

Mr. Patel is not the person to lead the FBI. My hope is that all of us should consider what Mr. Patel will do. He is going to use the power of the FBI to go after all those in government, those in the media, and those across the country that he doesn't agree with. He cannot serve as the next Director of the FBI.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON PATEL NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All postcloture time is expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Patel nomination?

Mr. DURBIN. 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 bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 61 Ex.]

YEAS—51

Banks	Graham	Moran
Barrasso	Grassley	Moreno
Blackburn	Hagerty	Mullin
Boozman	Hawley	Paul
Britt	Hoeben	Ricketts
Budd	Husted	Risch
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Cassidy	Johnson	Schmitt
Cornyn	Justice	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cramer	Lankford	Sheehy
Crapo	Lee	Sullivan
Cruz	Lummis	Thune
Curtis	Marshall	Tillis
Daines	McConnell	Tuberville
Ernst	McCormick	Wicker
Fischer	Moody	Young

NAYS—49

Alsobrooks	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Baldwin	Hirono	Sanders
Bennet	Kaine	Schatz
Blumenthal	Kelly	Schiff
Blunt Rochester	Kim	Schumer
Booker	King	Shaheen
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Slotkin
Collins	Lujan	Smith
Coons	Markley	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Murkowski	Warnock
Durbin	Murphy	Warren
Fetterman	Murray	Welch
Galleo	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Padilla	Wyden
Hassan	Peters	
Heinrich	Reed	

The nomination was confirmed.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORENO). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

SETTING FORTH THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET FOR THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2025 AND SETTING FORTH THE APPROPRIATE BUDGETARY LEVELS FOR FISCAL YEARS 2026 THROUGH 2034

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

The Senator from South Carolina.

BUDGET RECONCILIATION

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, my colleagues will soon be starting what is commonly called a vote-arama. If you have never been in one, it is OK. But know it is a chance to have a spirited discussion and debate about policy and about the budget resolution.

So what has happened here is that the Budget Committee reported out S. Con. Res. 7. That will allow, through the reconciliation process, the spending of money and the reduction of spending based on different committees.

This resolution allows for \$175 billion of border and immigration policy enhancements, but it doesn't spend a penny. It allows the Judiciary Committee and the Homeland Security Committee to come up with an up-to-\$175 billion plan to secure our border and do immigration reform.

And what will happen is that those two committees will work with the Trump administration to meet their priorities. There is nothing in this resolution directing one dime of spending, and no spending bill can be implemented without Presidential signature. So I want to make sure that is clear.

There is \$150 billion in increased defense spending. Why? Because we have a lot of threats.

Since the withdrawal of Afghanistan, radical Islam is on the rise. We have got a hot war with Russia and Ukraine. Israel is facing enemies on seven sides. We have provided weapons to allies in Ukraine and Israel. We have run out of 155 howitzer rounds. We have got to reinforce our industrial base. We need more money into our military yesterday to make sure that we can deter a war, and, if we get into a war, we win it.

So the \$150 billion will be allocated by the Armed Services Committee. We don't direct how the \$150 billion is spent. We just allow the Armed Services Committee to spend that much, if they choose. They decide what to spend it on.

So this idea that there is somehow money in this resolution for Ukraine or any other specific purpose is not true. All we do is create a number for the committees to mark up to, and it is up to the committee as to what is in the \$150 billion package.

And to all the colleagues here, you eventually get to vote on that work product, and, if you don't like it, you can vote no. And, eventually, that work product will have to be signed by the President. So that is the way the process works.

What we are doing today is jump-starting a process that will allow the Republican Party to meet President Trump's immigration agenda through the reconciliation process. And the Democrats chose this very process to pass ObamaCare and the Inflation Reduction Act.

We are going to use it to secure our border. We are not going to grow the

government just for the sense of growing the government. We are not going to create a Green New Deal. We are going to create border security transformational in nature.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are about to embark on a plan to jump-start the most transformational border security bill in the history of the United States because we need it yesterday. We have had 11 million people come to this country illegally. Fentanyl kills 3,000 Americans every 2 weeks. It comes across that southern border.

We are running out of detention space to hold people. Tom Homan, the border czar, came to the Republican Senate last week or 2 weeks ago and said that ICE is out of money. This resolution jump-starts the process to get Tom Homan the money he needs to fulfill the promises we made, to build more detention beds so you don't have to let people go. Laken Riley's murderer was in detention and released because of lack of bed space and wound up killing the young lady. That should never happen again. When you are detained, we should hold you and process you according to law, not release you. We need more detention beds.

We need to finish the wall. This \$175 billion will be allocated by the committees in question, and it will allow President Trump to finish the wall, secure the border, and deport criminals.

ICE is out of money.

If you think it is a good idea to go after the criminal gangs that have come here over the years illegally, then you are right.

To my Democratic colleagues, you should be working with us, not against us. Everybody should want to clean up the mess of the last 4 years. Everybody should want to go after criminal gangs. Everybody should want to secure the border because it is a national security nightmare. And nobody should want the dilemma of a nation having to let somebody go who could potentially be dangerous because you have no place to put them.

This \$175 billion will allow for the most transformational border security bill in the history of the country at a time of great need.

The \$150 billion will be allocated by the Armed Services Committee. They will decide what to spend it on. There is a lot of modernization we need of our nuclear triad fleet. We need more weapons. Our stockpile is low. There are a bunch of things we can spend \$150 billion, but we will let the Armed Services Committee decide those priorities.

When it comes to border security—the \$175 billion plan—the committees of jurisdiction will allocate that money, not this resolution. But without this resolution, we can't move forward.

Why is this resolution important? Without this bill passing, S. Con. Res. 7, there is no hope getting money for the border the way it needs to be done. Without this resolution passing tonight or early tomorrow, we are not

going to get any money for the military without having to negotiate non-military spending increases.

We don't have a lack-of-spending problem in our country; we have spent way too much on things that don't matter enough. Part of this process will be committees finding offsets, reducing spending.

So we are telling the Armed Services Committee: Spend \$150 billion the way you see fit. We are telling two committees to spend \$175 billion to secure our border. We are telling seven other committees: Find savings inside your committee to offset the spending we are creating in this bill.

I think they can do that. I think what DOGE is doing is good. This is a form of that.

Every committee that has been instructed to save at least \$1 billion will be able finally to go into the committee itself, see what they spend on, and reduce spending because we are directing them to.

My hope is that the \$342 billion we are going to spend to secure our border, help the military, and enhance the Coast Guard will be offset with \$342 billion of cuts in other parts of the government. We can do it, but this resolution has to pass or we won't do it.

I am highly confident that the Republican chairmen of the committees in question will deliver. I am highly confident that we can find savings in the government to offset the spending we are creating.

The Democratic Party used this process for their Green New Deal. They used this process for ObamaCare. We are using this process to help our military, who needs help, to secure a border that has been broken, and to enhance the Coast Guard. That is the difference. We are doing things that need to be done to make us safe.

Mr. President, 3,000 Americans die every 2 weeks because fentanyl comes across the border. We are going to fix that.

Since President Trump has been in office, border crossings have gone down by 90 percent. We want to reinforce this success. We want to finish that wall. We want to make sure we never release another person in this country because we don't have a bed. We are going to make sure the criminal gangs keep leaving, not staying because ICE doesn't have enough money.

Why are we doing this? Because Tom Homan and Mr. Vought, the head of OMB, told us 2 weeks ago that we are out of money to finish the job President Trump started.

To my House colleagues: I prefer one big beautiful bill that makes the tax cuts permanent, that does the things we need to do on the border and with our military and cuts spending. I wish you all the best. I prefer what you are doing to what we are doing, but we have to have a plan B if you can't get it done soon.

What is the Senate doing? We have decided to front-end load security. We

want to cut taxes. We want to make the tax cuts permanent. We are going to work with our House colleagues to do that. They expire at the end of the year, but we have time to do that.

It is the view of the Republican Senate that when it comes to border security, we need not fail. We should have the money now to keep the momentum going. When it comes to the Republican Senate, we believe the military needs money now because the world is on fire.

To my House colleagues: We will all get there together. If you can pass the one big beautiful bill that makes the tax cuts permanent—not 4, 5 years—then we will all cheer over here. Nothing would please me more than Speaker JOHNSON being able to put together the bill that President Trump wants. I want that to happen, but I cannot sit on the sidelines and not have a plan B.

This Nation is under threat. The illegal immigrants who have come here by the millions need to be sent back by the millions. The border needs to be secured. The wall needs to be finished. We need more detention space. We need to upgrade our military capability now.

The reason we are doing it now is because we were told ICE is out of money now.

I am hoping the House can deliver, but I am very confident that in the Senate, early in the morning, Republicans—not one Democrat vote—will set in motion a process that will transform our border security to the most modern, aggressive border security plan in the history of the country, north and south; that it will set in motion \$175 billion of new spending to secure the border in a way that has never been achieved in the past.

If this resolution fails, God help us all. If this resolution passes, help is on the way.

If you believe that America needs to be serious about securing our border, this bill gets the job done. If you believe the military needs to be stronger, not weaker, at a time of threat, this bill gets it done. If you believe the Coast Guard needs more capability to deal with drugs and national security threats, this bill delivers. This is a security bill.

This is a bill that will combat fentanyl killing Americans. There are more Americans dying every 2 weeks from fentanyl than on 9/11. Hundreds of thousands of young Americans—young and old but mostly young—have died from fentanyl poisoning coming across that southern border. We are going to go after those cartels. I am confident that President Trump is the new sheriff in town that we need. But without resources, it won't work.

Tom Homan came to us and begged us for money to continue the plan he has enacted to get gangs out of this country, to secure that border, and to add more detention space.

Tom, we heard you. We are going to meet your needs.

I am excited about this debate. I am excited about Republican-led chairmen finding ways to reduce spending to pay for this.

This is a big deal, folks. The Republican Party is going to go all in on border security. We are going to upgrade our defense capability, and we are going to pay for it.

Has anybody at home ever had to pick between two things? You couldn't do everything. You couldn't have it all. You had to spend because your child got sick or hurt, and you had to cut somewhere else because there wasn't enough money to do both. We are going to set priorities. If you have a sick child or something bad in your family happens, that goes first. That means you have to pick somewhere else—except in Washington.

That model is over. We are going to start a new way of doing business. We are going to spend on things that need to be done and should be done by the Federal Government to keep us safe, and we are going to offset it by reducing spending in areas that are not as important.

I am excited about this process. I urge my colleagues to come down on both sides of the aisle and participate in this debate. This is what I was elected to do, I think—make America safe and prosperous and do it in a fiscally responsible way. The idea that we are going to actually offset spending is a great day. We are going to deliver.

This is going to go into the night. Our Democratic colleagues are going to have a chance to offer a lot of amendments to our approach. They will want this and they will want that. What breaks my heart is they don't see the value what we are trying to do.

Every American should want more money going into DHS to secure our border. Every American should want more capability in the hands of the military at a time of great threat. But we can't get there. We can't reach common ground on those issues. So we are going to use the process they used. They used the process to create ObamaCare, the Green New Deal, and the Inflation Reduction Act. We are going to use that very same process to make the cartel's life miserable, to go after criminal gangs, to finish the wall, upgrade the capability of the Coast Guard, and make our military the most lethal it has been since Ronald Reagan, and we are going to pay for it all.

In a bit, I will read a script that starts the process.

To the Senator from Ohio, the Presiding Officer, this is why you came. This is what you promised to do. I was on the campaign with you, and you looked your voters in the eye and said: We are going to do things different. We are going to secure our border, we are stop the fentanyl from poisoning your kids, and we are going to be serious about fiscal responsibility. We are going to pay for all of this.

Mr. President, you have a chance here to do what you promised you would do.

All of us on this side of the aisle—people are counting on us. They are counting on this Republican majority to deal with the mess that has been created for the last 4 years. They are counting on this Republican majority to give the President the money he needs to do the job that he promised to do. And we are going to deliver. We are going to do it, and we are going to do it tonight. If it is 5 o'clock in the morning—I don't care how long it takes—we are going to deliver, and we are going to pay for everything we do.

In a little bit, in a small period of time, around 5 o'clock, we are going to start this process. This is a big deal, folks. This is not just business as usual in Washington; this is a different way of doing business.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, we need to be focused on solving problems. I think most of us here get that. No matter who the President is, our constituents expect us to work for them. They expect us to fight for them, and they expect us to do the hard work of passing laws to make their lives better.

People don't send us here to make their lives worse, but that is exactly what Trump and Musk are doing. They are looking at our most pressing problems and making them worse. This budget proposal will only add fuel to that fire.

Right now, even as egg prices hit an alltime high, Trump and Musk have done nothing to lower prices. They have done nothing to address the housing crisis or help families get quality, affordable childcare or address other issues I hear about from folks all the time. Instead, they are slashing programs that help our families make ends meet. They are gutting an Agency that saves working people money and protects them from scams and starting trade wars that will impose what is effectively a Trump sales tax entirely on the backs of American workers.

As China works to strengthen its global leadership, Trump and Musk have ceded the ground almost entirely, illegally cutting off investments we make to continue our country's leadership and help our allies.

At the most precarious moment for the Middle East in decades, Trump is casually proposing to ethnically cleanse Gaza so that Trump and his family can build waterfront property there.

When it comes to helping our allies in Ukraine secure a just peace, Trump is giving away countless concessions to Putin—out of the gate—calling our ally a “dictator” and meeting with Russia without inviting Ukraine.

When it comes to the bird flu, Trump and Musk are firing the very workers who are responsible for tracking the disease and keeping it from spreading further; and now, suddenly, they are desperately trying to hire them back.

As Texas deals with a serious measles outbreak, Trump's Secretary can't

even confirm the obvious and tell parents the vaccine doesn't cause autism, which, to be clear, it does not.

And almost unbelievably—just weeks after the deadliest commercial plane crash in the United States in over two decades—Trump and Musk are firing FAA workers who make sure flying is safe. Who does that help?

Now Trump is letting Musk run wild by inappropriately accessing and rifling through sensitive SSA and Treasury files, with the IRS being next—your data. How does that make sense?

But while President Trump is busy making problems worse and trampling our laws and quoting dictators, what are we doing here in the Senate? Are we holding President Trump accountable? Are we holding his “co-President,” Elon Musk—the richest man in the world who has billions of dollars in conflicts of interest—accountable? Are we putting a stop to the catastrophic cuts and reckless firings that are hurting people and our communities and setting our country back decades?

It seems to me that would be a good use of time. After all, I have even heard some Republicans admit that cutting things like medical research and firing people like our VA workers are bad ideas. So you would think, maybe, we could work together from that common ground, but, instead, Republicans are throwing all their effort behind a partisan plan to slash and burn programs that help our families and raise costs for everyday Americans and shovel billions of dollars to help people who already have billions of dollars.

Meanwhile, I would like to recommend to my colleagues that we are less than a month away from a deadline to pass bills to fund our government, and as we approach that deadline, the entire world is watching as President Trump and Elon Musk shut the government down bit by bit—whatever parts Elon doesn't like. Trump and Musk are already showing thousands of our essential workers the door despite the fact they have no clue what those workers do or why their jobs matter. They are just turning off the lights and hoping for the best.

I am hearing so much alarm on this from back home—from fired workers and from the people who depend on them. Trump and his “co-President” are shuttering entire Agencies. They are locking workers out of their devices and out of their buildings and demanding the work of the American people come to a screeching halt—again, for no good reason.

Let me really drive home just how damaging and extreme these firings are because we are not talking about some routine changing of the guard or some thoughtful or strategic plan to make government more efficient. Trump and Musk are just taking a wrecking ball to the U.S. Government. They don't care what they smash up. They don't care whom they hurt, and they don't seem to have any idea just how painful this is for American families. We are

talking about tens of thousands of people—and counting—being pushed out the door without any plan and without any justification beyond Trump and Elon just wanting to slash and cut with reckless abandon.

This has nothing to do with making government more efficient; it is about breaking it beyond repair. Fundamentally, this is not about cutting waste or curbing fraud. Instead, this is about putting the Federal workforce into trauma. That is how OMB Director Russell Vought callously put it. So they are mass firing hard-working women and men—many of them veterans—whose only mistake was serving our country, serving our communities, and believing they wouldn't get stabbed in the back by a wannabe dictator and the richest man in the world.

In setting aside the fact that many were illegally fired and without real cause, it is not just the workers who are suffering because of this. These cuts undermine essential services for the American people right down to some of the most basic functions of government.

Trump and Musk are firing people who help Americans find quality, affordable health insurance; people who help small businesses get a loan; people who help communities and families get back on their feet after a disaster; and people who help Americans get their tax refunds.

They are firing people who help our economy stay competitive—from firings that undermine energy projects and thousands of good new jobs to firings that undermine innovation and technology, to firings that are hurting our farmers and undermining agricultural research.

They are laying off national park rangers, which will mean longer wait times, dirtier bathrooms, delayed emergency responses, and closed parks. They fired Forest Service workers who are crucial to preventing wildfires.

Again, I have to emphasize they are firing FAA workers, for crying out loud, including personnel who work on radar and landing and other critical infrastructure that help our aircraft navigate safely. They are firing these people and pretending it is no big deal, all just weeks after, by the way, the deadliest crash our Nation has seen in decades. Trump and Elon might not fly commercial, but the rest of us do.

In the Pacific Northwest, the Bonneville Power Administration is losing hundreds of highly skilled workers, and that includes everyone from electricians, engineers, dispatchers, line workers, cybersecurity experts, and many more. These are literally the people who keep the lights on, and now they are being fired on a whim because Trump and Elon Musk do not have a clue about what they do and why it is important. And do you know what? They don't care. They don't even seem to understand, actually, that these positions are funded by ratepayers—by all of us who live in the Northwest. They are not from Federal funding.

Trump and Musk have even fired over 1,000 VA workers, including people who are doing lifesaving research for our veterans: research to prevent veteran suicide; to build life-changing prosthetics; and to address opioid addiction and more. These layoffs will mean longer wait times for veterans to see their healthcare providers. It could mean ongoing clinical trials coming to a sudden stop. It means delays in getting your disability claim approved because Trump and Musk went ahead and fired clinicians and claims raters even while, today, the current backlog of disability claims is over 250,000. That is not just a betrayal of these public workers; it is a betrayal of our women and men who have served us in uniform. It is also worth noting that many of the workers being fired are veterans themselves. Trump is firing veterans.

And let's not forget the thousands of NIH researchers who are having their research thrown into jeopardy and the patients who are watching President Trump carelessly toss their best hope for a cure into the shredder—or CMS experts. They are working on improving maternal health outcomes so fewer pregnant women die in this country.

Medical research layoffs aren't the only ones putting American lives at risk because Trump and Musk are firing public health workers who respond to disease outbreaks: cybersecurity experts who protect our critical infrastructure, sensitive systems, and our data; scientists who make sure our water and our air are clean and that we are ready for extreme weather; workers who help our communities prepare for, respond to, and recover from disasters, not to mention members of law enforcement who help stop violent criminals, and, of course, our nuclear engineers.

Seriously, people who manage our nuclear weapons stockpile are being fired by the hundreds with no real strategy, and we know there is no strategy because then Trump and Musk frantically turned around and rehired many of them. We also know they haven't learned their lesson because they just did the exact same thing to our workers who are responding to bird flu—reckless layoffs followed by: Wait. No. Come back.

That is not a plan. That is not a plan. To callously fire people who help us stay ahead of deadly diseases and to maintain a safe, secure, and reliable nuclear weapons stockpile—that is the height of dangerous incompetence.

Nuclear cleanup work has been hit as well. I have been fighting to get more resources for the Hanford cleanup in Washington State for years. It is already understaffed, and now Trump is actively making things worse. I have heard directly—directly—from workers at Hanford who have been laid off even after some were recognized just this past year for their outstanding work.

And, by the way, that underscores another reality of these firings: They have absolutely nothing to do with

merit. In fact, they are targeting new employees, including people who were recently promoted. So now these workers are getting fired from their newly earned jobs—literally pushing out some of our best performers and our most committed workers.

One more thing. They are even illegally firing the government watchdogs who provide accountability and prevent fraud. If Trump and Musk were really committed to tackling waste, fraud, and abuse, would they fire the very people serving in nonpartisan roles and whose very jobs are to uncover and reduce waste, fraud, and abuse? If they were really interested in transparency, would they have torn down websites where the public can find information about Agencies' spending and policy?

The list of pointless, actively dangerous firings goes on and on. It grows by the day as does the followup alarm being caused by it. My phones have been ringing off the hook, and I know I am not the only one. Again, these sweeping layoffs do not address fraud or waste. They are totally arbitrary, pushing out high performers and the promising next generation of our Federal workforce, which won't be easily replaced, not to mention the hiring freeze prevents them from even trying.

And here is the thing that is so important to remember: These are people who have families. They work hard. They love their country. They are not being sent packing because they have done anything wrong or because their work is not important. They are being pushed out simply because Trump and Musk are trying to break the government, trying to make it not work for the people who need it. It is wrong, and if this doesn't stop now, it will be catastrophic.

The scale and scope of Trump and Elon's purge will set our country back decades. It is not like you can fire anyone and say: Oh, wait—my bad—and hire them back with the snap of a finger. If you are a VA medical researcher, working for less than you could make in the private sector, and you are fired by a billionaire who decides your research on cancer and burn pit exposure isn't worth the investment, would you want to come back, especially with the chaos and sheer incompetence of this administration?

The Federal Government is not Twitter. You can't just fire everyone and break things and hope for the best. People's lives are at stake. Elon Musk has no clue what nuclear safety engineers do at Hanford. He doesn't care that the Social Security Administration is already understaffed, and pushing more of those Federal workers out the door will make life harder for our seniors.

This effort to push out and arbitrarily fire Federal workers is going to break something worse than it already has, and it is going to break it irreparably. When that happens, the blame will fall squarely on Trump and Musk and the Republicans.

And it is not just people being fired that is a serious problem. There are also still—still today—funds frozen without rhyme or reason or legal authority for Trump to do that. So I am not only worried about the fast-approaching funding deadline in March, I am worried about the de facto government shutdown that is happening right now. As we speak, Trump and Musk are still illegally blocking hundreds of billions of dollars in funding we all secured for the people we represent back home, putting good-paying jobs on the chopping block, creating incredible uncertainty for businesses, stalling funds for our infrastructure and energy projects, and a lot more.

As another week of Trump's illegally funding blockade has come and gone, still, reports are coming in from across my State and across the country of the chaos and cuts this is causing, and yet little to nothing has been done by this administration to restore investments in people in red and blue States that they are counting on.

Republicans here in Congress continue to sit by idly while our communities are robbed of hundreds of billions of dollars in bipartisan spending. Meanwhile, it is our workers, it is our families, it is our businesses that are feeling this consequence. With each day that passes, the uncertain fate of these investments takes a toll of its own: ever-growing anxiety for workers whose jobs are in jeopardy, for farmers who are eyeing the calendar and waiting on resources that they are owed, for business owners worried a ripped-up contract might put them under.

I have heard USDA grants have been cut off to rural businesses and farmers in my home State of Washington, and it is putting those hard-working Americans in dire straits.

A small laundromat ordered new machines, but now Trump is stiffing them on funds they need to make that payment.

A wheat farmer installed solar panels under a Federal program, but Trump is going to leave them holding the bag.

A greenhouse has completed its end of the bargain to install upgrades. Trump has stopped the Federal Government from doing the part it promised.

And there are so many other Federal investments on hold as well: Forest Service funding to reduce wildfire risks and restore ecosystems, EPA funding for clean water infrastructure and cleanup work on our Superfund sites, HUD and Department of Energy investments to bring down folks' energy costs and create new, good-paying jobs, funding for our roads and bridges and transit and flood mapping and fisheries—so many other things.

Medical research has also been completely upended at research institutions across our country, throwing lifesaving research, clinical trials, and patients into uncertainty.

Meanwhile, they have not only illegally blocked our foreign assistance and shuttered USAID programs that

bolster our global leadership and make the world safer for Americans, they are now illegally dismantling the Department of Education. They have already bulldozed the independent research arm of the Department of Education. They are taking a wrecking ball to ongoing evidence-based research and basic collection data we need for accountability to improve student outcomes at our K through 12 schools and colleges.

And among the many contracts Trump canceled with his Executive orders was funding for a program that helps students with disabilities transition from high school to work and work to improve adoption of evidence-based literacy practices in Washington State.

These billionaires have no idea what programs they are cutting. Given the chaos of all these efforts—from Trump's sweeping, radical, and illegal Executive orders to Elon Musk jumping from Agency to Agency and doing seemingly whatever he pleases and whatever is good for his business—it is getting hard to even keep track of all the funding that is being illegally blocked. Even stuff they say is not blocked or say has been unblocked is still frozen.

But one thing that is clear: This is hurting our families, hurting our communities, and it needs to stop.

Remember, Musk is the richest man on Earth, with deep business ties to China and a direct line to Putin. Republicans have chosen to stand by and twiddle their thumbs as he unilaterally, clandestinely, and illegally cuts our constituents off from the Federal investments they are owed and badly in need of. We have zero insight or oversight of what conflicts of interest Musk has, as he chokes off government funding left and right and as he hands over our sensitive financial data and systems to patently unqualified individuals with no accountability.

This multibillionaire is operating completely in the dark, hoping his lies are loud enough to drown out any calls for truth or transparency.

You can agree or disagree about Federal spending. Goodness knows, we have a lot of debates on it here. But it is a complete lie to try and say this is all fraud, waste, or conspiracy.

As a longtime appropriator, I can tell you, we debate these bills publicly. We post the details out in the open. We pass them in a bipartisan way. Republicans overwhelmingly supported the individual bills we put together in committee last year—many unanimously.

Spending is not a “conspiracy” just because Elon Musk doesn't know how to read USAspending.gov. A program is not waste just because it doesn't help the richest man in the world. It is not fraud just because he doesn't like it. A law is not illegal just because he disagrees with it.

This guy just does not know what he is talking about, and it is, frankly, em-

barrassing. He doesn't know how to count.

The DOGE website says it is slashing \$55 billion, but it only lists \$16.6 billion, and half of that is a typo. They took \$8 million, with an M, as in “Musk can't count” and counted it as \$8 billion, with a B, as in “BS.” That is not saving money; it is poor reading comprehension.

Speaking of reading comprehension, I don't think Elon fully grasps what the concepts of transparency and accountability mean.

When he tweeted out the names of government employees months ago—and again this month, even—that was accountability. But when reporters name people gaining illegal access to Treasury's payment system, that is a crime?

Elon Musk gets to look at all of our most sensitive data, but no one gets to look at what he is actually doing? That cannot be the standard. It is not “maximally transparent” for Elon Musk to decide for himself what he shares publicly about his actions. It is maximally concerning, especially given that there are many obvious conflicts of interest but Elon has not recused himself from a single decision.

How is it not a conflict when the owner of SpaceX is gutting NASA while taxpayer funds to his company keep flowing?

How is it not blatant corruption when the owner of Tesla is freezing grants and loans that benefit his competitors?

How are we supposed to just trust him when he is probing Agencies that have done—or are doing right now—investigations into his businesses?

Trump fired the Ag inspector general who was investigating Elon's company Neuralink and then fired the FDA officials who were reviewing it. He fired the EPA inspector general and Transportation inspector general as they were looking at Tesla. He fired the Labor inspector general, as the Department has several investigations into Musk's companies. And Trump fired the Defense inspector general who was looking at SpaceX and, notably, Musk's connection to Putin.

And it is not just Musk who is concerning. He has brought on an army of walking redflags to pry into our government's most sensitive data.

How are Americans supposed to feel knowing someone who was previously fired for leaking sensitive information from their employer is digging through their most private financial data?

How are Americans supposed to feel knowing someone who engaged with prominent White supremacists and misogynists online is helping to shut down USAID?

How are they supposed to feel knowing someone who tweeted explicitly racist statements, someone who said they were “racist before it was cool” was given control over incredibly important Treasury payments?

What sort of vetting, if any, is going on here? Are they trying to pick the

least qualified, most concerning people?

Hey, Elon, you were supposed to filter out redflags, not select for them.

The American people deserve transparency. If Elon Musk really has nothing to hide, then he should leave his safe place on X and at Trump rallies and come before us at a congressional hearing to be held accountable to the public.

What they are doing here is not just illegal; it is devastating for working people in every ZIP code in America, red and blue States alike.

Right now, we need to be speaking out with a unified voice to ensure that when Congress passes a bill, the law is followed. And we need to focus on negotiating serious funding bills on a bipartisan basis ahead of the fast-approaching March 14 deadline. That is exactly what I am trying to do right now, and a long-term CR should not be acceptable for anyone here.

As I have reminded my colleagues many times now, there is a world of difference between a short-term CR that gives us additional time for good-faith negotiations on full-year funding bills and a long-term CR that would not only create major shortfalls for critical programs but would also hand vast power over spending decisions to an administration that absolutely cannot and should not be trusted.

Passing a clean, full-year CR would, first of all, create major shortfalls and fail to adjust for new realities on the ground; it could mean that instead of babies getting fed through WIC, moms are getting put on a waitlist for the first time in that program's history, and instead of families getting rental assistance, they get cut off.

A clean, full-year CR means veterans are not able to get the care they need and the benefits they have earned in a timely way, and it means our military falling behind, from forcing cuts across DOD to pausing promotions, station changes, and other really essential functions.

It also means losing opportunities to provide resources for new challenges and to provide a check on Trump policies, including ones it is clear Members on both sides of this aisle have issues with.

And on that note, I want to emphasize—because this is really critical—unlike a short-term CR, a clean, full-year CR means hundreds of specific funding directives from Congress fall away, effectively creating slush funds for this administration to adjust spending priorities and potentially eliminate longstanding programs as they see fit. That is a nonstarter.

With a full-year CR, Congress would be turning over our power of the purse to a President who has already shown he couldn't care less about the separation of powers.

A year-long CR would be a green light for President Trump, Elon Musk, and Russell Vought to redirect funding to their own pet projects and slash and

burn and zero out the programs we have supported from Congress that our families count on. Maybe they siphon money away from public schools. Maybe they slash Federal work study grants and financial aid. Maybe they zero out money for national parks or monuments they think are too woke. What would that even mean?

Maybe they scrap all our oversight of immigration courts or end family reunification or dismantle the guardrails for detaining immigrants—something we are already seeing, by the way, with the use of Guantanamo Bay.

They could cut funding to eliminate HIV, address maternal mortality, or increase vaccination rates. They could turn our constituents' priorities into slush funds. Clean energy investments could become a payday for fossil fuels. Money meant to stop fentanyl and opioids could fuel private prison operations and mass deportations.

Congress must detail its spending priorities and direct President Trump to implement these programs faithfully by passing appropriations bills, just as it does every year. There is truly no telling just how far they would go in bending our Federal budget from what our constituents need to whatever Trump and Musk want.

If you don't think things could get worse, you are wrong. A clean, year-long CR is, frankly, an unacceptable outcome. We cannot tell our constituents that instead of using our authority to check a President, we give him the keys to the kingdom. We cannot say: Instead of fighting to get you the resources you need, we will let a billionaire have more say in where your tax dollar goes instead.

So we need Republicans to get serious about these bipartisan funding bills. And we have got to know that once those bills become law, Trump will actually follow them. We cannot just reach an agreement, pass a bill, and then stand by while President Trump rips our laws in half.

There is a serious bipartisan path forward for our country, but it is one where Congress works together to avoid a shutdown, stops the de facto shutdown that is already happening, and reasserts its authority to protect the funding our communities need. But, unfortunately, that is a far cry from the path Republicans are going down with this pro-billionaire, anti-middle class budget resolution that is on the floor.

Let's be very clear: Republicans' budget resolution doesn't just accept; it actually doubles down on what Trump and Musk are doing.

And it is not about balancing the budget—we all know that—because they don't plan to reverse one of the biggest drivers of the debt: Republican tax cuts. Despite all of the bogeymen Republicans like to point to as driving the national debt, the reality is that the single biggest driver of our national debt since 2001 has been Republican tax cuts. The Trump and Bush

tax cuts have cost our Nation over \$10 trillion and counting.

And you will never guess what our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are focused on right now. Nothing to lower the cost of eggs. It is actually more Republican tax cuts.

And, no, they will not be paid for, and, yes, they will blow up the national debt. While Elon Musk hacks and chops his way through the government in the name of meager "savings" and Republicans are cheering him on, they are all hoping that we will ignore the elephant they brought into the room, even as this budget is a roadmap for painful cuts to programs families count on each and every day—all so they can give billionaires more tax cuts.

Republicans are going down this partisan path because they know Democrats are not going to join them in throwing Medicaid, nutrition assistance, and veterans benefits into the woodchuck so they can throw more tax cuts at billionaires and the biggest corporations.

Make no mistake, this budget resolution is the DOGE resolution, as it assumes a staggering amount of \$1 trillion in unspecified cuts in 2025 alone and \$9 trillion over 10 years. Where do we think those kinds of dramatic cuts are going to come from? It is going to come out of SNAP benefits that keep our kids from going hungry. It is going to come out of our public schools and community health centers. It is going to come out of lifesaving medical research.

It will mean costs going up—up—for everyday Americans. It means childcare costs going up when families lose access to Head Start and other quality, affordable options. It means heating and cooling costs going up when families get cut off from LIHEAP. It means rent going up as assistance programs get slashed. It means your healthcare costs go up as community health centers and family planning providers are forced to close their doors. It means grocery costs going up as programs like SNAP and WIC are gutted, not to mention what happens when you cut support for farmers and for ag research.

And make no mistake, if you are cutting that deeply, that painfully, you are going to start cutting things like veterans' disability and education benefits. You are going to start cutting Medicare and Medicaid, which, for the information of all Senators, 30 million children rely on.

There is just no other way to make those numbers work, especially when we know that this is just step one in their plan. And step two is tax breaks for billionaires and massive corporations.

So, first, they are handing Elon Musk a chain saw to cut programs that families rely on, with no accountability. Then they are rewarding him with enormous tax breaks, and that is completely unacceptable. We should not be taking kids out of childcare to give bil-

lionaires a tax break. We should not be taking food off the family table to put more fuel in private jets.

I grew up in a family that knew what it was like to fall on hard times. My dad, who was a veteran, got too sick to work. He had multiple sclerosis. My mom kept us afloat with my dad's VA benefits and food stamps and a new job that she got thanks to a Federal workforce program.

It wasn't easy. Mom always said they crawled—crawled—to Social Security and Medicare, but she worked hard, and our government was there for them when those hard times came. I know there are families struggling right now just like my family struggled then. I hear from them every day in the letters we get here in Washington, DC, and in the conversations I have back home in Washington State.

