

U.S. airlines are flying to Cuba, does anyone here honestly think that preventing Americans from traveling there is an appropriate role of the Federal government? Why only Cuba? Why not Venezuela? Or Russia? Or Iran, or anywhere else? It is a vindictive, discriminatory, self-defeating vestige of a time long passed.

This bill would end these Cold War restrictions on the freedom of Americans to travel. It would not do away with the embargo.

Americans overwhelmingly favor travel to Cuba. The last poll I saw, a CBS poll, found that 81 percent of Americans support expanding travel to Cuba. Officials in the White House, however, have a different agenda, driven by purely domestic political calculations. They have not only rolled back steps taken by the previous administration to encourage engagement with Cuba, they have gone further by imposing even more onerous restrictions on the right of Americans to travel. As a result, the number of Americans traveling to Cuba this year is projected to plummet by half, due to the policies of their own government. And the thousands of private Cuban entrepreneurs, the taxi drivers, the Airbnb renters, restaurants, and shops that depend on American customers are struggling to survive. It is a shortsighted, anachronistic policy that is beneath our democracy.

I and others, including Republicans, have traveled to Cuba many times over the past 20 years, met with Cuban officials, with Cubans who have been persecuted for opposing the government, and with many others. Every one of us wants to see an end to political repression in Cuba. The arrests and mistreatment of dissidents by the Cuban government should be condemned, just as we should condemn such abuses by other governments including some, like Egypt and Turkey, whose leaders have been welcomed at the White House and the State Department. Americans can travel freely to Egypt, Turkey, and Saudi Arabia, but not to Cuba.

The issue is how best to support the people of Cuba who struggle to make ends meet, and who want to live in a country where freedom of expression and association are protected. Anyone who thinks that more economic pressure, or ultimatums, will force the Cuban authorities to stop arresting political dissidents and embrace democracy have learned nothing from history. For more than half a century we tried a policy of unilateral sanctions and isolation, and it achieved neither of those goals. Instead, it is the Cuban people who were hurt the most. And it provided an opening in this hemisphere for Russia, China, and our other competitors.

Change is coming to Cuba, and we can help support that process. Or we can sit on the sidelines and falsely claim to be helping the Cuban people, while pursuing a failed policy of puni-

tive sanctions. The bipartisan bill I am introducing is about the right of Americans, not Cubans, to travel. Every member of Congress, especially those who have been to Cuba, should oppose restrictions on American citizens that have no place in the law books of a free society.

## SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

### SENATE RESOLUTION 287—ESTABLISHING APPROPRIATE THRESHOLDS FOR CERTAIN BUDGET POINTS OF ORDER IN THE SENATE, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. BRAUN (for himself and Ms. ERNST) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Budget:

S. RES. 287

*Resolved,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Make Rules Matter Act".

#### SEC. 2. THRESHOLDS FOR BUDGET POINTS OF ORDER.

(a) THRESHOLD FOR POINT OF ORDER AGAINST EMERGENCY DESIGNATIONS.—

(1) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term "emergency designation point of order" means a point of order raised under—

(A) section 314(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 645(e));

(B) section 4(g)(3) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (2 U.S.C. 933(g)(3)); or

(C) section 4112(e) of H. Con. Res. 71 (115th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018.

(2) WAIVER.—In the Senate, an emergency designation point of order may be waived or suspended only by the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(3) APPEAL.—In the Senate, an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on an emergency designation point of order.

(b) THRESHOLD FOR LARGE BUDGET IMPACT FOR CERTAIN CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT OF 1974 POINTS OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A point of order described in paragraph (3) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL.—In the Senate, an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order described in paragraph (3).

(3) DESCRIPTION OF LARGE BUDGET IMPACT.—A point of order described in this paragraph is a point of order under section 302(f)(2) or 311(a)(2)(A) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(f)(2), 642(a)(2)(A)) against legislation that would, within the time periods applicable to the point of order, as determined by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate, cause budget authority or outlays to exceed the applicable allocation, suballocation, level, or aggregate by more than \$5,000,000,000.

(c) DE MINIMIS BUDGET IMPACT.—For a violation for which the absolute value of the violation is not more than \$500,000, a point of order shall not lie—

(1) under the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.) (except for a point of order under section 302 or 311 of such Act (2 U.S.C. 633, 642)); or

(2) under any concurrent resolution on the budget.

