



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 119th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 171

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JUNE 30, 2025

No. 113

Senate

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

ONE BIG BEAUTIFUL BILL ACT— Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 1, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of H. Con. Res. 14.

Pending:

Thune (for Graham) amendment No. 2360, in the nature of a substitute.

Schumer motion to appeal the ruling of the Chair that Thune point of order under section 313(b)(1)(E) of the Congressional Budget Act against Thune (for Graham) amendment No. 2360 (listed above).

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

H.R. 1

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, today, Senate Republicans have to decide: choose the American people or bow down to Donald Trump and his coterie of billionaires because this bill, as we have said for months, steals people's healthcare, jacks up their electricity bills, takes away their jobs—all to pay for tax breaks for billionaires.

All month, Senate Democrats have put this bill on trial in the court of public opinion. We have exposed how it steals Medicaid for more than 16 million Americans. We have exposed how it takes away food benefits from millions of hungry kids. We have exposed how this bill increases the debt by \$3.5 trillion to bankroll billionaire tax breaks. We have shown how this bill increases the debt \$1 trillion more than the House bill. We have shown how this bill cuts Medicaid even more than the House bill. We have shown how this bill kills climate jobs even more than the House bill.

With every rewrite, Senate Republicans have made their bill more ex-

treme, pro-billionaire, and more hostile to people's healthcare and livelihoods. Why do they do that? There is a small group on that side of the aisle—the MAGA hard-rightwingers—who is dictating what has happened, and all the rest of the Senators on the Republican side, who know it is wrong, go along. It is a small group. They don't represent more than 10 percent of the American people, but they are dictating what this body does, A, because of the rules we have—a simple majority—but, B, because our colleagues on the Republican side lack the courage of their convictions to do the right thing for the American people.

It is outrageous cutting people's healthcare, causing people to get sicker and to even die; cutting people's healthcare so that it is certain, almost, that more people will die—just to give tax breaks to billionaires. It is so destructive for Republicans to pass a bill like this at a time when people pay more for groceries, when people pay more for rent, pay more for childcare, pay more for medication. It makes no sense to reward the billionaire class and special interests at the expense of everyone else.

Look, there is nothing wrong with being wealthy, but they don't need another tax break, and they certainly shouldn't get a tax break by taking food from the mouths of hungry children—how outrageous, how cruel, how mean, how heartless, how uncaring—all to help the billionaires, whom they are enthralled to.

No surprise about it, many Republicans themselves don't seem all happy about the bill in front of them. We heard what our colleague from North Carolina had to say about this bill. My guess is about half—maybe even more than half—of the Republicans in the Senate totally agree with him, but he had the courage to speak the truth—the backbone to speak the truth—but not our other colleagues. Senator TLLIS spoke candidly. He was one of

The Senate met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty and everlasting God, You have been our help in ages past. You are our hope for the years to come. You are our shelter from the stormy blast. You are our eternal home.

Lord, today, keep our lawmakers from being so busy and weary that they have no time to listen to Your voice. Keep them from permitting the voice of their desires to make them deaf to Your word. Lord, keep us all from sometimes forgetting that Your commands are meant for us, and Your promises are true.

We pray in Your marvelous Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORENO). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S4037

the few truth-tellers on the other side as the bill devastates his State.

But make no mistake about it, it will devastate the States of most every Republican here. Week after week, month after month, year after year, when this bill passes, the destructive treatise will be all over their States, with people losing jobs, with people's costs going up, with people not getting healthcare, with hungry kids not getting food. It is a piece of legislation that TILLIS can't sell back home, and you won't be able to either, my Republican colleagues.

How can any Senator go home and tell their constituents, "I am sorry. I took away your healthcare because I wanted to give tax breaks to billionaires"?

Yet, Republicans are dead set on walking off a cliff by passing a bill they know will be ruinous to their own constituents.

That is why Democrats—Senate Democrats—forced this Chamber to read the bill cover to cover. That is why we debated all day yesterday, and now it is the Republicans' turn to vote.

Later this morning—very soon—we will begin the vote-arama process. Senate Democrats will bring one amendment after the other—again and again and again—to put Republicans on the record. We will begin this morning with a motion to appeal the ruling of the Chair to try to reverse Republicans' brazen attempts to deceive the American people about the true costs of the bill.

Republicans are doing something that has never been done before in the Senate by deploying fake math and budgetary hocus-pocus to make it seem like their billionaire giveaways don't cost anything. That is obviously outrageous, and it is absurd that the Budget chair is taking the Senate down this fact-free road. He is helping erode and even destroy the Senate. Every Senator will soon have an opportunity to reject this nonsense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will remind the Senator of rule XIX.

Mr. SCHUMER. Every Senator will soon have an opportunity to reject this nonsense and vote for commonsense budgeting. Americans will be watching.

Later this morning, I will offer a very simple amendment to send this bill back to the Finance Committee so that we can get rid of any provision that raises healthcare costs for families and small businesses to pay for tax cuts for billionaires. My colleagues will offer many other amendments here too. We will see, once and for all, if Republicans really meant all of those nice things they have been saying about strengthening Medicare and about protecting middle-class families or if they were just lying. The American people will find out in a few hours.

Republicans have said they don't want to cut Medicaid. Today, we will give you the chance.

Republicans say they want to prioritize the middle class. Today, we will give you the chance.

Our amendments will give Republicans so many chances to defend Medicaid and SNAP and good-paying jobs and clean energy that, if they say no, they will regret it long after this debate is done.

Finally, to my Republican colleagues, let me offer a warning in good faith. You all know that Donald Trump makes things up. He has no regard for the truth. When he talks about this bill, he is lying. When Donald Trump says this bill won't cut Medicaid, he is lying. When he says this bill will grow the economy, he is lying. When he says this is the best thing Congress could pass for our country, he is lying.

So what are my colleagues on the Republican side going to do—listen to someone who just makes things up? Listen to someone who peddles lies and fantasies? Follow Donald Trump off a political cliff by passing a bill that will be disastrous for the people back home or will my colleagues stand up for the American people—stand up to protect healthcare, good-paying jobs, and middle-class families?

The American people will not forget what Republicans do in this Chamber today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To my colleagues, it is going to be a long day. I just want to remind everybody the rules of the Senate, rule XIX, that no Senator to debate shall directly or indirectly, by any form of words, impute to another Senator or other Senators any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming of a Senator.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

H.R. 1

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, we are going to vote here real soon on a bill that has been worked on for many, many months. I want to start by thanking the staff on the committees, the relevant committees, the floor staff—everybody who has been around who has to put in the hours and get us to where we are today. They are extraordinary people who are very dedicated to their jobs and the public service, and we are grateful for that.

I will say, too, we went through the reading of the bill—which the Democratic leader just pointed out was important for people to hear—through the middle of the night. I don't think there was a big American audience for that. I think a lot of people were at their jobs, working their shifts—people like nurses and firefighters who are going to benefit under this bill. To think that they were sitting there in their jobs watching the bill be read on the floor for endless hours in the middle of the night—I am not sure what that achieved; but I will tell you what the Senator said, the Democrat leader, back in 2021, when a Republican Senator required that to be done. He said this:

It will accomplish little more than a few sore throats for the Senate clerks who work

very hard day in, day out to help the Senate function.

Those clerks are here today. And one of the reasons that we tried to give them a break last night is because they had to stay here the night before to read through the bill. In the dead of the night, nobody watching, but they did it. So, hopefully, they got a little bit of rest last night so we can start this off.

Mr. President, the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act was one of the most successful economic policy pieces of legislation in history, and the data bears it out. Look at what happened. After the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act passed, unemployment hit a 50-year low, poverty levels at record-level lows, and incomes grew. Incomes and wages increased most among lower income Americans. We started to narrow the wage gap as a result of the passage of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

So what is this about? This is about extending that tax relief so the same people who benefited from it back in 2017 and for the last 8 years don't end up having a colossal, massive tax increase hitting them in the face come January 1.

Now, who are those people? It is people, it is families making less than \$400,000 a year on whom the bulk of this would fall; \$2.6 trillion of this tax hike that they are supporting would hit families making less than \$400,000 a year.

It would hit small businesses to the tune of \$600 billion in tax increases. These are passthrough businesses, the businesses that are out there creating the jobs every day. If we don't do this, they are going to face a \$600 billion tax increase. That is what we are talking about.

If you want to put it in plain terms, if you are one of those families making less than \$400,000 a year, the child tax credit would be cut in half, the standard deduction would be cut in half, and you wouldn't get the benefit that many taxpayers are going to get under the legislation that we are going to be debating today, which would allow tips to go untaxed, allow overtime to go untaxed. Those nurses, those firefighters who are working the long shifts, not watching the bill be read here on the Senate floor, actually get something out of this that makes their families more able to cope with the challenges that they face every day. So the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act was a massive—by any stretch of the imagination—success.

There is probably no better evidence of that than the fact that the Congressional Budget Office, which has been quoted a lot here in the last few hours, actually underestimated the amount of revenue that would come into the Federal Government by \$1.5 trillion, underestimated the amount of growth in the economy by 5.4 percent—dramatically underestimated what it would generate in terms of revenue and what it would generate in terms of growth. So let's just say what this is.

And, by the way, billionaires next year will pay the same tax rate they are paying this year. The people who are going to get hit with a tax increase if we don't do something are those families making less than \$400,000 a year, who are going to see their child tax credit cut in half, their standard deduction cut in half, and their rates go back up to what they were in 2017. In my State of South Dakota, the average family is going to pay \$2,500 more if we don't do something to extend the tax relief that was passed in 2017.

The other thing that the Democrat leader got up and talked about is: Oh, they are going to be cutting Medicaid. There are a lot of government programs that haven't been looked at in a long time. We all acknowledge that 75 percent now of Federal spending is what we call mandatory spending, entitlement programs, things that Congress doesn't annually appropriate for. And it continues to grow at an uncontrollable rate.

In fact, the growth and the rate of Medicaid spending in the last 5 years has been 50 percent. That is not sustainable. We know that is not sustainable.

In the time I have been here, we have never, ever done anything to reform and improve and strengthen these programs that are growing at an unsustainable rate that will wreck our economy and wreck our country if we don't start making some changes.

So, yes, there are some improvements and reforms to Medicaid to make it more efficient, to make sure that the people who are supposed to benefit from Medicaid do, and that it doesn't go to people who shouldn't benefit from Medicaid.

Now, most of the increase in spending in Medicaid has been at what we call the expansion population, and that is the number of people out there for whom States get a 90-percent reimbursement from the Federal Government. So that has grown dramatically.

And what does that represent? It is a lot of able-bodied adults—people who should be working, people who, perhaps, don't need to be getting the assistance that is designed for people who are disabled, and the low-income, the elderly, and pregnant moms. That is what Medicaid was about.

States have, with the Federal Government, a partnership, shared for the years at a traditional rate. The expansion population is 90 percent, paid for by the Federal taxpayers. So what do States do? They game the system to get more Federal money. They add more people to the rolls. So you have people on the rolls today who are here illegally and people on the rolls here today who are not eligible for this program, and you have people here today in that program for whom there is no work requirement. So what this does is it makes some reforms, one of which—one of which—includes work requirements.

I don't think that is a novel concept. It certainly isn't a concept that I think most Americans would disagree with.

In fact, it was a Democrat President. Back in the 1990s, there was something called welfare reform. Bill Clinton, a Democrat President, proposed work requirements for welfare recipients.

