

of that debt has been accumulated at periods in their life either before they were born or before they were old enough to vote.

It amounts to, in a sense, a really pernicious form of taxation without representation. We fought a war over that principle, and we won that war.

We shouldn't be doing this defiantly without a plan for turning it around, without a reason to have to do that—a reason that has to do with our very survival—without some sort of plan for getting out of it. But instead of getting out it, we are accelerating into it, and that is troubling.

Some might argue, and, in fact, some within this body and in the House of Representatives have argued that so-called discretionary spending is not worth worrying about. Discretionary spending, for those of you not familiar with the term, refers to that part of the government that Congress decides on each and every year that isn't predecided the way our entitlement programs are.

In other words, mandatory or entitlement spending, spending on things like Social Security and Medicare that are already set aside—those are things we don't have discretion over. They are already called for by law. We already have to spend money on them.

There are those in Congress who will maintain that we shouldn't worry about discretionary spending, which is the primary focus of this measure, of this budget caps deal, and of this debt ceiling deal, because, really, the bigger picture, the bigger concern, and the bigger threat is, in fact, about mandatory spending. It is the entitlement programs, they will say, that really are driving the looming debt crisis. But it is important to point out that we are not reforming those either. We couldn't even stick to the budget caps that both parties in both Houses and the White House agreed to just a few years ago.

It defies logic and reason, in my mind, for people to say: Well, we shouldn't worry about discretionary spending because mandatory spending is really where the problem is. No one would ever advise someone struggling with alcohol consumption that they shouldn't worry about consuming too much alcohol if they are also addicted to something else—meth or heroin or some other terribly addictive substance that might also be harmful to them. The fact that you are dealing with one problem doesn't mean that you don't also have to face the other problem. That is the concern I have with this deal. That is the reason I plan to vote against it.

I know and I will be the first to admit that there are no easy solutions here. There are no solutions that anyone would look to and say: Yes, that sounds like a lot of fun. I don't want to do that.

It reminds me of a time when my sister, Stephanie, was enrolled in a new school shortly after my family moved back to Utah. Stephanie was in kinder-

garten. Stephanie was asked by the teacher, as they were testing her to try to figure out which class she should be in, to take out her favorite color of crayon and write down her name. My mom watched from a distance as the teacher administered this test. She knew that Stephanie knew full well how to write her name. She watched in a certain degree of agony as Stephanie sat there and didn't pick up a single crayon.

After the test was complete and the teacher concluded, mistakenly, that Stephanie didn't know how to write her name, my mom asked her: Why didn't you write your name?

She said: The lady asked me to pick out my favorite color of crayon, and they didn't have pink. So I didn't write my name.

Sometimes I wonder whether Congress is in the same position as my sister Stephanie when she was at that young age being tested. We don't see our favorite color of crayon. We don't see our favorite option. We don't see any easy options there.

In fact, we see a whole lot of options that would involve putting a dent in this problem—this growing, building problem that I have pointed out in the graph—and we see criticism that would likely ensue from any one of those options. Now, I understand that. It doesn't mean that the laws of mathematics will not eventually catch up to us.

Winston Churchill is known to have said of the American people that the American people will always make the right choice after they have exhausted every other alternative. Now, I don't know whether he, in fact, said that. If he did, in fact, say it, I don't think he meant it as a compliment to the American people, but I take it as such. It is a compliment. It is what differentiates us from other countries. We do, in fact, make the right choice. We are great not because of who we are but because of what we do, and, generally, at least after we have exhausted other alternatives, we do make the right choice—a choice that reflects the principles of liberty that really have always defined us as a nation.

Those principles cannot coexist with an effort that suggests to us that our government is so big and has to be so big that there is nothing we can do about the fact that Americans are required to work weeks or months out of every year just to pay their Federal taxes and then be told that we are \$22 trillion in debt. By the time the 2 years contemplated under this deal have passed, we may well be at \$23 trillion, \$24 trillion, or, perhaps, approaching \$25 trillion in debt. Is it going to be any easier then to deal with the problem than it is now? I think not.