(d) THRESHOLD FOR INCREASING SHORT-TERM DEFICITS.—

(1) REDUCTION IN NET INCREASE IN THE DEFICIT.—In the Senate, section 404(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010, shall be applied by substituting "\$1,000,000,000" for "\$10,000,000,000".

(2) WAIVER AND APPEAL FOR LARGE BUDGET IMPACT IN THE SENATE.—

(A) WAIVER.—In the Senate, section 404(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010, may be waived or suspended by the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn, if the net increase in the deficit in any fiscal year exceeds \$10,000,000,000.

(B) APPEAL.—In the Senate, an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under section 404(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010, if the net increase in the deficit in any fiscal year exceeds \$10,000,000,000.

(e) THRESHOLD FOR INCREASING LONG-TERM DEFICITS.—

(1) REDUCTION IN NET INCREASE IN THE DEFICIT.—In the Senate, subsections (a) and (b)(1) of section 3101 of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, shall each be applied by substituting "\$1,000,000,000" for "\$5,000,000,000".

(2) WAIVER AND APPEAL FOR LARGE BUDGET IMPACT IN THE SENATE.—

(A) WAIVER.—In the Senate, section 3101(b)(1) of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, may be waived or suspended by the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn, if the net increase in on-budget deficits in any 10-fiscal-year period exceeds \$10,000,000,000.

(B) APPEAL.—In the Senate, an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under section 3101(b)(1) of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, if the net increase in on-budget deficits in any 10-fiscal-year period exceeds \$10,000,000,000.

### SENATE RESOLUTION 288—AFFIRMING THE IMPORTANCE OF THE LONG-TERM SOLVENCY OF THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

Mr. BRAUN submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Environment and Public Works:

S. RES. 288

Whereas, in July 2019, the public debt of the United States was more than \$22,000,000,000,000, increasing each year by a Federal budget deficit of nearly \$1,000,000,000,000;

Whereas the Federal Government is facing shortfalls in several Federal trust funds, including the Highway Trust Fund, which is expected to reach insolvency in July 2021;

Whereas the infrastructure of the United States needs substantial investment in order to continue supporting the growing economy of the United States;

Whereas, according to a report published in 2015 by the Federal Highway Administration, 20 percent of the Federal-aid highways in the United States were in poor condition;

Whereas short-term extensions providing funding to the Highway Trust Fund do not provide the certainty needed by States and local governments to enter into long-term roadbuilding contracts; and

Whereas short-term extensions providing funding to the Highway Trust Fund, based solely on deficit spending, exacerbate the problem described in the preceding whereas clause and only serve to postpone solving the problem: Now, therefore, be it *Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

- (1) the Highway Trust Fund should achieve long-term solvency through user fees; and
- (2) any spending on Federal highway programs during the next reauthorization period that exceeds current Highway Trust Fund revenues and balances should be fully offset.

SENATE RESOLUTION 289—EX-PRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT SOCIALISM POSES A SIGNIFICANT THREAT TO FREEDOM, LIBERTY, AND ECONOMIC PROSPERITY

Mr. DAINES submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 289

Whereas Merriam-Webster Dictionary defines socialism as—

- (1) “any of various economic and political theories advocating collective or governmental ownership and administration of the means of production and distribution of goods”; and
- (2) “a system of society or group living in which there is no private property”;

Whereas socialism and the policies advocated by self-described “democratic socialists” have an underlying historical connection to the Marxist theory;

Whereas history has witnessed countless failed Marxist-inspired regimes;

Whereas, because of the perverse incentives and inherent flaws of the Marxist theory, socialism inevitably leads to societal rot, resulting in devastation, economic poverty, and destruction;

Whereas prominent elected officials in the Senate and the House of Representatives are self-described socialists and espouse socialist proposals;

Whereas socialist policies such as the Green New Deal and socialized medicine would—

- (1) eliminate the private property rights of all people of the United States; and
- (2) force taxpayers to pay trillions of dollars to implement;

Whereas Alexis de Tocqueville wrote, “Democracy and socialism have nothing in common but one word, equality. But notice the difference: while democracy seeks equality in liberty, socialism seeks equality in restraint and servitude.”;

Whereas Margaret Thatcher once stated, “Socialist governments . . . always run out of other people’s money”, and thus the way to prosperity is for the state to give “the people more choice to spend their own money in their own way”;

Whereas free-market capitalism is the greatest engine for human advancement in the history of the world, bringing more people out of poverty and into prosperity than any economic model in the history of mankind;