And do you want to know something? The work requirements in the Welfare Reform Act passed back in 1996 and signed into law by Democrat President Bill Clinton had stronger work requirements than are included in this bill—stronger work requirements in a bill passed, signed into law by a Democrat President than what is in this bill, and proposed, I might add, by a Democrat President.

So that is one of the reforms that we are making. These are the reforms that are going to make this program stronger, more effective, more efficient, improve it in a way that it gets the assistance to the people for whom it was intended and not to people who are gaming the system.

And, yes, we address the issue of provider taxes, which has been abused—no question about it. It is another way to leverage Federal money, get more Federal money into the State coffers. And the States have used it for things not just to cover people but also for other reasons; and you have States like New York and California who gamed the system.

The whole issue of what we are doing with the Medicaid Program is to get rid of the waste, fraud, and abuse and make it work in the way in which it was intended, to cover the people for whom it was intended, and to make sure that we have work requirements included in there.

To the current policy baseline—everybody got up last night, and they were clamoring and yelling—very animated speeches—about how the Republicans are using the current policy baseline—how could they ever do that?

Well, do you know what? Back in 2012, President Obama and one of the people who was working for him at the time named Jeff Zients used the current policy baseline to make permanent the Bush tax cuts. And the way he described it—Jeff Zients described it at the time—he called it the alternative fiscal scenario. That is how they explained it to the American people. Then he translated it and said: What it is, it is a current policy baseline.

So the Democrats have used this before. In fact, they kind of—you can argue—pioneered it. But current policy baseline is something that has been used by both sides. So spare me the hypocrisy and the noise about current policy baseline. Alternative fiscal scenario, he called it, and then he went on to explain current policy baseline.

Finally, with regard to the issue of the deficits. It is rich to hear Democrats all of a sudden concerned about debt and deficits. Really? I mean, I have been here a long time, and I have not been involved in a single spending

debate and fight in which Republicans were trying to spend less and Democrats were trying to spend more, with one exception—with one exception—and that is national security. Democrats are always willing to cut defense but never want to cut anywhere else. That is my experience.

And I think it was borne out a couple of years ago when Democrats had then but we have now, which is unified control of the government—the House, Senate, and White House. So they had an opportunity to use reconciliation, which they did twice. One of the bills cost \$2 trillion; the other bill cost \$1 trillion. And it was all spending. And that, ladies and gentlemen, is the fundamental difference between us here, and I understand that. We have different views about the role of government. Democrats like government, and one of the things we know about government is when you send money to Washington—money is power, and when you send money to Washington from the American taxpayers, that means Washington has more power; it has more control. And Republicans fundamentally have believed that it is better if you allow the American people to keep their own money, that you distribute power out of Washington, DC, back to State and local governments, which are closer to the people and can make better decisions that are more informed by what is actually happening in their individual States.

So when we use reconciliation to keep taxes low—and, by the way, that is all we are doing here, is extending current tax policy. We are preventing over a \$4 trillion tax increase on the American people. And when you vote against us, that is what you would be voting for.

Now, a good example of this spending issue was the 2011 Budget Control Act in which—authored by a number of people, including Senator McCONNELL—that created a supercommittee equally represented on both sides of the aisle. And they met for a long time trying to come up with some ways that we could come up with, ways to reform the entitlement programs. And, of course, what happened is they deadlocked because every Democrat voted against it and every Republican voted for it. It even included some revenue increases, which is something Democrats are always for.

So getting up and talking about deficits all of a sudden, honestly, is kind of mind-blowing coming from this side of the aisle. What we are doing here is extending existing tax policy, using a current policy baseline which was used by the Democrats, President Obama, Jeff Zients, no less than a little more than 10 years ago.

It is time to vote, and Democrats are going to get a chance to offer all of their amendments, and they will attack this thing as cutting taxes for billionaires. What we are doing here is extending tax relief for the American people, keeping their rates low, making sure they don't have their child tax

credit cut in half, their standard deduction cut in half, including new provisions that provide more relief for working Americans, which is what President Trump campaigned on. No tax on tips, no tax on overtime, lower taxes for seniors, for Social Security recipients—these are all targeted at working Americans, working families. That is, first and foremost, what this is about.

This will make this country safer, stronger, and more prosperous. It addresses military modernization. It addresses securing our border. It addresses security dominance. It extends tax relief for the American people so they can avoid a \$4 trillion tax increase at the end of the year. And, yes, it includes some savings associated with reforms that are made in a way that targets assistance from Federal programs to where it was intended to go. And, yes, we have work requirements—work requirements that were initiated by Bill Clinton and the Clinton administration during welfare reform back in the 1990s; only, I would say again, they are not as strong.

The work requirements included in that legislation back in the 1990s—what we have in this bill, the work requirements here are not as strong.

Mr. President, let's vote. This is good for America. This is good for the American people. It is good for working families.

It has been a long debate. I know people are weary, but at the end of the day, we want to get this done so that this country is safer and stronger and more prosperous, not only for today but for future generations of Americans.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be 2 minutes equally divided prior to all rollcall votes in relation to Calendar No. 107, H.R. 1.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, well, we are about to vote on something that we have never seen before in the Senate, and rather than be honest with the American people about the true costs of these billionaire giveaways—and, by the way, I didn't hear Trump campaigning on tax breaks for billionaires, which is the main thrust of this bill. He wouldn't tell them about that.

But Republicans are doing something the Senate has never done before: deploying fake math, accounting gimmicks, to hide the true cost of the bill.

Look, Republicans can use whatever budgetary gimmicks they want to try to make the math work on paper, but you can't paper over the real-life economic consequences of adding tens of trillions to the debt, and that is what this does, make no mistake about it. And it is the way we have always calculated things.

So to vote yes on this—make no mistake about it, my colleagues—will in a dramatic way further erode the Senate. I urge a “no” vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, as to being weary, I feel great. I have never felt better. I have been wanting to do this for, like, a long time, and our ship is about in. So I am a very happy Budget chair.

As to what we are talking about right now, we are not overruling the Parliamentarian because she said it was up to the Budget chairman to set the baseline. The Chair made a decision that was right. The budget resolution gives me the authority—that we all passed—to do this.

In 2008, Senator Conrad changed the baseline to accommodate the farm bill, and the Republican former chairman, Judd Gregg, said: The chairman of the Budget Committee declared the baseline under a new budget. The Budget chairman has a right to do that.

That is what I am doing.

In 2022, Senator SANDERS directed CBO to write a new scoring rule changing the baseline to get Head Start money into the budget. So this has been done.

In 2012, in a bipartisan fashion, as the Bush tax cuts were about to expire, they extended them using current policy.

Back home: What I am trying to do—and I am very happy about it—is make sure the tax cuts don't expire 10 years from now. I want you to be able to go to bed tonight and wake up tomorrow knowing the tax cuts you have today are permanent, unless one day my Democratic colleagues change it through reconciliation.

So if you are for open borders, this bill is your worst nightmare because we control the border. If you want higher taxes, which apparently they do, this bill is your nightmare because we are going to keep taxes low. If you want to have a weak military, this is a bad bill for you because we give the military \$150 billion. If you think Washington should control spending, this is a good bill for you. If you think the government is running just perfectly and nothing could be changed, this is your nightmare.

So for those big liberal folks—whom I like personally—this bill is a nightmare for you. This bill is good for the American people who work hard. People have got to work when they can. That is a good thing. If you want taxes low, we deliver. If you want to secure the border like President Trump has done, we make it that way forever by having \$175 billion spent to get it controlled forever, not just right now. This is a good bill. We are doing nothing that we haven't done before.

Vote yes to uphold the ruling of the Chair. We are starting a process that is long overdue in this town: controlling spending, keeping taxes down, making the military strong, and finally, finally, looking at a way to get efficiency in government. Vote yes.

VOTE ON APPEALING THE RULING OF THE CHAIR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the decision of the

Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

The yeas and nays were previously ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 330 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
Gallego	Ossoff	Welch
Gillibrand	Padilla	Whitehouse
Hassan	Peters	Wyden
Heinrich	Reed	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAGERTY). On this vote, the yeas are 53, the nays are 47.

The decision of the Chair stands as the judgment of the Senate.

The majority leader.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for the following Senators to be recognized to offer amendments, motions, or points of order; that the amendments be reported by number with no amendments in order prior to a vote in relation to the amendments or motions: Schumer motion, No. 1, motion to commit on healthcare costs, Markey motion, and then the Klobuchar point of order.

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

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I make a point of order under section 313(b)(1)(b) of the Congressional Budget Act against title VII of substitute amendment No. 2360.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the Congressional Budget Act, in the presence of the Senate, the Chair must rely on the determinations made by the Budget Committee in assessing the budgetary effects of the amendment. Section 312 of the Budget Act states:

For purposes of this title and title IV, the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, and revenues for a fiscal year shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the

Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives or the Senate, as applicable.

Unless the Budget Committee, speaking to its chairman, asserts that the amendment causes a violation of the Budget Act, the Chair will not so hold.

Therefore, the point of order is not well-taken.

The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

APPEALING THE RULING OF THE CHAIR

Mr. MERKLEY. I appeal the ruling of the Chair, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

There is now 2 minutes of debate, equally divided.

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the CBO letter of June 29 to the ranking member of the Budget Committee be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
U.S. CONGRESS,
June 29, 2025.

Re Estimated Budgetary Effects of Title VII, Finance, Within an Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute to H.R. 1.

Hon. JEFF MERKLEY,
*Ranking Member, Committee on the Budget,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.*

DEAR RANKING MEMBER MERKLEY: I am writing to provide information you requested regarding the Congressional Budget Office's analysis of an amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 1, the One Big Beautiful Bill Act, as posted on the website of the Senate Committee on the Budget on June 27, 2025 (<https://tinyurl.com/2ejs4ut5>).

CBO prepared two estimates for the legislation. The first is relative to the budget enforcement baseline for consideration in the Senate. That baseline reflects adjustments regarding current tax policy made by the Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget.

The second estimate is relative to CBO's January 2025 baseline. CBO is required to construct its baseline under the assumptions specified in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Public Law 99-177) and the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-344).

In response to your questions—about the cost of title VII, Finance, estimated against CBO's January 2025 baseline—here are CBO's answers:

Would title VII, Finance, increase the deficit by more than \$1.5 trillion over the 2025-2034 period?

Yes. CBO estimates that enacting title VII would increase the deficit by nearly \$3.5 trillion over the 2025-2034 period relative to the amount in the January 2025 baseline.

Would title VII, Finance, increase deficits in any year beyond 2034?

Yes. CBO estimates that title VII would also increase deficits in years after 2034.

I hope this information is useful to you. Please contact me if you have further questions.

Sincerely,
PHILLIP L. SWAGEL,
Director.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, and in this letter, it notes that the baseline

was prepared—the alternative baseline—based on a request made by the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget.

But the letter goes on to say this:

The CBO estimates that enacting this title [VII] would increase the deficit by \$3.5 trillion over the 2025-3034 period.

Clearly, that amount, done by honest numbers from CBO, exceeds the budget resolution level, and, therefore, we should not affirm the ruling of the Chair.

It is said in this ruling, I just heard, that precedent provides a foundation for this. But, in fact, the ability of the Chair to create a phony baseline has never been used in reconciliation, not ever, and, in fact, the example cited over Head Start—Head Start—that never appeared in any budget reconciliation.

And, in fact, that conversation about Jeffrey Zients that we heard from the majority leader, that, too, was absolutely wrong. Current law was used for estimating the cost of that bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Time has expired.

