

90 days. We think the deportation shot clock will empower the Trump administration to expedite deportations of these criminals and get them off our streets.

And following the dangerous actions of Nashville Mayor O'Connell and his office, I am also introducing legislation that will make it illegal to doxx Federal law enforcement officials who are working to get these criminal illegal aliens off the streets. We realized after this occurrence that they were not included in the "covered persons" provisions.

So I invite my Democrat colleagues to join us in this. If not, I invite them, come down here. Talk about why they would choose to support criminal illegal aliens instead of working to make our community safer and to uphold the rule of law.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—RECESS

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate recess following the cloture vote on the O'Neill nomination until 4 p.m. today.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

BUDGET RECONCILIATION

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, no one asked for this. No one asked for the biggest wealth transfer in American history from the poorest people in the country to the richest people to ever exist. No one asked for the biggest ever cuts to Medicaid, to kick 14 million people off of health insurance, and raise out-of-pocket costs for 20 million people. No one asked for food assistance to be slashed for millions of children and low-income families. No one asked for higher prices at the pump or on their electricity bills. No one asked for students across the country to lose Federal financial aid.

No one asked for any of this—and I really mean that. That is not just a rhetorical flourish. I don't think Trump voters asked for this. I know Harris voters did not ask for this. I don't think anybody really wants this.

I think the reason that all of these crazy, harmful policies are about to be enacted is for one simple reason, and that is to generate enough revenue to satisfy the insatiable desire for tax cuts for people who make more than \$4 million a year. They are literally taking money out of food assistance and Medicaid and Affordable Care Act monthly subsidies.

By the way, you don't know if you get a subsidy or not. You just go on the exchange, and you pay the thing. The thing is, that thing is probably \$400 or \$500 or \$600 a month less than it used to be because of the subsidies.

It is one thing to say 14 million people are going to get kicked off of Medicaid—and they will. It is another thing to say, because of those Medicaid cuts, a bunch of clinics and hospitals in rural communities are going to shut down—and they will.

I think what is a little underrated is many, many more millions of people

are going to pay not \$50 more a year, not \$100 more per month, but many hundreds of dollars more per month. Why? Because when you yank that money out of the system, it is what is called a pay-for. It means it generates a ton of revenue.

How does it generate that revenue? By screwing regular people.

They are racing to pass a bill that does all of these things and that raises the debt by many trillions of dollars.

I think the problem some of us have—and I really appreciate the Presiding Officer. And when we agree, we work really well together, and when we disagree, we are at least able to stay civil. So I am trying to take the edge off of this. But one of the reasons that it sounds like I am frothing at the mouth and saying a bunch of partisan talking points is that it is kind of hard to believe that any political party would actually do this on purpose.

It is quite hard to believe that you would cut food assistance and cut healthcare and cut help for regular working people in order to shovel money to people making more than \$4 million a year. But that is exactly what they are doing.

It is as if they designed this bill in a lab to make the maximum number of people angry. It is unpopular. It is unnecessary. And they are doing it anyway.

Hospitals serving rural and low-income communities will be forced to shutter because they won't be adequately compensated for their services—by the way, again, not a talking point. Go and visit any rural clinic or hospital. Ask them what percentage of their payer mix comes from Medicaid and what would happen if they lost a big chunk of that. A lot of them say—the big ones—big is relative. But in the State of Hawaii, our big institutions say: We could stay afloat. We just have to deliver a lot less care. And then everybody would end up in the ER, right?

The Queen's Medical Center, the sort of No. 1 trauma center in the middle of Honolulu, is already bursting at the seams. You have multiple people in the hallways. All of the rooms, all of the beds are taken. It was just a couple of months ago that they finally figured out a way not to release the psychiatric emergencies right onto Punchbowl Street in their hospital gowns.

That is before they do this to the hospitals.

After the ACA passed, you would go on the exchange, select a plan, and pay a fraction of what you used to pay. I think one of the things is that ObamaCare is now so old that people forgot how horrible it was before then—really horrible. So now you just go on, and you are kind of irritated because it is still money, and it still feels like too much, and it feels like your HMO or provider nitpicks you and doesn't cover a bunch of care, and copays are too high. But it is way, way better than it used to be.