They work hard. They play by the rules. They deserve, at the very least, the same opportunity my parents had when I was growing up. And I am not going to stand by silently while Republicans try to sell that opportunity away to pay for even more tax breaks for billionaires.

I get why that sounds like a good idea to billionaires like Donald Trump. I get why it is a sweet deal for Elon Musk, the richest man in the world. It is great for them because they are not the ones footing the bill. The bill for these tax breaks—the cost of these cuts—is going to be paid by folks like my mom and dad.

Everyday Americans will pay for billionaire tax breaks with their healthcare. They will pay for billionaire tax breaks with abandoned medical research. They will pay for billionaire tax breaks with shuttered family farms and small businesses.

And Republicans can try and spin a fairytale about how this will pay for itself, how this will work out for everyone, and how nothing anyone cares about will be affected. But the reality is going to show through pretty darn quick and pretty darn painfully because spin is not going to put food on the table. It will not pay the rent. It won't fix the roads. It won't lower prices. It won't lower interest rates, and it won't put money in families' dwindling bank accounts.

When it comes to the job we are all sent here to do, helping people and solving problems, families need real solutions, not tax breaks for billionaires and talking points for everyone who loses out.

Mr. President, I urge all of my colleagues: Hit the brakes—and not just on this devastating partisan budget resolution. Hit the brakes on what President Trump and Elon Musk are doing right now. Let's, instead, come together and work on serious bipartisan bills to fund the government. Let's get investments that are sorely needed out to the folks we represent. Let's pass legislation that gives folks a hand instead of this Republican plan that gives billionaires a handout.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUDD). The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, things are not as they appear to be, and in Washington, that is not unusual. In fact, that may be the norm—that in Washington, things are often not what they appear to be.

If you follow the news, you have been seeing reports of Elon Musk and DOGE and getting rid of waste and fraud and abuse by the billions, if not trillions, of dollars. And yet, we are meeting here today, though, because Congress, namely the Senate, wants to increase Federal spending.

So on the one hand, you have Elon Musk and DOGE, and the Democrats complaining to high heavens, “They are cutting too much; they are cutting too much,” and Senate Republicans are coming forward today to pass a budget to allow them to raise Federal spending. What gives?

Are Republicans for getting rid of waste, fraud, and abuse and reducing the deficit, balancing the budget, as the President says? Or are they really for increasing spending \$340 billion?

The budget that we will vote on will allow increased spending in the military by \$150 billion; increased spending for the border, \$175 billion; \$20 billion for the Coast Guard. That adds up to about \$340 billion.

Well, if we were fiscally prudent, if we were fiscally conservative, why wouldn't we take the savings from Elon Musk and DOGE and move it over here and help with the border? Why would we be doing a brandnew bill to increase spending by \$340 billion?

That is because the Senate is acting as it always has. The Senate hasn't gotten the message. President Trump came to town—a new way of thinking. They are shuttering the Agencies. They are shutting people down. They are buying things like \$2 million spent in Guatemala for sex changes, \$2 million spent in Brazil for girl-centric climate change, \$4.8 million spent in Ukraine for social media influencers.

While you are at it, we spent—not we, but the people who voted for this. I voted against all of this. But the Members of the Senate who voted for this spent several hundred thousand dollars sending designers in Ukraine to the fashion show in Paris.

It goes on and on: thousands of dollars for a trans opera in Colombia, more thousands of dollars for a trans comic book in Peru, hundreds of thousands of dollars spent studying rats to see if lonely rats use more cocaine than well-socialized rats. Guess what. Lonely rats love the cocaine. They spent hundreds of thousands of dollars of your money on this craziness.

Why not take that crazy spending that DOGE and Elon Musk are finding and move it over to secure the border? Instead, fiscal conservatives are faced with a bill they are putting forward to just simply increase the spending.

I am all for moving it around. I am all for saving it from the craziness and

pushing it over into something more valuable. There is a procedure for doing this. It is a special procedure. It doesn't require any Democrat vote. It can happen through simple majority, and it has a fancy name. It is called rescission. So all the administration would have to do is bundle together several million dollars of savings—which it appears they are finding—bundle it together in one bill, send it back to us, and by simple majority, without any help from the Democrats, Republicans can cut spending.

Instead, things aren't what they appear to be. You see all this great work being done to cut spending, to cut waste, fraud, and abuse, and then you see the Senate acting—we are going to vote all night long to set up a bill to increase spending by \$340 billion.

There is a true philosophical debate within the Republican Party—and really within both parties—about what the biggest threats to our country are. Are the greatest threats to America from within or from without?

I would argue that they are from within. I don't lie awake at night fearing foreign invasion, that invaders are coming to our shores any moment. It doesn't mean we shouldn't be prepared, that we shouldn't defend ourselves. But it does mean that we don't have to have unlimited spending on our military.

Look, many of my family served. Soldiers have to be paid. We should take care of them. But, at the same time, we shouldn't be everywhere around the world, all the time.

We spent close to \$300 billion in Ukraine. We have got soldiers all over Africa. We have got soldiers in Syria. We have got soldiers everywhere.

We don't need to be doing that.

If you want to put our military's money and spending in perspective, we spend more than the next nine countries combined. It is not that we are spending too little. We are spending a lot. But if you decide that you want more money for the military, take it from the climate change—the girl-centric climate change in Brazil. Quit spending your money overseas.

Over the years, we have given Egypt nearly \$60 billion. Who runs Egypt? A general, where there are no elections, kind of like Ukraine, where there is a president, but he doesn't have to run for reelection because he has canceled the elections.

Why in the world would we be giving money hand over fist to dictators and people who don't stand for election? In Egypt, we gave it to one family, the Mubarak family. When he was finally ousted from power, he had \$20 billion on him.

Well, it actually wasn't on him. A lot of it was in Swiss banks and all over the place, but he was worth 20 billion. That is nothing. Each of his kids was worth another 5 billion. So he basically was able to steal 30 billion of the 60 billion that American taxpayers sent to Egypt.

That is foreign aid. That is the story of your foreign aid. It is that you have been being ripped off decade after decade.

But while Elon Musk and DOGE are doing their job working overtime until late at night, finding us those savings for foreign aid, send them back. We spent 40 billion in foreign aid. You could send 30 billion back and America would be safer and stronger, and you could put the 30 billion toward either the military or to the border—your choice.

There is money like that that can be saved and moved around, but it is going to have to come back. Ultimately, all the talk of the savings is ephemeral. It isn't real until Congress has the courage to vote on it. It has to be certified by a vote.

If Congress doesn't vote, it sort of wishes and washes around in the ether and may or may not wind up being savings. Ultimately, Congress is going to have to do their job.

But what we are doing today to vote on the budget is not doing our job. What we are doing today, which will be a Republican-led effort—minus me—will be an effort to tee up a bill to increase Federal spending.

I would say, let's take the savings that we are finding, move that over to any accounts, do it through a vote of Congress, do it through a simple majority. It can actually be done even without the budgetary process.

A rescission package can be sent back without even going through the whole budget problem. What we are faced with, though, is come the end of the year—we are halfway through the year, so we are voting on a budget today that is really somewhat of a fiction because the year is already half over. We know what is being spent. We know that in the end, we are going to spend a little over \$7 trillion this year. The problem is, we are going to bring in about \$5 trillion, and we are going to spend about \$7 trillion. We are \$2 trillion short.

They are getting ready within weeks to add a couple hundred billion dollars for California. It is appropriate to have sympathy for people in their plight, but it is not good for the country simply to borrow money to send it to anyone. If we are going to help people in need, we should be taking that money from the taxes that come in. We shouldn't be borrowing it from China and sending it to California. No matter how noble the purpose is, we should be spending what comes in. We should not be borrowing a penny.

But come the end of the year, we are going to be over \$2 trillion in increased debt for 1 year. What is our total? Our total is going to be over \$37 trillion, maybe \$38 trillion by the end of the year. Interest? The largest item in our budget is now interest—about \$1 trillion in interest every year. One estimate is that over the next 10 years, it will be like \$14 trillion in interest.

Now, interest doesn't buy anything. Interest isn't feeding anybody. Interest

isn't putting out fires in California. Interest is simply wasted because of the profligate ways of both parties.

People voted for a change. They said: We are going to get a change. They like what Donald Trump is doing. They like what DOGE is doing. They like what Elon is doing. Yet here we are. The Republicans are acting like the Democrats. They are going to vote to increase spending by \$342 billion. It is all going to be borrowed.

Now, some will say: We are going to cut spending to equalize the money we are going to spend here. But none of that is listed in the budget.

Now, the House has a budget. The House Republicans have passed a different budget, and in their budget, they list \$1.5 trillion worth of savings. They have to get to this. They cannot do their special simple majority vote, the reconciliation vote, unless they find \$1.5 trillion.

In the Senate bill, there is \$4 billion. Now, they will say, "That is just a floor; we are going to find more than that," but all they would promise was the 4. In the House, they realized that is not really believable, that is not really comforting, so the House said: No, we are doing \$1.5 trillion.

So as this debate unfolds over the next 10, 12, 15 hours—we will be here for a long time. You know, get your popcorn. Turn your C-SPAN on. But as this unfolds, I will offer an amendment, and my amendment will say, let's alter the budget to not only say we are going to increase spending by \$340 billion, my amendment will say we should cut spending to pay for it by \$1.5 trillion.

Ideally, we would do this simply by bringing a rescission package of the savings that Elon and DOGE are finding, but it would work this way as well to at least show that we are serious about this. I have seen this happen again and again, and I know how the story is going to turn out. I know that come September, which is the end of our fiscal year, we are about halfway through it. As we get to the end of the fiscal year, Republicans are going to be going: Uh-oh, I have to go home and explain to people that the deficit is \$2.2 trillion—one of the worst years ever. I have to explain to people "Republicans are in charge; we are taking care of it now" when it looks like the problem is getting worse.

We have to immediately start cutting spending. Every Republican needs to be voting to cut spending. There is a way to do it. It is called a rescission package.

If you continue to borrow, though, if you think "I am going to be nice to everyone and give everyone money," you can do it, but the borrowing is going to crowd out everything, because we have made many, many promises. We have promised people Medicare. We promised people Social Security. We promised people food stamps. Well, guess what, that equals all of our tax revenue. Those four promises—Medicare, Medicaid,

food stamps, Social Security—that equals all of our tax revenue. We don't even vote on those programs.

The programs that we vote on—that is the budget, that is military and non-military—are a third of the spending. It is all borrowed now. Essentially, our debt equals our budget. Everything we vote to spend in the budget is borrowed. So things are out of whack. You can't help everyone and be everything to everybody.

A way to look at this is, let's say you make \$25,000 a year, and all of your money goes to your rent and your food and taking care of your family. You have nothing left over. You are working poor. You walk by somebody on the side of the street, and they are homeless, and you feel sorry for them. Would you immediately go to a bank and borrow \$1,000 and give it to a homeless person? No, you wouldn't, because that would make no sense whatsoever.

That is what we are doing. We look around the world, and we see homeless people. We look around the world, and we see hungry people. So we just simply go to China, the bank, and we borrow money from China and then we send it to Africa. Well, you know what, if you send your own money, it is charity. If you send your own money, it is noble. If you send somebody else's money or you borrow the money and you make the country go further in debt and you put us more in peril, that is not charity. That is what is destroying our country. That is what is eating us up from the inside out. The greatest threat to America is from within, not from without.

What happens when the currency unravels? What happens when the value of the dollar doesn't lose 5 percent in a year but loses 5 percent in a week? That is what happens in the end stages of a currency being destroyed. People say it will never happen to America. Can't happen in America. We are the strongest dollar. We are the reserve currency of the world. Can't happen here.

It can and has happened to great nations. It has happened to great civilizations that have lost their currency, that have destroyed their currency. Does it always unravel gradually enough that you can fix it? No. Sometimes it unravels in the space of weeks.

When the German money lost its value in the early 1920s after the first war, in September, it took like 100 marks to buy a loaf of bread. Two weeks later, mid-September, it was 1,000 marks. At the end of September, it was 1 million. In the middle of October, it was 10 million.

The currency, if you look at the currency and what it would buy in a 2-month period, was completely destroyed in a 2-month period. The pictures from the history books will show people putting the German mark into wheelbarrows and wheeling it up to fires to burn for warmth. It was worth more as fuel than it was to buy things.

The workers were demanding that they be paid more than once a day because you had to go out and get your pay at noon and spend it then because it was worth half as much by the end of the day. That is what it looks like when a country destroys its currency.

How do you destroy your currency? How does inflation occur? If you watch television, you see that these people are either dishonest or would fail basic economics. They are like: Well, inflation is transitory, and, you know, we are not sure where it is from, but maybe it could be—oh, greedy people owning grocery stores causes inflation.

No. Inflation is an economic fact that comes from borrowing money, and the Federal Reserve prints up money to buy the borrowed money.

Treasury—when we get behind on our payments, we spend more than comes in, so we have to borrow money. The Fed buys our Treasury bills. Well, the Fed doesn't have any money; the Fed creates that money. That is what inflation is. And so much of it gets passed on to government.

Everybody knows that in the last 3 or 4 years—and part of the election was over the inflation of the Biden administration. Prices were up about 20 percent over 3 or 4 years. But in order to keep up with that, we built in inflation protection to most of our government programs. So Social Security has cost-of-living increases. So they keep up with inflation or try to keep up with inflation, but as they do, the programs just get larger and larger and larger, and we get more and more behind the eight ball. That is what is happening.

But it is coming to a head. Social Security runs out of money in 2033. When it runs out of money, everybody gets 20 to 25 percent less in Social Security. What do you think is going to happen in our country when the poorest among us who live only on Social Security—when they lose the value of their check, they lose 25 percent of their check? What do you think is going to happen in this country? And nobody is preparing them for it. Nobody is doing anything to reform Social Security, reform Medicare, reform Medicaid.

You know, people are just petrified of everything. What is so horrible and so hard to say about people who are able-bodied ought to work? I think everyone should work. I think everyone who is able-bodied should work not as punishment but as reward. We should have a work requirement on every check that goes out. Everybody should work. I mean, it is how you get your self-esteem. You can't give people self-esteem. You can't say: Here, Johnny, here is a trophy. We know you can't spell or add, but here is a trophy for being a mathlete.

No, you have to earn your self-esteem. You earn it through work.

Just adding work to Medicaid and saying: You want free health insurance from the government—adding a work requirement saves \$100 billion. Having the States pay more for Medicaid. Why

do I want the States to pay for more Medicaid? Because they don't have a printing press. Why are the decisions of this body so awful? Because there is a printing press.

I had a conversation with one of my Democratic colleagues, and I said: We have to make a choice. You have to decide whether you want to help the poor in our country or help the poor in Ukraine or help whoever you are paying in Ukraine.

He said: We shouldn't have to make a choice.

It is like, you do have to make a choice. The fact that you think you don't have to make a choice is why we are \$36 trillion in the hole. You have to make choices. Which comes first—Ukraine or America? You can't do both because we don't have enough money. We only have enough taxes coming in to pay for Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and food stamps. Everything else is borrowed.

So maybe able-bodied people need to go back to work. Maybe there needs to be a work requirement. Maybe, for goodness' sake, food stamps shouldn't buy sugared drinks, chips, Ding Dongs, and Twinkies. Could we not reform our system such that we try to cure the obesity plague in our country by cutting back what the government buys as far as food?

But today, the opposite will happen. Things aren't what they appear to be. Things are never, in Congress, really what they seem to be. We will pass a bill ostensibly by the conservative majority, but the purpose of this bill is to spend \$340 billion in new spending.

Instead, what we should be doing is taking the savings from the waste, fraud, and abuse that DOGE and Elon are finding—we should take those savings and use it to spend for things that people think are of higher priority, such as the border and/or the military.

But I will oppose this budget because I am not for spending more money. I will oppose this budget because I want to have nothing to do with a \$2.2 trillion deficit. At the end of the year, those who vote for this budget and those who vote for the new spending will have to explain to people at home: How about that \$2.2 trillion deficit? How did that happen under a Republican watch?

Until someone is brave enough to say no, it is going to go on and on, and there is a danger that if we don't stop it, we are going to destroy the country.

So I will offer an amendment later on to cut spending, to actually put teeth into this budget resolution, to cut real spending, to balance our budget, and to do and complete the promises that the President had in the campaign.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to enter into a colloquy with my colleague from North Carolina Senator TILLIS.

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

UKRAINE

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I am pleased to come to the floor today with my friend and colleague Senator TILLIS. He and I have cochaired the Senate NATO Observer Group. We have traveled together on a number of occasions, and we just came back on Tuesday from a very brief trip to Ukraine. We were joined by Senator BENNET, who is not able to join us right now. But I think it is important for us to come to the floor and to talk about what we saw and what we heard in Ukraine.

It was incredibly powerful to travel to Ukraine, to see firsthand the situation on the ground there, and we visited a number of places during the day. We met with residents in downtown Kyiv who had lost their homes in the January 1 missile attack there, an attack that landed only about 2 blocks from the Presidential Palace.

While we were there actually meeting with the folks who had lost their homes, the air raid sirens went off, which is a pretty usual occurrence apparently in Kyiv. Fortunately, it was not aimed at us in downtown Kyiv but another outlying community. But it was a warning of more incoming Russian missiles.

And I have seen the reports in the last couple of days that say that Vladimir Putin wants peace, but I have to say I am skeptical because if he really wants peace, nothing is stopping him from calling off those missile and drone attacks, attacks that are not targeting just Ukraine's military but that are targeting civilians throughout the country. They are damaging power stations that Ukrainians depend on for electricity for daily life.

And, in fact, we visited one of those power stations. This is us. You can see it was a very cold day. You can't see the power station in the background, but it was a unique design that had been done by the Ukrainians in a very short period of time with help from the United States to protect that site from Russian attacks. And, in fact, they had just had, in late December, a missile that hit the side of the transfer station in ways that, if they had not had the reinforcements, it would have taken down that station.

But what is interesting is that not only have they figured out the design on the station, but they had what they call a mobile firing team; that is, two machineguns—you can see, just barely see, one of them on the truck—and a radar, which is down here sort of out of sight, again, done with U.S. dollars.

They were able to protect that transfer station and have those mobile firing teams at a number of sites around the country to protect their electricity grid because what we know and what we heard is that the Russians are trying to shut down their power grid because they want to freeze out the Ukrainians in this war.

We also visited a children's hospital that was bombed in July. We visited

with two teenagers, one young woman who was 16 who not only lost her mother in a Russian attack, but she lost her ability to walk.

I think she had had, Senator TILLIS, about 16 operations at the point that we saw her, and they were pleased that they thought she was going to actually be able to walk again, thanks to the great care she got at the Ohmatdyt Children's Hospital that the Russians bombed—deliberately targeted in July.

But like so many Ukrainians, the young woman we met with hasn't given up. Her father sat by her side, surgery after surgery. And despite the odds, she is learning to walk again. She reflects, I think, the resilience, the perseverance that we witnessed every place we went in every meeting that we had.

Despite Russia's advantages in size and manpower, Ukrainians have not and will not give up, and we should not give up on them either.

Ukrainians have developed robotic mobile firing teams, as I said. They have been able to make incredible innovations to fix damaged battlefield equipment. We had a chance on our way into Ukraine to go through Poland, where they are moving equipment into Ukraine and where we saw the center where they have a group chat with people on the frontlines to help them with instructions on how to fix the equipment in realtime as it gets damaged.

This not only saves time and money for the Ukrainians but for us. It is an incredible learning opportunity for us as we think about what we need to do to support our own military. So the Ukrainians are sharing their battlefield innovations and insights. It makes the United States stronger, and it shows how much of the assistance we have given to Ukraine is actually going to benefit us here in America.

When the assistance was frozen in January, it had a major impact on the ground. We spoke to NGOs in Poland, people who are supporting Ukrainian refugees in that country. And as one of them was preparing to give us a presentation, he stopped. He turned to us, and he said: I can't give this presentation and act like everything is normal.

I thought he was one of the most impactful people we heard from. I don't know if you felt that way, too, Senator TILLIS.

But he said that on January 24, the U.S. Embassy told me to stop all work. He said: I had to fire single Ukrainian mothers who escaped the war and now have no jobs and no way to feed their children. He had to stop psychosocial support services for those who are traumatized by the war. One girl they had been treating for self-harm is gone, and he doesn't know if she is alive or not. He was worried she might take her own life.

Along with the stop-work orders, the NGOs were told to remove all American flags. Think of that. American flags are coming down in Poland, one of the most pro-American countries that we can have.

The people that we spoke to said that their trust has been broken. The decades of investments in these alliances that we have made were gone with just one phone call.

Now, I understand that people are tired of this war. But if we think giving Russia or China free rein won't affect us here in the United States, we are wrong. The Russians are thrilled. Vladimir Putin has to be loving this. He has always wanted to undermine NATO.

"Peace for our time" is what Chamberlain said when he signed the pact with Hitler. Appeasement doesn't work with dictators. When Vladimir Putin gets what he wants, it puts Americans in danger. We understand this. Putin can't be trusted. That is a realistic assessment of the battlefield.

One Ukrainian woman who lost her husband and son in the fighting told us she would support cease-fire negotiations but with security guarantees for Ukraine. Simply freezing the frontline won't do anything, she warned, because in a few years Russia will invade again. And she is right. Putin invaded Crimea in 2014. He invaded Ukraine again in 2022.

There must be a guarantee that Russia won't attack again in a couple of years. I believe NATO membership for Ukraine needs to be on the table. This is not only going to protect Ukraine from future attacks, it will put Ukraine in the best possible negotiating position.

Putin wants Ukrainians to be afraid. We saw that when we visited Bucha. Some people may remember this was a suburb of Kyiv. It was under siege for 33 days, held by the Russians. We talked to the mayor, to the priest of the church, we saw the mass graves where people were buried, the 500-plus people, civilians, who were killed in Bucha. They were killed just going about their daily lives.

This is the picture of the body of one of those civilians killed. You know how they identified her? It was her manicure. She identified her by the manicure.

We met with the investigators who showed us the picture of the Russian commander who gave the order to kill the civilians. He did it because he wanted to frighten the population. Vladimir Putin is responsible for this. He is responsible for the bodies in Bucha and for thousands across Ukraine, and he has to be held accountable. We cannot let him get away with this.

I want to end by underlying an important point. There is bipartisan support for Ukraine in Congress. I believe we will continue to support funding and that if we had another supplemental bill that came to the floor, it would pass with Republican votes because Americans like Senator TILLIS and I and Senator BENNET, who went with us, we have been impressed by the Ukrainians' courage, by their resilience, by their willingness to defend

their freedoms and our freedoms. They have kept their economy and their people going throughout this horrible war.

But by June, Ukraine is going to start running out of what they need. That is why we need to use the nearly \$300 billion of Russian-seized assets to help Ukraine rebuild. That is why I called on Secretary Rubio to prioritize the waivers for unfreezing aid to Ukraine.

Thousands of Ukrainians have given their lives in the fight for a sovereign Ukraine. They have been on the front lines for all of us defending democracy. To abandon them now would not only be a gift to Putin, it would endanger our allies and the security of the United States.

I yield the floor to my colleague Senator TILLIS.

Mr. TILLIS. I want to thank Senator SHAHEEN for, actually, a long-term friendship and vision that she had back in 2018 when she came to me and wanted to reconstitute the Senate NATO Observer Group. It could not have been a better time for us to pay more attention to this very important alliance.

But it is also, right now, today—4 days away from the 3-year anniversary of the invasion of Ukraine—very important to talk about the nature of Vladimir Putin and the tactics that they use to terrorize populations.

President Putin, in October, prior to the invasion in February, said that he was sending troops to an area to do a training exercise. While we were getting intelligence that it looked like more than that, he was already lying to the world by saying: We are just going to train up our soldiers a little bit more.

Then after the first part of the year going into January, he said: Well, we are doing the training exercise that just, coincidentally, happens to be along the Ukrainian border, but it is just a training exercise.

And then he creates any number of pretext to then talk about how provocative Ukraine is operating a democracy within their borders. And he creates the pretext for a "special military operation," invading Ukraine, trying to finish what he started when he invaded Crimea back in 2014.

Vladimir Putin is a liar, a murderer, and responsible for the deaths of hundreds of thousands of Ukrainians. And that is bad by itself. But you know what is worse is when you employ tactics that intentionally terrorize a population.

Senator SHAHEEN talked about the power grid. I was in that meeting she was talking about. Let's talk about systematically how his mind works, the mind of Vladimir Putin, the leadership of Russia. It is very cold in Ukraine—very, very cold in the winter-time. And they have tried to systematically deny them heat over the winter to freeze them out. They have had to spend millions of dollars hardening substations just to prevent families, hospitals, critical businesses, first re-

sponders from having power. That is how this man thinks.

But that is not bad enough. Shortly after they invaded Ukraine and they got the surprise of their life that the Ukrainian people were willing to fight and die for their country—and they have done it in a way that Putin could not possibly have imagined. Putin should be embarrassed. A so-called world power got repulsed by what now is the largest army in Europe—standing army. It wasn't when the invasion occurred.

Just with our help through materials, they have held off Russia for 3 years. Putin probably understood at some point that he wasn't going to be able to win it through conventional tactics. So what does he go to? Terrorist tactics—the same sort of tactics he uses in Africa with mercenaries, terrorizing populations, indiscriminately killing people. That is what Vladimir Putin does every single day, 24/7, 365 around the globe.

Now let's get back to Ukraine. He decides to allow, under orders, Russia military to go into a community of about 200,000 people. That is roughly the size of the community I live in North Carolina, just north of Charlotte. Imagine what they are doing. They are going through the city and indiscriminately, when somebody walks past them, shooting them, sometimes with 50-caliber weapons and tank armor, murdering them, stacking them up in mass graves.

I went to this site. I saw it firsthand. This is how he is trying to win the war because he can't win the hearts and minds of the Ukrainian people. He destroyed the hopes and dreams of anybody who has lived in the Soviet era. He wants that to reemerge. He is willing to do anything, including terrorizing innocent civilians to break their will.

But, thank God, the Ukrainian people are the brave people that they are because this hardened them. This made them go onto a battlefield and live in trenches 24 hours a day repulsing the Russian invasion.

There is no moral person on this planet who can consider Putin to have a legitimate reason to affect this sort of carnage. And I saw it firsthand. I will never be able to forget it. And what the American people and the world population will never be able to forget either is the aftermath of appeasing Vladimir Putin.

Ladies and gentlemen, China is already helping Russia. North Korea has sent thousands of troops. And North Korea doesn't really care about life. They have allowed 4,000 to 5,000 of their soldiers to die on the battlefield within 6 weeks of getting on the ground. They are throwing body after body trying to kill and break the will of the Ukrainian people. It is just unacceptable.

Look, I am a Republican. I support President Trump, and I believe that most of his policies on national security are right. I believe his instincts

are pretty good. But what I am telling you, whoever believes that there is any space for Vladimir Putin and the future of a stable globe better go to Ukraine; they better go to Europe; they better invest the time to understand that this man is a cancer and the greatest threat to democracy in my lifetime. And it will be a cancer that spreads into the South China Sea, into Taiwan, and metastasize across the globe.

Ladies and gentlemen, when I tell you that Vladimir Putin is a liar, a murderer, and a man responsible for ordering the systematic torture, kidnapping, and rape of innocent civilians, believe me because the evidence is a mile high.

So for those of us who have invested the time to understand this, believe me when I tell you this is important to every single one of you. If you believe that Ukraine is a country an ocean away and not relevant to our national security, think again. The world is small. The world is watching. The strength of our alliances are on the line and the future of democracy in the world is on the line if we do anything less than defeat Vladimir Putin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUSTED). The Senator from Idaho.

BUDGET RECONCILIATION

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, today we are debating the narrow Senate fiscal year 2025 budget resolution that fulfills promises to secure America's borders, our national defense, and unleash our energy potential and finally start to get our fiscal house in order.

In the near future, I expect us to move forward with a budget resolution that allows us to prevent more than a \$4 trillion tax hike on American households, the largest tax hike in the history of America. That will be felt by virtually every American if tax cuts expire at the end of this year.

Because the other side has filed a litany of tax amendments that rehash various false narratives and each side will only have 1 minute to debate, I am going to spend a little time right now explaining why we can't afford a \$4 trillion-plus tax increase, the positive impact that the Trump tax cuts had on the economy, and some of the key provisions that expire at the end of the year.

At the end of this year, many key provisions of President Trump's 2017 Tax Cuts and Jobs Act are set to expire, triggering an over \$4 trillion tax hike on American families and businesses. While taxes will increase on Americans of all income levels, the majority of this tax hike, about \$2.6 trillion of it, will fall on those making less than \$400,000 per year. An average family of four making about \$80,000 a year will see a \$1,700 tax hike in 2016. Another \$600 billion-plus will hit millions of small business owners who could see Federal tax rates skyrocket up to 43.4 percent. Tens of millions of families will see their Child Tax Credit cut in half from \$2,000 to \$1,000. The list goes on.

But, first, I will talk about what the Trump tax cuts actually did and why failing to extend key provisions would be economically devastating for millions of hard-working taxpayers.

So what did the Trump tax cuts do? There has been a lot of talk recently about how extending these tax cuts are for billionaires and corporations, but the facts actually show otherwise. The 2017 tax bill increased the take-home pay and powered a growing economy. Individuals across all income brackets received a tax cut, not just—as opponents suggest—for the uberwealthy.

In fact, the Trump tax cuts made the Tax Code more progressive, meaning the highest income earners now pay a greater share of all income taxes than they did before 2017. The majority of benefits accrued to the working middle-class families of America. Between the bill's passage in 2017 and 2021, the bottom 50 percent of earners received the largest reduction in average tax rates at 17.3 percent.

In addition to lowering tax rates across the board, the Trump tax cuts doubled the standard deduction and the Child Tax Credit and provided tax relief to America's entrepreneurs and small businesses.

The effect of pro-growth tax reform was immediate. Not only did taxpayers get to keep more of their hard-earned money, but a growing economy helped a median household income reach all-time highs. The labor market improved; workers saw wage growth; and the unemployment rate fell dramatically to 3.5 percent—the lowest in 50 years; and the lowest income workers experienced the largest wage growth. Corporate inversions became a thing of the past, and America became the place to do business. All Americans reaped the benefits of a booming economy.

Extending this current, proven tax policy and building on it is the best way to restore economic prosperity and opportunity for working families, many of whom are still struggling to recover from the historic inflation of the last 4 years. As American families contend with increasing costs of everyday living, the last thing they need is another massive tax hike on top of that inflation. Failure is simply not an option.

What happens if the Trump tax cuts expire? As I have said, if we do not extend these tax policies, Americans will be hit with an over \$4 trillion tax increase. More than \$2.6 trillion of that tax increase will fall on households earning less than \$400,000 per year. An average family of four making \$80,000 will be saddled with a \$1,700 tax increase. This is the equivalent of 6 to 8 weeks' worth of groceries for a family of four. Tens of millions of families will see their child tax credit cut in half to \$1,000, and 90 percent of taxpayers would see their standard deduction cut in half.

Owners of over 20 million small businesses will face a massive tax hike,

with taxes up to 43.4 percent, and 7 million taxpayers will be impacted by the alternative minimum tax, up from just 200,000 taxpayers currently. Many more small businesses and farms will have their death tax exemption cut in half. The National Association of Manufacturers recently highlighted that, if we allow the tax cuts to expire, 6 million jobs will be at risk; \$540 billion in employee compensation will be lost; and the U.S. gross domestic product will be reduced by \$1.1 trillion.

The bottom line: While we aren't considering tax policy as a part of this reconciliation package, it is important to set the record straight as to what is at stake in the upcoming tax debate. The stakes couldn't be higher. You are going to hear tonight dozens and dozens of tax amendments being brought. We are going to respond to each of those by explaining that that debate is not this amendment.

This budget that we are debating today is on the border, on our national defense, and on increasing our oil and gas production to strengthen our economy. That is why the Senate and House Republicans are working together to act as quickly as possible to make these tax cuts permanent—but that will be in the next step—to prevent a massive tax hike and to provide certainty and relief to families and businesses across this Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the news is coming so hard and fast these days that it is hard to sort it all out. Every day seems to be something new that captures our attention, our concern, our interest.

What I would like to do today is to try to put some of it in perspective as to what is going on in our governing of this country. I don't believe what I am going to be talking about today is partisan. It should not be partisan because what I am really talking about is competent government and constitutional government—really, two categories: competent government and constitutional government. That should not be a controversial issue. Neither of those is something we should be arguing about. It is what we have a responsibility to carry through in terms of our jobs here in the U.S. Senate. So, of the two categories I want to talk about, my headings are “thoughtless” and “dangerous.”

First, I want to talk about “thoughtless.”

The hiring freeze. A hiring freeze can be an effective tool if it is used thoughtfully and systematically, but to do it across the board, without a process for exceptions that is built into it, you end up with all kinds of unintended and negative consequences with firefighters, parks, losses elsewhere by attrition. There should be a systematic exemption process. Now it is haphazard and random.

Park seasonal employees first were under the hiring freeze; now they are

not. It is sort of like: Oh. Oh, never mind. We are going to be OK with park seasonal employees.

VA frontline health workers were first subject to the hiring freeze. Then people said: Oh. Well, we didn't mean doctors and nurses, so that is OK. You can hire them.

My point is, it is not a rational process. It is ready, fire, aim. Literally, ready, fire, aim is what we are talking about, and people aren't doing this in a thoughtful and systematic way.

By the way, the difference between frontline deliverers of care at the VA and the people who answer the phones who are categorized as bureaucrats—I don't think there is a stark difference there. If you are a veteran and are seeking care and an appointment at a VA health facility and nobody answers the phone, that is a denial of benefits. That is a denial of benefits just as if they had closed the door in your face. That is what we are talking about—weakening the systems that are serving our public.

So the hiring freeze: It is possible to do a hiring freeze. When I was the Governor of Maine, I instituted a hiring freeze, but we did it in a systematic and thoughtful way. We had a process for dealing with exemptions and without destroying the morale and throwing the entire operation of government into chaos.

By the way, why do we have the government? To serve the people. To serve the people.

So let's talk about the next step—the firings. The famous "Fork in the Road" letter is a perfect example of a thoughtless way to approach a problem.

The letter went to everybody. The letter wasn't selective. It went to everybody—all civilians in the CIA, in the National Security Agency, in the Defense Department, and also, of course, to all the other civilian Agencies, but it wasn't targeted in any way. It was, "If you want to leave Federal service, we will pay you through September," but it hit everybody. Again, it is not a rational or thoughtful way to trim the Federal workforce.

You should be talking about, Where are we over? Do we have too many people? Do we have overstock in terms of public servants, and where do we need more, for example. Instead, it went to everybody. By definition, that is not a rational process. Let me just put this in perspective by the way.