Mr. MERKLEY. This is a 51-year tradition of the Senate for honest numbers—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time is expired.

The Senator from Idaho.

MR. CRAPO. Mr. President, we are just rehashing the same old arguments, but I want to make something really clear. This Congress, in the budget resolution for this reconciliation, adopted the current policy baseline. CBO scored that current policy baseline. It said that our bill generates a \$506 billion deficit reduction.

The ranking member for the Budget Committee asked them to give it a new score based on a different baseline, the current law baseline, which says that we have to say that if we don't raise people's taxes, that we are causing a deficit.

They said they would. They always do. They give the scores that different Members of Congress asked them to give. And they gave that score and said: Well, if you raise taxes by \$4 trillion, then you will have a \$4 trillion increase in tax revenue. That is what the whole debate is about, folks.

You can complain and use different words and deficits and all that stuff. There is a CBO score on the baseline adopted by this Congress on this resolution that sets the score at \$506 or \$507 billion of deficit reduction.

VOTE ON APPEALING RULING OF THE CHAIR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

The yeas and nays were previously ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 331 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
Gallego	Ossoff	Welch
Gillibrand	Padilla	Whitehouse
Hassan	Peters	Wyden
Heinrich	Reed	

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

The decision of the Chair stands as the judgment of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator Risch and I be permitted to speak for up to 1 minute each regarding the recent tragedy in our State.

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

IDAHO SHOOTINGS

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, the Senate has important work to accomplish today to prevent a more than \$4 trillion tax hike on American workers and families, and we will accomplish that goal. However, while business continues here, life for the North Idaho community of Coeur d'Alene remains at a very painful standstill as we mourn the horrific loss of two firefighters.

Yesterday afternoon, firefighters from Coeur d'Alene and Kootenai County were responding to a fire on Canfield Mountain. Upon arrival, they were ambushed by gunfire. Two brave firefighters were murdered. Another has already undergone surgery for gunshot wounds.

As we continue our work today, I ask my colleagues to join me in sending your prayers for that firefighter's full recovery, for the deceased victims, for their families, and for the entire North Idaho community grieving this heinous act.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, fellow Senators, while the Senate continues our important work to provide the American people with the largest tax cut in history today, we would be remiss if we did not pause for a moment and call attention to the tragic events

that happened in Coeur d'Alene, ID, yesterday.

While responding to a fire, as my colleague indicated, two of North Idaho's brave firefighters were ambushed and murdered, and one is in serious to critical condition. This evil attack on the people who dedicate their lives to protecting and serving our communities is despicable, and it is not Idaho.

I ask my Senate colleagues to join me, Senator CRAPO, and all Idahoans in praying for the victims, the loved ones, and all who have been affected by this reprehensible act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I stand with my Idaho colleagues. This is a very tight-knit community between Washington and Idaho. Many Washington police and responders participated in yesterday's activities.

Our hearts go out to the people of Idaho. Yes, we want a moment of silence to remember these firefighters.

Mr. RISCH. Thank you, and thank you to Washington for your help. You did send a number of first responders, which was very helpful. Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I, too, want to stand and join with our colleagues from Idaho with our deep sorrow for everyone in those impacted communities. It is close to the border of Washington.

Many of our responders joined with all of you, and our hearts and thoughts and prayers go to everyone impacted. That community will be devastated for a long time to come.

Mr. CRAPO. As we close, I would like to thank my colleagues from Washington as well as all of you. Many of you have come up and expressed your sentiments today.

I would say even the Federal workers were there, the FBI and others. There was a huge influx of support from those who put their lives on the line every day, and some lost their lives yesterday.

Because of that, I ask you to join us for just a moment of silence and prayer.

(Moment of silence.)

Mr. CRAPO. Thank you, Mr. President.

H.R. 1

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, when the Senate considers the reconciliation bill, H.R. 1, it is my intention to make the following motions to commit the bill:

1. A motion to commit the bill to the Committee on Finance of the Senate with instructions to report changes that would prevent changes in policy that will lead to increased electricity prices for American families and small businesses, while protecting American energy jobs.

This motion to commit is supported by Senators Cantwell, Bennet, Warren, Smith, Luján, Warnock, Welch, Booker, Gallego, Heinrich, Hickenlooper, Rosen, Schatz, Schiff, Schumer, and Shaheen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

MOTION TO COMMIT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I have a motion to commit at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] moves to commit the bill H.R. 1 to the Committee on Finance of the Senate with instructions to report the same back to the Senate in 3 days, not counting any day on which the Senate is not in session.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask that further reading of the motion be dispensed with.

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

The motion is as follows:

Mr. SCHUMER moves to commit the bill H.R. 1 to the Committee on Finance of the Senate with instructions to report the same back to the Senate in 3 days, not counting any day on which the Senate is not in session, with changes that—

(1) are within the jurisdiction of such committee; and

(2) would reduce the cost of health care for American families and small businesses while ensuring the wealthy and big corporations pay their fair share.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, this amendment, the first we will offer, is simple. It undoes the travesty that is at the core of the Republican bill. Their bill, the so-called Big Beautiful Bill, which is really a big, ugly betrayal, cuts taxes for billionaires by taking away healthcare from millions of people. My amendment simply says that if people's healthcare costs go up, the billionaire tax cuts vanish.

Republicans—you can tell in the speeches already—are on the defensive. They know how bad this bill is for the American people. They know that Donald Trump is lying when he says it won't cut healthcare.

I salute my colleague from North Carolina. We all heard what our colleague from North Carolina had to say yesterday about this bill. My guess is about half—maybe even more than half—of the Republicans in the Senate agree with him. But he had the courage to speak the truth. He said it himself: The bill devastates his State. But make no mistake about it, it will devastate the States of almost every Republican here.

It is outrageous—outrageous—to take food out of the mouths of hungry children, to take healthcare away from people who need it to survive—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time expired.

Mr. SCHUMER.—just for tax cuts for billionaires, and the American people know it.

To my colleagues—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. SCHUMER. To my colleagues, in conclusion, I say you know what the right thing is. Say no to cutting healthcare. Say no to gutting jobs.

Mr. CORNYN. Regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time expired.

Mr. SCHUMER. Say no to this shameful, backwards bill and vote yes on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senate from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. This is something we will hear a lot of today, and this will just be the first shot at it.

The bottom line is, billionaires are going to pay the same amount of taxes after this bill as they paid before this bill. They are going to pay the same amount. This notion about billionaires getting tax cuts at the expense of everybody else is just the politics of class rather than the politics of fear. The rest of the argument is the politics of fear.

The reality is, the reforms we are putting into place are to try to rein in control of wasteful and fraudulent and abusive spending that actually diverts resources away from the people who these programs really deserve to receive.

I urge a strong "no" vote against this amendment.

VOTE ON MOTION TO COMMIT

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

Mr. SCHUMER. 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 senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 332 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
Gallego	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 motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORENO). The Senator from Massachusetts.

MOTION TO COMMIT

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I have a motion to commit at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY] moves to commit to the bill, H.R. 1, to the Committee on Finance of the Senate with instructions to report the same back to the Senate in 3 days.

Mr. MERKLEY. I further ask that further reading of the motion be dispensed with.

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

The motion is as follows:

Mr. MARKEY moves to commit the bill H.R. 1 to the Committee on Finance of the Senate with instructions to report the same back to the Senate in 3 days, not counting any day on which the Senate is not in session, with changes that—

(1) are within the jurisdiction of such committee; and

(2) would strike any provision that would result in increased likelihood of rural hospitals being forced to close, convert, or reduce or stop providing services, including emergency care, mental and behavioral health care, and labor and delivery services.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I rise today to cut any part of this “Big Ugly Bill” that would force rural hospitals to limit their services or actually close their doors.

I have released a list of more than 300 rural hospitals across the country at risk of closing or stopping services because of any major cuts to Medicare and Medicaid.

Today, that is what Republicans are guaranteeing with a \$1 trillion cut to our healthcare system that they would create in this bill.

My Republican colleagues’ so-called Medicaid cuts replacement fund is like giving aspirin to a cancer patient. It is not enough. It is pathetically inadequate to deal with the healthcare crisis Republicans are creating here today on the Senate floor.

No billionaire tax break or Donald Trump pat-on-the-back is worth the risk of people’s lives.

Vote yes on this motion. Stop these healthcare cuts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, more of the politics of fear. Rural hospitals and providers not only deliver essential healthcare services in their communities but also strengthen local economies, employing hundreds of individuals and supporting regional business development.

Unfortunately, for far too long, some rural hospitals have struggled to achieve financial stability, even with a wide range of targeted payment enhancements. These issues predate the consideration of the reforms that we are including in the legislation today.

Let me be clear. This amendment is intended to derail this very bill. The Finance Committee has a long tradition of coming together on bipartisan

issues, like bolstering our rural healthcare system. I look forward to working with all of my colleagues to advance permanent solutions to provide rural providers, from telehealth to innovative reimbursement models.

Today, we need to pass this essential legislation, and I oppose this amendment.

VOTE ON MOTION TO COMMIT

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

Mr. MARKEY. 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 49, nays 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 333 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
Gallego	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Padilla	Wyden
Hassan	Peters	
Heinrich	Reed	

NAYS—51

Banks	Graham	Moran
Barrasso	Grassley	Moreno
Blackburn	Hagerty	Mullin
Boozman	Hawley	Paul
Britt	Hoeven	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 motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for the following Senators to be recognized to offer amendments, motions, or points of order; that amendments be reported by number, with no amendments in order prior to a vote in relation to the amendments or motions: Wyden, motion to commit; Coons, motion to commit.

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

The Senator from Minnesota.

POINT OF ORDER

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I make a point of order that the pending measure contains an unfunded intergovernmental mandate, and thus it violates section 425(a)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

In nutrition assistance alone, this bill shifts tens of billions of dollars onto the States, creating chaos for State budgets and hardship for families.

The CBO score for this bill says this:

The nontax provisions of the substitute amendment would impose intergovernmental and private sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, and that the SNAP cost-shift provision would impose the largest intergovernmental mandate.

Seriously, the largest shift in this whole bill, the largest unfunded mandate is on the backs of kids and veterans and seniors and people with disabilities.

Sixty-four billion dollars over to the States, 44 of them have balanced budget amendments. You know they can’t pay for this. It is hurting local grocery stores; it is hurting our farmers; and it is all done to pay for tax cuts for the wealthy.

I say to our colleagues, vote for families over billionaires. Vote for fiscal sanity over this “Big Beautiful Betrayal,” and vote yes. This is an unfunded mandate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

MOTION TO WAIVE

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I rise to waive the point order raised by my colleague from Minnesota. I urge my colleagues to vote to waive the point of order.

In 2023, the SNAP payment error exceeded 11 percent—11 percent—amounting to more than \$10 million in misspent taxpayer dollars. This underscores the need for stronger State accountability in administering this program.

This title incentivizes States to be a better steward of taxpayer dollars to use resources that are prioritized for those most in need. If a State’s payment error is below 6 percent, that State is exempt from any share of the cost of SNAP benefits. This is a reasonable approach that will help preserve the integrity and long-term sustainability of the program.

There is ample time for the States to adjust, plan, and budget for this to take effect in 2028. States can also work to lower their payment error rate over the next couple of years so that they would be exempt from the match altogether.

Mr. President, I move to waive the point of order for the consideration of the pending legislation, 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 bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT).

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 334 Leg.]