If not us, who? If not now, when? The way we start making steps in the right direction is to vote against a bill—a bill that, like this one, does not meaningfully address the problem.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE).  
The Senator from Indiana.

#### DEBT CEILING

Mr. BRAUN. Mr. President, I have the good fortune every Thursday of sitting here anywhere from 3 to 6, depending on what the workload is. Since I have gotten here, as a Senator from Indiana, as a Main Street entrepreneur, almost everything I talk about is stuff that I have learned back in the real world.

Now and then, there will be a speaker here that breaks up the monotony of sitting there for that amount of time. My friend and fellow Senator, Mr. LEE, couldn't have said it more eloquently. You have a beautiful graph here to show the issue. I am going to take just a few minutes to reinforce what he said.

When I ran for Senate, I did it out of the frustration that it seems like only here in DC do we hear the same things year after year and nothing ever seems to change. I know the responsibility of leadership and trying to navigate through the system. But sooner or later, we have to simply say enough is enough.

This year, the President, I really think, wanted to shake the system up. I was hoping, like back in March of 2018, when there was a continuing resolution agreed to, to re-enable defense, which, in my opinion, is probably the most important thing the Federal Government should do. That might be the last time. As Senator LEE said: Look at the chart.

There was always a good reason in the past, and it was generally along the lines of defending our country. But the ethic back then should be what the ethic is now—like it is for every household, every State government, every school board, and especially every business—that you borrow money not to consume. That is called putting it on a credit card. In almost everything we do in the Federal Government, there is not a tangible asset to show for it. We are actually spending it and consuming it.

When you borrow money in any business, there is a difference between expenses and supplies and capital expenditures. We do not even talk about that.

I am going to accept the reality of the system today. I don't like it. I am going to vote against the bill as well. I have talked to my fellow Members that we need to, sooner or later, quit saying the same things. We need to, sooner or later, reform the system, to actually do things that are going to be different from everything we have done in the past that has led us to this.

How is it going to happen? We are going to need to have more Senators like Senator LEE, like myself, who get involved and make the case. But the only way this is really going to happen is if Hoosiers and Americans know you could never get by with this in your own household.

I know I could have never built a national business by doing this over 37 years. It is like in business. People always ask you: How did you get there? I will tell you how I got there: patience, perseverance, hard work, reinvesting every penny I made, borrowing money only when it made sense. And it wasn't for a nicer corporate headquarters. My office was in a mobile home for 17 years. I appreciated low overhead.

When you do things like that, great opportunities come your way. To all the people who come here from Indiana every week somehow connected with the Federal Government wanting more, my advice to them is hedge your bets. If you are dependent on an institution like this that just is so stubborn and will not correct itself, this trajectory will lead to a bad day somewhere down the road that our kids and grandkids will deal with.

I think the other side of the aisle does drive a lot of this mentality that the Federal Government should do more regardless of what it costs.

The income tax occurred about right back in here. That became a source of revenue for the Federal Government that we pretty well disciplined ourselves with, until we got to right here, when entitlements and the mandated spending took over the dynamic of our Federal Government.

We have everything on auto pilot here where you can't even discuss it. From Medicaid, Medicare, Social Security, and interest on our debt to about another 10 to 15 percent that we have moved from discretionary to mandatory—another gimmick here—it is only 30 percent of the budget that we can deal with. Senator LEE talked about it.

All of that we know, and all I am asking leadership and the President, when we do win in 2020—because I think we will, because anybody that is proposing ideas like the Green New Deal, Medicare for All, free college tuition, and getting rid of college debt is only going to add fuel to the fire—is that we as fiscal conservatives are going to have to be heard, and leadership and the President are going to have to hear us.

Even though it is not going to happen this time, we shouldn't be afraid to talk about it, because everyone else in our country—households, school boards, businesses, and State governments—does. That is because they have the common sense to live within their means, not loot the bank in the present and shovel all these troubles onto future generations.

I yield the floor.

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

#### VOTE EXPLANATION

• Ms. HARRIS. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent but, had I been present, would have voted no on roll-call vote No. 228, the confirmation of

Wendy Williams Berger, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida.