In the "Fork in the Road" letter, the estimate, as of today, is that 75,000 people have taken that option and left. I suppose the people who are behind this thing think that that is a good victory. The dollars saved to the Treasury from those 75,000 people represent one-tenth of 1 percent of the Federal budget. So the people who are saying that we are cutting the budget; we are cutting; we are saving; we are saving the taxpayers' money, it is one-tenth of 1 percent. Given the chaos and the uncertainty and the deletion of services to

our American people, I would argue that is not worth it—one-tenth of 1 percent. Everyone got these letters. People are being fired now in the CIA, the FBI, the VA.

On this letter, what if only the best people take the option to leave? Then you will have really shot yourself in the foot. You will have encouraged people who were going to retire anyway or who could get a better job in the private sector. So it is almost—it is an anti-intelligent way to handle this.

Then you have got situations like at the Department of Energy. In the first weekend, they fired 350 people in the National Nuclear Security Administration. Of the people who handle nuclear materials and are responsible for our nuclear stockpile, they fired almost—I think it was—something like 20 percent of the personnel. Then, 3 or 4 days later, they realized: Uh-oh. That was a mistake. So now they are trying to bring these people back.

The point I am making is, a good, solid, thoughtful process wouldn't have made a mistake like that. They would have realized from the outset that these are jobs that we aren't going to be firing, that we aren't going to be eliminating. It seems to be based on some kind of quota. I don't know what it is.

OK. So now we are seeing everybody is being fired who is on probation, probationary people—people who have worked for the government for less than a year or two. OK. Again, that is arbitrary. Being on probation doesn't mean you are an effective employee or you are not an effective employee. You could be one of the best employees in the whole Federal Government, and you have just come on, and yet you are going to be fired. It has nothing to do with the productivity or skill of the worker. It has nothing to do with the importance of the position. It has nothing to do with the effectiveness of the Agency in question that is serving the people of Maine. If you are probationary, you are gone.

Here is another thing about probation: It turns out, in the Federal Government, if you are promoted, you are on probation in the new position. You may have worked for the Department for 5 or 10 years. You are promoted. You are on probation. You are fired. Even though you have 5 or 10 years of experience—you are capable; you are doing a good job—there was no effort that I can see. People did get these ridiculous letters saying: Your performance has not been adequate. There was no basis for those letters. It was arbitrary—arbitrary.

Remember, I said my categories are "thoughtless" and "dangerous." This is thoughtless: probation.

Oh, by the way, about 30 percent of the Federal workforce are veterans. Now, we don't know the exact figures. That is one of the problems. We have no transparency about what is going on here and who is actually being let go and who isn't, but a reasonable ex-

trapolation is 30 percent of the people being fired are veterans—people who put their lives on the line for this country. Then they went into public service, and they are being fired. That is outrageous.

Again, was no one thinking about this? A thousand were fired at the VA just a couple of days ago.

We learned that people supporting the VA crisis line were fired. What genius thought that was a good idea?

Last Friday, immigration judges were fired. We are talking about immigration and the border and the control of immigration, and we are firing immigration judges? What possible sense does that make?

Here is one: We have had, I think, three serious aircraft incidents in the last month, and they just fired, I think, 300 people at the FAA—great—including people who are in the business of maintaining the systems that keep our airplanes safe. In the wake of 3 serious airplane crashes, including 1 here in Washington that killed 67 people, we are firing people at the FAA? Give me a break. What kind of sense does that make? What kind of service is that to the people of the United States?

Here is one that is not life or death, but it is the National Park Service. A thousand people were fired last weekend at the National Park Service. I suspect they were probationary. That means, OK, they had only been there a year or two, but that doesn't mean they weren't in jobs that weren't important. The headline in this morning's paper: "Chaos at the National Parks." The lines are twice as long as they normally are, and if there is chaos at the National Parks in February, Lord knows what it is going to be in June or July in Yosemite and at the Grand Canyon and in Acadia, which is in my State of Maine.

Here is a beauty: Some of these people who are being fired are the people who collect fees at the park. So, to save a buck, we are going to lose 5 bucks from fees not being collected. Genius. Come on. Five percent of the workforce at the National Park Service is being fired.

I can tell you I am the cochair of the National Park Subcommittee of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. We need more people at the national parks, not less. We have had a staffing shortage going back a half a dozen or 10 years, where visitation is way up, and staff is flat or declining. Now it is really declining. This is a direct, hands-on experience for the American people.

Gettysburg: They have been laying off people at the battlefield. Last night, apparently, something called the Presidential Management Fellows Program—a training program that is decades old that brings talented people into the Federal Government—was eliminated. No explanation. No rationale. Eliminated.

OK. That is the thoughtless part. And let me give you a little personal experience. When I was elected Governor of Maine, we had a serious budget deficit. We were in the middle of a recession. So we went through a process very similar to the impetus for what is going on now. We looked at the entire workforce of the State of Maine, but we did it in a thoughtful and transparent way. We developed a task force that included private citizens, legislators, and members of the administration, and we took 8 months—8 months, not 8 weeks—and we looked at the entire structure of the State of Maine government and reduced our workforce by about 10 percent—a significant reduction, but we did it in a thoughtful way and in a way that made sense in terms of the ongoing service to the people of Maine.

So it can be done, and I am not unsympathetic with the idea of making things more efficient and even possibly downsizing the government where it is called for and where additional people aren't necessary. So I am not here to say we shouldn't be looking for efficiency and saying everything in the Federal Government is perfect. I don't believe that for a minute. But I think, if we are going to take on this exercise, it ought to be done in a sensible way by people who know what they are doing.

That brings me to DOGE. I don't know what they are doing. Nobody does. I don't know who these 25-year-olds are that are in the IRS, rummaging around in the IRS IT system or—we learned in the last couple of days—Social Security. What are they doing? Who are they? What are their qualifications? Do they have security clearances? Do they have conflicts of interest?

All of the rules that are designed to protect us from people making arbitrary decisions that aren't accountable—you talk about bureaucrats being unaccountable; these are the ultimate unaccountable people. We don't know what their relationship is to the Federal Government, what authority they have, under what law are they operating. It is pretty clear from mistakes like firing 350 people at the Nuclear Security Agency—it is pretty clear they don't know what they are doing, and they are firing people whom we need. OK. That is the thoughtless part, and it is inexcusable.

That is just pure efficiency of government, of doing the right thing, and it can be done, but these people aren't doing it.

The second part of what is going on is the dangerous part, and this is where I call upon my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who are standing by and watching the structure of our government be attacked with no response—elimination of entire congressionally created Agencies.

USAID was established by statute, and over a weekend, these people fired everybody, closed the Agency, took the name off the door, and threw the rest

of the world into chaos where these people were working on important projects all over the world that were part of our outreach to the world.

And, you know what, as soon as we went out of business at AID, China is right in the market. It is like walking away from engagement with the world. It couldn't be a more self-defeating piece of work.

By the way, it is a tiny part of the Federal budget.

James Mattis famously said when he was a general: If you cut the foreign aid budget, you are going to have to buy me more bullets.

Foreign aid is part of the national security of this country, and to demolish this Agency without any input from Congress, without any relationship to the Foreign Affairs Committee or anybody else up here in Congress, is grossly unconstitutional. It is grossly unconstitutional.

Here is the problem: This isn't just a battle between the Senate and the House and the President and they are fighting about powers. No. The reason the Framers designed our Constitution the way they did was that they were afraid of concentrated power. They had just fought a brutal 8-year war with a King. They didn't want a King. They wanted a constitutional republic where power was divided between the Congress and the President and the courts.

We are collapsing that structure. And the structure wasn't there for fun. It wasn't there because, hey, we are just going to design this complicated system. It was there to protect our freedom because the people who wrote our Constitution understood human nature, and they understood a very important thousand-year-old principle: Power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely.

So the whole idea was to divide power. To the extent we allow this assault on our Constitution, this collapsing and excessive power being granted to the Executive to ignore the laws passed by Congress—and, by the way, appropriations bills are laws passed by Congress, which the administration is also ignoring by freezing funding for programs authorized and funded by Congress. To the extent we do that, we are not only making a mistake now, but we are altering the essential structure of our Constitution that is there for a reason, that is there to protect our freedom.

The people who are cheering this on, I fear, in a reasonably short period of time, are going to say: Where did this go? How did this happen? How did we make our President into a monarch? How did this happen?

How it happened is we gave it up.

James Madison thought we would fight for our power—but no. Right now, we are just sitting back and watching it happen.

Article II of the Constitution—the President said: Oh, article II gives me a lot of power.

No, it doesn't. It makes the President Commander in Chief; that is true. But

here is the key sentence in article II of the Constitution, which defines a President's power. The key sentence is not the power of the President. The responsibility of the President is to "take care that the laws be faithfully executed"—not write the laws, not deny the laws, not ignore the laws, not pick which laws he or she likes. To "take care that the laws be faithfully executed"—that is the responsibility of the President. Right now, those laws are being ignored.

Impoundment. Impoundment. The President is trying to say: Congress appropriated this money with an appropriation bill signed by the President, but I am not going to spend it because I don't like it. I don't like that purpose, whatever it is.

I am sorry. It is absolutely straight-up unconstitutional, and it is illegal. President Nixon tried to do that in 1973, and the Congress virtually unanimously passed the Impoundment Control Act, which said: No, Presidents can't do that; they can't ignore the will of Congress because article I of the Constitution gives the Congress the power of the purse.

We are giving it away this week. We are standing by and watching it, watching the essential power of this body evaporate—not evaporate—migrate down the street to 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. The power was divided for a reason.

There is some criticism now in the press saying people are talking about a constitutional crisis; they are crying wolf. No. This is a constitutional crisis. It is the most serious assault on our Constitution in the history of this country. It is the most serious assault on the very structure of our Constitution, which is designed to protect our freedoms and our liberty, in the history of this country.

It is a constitutional crisis, and I will tell you what makes it worse: The President and the Vice President are already hinting that they are not going to obey decisions of the courts.

Many of my friends in this body say: Well, you know, it would be hard. We don't want to buck the President and everything. We are going to let the courts take care of this.

No. 1, that is a copout. It is our responsibility to protect the Constitution. That is what we swear to when we enter this body. But to stand back and say: Oh, we are going to watch all this happen, and the courts are going to take care of it—that is an abdication of our responsibility.

By the way, if you look at history, yes, it is true Presidents have gained power. In my reading of history, usually it wasn't because Presidents usurped power but because the Congress abdicated it. We haven't declared war, for example, since 1942, and yet that is a clear responsibility of Congress. And we sure have been in some scrapes since 1942. We have abdicated that power. And we are now in the process of abdicating the power to control the appropriations process.

I mentioned about DOGE: no authority, no accountability, no transparency. We literally don't know what they are doing. We can't find out what they are doing.

Then, just this week, the destruction of the independent Agencies created by Congress. They were created as independent Agencies for a reason—because they didn't want them to be dominated by the vicissitudes of politics.

The President gets to appoint members of the board, and they are very carefully balanced—not firing someone at the National Labor Relations Board so there is no quorum so they can't act. That is a direct violation of congressionally established policy.

These independent Agencies were created for a reason.

Oh, I forgot to mention the illegal firing of inspectors general. The Senator from Iowa is a champion of inspectors general. In the first few days, something like 18 inspectors general were fired, completely contrary to the law. The law is the Congress must be given 30 days' notice of the firing of an inspector general and reasons therefor. Not done. Not a peep.

What is it going to take for us to wake up—when I say “us,” I mean this entire body—to wake up to what is going on here? Is it going to be too late? Is it going to be when the President has accreted all this power and the Congress is an afterthought? What is it going to take? The offenses keep piling up.

As I said, leaving it to the courts, No. 1, is a copout. No. 2, when the Vice President said something—I can't remember exactly what he said—but why should we—the courts should not have the power to do this. And, of course, the President, over the weekend, famously quoted Napoleon: When you are saving your country, you don't have to obey any law.

Wow. A President of the United States quoting Napoleon about not having to obey the law.

So I intended to talk about Ukraine, but Senator TILLIS and Senator SHAHEEN did it so articulately. I think I will let that pass except to say that it is shameful that we have suddenly pivoted from the support of a democracy that was grossly and illegally invaded—from the support of that country to the support of a murderous dictator.

I heard something about Zelenskyy is a dictator. The only dictator in this game is Vladimir Putin. He is the dictator. And to argue that somehow Ukraine started the war—what universe is somebody in that would say something like that?

Again, I won't pursue, but I can tell you, Putin is happy, Xi Jinping is happy, Iran is happy, and North Korea is happy. They love what is going on, to see us retreating from the world, whether it is AID or Ukraine. They love to see us retreating from the world, looking weak and looking unreliable.

Finally, on this point, we seem to be systematically alienating our allies. I have been on Armed Services now for 12 years, and I have learned that the key asymmetric advantage that this country has in the world is allies. China has customers; we have allies. Well, we are giving that away. If I wasn't on the floor of the U.S. Senate, I would use a slightly different term. But we are giving away our asymmetric advantage in the world by what looks like systematically alienating our allies, whether it is threats of tariffs or speeches in Europe telling them what their problems are, basically saying we are going to abandon Europe.

What a great idea: Abandon Europe at a time when there is a murderous dictator who has his eyes on the Baltics, on Poland, and who has said he would like to reestablish the Soviet empire. The worst possible geopolitical thing that we could do would be to abandon Ukraine.

So this is a constitutional crisis, and we have to respond to it. And I am just waiting for this whole body to stand up and say: No, no. We don't do it this way. We don't do it this way. We do things constitutionally.

Yes, it is more cumbersome. It is slower. That is what the Framers intended. They didn't intend to have an efficient dictatorship, and that is what we are headed for. This is a very dangerous moment. We have to wake up, protect this institution, but much more importantly, protect the people of the United States of America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise to support the budget resolution that is before the U.S. Senate. Speaking to that, I want to remind people of some history.

These famous words came from Rahm Emanuel, President Obama's Chief of Staff. It dates from about 2008. He famously said:

You never want a serious crisis to go away.

There is no statement that better encapsulates the mindset of the previous administration. We all know Americans are struggling to cope with economic and social disruption still carrying on from the pandemic. The Biden administration saw a real opportunity, an opportunity to permanently increase the size and scope of government.

They said that they wanted to transform America. I hope everybody on my side of the aisle wants to preserve America. In my view, it makes sense, in times of national emergency, for government to take steps to help individuals, families, and small businesses weather that storm.

But once the crisis subsides, so should the programs and spending enacted in response. Yet here we are in 2025, and Federal spending, as a share of the economy, remains at levels never seen outside of war or national emergency like recessions or depressions.

In 2019, before the pandemic, the total Federal spending totaled \$4.45 trillion. In 2024, the Federal Government spent over \$2 trillion more. So that is a total of \$6.75 trillion, a relative increase of over 50 percent.

We must begin to put spending back on a path of normalcy, and that is why we are having this debate that we call the budget resolution. The path to normalcy is a spending path that accounts for the historic inflation of the past 4 years as well as population growth.

Now, there are a lot of people in this body that would say that spending that much is still too much, but I think it fits in with the principle of the 1974 budget resolution.

Once inflation and population growth are factored in, Federal spending in 2024 remained roughly \$1 trillion above prepandemic levels. If Social Security and Medicare and interest on the debt are set to the side, Federal spending was still over half a trillion dollars above 2019 levels. I hope you will study the chart here that shows what I just told you.

Unless we have a course correction, our national debt will set a new record as a share of our economy in 2028. That is eclipsing the previous high-water mark set in the wake of World War II. You can see that here in the period of time where it was at World War II.

As another Democrat said, elections have consequences. So as a part of the November mandate, President Trump is looking for ways to reduce wasteful government spending. Through this budget resolution before the Senate now, we plan to help in that process.

But, in fact, that power should rest here. The President shouldn't have to do it. But it is Congress that has the power of the purse, and we will have to do the heavy lifting. Getting out of the fiscal hole that we dug for ourselves requires that we first stop digging.

The budget that we are debating this week takes that first step, and some people would say it is too small of a first step. Any new spending will have to be accomplished by reductions in spending elsewhere. I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues on a return to fiscal sanity, and that fiscal sanity is the prepandemic level of spending increased only by inflation and population growth.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, the American people are being robbed in broad daylight. Big Oil is cashing in on their billion-dollar deal with Donald Trump from his campaign; the \$1 billion to help Trump win. And in return, he will rig the rules of the game in line with the pockets of the oil, gas, and coal industry 10 times over.

So let's call Trump's energy agenda what it really is: Oil above all, not all of the above. Trump's billionaire friends promised to raise tens of millions of dollars; and, in return, he promised he would deliver policies that

will force working families to pay more, inhale more toxic air, and reduce their kids' chances for a healthier future.

Especially as the climate crisis continues to turbocharge extreme weather—costing billions in damages, sky-high energy bills—we know that working families don't have any more to give to the oil, gas, and coal industries.

Gas prices are up. Electricity bills are up. Home heating costs are up. And yet Donald Trump is going after the programs, the Agencies, and the workers that help keep our air and water clean and create jobs.

Meanwhile, Big Oil is raking in record profits, more than \$172 billion in profits in 2023 alone. This administration isn't governing, it is groveling to Big Oil and Big Gas and Big Coal and the entire fossil fuel industry. Every dollar that goes into a billionaire's pocket is a dollar taken out of a working family's budget—money that should go toward food, rent, and education.

It is robbery in broad daylight from working families to create tax breaks for billionaires, and the Trump administration is trying to carry out their single biggest heist right now: attempting to illegally seize \$20 billion from the congressionally authorized climate bank. As we speak, they are trying to loot the climate bank.

This bank, formally called the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund, is based on my national climate bank legislation with CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, and it is already at work for you, leveraging private dollars to cut energy bills for families and small businesses, improve resiliency against climate change-fueled disasters, and create local economic opportunity.

Trump and Musk are trying to get their hands on this money—your money—through whatever means necessary, even if that meant forcing Denise Cheung, head of the criminal division of the DC U.S. Attorney's Office, to say that there had been a crime committed in the climate bank, which then would allow Trump to reclaim all the money in the climate bank.

What did Denise Cheung say? She said she could not find a crime. They said: You are going to find a crime. She said she could not find a crime in the climate bank, and so she had to resign. She had to resign from being the head of the Criminal Division in the U.S. Attorney's Office right here in Washington, DC, because she refused to follow the orders of her supervisor who is getting instructions from the White House because that was the only way they could fulfill the promise to oil, gas, and coal to kill the climate bank.

They wanted to freeze that money in the absence of any crimes, any wrongdoing, which—surprise—just happened this week. Just happened. Their goal is to take money away from families, take money from clean energy, take money from disadvantaged communities and give it to the fossil fuel companies and special interests.

So, yes, they want to raid Medicaid; they want to raid education programs; they want to raid veterans' benefits. But also, for the oil, gas, and coal industry, they have got to kill the tax breaks for wind and solar; they have got to gut the climate bank, which is revolutionizing the way in which we generate energy electricity in this country.

That is not powerful leadership; it is political plunder. And working families are paying the price. Trump's farce of an energy emergency declaration creates a financial emergency for the American people. Instead of taking steps to lower energy costs for families, the Trump administration is actively driving up your energy costs by pushing for our energy, American energy, to get shipped overseas for higher profits and tying our energy market to the volatility of the global energy marketplace.

From late 2021 through 2022, surging exports of our energy from the United States, liquified natural gas cost Americans \$111 billion in higher energy prices for natural gas customers here in the United States—consumers, homeowners, businesses. Why? Because Big Oil and Big Gas want to export our energy out of our country, send it overseas because they get a bigger price on the open seas. That is what it is all about.

In a recent study, the Department of Energy found that it is extremely likely LNG exports will lead to more stickier shock for Americans, an average increase of over \$120 per year still coming—again while oil executives, natural gas executives cash in on even bigger paydays. What is the Trump plan? Turn consumers in America upside down and shake money out of their pockets for profits for the oil and gas industry.

What happens? Prices go higher for consumers here. That is how they make their money. They are doing it hand in glove with the Trump administration. This is not an energy emergency. This is a Trump energy tax on the American people, an energy tax, which, to be clear, is only growing in severity as Trump cuts off funding for clean energy projects, fires hard-working government employees, imposes tariffs—all of which will make electricity even more expensive for American businesses, for American consumers.

It is a deliberate strategy to make sure working families stay dependent on a damaging fuel source that makes a handful of billionaires richer and richer and richer by the day. But make no mistake, they are not attacking us, because they are winning.

The fossil fuel industry is backing Donald Trump because they know they are losing. They are losing, despite Trump's attempts to kill the green revolution. The clean energy boom is happening all across our country.

The fossil fuel industry is terrified because they know that wind and solar are the future.

Last year, get this number, are you ready? This is why they are petrified. This is why they are scared, 90 percent of all new electricity generation capacity brought online in the United States was renewable—10 percent natural gas, 90 percent renewable last year.

Why do they have to kill the tax breaks? Why do they have to kill the climate bank? You do 90 percent renewables every year for the next 10 years, then it drives right at the heart of the business model of the natural gas and coal and oil industries in our country.

That is why they need to loot the climate bank. That is why they need to kill the tax breaks for wind and solar, all-electric vehicles in our country. Onshore wind. Onshore wind and solar power were the cheapest megawatts on the grid last year, 2024, from construction to operation.

And the Big Oil bosses know that if given the choice, Americans will pick the cheapest, cleanest energy source every single time. So they are killing your choice. They are not letting you pick which energy source you want.

Nearly 80 percent of clean energy investments from the Inflation Reduction Act, also known as the biggest climate bill in world history, but 80 percent of the energy investments have gone to Republican districts, creating hundreds of thousands of new jobs just in 2½ years.

Think about that. Trump is actively working to destroy economic growth and jobs in the very places that got him elected. Eighty percent of the jobs are in red States. Think about that. But that is the payback to the oil, gas, and coal industry for raising the money for him last year. We are talking about electricians installing solar panels, construction workers building wind turbines, engineers designing the next generation of battery storage. All of these are good-paying, family-sustaining jobs that are helping to build America's future. And yet—and yet—Trump and his enablers want to tear it all down just to keep their fossil fuel cronies happy, just to keep the greenhouse gas emitters happy, just to make sure there is no competition.

They don't believe in competition. This should be Darwinian paranoia-inducing competition. What oil, gas, and coal has extracted from this administration is killing the competition. It is killing them in the marketplace.

Adam Smith was spinning in his grave thinking about this cut. He had a big smile on his face last year, Adam Smith. The market is finally working. We finally have incentives for the competition. But that had to be killed. That had to be killed.

And if that wasn't enough, Trump is attacking the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Agency that warns and helps protect us against hurricanes and floods and wildfires.

Why? Because it gets in the way of his fossil fuel allies' ability to pollute and to profit without consequence. Just last year, get this number, disasters supercharged by climate change

cost the United States more than \$500 billion. Hurricanes Milton and Helene, they cost \$300 billion—billion—in damage. The fires in L.A., \$200 billion. Three incidents, \$500 billion worth of damage. Three. That is all. Half of the defense budget of the United States.

What are they doing? They are taking down the defense in the future against superstorms. They are going to take it down. They are going to ravage homeowners, businesses across our country. Insurance rates are going to skyrocket. It is going to have a devastating impact upon our country. We are not even through the month of February, and already in Los Angeles and other places, we can see the storms; we can see the floods; we can see the damage.

So this is absolutely unbelievable what is happening. Families forced from their homes. Businesses wiped out. Entire communities devastated. And instead of preparing for the future, Trump is making sure it gets worse. Imagine, standing in the wreckage of a hurricane-ravaged neighborhood, with nothing but rubble left of your home, and knowing that your President, right now, is actively choosing to make future disasters worse and firing the workers that would help you rebuild. That is the cruelty of his administration.

It has become a wholly owned subsidiary of the oil, gas, and coal industry, giving them a permission slip to wreak havoc on every other American. At every turn, this administration is picking fossil fuel billionaires over working people, and they aren't even hiding it.

Since April of last year after Trump sat down with the Big Oil executives and asked for a billion-dollar campaign check, these executives' wealth has ballooned by more than \$40 billion in 1 year, \$40 billion more in the wealth of those individuals, while families across the country wonder how they will pay their heating bills.

Trump's fossil fuel donors are making a fortune. And let's not forget the bigger picture. Our global standing is on the line. While we stall and we let the fossil fuel industry dictate our energy policy, China is surging ahead. China is saying: Thank you, Trump administration. Thank you for letting us take over the renewable energy industry.

They are investing in clean energy, in electric vehicles, in battery storage—in all the industries that will define the 21st century economy. And what is Trump doing? Kneecapping our ability to compete. He is locking us into outdated, expensive, and polluting energy systems, while the rest of the world moves forward without us. You can't be an isolationist when it comes to climate change; it is global warming.

This isn't just about energy policy. This is about what kind of country we want to be. Will we be the leader or the laggard? Do we want to be a country

that builds, innovates, and transforms, or do we want to be a country that clings to the past and knowingly raises costs on American families that pollute the air we breathe in order to line the pockets of the ultrawealthy? The choice is ours.

Trump and his fossil fuel friends want you to believe that you don't have a choice; that you have to accept higher prices, dirtier air, polluted water, and an onslaught of hurricanes and fires brought on by a worsening climate crisis that the President of the United States, Donald Trump, denies even exists, calling it a Chinese hoax. It is no hoax. Three events, \$500 billion worth of damage, and I am not even mentioning all the other damage last year and early this year, but there were.

People want lower bills, not higher profits for Exxon. Our communities deserve good-paying jobs, not another handout to Chevron. It is not drill, baby, drill. It is plug in, baby, plug in. That is what this generation of young people want: plug into the electric revolution, plug into the nonpolluting future.

We have a choice. We can fight for lower costs, good jobs, and a livable future. We can invest in the industries of tomorrow instead of getting locked into the polluting past. We can stop exporting American fossil fuels abroad and driving up our own prices for our own consumers here in America. We can ban fossil fuel executives and lobbyists from being able to use our energy-related Agencies for their own personal pocketbooks or, as I call for in my "BIG OIL from the Cabinet Act," they can't work; they can't work for the Energy Department. They can't be inside taking over the agenda. We can strengthen the low-income heating and cooling relief program so that the poorest Americans don't have to put so much of their paycheck toward heating and cooling.

We can safeguard energy efficiency standards for appliances so that people pay less on their bills. We can do that. We can remove the tax loopholes that prevent the oil and gas companies from paying their fair share.

We are talking about tax breaks for oil companies that have been on the books for 100 years. They call creating a climate bank socialism. What do you call 100 years of tax breaks for the oil, gas, and coal industry? That is socialism. That is allowing for a noncompetitive marketplace.

So the new technologies, the clean technologies, solar and wind, electric battery technologies, they can't be deployed. We can remove those tax breaks. That is what we should be debating here.

But at a minimum, we can't take away the competition. They are monopolists. They are all oligopolists. That is all it is. They want to stifle new technology. They don't have any new ideas, except making themselves rich.

If Republicans are here tonight looking for revenue to pay for the things that they want to pay for, let's start with ending those tax breaks now and having oil companies finally pay their fair share.

Ultimately, we can stand up to the corporate greed that is bleeding working families dry and demand a future where energy policy serves the people, not just the powerful. And that is exactly what we are going to do because the clean energy revolution isn't just coming; it is already here. And it is scaring the living daylights out of the oil, gas, and coal industry. They are petrified.

It is happening in red States, 80 percent, and blue States. It is lowering costs, creating jobs, making communities stronger. No amount of corruption, no amount of grift, no amount of fossil fuel money is going to stop it, and we are not going to back down. And we will not allow the Trump administration to sell out the American people, especially young people. We are not going to allow their future to get sold out. We are not going to surrender the way the oil, gas, and coal industry wants us to surrender because this is not about the highest bidder who can loot the programs like the National Climate Bank to pay for their billionaire tax breaks.

We will fight for the workers building America's clean energy future. We will fight for all families, ensuring they have lower energy bills, cleaner air. And we will fight for a livable future, not just for ourselves but for all coming children and grandchildren right now.

This is not just a political fight; it is a moral fight. This is about justice. This is about fairness. This is about the very future of our country. We cannot back down now. This is the time. This is the place. We must wage this battle on behalf of the coming generations or else the devastation will become catastrophically unimaginable.

So let's have this fight this year about our future. I think that is the least we owe to the young people in our country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I have two unanimous consent requests. I ask unanimous consent that for the duration of S. Con. Res. 7, the budget resolution for fiscal year 2025, the majority and the Democratic managers of the resolution, while seated or standing at the managers' desk, be permitted to deliver floor remarks, retrieve, review, and edit documents, and send email and other data communications from text displayed on a wireless personal assistance device and tablet devices.

I further ask unanimous consent that the use of calculators be permitted on the floor during consideration of the budget resolution; further, that the staff be permitted to make technical

and conforming changes to the resolution, if necessary, consistent with amendments adopted during Senate consideration, including calculating the associated change in the net interest function and incorporating the effect of such adopted amendments on the budgetary aggregates for Federal revenue, the amount by which the Federal revenue should be changed, new budget authority, budget outlays, deficits, public debt and debt held by the public.

Further, I ask unanimous consent for 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to each vote during consideration of S. Con. Res. 7.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

S. CON. RES. 7

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the rhetoric of Donald Trump and Republicans on the budget is all over the map. Here is what is important to know. Republicans want \$4.5 trillion in tax cuts, primarily for the richest Americans, paid for with sharp cuts in programs that help average Americans and the most vulnerable in our society.

Yesterday, I spoke on the floor about one of the most cynical parts of this resolution: gutting healthcare for children, seniors, and Americans with disabilities through extreme cuts to Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program, or CHIP.

Donald Trump said that Medicaid and Medicare would be off limits, but the budgets put out by Republicans indicate something quite different.

During the debate on this budget, Republicans will have the opportunity to vote on amendments to show where they stand, and, more importantly, who they stand with—everyday Americans or the roughly 750 billionaires in the United States. That is the stakes—hundreds of millions of nurses, firefighters, office workers, systems administrators, salespeople, and their children versus the interests of roughly 750 people whose wealth grows by millions every single day.

Ripping health coverage away from Americans may be the worst part of this budget, but it is far from the only bad provision. Instead, this budget is part of a broader decision by President Trump and congressional Republicans to force American families to pay more for food, healthcare, and education—again, all so the wealthiest Americans can get a huge tax break.

The “big, beautiful bill” that Donald Trump favors is expected to gut Medicaid by at least \$880 billion dollars. The cuts would be devastating for the 80 million Americans who rely on Medicaid and CHIP, who are almost entirely children, seniors, people with disabilities, and working men and women who depend upon Medicaid protection. Forcing struggling Americans to pay more for health insurance or to lose health coverage altogether is

heartless policy and a slap in the face to the millions of families who are struggling to make ends meet.

And yet Medicaid is not the only target in this resolution. Food for the dinner table is also on the chopping block with cuts of reportedly at least \$230 billion to SNAP. Each of us has seen news reports about the long lines at food pantries in our States. Who hasn't heard that the price of eggs is up 15 percent in the last month alone? Who doesn't remember, also, the campaign promise of Donald Trump to bring grocery prices down on the first day of his term?

Yet here we are with a Trump-backed bill that makes groceries even more expensive for 42 million Americans who qualify for SNAP. Gutting this program, the SNAP program, doesn't lower prices, but it sure will increase the problem of hunger in the richest country in the world.

Put simply, President Trump's “big, beautiful bill” is forcing vulnerable American families to pay more for food and healthcare. Such policies directly contradict the President's campaign promise that “starting on day one, we will end inflation and make America affordable again.”

Republicans can't dodge the truth: \$880 billion in Medicaid cuts and \$230 billion in SNAP cuts will mean more kids go hungry, more seniors can't afford lifesaving treatment, and more households are forced into poverty.

The budget resolution's cost-raising trifecta ends with higher education costs. Instead of making college more affordable and offering young Americans more pathways to prosperity, this Republican budget will increase the cost of student loans and cut other programs that help Americans offset the costs of education.

Education cuts come at, perhaps, the worst time. Most jobs that provide living wages require some postsecondary education or training. A college education, which has long been a ticket to the middle class, is now too expensive for too many families. Meanwhile, the main source of government higher education aid for low- and moderate-income families, the Pell grant, has lost most of its purchasing power. At its peak in 1975 and 1976, the Pell grant—named after my predecessor, Senator Claiborne Pell—covered more than 75 percent of the cost of attendance at a public 4-year college. Today, it covers less than 30 percent.

Unsurprisingly, over 40 million Americans now have student loan debt, which prevents them, in many cases, from purchasing a home or moving to areas where they might be able to use their talents more effectively, and has many other consequences.

Forcing Americans to pay even more for college makes higher education less attainable, weakens our labor force, and will have long-term repercussions for American families, American prosperity, and American security.

Now, many Americans may be wondering: What is the point of all of these cuts?

It is not about reforming programs. There has been no serious cost-benefit analysis of any of these programs. All they have looked at is, What does it cost, and how can we use that money to fund taxes?

That is not government reform. That is not wise government. That is just ripping off most Americans to satisfy 750 billionaires.

And it is not even about reducing the deficit. As I said, it is just about unlocking a fast-track way to reward the wealthiest Americans—some of whom are now in the Trump administration.

Republicans have been pretty clear. The central purpose of their budget is to permanently extend the failed 2017 Trump tax bill, which was an unpopular giveaway to the wealthiest Americans. Nearly half of the benefits from extending the Trump tax bill will flow just to the richest Americans, those earning \$450,000 or more each year.

President Trump promised on the campaign trail that “starting on day one, we will end inflation and make America affordable again.” But we are now on day 32, and costs have not come down. In fact, inflation hit 3 percent for the first time in months this January, and the President took no action while egg prices hit record highs—a particular point of pain for many families.

And just like this budget resolution, the President has been intent on forcing families to pay more, not less, for everyday goods. In just 1 month, the President has implemented or threatened tariff taxes on nearly every item imaginable.

Nonpartisan experts are clear: These tariff taxes will not “make America affordable again.” The Peterson Institute projects the tariff taxes on Canada, Mexico, and China alone would cost U.S. households \$1,200 a year—a tariff tax. Yale researchers have found the President's threat to place reciprocal tariffs on our trading partners would cost families \$2,600. Analysts at the investment bank Jefferies projects car prices will jump by \$2,700 under the President's Canada and Mexico tariffs, while the National Association of Home Builders found President Trump's lumber tariffs during his first term—which he promised to raise again—in his first term, raised housing prices by \$9,000, and he still wants to do it again.

We have also heard a lot about Mr. Musk's DOGE and fraud, waste, and abuse, but that operation doesn't seem to be about preventing fraud, waste, and abuse, or lowering costs.