YEAS—51

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

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	Lujan	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

NOT VOTING—1

Scott (SC)

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

MOTION TO COMMIT

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I have a motion to commit at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN] moves to commit the bill to the Committee on Finance with instructions to report back forthwith.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask that further reading of the motion be dispensed with.

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

The motion is as follows:

Mr. WYDEN moves to commit the bill H.R. 1 to the Committee on Finance of the Senate with instructions to report the same back to the Senate in 3 days, not counting any day on which the Senate is not in session, with changes that—

(1) are within the jurisdiction of such committee;

(2) would strike any provision that cuts funding for Medicaid; and

(3) would ensure big corporations and the ultra-wealthy pay a fair share in taxes.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, this is a motion supported by all Finance Democrats to send the bill back to the Finance Committee to strike all the Medicaid cuts and ensure that big corporations and the ultrawealthy pay their fair share in taxes.

It is now clear that there is bipartisan opposition in the Senate to the Medicaid cuts in this bill. That is because it is the biggest Medicaid cut in history and represents the largest transfer of wealth in history.

It is caviar over kids, hedge funds over healthcare, Mar-a-Lago over the middle class.

These Medicaid cuts are going to reach down into every corner of our Nation's healthcare system. We have heard from rural America: Rural hospitals will close their doors.

Seniors are going to lose care at home and be left with fewer nursing homes and fewer nurses. Kids with disabilities will lose healthcare. We saw them on the steps of the Capitol last night.

Never have I seen legislation—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. WYDEN.—focused on denying healthcare to eligible Americans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. WYDEN. This amendment is an opportunity to take these awful Medicaid cuts off the table and find another way forward.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MARSHALL. Good morning. It is great to be here.

I want to share with America the great work that Republicans have done on Medicaid. We are preserving it. We are protecting it. We are strengthening it for those who need it the most. We are going to make sure that your seniors in nursing homes, that pregnant women, children, and people with disabilities have Medicaid in the future. We are fiscally making Medicaid more sound.

You know, it is only in Washington, DC, that you increase spending at a rate faster than inflation and you call it a cut. So we are increasing spending on this legislation. We are increasing funding for Medicaid. We are preserving and protecting it for those who need it the most.

I urge everyone to vote no on this amendment.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON MOTION

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

Mr. WYDEN. 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 47, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 335 Leg.]

YEAS—47

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

Warner	Warren	Whitehouse
Warnock	Welch	Wyden

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 motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

MOTION TO COMMIT

Mr. COONS. I have a motion to commit at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant executive clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. COONS] moves to commit the bill H.R. 1 to the Committee on Finance with instructions to report back forthwith.

Mr. COONS. I ask for the reading of the motion to be dispensed with.

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

The motion is as follows:

Mr. COONS moves to commit the bill H.R. 1 to the Committee on Finance of the Senate with instructions to report the same back to the Senate in 3 days, not counting any day on which the Senate is not in session, with changes that—

(1) are within the jurisdiction of such committee; and

(2) would remove provisions stripping individuals in the United States of the Federal benefits to which they are entitled, by methods including but not limited to the creation of new administrative burdens and paperwork requirements.

Mr. COONS. Colleagues, the ugly truth about this so-called Big Beautiful Bill is that it will kick 17 million Americans off their healthcare. This bill cuts almost \$1 trillion from Medicaid and other healthcare programs by tying people up in redtape.

Republicans will tell you they are trying to improve Medicaid, but the truth is, they are not. It is cruel and dishonest to bury parents, kids, and seniors in paperwork and then blame them when they lose their healthcare, all to further rig our Tax Code for the very wealthiest.

This week, I met with 30 nurses from Delaware. Their patients couldn't come to DC, so they did. They care for seniors and newborns, families, and the disabled. And their ask to us: Don't take healthcare away from tens of thousands of Delawareans and millions of Americans.

Colleagues, support this Coons amendment to eliminate cruel and unnecessary redtape and allow Americans to keep the healthcare they need and deserve.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, as I look at this, the Senator's motion is on work requirements. Back home, we had a saying for people that had an aversion to work. They called it an allergy to work.

My question is, don't you think a job brings value, that it brings dignity? Don't you think a job brings purpose and meaning to life? We have 7 million healthy American men across our country of working age that aren't working right now. Yes, we want to encourage people to go back to work.

Our bill, as you point out, preserves and protects it for those groups. It makes it financially stronger so we can protect and strengthen it for seniors in nursing homes, for people with disabilities, for pregnant women, and for children. Let's protect Medicaid for those who need it the most.

I urge a "no" vote on this. I will never apologize for encouraging people to go to work.

VOTE ON MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. LUMMIS). The question occurs on agreeing to the motion.

Mr. COONS. 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. 336 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	Lujan	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 motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORENO). The majority whip.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for the following Senators to be recognized to offer amendments, motions, or

points of order; that the amendments be reported by number, with no amendments in order prior to a vote in relation to the amendments or motions: No. 1, Luján motion to commit; No. 2, Reed motion to commit.

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

Mr. BARRASSO. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

MOTION TO COMMIT

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. President, I have a motion to commit at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. LUJÁN] moves to commit the bill, H.R. 1, to the Committee on Finance with instructions to report back forthwith.

The motion is as follows:

(1) are within the jurisdiction of such committee; and

(2) strike all provisions relating to the supplemental nutrition assistance program in order—

(A) to maintain the 50-year bipartisan commitment to ensure that low income children, adults, and seniors get the help they need to afford food, regardless of where they live;

(B) to prevent extreme cuts that will take food assistance away from millions of people already struggling to afford the high cost of groceries, including families with children, workers, veterans, seniors, people with disabilities, and people with chronic health conditions;

(C) to protect State governments from being saddled with a massive unfunded mandate;

(D) to ensure that farmers and small business owners who rely on the purchasing power of funds from the supplemental nutrition assistance program are not impacted; and

(E) to work toward a bipartisan farm bill.

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. President, recently, a Republican colleague said regarding this bill's SNAP cuts:

If we don't watch out, people are going to get hurt.

He is right—people are going to get hurt.

For the past 50 years, the United States of America has maintained a bipartisan promise to feed our children, our veterans, our seniors, and our working families. This bill betrays that promise. It cuts more than \$1 trillion from Medicaid and SNAP—cuts that will harm all of our constituents.

With this motion, I am offering my colleagues the opportunity to step away from these devastating cuts, to show our fellow Americans that in this country we care for our friends, families, and neighbors who need support.

I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle can agree that this is a promise worth keeping.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the motion raised by my colleague from New Mexico.

The agriculture title of this bill takes a practical approach to improve

SNAP by reducing waste, enhancing accountability, and encouraging recipients to move toward self-reliance through work and training.

SNAP spending has nearly doubled since 2018, putting this vital program on an unsustainable path, wrought with mismanagement and waste. This program has devolved into viewing "success" as enrolling more individuals to be dependent on government assistance. SNAP is long overdue for change.

This motion would jeopardize the ability for the Senate to meet its reconciliation instructions and deliver the President's agenda to the American people.

I urge my colleagues to vote no.

VOTE ON MOTION

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

Mr. LUJÁN. 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. 337 Leg.]

YEAS—49

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

NAYS—51

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

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BRITT). The Senator from Rhode Island.

MOTION TO COMMIT

Mr. REED. Madam President, I have a motion to commit at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. REED] moves to commit the bill to the Committee on Finance with instructions to report back forthwith.

Mr. REED. Madam President, I ask that further reading of the motion be dispensed with.

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

The motion is as follows:

Mr. REED moves to commit the bill H.R. 1 to the Committee on Finance of the Senate with instructions to report the same back to the Senate in 3 days, not counting any day on which the Senate is not in session, with changes that—

(1) are within the jurisdiction of such committee;

(2) would eliminate any provisions that change State provider taxes; and

(3) would eliminate any provisions that would lead to any nursing home closures.

Mr. REED. Madam President, Medicaid is a lifeline for seniors. More than 7 million seniors get care through Medicaid and in two in three nursing homes, residents pay for that care with Medicaid.

The bill we are voting on today takes away key revenue sources from States and nursing homes. Brown University's School of Public Health has estimated that 579 nursing homes nationwide would be at risk of closing because of this bill. Even if nursing homes do not close, they will have to reduce their beds.

This motion would simply prevent any cuts in Medicaid that could lead to nursing home closures, something I believe we all can agree on, and I would urge my colleagues to support this motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Madam President, Republicans are restoring integrity to the Medicaid Program by closing loopholes and preventing States from exploiting Medicaid Federal match rates. States' provider taxes for nursing homes and immediate-care facilities are not phased down under this bill.

Additionally, the bill repeals the harmful Biden administration's nursing home staffing rule that would have forced the closure of nursing homes and long-term care facilities.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

VOTE ON MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs on agreeing to the Reed motion to commit.

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 48, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 338 Leg.]

YEAS—48

Alsbrooks	Cantwell	Fetterman
Baldwin	Collins	Gallego
Bennet	Coons	Gillibrand
Blumenthal	Cortez Masto	Hassan
Blunt Rochester	Duckworth	Heinrich
Booker	Durbin	Hickenlooper

Hirono	Murray	Shaheen
Kaine	Ossoff	Slotkin
Kelly	Padilla	Smith
Kim	Peters	Van Hollen
King	Reed	Warner
Klobuchar	Rosen	Warnock
Lujan	Sanders	Warren
Markey	Schatz	Welch
Merkley	Schiff	Whitehouse
Murphy	Schumer	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 motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for the following Senators to be recognized to offer amendments, motions, or points of order; that the amendments be reported by number, with no amendments in order prior to the vote in relation to the amendment or motions; and that is Ossoff No. 2696.

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

The Senator from Georgia.

AMENDMENT NO. 2696 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2360

Mr. OSSOFF. Madam President, I call up my amendment No. 2696 and ask it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. OSSOFF] proposes an amendment numbered 2696 to amendment No. 2360.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the enhanced premium tax credits and increase the individual tax rate for taxpayers with income over \$10,000,000)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____ . EXTENSION OF ENHANCED PREMIUM TAX CREDITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 36B(b)(3)(A)(iii) is amended—

(1) by striking “, and before January 1, 2026”, and

(2) by striking “2021 THROUGH 2025” in the heading and inserting “YEARS AFTER 2020”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2025.

SEC. _____ . 39.6 PERCENT RATE BRACKET.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1(j)(2) is amended by redesignating subparagraph (F) as subparagraph (G) and by inserting after subparagraph (E) the following new subparagraph:

“(F) 39.6 PERCENT RATE BRACKET.—Notwithstanding subparagraphs (A) through (E), in prescribing the tables under this subsection for purposes of paragraph (3)(B)—

“(i) the excess of taxable income over \$10,000,000 (\$5,000,000, in the case of married individuals filing separate returns), if any, shall be taxed at a rate of 39.6 percent, and

“(ii) paragraph (3)(B)(i) shall be applied with respect to such \$10,000,000 and \$5,000,000 amounts by substituting ‘2024’ for ‘2017’.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2025.

Mr. OSSOFF. Madam President, instead of adding trillions to the debt in tax cuts to the rich while destroying Medicaid and renewable energy, I propose we help our constituents afford health insurance.

If we allow Affordable Care Act benefits to expire, as this bill would, more than a million Georgians will pay more for health insurance next year. A family of four in Clayton County making \$65,000 a year, that is a \$2,600 increase in the cost of health insurance; Dougherty County, \$2,200; Chattahoochee County, \$2,300; Augusta-Richmond County, \$2,600; Liberty County, \$2,600; Macon-Bibb County, \$2,700.