So this whole enterprise is for one single purpose, and that is to generate

enough money to cut taxes for billionaire corporations and people who make \$4 million or more in revenue. It is very, very few people benefiting and tens of millions of people being screwed.

There is little in this bill that will help regular people who are already struggling to meet their monthly obligations. But there are plenty of rewards for the ultrawealthy. Millionaires stand to gain roughly \$70,000 in tax cuts, while billionaires in the top 1 percent receive close to \$300,000 in benefits.

And how did they find that money to shovel to the millionaires and billionaires?

I don't mind a millionaire or a billionaire. I know, like, two billionaires. We are not close, but I have met them. I am sure I know many millionaires. There are a number of colleagues in the Senate who are in that category. So it is not like—I am not trying to demonize anybody.

I am saying: Do they need \$300,000? I know people who need \$300. I know people who actually won't be able to stay on any healthcare at all if these subsidies go away.

This is not the closing of loopholes. This is not fiscal discipline. I want to make this point as clearly as I can. We would be in a harder position to argue against this bill if it were actually deficit-neutral because, traditionally, the accusation against Democrats is they want to bust the budget, and Republicans want to be responsible.

But this one is weird because this is under the guise of "We have got to do austerity; we have got to do tough stuff; we have got to cut." Then they come up with a bill that actually increases the deficit over baseline, even when they do their kind of nonsensical accounting where they basically have stopped counting the tax cuts that are in place because, you know, that is the baseline.

And so the whole enterprise—and everybody needs to understand this. They are making everything more expensive. That is food. That is medicine. That is groceries. That is gasoline. That is electricity. And the reason they are making it more expensive is because they are either indifferent to the suffering or, more importantly, they just need the money.

And they don't need the money to—you know, we raised taxes in the past, as a country, to fight a war, to beat Nazism; or we raised taxes in the past to shrink the deficit; or we raised taxes and raised costs for people to invest in something important. That is not what we are doing here. We are blowing up the budget, and we are harming regular people in order to provide tax cuts for people who literally didn't ask for it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1943

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am here to ask unanimous consent on

a very simple measure to make sure that the data systems of Social Security were not compromised—that no data was exfiltrated, no bugs were infiltrated, and no back doors were left in when Elon Musk and his little gang of miscreants went into Social Security.

I will talk more about this afterward, but the chairman of the Finance Committee has elsewhere to be. So I will speak after I have offered this, and he has responded. I will go directly to my unanimous consent request.

As if in legislative session, and notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of my bill, S. 1943, introduced earlier today; that the bill be considered read three times and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I rise today to discuss Senator WHITEHOUSE's request for unanimous consent for the Senate to pass the Protecting Seniors' Data Act of 2025.

I agree with my colleague that Federal Agencies must take all necessary steps to safeguard the personally identifiable information entrusted to them by the people they serve.

Along these lines, the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration, SSA, who was nominated by President Trump and confirmed by Senate Republicans last month, has spent his career protecting personally identifiable information. He has also committed to doing the same as Commissioner of the SSA.

However, legislation is not needed to request a Government Accountability Office, GAO, audit on a specific topic of interest.

Additionally, the Comptroller General, who leads the GAO, testified before the Senate Appropriations Committee earlier this year that GAO is already conducting a review of DOGE's access to agency systems, including at the Social Security Administration.

During his testimony, the Comptroller General also stated that GAO will issue public reports to the Congress on its findings from these reviews.

For these reasons, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. These remarks would ordinarily precede the exchange we just had, but as a courtesy to the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee, we are going a little bit out of order. I will now fill in the statement that I would have made.

Senator CRAPO is obviously well aware of my concerns here. As I said at the very beginning, we have reason to believe that Elon Musk and his little gang of frat boys, tech bros, miscreants—call them the “Muskrats,”

the “DOGE Boys”—whatever you want. They went into Social Security with bad intent.