Mr. President, I was necessarily absent but, had I been present, would have voted no on roll-call vote No. 229, the confirmation of Brian C. Buescher, of Nebraska, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nebraska.●

#### INTERFERENCE WITH ELECTIONS ACT

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I would like to speak about the Prevention of Foreign Interference with Elections Act, which I introduced in June.

The bill is cosponsored by all 10 Democratic members of the Judiciary Committee, plus Senators MARKEY and SMITH. This bill is necessary because we know foreign actors are working to influence our elections. The Mueller report showed us how Russia interfered in 2016, and we can expect it to happen again in 2020. The bill's goal is to provide enhanced criminal penalties to prevent foreign interference in our elections. The bill makes five changes to current law in order to accomplish that.

First, it explicitly makes it a crime to work with foreign nationals to interfere in U.S. elections.

Second, the bill prohibits Americans from helping foreign nationals funnel illegal contributions or donations into U.S. elections.

Third, the bill expands restrictions on foreign-financed election ads. Notably, it restricts foreign-financed issue ads and foreign-financed digital ads.

Fourth, the bill creates a civil action so that when the Attorney General learns of foreign interference, the Justice Department can immediately get an injunction.

And fifth, the bill modifies immigration law so if a non-U.S. citizen is convicted of interfering in our elections, they would be inadmissible into the United States.

Unless we take action, Russia or another foreign power will interfere with our elections. It is not a question of if, it is a question of when.

We need to make clear that such interference will result in criminal punishment, and we must update our election laws to combat these new cyber attacks.

This bill accomplishes both. Thank you.

#### 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF "APOLLO 11"

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the 50th anniversary of the moon landing and New Hampshire's role in this important moment of history.

On July 20, 1969, Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin completed their 13th orbit around the Moon and fired up the descent engine on the now-historic *Eagle* Apollo Lunar Module. With pilot Mi-

chael Collins staying behind in the command module, *Columbia*, these American heroes, with the entire world watching and backed by a whole generation of scientists, engineers, and specialists supporting them on the ground, began their initial descent to be the first humans to set foot on another planetary body.

What many Americans may not know is that as both pilots began their historic descent, critical New Hampshire-made technology was helping them along the way. Sensors made by RdF Corporation in Hudson were a part of the lunar module propulsion system guiding them to the lunar surface. RdF sensors were also on their spacesuits as they took that first giant leap for mankind.

RdF, which continues to support the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, NASA, as it looks to return to the Moon and then Mars, is just one of the many innovative small businesses in the Granite State that have played such a critical role in our country's space program.

For example, the Saturn V rocket program, which launched the Apollo crews to the Moon, benefitted from a state-of-the-art computerized system which was developed at Sanders Associates in Nashua, now a part of BAE Systems. HaighFarr in Bedford has been in business for over 50 years designing complex antennas for the space program and has played a significant role in our Mars lander and rover programs. Mikrolar, in Hampton, manufactures high precision positioning systems and is a critical piece of the James Webb Telescope, which will be the successor to the Hubble sometime in the next decade.

The fact is that New Hampshire's pioneering and innovative small business community has been a mainstay in the aerospace community for decades and remains so today. As the ranking member on the Appropriations Subcommittee that oversees and funds NASA, I am supportive of NASA's efforts to get us back to the Moon and eventually Mars, particularly because I know Granite State businesses will be leading those efforts.

It is not just the private sector in New Hampshire that has stepped up to keep us competitive in science and space. It is also our educational community. The University of New Hampshire, UNH, is a key contributor to NASA's Lunar Reconnaissance Orbiter, which has been in orbit around the Moon since 2009. The New Hampshire Space Grant Consortium, which includes nine Granite State affiliates, including UNH, Dartmouth, and our very own McAuliffe-Shepard Discovery Center, is focused on educating our future scientists and space technicians.

A true accounting of New Hampshire's role in space would not be complete without calling attention to two of our State's most impressive space-faring heroes: Alan Shepard and Christa McAuliffe.