The AJC, our paper, reports 300,000 Georgians would lose insurance altogether. And that is on top of the cuts to Medicaid and hospitals.

A vote against this amendment is a vote to gut the Affordable Care Act and raise health insurance premiums. I urge a “yes” vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, this amendment would disproportionately hit our successful job creators throughout the country, harming workers, consumers, and local economies. That result runs directly contrary to the central themes of this bill: preventing a more than \$4 trillion tax hike on all Americans, making permanent the Trump tax cuts, which proportionately benefit the middle class the most.

But despite Democrats' rhetoric, they are conflating two separate issues. Ensuring healthcare affordability and access requires thoughtful, deliberative, and real solutions.

Unfortunately, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle enacted costly and uncapped enhanced premium tax credits that use taxpayer dollars to mask underlying issues in the ACA market, such as declining value and fraudulent enrollment.

So I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment and instead work to reform the underlying issues in the market that drive costs for patients and families.

POINT OF ORDER

Madam President, the pending amendment, No. 2696, would cause the underlying legislation to exceed the Finance Committee's section 302(a) allocation of new budget authority and outliers; therefore, I raise a point of order against this measure pursuant to section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. OSSOFF. How much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 5 seconds.

Mr. OSSOFF. A vote against this amendment will repeal the Affordable Care Act benefits for your constituents and raise their healthcare premium.

MOTION TO WAIVE

And pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I move to waive section 302(f) of that act for purposes of this amendment.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

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

[Rollcall Vote No. 339 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	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. 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 PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORENO). The majority leader.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for the following Senator to be recognized to offer amendments, motions, or points of order; that the amendments be reported by number, with no amendments in order prior to a vote in relation to the amendments or motions: Blunt Rochester—motion to commit.

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

The Senator from Delaware.

MOTION TO COMMIT

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Mr. President, I have a motion at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Delaware [Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER] moves to commit H.R. 1 to the Committee on Finance, with instructions to report back forthwith.

The motion is as follows:

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER moves to commit the bill H.R. 1 to the Committee on Finance of the Senate with instructions to report the same back to the Senate in 3 days, not counting any day on which the Senate is not in session, with changes that—

(1) are within the jurisdiction of such committee;

(2) would strike any provision limiting Medicaid State-directed payments; and

(3) would preserve access to hospital labor and delivery units to protect the 40 percent of births nationwide and nearly 50 percent of births in rural communities that are financed by Medicaid.

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

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

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Mr. President, in one of the richest countries in the world, we have maternal and infant mortality crises. In fact, we have the highest maternal mortality rate among wealthy nations.

Today, Medicaid is the single largest payer of maternity care in the United States, covering 40 percent of births nationwide and nearly half of all births in our rural communities. Obstetric units, particularly in rural hospitals, are closing at alarming rates—actually creating maternity deserts in this country. And a reason why? Low Medicaid hospital rates.

To be blunt, now is not the time to be slashing the Medicaid program. My amendment would stop cuts to Medicaid used for vital hospital services, especially for labor and delivery rooms.

Leader THUNE said it himself earlier today, that Medicaid should be for pregnant moms.

So, my colleagues, we have a choice. Do we stand for billionaires or do we stand up for moms and babies?

For Democrats, the choice is clear, and I urge my Republican colleagues to vote yes on the motion to support families over billionaires.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON MOTION TO COMMIT

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

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. 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 senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

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

[Rollcall Vote No. 340 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
Galleo	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 motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for the following Senator to be recognized to offer amendments, motions, or points of order; that the amendments be reported by number, with no amendments to be in order prior to a vote in relation to the amendment or the motions: Warren, No. 2414.

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

The Senator from Massachusetts.

AMENDMENT NO. 2414 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2360

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 2414 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 Massachusetts [Ms. WARREN] proposes an amendment numbered 2414 to amendment No. 2360.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To strike the reduction in the funding cap for the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection)

Strike section 30001.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau is the financial watchdog to keep people from getting cheated on credit cards and mortgages and Venmo and payday loans and a zillion other transactions. When this financial cop can't do its job, there is no one else in the Federal Government to pick up the slack.

The CFPB has returned over \$21 billion to more than 205 million Americans who were cheated by big banks

and giant corporations. That is why this Agency is popular across the country.

But, from the beginning, Republicans in Congress have been trying to kill it, and now they want to slash the CFPB's modest funding cap almost in half—not to save working people money but to make it easier for corporations to trick and trap millions of people. Scammers love this Republican move.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes to support the CFPB, the little Agency that fights for all Americans, and I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Section 30001 is purely budgetary and changes the CFPB's funding cap from 12 percent to 6.5 percent. It would provide the Agency with ample funding to perform its statutory mandate. The funding available to the Agency will grow each year as it is adjusted for inflation.

There is nothing more budgetary than Congress deciding the funding level of an Agency. I ask my colleagues to vote no on this amendment.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. President, the pending amendment numbered 2414 would cause the underlying legislation to exceed the Banking Committee section 302(a) allocation of the new budget authority and outlays; therefore, I raise a point of order against this measure pursuant to section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

MOTION TO WAIVE

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I move to waive section 302(f) of that act for the purposes of the pending amendment.

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 assistant bill clerk called the roll.

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

[Rollcall Vote No. 341 Leg.]

YEAS—47

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

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

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	

(Mr. MARSHALL assumed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORENO). On this vote, the yeas are 47, the nays are 53.

Three-fifth 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.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for the following Senators to be recognized to offer amendments, motions, or points of order; that the amendments be reported by number, with no amendments in order prior to a vote in relation to the amendments or motions: Cornyn No. 2705, Merkley No. 2446.

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

The Senator from Texas.

AMENDMENT NO. 2705 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2360

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 2705, and I ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CORNYN] proposes an amendment numbered 2705 to amendment No. 2360.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To reduce the FMAP for the Medicaid expansion to 80 percent in expansion States that provide State-funded coverage to aliens who are not qualified aliens and who are have been charged with or convicted of certain acts)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . EXPANSION FMAP FOR CERTAIN STATES PROVIDING PAYMENTS FOR HEALTH CARE FURNISHED TO CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1905 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d) is amended—

(1) in subsection (y)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(E), by inserting “(or, for calendar quarters beginning on or after October 1, 2027, in the case such State is a specified State with respect to such calendar quarter, 80 percent)” after “thereafter”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) SPECIFIED STATE.—The term ‘specified State’ means, with respect to a quarter, a State that—

“(i) provides any form of financial assistance from a State general fund during such quarter, in whole or in part, whether or not made under a State plan (or waiver of such plan) under this title or under another program established by the State, to or on behalf of an alien who is not a qualified alien and has been charged with, or convicted of, an act described in subparagraph (D), for the purchasing of health insurance coverage (as defined in section 2791(b)(1) of the Public Health Service Act) for any such alien; or

“(ii) provides any form of comprehensive health benefits coverage, except such coverage required by Federal law, during such quarter, whether or not under a State plan (or waiver of such plan) under this title or under another program established by the State, and regardless of the source of funding for such coverage, to any such alien.

“(D) ACTS DESCRIBED.—For purposes of subparagraph (C)(i), an act described in this subparagraph is any of the following:

“(i) A sex offense (as defined in section 111 of the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act (34 U.S.C. 20911)).

“(ii) A crime involving severe forms of trafficking in persons (as defined in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102)).

“(iii) A crime of domestic violence (as defined in section 4002(a) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12291(a))).

“(iv) A crime of child abuse and neglect (as defined in section 3 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (Public Law 93-247; 42 U.S.C. 5101 note)).

“(v) Murder, manslaughter, or an attempt to commit murder or manslaughter (within the meanings of such terms in sections 1111, 1112, and 1113 of title 18, United States Code).

“(vi) A crime involving receipt, distribution, or possession of a visual depiction of a minor engaging in sexually explicit conduct (within the meanings of such terms in section 2252 of title 18, United States Code).

“(E) IMMIGRATION TERMS.—

“(i) ALIEN.—The term ‘alien’ has the meaning given such term in section 101(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

“(ii) QUALIFIED ALIEN.—The term ‘qualified alien’ has the meaning given such term in section 431 of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, except that the references to ‘(in the opinion of the agency providing such benefits)’ in subsection (c) of such section 431 shall be treated as references to ‘(in the opinion of the State in which such comprehensive health benefits coverage or such financial assistance is provided, as applicable).’; and

(2) in subsection (z)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “for such year” and inserting “for such quarter”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)(i)—

(i) in the matter preceding subclause (I), by striking “for a year” and inserting “for a calendar quarter in a year”; and

(ii) in subclause (II), by striking “for the year” and inserting “for the quarter for the State”.

(b) REPEAL.—Section 71110 of this Act is repealed, and the Social Security Act shall be applied as if the amendments made by such section had not been enacted.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, American tax dollars should not be used to fund healthcare for illegal immigrants. Border Patrol talks about push factors and pull factors. One of the pull factors

for illegal immigration is the knowledge that people will be able to receive various benefits once they make it into the country.

We need legal immigration, which has been one of the greatest gifts to our country we have ever had. Illegal immigration has been an unmitigated disaster. But here the problem is that States are using their Medicaid funds to pay for healthcare for illegal aliens. We don't want our safeguard for our seniors and most vulnerable individuals to be dissipated on behalf of people who should not be here in the United States in the first place. It is only common sense. We should be able to agree on reducing Federal funding for States that provide Medicaid to criminal aliens convicted or charged with sex offenses, human trafficking, domestic or child abuse, murder or manslaughter, or child pornography.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time is expired.

The Senator from Oregon.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I raise a point of order. The amendment violates the Byrd rule, section 313(b)(1)(D) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

Once again, Republicans have chosen the comforting embrace of partisan politics, but here are a few facts to cut through the noise: Zero Federal dollars are spent on health coverage. Second, this policy dictates how States spent their own funds. What happened to States' rights? Third, this policy violates "innocent until proven guilty" because it even talks about those charged with a crime. But most importantly, what this amendment says is that if one person, despite State law, through a bureaucratic mistake is receiving funds, then the whole State pays a price and has their rate on expanded Medicaid changed from 90 percent to 80 percent.

This is a backdoor for 41 States—which includes the majority of Republican States—to reduce the Federal mandate from 90 percent to 80 percent, with huge, huge impact on the coverage of individuals across this country.

Haven't we done enough damage already to the fundamental principle of healthcare without this collective punishment of American citizens by reducing the State funding from 90 percent to 80 percent?

I renew my point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

MOTION TO WAIVE

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, 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.

VOTE ON MOTION

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.
The bill clerk called the roll.
The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 56, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 342 Leg.]

YEAS—56

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

NAYS—44

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
Cooms	Markey	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warren
Fetterman	Murray	Welch
Gallego	Padilla	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Peters	Wyden
Heinrich	Reed	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHEEHY). On this vote, the yeas are 56, the nays are 44.

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 Oregon.