The cover that they went in under was they were going to look for waste, fraud, and abuse. But I think we know that the waste, fraud, and abuse veil in which the “DOGE Boys” wrapped themselves was a fake, because if you were actually concerned about waste, fraud, and abuse, you wouldn't fire all the inspectors general.

You would actually try to recruit the inspectors general into your so-called government efficiency effort because what inspectors general do all day is actually look for waste, fraud, and abuse.

And you could go through their files and say: Here, what are the biggest areas that we should be paying attention to?

And you would work with the inspectors general. Instead, they were fired. That whole apparatus to actually seek waste, fraud, and abuse was set aside and in came the “DOGE Boys,” a little bit like in “The Cat in the Hat”—“Thing One” and “Thing Two”—except there were 100 more of them running around doing considerable damage to government Agencies and government systems.

And to a very significant extent, doing damage to government Agencies and systems was the point. This was not the bug. This was the feature. They went in to try to wreck stuff, and it became particularly dangerous around Social Security because, first of all, there was a propaganda campaign to talk down Social Security, to pretend, falsely, that it was riddled with fraud. That took place, including right over on the House floor, when the President came to speak to Congress and repeatedly lied about Social Security fraud.

Then you had the infiltration of people who were from tech bro world and from private equity world, exactly taking over Social Security. Then you had people talking up benefit interruptions like that was an OK thing. Well, a benefit interruption would be an excuse to go in and take over Social Security to privatize it with tech bros and with private equity people.

I think the noise that we made about that headed it off, but there remains the lingering danger that when they got into Social Security's data systems, they exfiltrated data because data has enormous value, or they infiltrated bugs to do damage to the old systems of Social Security; or, worst of all, perhaps, they left back doors so that Elon Musk or other folks who were interested in getting access to massive amounts of Americans' data can find their way into Social Security's data systems secretly.

So this is a very simple measure. It asks for an audit of Social Security data systems to make sure that those things did not happen. That really ought to be a bipartisan, if not unanimous, expression of Senate intention. That is why I hoped we could generate unanimous consent for it today.

I yield the floor to the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Finance Senator WYDEN.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I rise in support of his efforts. He is a valued member of the Senate Finance Committee, and this is a thoughtful approach to bring accountability at Social Security.

The legislation directs the independent nonpartisan Government Accountability Office to conduct a top-to-bottom audit of Social Security's databases and in the process, determine whether DOGE left the Agency vulnerable to cyber attacks when its agents gained unfettered access to Agency records.

Americans want to know whether the DOGE agents violated Federal privacy and cyber security laws when they accessed their personal information.

Now, I have said it once. I will repeat it again. Social Security's databases represent the Fort Knox of Americans' personal lives.

I see our friend from South Dakota here. He is a member of the Intelligence Committee. We have talked about privacy issues on a number of occasions, and privacy is what the Whitehouse legislation is all about. This whole question of the Social Security databases involves people's bank account numbers, their home addresses, work histories, salaries, medical records. The list goes on and on.

Social Security, under the direction of the DOGE-appointed Acting Commissioner, let Mr. Musk's cronies stroll in without raising a finger. It remains to be seen what is going to happen with Mr. Musk no longer leading DOGE and the new Commissioner Mr. Bisignano taking the helm at Social Security.

It is clear that DOGE accessed the original records under false pretenses, and they were claiming that there was rampant fraud throughout the Social Security program.

As the top Democrat on the Senate Finance Committee, I have been demanding evidence from the Trump administration for some time now about the existence of all of this “fraud.” Social Security has refused to provide me with a single shred of evidence. That is because—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BANKS). The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent and my friend from South Dakota for 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, Social Security, as I say, has refused to provide me with a shred of evidence because we already know from the Social Security watchdog that Social Security fraud—and, colleagues, this is the relevant number—represents 0.009 percent of payments.

So we have known for some time that this effort is part of the Trump plan to cut Americans' Social Security benefits. I believe the long-term objective is

to privatize the program so it can be sold off to some billionaires and he can weaponize Social Security to go after groups it wants to target.

This effort is also part of what Donald Trump, Mr. Musk, and Peter Thiel have made a broader effort all about, and that is to collect and compile a master list of personal information on each American by pulling from the IRS and the Departments of Homeland Security, Education, and Social Security.