By the way, if you were really interested in eliminating waste, fraud, and abuse in the Federal Government, why would you fire all the inspectors general? They are independent agents who are charged specifically to root out waste and corruption in the Federal

Government. President Trump did that. So this is not about getting rid of waste or anything else. Again, it is finding trillions of dollars to give away to rich Americans.

In fact, the other aspect of DOGE is just to create mayhem to impact so much of government: firing responsible staffers who are handling key issues, weapons—nuclear weapons.

I was in the airport, on Monday evening, flying down from Providence, and a young lady came up to me and said she was fired a few days ago from the National Nuclear Security Administration because she was a probationary hire. But guess what. When they discovered that they could not protect nuclear weapons—not do sensitive maintenance on them so that they would be ready for deterrence—she was suddenly called back. Not very smart.

DOGE is also trying to fire researchers who are out to cure Alzheimer's disease, trying to get rid of experts who fight bird flu, and seeking access to computer systems at the IRS and the Social Security Administration—which contain personal and financial information for each and every single American.

I don't think most Americans want Elon Musk to know all of their financial information, their personal information, maybe even healthcare information. But that could happen.

It is not combating fraud, all of these things. In fact, it is close to—particularly with the IRS information—committing fraud.

Indeed, the budget resolution we will vote on tonight is just further evidence that Republicans and President Trump have no plan and no real interest in lowering costs for families, and I think that is wrong.

Now, I am all for tax cuts, but it should be tax cuts for the middle class, tax cuts for those struggling with high prices, and tax cuts for small businesses, not 750 billionaires. Forcing regular Americans to cover tax cuts to the richest Americans is not the sort of economic policy we should be pursuing in the Senate.

I urge my colleagues to rethink which Americans deserve their support.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, starting last week, the Trump administration began firing hundreds of Federal Aviation Administration employees. Today, we had a hearing in the Commerce Committee to talk about what kind of a key Deputy Secretary we need at the DOT, and we asked questions about this.

But what is perplexing is, while the American people were watching in horror as a Delta Airlines plane flipped over on the Toronto runway, President Trump was focused instead on purging dedicated FAA employees from the Federal workforce, something that I believe makes us less safe in the skies.

Among those fired were aeronautical information specialists, legal instrument examiners, telecommunication specialists—all of whom played a key role in supporting the work of air traffic controllers.

In fact, there was a story today in Politico. The headline is, "Air traffic controllers cannot do their work without us." That is a quote from the article. And inside the article, a statement, reading from the article, "One of the people last week let go was an aeronautical information specialist, a member of a team outside Washington whose job it was to create maps and highways in the sky, the pre-planned routes that pilots control and controllers use to guide airplanes."

So it is very perplexing that we have had these accidents, and now, we have an administration that wants to cut people at the FAA. This headline here refers to the fact that the last Trump administration actually blocked safety rules, and that is what today's Commerce hearing was about for the No. 2 person at the Department of Transportation, the people that served in the first Trump administration, and why did they block these safety rules?

In fact, some of these safety rules, which would have required manufacturers to have better safety, were written and proposed by the FAA—but when the Trump administration came in and then 9 days after the first MAX crash—somehow, the rule that was set to move forward was pulled.

So now, we are seeing an administration that is being, in my mind, thoughtless to the incidents that we have now seen in aviation and saying it is okay to cut people at the FAA. I disagree.

The administration has said that it is no big deal because it is 1 percent of the workforce. Now, I know the objective is to give a \$4 trillion tax break to corporations and ultrawealthy people, but I don't understand how making the skies less safe helps you in that agenda. It doesn't. The individual lives and safety of the American people are worth way more.

These people that got fired are not just a bunch of junior hires, no—one news report stated that "More than 130 of those eliminated held jobs that directly or indirectly support the air traffic controllers. They support the facilities and the technologies they use to keep the planes and their passengers safe."

So you are going to tell me that a telecommunication specialist who supports the maintenance of key communications technology used by controllers is not important to aviation safety?

Are you going to tell me that the legal instrument examiners who ensure that the pilots are medically fit to fly are not important to aviation safety? Are you going to tell me that the air traffic controllers—the same workers that originally were not exempted from the administration's hiring freeze, but

then, only after the fatal collision at DCA put a spotlight on the issue, they finally exempted controllers from the freeze.

Most astonishing of all, though, is that the administration has let go of aeronautical information specialists who evaluate and prepare navigational charts and helicopter routes used by both controllers and pilots.

Now, we have just had this midair collision in the DCA area, and what was it about? A route that didn't seem to be a decision somebody had made to let these planes fly too close together? Made no sense.

How did that route get approved? Who at the FAA said it was a good idea to allow the Department of Defense to fly in the same air space as a plane landing on runway 33 at DCA airport?

So mapping helicopter routes in a busy air space, I think, is critically important—and not somebody who should have been fired this week from a job.

Our aviation system is not a place where you can shortchange workers. This SMS rule proves it. This rule, which would have mandated that manufacturers of aviation implement a Safety Management System, constantly approving on analytical basis, is critical information about how to maintain safety. But it never got implemented.

So I am concerned that an administration that in the previous Trump years thwarted the safety rule and now is firing people at the FAA after these crashes are going to continue to erode the aviation safety net.

Surprisingly, after the helicopter crash with the CRJ from American Airlines—there was a lot of discussion about how and why a military helicopter would be in the same space as a CRJ regional jet trying to land in DCA from Kansas. One of the questions asked was, why was there not this Next Generation technology that would allow the helicopter to be detected? This included a DOD helicopter in the DCA collision incident.

The issue is that the controllers needed this information, but in an exemption done in the Trump administration, gave them an exemption to do this. And this week, we find out in a letter that they never, ever use ADS-B as a way to help us in our navigation safety.

Air traffic controllers themselves know that these firings are anti-safety. Ken Greenwood, a constituent of mine in Washington State, who is a former air traffic controller, wrote me on Sunday about how important these workers are. According to him, he said, "These technicians and engineers maintain every piece of equipment that keeps our flying public safe, keeps radars and instrument landing to air traffic controllers on automation. FAA technicians undergo years of specialized training to maintain critical missions and systems and cannot be replaced quickly. In the 35 years since I began my controller career, we have

never, never had a surplus of technicians or engineers.

“To the contrary, it’s a challenge to keep them in these jobs. Once our aviation system infrastructure is compromised, it takes decades to take it back, and money will not be saved and lives may be lost.”

I thank Mr. Greenwood for his service. I hope the administration is listening. I hope that you figure out now is not this time to shortchange aviation. Unfortunately, right now, we don’t even have a confirmed FAA Administrator. They are critical to this job. We had a strong Administrator, Mike Whitaker, who was confirmed 98-0 by this body. But that didn’t matter to Elon Musk, who went after Administrator Whitaker because he dared to fine SpaceX for not following the rules, and as a result, the FAA now does not have an Administrator at one of its most critical points in decades.

All the firing of employees and dangling resignations and trying to get people to resign to save money to give a tax break of \$4 trillion to corporations and the ultrawealthy is not what we should be doing.

We should be working hard on aviation safety. We should not be rolling back safety rules. We should be enforcing safety rules and implementing them as fast as we can that says this body, this body knows that aviation safety is a priority.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

UKRAINE

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity to speak.

I returned from Ukraine earlier this week, where I saw both the suffering that the Ukrainian people have endured over the past 3 years at Putin’s hand and the courage they have forged to save their country and their children—the suburban town of Bucha, where Russian troops tortured and massacred hundreds of civilians in the first day of Putin’s unprovoked invasion; the shattered children’s hospital Putin’s missiles nearly destroyed; apartment buildings in central Kyiv struck by Putin’s drones; and lawyers searching for the thousands of Ukrainian children who have been kidnapped from their parents by Russian soldiers.

By most estimates, at least 40,000 Ukrainian troops have been killed in battle and another 380,000 have been wounded since Putin’s invasion. A draft of the general population in that country means that war has scarred nearly every neighborhood in this massive country. In cemeteries all across Ukraine, fresh graves piled with dirt and flowers testify to their sacrifice. At least 12,000 civilians have been killed.

Amid this torment, the Ukrainian people continue to send troops to the front in the dead of winter and to mobilize to keep their businesses and their homes and their kids in school. They did not ask for Putin’s thuggish invasion.

From the very beginning, our intelligence Agencies have told us something that Putin never has understood—that the Ukrainian people will never submit to him; that if every weapon were denied them, they would fight with sticks and stones and their bare hands to protect their country from any invading tyrant but especially from Vladimir Putin of Russia.

Fortunately for Ukraine and for the rest of the free world, they have not had to fight this invasion with their bare hands. The American people have steadfastly supported them. We have sent \$66 billion in military aid and \$51 billion in nonmilitary aid. That is a lot of money, but it represents just 0.52 percent of our GDP. Unlike the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, not a single American soldier has been sent to fight.

Our European allies have stepped up as well. Together, they have actually committed more than the United States. But their sums represent a much larger percentage of their economy—which makes sense because they are closer to the danger that Russia poses. At the same time, even farther allies, like Australia and Japan, continue to support Ukraine as well.

Our allies and our partners know the stakes of this war. They know that supporting Ukraine means standing with people that are willing to fight for the country they love. They know that rolling over to Putin will embolden other dictators around the world, especially Xi Jinping of China.

The rest of us may not need this reminder, but the people sitting at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue apparently do since they seem to be the only ones in the free world who do not understand the stakes of this war.

Over the last few days, President Trump has chosen the side of tyranny of Putin, of Xi, and profoundly undermined our national security. Like someone reading Russian Twitter bots, he deliberately and falsely accused Ukraine of starting the war. He called Zelenskyy—the freedom fighter who is leading the fight in Ukraine—a dictator.

Mr. President, he invited Russia to rejoin the G7, a group of the world’s most powerful democracies that has met regularly since the 1970s and which threw out Russia after Putin invaded Ukraine in 2014.

Before negotiations have even started, President Trump’s Secretary of Defense, Pete Hegseth, took Ukraine’s potential NATO membership off the table. And just this week, the Trump administration held talks with Russia in Saudi Arabia without the decency of even inviting Ukraine to the table. It pains me to say it, but our old colleague Secretary of State Marco Rubio even suggested that the United States should lift sanctions on and bolster economic collaboration with Russia while Russia shells civilians in Ukraine.

Some of our Republican colleagues believe that it doesn’t matter what

President Trump says, only what he does; that it doesn’t matter when he says that he is going to send American troops to Gaza or seize the Panama Canal or falsely accuses Ukraine of starting this war. But a President’s words matter more than most, and President Trump’s harmful words and policies will only embolden Putin. They will further convince Putin that he is winning, that time is on his side, and that he has no reason to accept a peace deal that is anything less than overwhelmingly favorable to his maximalist desire.

In literally every one of his comments on Ukraine, President Trump has undermined our national security. Every time he opens his mouth, he weakens our bargaining position and makes the world more dangerous.

We all want this war to end. On that, the President and I agree. But for the sake of Ukraine and the sake of the free world, it must only end with a just and enduring peace.

While the United States and our allies and Ukraine work together to establish the terms of the peace and get ready to negotiate with Putin, the Ukrainians are going to have to keep fighting throughout this winter season—this freezing winter—where the civilian population is just doing everything they can to keep their houses and their businesses and their schools warm and livable. The Ukrainian soldiers are not asking to be relieved of this terrible burden. They are embracing it because they know that any cease-fire without meaningful security guarantees will allow Putin to rebuild his weakened army and attack again and again and again.

Obviously—obviously—everyone in this Chamber knows that any meaningful negotiation has to include Ukraine. Doing anything else, as the Trump administration just did in Saudi Arabia, would be an insult to the memory of every soldier who has laid down their life in this war.

I cannot claim to know Donald Trump well. It is obvious that I deeply regret his election, but I don’t blame him for winning the election. He beat my party, the Democratic Party, badly in two elections. He even found a way to get elected after he was the first President in American history to take away a fundamental civil right from the American people—a woman’s right to choose. He still got elected again. That is extraordinary, and it is a testament, I am sorry to say, to the Democratic Party’s weaknesses and to his own skills and talents, particularly in this era.

I don’t doubt that his experience as a reality TV star taught him things that helped him get elected. I am much less certain, however, that his checkered commercial real estate background prepared him to negotiate a hotel deal with Vladimir Putin, much less a deal that concerns the fate of the free world.

Donald Trump is not the only person with private sector experience in our

government. I can tell you from my experience from working in Denver, when someone is having a negotiation who has deal fever, you can see it. You can smell it when they are so desperate for a deal on any terms. The people who I negotiated with in Denver had a lot more discipline than that. We told each other that we would never agree to any deal that hadn't cratered at least three times, because that was the only way you could tell whether you were getting the best deal. If you didn't have the guts to walk away, you were never going to get the best deal that you could.

I have never seen a worse case of deal fever than Donald Trump's approach to the coming negotiation with Vladimir Putin. Never in my life have I seen it, and it has never been more important. I doubt the world has seen such an ill-conceived pursuit of negotiation since the infamous 1938 Munich Agreement in which the UK and France and Italy allowed Nazi Germany to annex part of Czechoslovakia. The damage he is doing is not only that we will get a worse deal; it is that we will undermine Ukraine's position on the frontlines. Without security guarantees from the United States and from Europe, Putin will only bide his time, regroup, and invade again.

After the fictions that President Trump has spewed about who started this war, not to mention the chorus of defeatism from his Vice President, his Secretary of Defense, and the Director of National Intelligence, does anyone—does anybody—including Putin and Xi Jinping, doubt what would happen if Putin invaded again? This is less the “Art of the Deal,” I am afraid, than it is the “art of defeat.” After all of these years, after all of these battles, it would be truly pathetic for the United States, the world's most powerful country, to accept a fever-induced deal with Russia, like the Munich Agreement.

Look it up—not, perhaps, on Twitter but in your much more reliable 10th grade Western civ textbook. After that deal, Hitler did not stop at Czechoslovakia but continued his war on Europe. Left unchecked, Putin will do the same thing, as Putin's propagandists have told us repeatedly.

To make matters worse, anyone concerned about Beijing's potential takeover of Taiwan knows that there will be no better test of how the free world will respond to Xi's potential invasion than how we respond to Putin. Come to think of it, if China does invade Taiwan, how would we evaluate the leadership capacity of an American President who claimed that it was Taiwan who had invaded China, not the other way around? That is the level of duplicity that we are seeing from Donald Trump right now.

So why the deal fever? That is a good question. President Trump's aspiration for a Nobel Peace Prize is well known. He can hang it next to his gold-plated faucets and his first editions of the

“Art of the Deal.” But if he heard from people in this Chamber, even he might think twice if he understood that walking down this path of appeasement makes him more likely to be remembered like Neville Chamberlain.

Negotiations can end this war in a just manner only if Ukraine can negotiate them from a place of strength.

The American people have been incredibly generous in our support of Ukraine, but, even so, this war has cost us less than 0.6 percent of our GDP while allowing us to send Ukraine old weapons when we invest in our own cutting-edge replacements, permitting us to learn from Ukraine's extraordinary innovation on the frontlines and its world-class use of new warfighting technologies, such as drones, and boosting our economy without costing a single American soldier's life.

We and our European allies have to continue surging military assistance to Ukraine, not forever but so Ukraine is best positioned to make this deal not just for Ukraine but for us and for free countries all over the world. Contrary to what many people believed at the outset of this war and what President Trump apparently believes today, Putin's invasion of Ukraine has been costly to him—very costly to him. Three years of the Ukrainian peoples' tenacity and courage have degraded the Russian military. As we speak, Russia is losing twice the number of soldiers every month as Putin's war continues. In total, Putin has squandered more than \$200 billion and suffered a staggering 700,000 in casualties at the hands of Ukrainian patriots. It is three times the number of soldiers Russia lost in Afghanistan—a country famously regarded as the graveyard of empires.

We didn't ask for this war, neither did Ukraine, but Putin is in a weaker position to threaten Europe today than when he first swung his iron fist at the Ukrainian people. The last thing we should do now is weaken our negotiating position when we and Europe have so much at stake—when the world has so much at stake.

Putin believes he can beat Ukraine not because he thinks Ukrainians are weak but because he thinks we are weak, and he thinks President Trump is a pushover and a sucker. At the beginning of his invasion of Ukraine, Putin, who was surrounded as tyrants are and as dictators are by yes-men who are scared to tell them the truth about their own weaknesses and, in this case, Russia's weaknesses, made three fundamental miscalculations going into the war.

One was about the strength of his own army. He had invested billions of dollars planning for the invasion, but much of it was siphoned off because of Russia's endemic corruption.

The second miscalculation was about the Ukrainian people's patriotism and willingness to fight to the death. No matter how President Trump tries to undermine this sacrifice, the honor roll

of history will forever—will forever—record Ukraine's courage.

Putin's third miscalculation was that the world would roll over and allow him to invade his peaceful neighbor. Unlike the other two mistakes, he had evidence for the final point. After all, when he began his invasion in 2014 by lawlessly sending his “little green men” to occupy Crimea, which is part of Ukraine, the world did nothing. The United States did nothing. He thought the world would do nothing when he invaded again.

It turned out, unlike Putin, we actually learned from our mistake. The free world has stood up to Putin this time around. We have supplied arms and other support while the Ukrainian people have died on the frontline of their country and for the West. Their cemeteries are bulging with fresh graves. They have earned the free world's support.

But even more important to us and our allies, we have protected our national security and affirmed our commitment to the post-World War II rules-based international order. How this ends will determine whether that order persists and whether the United States continues to provide the leadership our parents and grandparents supplied since World War II. World War II was another war started by a tyrant, but it was ended by the world's democracies.

Many Americans inside this Chamber and outside understand the stakes. They know, as Ronald Reagan proclaimed 40 years ago, in advancing freedom, Americans carry a special burden: a belief in the dignity of man and that freedom is America's core and that we should never deny it nor forsake it. This is what we risk today by withdrawing our support of Ukraine. We will abandon both the Ukrainian people and the core of what America stands for, and we cannot do it.

This is personal for me and so many of us. My mom was born a Jew in Warsaw in 1938. She and her parents and an aunt were the only ones who survived the Holocaust. The Nazis killed everyone else in her family. Authoritarian aggression left an indelible mark on my family and countless other families in Ukraine and Poland in the 1930s and 1940s, where Stalin and Hitler killed together 16 million human beings. These victims of fascism died, believing that they were invisible to the rest of the world, forgotten people in unforgettable years.

The lesson I learned from my mom is that the United States can never let that happen again by trying to appease a dictator the way that Chamberlain did. That is not apocryphal, or a made-up story. I had dinner last night with my mom. She is 86 years old. She can't believe that she has lived long enough—I am happy that she has, but she can't believe that she has lived long enough to see another tyrant's invasion of their peaceful, democratic European neighbor. But she hasn't

lived long enough to forget her generation's searing lessons. She knows the eternal truth—that the greatest enemy of fascism is man.

Even if President Trump continues to ignore reality, my mother and millions of Americans who make up the “greatest generation” understand the United States has a special responsibility.

It has always been far too easy for some in high office to ignore their moral responsibility to people sacrificing their lives a continent away on behalf of our shared values and interests. History occasionally records their names—like Chamberlain's—in blood.

It is particularly easy today to play to self-defeating isolationist tendencies in the daily headlines, to make rash comments that are foolish and unpatriotic and that Russian trolls spread like wildfire across social media platforms. It is far too easy to do the wrong thing. It always has been.

It is a lot harder, but necessary, for the living to stand for freedom and democracy and those willing to give the last measure of themselves for those eternal values. At this moment, the United States is the only country who can lead the free world against these dictators, against these tyrants.

The Americans who serve in this Chamber must fulfill our responsibility to the American people and demand the President fulfill his patriotic responsibility in the days ahead. Everything now is in our hands. The moment demands that the United States of America lead—for the sake of the Ukrainian people, for our own national security, and for democracy around the world. Our failure will not just be damaging; it will be devastating.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, we live in difficult times, in times where people throughout our country are experiencing a great deal of anxiety for a number of reasons. And in the midst of all of that, it is important that we not forget what is taking place not only in Ukraine but back home here in the United States.

And back home, right now, tens of millions of Americans are struggling economically to keep their heads above water. Mr. President, 60 percent of our people are living paycheck to paycheck, 85 million are uninsured or underinsured, and we have the highest rate of childhood poverty of almost any major nation on Earth.

And as someone who has visited senior centers throughout the State of Vermont and has spoken to seniors throughout our country, I can tell you that there is a significant level of fear and anxiety among the older people in this country with regard to what is happening right here in DC. When we have a President of the United States and Republicans who are talking about massive cuts to Medicaid, let's understand—and seniors do understand—that we are not just talking about throwing

millions of kids off the healthcare that they have at a time when we are the only major country not to provide healthcare to all people—not just kids off their healthcare, we are talking about massive cuts to community health centers, which receive over 40 percent of their funding from Medicaid and where millions of seniors go to get the primary care they need.

And at a time when we already have a major crisis in nursing home availability, let us understand that Medicaid provides funding for two out of every three seniors who live in nursing homes. In other words, massive cuts to Medicaid would be a disaster for senior citizens throughout this country.

But it is not just Medicaid cuts that worry our seniors. Today, quite unbelievably—and we don't talk about this anywhere near enough—25 percent of people in our country who are 65 years of age or older are trying to survive on incomes of \$15,000 a year or less. I myself do not know how anybody, let alone a senior with healthcare needs, can survive on \$15,000 a year, but that is what 25 percent of our seniors are trying to do.

Mr. President, this issue of so many seniors struggling to get by, struggling to heat their homes, struggling to buy the food or the prescription drugs they need, this is an issue we must address, and it is a crisis that is unacceptable in the richest country in the history of the world.

That is why I am proud to tell you that within the next several weeks, I, along with a number of cosponsors, will be introducing legislation that expands Social Security benefits and extends the solvency of Social Security for decades.

We are hearing a lot of talk about cutting Social Security. We should not be talking about cutting Social Security; we must be talking about expanding Social Security benefits. And the legislation that I will introduce would do just that. It would expand Social Security benefits by \$2,400 a year, and it would not raise taxes by one penny on the bottom 93 percent of Americans, those who make less than \$250,000 a year.

And how do we do that? By lifting the cap at applying the Social Security payroll tax on all income above \$250,000. Unbelievably, under current law, a billionaire pays the same amount of money into Social Security as someone who makes \$176,000 a year. Elon Musk, worth \$400 billion, pays the same amount into Social Security as somebody who makes \$176,000. That is because, under Social Security, there is an absurd cap on taxable income. If we lifted that cap and made sure that millionaires and billionaires paid the same percentage of their income into Social Security as the working class of this country, we could extend the life of Social Security for generations to come and lift millions of seniors out of poverty.

Further, when we talk about the needs of senior citizens in this country,

I want to mention that I will also be introducing legislation to expand Medicare to cover dental, vision, and hearing. It is unacceptable that millions of seniors are unable to read a newspaper because they cannot afford eyeglasses, can't have conversations with their grandchildren because they can't afford hearing aids, and have trouble eating because they cannot afford dentures. That should not be happening in the United States of America in the year 2025.

Expanding Medicare to cover dental, vision, and hearing is an extremely popular concept. Poll after poll shows that 80 percent of the American people—Democrats, Republicans, Independents—support doing just that.

Mr. President, when we talk about the anxieties that the American people are now experiencing, it is not just, to say the least, senior citizens. All across this country, there is a growing fear that the Trump administration is undermining the Constitution of our country, a Constitution which has kept us a free nation, an example, a model for the rest of the world for the last 250 years.

During the last month alone, President Trump has attempted to usurp the powers of Congress, illegally and unconstitutionally refusing to fund programs passed by Congress. He has illegally destroyed agencies like USAID and the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau that were created by Congress. And under the leadership of Mr. Musk, they have illegally and inappropriately gained access to tax data and Social Security data of millions of Americans, et cetera, et cetera. Every day, they are acting in an illegal and unconstitutional manner.

And I would say this—and I don't know if people take it seriously or not; I do—just this week, President Trump tweeted:

He who saves his Country does not violate any Law.

Wow. In other words, Mr. Trump sees himself, the President of the United States, as above the law and immune from the basic rules of the Constitution and the separation of powers that have governed this country since the founding.

Hey, anything I want to do—I am President—I can do it. It doesn't matter what Congress says. It doesn't matter what the Constitution says. It doesn't matter what the rule of law is about. Hey, I am the President. I am trying to save the country. I don't need to hear from anybody else.

That is not what Americans fought and died to preserve. That is not what this country is about.

And with regard to the movement toward authoritarianism, let me say a few words about an area that I think has not gotten much attention at all, and that is Trump's attack on the free press, which is protected by the First Amendment of the Constitution. The Founding Fathers of this country considered freedom of speech and free

press to be enormously important. That was the First Amendment.

Mr. Trump has sued CBS and its parent company, Paramount, for \$20 billion because he didn't like how they edited an interview with Vice President Kamala Harris. The company is now reportedly considering settling the lawsuit—and I certainly hope they do not do that—out of fear of retaliation from Trump's FCC.

He did not like a television program on CBS. Well, many of us don't like television programs on CBS or NBC or FOX or ABC, but you don't sue somebody for \$20 billion because you didn't like the program. And, obviously, the intention of that lawsuit is clear, and that is that CBS and every other network and media outlet will now have to look over their shoulder: Oh, my goodness, we are saying something critical of Donald Trump. Is he going to sue us for 5 billion, for 10 billion? Is he going to drive us out of business? Maybe we should not run that program. Maybe we should not do that investigative report.

Not just CBS. In recent times, he has sued ABC. He has sued Meta, which owns Facebook and Instagram. He has sued the Des Moines Register. What crime did a little newspaper in Iowa make? What was their crime? They ran a poll which turned out, in retrospect, to be inaccurate.

So pollsters all over America, be careful. There was a poll coming out just today—I saw it—that Trump's unfavorables are going up. Hey, you may be sued. Pull that poll.

I mean, how absurd is that? And what kind of threat is it to freedom of speech and expression in this country?

And when we talk about the Trump administration's movement toward authoritarianism, we should take note of another remarkable and troubling set of events that happened just this week, and my colleague from Colorado spoke at length on that. We saw the President of the United States openly aligning himself with the dictator of Russia—the dictator of Russia—Vladimir Putin, to undermine the independence of Ukraine and abandon our closest democratic allies in Europe.

Trump made it clear that he sees one of the world's most brutal dictators as his pal and our longtime democratic allies as his enemies. It appears that Mr. Trump wants a world that is safe for authoritarians and oligarchs but dangerous and unstable for democracies.

And when we talk about authoritarianism, we have got to mention the growing phenomenon in this country of the Big Lie. The Big Lie.

Say something that is blatantly untrue, repeat it over and over again, and then blast that lie out on social media until people actually believe it.

Let me mention one of the very big lies that Trump said recently regarding the war in Ukraine earlier this week. The President said that Ukraine started the war. Trump said that Ukraine started the war. Really? That is, as I

hope every Member of the Senate knows, an absolute lie.

Russia invaded Ukraine twice; first, in 2014 and then again on February 24, 2022. And on that date, February 24, 2022, Putin's tanks and troops rolled into Ukraine. And on that day, Russian aircraft began bombing targets all over Ukraine. Russia started the war. Period. End of discussion. Trump is lying.

Since Putin's invasion, over 1 million people have been killed or injured every single day. Russia continues to rain down hundreds of missiles and drones on Ukrainian cities. Putin's forces have massacred civilians and kidnapped thousands of Ukrainian children, bringing them back to Russian reeducation camps. These atrocities led the International Criminal Court to issue an arrest warrant for Vladimir Putin in 2023 as a war criminal.

Further, Trump called Ukrainian President Zelenskyy—not Putin, but Zelenskyy—a dictator, and that obviously is not true either. Zelenskyy won 75 percent of the vote in free elections, and in the midst of a brutal war, Ukraine's Parliament continues to function and open and unfettered political debate takes place.

Trump recently claimed that our European allies have done little to support Ukraine in its fight against Putin's invasion. He said the United States has contributed three times more than Europe. Well, that is another lie. In fact, Europe has provided more aid to Ukraine than the United States.

But it is not just that Trump is lying again. That is not new. It is what this all reveals about where we want to take our country and where we want the world to be moving—what direction.

Trump is cozying up to Vladimir Putin. So who is Putin, and what kind of world does Putin want to build? Putin is a dictator who crushed Russia's movement toward democracy after the end of the Cold War. Russia now holds sham elections where Putin wins 90 percent of the vote, and authorities there do not even try to hide their ballot stuffing.

There is no freedom of speech or free media in Putin's Russia. Protests are violently suppressed. Tens of thousands of people are imprisoned for protesting Putin's invasion of Ukraine.

Political dissidents are harassed or thrown into jail. The bravest people like Alexei Navalny are killed outright. Hundreds of thousands of Russians have fled Putin's Russia since his invasion of Ukraine.

That is the Russian leader that Donald Trump admires. But my Republican colleagues know all of this. And what is particularly disturbing to me—and I believe the American people—is my colleagues, my Republican colleagues, understand and know that Trump is lying; they know that Russia started the war, not Ukraine; they know that Putin is a dictator, not Zelenskyy, but their silence has been overwhelming on this issue.

I cannot tell you how many times I have sat here on the floor and I have listened to my Republican colleagues come to the Senate to condemn Vladimir Putin and his brutal invasion of Ukraine. Many of their remarks were right on the money. They were perceptive, and they were right.

And my simple question to my Republican colleagues right now is: Where are you now? Last I heard, this is still a democracy. Last I heard, we are still allowed to disagree with the President of the United States, even if he is a member of your own party.

Last I heard, we are allowed to call out the President when he lies—blatantly lies—even if he is a member of our own party. And what really bothers me is I know that many of my Republican colleagues understand all of this.

I just want to give you an example of what is going on right now. Let me just quote a few of my Republican colleagues in statements they have made since Putin's invasion of Ukraine.

These are Republican Members of the U.S. Senate, and I am not going to mention names right now. I don't want to embarrass anyone, put anybody on the spot. These are quotes.

One leading Republican said:

We must remember that the instigator of this war was Russia. It was President Putin who launched an unprovoked attack on Ukraine.

That Republican colleague was obviously right.

Another Republican said:

I think Vladimir Putin started the war. I also believe, through bitter experience, that Vladimir Putin is a gangster.

That is a Republican colleague.

A third Republican colleague:

There is no equivalency between Vladimir Putin and President Zelenskyy. President Putin is evil, and he has to be stopped.

Fourth Republican—and this is just a few of the quotes. I could probably come up with dozens of quotes. Fourth Republican said when the war began:

Today's invasion of Ukraine by Russia is a premeditated and flagrant act of war. Putin has violated the border of a sovereign country.

That Senator later said:

Anyone who is surprised by Putin's deadly attack on a sovereign nation has not been paying attention. These are the actions of a madman.

Just recently that very same Senator said:

Putin is not going to stop with Ukraine. If we abandon Ukraine and throw in the towel—as some would like us to do—that is going to drastically change how people view the United States, and how people rely on the United States, and there will be major consequences.

A fifth Republican—fifth Republican colleague here in the Senate called Putin a thug and compared him to Hitler. He said:

Vladimir Putin is not a legitimate leader. He is a war criminal that needs to be dealt with.

That is what my Republican colleagues have said time and time again.

The question is, Now do you have the courage to continue telling the truth when the President of the United States is lying?

This is an extraordinarily pivotal moment in American history, and all of us must have the courage to stand up for truth, to stand up for democracy, to oppose authoritarianism. This is the moment.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

S. CON. RES. 7

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, families lose, billionaires win. That is the proposition at the heart of the Republican budget resolution. Now, this plan is going to be explored tonight through a series of amendments.

As the American people watch how we vote on these amendments, it will become clearer and clearer what it is all about; families lose, billionaires win.

We will see tonight that Democrats vote against irreparable increases to the deficit, and Republicans vote to explode the deficit.

We will see tonight, Democrats vote against tax giveaways to the billionaires, and Republicans vote for tax giveaways to the billionaires.

We will see tonight, Democrats vote again and again to protect programs that support families while Republicans vote time and time again to slash those programs, those programs that families depend on to be on their feet and to thrive, to move into the middle class, to move beyond the middle class, to know with confidence that their children will have a strong foundation for growing up.

That is what we will see tonight; families lose, and billionaires win. Democrats will fight this terrible vision for America in every single way we can.

Now, our Republican colleagues earlier on the floor said: Oh, no, no. This bill is nothing except a little bit about border security and national security.

If that were true, then why isn't this a conversation in the spending committee, the Appropriations Committee? If that were true, why did our Republican colleagues repeatedly block bipartisan border and Defense bills?

Last year, the Appropriations Committee passed a strong bipartisan defense bill. Let's pass it. Last year, the Senate negotiated a bipartisan border deal, and Donald Trump, the candidate, killed it saying he wanted to exploit the issue of immigration on the campaign trail. Well, the campaign is over. There is a path now for that same bipartisan bill on the border.

All of this makes it absolutely clear that this bill is not about border and defense. This bill is all about this; families losing, billionaires winning.

This bill has a budget table that relays that they are going to slash \$1 trillion in programs for families in just the last 6 months of this fiscal year—between now and September 30—and to

do so, to fund more tax giveaways to megamillionaires and billionaires, cut the programs for families to fund tax cuts for billionaires. That is what this is about.

We saw that also last Wednesday in the Budget Committee. Democrats offered amendment after amendment to protect the programs, and what did we see to protect against the rising cost of groceries? Democrats voted for that protection; Republicans rejected it.

Make sure that we don't lose the tax credits that enable the middle class to buy health insurance on the exchange? Democrats defended those credits; Republicans voted against it.

Attack Medicaid, healthcare for the poor? Democrats voted to protect Medicaid, and Republicans voted against it.

Lower the price of prescription drugs so we don't pay more than people in other countries? Democrats voted for that protection; Republicans rejected it.

And on and on. Renting or buying a home, controlling the costs? Democrats voted to defend and lower housing costs; Republicans rejected it.

Making college more expensive? Democrats said: No way. We voted against that. Republicans rejected it so they could raise costs of college loans and childcare.

That is what this bill is about; families lose, and billionaires win. Republicans rejected every single amendment to help families stand on their feet and thrive, and families are going to pay a much higher price. In fact, this budget resolution opens the door to higher prices on groceries. That is Trumpflation. Trumpflation has arrived. This budget opens the door to making healthcare more expensive, both for low-income families and for middle-class families.

Trumpflation, this budget opens the door to making college more expensive. I was the first in my family to go to college. It was a really big deal that we found a way to be able to afford to go.

My family helped out, and I worked my way all through college. Making it more expensive, that is wrong. Trumpflation has arrived in the form of making college more expensive—all of this strategy to increase the costs for Americans.