AMENDMENT NO. 2446 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2360

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 2446 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 Oregon [Mr. MERKLEY] proposes an amendment, for himself and others, numbered 2446 to amendment No. 2360.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To prevent cryptocurrency corruption)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . PREVENTING CRYPTOCURRENCY CORRUPTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

(A) the term "covered cryptocurrency" means any cryptocurrency, meme coin, token, non-fungible token, payment stablecoin, or other digital asset that is sold for remuneration;

(B) the term "covered former special Government employee" means an individual who—

(i) served as a special Government employee associated with the Executive Office of the President on or after January 1, 2024; and

(ii) ceased to serve as a special Government employee associated with the Execu-

tive Office of the President during the period beginning on January 2, 2024 and ending on the day before the date of enactment of this Act;

(C) the term "covered individual" means—
(i) the President;
(ii) the Vice President;
(iii) a Member of Congress;
(iv) an individual appointed to a Senate-confirmed position;

(v) a special Government employee associated with the Executive Office of the President; or

(vi) a covered former special Government employee;

(D) the term "directly" means by virtue of the ownership or beneficial interest of a covered individual, or the spouse or child of a covered individual, in an issuer of a covered cryptocurrency;

(E) the term "indirectly" means by virtue of the financial interest of a covered individual, or the spouse or child of a covered individual, in a business entity, partnership interest, company, investment fund, trust, or other third party in which the covered individual, or the spouse or child of a covered individual, has an ownership or beneficial interest;

(F) the term "Member of Congress" has the meaning given that term in section 13101 of title 5, United States Code;

(G) the term "payment stablecoin"—

(i) means a digital asset—

(I) that is, or is designed to be, used as a means of payment or settlement; and

(II) the issuer of which—

(aa) is obligated to convert, redeem, or repurchase for a fixed amount of monetary value, not including a digital asset denominated in a fixed amount of monetary value; and

(bb) represents that such issuer will maintain, or create the reasonable expectation that it will maintain, a stable value relative to the value of a fixed amount of monetary value; and

(ii) does not include a digital asset that—

(I) is a national currency;

(II) is a deposit (as defined in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813)), including a deposit recorded using distributed ledger technology; or

(III) is a security, as defined in section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77b), section 3 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c), or section 2 of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-2);

(H) the term "promote" includes the use of the name and likeness of a covered individual in any marketing materials, including in the title of the covered cryptocurrency; and

(I) the term "special Government employee" has the meaning given the term in section 202(a) of title 18, United States Code.

(2) PROHIBITION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—It shall be unlawful for any covered individual described in clauses (i) through (v) of paragraph (1)(C), or any spouse or child of any such covered individual, to directly or indirectly own, control, promote in exchange for anything of value, or affiliate with any issuer of a covered cryptocurrency or any entity that provides custodial or safekeeping services for covered cryptocurrencies.

(B) COVERED FORMER SPECIAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.—It shall be unlawful for any covered former special Government employee, or any spouse or child of a covered special Government employee, to directly or indirectly own, control, promote in exchange for anything of value, or affiliate with any issuer of a covered cryptocurrency or any entity that provides custodial or safekeeping services for covered cryptocurrencies during the 1-year period beginning on the last day

of service of the covered former special Government employee as a special Government employee associated with the Executive Office of the President.

(3) TRANSITION.—Any individual in violation of subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (2) on the date of enactment of this Act shall, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, come into compliance with the prohibition under that paragraph.

(4) ENFORCEMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Beginning on the date that is 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, a violation of paragraph (2) shall be punishable by not more than 5 years in prison and fines of not more than 3 times the monetary value of any earnings related to the violation.

(B) NOT AN OFFICIAL ACT.—A violation of paragraph (2)(A) shall not be deemed an official act if committed by any covered individual described in clauses (i) through (v) of paragraph (1)(C) who is in office at the time of the violation.

(C) STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.—No person shall be prosecuted, tried, or punished for any offense under this subsection unless the indictment for such offense is found, or the information for such offense is instituted, not later than 15 years after the date on which the offense was committed.

(b) FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE REPORTS.—Section 13104(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) DISCLOSURE RELATING TO COVERED CRYPTOCURRENCY INVOLVEMENT.—

“(A) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

“(i) COVERED CRYPTOCURRENCY.—The term ‘covered cryptocurrency’ means any cryptocurrency, meme coin, token, non-fungible token, payment stablecoin, or other digital asset that is sold for remuneration.

“(ii) DIRECTLY.—The term ‘directly’ means by virtue of the ownership or beneficial interest of a reporting individual, or the spouse or child of a reporting individual, in a covered cryptocurrency issuer.

“(iii) INDIRECTLY.—The term ‘indirectly’ means by virtue of the financial interest of a reporting individual, or the spouse or child of a reporting individual, in a business entity, partnership interest, company, investment fund, trust, or other third party in which the reporting individual, or the spouse or child of a reporting individual, has an ownership or beneficial interest.

“(iv) PAYMENT STABLECOIN.—The term ‘payment stablecoin’—

“(I) means a digital asset—

“(aa) that is, or is designed to be, used as a means of payment or settlement; and

“(bb) the issuer of which—

“(AA) is obligated to convert, redeem, or repurchase for a fixed amount of monetary value, not including a digital asset denominated in a fixed amount of monetary value; and

“(BB) represents that such issuer will maintain, or create the reasonable expectation that it will maintain, a stable value relative to the value of a fixed amount of monetary value; and

“(II) does not include a digital asset that—

“(aa) is a national currency;

“(bb) is a deposit (as defined in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813)), including a deposit recorded using distributed ledger technology; or

“(cc) is a security, as defined in section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77b), section 3 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c), or section 2 of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80a-2).

“(v) PROMOTE.—The term ‘promote’ includes the use of the name and likeness of a reporting individual in any marketing materials, including in the title of the covered cryptocurrency.

“(B) REQUIREMENT.—Each report filed pursuant to subsections (b) and (c) of section 13103 shall include a statement of whether the reporting individual, or the spouse or child of the reporting individual, as of the filing date, directly or indirectly owns, controls, promotes in exchange for anything of value, or affiliates with any covered cryptocurrency issuer or any entity that provides custodial or safekeeping services for covered cryptocurrencies.”.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, this amendment is about defending the integrity of the legislative process.

Every now and then, a new strategy creates either the appearance of a conflict of interest or a real conflict of interest. That is the case with elected officials who promote and/or sell cryptocurrencies in which they have a personal financial stake. These digital coins cost little to make, so the buyers know they are enriching the elected officials who are selling them. Some people believe, therefore, that perhaps they can influence government policy by buying these coins, enrich the individuals who serve in government, and, therefore, change policy. In fact, a buyer of \$2 million in meme coins announced that he bought the coins to get favorable consideration in a change in trade policy.

My friends, the sale of cryptocurrencies by any of us for a financial benefit is corrupting our responsibility to govern by and for the people. Vote aye to defend the integrity of our “we the people” government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Ms. LUMMIS. Mr. President, I rise to express my opposition to the amendment proposed by my colleague from Oregon and others.

I appreciate their concerns about ethics and transparency in government, but this amendment would inflict serious harm on American innovation and competitiveness. For that matter, it applies to the adult children, directly or indirectly, of elected and nonelected officials. It goes too far. If we had passed something like this in the early days of the internet, we would have sent a clear message that America is closed for business when it comes to digital innovation, and that is what we risk doing now. That is the last thing we want to be doing. The irony is this amendment would actually harm our government’s ability to understand and regulate digital assets effectively.

If we are serious about ethics in financial products, let’s focus on real solutions in all financial products, not just digital. I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. President, I raise a point of order that the pending amendment violates the Byrd rule, section 313(b)(1)(D) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

MOTION TO WAIVE

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I move to waive section 313 of that act for the purpose of the pending amendment.

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 executive clerk called the roll.

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

[Rollcall Vote No. 343 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
Gallego	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 (Mr. CURTIS). 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 rejected.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for the following Senators to be recognized to offer amendments, motions, or points of order; that the amendments be reported by number, with no amendments in order prior to a vote in relation to the amendments or motions: MURRAY, No. 2771.

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

The Senator from Washington.

AMENDMENT NO. 2771 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2360

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 2771 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 Washington [Mrs. MURRAY] proposes an amendment numbered 2771 to amendment No. 2360.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To strike the provision to defund Planned Parenthood)

Strike section 71115.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, my amendment is about a really important issue that has not gotten near enough attention for how devastating it will be for women in our country. The Republicans' bill will cut millions of women off from birth control, cancer screenings, essential preventive healthcare—care that they will not be able to afford anywhere else—and it will shutter some 200 healthcare clinics in our country and take another step toward enacting Republicans' plan for a backdoor, nationwide abortion ban.

How does it do this? By defunding Planned Parenthood. This is a long-sought goal of anti-choice extremists—no surprise. It is overwhelmingly unpopular with the American people, but Republicans are bent on ripping away any access to abortion care and happy to cut off this lifesaving care, no matter that women may not have another place to get the care that they can't afford or another place they can get any care at all.

This amendment that I am offering will strip this awful provision to defund Planned Parenthood from this bill and protect healthcare access to the millions of patients who rely on Planned Parenthood health centers.

I urge a "yes" vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from Mississippi.

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH. Mr. President, I object to the Senator's motion to strike the provision establishing a commonsense protection of taxpayer dollars by prohibiting abortion providers from receiving Medicaid funds for 1 year.

There was a time when protecting American tax dollars from supporting the abortion industry was an uncontroversial, nonpartisan effort that we could all get behind, even if we held opposing views on protecting the dignity of human life.

This provision does not target any one entity. If a medical provider wishes to stay within the Medicaid Program, it should simply cut elective abortion procedures from its services.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. President, the pending amendment, No. 2771, would cause the underlying legislation to exceed the Finance Committee's section 302(a) allocation of new budget authority and outlays; therefore, I raise a point of order against this measure pursuant to section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

MOTION TO WAIVE

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I move to waive section 302(f) of that act for the purposes of the pending amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

VOTE ON MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs 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 49, nays 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 344 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
Gallego	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Padilla	Wyden
Hassan	Peters	
Heinrich	Reed	

NAYS—51

Banks	Graham	Moran
Barrasso	Grassley	Moreno
Blackburn	Hagerty	Mullin
Boozman	Hawley	Paul
Britt	Hoeven	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 PRESIDING OFFICER. 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.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. THUNE. I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for the following Senators to be recognized to offer amendments, motions, or points of order; that the amendments be reported by number, with no amendments in order prior to the vote in relation to the amendment or motion: Blackburn, No. 2401.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Tennessee.

AMENDMENT NO. 2401 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2360

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I call up my amendment No. 2401 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 Tennessee [Mrs. BLACKBURN] proposes an amendment numbered 2401 to amendment No. 2360.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To prohibit Federal financial participation under Medicaid and CHIP for individuals without verified citizenship, nationality, or satisfactory immigration status)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . PROHIBITING FEDERAL FINANCIAL PARTICIPATION UNDER MEDICAID AND CHIP FOR INDIVIDUALS WITHOUT VERIFIED CITIZENSHIP, NATIONALITY, OR SATISFACTORY IMMIGRATION STATUS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) MEDICAID.—Section 1903(i)(22) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396b(i)(22)) is amended—

(A) by adding "and" at the end;

(B) by striking "to amounts" and inserting "to—"

"(A) amounts"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(B) in the case that the State elects under section 1902(a)(46)(C) to provide for making medical assistance available to an individual during—

"(i) the period in which the individual is provided the reasonable opportunity to present satisfactory documentary evidence of citizenship or nationality under section 1902(ee)(2)(C) or subsection (x)(4);

"(ii) the 90-day period described in section 1902(ee)(1)(B)(ii)(II); or

"(iii) the period in which the individual is provided the reasonable opportunity to submit evidence indicating a satisfactory immigration status under section 1137(d)(4), amounts expended for such medical assistance, unless the citizenship or nationality of such individual or the satisfactory immigration status of such individual (as applicable) is verified by the end of such period;".