Whereas the United States is the single greatest country in the history of the world, due in large part to its system of government that secures the private property rights of all citizens through the genius of the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas, on February 5, 2019, in the State of the Union address, President Donald J. Trump declared—

(1) “We are alarmed by new calls to adopt socialism in our country”; and

(2) “America will never be a socialist country”: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) acknowledges that Marxism and socialism are failed ideologies;

(2) recognizes that socialism poses a significant threat to the freedom, liberty, and economic prosperity of all countries and people around the world;

(3) accepts that socialism is a failed experiment of governance that inevitably ends in misery and suffering;

(4) declares that, throughout the history, tradition, and national civic spirit of the United States, the United States has been a beacon of light shining like a lighthouse to the rest of the world, demonstrating that freedom and liberty are the surest foundation of government; and

(5) affirms that the United States should never be a socialist country.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, we are at a pivotal time in our great Nation’s history. America was founded upon the principles of liberty, the free enterprise system, the promotion of national sovereignty, and a strong national defense. Under these principles, we have built the greatest country in the history of the world. We have shown the world time and again the genius of American ingenuity and the grit of American determination.

What makes America so great is not that we are bonded by one ethnicity or one race but that we are bonded together by the idea of liberty. Montanans agree. Montanans want less government. Montanans don’t want the hand of Big Government and Washington, DC, in their pockets, making decisions on their behalf or limiting their freedoms. In Montana, we understand the principles of freedom.

However, a radical, socialist, far-left movement is growing across this country and has taken root as the new voice of the Democratic Party. My Grandpa was a Democrat from Billings, MT. I spent many days out with Grandpa fishing and hunting in certain places in Montana. I love my Grandpa dearly. But if he were around today, he would be appalled as a Democrat at some of the things the far left are saying and advocating for. The words and the actions of certain radical Members of the Democratic House highlight this new standard for the Democratic Party.

It was renowned economist Milton Friedman who once said, “One of the great mistakes is to judge policies and programs by their intentions rather than their results.”

Radical Democrats are advocating for disastrous policies that would wreck our economy under the guise of cleaning up the environment. Fantasy policies, like the Green New Deal, would be a disaster for Montana and the American people. Under this socialist wish list, Montanans and millions of the American people would have to give up their cars and air travel. Montana truckers, our ag haulers, our pilots, and the industries that rely on

them would be wiped out. What the socialists are calling for is a disbanding of our coal plants, leaving countless Montana communities in the dark and in the cold and putting many more out of good-paying jobs and putting a diverse energy sector out of business.

Above all else, to fund this disaster of a policy, it is estimated it would take \$93 trillion—that is with a “t.” Who do they think is going to pay for that? It would be Montanans, Americans, our moms and dads, our children.

Just last week in Berkley, CA, their city council banned natural gas in new homes. Whatever happened to supporting all of the above energy agenda? They are banning natural gas in new homes in Berkley, CA.

Another disastrous policy that the radical left is pushing for is this so-called Medicare for All or rather socialized medicine. They are calling for a complete takeover of our healthcare system by the Federal Government, eliminating private insurance and eliminating choice.

This so-called plan will cost the taxpayers another \$32 trillion over 10 years—\$32 trillion with a “t.” Combine this cost with the cost of the Green New Deal proposal, and the country you and I know will cease to exist. Our economy will be destroyed.

We are also seeing far-left, radical Democrats normalize crime and the blatant disregard of the law with their push for open borders. We are a sovereign nation with established borders. We are a nation based on the rule of law.

Lost in this heated immigration debate taking place at our southern border are the stories of the law-abiding, legal American immigrants who have fled socialist regimes for a chance at freedom. Some of these immigrants include the Vietnamese boat people, the Cuban refugees who fled Castro’s murderous regime, and Chinese Christians persecuted for practicing their faith. You see, in talking to these immigrants—these legal immigrants—they will tell you what socialism looks like. They will also tell you how grateful they are to have freedom here in America. They are proud to be Americans.

So we, as Americans, have a choice. One path leads to complete government control, undermining our Constitution and our American way of life. The other path is the path of freedom. You see, capitalism and the free enterprise system has done more than any other system in the world to lift people out of poverty.

As a former technology executive, I can speak to the wonders of the free enterprise system because I saw it happen firsthand in my hometown of Bozeman, MT. What was once a small start-up cloud computing business, grew into a billion-dollar company headquartered in Bozeman, MT, and it transformed Bozeman into becoming one of the tech hubs now of the West. It is all because the American free enterprise system thrives in innovation, and it rewards