Boy, I am not getting any calls to my office. Are you getting any calls to your office, colleagues? Saying we want to raise the cost for Americans? Didn't I hear Trump on the campaign trail saying he was all about lowering costs?

But tonight, this bill is about Trumpflation increasing the cost of goods to ordinary Americans. Yes, it is about decreasing the cost to billionaires through massive tax cuts. This bill is all about helping the billionaire team.

But those thousands of phone calls I have gotten—some days I have had over 2,000 phone calls—not one—not one single one said: We want Trumpflation. Not one single one said:

We want tax cuts for billionaires. Not one single call at 2,000 a day said: We want you to cut the programs that enable families to be on their feet in healthcare and housing and education and childcare.

Candidate Trump is a different person from President Trump. Candidate Trump said: I am running to fight for families. But now who is he fighting for? He is fighting for the megamillionaires and the billionaires. This is a great betrayal.

And this connection exists between cutting the programs for families and funding tax giveaways to those megamillionaires and billionaires, and we have seen this movie before. We saw it in the 2017 strategy during the last Trump administration. They did a tax bill and almost all the money went to the wealthiest Americans.

So this isn't some, like, fiction about President Trump. This is a clear replay of the Republican plan. They did it before, and they are doing it again.

Now, you probably heard the expression during your life: Fool me once, shame on you; fool me twice, shame on me. Well, America, you are getting fooled a second time. This is the great betrayal. Let's not let that happen.

We will fight it here, but it is going to take American citizens rising up to their feet, getting off of the couch, joining organizations, making their voice heard. That is what is going to make the difference in the course of what happens here in Congress. It is the voice of the people on the streets, as well as the battle we lead inside this Chamber, that is going to save us from Trumpflation, that is going to save us from the plan that attacks families and feathers the nests of billionaires.

This connection between cutting programs for families and increasing tax giveaways for billionaires, it is actually in the Republican bill on the House side. They made it explicit.

This House language says for every additional dollar they cut from the safety net, they can give away an additional dollar to billionaires in tax cuts.

It is in the Republican bill in the House just down the hall. That is a pretty remarkable and bold thing to lay out for all of America to read. There is an additional factor here in the Republican plan, and that is to run the Nation deeper into debt.

We have seen this play again before. Each of these bars represents an administration. The first President Bush administration, the Clinton administration, George W. Bush, his 8 years, Obama's 8 years, Trump's 4 years, Biden's 4 years, and what you see is the difference between the deficit their first year in office and their last year in office.

So what happened over the course of H.W. Bush's 4 years is the deficit went up. What you see in Clinton's 8 years is the annual deficit went down. His last deficit was not even a deficit, it was a surplus.

George W. Bush came along and said: Let's run that deficit right back up,

and he did it, 8 years; a lot more deficit in his eighth year than his first year. Obama came along and set fiscal discipline. Let's lower that deficit, and he lowered it year after year from his first year to his eighth year.

And then we come to the first Trump administration, and he just blew the top off it all. Talk about the biggest contributor, the biggest deficits, the biggest contributors to national debt, it is the first Trump administration. And along comes the Biden administration and says: We have got to lower those deficits; and in his 4 years, his fourth deficit was much lower than his first.

Now we are seeing Trump II, and this budget plan tonight, that is this bar. This is going back up. Maybe not as large to be planned as Trump I in terms of that, but absolutely going in the wrong direction.

So it is a mystery. My Republican colleagues, they campaign as fiscally conservative. They say they are going to lower the deficit, and every single time they fool us. They come in here, they cut the taxes for the richest Americans, revenues proceed to fail to compensate, and they run up the deficit.

And now they are going to do it again if we let this budget resolution pass. So let's not let it pass. Let's oppose it.

Republican colleagues, come and join us in fiscal responsibility and take this budget resolution that is laying out a vision of more and more deficits and more and more debt and put it in the woodchipper.

We have been hearing a lot about the woodchipper. Take this plan that cuts programs for families and put it in the woodchipper. Take this plan that gives tax giveaways to the richest Americans—the megamillionaires and the billionaires—and put it in the woodchipper because it is wrong for America to attack the programs for families in order to fund tax giveaways to billionaires.

President Trump has said he wants a “big, beautiful”—beautiful—“bill.” But you know what? There is nothing beautiful about the bill that is on the floor tonight. There is nothing beautiful about destroying the programs families depend on. There is nothing beautiful about using those cuts to fund tax cuts for billionaires. There is nothing beautiful about running up the deficits and debt Republican-style that they do every single time.

What we have right now is not government by and for the people. What we have right now is by and for the billionaires. President Trump made that very clear at his inaugural address. Who do we have standing right behind him? Mark Zuckerberg, the billionaire of Facebook; at this end, the scowl on his face, Elon Musk, CEO of so many companies, including Tesla. Who do we have? Jeff Bezos of Amazon, one of the richest men in the world along with Elon Musk. And we have Sundar Pichai, the CEO of Alphabet, the moth-

er company of Google. By and for billionaires, that is what that is all about.

So Democrats will not rest tonight until we vote on each of our amendments to protect working families. We will not rest tonight till we vote on each of our amendments to stop the tax giveaways to billionaires. And tonight, Democrats will be fighting by ourselves, inviting our Republican colleagues to join us.

But we will not be fighting for ourselves alone; we are fighting for the American family. This Republican budget, it is the great betrayal; and we, the Democrats, will fight to stop it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, now, in a few moments, Senators will begin voting on amendments to the Republican plan that cuts taxes for the ultrarich. Everything—everything that Donald Trump and the Republicans have done over the last month—all the chaos, all the lawlessness that we have seen—serves one crooked goal. Donald Trump, Elon Musk, and Republicans are trying to give their billionaire buddies a tax break and have you—the American people—pay the cost.

It can be summed up very simply in this wonderful chart that my friend from Oregon has put together. What the chart says, under the Republican plan: “Families lose, billionaires win.”

What could be further from what Americans want? What could be further? Tonight, Democrats are going to force Republicans to defend their tax cuts for billionaires like Elon Musk.

We are going to be here all night. We are going to put forward amendments forcing Republicans to defend their unpopular agenda, exposing the Republican plan for what it is: a massive, massive billionaire giveaway, paid for on the backs of working-class and middle-class Americans.

The Republicans know they want to hide this. They know it is not popular. They know 80 percent of the American people dislike this plan. So Donald Trump and others obfuscate. They want us to pay attention to Gulf of America, building hotels in Gaza, annexing Canada. Why?

Why are they doing these bits of foolishness? They don't want the American people to see that the Republican plan has families lose and billionaires win.

Our amendments will come in three categories: One focused on tax cuts for the billionaires, trying to undo those; one focused on the damage Republicans will inflict on American families in order to pay for their tax cuts; and one bucket—the final bucket—focused on lawlessness and corruption done in service to create chaos so they can cut taxes for billionaires.

Those are the categories: one focused on tax cuts for billionaires, one focused on damage Republicans inflict on American families to pay for those tax cuts, and one on Trump's lawlessness

and corruption done in service to create chaos, so they can cut taxes for billionaires.

Let me repeat: Tonight, Democrats will force Republicans to defend their cuts for billionaires, and tonight will just be the first time. We will be doing this over and over again.

Because we know that they don't want the American people to know that that is their North Star. Almost everything they do is aimed at getting those tax breaks for the billionaires. We are also going to force Republicans to defend their cuts on American families, cutting healthcare and Medicaid and education and housing and more. All to pay for the tax cuts of their billionaire buddies.

Finally, Democrats will force the Republicans to defend Donald Trump's scorched earth assault on the rule of law, an assault he is waging in order to put more money in the pockets of billionaires.

That is what tonight is all about, how Republicans want to help billionaires win, American families lose, and the rule of law burned to the ground.

I thank my colleagues for bringing the amendments to the floor. We are going to be here all night. We have lots of amendments that are in these three categories. It will be a long night, but it is a debate the American people need to see, deserve to see. And that is why we are here.

We Democrats are glad to have this debate. Let's have it two, three more times, when they come up with this new reconciliation and that, when the House and Senate Republicans finally get their act together. Bring it on.

I am proud to offer tonight's very first amendment, one that makes a simple proposal: Nobody, nobody, nobody making more than a billion dollars should get yet another tax break. That is it. That is the amendment. If you make a billion dollars, God bless you, you are doing fine, but you don't deserve a tax break.

I would love to hear the Republicans argue why of all people who need a tax break right now, it is the billionaire class.

In this era of high inflation and growing inequality, billionaires aren't the ones who should be getting the massive tax giveaway. They are doing just fine. Instead, we should be helping working- and middle-class Americans get better jobs, earn higher paychecks, and pay lower costs.

So, tonight, the very first question Republicans must answer is this: Do you agree—Mr./Mrs. Republican Senator, Ms. Republican Senator, all the Republican Senators—do all the Republican Senators agree that billionaires should not be getting another tax break? Yes or no? And if you don't think they should get a tax break—that billionaires should get a tax break—just vote with us in supporting this amendment.

We are going to get our answer very, very soon, and that answer, the American people are going to see over and

over and over again, over the next hours, the next days, the next weeks, the next months.

The second amendment will be offered by Senator KLOBUCHAR to prevent Republicans from lowering taxes for billionaires if the price of food keeps going up.

Donald Trump said, when he was campaigning, he was going to bring inflation down on day one, but inflation is going up.

Donald Trump—Mr. President Trump—it is going up. What about your promise—it is going to go down on day one?

Grocery prices are up: chicken, pork, steak—more expensive—eggs, up 15 percent from last month.

While Americans continue to struggle paying for groceries, feeding their kids, the last thing we should be doing is cutting taxes for the richest of the rich in this country.

And I will offer the third amendment of the evening, one that stops Republicans from kicking people off Medicaid to pay for their billionaire tax breaks.

Eighty million Americans, a little less than a quarter of all Americans—80 million—get health insurance through Medicaid, from newborn kids to working moms, to seniors in nursing homes and assisted living homes. Republicans have made it crystal clear that gutting Medicaid is one of their main strategies for paying for their massive tax cuts. Look no further than the House Republican proposal: a huge amount of the cuts to Medicaid.

What do you tell people who need healthcare who are working people who use Medicaid? What do you tell people who use community health centers, which give efficient healthcare, Mr. Musk—efficient healthcare? What do you tell a family who has a mom in a nursing home and that nursing home will get cut so mom has to come home and live with that family? Build a new room in the house? But wood prices are going up if Trump puts in his tariffs. What do you tell them?

And remember, I would remind my Republican colleagues, when you tried this in 2017—tax cuts for the rich, cutting healthcare, in that case the ACA—America didn't like it. They are not going to like it again.

My amendment will ask Republicans: Do they really want to cut taxes for billionaires so badly that they are willing to take healthcare away from kids, that they are willing to kick grandparents out of nursing homes and abandon Americans with disability and take away healthcare from rural America? We will see what they do.

Now, Republicans can spin their agenda however they want. They certainly will try to change the subject. They won't admit that their tax breaks are aimed at the wealthiest.

They can try to pass one bill. They can try to pass two bills. They can try to pass 50 bills. It doesn't matter. They can slice and dice their policies in whatever order they wish. It doesn't

matter in the end. Republican's North Star is singular, unchanging. They are trying to give their billionaire buddies a tax break and have you—the American people, American families—pay the cost.

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.

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

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

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I yield back all time.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. THUNE. And I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be the first amendments in order; that the amendments be reported by number, with no amendments in order prior to a vote in relation to the amendments: Schumer No. 454, Klobuchar No. 494, Merkley No. 473.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

AMENDMENT NO. 454

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 454 and ask that it be reported my number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] proposes an amendment numbered 454.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To prevent unwarranted tax cuts for the ultra-rich)

At the appropriate place in title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST TAX BREAKS FOR THE WEALTHY.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that cuts taxes for taxpayers with an adjusted gross income greater than \$1,000,000,000.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—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).

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I am proud to offer tonight's very first amendment. It makes a simple proposal: No billionaire should get another tax break. I ask my Republican colleagues, yes or no, do you believe billionaires should get another tax break or not? Vote yes on this amendment if you think billionaires should not get another tax break.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, the targeted budget blueprint before us today would secure the border, strengthen the military, and facilitate energy independence, and take initial steps to get our fiscal house in order.

While the Finance Committee does have a \$1 billion deficit decreasing instruction, this is not a tax bill nor a healthcare reform bill. The instruction makes that clear.

To meet this instruction, the Finance Committee will reverse a Biden administration nursing home rule that would increase taxpayer costs by billions and jeopardize patient access to the long term, especially in our already underserved rural communities.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. President, I have been advised that this amendment would be corrosive to the privilege of the budget resolution if adopted. Because the amendment contains matters that are inappropriate for a budget resolution, its adoption could jeopardize the resolution's privilege.

Additionally, this amendment violates the Congressional Budget Act because it is not germane to the budget resolution.

Since the amendment does not meet a standard required by law, I raise a point of order against the amendment under section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

MOTION TO WAIVE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act, I move to waive and ask for the yeas and nays.

VOTE ON MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

Mr. SCHUMER. 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. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) is necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 47, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 62 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Alsobrooks	Heinrich	Reed
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Bennet	Hirono	Sanders
Blumenthal	Kaine	Schatz
Blunt Rochester	Kelly	Schiff
Booker	Kim	Schumer
Cantwell	King	Shaheen
Collins	Klobuchar	Slotkin
Coons	Lujan	Smith
Cortez Masto	Markey	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warnock
Durbin	Murphy	Warren
Fetterman	Murray	Welch
Gallago	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Padilla	Wyden
Hassan	Peters	

NAYS—52

Banks	Blackburn	Britt
Barrasso	Boozman	Budd

Capito	Husted	Paul
Cassidy	Hyde-Smith	Ricketts
Cornyn	Johnson	Risch
Cotton	Justice	Rounds
Cramer	Kennedy	Schmitt
Crapo	Lankford	Scott (FL)
Cruz	Lee	Scott (SC)
Curtis	Lummis	Sheehy
Daines	Marshall	Sullivan
Ernst	McConnell	Thune
Fischer	McCormick	Tillis
Graham	Moody	Tuberville
Grassley	Moran	Wicker
Hagerty	Moreno	Young
Hawley	Mullin	
Hoeven	Murkowski	

NOT VOTING—1

Warner

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. MOODY). On this vote, the yeas are 47, the nays are 52.

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

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment falls.

The Senator from Minnesota.

AMENDMENT NO. 494

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I call up my amendment, No. 494, and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Minnesota [Ms. KLOBUCHAR] proposes an amendment numbered 494.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To stop tax cuts for the ultra-rich while families struggle to put food on the table)

At the appropriate place in title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST TAX CUTS FOR THE WEALTHY IN LIEU OF REDUCING FOOD COSTS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that cuts taxes for taxpayers with an adjusted gross income greater than \$1,000,000,000 if the most recent change in the Consumer Price Index shows an increase in food prices.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—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).

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I rise today with a commonsense amendment, and that is that no one should be cutting taxes for billionaires while food prices are rising.

Democrats and Republicans alike can agree that food prices are just too high. The price of eggs recently hit a record high of \$4.95. That is 53 percent higher than a year ago. And wholesale egg prices have increased 30 percent since the President took office to more than \$8. That means egg prices will continue to skyrocket.

And as an aside, accidentally firing frontline avian flu workers isn't going to change any of that.

Prices of other groceries like beef, fish, and fresh fruit have also increased, with the most recent consumer price index showing overall food prices rising.

Instead of focusing on \$2 trillion in tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans, we should work together to lower food prices for Americans across the country. That is why I call on my colleagues to support my amendment, which will ensure that there are no tax cuts for billionaires unless food prices are lowered for regular Americans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CRAPO. Madam President, the targeted budget blueprint before us today would secure the border, strengthen the military, facilitate energy independence, and take initial steps to get our fiscal house in order.

While the Finance Committee does have a \$1 billion deficit-decreasing instruction, this is not a tax bill nor a healthcare reform bill. The instruction makes that very clear. To meet this instruction, the Finance Committee will reverse a Biden administration nursing home rule that would increase taxpayer costs by billions and jeopardize patient access.

Madam President, I have been advised that this amendment would be corrosive to the privilege of this budget resolution if adopted. Because the amendment contains matter that is inappropriate for a budget resolution, its adoption could jeopardize the resolution's privilege.

Additionally, this amendment violates the Congressional Budget Act because it is not germane to the budget resolution. Since the amendment does not meet that standard required by law, I raise a point of order against the amendment under section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

MOTION TO WAIVE

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act, I move to waive, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

VOTE ON MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. 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.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 48, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 63 Leg.]

YEAS—48

Alsobrooks	Cortez Masto	Hirono
Baldwin	Duckworth	Kaine
Bennet	Durbin	Kelly
Blumenthal	Fetterman	Kim
Blunt Rochester	Gallagher	King
Booker	Gillibrand	Klobuchar
Cantwell	Hassan	Lujan
Collins	Heinrich	Markey
Coons	Hickenlooper	Merkley

Murphy	Sanders	Van Hollen
Murray	Schatz	Warner
Ossoff	Schiff	Warnock
Padilla	Schumer	Warren
Peters	Shaheen	Welch
Reed	Slotkin	Whitehouse
Rosen	Smith	Wyden

NAYS—52

Banks	Grassley	Mullin
Barrasso	Hagerty	Murkowski
Blackburn	Hawley	Paul
Boozman	Hoeven	Ricketts
Britt	Husted	Risch
Budd	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Capito	Johnson	Schmitt
Cassidy	Justice	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Lankford	Sheehy
Cramer	Lee	Sullivan
Crapo	Lummis	Thune
Cruz	Marshall	Tillis
Curtis	McConnell	Tuberville
Daines	McCormick	Wicker
Ernst	Moody	Young
Fischer	Moran	
Graham	Moreno	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 48, and the nays are 52.

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

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment falls.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

AMENDMENT NO. 473

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 473 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MERKLEY] proposes an amendment numbered 473.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to the impacts of hedge fund ownership of single-family homes and rent prices)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REDUCING THE IMPACTS OF HEDGE FUND OWNERSHIP OF SINGLE-FAMILY HOMES AND RENT PRICES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to lowering rent for American families, which may include reducing the single-family housing market share of large single-family housing investors or addressing the impact of these investors' activities on housing availability, housing affordability, eviction rates, home maintenance, and gentrification, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, colleagues, the dream of home ownership is dying, and this is a big deal. Your home is your castle. This is a major source of wealth for middle-class families. And a factor killing the dream of home ownership is private equity and hedge funds buying up homes all across America.

In fact, ordinary families can't compete with their all-cash, no inspection offers. They are driving up the prices to buy homes. They are driving up the rent. So today, let's take a step toward restoring the dream of homeownership. This is a deficit-neutral reserve fund that creates incentives for private-equity hedge funds to ease their way out of this market so that families can continue to be homeowners in America, their children can continue to be homeowners.

Let's not let this dream die on our watch. I encourage you to vote for this because houses should be homes for families, not a profit center for Wall Street.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Madam President, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. Here is why: They are putting the blame in the wrong place.

We all agree the housing prices have skyrocketed over the last 4 years. Unfortunately, my colleagues across the aisle aren't interested in new solutions. They are willing to place the blame anywhere except where it belongs.

The real culprit in the failed housing policies is the Biden administration. Under the previous administration, rental costs rose 20 percent. We should be discussing how to make housing more affordable for more Americans. I plan to do just that at the Banking Housing and Urban Development Committee.

I urge my colleagues to work with me. Working with President Trump and Secretary Turner, we can achieve a housing comeback for the blue-collar workers. I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 473

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on adoption of the amendment.

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.

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 64 Leg.]

YEAS—48

Alsobrooks	Heinrich	Reed
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Bennet	Hirono	Sanders
Blumenthal	Kaine	Schatz
Blunt Rochester	Kelly	Schiff
Booker	Kim	Schumer
Cantwell	King	Shaheen
Coons	Klobuchar	Slotkin
Cortez Masto	Lujan	Smith
Duckworth	Markey	Van Hollen
Durbin	Merkley	Warner
Fetterman	Murphy	Warnock
Gallago	Murray	Warren
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Welch
Hassan	Padilla	Whitehouse
Hawley	Peters	Wyden

NAYS—52

Banks	Boozman	Capito
Barrasso	Britt	Cassidy
Blackburn	Budd	Collins

Cornyn	Johnson	Ricketts
Cotton	Justice	Risch
Cramer	Kennedy	Rounds
Crapo	Lankford	Schmitt
Cruz	Lee	Scott (FL)
Curtis	Lummis	Scott (SC)
Daines	Marshall	Sheehy
Ernst	McConnell	Sullivan
Fischer	McCormick	Thune
Graham	Moody	Tillis
Grassley	Moran	Tuberville
Hagerty	Moreno	Wicker
Hoehen	Mullin	Young
Husted	Murkowski	
Hyde-Smith	Paul	

The amendment (No. 473) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be the first amendments in order; that the amendments be reported by number, with no amendments prior to a vote in relation to the amendments: Warner No. 130, Murray No. 878, Hickenlooper No. 925.

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

The Senator from Virginia.

AMENDMENT NO. 130

Mr. WARNER. I thank the majority leader for having my amendment.

I would like to call up my amendment No. 130 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER] proposes amendment numbered 130.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To create a point of order against any reconciliation bill that would not decrease the cost of housing for American families)

At the appropriate place in title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ANY RECONCILIATION BILL THAT WOULD NOT DECREASE THE COST OF HOUSING FOR AMERICAN FAMILIES.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider a reconciliation bill or a reconciliation resolution pursuant to section 310 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 644), or an amendment to, conference report on, or amendment between the Houses in relation to such a bill or resolution, that would not decrease the cost of housing for American families.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—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).

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I rise in support of this amendment, which would prohibit any reconciliation bill that does not decrease the cost of housing for American families. I don't think there is any of us in this body that doesn't hear about the enormous rising cost of housing.

Throughout the years, both under Biden and Trump, we kept saying: We

are getting to housing next; we are getting to housing next. President Trump said, on day one, that he would come in and lower the cost of housing. He has done nothing of the kind. Instead, we have 3.7 million Americans who have a shortage of housing units, and 30 percent of all renters pay more than half of their income in rental cost.

We have got to make sure we send a message to the American people that we are going to take on the rising cost of housing. One way we can do that is supporting my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. Democrats are the ones who caused the record-high inflation and soaring consumer prices with their reckless partisan spending. The cost of everything is up 20 percent, and the cost of housing went up 40 percent during Joe Biden's Presidency.

Reducing illegal immigration and cutting energy costs through reconciliation are critical components of reducing costs at the checkout aisle.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. President, this amendment, however, is not in order. If adopted it would jeopardize the privileged status of the budget resolution and could derail our efforts to use reconciliation.

Since the amendment does not meet the standard required by law, I raise a point of order against the amendment under section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

I urge—I urge—my colleagues to just vote no.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

MOTION TO WAIVE

Mr. WARNER. While I have great respect for my friend from South Carolina, and I do hope we can find some common ground on housing, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act, I move to waive and ask for the yeas and nays.

VOTE ON MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

Mr. WARNER. 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.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 47, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 65 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Alsobrooks	Durbin	Kim
Baldwin	Fetterman	King
Bennet	Gallago	Klobuchar
Blumenthal	Gillibrand	Lujan
Blunt Rochester	Hassan	Markey
Booker	Heinrich	Merkley
Cantwell	Hickenlooper	Murphy
Coons	Hirono	Murray
Cortez Masto	Kaine	Ossoff
Duckworth	Kelly	Padilla

Peters	Schumer	Warnock
Reed	Shaheen	Warren
Rosen	Slotkin	Welch
Sanders	Smith	Whitehouse
Schatz	Van Hollen	Wyden
Schiff	Warner	

NAYS—53

Banks	Graham	Moreno
Barrasso	Grassley	Mullin
Blackburn	Hagerty	Murkowski
Boozman	Hawley	Paul
Britt	Hoeven	Ricketts
Budd	Husted	Risch
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Cassidy	Johnson	Schmitt
Collins	Justice	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Lankford	Sheehy
Cramer	Lee	Sullivan
Crapo	Lummis	Thune
Cruz	Marshall	Tillis
Curtis	McConnell	Tuberville
Daines	McCormick	Wicker
Ernst	Moody	Young
Fischer	Moran	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 47, the nays are 53.

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

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained, and the amendment falls.

The Senator from Washington.

AMENDMENT NO. 878

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I call up my amendment No. 878 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Washington [Mrs. MURRAY] proposes an amendment numbered 878.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To strike the reconciliation instructions and create a reserve fund to implement a bipartisan, multi-year agreement to provide up to \$171,000,000,000 in discretionary funding for defense and up to \$171,000,000,000 in discretionary funding for other programs, accounts, and activities to address border, veterans, farmers, food and nutrition, disaster relief, and other needs)

On page 45, strike line 10 and all that follows through page 52, line 19, and insert the following:

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS

SEC. 3001. RESERVE FUND FOR BIPARTISAN AGREEMENT ON DISCRETIONARY SPENDING.

(a) SENATE.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, and, consistent with section 4004, make adjustments to address revisions to the statutory caps on discretionary spending for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports that provide up to an additional \$171,000,000,000 in discretionary budget authority for defense over the period of fiscal year 2025 to fiscal year 2028 and up to an additional \$171,000,000,000 in budget authority for other discretionary spending over the period of fiscal year 2025 to fiscal year 2028.

(b) HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in

this resolution, make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, and make adjustments to address revisions to the statutory caps on discretionary spending for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports that provide up to an additional \$171,000,000,000 in discretionary budget authority for defense over the period of fiscal year 2025 to fiscal year 2028 and up to an additional \$171,000,000,000 in budget authority for other discretionary spending over the period of fiscal year 2025 to fiscal year 2028.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, my amendment does two things.

First of all, it strikes the reconciliation instructions. Secondly, it creates a reserve fund to implement a bipartisan, multiyear agreement to provide \$171 billion in discretionary funding for both defense and nondefense.

Democrats do agree we need more resources to invest in our national security and address the challenges at the border and counter China, but we cannot leave the rest of the budget in the dust while we do that. So let's deliver investments to do both and make sure we also support our veterans, agriculture, disaster response, biomedical research, FAA, childcare, and more.

These are all big challenges. Democrats stand ready to work with our colleagues, as we have in the past, including through our bipartisan efforts on the Appropriations Committee. But that can only happen if the Republicans are willing to work with us, and working with us means actually working with us, not telling us to accept Elon Musk's cutting \$1 trillion in fiscal year 2025 to our priorities, which is assumed in this Republican plan, and, at the same time, spending \$342 billion on their own priorities. It also means not sitting on your hands—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mrs. MURRAY. —while Elon and Trump rip up our bipartisan laws. I urge my colleagues—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mrs. MURRAY. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks time in opposition?

The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Madam President, yeah, this is a big-time no. They are rewriting the budget resolution. They want to take half of the \$342 billion and spend it on things not related to what we want to do.

We want to secure the border. We want to give President Trump \$175 billion to secure the border through Homeland Security and Judiciary, and we will figure out how to spend it. We want to do \$150 billion for defense because the world is on fire. We want to do \$20 billion for the Coast Guard to help us become safer.

They are rewriting the resolution. They are taking half the money we have dedicated for border security and defense and spending it on more non-

defense stuff. We are tired of that. We are not going to do that anymore. We are going to defend America in this resolution. We are not going to take half the money and spend it on more social spending. We are going to defend our border. We are going to make the military more lethal, and we are going to help the Coast Guard, and we are going to pay for it—something you would never do. So vote no.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 878

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on the adoption of the amendment.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, 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.

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 66 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Alsobrooks	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Baldwin	Hirono	Sanders
Bennet	Kaine	Schatz
Blumenthal	Kelly	Schiff
Blunt Rochester	Kim	Schumer
Booker	King	Shaheen
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Slotkin
Coons	Lujan	Smith
Cortez Masto	Markey	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warnock
Fetterman	Murray	Warren
Gallago	Ossoff	Welch
Gillibrand	Padilla	Whitehouse
Hassan	Peters	Wyden
Heinrich	Reed	

NAYS—53

Banks	Graham	Moreno
Barrasso	Grassley	Mullin
Blackburn	Hagerty	Murkowski
Boozman	Hawley	Paul
Britt	Hoeven	Ricketts
Budd	Husted	Risch
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Cassidy	Johnson	Schmitt
Collins	Justice	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Lankford	Sheehy
Cramer	Lee	Sullivan
Crapo	Lummis	Thune
Cruz	Marshall	Tillis
Curtis	McConnell	Tuberville
Daines	McCormick	Wicker
Ernst	Moody	Young
Fischer	Moran	

The amendment (No. 878) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCORMICK). The majority whip.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be the next amendments in order; that the amendments be reported by number, with no amendments in order prior to a vote in relation to the amendments. The first is Bennet No. 540, followed by Schiff No. 316, then Sullivan No. 1029, Schumer No. 776, Ossoff No. 407, Wyden No. 308, Baldwin No. 276, and Reed No. 172.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The majority whip.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask to amend the request that it be the Wyden No. 1156.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

AMENDMENT NO. 925

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 925 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] proposes an amendment numbered 925.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To create a point of order against legislation that would raise energy costs for Americans, including higher monthly electricity bills, building material expenses, and transportation costs)

At the appropriate place in title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST RAISING ENERGY COSTS FOR AMERICANS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would raise energy costs for Americans.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—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).

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the United States is producing more energy right now than any country in the history of the world. We are in the middle of an energy revolution. We got here by embracing an “all of the above” approach to energy, including solar, wind, and geothermal, to keep prices as low as possible for working people.

Most of the energy that is ready to go today is clean and affordable. Any action that blocks the rollout of that will raise prices for working Americans. It is going to kill jobs and seek complete control of emerging industries in China.

In fact, in the last few years, we have passed bills that make historic investments in American-made energy. These bills create more than 400,000 good-paying jobs, and yet there is an effort by this administration to trash the progress we have made.

These actions will balloon energy bills for families—at least 240 bucks a year for working families everywhere—at a time when they are struggling to afford eggs at the grocery just as inflation begins to rise again.

Rather than limiting energy or firing critical government employees, let's welcome our new energy future, a future marked by resilient energy, rebuilt by American innovation for cheaper, more reliable energy for every Coloradan in America. A simple yes-or-no point of order will ensure nothing in the budget will increase energy costs

for working families. How could you vote against that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, reducing energy costs for all Americans starts with reducing rent pay to develop our energy resources. If we built more gas pipelines, if we built more powerplants, more transmission lines, it will lower costs for consumers across the country.

Now, our friends on the other side of the aisle, the Democrats, spent decades attempting to force unreliable, expensive nonbaseload sources of power—things like solar, wind, and battery storage—not using the free market, using mandates and subsidies. That is not how we do things. It doesn't actually reduce costs.

This just forces American taxpayers to subsidize those industries. If we end the clean energy mandates and cut through the redtape that is stifling the energy development, we can make energy affordable and reliable for all Americans.

But, look, since the amendment does not meet the standard required by law, I raise a point of order against the amendment under section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

MOTION TO WAIVE

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act, I move to waive and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 47, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 67 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Alsobrooks	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Baldwin	Hirono	Sanders
Bennet	Kaine	Schatz
Blumenthal	Kelly	Schiff
Blunt Rochester	Kim	Schumer
Booker	King	Shaheen
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Slotkin
Coons	Lujan	Smith
Cortez Masto	Markley	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warnock
Fetterman	Murray	Warren
Gallego	Ossoff	Welch
Gillibrand	Padilla	Whitehouse
Hassan	Peters	Wyden
Heinrich	Reed	

NAYS—53

Banks	Ernst	McConnell
Barrasso	Fischer	McCormick
Blackburn	Graham	Moody
Boozman	Grassley	Moran
Britt	Hagerty	Moreno
Budd	Hawley	Mullin
Capito	Hoeven	Murkowski
Cassidy	Husted	Paul
Collins	Hyde-Smith	Ricketts
Cornyn	Johnson	Risch
Cotton	Justice	Rounds
Cramer	Kennedy	Schmitt
Crapo	Lankford	Scott (FL)
Cruz	Lee	Scott (SC)
Curtis	Lummis	Sheehy
Daines	Marshall	

Sullivan
Thune

Tillis
Tuberville

Wicker
Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 47, and the nays are 53.

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

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment falls.

The Senator from Colorado.

AMENDMENT NO. 540

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 540 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. BENNET] proposes an amendment numbered 540.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to reinstating the fired Federal employees at the Forest Service, National Park Service, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and Bureau of Land Management)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO FEDERAL LAND MANAGEMENT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to Federal land management, which may include reinstating the fired Federal employees at the Forest Service, National Park Service, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and Bureau of Land Management, including positions responsible for, among other things, wildfire mitigation, range and timber management, habitat conservation, outdoor recreation, or other uses that generate revenue for the Federal Government, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, this amendment reinstates the thousands of fired National Park Service, Forest Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, and Bureau of Land Management employees.

Our public lands are the crown jewel of America. With drought, wildfire, and record visitation, our public lands are facing more pressures than ever before. Now is not the time to fire dedicated public servants who perform wildfire mitigation, manage visitors, clear trails, permit grazing and mining and oil and gas operations.

Fewer boots on the ground means more wildfire risk and less access to our public lands and puts enormous burden on communities across the country, from Alaska to North Carolina, to Maine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, article II of the U.S. Constitution declares the

President of the United States to be the person who holds the executive power. He has the discretion to hire and fire those who work in executive branch Agencies.

Now, for decades, staffing for the Federal land and wildlife management and outdoor recreation Agencies has been a bipartisan issue. This amendment does not do that. Instead, it attempts to turn Federal land management Agency employment into a political football.

As chairman of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to address issues affecting Federal land management and Federal land management employees, including finding innovative solutions for their housing, working to ensure the concessionaires have flexibility and are not held up in endless paperwork, and giving land managers flexibility to work with their counties and gateway communities to hire qualified employees and work with gateway community businesses.

This is not that amendment. This goes the wrong way, and I oppose it.

Mr. BENNET. Do I have any time left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Six seconds remaining.

Mr. BENNET. I urge my opponents to vote for this amendment.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

I yield back my second.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 540

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on the adoption of the amendment.

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.

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 68 Leg.]