(2) CHIP.—Section 2107(e)(1)(O) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397gg(e)(1)(O)), as redesignated by section 71103(b)(1)(A), is amended by striking "and (17)" and inserting "(17), and (22)".

(b) ELIMINATING STATE REQUIREMENT TO PROVIDE MEDICAL ASSISTANCE DURING REASONABLE OPPORTUNITY PERIOD.—

(1) DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE OF CITIZENSHIP OR NATIONALITY.—Section 1903(x)(4) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396b(x)) is amended—

(A) by striking "under clauses (i) and (ii) of section 1137(d)(4)(A)" and inserting "under section 1137(d)(4)"; and

(B) by inserting " , except that the State shall not be required to make medical assistance available to such individual during the period in which such individual is provided such reasonable opportunity if the State has not elected the option under section 1902(a)(46)(C)" before the period at the end.

(2) SOCIAL SECURITY DATA MATCH.—Section 1902(ee) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(ee)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B)(ii)—

(i) in subclause (II), by striking "(and continues to provide the individual with medical assistance during such 90-day period)" and inserting "and, if the State has elected the option under subsection (a)(46)(C), continues to provide the individual with medical assistance during such 90-day period"; and

(ii) in subclause (III), by inserting " , or denies eligibility for medical assistance under this title for such individual, as applicable" after "under this title"; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(C)—

(i) by striking “under clauses (i) and (ii) of section 1137(d)(4)(A)” and inserting “under section 1137(d)(4)”; and

(ii) by inserting “, except that the State shall not be required to make medical assistance available to such individual during the period in which such individual is provided such reasonable opportunity if the State has not elected the option under section 1902(a)(46)(C)” before the period at the end.

(3) INDIVIDUALS WITH SATISFACTORY IMMIGRATION STATUS.—Section 1137(d)(4) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320b-7(d)(4)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by inserting “(except that such prohibition on delay, denial, reduction, or termination of eligibility for benefits under the Medicaid program under title XIX shall apply only if the State has elected the option under section 1902(a)(46)(C))” after “has been provided”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by inserting “(except that such prohibition on delay, denial, reduction, or termination of eligibility for benefits under the Medicaid program under title XIX shall apply only if the State has elected the option under section 1902(a)(46)(C))” after “status”.

(C) OPTION TO CONTINUE PROVIDING MEDICAL ASSISTANCE DURING REASONABLE OPPORTUNITY PERIOD.—

(1) MEDICAID.—Section 1902(a)(46) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)(46)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by adding “and” at the end; and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (B)(ii) the following new subparagraph:

“(C) provide, at the option of the State, for making medical assistance available—

“(i) to an individual described in subparagraph (B) during the period in which such individual is provided the reasonable opportunity to present satisfactory documentary evidence of citizenship or nationality under subsection (ee)(2)(C) or section 1903(x)(4), or during the 90-day period described in subsection (ee)(1)(B)(ii)(II); or

“(ii) to an individual who is not a citizen or national of the United States during the period in which such individual is provided the reasonable opportunity to submit evidence indicating a satisfactory immigration status under section 1137(d)(4);”.

(2) CHIP.—Section 2105(c)(9) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397ee(c)(9)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) OPTION TO CONTINUE PROVIDING CHILD HEALTH ASSISTANCE DURING REASONABLE OPPORTUNITY PERIOD.—Section 1902(a)(46)(C) shall apply to States under this title in the same manner as it applies to a State under title XIX.”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply beginning on October 1, 2026.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 2 minutes of debate equally divided.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, millions of vulnerable Americans—including the disabled, elderly, and low-income children—depend on Medicaid for vital healthcare services, but waste, fraud, and abuse are pushing this program to the point of insolvency. According to one estimate, there were more than \$1 trillion in improper payments over the last decade. To protect

Medicaid for those who truly need it, this corruption must end, including by removing the 1.4 million illegal aliens who are currently exploiting the program.

My amendment would close a loophole that allows illegal aliens to receive Medicaid coverage for up to 90 days by blocking Federal taxpayer dollars from funding benefits for prospective beneficiaries until their citizenship or lawful presence is verified.

I urge a “yes” vote on this amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, the Blackburn amendment penalizes innocent people who are eligible for Medicaid coverage and they are waiting to cut through a thicket of redtape and get healthcare. This can go on for months and months and defies basic fairness and common sense.

The Parliamentarian has already ruled that the Federal Government, if it does this, it would be coercive and not acceptable under the reconciliation rule. This is a distraction from Republican attempts to decimate Medicaid benefits.

POINT OF ORDER

And I therefore raise a point of order that the pending amendment violates the Byrd rule, section 313(b)(1)(D) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

MOTION TO WAIVE

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I move to waive, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

VOTE ON MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to waive.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

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

[Rollcall Vote No. 345 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
Gallego	Ossoff	Welch
Gillibrand	Padilla	Whitehouse
Hassan	Peters	Wyden
Heinrich	Reed	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUSTED). On this vote, the yeas are 53, and the nays are 47.

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.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for the following Senators to be recognized to offer amendments, motions, or points of order; that amendments be reported by number, with no amendments in order prior to a vote in relation to the amendments or motions: Kaine, motion to commit; Blumenthal, motion to commit.

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

The Senator from Virginia.

MOTION TO COMMIT

Mr. KAINÉ. Mr. President, I have a motion to commit at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. KAINÉ] moves to commit the bill H.R. 1 to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs with instructions to report back forthwith.

Mr. KAINÉ. Mr. President, I ask that further reading of the motion be dispensed with.

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

The motion is as follows:

Mr. KAINÉ moves to commit the bill H.R. 1 to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate with instructions to report the same back to the Senate in 3 days, not counting any day on which the Senate is not in session, with changes that—

(1) are within the jurisdiction of such committee; and

(2) include a provision prohibiting any Federal agency from carrying out, on or after January 20, 2025, the termination of more than 1 percent of the employees of the Federal agency if any of the terminated employees is a veteran (referred to in this paragraph as a “mass termination of Federal employees who are veterans”), unless the Federal agency submits to Congress, not later than 60 days before carrying out the mass termination of Federal employees who are veterans, a report that details the positions and number of employees proposed to be terminated and each component of the agency that employs the employees.

Mr. KAINÉ. Mr. President, 30 percent of the Federal workforce is veterans, compared with only 6 percent of the

overall workforce. The Trump administration has fired more veterans than any administration in the history of the United States.

Derek Copeland is an example. He is a 20-year Air Force veteran who trained bomb-sniffing dogs. He then took a job with the Department of Agriculture to train dogs to sniff out illegal agricultural products. He was fired 11 days before the end of his probationary year.

His termination letter said:

You have not demonstrated that your further employment at the Agency would be in the public interest.

He said:

I gave blood, sweat and tears to this country for 20 years to continue service to the federal government. . . . I . . . feel like I was just thrown out like a piece of trash.

My motion hits "pause" on this bill and would stop mass firings of veterans because it is wrong. I would ask my colleagues to support my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. SHEEHY. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for his concern for our veterans. I feel compelled to note that this motion alone would stop the Big Beautiful Bill in its tracks.

I have been asking for months, where was the Democrat outrage similarly when we laid off tens of thousands of veterans and contractors during the COVID vaccine hesitancy pandemic? There was no due process, and no consideration for their service was given.

Democrats are trying to nitpick and derail this bill by disguising the fact that they are advocating for the largest tax increase in the history of mankind—a \$4 trillion tax increase. That is what they are really advocating for.

This is also completely unnecessary. Federal law requires the Office of Personnel Management to consider military preference in hiring within our Federal workforce.

We have to stop using veterans as political pawns. The best thing we can do for veterans is have a strong, capable Federal Government that is fiscally sound.

Mr. President, I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, do I have any time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Six seconds.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, we can stop this, and we should. President Trump has only been in office 6 months, and he has already fired more veterans than any President in American history.

Please vote yes.

VOTE ON MOTION TO COMMIT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs on agreeing to the Kaine motion to commit.

Ms. BALDWIN. 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. 346 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
Gallego	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 motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

MOTION TO COMMIT

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I have a motion to commit at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant executive clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BLUMENTHAL] moves to commit the bill, H.R. 1, to the Committee on Armed Services with instructions to report back forthwith.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I ask that further reading of the motion be dispensed with.

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

The motion is as follows:

Mr. BLUMENTHAL moves to commit the bill H.R. 1 to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate with instructions to report the same back to the Senate in 3 days, not counting any day on which the Senate is not in session, with changes that—

(1) are within the jurisdiction of such committee; and

(2) would prohibit the Department of Defense from using any funds appropriated by Congress for national security purposes and to support the troops of the United States to accept, retrofit, or transfer a plane given by a foreign government for use as Air Force One during the Trump Administration.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I make this motion to commit the reconciliation bill to the Armed Services Committee on behalf of myself and Senator SCHUMER because President Trump, earlier this year, solicited and accepted a \$200 million gift from the Government of Qatar, a Boeing 747 jet to be retrofitted supposedly for use as

Air Force One. Make no mistake, this transfer is illegal. It is a blatant violation of the Constitution's emoluments clause, which prohibits exactly this kind of foreign gift, risking undue foreign influence.

It is also abhorrently wasteful, costing taxpayers at least \$1.5 billion to strip it down and install all the necessary security systems. And it won't even be ready before the end of Trump's term. And now we learn from the Air Force Secretary just last week that the money will be transferred from modernization of our nuclear arsenal, the Sentinel Intercontinental Ballistic Missile Program.

It is a sacrifice of our national security. Illegal, exorbitantly costly, dangerous to our national defense—we should stand up to this corrupt self-dealing.

This motion, which I have worked on with Senators SCHUMER and SCHATZ, would send the bill back to the Armed Services Committee with instructions to add a prohibition on using funds for this unconstitutional, wasteful self-enrichment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, this is the eighth motion to recommit that our friends across the aisle have offered. Each one of these would actually have the effect of ending this process and prohibiting this bill from being passed, and that is the reason they keep offering them.

I just want to point out there is nothing in this reconciliation bill about Presidential aircraft, the current one or any future ones.

Our colleagues have worked on the specifics, and I know my friend from Connecticut knows this because he is a senior member of the committee. We have specifically outlined every purpose for which the \$150 billion is to be used by the administration. And not only that, I have received an assurance from every witness we have who has come before the committee to become a member of this administration that they will follow our directions, without exception.

So given the fact that there is no funding in this bill for any Presidential aircraft and that the Department of Defense portion of this reconciliation is accompanied by specific language as to where it should be spent, I ask for another "no" vote on these dilatory motions to commit.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, in the 30 seconds I have left, let me just respond.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has no time.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Thank you, Mr. President.

VOTE ON MOTION TO COMMIT

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant executive clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 347 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
Gallego	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 motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for the following Senators to be recognized to offer amendments, motions, or points of order; that the amendments be reported by number, with no amendments in order prior to a vote in relation to the amendments or motions: Van Hollen, No. 2584; Gallego, motion to commit; Hassan, motion to commit.

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

The Senator from Arizona.

MOTION TO COMMIT

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. President, I have a motion to commit at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant executive clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GALLEGO] moves to commit the bill to the Committee on Finance with instructions to report back forthwith.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the motion be dispensed with.

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

The motion is as follows:

Mr. GALLEGO moves to commit the bill H.R. 1 to the Committee on Finance of the Senate with instructions to report the same back to the Senate in 3 days, not counting any day on which the Senate is not in session, with changes that—

(1) are within the jurisdiction of such committee;

(2) would strike any provision that cuts Medicaid payments for substance use disorder treatment; and

(3) would ensure big corporations and the ultra-wealthy pay a fair share in taxes.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. President, I rise today to offer a motion to strike provisions that cut Medicaid funding for substance abuse disorder treatments.

