirono	Rounds
Boozman	Hoeven	Schatz
Brown	Hyde-Smith	Schumer
Burr	Inhofe	Shaheen
Cantwell	Jones	Shelby
Capito	Kaine	Sinema
Cardin	King	Smith
Casey	Leahy	Stabenow
Cassidy	Markey	Sullivan
Collins	McConnell	Thune
Coons	McSally	Udall
Cornyn	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Cramer	Moran	Whitehouse
Crapo	Murkowski	Wicker
Duckworth	Murphy	Wyden
Durbin	Murray	Young
Ernst	Perdue	
Feinstein	Peters	

NAYS—27

Bennet	Gardner	Risch
Blackburn	Hawley	Romney
Braun	Johnson	Rubio
Carper	Kennedy	Sasse
Cotton	Klobuchar	Scott (FL)
Cruz	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Daines	Lee	Tester
Enzi	Manchin	Tillis
Fischer	Paul	Toomey

NOT VOTING—6

Booker	Harris	Sanders
Gillibrand	Isakson	Warren

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 67, the nays are 27.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I support the bipartisan budget deal that will extend the debt ceiling and lift the current budgets caps for the next 2 years.

This important deal will avoid harmful cuts to domestic priorities, prevent a default on our Nation's debt, and finally allow appropriators to get to work on this year's appropriations bills to fund the government.

Despite proposing draconian cuts in his budget, I am glad that President Trump has agreed to join Democrats in permanently ending the threat of sequester.

For too long, sequestration has handcuffed Congress's ability to make investments in middle-class priorities that advance the health, financial security, and well-being of the American people.

I am pleased that this agreement goes even further than previous budget deals by increasing nondefense spending by \$10 billion more than defense spending.

With this budget deal, Democrats have secured an increase of more than \$100 billion in funding for domestic priorities since President Trump took office.

I am especially pleased that this budget deal will allow us to continue making the big investments in medical research conducted at the National Institutes of Health, as well as the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, that will improve and save lives.

Because of NIH funding, new treatments have been developed that reduced cancer deaths more than 25 percent over past two decades.

Thirty years ago, HIV was a death sentence. Because of NIH funding, that is no longer the case.

Because of NIH-funded research, deaths from heart disease and stroke have fallen by nearly 80 percent since 1970.

Because of NIH funding, we are on the verge of curing—yes, curing—sickle cell anemia.

Consider this: Between 2010 and 2016, the Food and Drug Administration approved more than 200 new drugs and treatments for use in the United States; every single one of them was developed with NIH dollars.

Congress has recognized the importance of NIH, which is why we have, on a bipartisan basis, provided the NIH with \$9 billion in additional funding over the past 4 years, a 30 percent increase in that time.

This agreement will allow us to continue those vital investments.

Most importantly, this agreement will help prevent another harmful government shutdown from occurring this fall.

While not perfect, this budget deal will finally allow Congress to get to work on this year's appropriations bills and invest in the programs that the American people rely on.

I hope that my colleagues will join me in passing this agreement with overwhelming bipartisan support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all cloture time is expired.

The clerk will read the title of the bill for the third time.

The bill was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. WICKER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

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 (Mrs. FISCHER). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 67, nays 28, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 262 Leg.]

YEAS—67

Alexander	Graham	Portman
Baldwin	Grassley	Reed
Barrasso	Hassan	Roberts
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Rosen
Blunt	Hirono	Rounds
Boozman	Hoeven	Schatz
Brown	Hyde-Smith	Schumer
Burr	Inhofe	Shaheen
Cantwell	Jones	Shelby
Capito	Kaine	Sinema
Cardin	King	Smith
Casey	Leahy	Stabenow
Collins	Markey	Sullivan
Coons	McConnell	Thune
Cornyn	McSally	Udall
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cramer	Merkley	Warner
Crapo	Moran	Whitehouse
Duckworth	Murkowski	Wicker
Durbin	Murphy	Wyden
Ernst	Murray	Young
Feinstein	Perdue	
Gillibrand	Peters	

NAYS—28

Bennet	Gardner	Romney
Blackburn	Hawley	Rubio
Braun	Johnson	Sasse
Carper	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Klobuchar	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Lankford	Tester
Cruz	Lee	Tillis
Daines	Manchin	Toomey
Enzi	Paul	
Fischer	Risch	

NOT VOTING—5

Booker	Isakson	Warren
Harris	Sanders	

The bill (H.R. 3877) was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CORNYN. Madam 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. CORNYN. Madam President, when the Senate gavels out at the end of this day, Members will head home for the August work period to spend time with our constituents and family. I, for one, am eager to get back home to Texas and spend time with folks in about every region in my State. I have the honor of representing roughly 28 million people, and it takes a little bit of time and effort to get around the State, but I am looking forward to it.

I will have the chance to highlight some of the work that we have been

doing here in Washington and, yes, hear from my constituents, my fellow Texans, on what they care most about, what they agree with, what they disagree with, and everything in between.

With the passage of this bipartisan budget deal, we have now taken care of our final piece of business for this work period. The funding agreement we just passed will provide stability for our Nation through 2020 and deliver on some of the administration's key priorities. It has been the result of extensive negotiations between President Trump and Speaker PELOSI and represents a compromise between two sides that typically don't agree on much, and, yes, "compromise" is still not a dirty word. It is the only way things get done around here.

Obviously, this agreement is not perfect. That is the nature of compromise and the hallmark of responsible government. By passing this funding agreement, we are avoiding the possibility of a government shutdown again this fall. Instead, it provides us the time and space for wide-ranging debate about our government's spending habits. As our national deficit continues to grow, that could not be more critical.

I was glad to see that through the President's tough negotiations, it prevents 30 poison pills—or policy riders—from reaching the President's desk. It is no secret that our friends across the aisle have tried their best to eliminate the Hyde amendment, which, since 1976, has defined a consensus that no taxpayer funds be provided for abortions. That argument is over until 2020.

We also know there will be no Green New Deal done—no undoing of the President's regulatory reform through the backdoor.

Most importantly though, this funding agreement invests in our military. If there is one priority for what we ought to be doing here as elected representatives in the Federal Government, it is to provide for the common defense and for our national security.

This funding agreement provides the Pentagon with the predictability and flexibility they need in order to keep our country safe today and tomorrow. A predictable and steady budget gives our military leaders the ability to plan for the future and allows them to invest in the innovative and cutting-edge tools our servicemembers need and ensure that when the call comes, we are ready.

I was proud to support this funding agreement, and I am glad it is now headed to the White House for the President's signature.

DEBBIE SMITH ACT

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, over the last few months, I have spoken at length on the Senate floor about a bill I introduced earlier this year to reauthorize the Debbie Smith Act—legislation to help us end the nationwide rape kit backlog.

This legislation carries the name of a fierce and courageous woman—a sexual