YEAS—48

Alsobrooks	Hickenlooper	Reed
Baldwin	Hirono	Rosen
Bennet	Kaine	Sanders
Blumenthal	Kelly	Schatz
Blunt Rochester	Kim	Schiff
Booker	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Coons	Luján	Slotkin
Cortez Masto	Markey	Smith
Duckworth	Merkley	Van Hollen
Durbin	Murkowski	Warner
Fetterman	Murphy	Warnock
Gállego	Murray	Warren
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Welch
Hassan	Padilla	Whitehouse
Heinrich	Peters	Wyden

NAYS—52

Banks	Cruz	Justice
Barrasso	Curtis	Kennedy
Blackburn	Daines	Lankford
Boozman	Ernst	Lee
Britt	Fischer	Lummis
Budd	Graham	Marshall
Capito	Grassley	McConnell
Cassidy	Hagerty	McCormick
Collins	Hawley	Moody
Cornyn	Hoeven	Moran
Cotton	Husted	Moreno
Cramer	Hyde-Smith	Mullin
Crapo	Johnson	Paul

Ricketts	Scott (SC)	Tuberville
Risch	Sheehy	Wicker
Rounds	Sullivan	Young
Schmitt	Thune	
Scott (FL)	Tillis	

The amendment (No. 540) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). The Senator from California.

AMENDMENT NO. 316

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 316 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California [Mr. SCHIFF] proposes an amendment numbered 316.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to supporting Federal wildland firefighters and associated personnel)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORTING FEDERAL WILDLAND FIREFIGHTERS AND ASSOCIATED PERSONNEL.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to supporting Federal wildland firefighters or other Federal personnel necessary for hazardous fuels management and community wildfire resilience, which may include provisions to recruit and retain such personnel, paying such personnel a fair wage and providing industry-standard leave policies following wildfire deployments, supporting the health and wellbeing of such personnel, exempting such personnel from hiring freezes, or reinstating the employment of such personnel the positions of whom were terminated during calendar year 2025, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. President, I stand here on behalf of Western States colleagues—Senators PADILLA, HEINRICH, LUJÁN, BENNET, and HICKENLOOPER—to ask this Chamber to take a clear stand on behalf of the firefighters who help fight and prevent wildfires.

Wildfires don't discriminate. They hit red States and blue States. Even as deadly devastating wildfires were burning in L.A. County, President Trump adopted a freeze on hiring so widespread that it is blocking the Forest Service from onboarding the seasonal firefighters we require to prevent future fires.

Not only that, President Trump has also empowered an unelected billionaire to run rampant through the ranks of our public servants, not with a scalpel but with a hatchet. As a result, firefighters who had just finished week-ends of around-the-clock shifts fighting these dangerous fires were given a thank-you note from their Commander in Chief that said: Please quit.

Please quit—this was the reward our firefighters got.

Our amendment would make it very clear that we are committed to reversing these cuts to the ranks of wildland firefighters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from Montana.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Reserve funds can accomplish nothing beyond political messaging, are unnecessary, and, frankly, distract or delay the budgeting process.

This amendment would, in no way, impact the great firefighters who fight our Nation's fires out West. These firefighters deserve recognition. They deserve fair pay. In fact, we have the bill that does that, the Wildland Firefighter Paycheck Protection Act. It is bipartisan. It permanently addresses securing increases in their wages. If we want to support our wildland firefighters, let's pass this bill and get it on President Trump's desk.

Republicans are committed to protecting our environment and our public lands without suffocating the U.S. economy. I urge my colleagues to do the same and oppose this amendment.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 316

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on adoption of the amendment.

Mr. SCHIFF. 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 bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 69 Leg.]

YEAS—48

Alsobrooks	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Baldwin	Hirono	Sanders
Bennet	Kaine	Schatz
Blumenthal	Kelly	Schiff
Blunt Rochester	Kim	Schumer
Booker	King	Shaheen
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Slotkin
Coons	Luján	Smith
Cortez Masto	Markey	Sullivan
Duckworth	Merkley	Van Hollen
Durbin	Murphy	Warner
Fetterman	Murray	Warnock
Gállego	Ossoff	Warren
Gillibrand	Padilla	Welch
Hassan	Peters	Whitehouse
Heinrich	Reed	Wyden

NAYS—52

Banks	Graham	Moreno
Barrasso	Grassley	Mullin
Blackburn	Hagerty	Murkowski
Boozman	Hawley	Paul
Britt	Hoeven	Ricketts
Budd	Husted	Risch
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Cassidy	Johnson	Schmitt
Collins	Justice	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Lankford	Sheehy
Cramer	Lee	Thune
Crapo	Lummis	Tillis
Cruz	Marshall	Tuberville
Curtis	McConnell	Wicker
Daines	McCormick	Young
Ernst	Moody	
Fischer	Moran	

The amendment (No. 316) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

AMENDMENT NO. 1029

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 1029 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. SULLIVAN] proposes an amendment numbered 1029.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to protecting Medicare and Medicaid)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROTECTING MEDICARE AND MEDICAID.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to protecting the Medicaid program under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.), which may include strengthening and improving Medicaid for the most vulnerable populations, and extending the life of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, it is going to be a late night with a lot of votes. I want to take this opportunity to demonstrate our strong Republican support for Medicaid and Medicare right now.

My amendment is very simple. It says we are going to strengthen and improve Medicaid for the most vulnerable populations and strengthen Medicare so that it is available for years to come.

Now, I know my Democratic colleagues are going to try tonight to use scare tactics to message that Republicans don't support these vital programs, but we do. These are critical programs that Republicans support. Heck, President Trump has repeatedly said that these programs are not going to be touched. People rely on Medicare and Medicaid. Alaskans rely on Medicare and Medicaid, and we are here to strongly support them. We should all agree that we want to weed out waste, fraud, and abuse in our healthcare system, including in Medicare and Medicaid, and we must maintain our safety net programs. We can do both and make them stronger.

So I hope every single Member of the Senate tonight votes to support my simple amendment, which would strengthen both Medicaid and Medicare for the most vulnerable Americans. I ask for everybody's vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I rise in opposition. This amendment claims to protect Medicare and Medicaid, but it does neither.

In particular, the Medicaid language seeks to talk about a group called the

most vulnerable. Obviously, we care about them, but the language of the Sullivan amendment would leave millions behind, and we don't want to go there. The language in this amendment is code for kicking Americans with Medicaid coverage off their health insurance if they are not sick enough, not poor enough, or not disabled enough. This amendment does nothing to stop Republicans from cutting these essential healthcare programs, kicking millions of Americans off their coverage, all to pay for the tax cuts of billionaires.

I urge opposition.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, read the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. SULLIVAN. We support Medicare and Medicaid. It is that simple.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1029

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, 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.

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 70 Leg.]
YEAS—51

Banks	Graham	Moreno
Barrasso	Grassley	Mullin
Blackburn	Hagerty	Murkowski
Boozman	Hawley	Paul
Britt	Hoeven	Ricketts
Budd	Husted	Risch
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Cassidy	Johnson	Schmitt
Collins	Justice	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Lankford	Sheehy
Cramer	Lummis	Sullivan
Crapo	Marshall	Thune
Cruz	McConnell	Tillis
Daines	McCormick	Tuberville
Ernst	Moody	Wicker
Fischer	Moran	Young

NAYS—49

Alsobrooks	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Baldwin	Hirono	Sanders
Bennet	Kaine	Schatz
Blumenthal	Kelly	Schiff
Blunt Rochester	Kim	Schumer
Booker	King	Shaheen
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Slotkin
Coons	Lee	Smith
Cortez Masto	Lujan	Van Hollen
Curtis	Markley	Warner
Duckworth	Merkley	Warnock
Durbin	Murphy	Warren
Fetterman	Murray	Welch
Gallego	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Padilla	Wyden
Hassan	Peters	
Heinrich	Reed	

The amendment (No. 1029) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 776

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 776 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] proposes an amendment numbered 776.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To prevent tax cuts for the wealthy if a single dollar of Medicaid funding is cut)

At the appropriate place in title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST MEDICAID CUTS TO FUND TAX BREAKS FOR THE WEALTHY.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that—

(1) cuts taxes for taxpayers with adjusted gross income above \$1,000,000,000; and

(2) reduces coverage for people in Medicaid, shifts coverage or funding responsibility to states, or includes a net reduction in Federal funding for Medicaid.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—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).

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, this amendment is very simple. It allows no billionaires to have any tax cuts if a single dollar of Medicaid funding is cut. The American people need to know where Senate Republicans stand on Medicaid.

On Tuesday, Donald Trump claimed he is opposed to Medicaid cuts. Then, Wednesday, he supported it. And, today, he doubles down and even opened the door to Medicare. He is flip-flopping left and right. So the American people deserve to know: What about Senate Republicans? Where do they stand?

Cutting Medicaid to pay for billionaire tax cuts would be a gut punch to working people. Medicaid serves nearly 80 million people across the country in States red and blue, from our sickest kids to our infirm in nursing homes and vulnerable seniors.

These are the people we should focus on—kids, seniors, and rural Americans—not billionaires. They are doing well enough already.

My amendment will ask Republicans: Do they really want to cut taxes for billionaires so badly they are willing to take healthcare away from kids and kick grandparents out of nursing homes? How are you going to vote, colleagues?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, the Democrats know very well that this targeted budget blueprint does not cut Medicaid or Medicare. The blueprint before us focuses on securing the border, strengthening the military, facilitating energy independence, and taking the initial steps to get our fiscal house in order.

To meet this instruction, the Finance Committee will do one thing and one thing only, and that is reverse a Biden administration nursing home rule that would increase taxpayer costs

by billions and jeopardize patient access to long-term care, especially in already underserved rural communities.

Mr. President, I have been advised that this amendment would be corrosive to the privilege of this budget resolution if adopted. Because the amendment contains matter that is inappropriate for the budget resolution, its adoption could jeopardize the resolution's privilege.

Additionally, this amendment violates the Congressional Budget Act because it is not germane to the budget resolution. Since the amendment does not meet that standard required by law, I raised a point of order against the amendment under section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

MOTION TO WAIVE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act, I move to waive and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 49, nays 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 71 Leg.]

YEAS—49

Alsobrooks	Heinrich	Rosen
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Sanders
Bennet	Hirono	Schatz
Blumenthal	Kaine	Schiff
Blunt Rochester	Kelly	Schumer
Booker	Kim	Shaheen
Cantwell	King	Slotkin
Collins	Klobuchar	Smith
Coons	Lujan	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Markey	Warner
Duckworth	Merkley	Warnock
Durbin	Murphy	Warren
Fetterman	Murray	Welch
Gallego	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Padilla	Wyden
Hassan	Peters	
Hawley	Reed	

NAYS—51

Banks	Graham	Moreno
Barrasso	Grassley	Mullin
Blackburn	Hagerty	Murkowski
Boozman	Hoeven	Paul
Britt	Husted	Ricketts
Budd	Hyde-Smith	Risch
Capito	Johnson	Rounds
Cassidy	Justice	Schmitt
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Cramer	Lee	Sheehy
Crapo	Lummis	Sullivan
Cruz	Marshall	Thune
Curtis	McConnell	Tillis
Daines	McCormick	Tuberville
Ernst	Moody	Wicker
Fischer	Moran	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARSHALL). On this vote, the yeas are 49, the nays are 51.

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

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment falls.

The Senator from Georgia.

AMENDMENT NO. 407

Mr. OSSOFF. Mr. President, the momentum that is growing in Washington to gut the Medicaid program is alarm-

ing my constituents in Georgia, and I call up my amendment No. 407 and ask it to be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows: The Senator from Georgia [Mr. OSSOFF] proposes an amendment numbered 407.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to protecting access to maternal and pediatric health care through Medicaid)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROTECTING ACCESS TO MATERNAL AND PEDIATRIC HEALTH CARE THROUGH MEDICAID.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to access to health care, which may include legislation protecting access to maternal and pediatric health care through Medicaid by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

Mr. OSSOFF. The sheer number of people affected: In Georgia 5 out of 7 seniors in nursing homes are covered by Medicaid; nearly 50 percent of all births are covered by Medicaid; two out of five children in Georgia are covered by Medicaid. I was disappointed to see just moments ago the majority adopt an amendment to lay the foundation for deep cuts to Medicaid.

I hope we can build bipartisan support for my amendment to ensure that maternal and children's healthcare through Medicaid is protected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, once again the targeted budget blueprint before us today is not about cutting Medicare or Medicaid. It doesn't deal with securing the border, strengthening the military, facilitating the energy independence of our country and taking the initial steps to put our fiscal house in order.

While the Finance Committee does have a \$1 million deficit decreasing instruction, this is not a tax bill nor a healthcare reform bill, and the claims that we have heard continuously tonight, to me, seem just to be the politics of fear in the face of trying to deal with our Nation's critical issues.

To meet this instruction, the Finance Committee will reverse a Biden administration nursing home rule that would increase taxpayer cost by billions, jeopardize patient access to long-term care, especially in our already underserved rural communities.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment today, as it is not relevant to the Finance Committee's instruction.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 407

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. OSSOFF. Mr. President, the vote is whether to protect maternal and pediatric healthcare through Medicaid.

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.

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 72 Leg.]

YEAS—49

Alsobrooks	Heinrich	Rosen
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Sanders
Bennet	Hirono	Schatz
Blumenthal	Kaine	Schiff
Blunt Rochester	Kelly	Schumer
Booker	Kim	Shaheen
Cantwell	King	Slotkin
Collins	Klobuchar	Smith
Coons	Lujan	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Markey	Warner
Duckworth	Merkley	Warnock
Durbin	Murphy	Warren
Fetterman	Murray	Welch
Gallego	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Padilla	Wyden
Hassan	Peters	
Hawley	Reed	

NAYS—51

Banks	Graham	Moreno
Barrasso	Grassley	Mullin
Blackburn	Hagerty	Murkowski
Boozman	Hoeven	Paul
Britt	Husted	Ricketts
Budd	Hyde-Smith	Risch
Capito	Johnson	Rounds
Cassidy	Justice	Schmitt
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Cramer	Lee	Sheehy
Crapo	Lummis	Sullivan
Cruz	Marshall	Thune
Curtis	McConnell	Tillis
Daines	McCormick	Tuberville
Ernst	Moody	Wicker
Fischer	Moran	Young

The amendment (No. 407) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from the great State of Oregon.

AMENDMENT NO. 1156

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 1156 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN] proposes an amendment numbered 1156.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, this amendment is simple, it is direct, and, I believe, the only legislation tonight that is comprehensive on healthcare, that protects Medicaid and Medicare and the Affordable Care Act. It does that by taking cuts to these vital programs off the table in the Senate.

So what that means is, if you pass this amendment and the House sends us a budget resolution with severe cuts to healthcare, the Senate will have gone on record as being against the cuts.

Let's not jeopardize the health of millions of Americans. Support the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, once again, I think I have said this 10 times tonight. I will say it again. The budget blueprint we are working on does not deal with Medicare and Medicaid. It is to secure the border, strengthen the military, and facilitate our energy independence.

The instruction given to the Finance Committee deals solely with reversing a Biden administration nursing home rule that would increase taxpayer costs by billions and jeopardize patient access to long-term care, especially in our rural communities.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. President, I have also been advised that this amendment, too, would be corrosive to the privilege of the budget resolution if adopted. Because the amendment contains matter that is inappropriate for a budget resolution, its adoption could jeopardize the resolution's privilege.

Additionally, this amendment violates the Congressional Budget Act because it is not germane to the budget resolution. Since the amendment does not meet that standard required by law, I raise a point of order against the amendment under section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

Mr. WYDEN. How much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 24 seconds remaining.

Mr. WYDEN. I will use my 24 seconds to say the reality is the House is looking at a budget in the Energy and Commerce Committee with the prospect of significant cuts in healthcare. That is why I want us to go on record. If they send us something that cuts healthcare severely, we will be on record as protecting healthcare.

MOTION TO WAIVE

Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act, I move to waive and 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 executive clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 47, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 73 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Alsobrooks	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Baldwin	Hirono	Sanders
Bennet	Kaine	Schatz
Blumenthal	Kelly	Schiff
Blunt Rochester	Kim	Schumer
Booker	King	Shaheen
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Slotkin
Coons	Lujan	Smith
Cortez Masto	Markey	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warnock
Fetterman	Murray	Warren
Gallo	Ossoff	Welch
Gillibrand	Padilla	Whitehouse
Hassan	Peters	Wyden
Heinrich	Reed	

NAYS—53

Banks	Graham	Moreno
Barrasso	Grassley	Mullin
Blackburn	Hagerty	Murkowski
Boozman	Hawley	Paul
Britt	Hoeben	Ricketts
Budd	Husted	Risch
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Cassidy	Johnson	Schmitt
Collins	Justice	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Lankford	Sheehy
Cramer	Lee	Sullivan
Crapo	Lummis	Thune
Cruz	Marshall	Tillis
Curtis	McConnell	Tuberville
Daines	McCormick	Wicker
Ernst	Moody	Young
Fischer	Moran	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 47, the nays are 53.

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

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained, and the amendment falls.

The Senator from Wisconsin.

AMENDMENT NO. 276

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 276, to protect seniors relying on Medicaid, and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wisconsin [Ms. BALDWIN] proposes an amendment numbered 276.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To create a point of order against legislation that would take away health care from seniors, including those receiving care in nursing homes, through cuts to the Medicaid program)

At the appropriate place in title IV, add the following:

SEC. ____ . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD TAKE AWAY HEALTH CARE FROM SENIORS, INCLUDING THOSE RECEIVING CARE IN NURSING HOMES, THROUGH CUTS TO THE MEDICAID PROGRAM.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would make changes to the Medicaid program under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.) unless the Director of the Congressional Budget Office certifies that such changes would not result in lower coverage rates, reduced benefits, or decreased affordability for seniors, including seniors who are residents of nursing facilities or who receive services in their own homes.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—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).

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, Medicaid is a lifeline for 8 million seniors who rely on the program to access healthcare. Medicaid helps almost two-thirds of all nursing home residents have a safe roof over their heads.

Republicans would like us to believe that their proposed cuts are tackling

waste, fraud, and abuse. But make no mistake, stripping away healthcare and nursing home funding for our parents and grandparents is not reform nor is it eliminating waste. Rather, it is a deliberate choice to give tax breaks for their billionaire friends instead of ensuring that seniors across the country have access to the long-term care and support they need. It is a deliberate choice to prioritize tax cuts for billionaires over ensuring that nursing homes can keep their doors open. It is a deliberate choice to take away healthcare from millions of seniors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I will just say what I said before: This amendment violates the Congressional Budget Act because it is not germane to the budget resolution. Since the amendment does not meet that standard, I raise a point of order against the amendment under section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

MOTION TO WAIVE

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act, I move to waive, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. 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.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 48, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 74 Leg.]

YEAS—48

Alsobrooks	Heinrich	Reed
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Bennet	Hirono	Sanders
Blumenthal	Kaine	Schatz
Blunt Rochester	Kelly	Schiff
Booker	Kim	Schumer
Cantwell	King	Shaheen
Collins	Klobuchar	Slotkin
Coons	Lujan	Smith
Cortez Masto	Markey	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warnock
Fetterman	Murray	Warren
Gallo	Ossoff	Welch
Gillibrand	Padilla	Whitehouse
Hassan	Peters	Wyden

NAYS—52

Banks	Grassley	Mullin
Barrasso	Hagerty	Murkowski
Blackburn	Hawley	Paul
Boozman	Hoeben	Ricketts
Britt	Husted	Risch
Budd	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Capito	Johnson	Schmitt
Cassidy	Justice	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Lankford	Sheehy
Cramer	Lee	Sullivan
Crapo	Lummis	Thune
Cruz	Marshall	Tillis
Curtis	McConnell	Tuberville
Daines	McCormick	Wicker
Ernst	Moody	Young
Fischer	Moran	
Graham	Moreno	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BANKS). On this vote, the yeas are 48, the nays are 52.

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

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment falls.

The majority leader.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be the next amendments in order; that the amendments be reported by number, with no amendments in order prior to a vote in relation to the amendments: Reed-Shaheen No. 299, Paul No. 999, Slotkin No. 664, Van Hollen No. 233, and Shaheen No. 436.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Rhode Island.

AMENDMENT NO. 172

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to call up amendment No. 172, which is cosponsored by my colleagues Senators LUJÁN and ALSOBROOKS, and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. REED] proposes an amendment numbered 172.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To create a point of order against legislation that would reduce Medicare and Medicaid benefits for Americans)

At the appropriate place in title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD REDUCE MEDICARE AND MEDICAID BENEFITS FOR AMERICANS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would reduce Medicare or Medicaid benefits for working-class and middle-income Americans.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—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).

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the other day, President Donald Trump said:

Medicare, Medicaid—none of that stuff is going to be touched.

If that statement had any truth behind it, then my colleagues on the other side of the aisle should be voting for this amendment, which calls for a point of order against any legislation that cuts Medicaid or Medicare.

Medicare serves 67 million seniors and people with disabilities, and nearly 80 million Americans rely on Medicaid. Failing to pass this amendment will be a signal that these programs are on the chopping block.

This vote will be a test for all of us, particularly my Republican colleagues.

Are we going to protect Medicare and Medicaid or are they, my Republican colleagues, going to use this as a piggy bank for tax cuts for the wealthy?

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I repeat what I have said before. Because this amendment violates the Congressional Budget Act, it is not germane to the budget resolution. Since the amendment does not meet that standard required by law, I raise a point of order against the amendment under section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

MOTION TO WAIVE

Mr. REED. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act, I move to waive, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant executive clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 49, nays 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 75 Leg.]

YEAS—49

Alsobrooks	Heinrich	Rosen
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Sanders
Bennet	Hirono	Schatz
Blumenthal	Kaine	Schiff
Blunt Rochester	Kelly	Schumer
Booker	Kim	Shaheen
Cantwell	King	Slotkin
Collins	Klobuchar	Smith
Coons	Lujan	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Markley	Warner
Duckworth	Merkley	Warnock
Durbin	Murphy	Warren
Fetterman	Murray	Welch
Gallego	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Padilla	Wyden
Hassan	Peters	
Hayley	Reed	

NAYS—51

Banks	Graham	Moreno
Barrasso	Grassley	Mullin
Blackburn	Hagerty	Murkowski
Boozman	Hoeven	Paul
Britt	Husted	Ricketts
Budd	Hyde-Smith	Risch
Capito	Johnson	Rounds
Cassidy	Justice	Schmitt
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Cramer	Lee	Sheehy
Crapo	Lummis	Sullivan
Cruz	Marshall	Thune
Curtis	McConnell	Tillis
Daines	McCormick	Tuberville
Ernst	Moody	Wicker
Fischer	Moran	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 49, the nays are 51.

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

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment falls.

The Senator from Rhode Island.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR

Mr. REED. Mr. President, before I call up my amendment, I ask that Sen-

ator COONS be added as a cosponsor of the Reed-Shaheen amendment No. 299.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 299

Mr. REED. I call up my amendment No. 299 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant executive clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. REED] proposes an amendment numbered 299.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To ensure continued United States support for the Government of Ukraine to stand firm against aggression by the Government of Russia in Europe)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORTING UKRAINE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to strengthening support for the Government of Ukraine, which may include legislation that authorizes and funds assistance, expands training and intelligence-sharing, accelerates defense production and deliveries, ensures that negotiations about the future of Ukraine include representatives of the Government of Ukraine, or otherwise supports Ukraine's defense against Russia's illegal war, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, this amendment ensures continuous support for the government of Ukraine to stand firm against Russian aggression.

For 3 years, Ukraine has fought tooth and nail for its very survival.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. The Senate is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. REED. Heroically withstanding barbaric attacks and unspeakable violence by Russia.

The Ukrainians have achieved hard-won victories and have refused to bend to Putin's demands, but they require continued U.S. support to sustain their progress.

In those same 3 years, in this body, we have heard extensive criticism of the Biden administration's Ukraine policy. They were not going fast enough. They were not allowing Ukraine to be aggressive enough. The strategy is not enabling Ukraine to win on the battlefield. And yet, now, when the Trump administration is cutting deals with Putin and walking away from Ukraine, we do not hear much at all—a deafening silence. What has happened?

Well, regardless of what has happened, we cannot abandon Ukraine. We

cannot rush into a negotiation with a brutal dictator who we know will not stop at Ukraine. He will next turn his sights on NATO allies—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time is expired.

Mr. REED. We must support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to this amendment and urge my colleagues to oppose it. There is no greater supporter of Ukraine in this Senate than I am, but this is not the right vehicle.

This is a budget to add for national security investment, missile defense, shipbuilding, munition, cybersecurity, taking care of our troops, and protecting our borders.

There is a place to talk about Ukraine. It is not this budget. But passage of this amendment, though Members might wish to, will make it harder to pass this very valuable budget, and that is what this is about. That is why even I, a huge supporter of what we are doing in Ukraine, have to vote no on this, so we can pass a good budget.

I urge a "no" vote.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 299

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. REED. 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.

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 76 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Alsobrooks	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Baldwin	Hirono	Sanders
Bennet	Kaine	Schatz
Blumenthal	Kelly	Schiff
Blunt Rochester	Kim	Schumer
Booker	King	Shaheen
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Slotkin
Coons	Lujan	Smith
Cortez Masto	Markey	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warnock
Fetterman	Murray	Warren
Gallago	Ossoff	Welch
Gillibrand	Padilla	Whitehouse
Hassan	Peters	Wyden
Heinrich	Reed	

NAYS—53

Banks	Graham	Moreno
Barrasso	Grassley	Mullin
Blackburn	Hagerty	Murkowski
Boozman	Hawley	Paul
Britt	Hoeven	Ricketts
Budd	Husted	Risch
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Cassidy	Johnson	Schmitt
Collins	Justice	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Lankford	Sheehy
Cramer	Lee	Sullivan
Crapo	Lummis	Thune
Cruz	Marshall	Tillis
Curtis	McConnell	Tuberville
Daines	McCormick	Wicker
Ernst	Moody	Young
Fischer	Moran	

The amendment (No. 299) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

AMENDMENT NO. 999

Mr. PAUL. I call up my amendment No. 999 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant executive clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. PAUL] proposes an amendment numbered 999.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require an adequate amount of deficit reduction as part of reconciliation)

On page 45, strike line 10 and all that follows through page 49, line 23, and insert the following:

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

SEC. 2001. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit by not less than \$230,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

(b) COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES.—The Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that increase the deficit by not more than \$150,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

(c) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND WORKFORCE.—The Committee on Education and Workforce of the House of Representatives shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit by not less than \$330,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

(d) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—The Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit by not less than \$880,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

(e) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—The Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit by not less than \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

(f) COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY.—The Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that increase the deficit by not more than \$175,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

(g) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that increase the deficit by not more than \$175,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

(h) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit by not less than \$10,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

(i) COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES.—The Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit by not less than \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

(j) SUBMISSIONS.—In the House of Representatives, not later than March 7, 2025, the committees named in the subsections of this section shall submit their recommenda-

tions to the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives to carry out this section.

SEC. 2002. RECONCILIATION IN THE SENATE.

(a) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY.—The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit by not less than \$230,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

(b) COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES.—The Committee on Armed Services of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that increase the deficit by not more than \$150,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

(c) COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS.—The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit by not less than \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

(d) COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION.—The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit by not less than \$120,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

(e) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES.—The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit by not less than \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

(f) COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS.—The Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that increase the deficit by not more than \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

(g) COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.—The Committee on Finance of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit by not less than \$760,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

(h) COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS.—The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit by not less than \$330,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

(i) COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS.—The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that increase the deficit by not more than \$175,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

(j) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that increase the deficit by not more than \$175,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

(k) SUBMISSIONS.—In the Senate, not later than March 7, 2025, the committees named in the subsections of this section shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the Senate. Upon receiving all such recommendations, the Committee on the Budget of the Senate shall report to the Senate a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, the budget bill before us instructs the Senate to find \$342 billion in new spending. The budget bill, as written, is a spending bill. My amendment would add language to cut spending. The cuts would

total \$1.5 trillion. These cuts mirror the cuts from the House budget resolution that has been passed.

This year, the deficit will exceed \$2 trillion. It is a fiscal imperative that Congress begin to cut spending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, all evening we have been pointing out that, with this bill, families lose and billionaires win. That is certainly put onto steroids with this amendment because this amendment would add a quarter trillion dollars directed at the SNAP program. It would add a third of a trillion dollars directed at reducing the viability of student loans, and almost three-quarters of a trillion dollars to devastate Medicaid—programs that families depend on to be able to thrive, to live in the middle class, to pursue opportunity.

I encourage everyone, if you don't want to have a bill in which families lose, vote no.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 999

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on the adoption of the amendment.

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 senior assistant executive clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 76, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 77 Leg.]

YEAS—24

Barrasso	Husted	Moreno
Britt	Johnson	Paul
Cassidy	Justice	Risch
Cruz	Kennedy	Schmitt
Curtis	Lee	Scott (FL)
Daines	Lummis	Sheehy
Ernst	McCormick	Tuberville
Hagerty	Moody	Young

NAYS—76

Alsobrooks	Grassley	Peters
Baldwin	Hassan	Reed
Banks	Hawley	Ricketts
Bennet	Heinrich	Rosen
Blackburn	Hickenlooper	Rounds
Blumenthal	Hirono	Sanders
Blunt Rochester	Hoeven	Schatz
Booker	Hyde-Smith	Schiff
Boozman	Kaine	Schumer
Budd	Kelly	Scott (SC)
Cantwell	Kim	Shaheen
Capito	King	Slotkin
Collins	Klobuchar	Smith
Coons	Lankford	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lujan	Thune
Cortez Masto	Markey	Tillis
Cotton	Marshall	Van Hollen
Cramer	McConnell	Warner
Crapo	Merkley	Warnock
Duckworth	Moran	Warren
Durbin	Mullin	Welch
Fetterman	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Fischer	Murphy	Wicker
Galleo	Murray	Wyden
Gillibrand	Ossoff	
Graham	Padilla	

The amendment (No. 999) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BRITT). The Senator from Michigan.

AMENDMENT NO. 664

Ms. SLOTKIN. Madam President, I am not enjoying my first vote-arama,

but I do call up my amendment No. 664 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant executive clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Michigan [Ms. SLOTKIN] proposes an amendment numbered 664.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to preventing reductions in funding and staffing necessary to respond to, control, and prevent avian flu)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PREVENTING REDUCTIONS IN FUNDING AND STAFFING NECESSARY TO RESPOND TO, CONTROL, AND PREVENT THE HIGHLY PATHOGENIC AVIAN INFLUENZA.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to preventing the spread of animal diseases, which may include prohibiting reductions to funding and staff (including veterinarians) that monitor, respond to, control, mitigate, and prevent the spread of highly pathogenic avian influenza, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

Ms. SLOTKIN. Madam President, my amendment is simple. It prohibits cuts to the funding and staffing necessary to respond to and control avian flu. This should be an easy no-brainer. Avian flu is jumping between species. We are culling thousands of birds, and egg prices are the highest they have ever been in U.S. history.

I want to believe that this body should be able to agree that a bio-hazard that impacts every single one of our States should be something that we maintain funding for. It is our job to protect our constituents. That is basic. Avian flu is a threat. You know it. I know it. The world knows it.

I urge you to put partisanship aside. Vote for this very simple amendment. Maintain funding and staffing on avian flu.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam President, I rise in opposition to amendment No. 664.

Agriculture Secretary Rollins and the White House have made clear that addressing avian flu is a top priority.

I share my colleague from Michigan's concerns about avian flu, but this is not the appropriate venue for policy discussions on animal disease. This budget resolution is focused on securing the border, strengthening the military, and bolstering American energy independence.

I look forward to working with the Senator from Michigan, a fellow Member whom we are glad to have on the Agriculture Committee—a new member—to address animal disease threats in the farm bill.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the amendment.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 664

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on the adoption of the amendment.

Ms. SLOTKIN. Madam President, 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.

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 78 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Alsobrooks	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Baldwin	Hirono	Sanders
Bennet	Kaine	Schatz
Blumenthal	Kelly	Schiff
Blunt Rochester	Kim	Schumer
Booker	King	Shaheen
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Slotkin
Coons	Lujan	Smith
Cortez Masto	Markey	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warnock
Fetterman	Murray	Warren
Galleo	Ossoff	Welch
Gillibrand	Padilla	Whitehouse
Hassan	Peters	Wyden
Heinrich	Reed	

NAYS—53

Banks	Graham	Moreno
Barrasso	Grassley	Mullin
Blackburn	Hagerty	Murkowski
Boozman	Hawley	Paul
Britt	Hoeven	Ricketts
Budd	Husted	Risch
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Cassidy	Johnson	Schmitt
Collins	Justice	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Lankford	Sheehy
Cramer	Lee	Sullivan
Crapo	Lummis	Thune
Cruz	Marshall	Tillis
Curtis	McConnell	Tuberville
Daines	McCormick	Wicker
Ernst	Moody	Young
Fischer	Moran	

The amendment (No. 664) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

AMENDMENT NO. 233

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I call up my amendment No. 233 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. VAN HOLLEN], for himself and Ms. HIRONO, proposes an amendment numbered 233.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To create a point of order against legislation that would cut funding from the school lunch or school breakfast programs)

At the appropriate place in title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD CUT FUNDING FROM THE SCHOOL LUNCH OR SCHOOL BREAKFAST PROGRAMS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that cuts funding from the school lunch program under the Richard B.

Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.) or the school breakfast program established under section 4 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1773).

(b) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—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).

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I offer this amendment with my colleague Senator HIRONO. It is very straightforward. It creates a point of order against any legislation that would cut funding from the National School Lunch Program or the School Breakfast Program.

I think our colleagues know that nearly 14 million American children were hungry last year. One in five kids doesn't know where their next meal will come from or what it will be. So let's ensure that those kids get healthy meals and can focus on their education and their studies instead of their stomachs.

Madam President, 91 percent of public schools participate in the USDA meals programs. Over half of our kids are eligible for free and reduced lunch programs. They provide breakfast programs for over 2 billion of them a year.

So colleagues, let's not abandon those kids in order to provide tax cuts for Elon Musk and very rich people. I urge the adoption of our amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam President, I rise in opposition to amendment No. 233.

I appreciate the concerns of my colleague from Maryland, and I share support for the school meal programs. I am eager for the Agriculture Committee to turn to child nutrition reauthorization this Congress. However, this amendment threatens the privilege of the resolution.

Senators on the Ag Committee are openminded and welcoming of our colleague's involvement in important child nutrition programs; however, the budget process is not the proper venue to make policy changes to our school meals programs. For this reason, I urge my colleagues to vote no on this amendment.

Madam President, since the amendment does not meet the standard required by law, I raise a point of order against the amendment under section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

MOTION TO WAIVE

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act, I move to waive, and I ask for the yeas and nays and urge its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 49, nays 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 79 Leg.]