I close by saying, thankfully, Federal courts have slowed DOGE's access to Social Security records for now. But the fact is, there needs to be a comprehensive understanding of the damage to make sure Americans' data is protected. That is why Senator WHITEHOUSE's legislation is so important. I urge its passage.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

WAIVING QUORUM CALL

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to waive the mandatory quorum call with respect to the O'Neill nomination.

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

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 144, James O'Neill, of California, to be Deputy Secretary of Health and Human Services.

John Thune, Mike Crapo, Thom Tillis, Todd Young, Ron Johnson, Marsha Blackburn, Katie Boyd Britt, Cynthia M. Lummis, James Lankford, Markwayne Mullin, John Barrasso, Tommy Tuberville, Ted Budd, Chuck Grassley, Bill Cassidy, David McCormick.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the mandatory quorum call under rule XXII has been waived.

A quorum is present.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of James O'Neill, of California, to be Deputy Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. SHEEHY).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF) is necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 290 Ex.]

YEAS—51

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

NAYS—46

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

NOT VOTING—3

Capito	Ossoff	Sheehy
--------	--------	--------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 51, and the nays are 46.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of James O'Neill, of California, to be Deputy Secretary of Health and Human Services.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 4 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 2:35 p.m. recessed until 4 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. SCHMITT).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

ONE BIG BEAUTIFUL BILL ACT

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I am joining my colleagues today to speak in opposition to the Republicans' catastrophic budget bill that will end healthcare coverage for millions of American families so that President Trump can orchestrate the largest transfer of wealth from the poor and the working class to the ultrarich that we have ever seen in this country.

This bill has nearly \$1 trillion in healthcare cuts, including over \$800 billion in Medicaid cuts. In total, the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office estimates that this bill would not only add \$2.4 trillion to our national deficit,

but it also kicks 16 million Americans off of their health insurance in the next 10 years. In Nevada, that means about 95,271 people will lose their healthcare and 66,571 will be kicked off of Medicaid.

These numbers alone should at least give my Republican colleagues pause, make them think about how devastating this bill would be for our working families, and maybe even reconsider moving forward with trying to ram it through Congress.

But there is more to this than just these big numbers, and it needs to be brought to light. I was just home in Nevada meeting with Nevadans, hospitals, and providers. With the Medicaid cuts they are anticipating from this billionaire tax giveaway, hospitals are bracing themselves not just for coverage losses but for the downstream impact on care and costs. This is going to affect our most vulnerable populations in Nevada—seniors, children, veterans, parents of children with rare diseases, pregnant women, and our elderly in nursing homes.

When people lose coverage, they delay their care. A single mom who is living paycheck to paycheck and is worried about putting food on the table for her kids is not going to go to the doctor if she has a persistent cough; she will wait. But that means that when her cough turns serious, making it harder for her to breathe, she will have to go to the emergency room for treatment. By then, it is more dangerous for her and more expensive for everyone involved. The hospital she goes to has to treat her regardless of whether or not she has health insurance. If she can't pay, the hospital is on the hook for the cost of her care.

Now, if you are in a rural or underserved area, of which we have many in Nevada and across the country, and the one hospital for miles can't afford to keep those doors open, it may scale back or close altogether. The hospital staff has to choose which services to cut. Labor and delivery? Mental health care? Trauma units? These are services entire communities rely on. Or will they be forced to close entirely if they can't make up the cost?

In rural Nevada, people sometimes have to drive 2, 3, 4 hours to see their doctor. A hospital closure would be devastating for rural families trying to access even basic care. That is the danger we are facing with this bill.

This isn't just about Medicaid patients. As providers look to cover the cost of treating more uninsured patients, those expenses will shift to everyone, to working families and to employers, and premiums and out-of-pocket costs will soar—all so that this President and Republicans can pay for tax cuts for billionaires.

You know, this is also going to impact Nevadans who rely on the Affordable Care Act for their medical insurance. Republicans, in their bill, cut almost \$300 billion from the ACA marketplace plans, and that would kick