YEAS—49

Alsobrooks	Hickenlooper	Sanders
Baldwin	Hirono	Schatz
Bennet	Kaine	Schiff
Blumenthal	Kelly	Schumer
Blunt Rochester	Kim	Shaheen
Booker	King	Slotkin
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Smith
Collins	Lujan	Sullivan
Cooms	Markey	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Murphy	Warnock
Durbin	Murray	Warren
Fetterman	Ossoff	Welch
Gallego	Padilla	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Peters	Wyden
Hassan	Reed	
Heinrich	Rosen	

NAYS—51

Banks	Graham	Moran
Barrasso	Grassley	Moreno
Blackburn	Hagerty	Mullin
Boozman	Hawley	Murkowski
Britt	Hoeven	Paul
Budd	Husted	Ricketts
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Risch
Cassidy	Johnson	Rounds
Cornyn	Justice	Schmitt
Cotton	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cramer	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Crapo	Lee	Sheehy
Cruz	Lummis	Thune
Curtis	Marshall	Tillis
Daines	McConnell	Tuberville
Ernst	McCormick	Wicker
Fischer	Moody	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 49, the nays are 51.

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

The point of order is sustained and the amendment falls.

The majority leader.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be the next amendments in order, that the amendments be reported by number, with no amendments in order prior to a vote in relation to the amendments: Lujan, No. 699, Duckworth-Booker No. 971, Heinrich No. 101, and Blumenthal No. 659.

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

The Senator from New Hampshire.

AMENDMENT NO. 436

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I call up my amendment No. 436 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mrs. SHAHEEN], for herself and Ms. BALDWIN, proposes an amendment numbered 436.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to preserving and extending vital tax credits enacted under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, which make health care accessible and affordable and that have led to the lowest uninsured rate in our Nation's history)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PRESERVING HEALTH CARE ACCESS AND AFFORDABILITY FOR BENEFICIARIES OF THE PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to preserving health care access and affordability for Americans, which may include preserving and extending tax credits made available by amendment made to the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148) that will prevent catastrophic insurance premium hikes for 22,000,000 Americans or the loss of insurance coverage for an additional 4,000,000 Americans, or ensuring that any changes to such tax credits would not result in lower coverage rates, reduced benefits, or decreased affordability for individuals receiving coverage through private insurance markets established under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, this amendment would extend vital Affordable Care Act tax credits for millions of Americans. We all know that healthcare is still too expensive. Unfortunately, this reconciliation bill that we are ultimately going to vote on is going to make that worse.

In New Hampshire, we hear every day about people rationing medicines, skipping appointments, and delaying care all because of costs, but we can act now to lower those costs. We can extend those premium tax credits because if we don't act, they will skyrocket and 4 million Americans will lose their health insurance.

I urge a "yes" vote on my amendment to reinforce our support for working families and their access to healthcare.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Madam President, once again, this targeted budget blueprint before us would focus on the border, the military, and our energy independence. While the Finance Committee does have a \$1 billion instruction, this is neither a tax bill nor a healthcare reform bill. That instruction makes that clear.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment today as it is not relevant to the Finance Committee instruction.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 436

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on the adoption of the amendment.

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.

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 80 Leg.]

YEAS—48

Alsobrooks	Hickenlooper	Reed
Baldwin	Hirono	Rosen
Bennet	Kaine	Sanders
Blumenthal	Kelly	Schatz
Blunt Rochester	Kim	Schiff
Booker	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Coons	Luján	Slotkin
Cortez Masto	Markey	Smith
Duckworth	Merkley	Van Hollen
Durbin	Murkowski	Warner
Fetterman	Murphy	Warnock
Gallego	Murray	Warren
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Welch
Hassan	Padilla	Whitehouse
Heinrich	Peters	Wyden

NAYS—52

Banks	Graham	Moreno
Barrasso	Grassley	Mullin
Blackburn	Hagerty	Paul
Boozman	Hawley	Ricketts
Britt	Hoeven	Risch
Budd	Husted	Rounds
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Schmitt
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Collins	Justice	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Sheehy
Cotton	Lankford	Sullivan
Cramer	Lee	Thune
Crapo	Lummis	Tillis
Cruz	Marshall	Tuberville
Curtis	McConnell	Wicker
Daines	McCormick	Young
Ernst	Moody	
Fischer	Moran	

The amendment (No. 436) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MULLIN). The Senator from New Mexico.

AMENDMENT NO. 699

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. President, I would like to call up my amendment No. 699 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. LUJÁN] proposes an amendment numbered 699.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to supporting police, which may include initiatives that provide funding directly to law enforcement agencies to hire or rehire additional career law enforcement officers in an effort to increase their community policing capacity and crime prevention efforts)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO RELATING TO THE COPS HIRING PROGRAM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to supporting law enforce-

ment officers, which may include legislation supporting initiatives that provide funding directly to law enforcement agencies to hire or rehire additional career law enforcement officers in an effort to increase their community policing capacity and crime prevention efforts, including the COPS Hiring Program under section 1701(b)(2) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10381(b)(2)), by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. President, we are experiencing a nationwide shortage of police officers. Police departments are stretched thin, making our communities less safe. In the worst cases, some small departments have disbanded completely. Small towns need Federal dollars to bolster their ranks.

The Musk-Trump freeze took funding away from our police departments and law enforcement officials. The COPS hiring program is a lifeline to many law enforcement agencies. COPS hiring grants provide funding directly to law enforcement agencies to increase their community policing capacity and crime prevention efforts.

On behalf of all Americans who care about public safety, I introduce this amendment to provide increased resources for local law enforcement.

This is a bipartisan issue. It should be easy. I hope my colleagues just accept it, and we don't even have to have a vote on it. There is no reason to oppose this amendment. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. We should ensure that all law enforcement have the necessary equipment, training, and resources to keep our communities safe and thoroughly investigate crimes committed against all people. I have come to the floor and have spoken on this many, many times in the 10 years that I have been here.

Securing the border must remain the top priority in reducing crime, and this amendment does not adequately support necessary safety improvements. So I urge you to vote no.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 699

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. LUJÁN. 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 assistant bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 81 Leg.]

YEAS—48

Alsobrooks	Blunt Rochester	Cortez Masto
Baldwin	Booker	Duckworth
Bennet	Cantwell	Durbin
Blumenthal	Coons	Fetterman

Gallego
Gillibrand
Hassan
Heinrich
Hickenlooper
Hirono
Kaine
Kelly
Kim
King
Klobuchar
Luján

Markey
Merkley
Murphy
Murray
Ossoff
Padilla
Peters
Reed
Rosen
Sanders
Schatz
Schiff

Schumer
Shaheen
Slotkin
Smith
Sullivan
Van Hollen
Warner
Warnock
Warren
Welch
Whitehouse
Wyden

NAYS—52

Banks	Graham	Moreno
Barrasso	Grassley	Mullin
Blackburn	Hagerty	Murkowski
Boozman	Hawley	Paul
Britt	Hoeven	Ricketts
Budd	Husted	Risch
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Cassidy	Johnson	Schmitt
Collins	Justice	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Lankford	Sheehy
Cramer	Lee	Thune
Crapo	Lummis	Tillis
Cruz	Marshall	Tuberville
Curtis	McConnell	Wicker
Daines	McCormick	Young
Ernst	Moody	
Fischer	Moran	

The amendment (No. 699) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

AMENDMENT NO. 971

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. President, I call up Duckworth-Booker amendment No. 971 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Illinois [Ms. DUCKWORTH] proposes an amendment numbered 971.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to protecting access to fertility services, and eliminating barriers for families in need of high-quality, affordable fertility services by expanding nationwide coverage for in vitro fertilization)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO EXPANDING COVERAGE FOR IN VITRO FERTILIZATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reproductive health care, which may include legislation protecting access to, improving, or expanding nationwide coverage for reproductive health care, which may include fertility treatment services such as in vitro fertilization, that are consistent with widely accepted and evidence-based medical standards of care, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. President, this amendment would protect the right to IVF and other fertility care, and it would require insurance to cover IVF.

I know my Republican colleagues will claim President Trump has already solved this problem, but don't be fooled. Donald Trump's recent toothless, overly-vague Executive order does nothing to expand access to IVF. It was just lipservice from a known liar. In fact, it is because of President Trump and Senate Republicans that Roe v. Wade was overturned, causing IVF to be at risk in the first place.

If President Trump is supposedly so committed to making government more efficient, he could stop wasting time and resources on more bureaucracy.

The solution to this is simple and all laid out in the Right to IVF Act. If Senate Republicans want to put their votes where their mouths are, they must vote for this amendment that would provide hope for millions of Americans whose most desperate hope in the world is to have a family of their own.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mrs. BRITT. Mr. President, IVF is legal and accessible in all 50 States. This amendment is nothing more than a Trojan horse. It is far more expansive than they would want you to believe. It actually creates a universal right to "assisted reproductive technologies," allowing future administrations to move this into human cloning and gene-edited designer babies. It also contains no religious freedom protections.

Aside from being bad policy, let's take a step back and think about what has occurred. Two days ago, President Trump took the most pro-IVF Executive action ever towards increased treatment, access, and affordability, while President Biden played politics with IVF, hoping it would help that side of the aisle win on November 5. The American people saw through that. All 49 Republicans here in this Chamber at that time said we strongly support nationwide access to IVF.

We look forward over the next 90 days to working with President Trump to make sure that we increase access and affordability of treatment.

Mr. President, for that reason—today we are here to talk about the border, defense, and energy, and I urge my colleagues to vote this Trojan horse down.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 971

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on the adoption of the amendment.

Ms. DUCKWORTH. 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.

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 82 Leg.]

YEAS—49

Alsobrooks	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Baldwin	Hirono	Sanders
Bennet	Kaine	Schatz
Blumenthal	Kelly	Schiff
Blunt Rochester	Kim	Schumer
Booker	King	Shaheen
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Slotkin
Collins	Lujan	Smith
Coons	Markey	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Murkowski	Warnock
Durbin	Murphy	Warren
Fetterman	Murray	Welch
Gallago	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Padilla	Wyden
Hassan	Peters	
Heinrich	Reed	

NAYS—51

Banks	Graham	Moran
Barrasso	Grassley	Moreno
Blackburn	Hagerty	Mullin
Boozman	Hawley	Paul
Britt	Hoeben	Ricketts
Budd	Husted	Risch
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Cassidy	Johnson	Schmitt
Cornyn	Justice	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cramer	Lankford	Sheehy
Crapo	Lee	Sullivan
Cruz	Lummis	Thune
Curtis	Marshall	Tillis
Daines	McConnell	Tuberville
Ernst	McCormick	Wicker
Fischer	Moody	Young

The amendment (No. 971) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

AMENDMENT NO. 101

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 101 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HEINRICH] proposes an amendment numbered 101.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to funding for grants awarded by the Office on Violence Against Women)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. ____ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO FUNDING FOR GRANTS AWARDED BY THE OFFICE ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing funding for grants awarded by the Office on Violence Against Women of the Department of Justice that are designed to develop the capacity of the United States to reduce domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking by strengthening services to victims and holding offenders accountable, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I rise to offer this amendment to support grants for survivors of domestic violence and sexual abuse.

Over the last several weeks, I have heard from thousands of New Mexicans

about how Donald Trump and Elon Musk have thrown their lives and communities into chaos. That includes Alexandria Taylor and her New Mexico Coalition of Sexual Assault Programs. She called me about President Trump's blockade on Federal grants under the Violence Against Women Act. These grants do two things: They support survivors of rape and sexual assault, sexual abuse, and domestic violence; and they help law enforcement hold predators and abusers accountable.

These are not woke ideas. These are American values. If you support survivors of sexual assault and domestic violence, if you support law enforcement holding abusers and predators accountable, I hope you will support this amendment.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 101

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question occurs on the adoption of the amendment.

The amendment (No. 101) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHEEHY). The Senator from Connecticut.

AMENDMENT NO. 659

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, in order to protect our veterans, who deserve full funding, I call up my amendment No. 659 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BLUMENTHAL] proposes an amendment numbered 659.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To ensure full and uninterrupted funding for Department of Veterans Affairs health care and benefits provided by the Sergeant First Class Heath Robinson Honoring our Promise to Address Comprehensive Toxics Act of 2022 (Public Law 117-168), also known as the "PACT Act", preventing any cuts or delays)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 ____ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING FULL AND UNINTERRUPTED FUNDING FOR DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS HEALTH CARE AND BENEFITS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to strengthening veterans' health care and benefits, which may include legislation that would ensure full and uninterrupted funding for veterans' health care or benefits under the Sergeant First Class Heath Robinson Honoring our Promise to Address Comprehensive Toxics Act of 2022 (Public Law 117-168), also known as the "PACT Act", by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, this amendment very simply seeks to

protect full funding for the PACT Act. All of us—or most of us—voted for it. It was bipartisan. It was one of the most significant expansions of healthcare and benefits for toxic-exposed veterans in the VA's history.

Now it is threatened because the Trump administration is aggressively attempting to decimate the VA workforce. It has imposed a freeze, and it is cutting men and women employees who are integral to fulfilling our promise under the PACT Act.

We should be proud of it. We should preserve it. And if President Trump has no plans to erode the PACT Act, voting for this amendment should be easy for my Republican colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, this amendment is unnecessary. Full funding to carry out the Sergeant First Class Heath Robinson PACT Act is not in jeopardy. The PACT Act received widespread bipartisan support, bicameral commitment, because we care about toxic-exposed veterans and their families, and this is not a partisan issue.

Republicans have always fought to fully fund the VA. When the VA comes back to Congress asking for more money, like they did last September, because of unexpected shortfalls, we said yes. The administration and this Congress will continue to prioritize full and uninterrupted funding of the VA, including funding necessary to fulfill the laws, like the PACT Act, that Congress enacted.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 659

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question now occurs on the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. 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 assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. FETTERMAN) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 83 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Alsobrooks	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Baldwin	Hirono	Sanders
Bennet	Kaine	Schatz
Blumenthal	Kelly	Schiff
Blunt Rochester	Kim	Schumer
Booker	King	Shaheen
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Slotkin
Coons	Lujan	Smith
Cortez Masto	Markey	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warnock
Galleo	Murray	Warren
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Welch
Hassan	Padilla	Whitehouse
Hawley	Peters	Wyden
Heinrich	Reed	

NAYS—52

Banks	Graham	Mullin
Barrasso	Grassley	Murkowski
Blackburn	Hagerty	Paul
Boozman	Hoeven	Ricketts
Britt	Husted	Risch
Budd	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Capito	Johnson	Schmitt
Cassidy	Justice	Scott (FL)
Collins	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Lankford	Sheehy
Cotton	Lee	Sullivan
Cramer	Lummis	Thune
Crapo	Marshall	Tillis
Cruz	McConnell	Tuberville
Curtis	McCormick	Wicker
Daines	Moody	Young
Ernst	Moran	
Fischer	Moreno	

NOT VOTING—1

Fetterman

The amendment (No. 659) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I think for the benefit of all Members, I hope that very soon we will have a final agreement that will enable us to wind this down with a finite number of votes. And when that happens, I want to ask everybody to be in their seats so we can move fairly quickly through those. And in the intervening time period, while they are working that out, we have a couple more amendments.

I am going to ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be the final amendments in order; that the amendments be reported by number; that following disposition of the amendments, the Senate vote on adoption of the concurrent resolution, as amended, with no intervening action or debate; finally, if agreed to, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table: Markey 911; Coons 1223.

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

The Senator from Massachusetts.

AMENDMENT NO. 911

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 911 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY] proposes an amendment numbered 911.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to increasing funding for research on Alzheimer's disease and related dementias)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCREASING FUNDING FOR RESEARCH ON ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE AND RELATED DEMENTIAS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increasing funding for

Alzheimer's disease and related dementias, which may include research conducted or funded by the National Institutes of Health, where such funding would contribute to improving the development of treatment and cures, reduce health care costs for families and taxpayers, improve support for caregivers, or safeguard the United States' global leadership in neurodegenerative disease research and innovation, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, funding for Alzheimer's research at the NIH is essential. Nearly 7 million Americans are living with Alzheimer's right now, and if nothing changes, 15 million Americans—15 million baby boomers—will have Alzheimer's by 2050 with a cost of \$1 trillion a year to our healthcare system.

We need to tackle this challenge head-on by increasing funding for NIH research for Alzheimer's. Trump and DOGE have already cut and slowed down NIH research, interfering with our ability to cure this disease. This is a "Make America Sick" agenda. A "no" on this amendment means taking away hope from millions of Americans with Alzheimer's and their families. After the Bush billionaire tax cut in 2001, the NIH budget was cut in spending power by 20 percent over the next 5 years.

We must guarantee that Alzheimer's research is protected. I urge an aye vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. As we all know by now, the purpose of this budget resolution is to unlock reconciliation so we can once again secure the border and keep America safe.

I do look forward to working with the Senator from Massachusetts to prevent and better treat Alzheimer's, but the reserve funds in this instance are unnecessary and distract and delay the budgeting process.

We need targeted solutions, not broad funding that doesn't directly address the immediate needs. I urge a "no" vote.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 911

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on the adoption of the amendment.

The amendment (No. 911) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

AMENDMENT NO. 1223

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 1223 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. COONS] proposes an amendment numbered 1223.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To protect Americans' privacy from unauthorized access by DOGE)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROTECT TAXPAYER PRIVACY

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate level in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to protecting taxpayer information, which may include ensuring the protection of sensitive personal information of United States citizens and prohibiting political appointees and officials from the Department of Government Efficiency from accessing such data, including Social Security numbers, bank account information, tax returns, and addresses through Internal Revenue Service systems by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal year 2025 through 2034.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President and colleagues, unvetted and unaccountable DOGE agents have seized control of government systems and databases that contain vast troves of personally identifying, sensitive information about nearly every American—financial data, health data, Social Security numbers, home addresses. The risks to our privacy are immense, and the opportunities for corruption alarming.

The possibility that unqualified and inexperienced individuals will break critical systems through malice or incompetence is chilling.

In the past few weeks, I have received literally thousands of calls from concerned constituents, and I expect many of my colleagues have as well.

Musk and his DOGE bureaucrats are accessing private data, and I am urging a “yes” vote on this amendment that would prohibit their access to this data or misusing private information.

Voters are worried. They are worried that if they say the wrong thing or speak up against Trump or DOGE, their bank account information will end up on Twitter, their tax return won't come, or their family member won't get their Social Security check. I urge a “yes” vote on amendment No. 1223.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. This amendment is unnecessary. We already have laws on the books to protect people's information.

The most recent cases I can remember of leaking information like this involved an IRS contractor who illegally leaked the tax returns of President Trump, Elon Musk, and Jeff Bezos to the delight of many on the other side of the aisle.

That person, fortunately, though, is now in jail, which proves the point that we already have laws in place to take care of this. This amendment is a thinly veiled attempt to prevent DOGE

from doing the constructive job of finding waste. This is an amendment that says it is OK to spend \$2 million in Guatemala on sex change surgery. This is an amendment that says it is OK, look the other way, transgender comic books in Peru are great. This is an amendment that says it is OK to do trans operas in Colombia. This is an amendment that attacks people who are looking to save our money and spend it on legitimate diplomacy, not crazy, looney, leftwing ideas. And I am done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The vote is on the amendment.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is expired.

Mr. COONS. I will accept the voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on the adoption of the amendment.

The amendment (No. 1223) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be the final amendments in order; that the amendments be reported by number; that following disposition of the amendments, the Senate vote on adoption of the concurrent resolution, as amended, with no intervening action or debate; finally, if agreed to, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; Luján 957, Warren 734, Kelly 984, King 198, Lee 922, Blunt Rochester 311, Murray-Durbin 880, and Merkley 1207.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THUNE. And I would further ask consent these be 10-minute votes.

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

The Senator from New Mexico.

AMENDMENT NO. 957

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. President, 41.2 million Americans rely on SNAP to put food on the table. I would like to call up my amendment No. 957 and ask it to be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Luján] proposes an amendment numbered 957.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To strike reconciliation instructions requiring damaging cuts to programs critical to rural Americans and food assistance for American families)

Strike section 2002(a).

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. President, 41.2 million Americans rely on SNAP to put food on the table, and 40 percent of SNAP recipients are children.

The Republican budget resolution before us tonight will dramatically slash nutrition; conservation; other farm

programs for our children, families, and farmers—all to pay for the Trump tax scam. And we all know it is only going to benefit the wealthiest Americans.

Now, I want to get a farm bill done, and I think most of us here want to do that. Taking critical Federal dollars from our rural communities will make that nearly impossible. And that is not all. This means that costs will go up for families across America at a time when prices are already high. The result: Children and families will go hungry. We all know that that is unacceptable.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. Striking the all-powerful Agriculture Committee's reconciliation instruction will make it more difficult to pay for critical improvements for border security and our national defense.

A vote for this amendment indicates the Democrats don't believe there is a single area of waste, fraud, or abuse in our Federal nutrition programs.

In 2022 alone, the staff program had an overpayment rate of 10 percent, which amounts to billions of dollars in erroneous payments. Republicans will find commonsense savings in the Ag Committee's jurisdiction while ensuring we have a well-targeted, nutrition safety net for those in need.

I urge a “no” vote.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 957

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. LUJÁN. 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.

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 84 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Alsobrooks	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Baldwin	Hirono	Sanders
Bennet	Kaine	Schatz
Blumenthal	Kelly	Schiff
Blunt Rochester	Kim	Schumer
Booker	King	Shaheen
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Slotkin
Coons	Luján	Smith
Cortez Masto	Markey	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warnock
Fetterman	Murray	Warren
Galleo	Ossoff	Welch
Gillibrand	Padilla	Whitehouse
Hassan	Peters	Wyden
Heinrich	Reed	

NAYS—53

Banks	Britt	Collins
Barrasso	Budd	Cornyn
Blackburn	Capito	Cotton
Boozman	Cassidy	Cramer

Crapo	Justice	Ricketts
Cruz	Kennedy	Risch
Curtis	Lankford	Rounds
Daines	Lee	Schmitt
Ernst	Lummis	Scott (FL)
Fischer	Marshall	Scott (SC)
Graham	McConnell	Sheehy
Grassley	McCormick	Sullivan
Hagerty	Moody	Thune
Hawley	Moran	Tillis
Hoeben	Moreno	Tuberville
Husted	Mullin	Wicker
Hyde-Smith	Murkowski	Young
Johnson	Paul	

The amendment (No. 957) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

AMENDMENT NO. 734

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 734 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Massachusetts [Ms. WARREN] proposes an amendment numbered 734.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To modify the provision relating to the general reserve fund)

Beginning on page 52, strike line 20 and all that follows through page 53, line 6, and insert the following:

SEC. 3002. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR LEGISLATION THAT DOES NOT INCREASE TAX BREAKS FOR THE WEALTHY.

(a) SENATE.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports by the amounts provided in such legislation, provided that such legislation does not reduce the average tax liability of taxpayers with income over \$10,000,000 and provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

Ms. WARREN. As we begin the budget process, Democrats are asking Republicans questions about the basic principles of what they are planning to do. The first question is whether there is anyone who is so rich that Republicans think they don't need a tax giveaway.

My amendment says that anyone who earns more than \$10 million a year won't get a tax cut in the new Republican budget, and I want to know if Republicans will agree to that. I urge everyone, Democrat or Republican, to say yes.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, it seems to me that it is important, as we conclude tonight, that we admit to the American people what we know to be true ourselves, and that is that most of these amendments are fiction. It is professional wrestling. It is the Undertaker v. Andre the Giant. They have been all foam and no beer. All salt and no tequila.

Unless you do your research on Instagram, you know that our bill is

going to be not about taxes but about immigration and defense.

There will be time to consider my friend Senator WARREN's amendment, but it won't be on this bill. There will be time to point out that 60 percent of tax cuts in the 2017 Tax Cuts and Jobs Act affected the middle class. For that reason I ask for a "no" vote.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. You have 24 seconds.

Ms. WARREN. In my 24 seconds, I would like to say we all know what this is about. You are starting the process for a budget, and we just want to know the basic principle. Is there anyone so rich that Republicans think they shouldn't get a tax cut? And my view is, let's just start the bidding at \$10 million. Is that rich enough to say they are not going to get a tax giveaway from the Republicans?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, all foam, no beer.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 734

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs on the adoption of the amendment.

The amendment (No. 734) was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 984

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAMER). The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KELLY. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 984 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. KELLY] proposes an amendment numbered 984.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To modify the provision relating to the general reserve fund)

Beginning on page 52, strike line 20 and all that follows through page 53, line 6, and insert the following:

SEC. 3002. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR LEGISLATION THAT DOES NOT INCREASE TAX BREAKS FOR THE WEALTHY.

(a) SENATE.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports by the amounts provided in such legislation, provided that such legislation does not reduce the average tax liability of taxpayers with income over \$100,000,000 and provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

Mr. KELLY. Mr. President, since we now know that \$10 million did not meet the threshold, we are debating who in this country is so rich that they don't need a tax cut. That one didn't pass. So here is my proposal: Can we at least agree among all of us that no one mak-

ing more than \$100 million per year should get a tax cut?

The median income in this country is about \$80,000 per year, and it would take 1,245 years for someone making the median income in America to earn \$100 million. That is about 15 lifetimes.

Does somebody that rich need a tax cut? I don't think so. Vote yes if you agree.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, this is the same as the last one. So I am going to adopt Senator KENNEDY's debate and urge a "no" vote.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 984

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs on the adoption of the amendment.

The amendment (No. 984) is rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

AMENDMENT NO. 198

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 198 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maine [Mr. KING] proposes an amendment numbered 198.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To modify the provision relating to the general reserve fund)

Beginning on page 52, strike line 20 and all that follows through page 53, line 6, and insert the following:

SEC. 3002. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR LEGISLATION THAT DOES NOT INCREASE TAX BREAKS FOR THE WEALTHY.

(a) SENATE.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports by the amounts provided in such legislation, provided that such legislation does not reduce the average tax liability of taxpayers with income over \$500,000,000 and provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

Mr. KING. This afternoon I was on the floor. I was privileged to attend to the remarks of the distinguished chair of the Finance Committee where he characterized the upcoming tax bill that will be before us shortly. He characterized it as principally benefiting the middle class and working class and denied that it would be especially or in any way beneficial to the superwealthy in our country.

Well, I have always subscribed to Ronald Reagan's motto: Trust but verify. I am simply asking to verify what the chairman of the Finance Committee said this afternoon. My amendment would just say: no reduction in tax liability to someone making more than \$500 million. There are about 400 families in America, and \$500

million seems to me a number that would justify not having a tax reduction. That is all the amendment does—no tax reduction and liability for those making more than \$500 million.

I urge a “yes” vote to verify what we were told on the floor this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, the third time around, Senator KENNEDY’s debate still remains. Vote no.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 198

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs on the adoption of the amendment.

The amendment (No. 198) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

AMENDMENT NO. 922

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 922 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Utah [Mr. LEE] proposes an amendment numbered 922.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to Congress continuing its work to rein in the administrative state by supporting legislation that prevents Federal agencies from finalizing major rules without congressional approval, strengthens the Article I law-making powers of Congress, cuts spending resulting from costly regulations, reduces inflation, and unleashes economic growth)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO GOVERNMENT DEREGULATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reducing burdensome and costly Federal Government regulations by passing legislation focused on government deregulation that will decrease new spending arising from such regulations and reassert the proper constitutional role of Congress in the law-making process by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2025 through 2029 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, Congress, not unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats, should be making our laws. Article I, section 7 of the Constitution requires nothing less. And yet we generate about 100,000 pages of new laws a year. This is choking the American people.

The prior administration imposed countless rules and regulations that imposed trillions in new economic costs on the private sector. Many of these rules have been estimated to increase Federal spending, Federal man-

datory outlays, by hundreds of billions of dollars without congressional approval.

The Federal Government already spends too much money. This has contributed to persistent inflation the last couple of years and a debt level that will soon reach record-level highs that we cannot sustain.

Congress shouldn’t allow regulatory-driven spending to continue to worsen our country’s fiscal and economic health. I encourage my colleagues to support my amendment and demonstrate to the American people that they are serious about reducing excessive regulatory burdens. What we are trying to do is to push “pause” on these to bring about the reduction in these mandatory outlays. I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I appreciate my colleague’s commitment to empowering the legislative branch of government. We have worked together on a bill to rein in Presidential abuse of emergency powers. I hope we can get that across the finish line sometime this Congress.

Unfortunately, I am concerned that this amendment sets up a complex and arguably unconstitutional legislative scheme to get rid of regulations and undermine the bicameral legislative process. Under the regulatory approval scheme that this amendment tees up, one Chamber of Congress could effectively nullify the law previously passed by the whole of Congress simply by not approving a rule of implementation.

This amendment also undermines Agencies’ ability to implement key environmental health and safety laws, endangering the American people.

If Congress wants to repeal a law, we should repeal the law, not create some new arcane process to sabotage implementation.

I welcome the opportunity to work with colleagues to pass legislation to strengthen the power of Congress, including to ensure that the President cannot tear up bipartisan funding bills enacted by Congress. But I urge my colleagues to reject this potentially unconstitutional and dangerous deregulatory amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 922

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. LEE. 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 bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 85 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Banks	Graham	Moreno
Barrasso	Grassley	Mullin
Blackburn	Hagerty	Murkowski
Boozman	Hawley	Paul
Britt	Hoeben	Ricketts
Budd	Husted	Risch
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Cassidy	Johnson	Schmitt
Collins	Justice	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Lankford	Sheehy
Cramer	Lee	Sullivan
Crapo	Lummis	Thune
Cruz	Marshall	Tillis
Curtis	McConnell	Tuberville
Daines	McCormick	Wicker
Ernst	Moody	Young
Fischer	Moran	

NAYS—47

Alsobrooks	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Baldwin	Hirono	Sanders
Bennet	Kaine	Schatz
Blumenthal	Kelly	Schiff
Blunt Rochester	Kim	Schumer
Booker	King	Shaheen
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Slotkin
Coons	Lujan	Smith
Cortez Masto	Markey	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warnock
Fetterman	Murray	Warren
Galleo	Ossoff	Welch
Gillibrand	Padilla	Whitehouse
Hassan	Peters	Wyden
Heinrich	Reed	

The amendment (No. 922) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

AMENDMENT NO. 311

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 311 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Delaware [Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER] proposes an amendment numbered 311.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to preventing the indiscriminate termination of Federal employees who protect the health or safety of Americans, which may include scientists, emergency preparedness staff, frontline health care workers, drug or medical device reviewers, or other employees at the Department of Health and Human Services)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PREVENTING THE INDISCRIMINATE TERMINATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES WHO PROTECT THE HEALTH OR SAFETY OF AMERICANS, WHICH MAY INCLUDE SCIENTISTS, EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS STAFF, FRONTLINE HEALTH CARE WORKERS, DRUG OR MEDICAL DEVICE REVIEWERS, OR OTHER EMPLOYEES AT THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to preventing the indiscriminate termination of Federal employees who protect the health or safety of Americans, which may include scientists, emergency preparedness staff, frontline health

care workers, drug or medical device reviewers, or other employees at the Department of Health and Human Services, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Mr. President, this amendment would prevent the wrongful termination of Federal employees who protect the health and safety of all Americans.

At a time when our country is facing unprecedented workforce shortages, the Trump administration is thoughtlessly and callously firing thousands of public servants at the Department of Health and Human Services and other Departments, putting all of us at risk.

What does this mean? It means delaying cures for cancer. It means higher prescription drug costs for seniors, which we fought so hard to lower. It means higher maternity mortality rates and more American women dying needlessly while giving birth.

Who are these public servants? They are scientists, emergency preparedness experts, the frontline healthcare workers whom we call heroes. Bottom line: It is the people who keep us safe and healthy.

While Republicans work to cut taxes for billionaires, they are slashing the healthcare workforce our communities rely on. On behalf of our constituents and our country, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

As we have learned tonight, this budget resolution is about unlocking reconciliation to secure the border and keep Americans safe. This amendment is unnecessary and delays the budgeting process.

That being said, I look forward to working with the Senator from Delaware to make HHS great again.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 311

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on the adoption of the amendment.

The amendment (No. 311) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

AMENDMENT NO. 880

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 880 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Washington [Mrs. MURRAY] proposes an amendment numbered 880.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to reversing the Trump Administration's indiscriminate cut to biomedical research and the lifesaving work supported by the National Institutes of Health at research institutions across the country)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORTING LIFE-SAVING RESEARCH FUNDED BY THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to supporting life-saving biomedical research funded by the National Institutes of Health by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2025 through 2029 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, the Trump administration is working to destroy medical research as we know it with an illegal, unrealistic cap on the NIH reimbursement rate for indirect costs. It means cancer researchers laid off, lifesaving clinical trials canceled, and more, and it violates the bipartisan appropriations law. I should know—I helped author that provision. Republicans should know—they worked with me to pass it.

I yield to the senior Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, my Republican colleagues know, as I do, that President Trump's cuts, freezes, gag orders, and firings are devastating medical research at NIH. Since we get sick on a bipartisan basis, shouldn't we stand together on a bipartisan basis for medical research at NIH?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, all foam, no beer. This proposal deals with healthcare spending. I would remind my colleagues and friends that NIH recently announced their intention to cap indirect costs for grants. Many of our universities are spending all of the taxpayer money on overhead. Harvard is spending 69 percent; Yale, 67.5 percent—on overhead. Isn't that special? Johns Hopkins, 63.7 percent. This will make Bernie Madoff blush.

I will revise and extend my other remarks: all foam, no beer.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 880

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on the adoption of the amendment.

The amendment (No. 880) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

AMENDMENT NO. 1207

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 1207 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MERKLEY] proposes an amendment numbered 1207.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to ending price gouging on prescription drugs)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REDUCING FEDERAL HEALTH PROGRAM SPENDING FOR PRESCRIPTION DRUGS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reducing health care costs, which may include legislation enabling Americans to have a much improved opportunity to purchase prescription drugs at, or near, the lower prices manufacturers charge in other similarly developed nations, requiring pharmaceutical manufacturers to report annually the amount of taxpayer dollars used to benefit manufacturers' research and development efforts, or enacting other mechanisms to purchase prescription drugs at lower prices, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

Mr. MERKLEY. Colleagues, this amendment encourages the opportunity for Americans to purchase prescription drugs at or near the lower prices that manufacturers charge to individuals in other similar, developed nations.

Here is what every American knows: We all invest more in the research and development to develop drugs than the taxpayers of any other nation in the entire world, so we should be getting the best price, not the worst price. This amendment creates an opportunity for us to serve the American people and get them the fair prices they deserve.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment today because it is not relevant to the Finance Committee's instruction.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1207

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, 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 bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 86 Leg.]

YEAS—49

Alsobrooks	Blunt Rochester	Cortez Masto
Baldwin	Booker	Duckworth
Bennet	Cantwell	Durbin
Blumenthal	Coons	Fetterman

Gallego	Markey	Shaheen
Gillibrand	Merkley	Slotkin
Hassan	Murphy	Smith
Hawley	Murray	Sullivan
Heinrich	Ossoff	Van Hollen
Hickenlooper	Padilla	Warner
Hirono	Peters	Warnock
Kaine	Reed	Warren
Kelly	Rosen	Welch
Kim	Sanders	Whitehouse
King	Schatz	Wyden
Klobuchar	Schiff	
Luján	Schumer	

NAYS—51

Banks	Fischer	Moran
Barrasso	Graham	Moreno
Blackburn	Grassley	Mullin
Boozman	Hagerty	Murkowski
Britt	Hoeven	Paul
Budd	Husted	Ricketts
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Risch
Cassidy	Johnson	Rounds
Collins	Justice	Schmitt
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Cramer	Lee	Sheehy
Crapo	Lummis	Thune
Cruz	Marshall	Tillis
Curtis	McConnell	Tuberville
Daines	McCormick	Wicker
Ernst	Moody	Young

The amendment (No. 1207) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, to my colleagues, it has been a very long day. To the Budget Committee staff, Nick and your team, thank you very much.

Through this process, I have gotten to know Senator MERKLEY better. It has been a pleasure.

We are one step closer to fixing a problem that all Americans want us to fix, I think. The man who murdered Laken Riley was released from detention because we had no bed space. That should never happen again. There is \$175 billion in this bill to make sure we have enough bed space; we complete, finish the wall, and kick gang members and other criminals out of the country; \$150 billion for a military that has been worn out—they need the money; and \$20 billion for the mighty, mighty Coast Guard.

We are one step closer to fulfilling the promise Republicans made to make you safer. I hope we can get one big, beautiful bill in the House, but we need to act on border security and national security now. We are running out of time.

Thank you all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I so much appreciate the collaboration and cooperation and communication between the Budget team here on this side of the aisle and Senator GRAHAM's team.

We have had the chance to all be on the floor and have the discussion about issues that we rarely get to have. It isn't quite the give-and-take that you might see in some legislatures, but we are, in fact, here wrestling with the national issues.

This budget resolution comes down to one thing, and that is that families lose and billionaires win. I said at the beginning of the night that over the course of the evening, amendments

would show that Democrats are standing up for families—on groceries, on healthcare, on housing, on education, on childcare—and that is what has been demonstrated tonight.

I still invite our Republican colleagues to join us—join with us—and help the families of America rather than attacking the programs that serve them in order to fund tax giveaways for billionaires. Tax giveaways for billionaires will not make our Nation stronger; stronger families will make our Nation stronger.

VOTE ON S. CON. RES. 7

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question occurs on adoption of the concurrent resolution, as amended.

Mr. GRAHAM. This bill will be paid for.

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.

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 87 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Banks	Graham	Moreno
Barrasso	Grassley	Mullin
Blackburn	Hagerty	Murkowski
Boozman	Hawley	Ricketts
Britt	Hoeven	Risch
Budd	Husted	Rounds
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Schmitt
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Collins	Justice	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Sheehy
Cotton	Lankford	Sullivan
Cramer	Lee	Tillis
Crapo	Lummis	Thune
Cruz	Marshall	Tuberville
Curtis	McConnell	Wicker
Daines	McCormick	Young
Ernst	Moody	
Fischer	Moran	

NAYS—48

Alsobrooks	Hickenlooper	Reed
Baldwin	Hirono	Rosen
Bennet	Kaine	Sanders
Blumenthal	Kelly	Schatz
Blunt Rochester	Kim	Schiff
Booker	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Coons	Luján	Slotkin
Cortez Masto	Markey	Smith
Duckworth	Merkley	Van Hollen
Durbin	Murphy	Warner
Fetterman	Murray	Warnock
Gallego	Ossoff	Warren
Gillibrand	Padilla	Welch
Hassan	Paul	Whitehouse
Heinrich	Peters	Wyden

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 7), as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 7

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2025.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2025 and that this resolution sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2026 through 2034.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2025.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Subtitle A—Budgetary Levels in Both Houses

Sec. 1101. Recommended levels and amounts.
Sec. 1102. Major functional categories.

Subtitle B—Levels and Amounts in the Senate

Sec. 1201. Social Security in the Senate.
Sec. 1202. Postal Service discretionary administrative expenses in the Senate.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

Sec. 2001. Reconciliation in the House of Representatives.
Sec. 2002. Reconciliation in the Senate.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS

Sec. 3001. Reserve fund for reconciliation legislation.
Sec. 3002. Reserve fund for deficit-neutral legislation.
Sec. 3003. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to protecting Medicare and Medicaid.
Sec. 3004. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to Government deregulation.

TITLE IV—OTHER MATTERS

Sec. 4001. Enforcement filing.
Sec. 4002. Budgetary treatment of administrative expenses.
Sec. 4003. Application and effect of changes in allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels.
Sec. 4004. Adjustment authority for revisions to statutory caps.
Sec. 4005. Adjustments to reflect changes in concepts and definitions.
Sec. 4006. Adjustment for changes in the baseline.
Sec. 4007. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Subtitle A—Budgetary Levels in Both Houses

SEC. 1101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2025 through 2034:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2025: \$3,853,053,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: \$4,005,633,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: \$4,095,208,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028: \$4,221,709,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029: \$4,343,708,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030: \$4,536,585,000,000.
Fiscal year 2031: \$4,744,851,000,000.
Fiscal year 2032: \$4,939,252,000,000.
Fiscal year 2033: \$5,155,399,000,000.
Fiscal year 2034: \$5,375,311,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2025: −\$5,916,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: −\$211,035,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: −\$421,185,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028: −\$415,138,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029: −\$416,123,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030: −\$422,056,000,000.
Fiscal year 2031: −\$435,419,000,000.
Fiscal year 2032: −\$449,460,000,000.
Fiscal year 2033: −\$467,244,000,000.
Fiscal year 2034: −\$484,719,000,000.

(2) FEDERAL REVENUE CHANGES RELATIVE TO CURRENT POLICY.—The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed compared to current policy are as follows:

Fiscal year 2025: \$0.

Fiscal year 2026: \$0.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$0.
 Fiscal year 2028: \$0.
 Fiscal year 2029: \$0.
 Fiscal year 2030: \$0.
 Fiscal year 2031: \$0.
 Fiscal year 2032: \$0.
 Fiscal year 2033: \$0.
 Fiscal year 2034: \$0.

(3) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2025: \$4,660,822,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$4,787,172,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$4,918,969,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2028: \$5,195,931,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2029: \$5,348,812,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2030: \$5,634,695,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2031: \$5,877,961,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2032: \$6,148,105,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2033: \$6,480,776,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2034: \$6,681,550,000,000.

(4) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2025: \$4,636,002,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$4,803,228,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$4,995,184,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2028: \$5,283,709,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2029: \$5,338,399,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2030: \$5,621,606,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2031: \$5,845,033,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2032: \$6,078,132,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2033: \$6,437,602,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2034: \$6,592,030,000,000.

(5) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 2025: \$782,949,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$797,595,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$899,976,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2028: \$1,062,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2029: \$994,691,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2030: \$1,085,021,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2031: \$1,100,182,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2032: \$1,138,880,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2033: \$1,282,203,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2034: \$1,216,719,000,000.

(6) PUBLIC DEBT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632(a)(5)), the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2025: \$36,371,784,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$37,521,488,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$38,649,388,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2028: \$39,897,925,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2029: \$41,251,544,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2030: \$42,552,065,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2031: \$43,855,127,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2032: \$45,199,622,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2033: \$46,803,080,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2034: \$48,714,403,000,000.

(7) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2025: \$29,141,533,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$30,151,121,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$31,291,493,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2028: \$32,629,565,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2029: \$33,930,044,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2030: \$35,349,716,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2031: \$36,814,512,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2032: \$38,364,377,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2033: \$40,073,109,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2034: \$41,747,907,000,000.

SEC. 1102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2025 through 2034 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$933,481,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$909,629,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$901,220,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$904,412,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$923,020,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$911,956,000,000.

Fiscal year 2028:

(A) New budget authority, \$944,111,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$934,660,000,000.

Fiscal year 2029:

(A) New budget authority, \$966,203,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$942,419,000,000.

Fiscal year 2030:

(A) New budget authority, \$989,212,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$966,361,000,000.

Fiscal year 2031:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,012,715,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$984,795,000,000.

Fiscal year 2032:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,036,723,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,003,888,000,000.

Fiscal year 2033:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,062,319,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,037,888,000,000.

Fiscal year 2034:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,087,382,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,054,430,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$65,962,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$69,206,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$61,716,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$67,669,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$62,249,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$66,456,000,000.

Fiscal year 2028:

(A) New budget authority, \$63,512,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$62,391,000,000.

Fiscal year 2029:

(A) New budget authority, \$64,944,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$62,832,000,000.

Fiscal year 2030:

(A) New budget authority, \$66,408,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$63,077,000,000.

Fiscal year 2031:

(A) New budget authority, \$67,878,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$64,002,000,000.

Fiscal year 2032:

(A) New budget authority, \$69,343,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$65,176,000,000.

Fiscal year 2033:

(A) New budget authority, \$70,874,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$66,517,000,000.

Fiscal year 2034:

(A) New budget authority, \$72,435,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$67,889,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$42,084,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$41,734,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$41,345,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$41,844,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$42,264,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$41,923,000,000.

Fiscal year 2028:

(A) New budget authority, \$43,099,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$42,198,000,000.

Fiscal year 2029:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,017,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$42,887,000,000.

Fiscal year 2030:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,980,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$43,633,000,000.

Fiscal year 2031:

(A) New budget authority, \$45,946,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$44,551,000,000.

Fiscal year 2032:

(A) New budget authority, \$46,922,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$45,486,000,000.

Fiscal year 2033:

(A) New budget authority, \$47,936,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$46,460,000,000.

Fiscal year 2034:

(A) New budget authority, \$48,985,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$47,466,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$39,842,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$37,587,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$39,958,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$44,514,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$34,098,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$52,768,000,000.

Fiscal year 2028:

(A) New budget authority, \$34,825,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$51,623,000,000.

Fiscal year 2029:

(A) New budget authority, \$35,770,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$48,582,000,000.

Fiscal year 2030:

(A) New budget authority, \$33,946,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$42,596,000,000.

Fiscal year 2031:

(A) New budget authority, \$35,188,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$40,366,000,000.

Fiscal year 2032:

(A) New budget authority, \$39,697,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$41,611,000,000.

Fiscal year 2033:

(A) New budget authority, \$24,489,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,941,000,000.

Fiscal year 2034:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,203,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$17,040,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$88,219,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$90,074,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$67,633,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$80,552,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$45,140,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$75,844,000,000.

Fiscal year 2028:

(A) New budget authority, \$45,985,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$71,673,000,000.

Fiscal year 2029:

(A) New budget authority, \$46,956,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$67,691,000,000.

Fiscal year 2030:

(A) New budget authority, \$47,707,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$63,948,000,000.

Fiscal year 2031:

(A) New budget authority, \$48,854,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$60,580,000,000.

Fiscal year 2032:

(A) New budget authority, \$49,918,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$56,444,000,000.

Fiscal year 2033:

(A) New budget authority, \$51,246,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$55,797,000,000.

Fiscal year 2034:

(A) New budget authority, \$52,225,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$55,480,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$58,457,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$41,846,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$28,163,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$46,212,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$31,716,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,686,000,000.

Fiscal year 2028:

(A) New budget authority, \$33,008,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$34,426,000,000.

Fiscal year 2029:

(A) New budget authority, \$33,334,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$32,441,000,000.

Fiscal year 2030:

(A) New budget authority, \$30,857,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,098,000,000.

Fiscal year 2031:

(A) New budget authority, \$30,468,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$29,609,000,000.

Fiscal year 2032:

(A) New budget authority, \$31,239,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$30,163,000,000.
Fiscal year 2033:
(A) New budget authority, \$32,276,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$30,893,000,000.
Fiscal year 2034:
(A) New budget authority, \$32,912,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$31,721,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$12,477,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$18,175,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$32,747,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$626,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$28,145,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$7,710,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, —\$56,796,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$65,194,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, \$25,562,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$15,976,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, \$25,712,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$12,680,000,000.
Fiscal year 2031:
(A) New budget authority, \$25,941,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$7,932,000,000.
Fiscal year 2032:
(A) New budget authority, \$26,354,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$5,060,000,000.
Fiscal year 2033:
(A) New budget authority, \$20,192,000,000.
(B) Outlays, —\$4,224,000,000.
Fiscal year 2034:
(A) New budget authority, \$29,862,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$2,451,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$173,158,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$144,771,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$167,673,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$152,541,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$132,085,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$158,068,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, \$133,386,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$162,528,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, \$134,447,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$160,846,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, \$129,994,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$150,790,000,000.
Fiscal year 2031:
(A) New budget authority, \$130,964,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$147,539,000,000.
Fiscal year 2032:
(A) New budget authority, \$138,846,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$150,163,000,000.
Fiscal year 2033:
(A) New budget authority, \$140,544,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$149,247,000,000.
Fiscal year 2034:
(A) New budget authority, \$142,271,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$149,454,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$87,762,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$78,752,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$20,135,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$64,267,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$19,259,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$56,506,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, \$19,462,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$45,101,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, \$19,888,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$35,976,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, \$20,326,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$31,026,000,000.
Fiscal year 2031:
(A) New budget authority, \$20,727,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$27,543,000,000.
Fiscal year 2032:
(A) New budget authority, \$21,007,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$24,658,000,000.
Fiscal year 2033:
(A) New budget authority, \$21,462,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$22,754,000,000.
Fiscal year 2034:
(A) New budget authority, \$21,864,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$21,733,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$149,303,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$171,916,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$152,714,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$151,605,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$154,949,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$150,975,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, \$157,763,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$152,697,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, \$160,740,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$155,316,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, \$163,649,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$158,173,000,000.
Fiscal year 2031:
(A) New budget authority, \$166,633,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$161,098,000,000.
Fiscal year 2032:
(A) New budget authority, \$169,998,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$164,267,000,000.
Fiscal year 2033:
(A) New budget authority, \$173,554,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$167,569,000,000.
Fiscal year 2034:
(A) New budget authority, \$176,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$170,648,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$945,070,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$961,180,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$992,092,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$976,652,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$1,020,326,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,021,179,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, \$1,055,396,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,052,323,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, \$1,098,848,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,094,015,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, \$1,142,891,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,132,318,000,000.
Fiscal year 2031:
(A) New budget authority, \$1,176,522,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,175,476,000,000.
Fiscal year 2032:
(A) New budget authority, \$1,226,824,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,216,998,000,000.
Fiscal year 2033:
(A) New budget authority, \$1,276,881,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,266,068,000,000.
Fiscal year 2034:
(A) New budget authority, \$1,310,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,298,975,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$950,891,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$950,641,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$1,006,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,008,719,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$1,066,571,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,066,276,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, \$1,209,735,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,208,310,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, \$1,125,645,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,125,229,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, \$1,275,864,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,275,566,000,000.
Fiscal year 2031:
(A) New budget authority, \$1,357,791,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,357,726,000,000.
Fiscal year 2032:
(A) New budget authority, \$1,445,195,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,445,191,000,000.
Fiscal year 2033:
(A) New budget authority, \$1,663,779,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,663,796,000,000.
Fiscal year 2034:
(A) New budget authority, \$1,666,492,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,666,497,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$712,446,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$709,132,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$691,755,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$690,914,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$709,037,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$704,040,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, \$727,612,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$727,412,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, \$729,224,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$715,149,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, \$748,243,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$739,546,000,000.
Fiscal year 2031:
(A) New budget authority, \$761,438,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$752,199,000,000.
Fiscal year 2032:
(A) New budget authority, \$779,471,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$769,491,000,000.
Fiscal year 2033:
(A) New budget authority, \$800,819,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$797,512,000,000.
Fiscal year 2034:
(A) New budget authority, \$809,385,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$799,089,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$67,259,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$67,259,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$81,690,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$81,690,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$89,447,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$89,447,000,000.
Fiscal year 2028:
(A) New budget authority, \$94,419,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$94,419,000,000.
Fiscal year 2029:
(A) New budget authority, \$100,138,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$100,138,000,000.
Fiscal year 2030:
(A) New budget authority, \$106,208,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$106,208,000,000.
Fiscal year 2031:
(A) New budget authority, \$112,114,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$112,114,000,000.
Fiscal year 2032:
(A) New budget authority, \$118,485,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$118,485,000,000.
Fiscal year 2033:
(A) New budget authority, \$125,325,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$125,325,000,000.
Fiscal year 2034:
(A) New budget authority, \$132,539,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$132,539,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$361,349,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$357,760,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$382,555,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$378,814,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$404,594,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$401,319,000,000.

Fiscal year 2028:

(A) New budget authority, \$427,329,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$444,241,000,000.

Fiscal year 2029:

(A) New budget authority, \$447,757,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$422,317,000,000.

Fiscal year 2030:

(A) New budget authority, \$466,616,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$461,720,000,000.

Fiscal year 2031:

(A) New budget authority, \$486,716,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$481,638,000,000.

Fiscal year 2032:

(A) New budget authority, \$507,187,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$502,655,000,000.

Fiscal year 2033:

(A) New budget authority, \$528,733,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$548,734,000,000.

Fiscal year 2034:

(A) New budget authority, \$550,662,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$547,796,000,000.

(16) Administration of Justice (750):

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$83,111,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$85,235,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$88,992,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$87,024,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$87,701,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$86,420,000,000.

Fiscal year 2028:

(A) New budget authority, \$89,687,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$88,514,000,000.

Fiscal year 2029:

(A) New budget authority, \$92,142,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$90,690,000,000.

Fiscal year 2030:

(A) New budget authority, \$94,574,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$92,986,000,000.

Fiscal year 2031:

(A) New budget authority, \$96,848,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$94,869,000,000.

Fiscal year 2032:

(A) New budget authority, \$104,463,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$101,844,000,000.

Fiscal year 2033:

(A) New budget authority, \$107,160,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$104,339,000,000.

Fiscal year 2034:

(A) New budget authority, \$109,431,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$106,934,000,000.

(17) General Government (800):

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$10,089,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$37,960,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$30,666,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$38,285,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$32,065,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$38,261,000,000.

Fiscal year 2028:

(A) New budget authority, \$32,994,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$37,957,000,000.

Fiscal year 2029:

(A) New budget authority, \$33,770,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$37,793,000,000.

Fiscal year 2030:

(A) New budget authority, \$34,614,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$37,985,000,000.

Fiscal year 2031:

(A) New budget authority, \$35,247,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$37,024,000,000.

Fiscal year 2032:

(A) New budget authority, \$36,189,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$36,307,000,000.

Fiscal year 2033:

(A) New budget authority, \$36,960,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$36,758,000,000.

Fiscal year 2034:

(A) New budget authority, \$37,681,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$37,266,000,000.

(18) Net Interest (900):

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,010,050,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,010,050,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,022,935,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,022,935,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,064,571,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,064,571,000,000.

Fiscal year 2028:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,130,048,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,130,048,000,000.

Fiscal year 2029:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,186,820,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,186,820,000,000.

Fiscal year 2030:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,237,051,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,237,051,000,000.

Fiscal year 2031:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,294,533,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,294,533,000,000.

Fiscal year 2032:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,354,493,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,354,493,000,000.

Fiscal year 2033:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,407,576,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,407,576,000,000.

Fiscal year 2034:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,469,426,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,469,426,000,000.

(19) Allowances (920):

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,002,585,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$982,952,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$888,507,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$899,685,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$890,385,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$894,338,000,000.

Fiscal year 2028:

(A) New budget authority, \$848,499,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$850,453,000,000.

Fiscal year 2029:

(A) New budget authority, \$851,993,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$853,311,000,000.

Fiscal year 2030:

(A) New budget authority, \$874,575,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$874,575,000,000.

Fiscal year 2031:

(A) New budget authority, \$874,548,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$874,548,000,000.

Fiscal year 2032:

(A) New budget authority, \$894,135,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$894,135,000,000.

Fiscal year 2033:

(A) New budget authority, \$945,247,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$945,247,000,000.

Fiscal year 2034:

(A) New budget authority, \$913,790,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$913,790,000,000.

(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$127,603,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$127,603,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$135,110,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$135,110,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$137,883,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$137,883,000,000.

Fiscal year 2028:

(A) New budget authority, \$141,145,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$141,165,000,000.

Fiscal year 2029:

(A) New budget authority, \$145,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$145,407,000,000.

Fiscal year 2030:

(A) New budget authority, \$149,582,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$149,581,000,000.

Fiscal year 2031:

(A) New budget authority, \$154,014,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$154,013,000,000.

Fiscal year 2032:

(A) New budget authority, \$160,114,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$160,113,000,000.

Fiscal year 2033:

(A) New budget authority, \$166,102,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$166,101,000,000.

Fiscal year 2034:

(A) New budget authority, \$171,015,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$171,014,000,000.

Subtitle B—Levels and Amounts in the Senate

SEC. 1201. SOCIAL SECURITY IN THE SENATE.

(a) SOCIAL SECURITY REVENUES.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633 and 642), the amounts of revenues of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2025: \$1,303,924,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026: \$1,363,672,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027: \$1,418,444,000,000.

Fiscal year 2028: \$1,471,555,000,000.

Fiscal year 2029: \$1,530,067,000,000.

Fiscal year 2030: \$1,590,856,000,000.

Fiscal year 2031: \$1,653,864,000,000.

Fiscal year 2032: \$1,717,636,000,000.

Fiscal year 2033: \$1,781,872,000,000.

Fiscal year 2034: \$1,848,256,000,000.

(b) SOCIAL SECURITY OUTLAYS.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633 and 642), the amounts of outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2025: \$1,413,704,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026: \$1,496,323,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027: \$1,585,399,000,000.

Fiscal year 2028: \$1,686,635,000,000.

Fiscal year 2029: \$1,786,689,000,000.

Fiscal year 2030: \$1,890,295,000,000.

Fiscal year 2031: \$1,998,538,000,000.

Fiscal year 2032: \$2,111,627,000,000.

Fiscal year 2033: \$2,224,148,000,000.

Fiscal year 2034: \$2,324,954,000,000.

(c) SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund for administrative expenses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,408,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$6,338,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,268,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$6,287,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,455,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$6,422,000,000.

Fiscal year 2028:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,644,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$6,584,000,000.

Fiscal year 2029:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,832,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$6,765,000,000.

Fiscal year 2030:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,033,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$6,963,000,000.

Fiscal year 2031:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,233,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,162,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2032:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,437,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,365,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2033:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,651,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,576,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2034:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,869,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,792,000,000.

SEC. 1202. POSTAL SERVICE DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES IN THE SENATE.

In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Postal Service for discretionary administrative expenses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$268,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$268,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$279,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$279,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$289,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$289,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2028:
 (A) New budget authority, \$299,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$299,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2029:
 (A) New budget authority, \$309,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$309,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2030:
 (A) New budget authority, \$319,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$319,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2031:
 (A) New budget authority, \$330,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$330,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2032:
 (A) New budget authority, \$341,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$341,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2033:
 (A) New budget authority, \$352,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$352,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2034:
 (A) New budget authority, \$364,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$364,000,000.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

SEC. 2001. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit by not less than \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

(b) COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES.—The Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that increase the deficit by not more than \$150,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

(c) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND WORKFORCE.—The Committee on Education and Workforce of the House of Representatives shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit by not less than \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

(d) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—The Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit by not less than \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

(e) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—The Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit by not less than \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

(f) COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY.—The Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives shall report

changes in laws within its jurisdiction that increase the deficit by not more than \$175,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

(g) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that increase the deficit by not more than \$175,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

(h) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that increase the deficit by not more than \$20,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

(i) SUBMISSIONS.—In the House of Representatives, not later than March 7, 2025, the committees named in the subsections of this section shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives to carry out this section.

SEC. 2002. RECONCILIATION IN THE SENATE.

(a) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY.—The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit by not less than \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

(b) COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES.—The Committee on Armed Services of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that increase the deficit by not more than \$150,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

(c) COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION.—The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that increase the deficit by not more than \$20,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

(d) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES.—The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit by not less than \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

(e) COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS.—The Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that increase the deficit by not more than \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

(f) COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.—The Committee on Finance of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit by not less than \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

(g) COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS.—The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reduce the deficit by not less than \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

(h) COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS.—The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that increase the deficit by not more than \$175,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

(i) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that increase the deficit by not more than \$175,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

(j) SUBMISSIONS.—In the Senate, not later than March 7, 2025, the committees named in

the subsections of this section shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the Senate. Upon receiving all such recommendations, the Committee on the Budget of the Senate shall report to the Senate a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS

SEC. 3001. RESERVE FUND FOR RECONCILIATION LEGISLATION.

(a) HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In the House of the Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill or joint resolution considered pursuant to section 2001 containing the recommendations of one or more committees, or for one or more amendments to, a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to such a bill or joint resolution, by the amounts necessary to accommodate the budgetary effects of the legislation, if the budgetary effects of the legislation comply with the reconciliation instructions under this concurrent resolution.

(2) DETERMINATION OF COMPLIANCE.—For purposes of this section, compliance with the reconciliation instructions under this concurrent resolution shall be determined by the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives.

(3) EXCEPTION FOR LEGISLATION.—The point of order set forth in clause 10 of rule XXI of the House of Representatives shall not apply to reconciliation legislation reported by the Committee on the Budget pursuant to subsections under section 2001.

(b) SENATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for any bill or joint resolution considered pursuant to section 2002 containing the recommendations of one or more committees, or for one or more amendments to, a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to such a bill or joint resolution, by the amounts necessary to accommodate the budgetary effects of the legislation, if the budgetary effects of the legislation comply with the reconciliation instructions under this concurrent resolution.

(2) DETERMINATION OF COMPLIANCE.—For purposes of this section, compliance with the reconciliation instructions under this concurrent resolution shall be determined by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

(3) EXCEPTIONS FOR LEGISLATION.—

(A) SHORT-TERM.—Section 404 of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010, as amended by section 3201(b)(2) of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, shall not apply to legislation for which the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate has exercised the authority under paragraph (1).

(B) LONG-TERM.—Section 3101 of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, shall not apply to legislation for which the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate has exercised the authority under paragraph (1).

SEC. 3002. RESERVE FUND FOR DEFICIT-NEUTRAL LEGISLATION.

(a) SENATE.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate

levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports by the amounts provided in such legislation, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

(b) **HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**—The chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, or conference reports by the amounts provided in such legislation, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal year 2025 to fiscal year 2034.

SEC. 3003. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROTECTING MEDICARE AND MEDICAID.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to protecting the Medicaid program under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.), which may include strengthening and improving Medicaid for the most vulnerable populations, and extending the life of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

SEC. 3004. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO GOVERNMENT DEREGULATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reducing burdensome and costly Federal Government regulations by passing legislation focused on government deregulation that will decrease new spending arising from such regulations and reassert the proper constitutional role of Congress in the law-making process by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2025 through 2029 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

TITLE IV—OTHER MATTERS

SEC. 4001. ENFORCEMENT FILING.

(a) **IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**—In the House of Representatives, if a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2025 is adopted without the appointment of a committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses with respect to this concurrent resolution on the budget, for the purpose of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.) and applicable rules and requirements set forth in the concurrent resolution on the budget, the allocations provided for in this subsection shall apply in the House of Representatives in the same manner as if such allocations were in a joint explanatory statement accompanying a conference report on the budget for fiscal year 2025. The chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives shall submit a statement for

publication in the Congressional Record containing—

(1) for the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal year 2025 consistent with title I for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633); and

(2) for all committees other than the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations consistent with title I for fiscal year 2025 and for the period of fiscal years 2025 through 2034 for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633).

(b) **IN THE SENATE.**—If this concurrent resolution on the budget is agreed to by the Senate and House of Representatives without the appointment of a committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may submit a statement for publication in the Congressional Record containing—

(1) for the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal year 2025 consistent with the levels in title I for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633); and

(2) for all committees other than the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal years 2025, 2025 through 2029, and 2025 through 2034 consistent with the levels in title I for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633).

SEC. 4002. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

(a) **SENATE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In the Senate, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)(1)), section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 632 note), and section 2009a of title 39, United States Code, the report or the joint explanatory statement accompanying this concurrent resolution on the budget or the statement filed pursuant to section 4001(b), as applicable, shall include in an allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)) to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate of amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and the United States Postal Service.

(2) **SPECIAL RULE.**—In the Senate, for purposes of enforcing section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(f)), estimates of the level of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any discretionary amounts described in paragraph (1).

(b) **HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In the House of Representatives, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)(1)), section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 632 note), and section 2009a of title 39, United States Code, the report or the joint explanatory statement accompanying this concurrent resolution on the budget or the statement filed pursuant to section 4001(a), as applicable, shall include in an allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)) to the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives of amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and the United States Postal Service.

(2) **SPECIAL RULE.**—In the House of Representatives, for purposes of enforcing section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(f)), estimates of the level of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any dis-

cretionary amounts described in paragraph (1).

SEC. 4003. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS, AGGREGATES, AND OTHER BUDGETARY LEVELS.

(a) **APPLICATION.**—Any adjustments of allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels made pursuant to this concurrent resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) **EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS, AGGREGATES, AND OTHER BUDGETARY LEVELS.**—Revised allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.) as the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels contained in this concurrent resolution.

(c) **BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.**—For purposes of this concurrent resolution, the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the applicable House of Congress.

SEC. 4004. ADJUSTMENT AUTHORITY FOR REVISIONS TO STATUTORY CAPS.

During the 119th Congress, if a legislative measure is enacted that revises the discretionary spending limit established under subsection (c) of section 251 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901), the Chair of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may, consistent with the legislative measure and as necessary—

(1) adjust the allocation required under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)) to the appropriate committee or committees of the Senate; and

(2) adjust all other budgetary aggregates, allocations, levels, and limits established under this Concurrent Resolution.

SEC. 4005. ADJUSTMENTS TO REFLECT CHANGES IN CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.

(a) **HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**—In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the appropriate aggregates, allocations, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any change in budgetary concepts and definitions consistent with section 251(b)(1) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(1)).

(b) **SENATE.**—In the Senate, upon the enactment of a bill or joint resolution providing for a change in concepts or definitions, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may make adjustments to the levels and allocations in this concurrent resolution in accordance with section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)).

SEC. 4006. ADJUSTMENT FOR CHANGES IN THE BASELINE.

The chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution to reflect changes resulting from the Congressional Budget Office's updates to its baseline for fiscal years 2025 through 2034, including the effects of legislation enacted before the date on which this concurrent resolution is agreed to.

SEC. 4007. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

Congress adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House or of that House to which they specifically apply, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such other rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either the Senate or the House of Representatives to change those rules (insofar as they relate to that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as is the case of any other rule of the Senate or House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table.

The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, tonight, one amendment at a time, Democrats exposed Republicans' true colors here on the Senate floor. For the first time this year, Senate Republicans were forced to go on record and defend their plans to cut taxes for Donald Trump's billionaire friends.

What happened tonight was only the beginning. This debate is going to go on for weeks and maybe months. Democrats will be ready to come back and do this over and over again because Americans deserve to know the truth. And what is the truth? Under Donald Trump's Republican Party, billionaires win and American families lose. Billionaires win and American families lose. That is it. That is the Republican agenda.

Tonight, we gave Republicans one chance after another to do the right thing and put the needs of American families first. We voted on amendments to prevent any tax cuts for billionaires paid for with cuts to Medicaid. Republicans said no. We voted on an amendment to protect maternal and children's healthcare from draconian cuts. Republicans said no. We voted on an amendment to make it easier for Americans to rent or own a home. Republicans said no. Again and again and again, Republicans sent a clear and consistent message from the Senate floor: Under their agenda, billionaires win and American families lose.

If Republicans continue with this reckless plan to help their billionaire buddies at the expense of American families, Democrats will make sure the American people know the truth at every opportunity.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

EXECUTIVE SESSION**EXECUTIVE CALENDAR**

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 21.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Daniel Driscoll, of North Carolina, to be Secretary of the Army.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 21, Daniel Driscoll, of North Carolina, to be Secretary of the Army.

John Thune, John R. Curtis, Steve Daines, Tim Sheehy, Marsha Blackburn, Eric Schmitt, John Boozman, Mike Crapo, Mike Rounds, Tommy Tuberville, Jim Justice, Markwayne Mullin, John Barrasso, Cindy Hyde-Smith, James Lankford, Ted Budd, Mike Lee.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION**EXECUTIVE CALENDAR**

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 22.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Jamieson Greer, of Maryland, to be United States Trade Representative, with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 22, Jamieson Greer, of Maryland, to be United States Trade Representative, with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

John Thune, John R. Curtis, Steve Daines, Tim Sheehy, Marsha Blackburn, Eric Schmitt, John Boozman, Mike Crapo, Tommy Tuberville, Mike Rounds, Jim Justice, Markwayne Mullin, John Barrasso, Cindy Hyde-Smith, James Lankford, Ted Budd, Mike Lee.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session and 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.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS**TRIBUTE TO JOEL FLATOW**

• Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, earlier this month, Joel Flatow celebrated his 30th anniversary working with the Recording Industry Association of America, RIAA. I rise today to recognize his three decades of dedication to the music industry, fighting to protect the rights of musicians across the country.

The son of naturally gifted singers Meyer and Elinor Flatow, Joel was raised to love music. Growing up on Long Island alongside his brother Edward and sister Paula, he was immersed in the world of music from an early age. In school, he mastered everything from the piano to the French horn to childhood operas, even training at the Juilliard and Manhattan School of Music Pre-College Divisions from ages 6 to 18.

When he left New York to attend Yale University, he found a community of artists just like him and began to perform as a soloist with the Yale Bach Society and Yale Glee Club. His senior year, he even earned a spot with the famed a capella group the Yale Whiffenpoofs that took him around the world.

After graduation, Joel found himself in Washington, DC, advocating for more Federal funding for the arts with the Congressional Arts Caucus and later working for New York Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan. Even through busy days and nights on the Hill, his love for performing never stopped. Soon after arriving, Joel had auditioned and earned a full year contract as a tenor for the Washington Opera at the Kennedy Center, the first of what would become 10 seasons with the company.

In 1995, he was hired by RIAA and was quickly making waves mobilizing support for the Digital Performance Right in Sound Recordings Act, which was signed into law in 1995. By 2000, Joel headed west for Los Angeles, tasked with setting up RIAA's West Coast office.

As senior vice president of artist and industry relations and chief of West