Families across the country are facing the heartbreaking reality of loved ones battling substance abuse disorders. For many, Medicaid is the only way to afford the treatment they need. Republican efforts to cut Medicaid funding for substance abuse treatment is cruel. It hurts those who have shown the bravery to seek help, and it undermines our Nation's efforts to combat public health crises, such as the fentanyl epidemic.

At the same time, this Republican bill will give the wealthiest Americans and large corporations tax cuts and loopholes that will only benefit the elite.

We can continue to fund substance abuse disorder treatment by finally making corporations and the ultrawealthy pay their fair share in taxes. I urge my colleagues to support this motion to protect those who are seeking treatment and to finally make corporations and the ultrawealthy pay their fair share.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, Republicans are strengthening Medicaid and setting it on a more fiscally sustainable path by targeting waste, fraud, and abuse.

This bill does not take Medicaid away from children, the elderly, the disabled, or the medically frail, adults caring for children and elderly relatives, or any recipient the program was originally designed to help. It increases eligibility for home- and community-based services, which will increase access to mental health or substance abuse disorder treatments.

If this motion were adopted, it would delay a vote on this bill and stand in the way of Republicans' efforts to prevent a \$4 trillion tax hike on working families and deliver additional tax relief to the middle class.

I urge my colleagues to vote no.

VOTE ON MOTION

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

Mr. GALLEGO. 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. 348 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
Gallego	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 motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MULLIN). The Senator from New Hampshire.

MOTION TO COMMIT

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I have a motion to commit at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant executive clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Hampshire [Ms. HASSAN] moves to commit the bill H.R. 1 to the Committee on Finance with instructions to report back forthwith.

Ms. HASSAN. I ask that further reading of the motion be dispensed with.

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

The motion is as follows:

Ms. HASSAN moves to commit the bill H.R. 1 to the Committee on Finance of the Senate with instructions to report the same back to the Senate in 3 days, not counting any day on which the Senate is not in session, with changes that—

(1) are within the jurisdiction of such committee; and

(2) would protect families and small businesses from cost increases by ending the trade war with Canada.

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, across the country, Americans of every political stripe are urging us to come together to help bring down painfully high costs. Instead, the President is making life even less affordable, both with this partisan budget bill and with his decision to launch a trade war with our ally Canada.

The President's tariffs, combined with this bill, will raise costs for firefighters, truckdrivers, and teachers by \$500, all so that the wealthiest 0.1 percent, making over \$4 million, get a \$350,000 windfall.

At a time when the American people need their costs to come down, I can

think of few ideas as willfully self-destructive as launching a trade war with one of our closest allies and, in effect, imposing a national sales tax on families and small businesses.

I urge my colleagues to listen to the great majority of Americans who need their costs to come down and to support my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, no decision has been made about tariffs in this bill. More importantly, none of the President's tariffs rely on any authorities made from a prior reconciliation bill or are contingent on this bill.

We can and should have a debate about the precise approaches, including how best to incorporate tariff policy, but this is not the appropriate vehicle to have a serious debate on trade.

If adopted, this motion would commit the whole bill to a delay and stand in the way of our efforts to prevent a \$4 trillion tax hike on working families and deliver additional tax relief to the middle class.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to vote no.

VOTE ON MOTION TO COMMIT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs on agreeing to the Hassan motion to commit.

Ms. HASSAN. 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. 349 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
Gallego	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 motion was rejected.

(Mr. HUSTED assumed the Chair.)

(Mr. LANKFORD assumed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARSHALL). The majority leader.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for the following Senators to be recognized to offer amendments, motions, or points of order; that the amendments be reported by number, with no amendments in order prior to a vote in relation to the amendments or motions and with 12 minutes of debate equally divided on the Kennedy amendment No. 2772 between Senators KENNEDY, WELCH, and SCOTT of South Carolina; DUCKWORTH, motion to commit; SCHIFF, motion to commit; KENNEDY, No. 2772; ALSOBROOKS, motion to commit; KELLY, motion to commit; MURPHY, motion to commit; KING, motion to commit; PADILLA, motion to commit; BENNET, motion to commit; and COLLINS, No. 2812.

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

The Senator from Illinois.

MOTION TO COMMIT

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. President, I have a motion to commit at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Illinois [Ms. DUCKWORTH] moves to commit the bill, H.R. 1, to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, with instructions to report back forthwith.

Ms. DUCKWORTH. I ask that further reading of the motion be dispensed with.

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

The motion is as follows:

Ms. DUCKWORTH moves to commit the bill H.R. 1 to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate with instructions to report the same back to the Senate in 3 days, not counting any day on which the Senate is not in session, with changes that—

(1) are within the jurisdiction of such committee; and

(2) would ensure that benefits provided under the supplemental nutrition assistance program are not terminated or reduced for—

(A) a parent or other member of a household with responsibility for a dependent child under 18 years of age;

(B) a veteran;

(C) a homeless individual; or

(D) an individual who was in foster care and is 24 years of age or younger.

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. President, when House Republicans were confronted with concerns that H.R. 1 would threaten SNAP benefits for veterans, the Republican chairman of the House Agriculture Committee defiantly claimed:

Our veterans are exempt from the SNAP work requirement, which is the law . . . and we're not changing it.

Well, he spoke too soon because without a hearing, without notice, and certainly without good cause, Senate Republicans literally stripped away the very protection that House Republicans cited when arguing that vet-

erans would not be harmed by this ugly bill.

Senate Republicans are abandoning veterans, the homeless, former foster youth, and also parents with children above the age of 13—because we all know teenagers don't have big appetites—to be beaten down with complex paperwork and confusing bureaucracy that has nothing to do with helping struggling Americans find work and, rather, is simply a cynical scheme to discourage those who served our Nation in uniform from receiving the safety net support they are eligible for under the law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the motion raised by my colleague from Illinois.

The Agriculture title of the bill empowers individuals to pursue work, education, training, and volunteer opportunities, equipping SNAP recipients to eventually transition off the program through real growth in their income.

It is reasonable to expect SNAP recipients who can work to do so, including parents of school-age children who can work while their children are in school. Any individual who is physically or mentally unfit for employment continues to be exempt from the work requirement.

This motion would jeopardize the ability of the Senate to meet its reconciliation instructions and deliver the President's agenda to the American people.

I urge my colleagues to vote no.

VOTE ON MOTION

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

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 PRESIDING OFFICER. 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. 350 Leg.]

YEAS—49

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

NAYS—51

Banks	Boozman	Capito
Barrasso	Britt	Cassidy
Blackburn	Budd	Collins

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

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

MOTION TO COMMIT

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. President, I have a motion to commit at the desk.

The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California [Mr. SCHIFF] moves to commit the bill H.R. 1 to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. President, I ask that the reading of the motion be dispensed with.

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

The motion is as follows:

Mr. SCHIFF moves to commit the bill H.R. 1 to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate with instructions to report the same back to the Senate in 3 days, not counting any day on which the Senate is not in session, with changes that—

(1) are within the jurisdiction of such committee; and

(2) would ensure that no provision of the bill cuts any food assistance benefits for families with children under the age of 12.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. President, my motion is simple. It will prevent families with kids under 12 from losing food assistance under the bill. It is bad enough that we are borrowing money—trillions of dollars—from our kids and grandkids to pay for tax cuts for rich people, but it is worse still that we leave families hungry today.

Mr. President, I reserve the balance of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the motion raised by my colleague from California. The agricultural title of this bill takes a practical approach to improve SNAP by reducing waste, enhancing accountability, and encouraging recipients to move toward self-reliance through work and training.

SNAP spending has nearly doubled since 2018, putting this vital program on an unsustainable path, wrought with mismanagement and waste. SNAP is long overdue for change. This program has devolved into viewing success as enrolling more individuals to be dependent on government assistance.

This motion would jeopardize the ability of the Senate to meet its reconciliation instructions and deliver the President's agenda to the American people.

I urge my colleagues to vote no.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. President, reclaiming my time, feeding hungry kids is not

waste, and if we have to send this bill back to committee to fix it and bring it back so kids can get fed, we should do it.

This bill is going to take lunches out of school cafeterias. It is going to mean hungry families. We can't pick a number like \$200 billion out of thin air and say, "You can take that money for tax cuts," and not leave a lot of American kids hungry.

Mr. President, I urge an "aye" vote.

VOTE ON MOTION TO COMMIT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs on agreeing to the Schiff motion to commit.

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 senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 351 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
Gallego	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 motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

AMENDMENT NO. 2772 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2360

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 2772 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. KENNEDY] proposes an amendment numbered 2772 to amendment No. 2360.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To prohibit the use of Defense Production Act of 1950 funds without the approval of Congress)

Strike section 30004 and insert the following:

SEC. 30004. APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In addition to amounts otherwise available, there is appropriated for fiscal year 2025, out of amounts not otherwise appropriated, \$1,000,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2027, to carry out the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. 4501 et seq.).

(b) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the amounts appropriated under this section may be obligated or expended to provide financing under the Defense Production Act of 1950 unless a joint resolution approving the financing is enacted into law.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, we just spent 13 hours on motions to commit. I am not blaming my Democratic colleagues because we had to agree to it. But anybody with a brain above a single-cell organism knows that a motion to commit has no chance of passing. So, basically, we have been standing around for 13 hours. We might as well have just been standing around sucking on our teeth.

Now, I would like to ask for order in this Chamber. At least we can have that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let there be order, please.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, in this bill, \$1 billion is set aside to be spent by September 30, 2027, to carry out the Defense Production Act. That is it. That is all there is.

Now, I am not a big fan of government-directed industrialization. Government-directed industrialization is when government, with its superior instincts and unfathomable judgment, decides to pick winners and losers in the private sector.

This business gets some money; but you, Ms. Businesswoman, you can't have the money. I am against that for two reasons. No. 1, it is immoral. It is unfair to people who don't get the money, the gift from government. And, No. 2, when government does it, when it picks winners and losers, government consistently picks losers.

Now, I was against it in the prior administration, and, just recently, in my subcommittee, we had a hearing where the prior administration handed out \$90 billion in the last 76 days of its administration in gifts and loans to entities in the private sector. And I raised fresh hell.

And now we are about to do it again—a billion dollars. Now I am—and that is all it says, a billion dollars to be spent, period.

Now, I have been told that the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of the Interior are going to describe, in their unfettered discretion, who is going to get this money in the private sector, and they are both two good men. I know both of those Secretaries; I voted for them. They are total ballers. I love them to death. But when I am in Washington, I live by this adage: Trust in God, but tie up your camel.

Trust in God, but tie up your camel. This bill will say they can give these gifts and grants to whomever they want, but Congress has to approve them.

Now, about—I don't know—about an hour ago, I got a call from one of my supporters. And you know what he said to me? He said: Kennedy, for your own good, you need to pull down this amendment. You have to pull down this amendment. Kennedy, for your own good, you have to pull down this amendment.

And you know what I told him? I said Scooter—I said, Scooter, there are only two things I have to do in this world: be cool and die, and I am not pulling down this amendment.

It wasn't right when it was done in the prior administration; it is not right now that we are in charge. This is Congress's job, and, by God, we ought to do it.

And I reserve my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. President, I support the Kennedy amendment but not for the reasons my friend from Louisiana does.

I think that there should be some flexibility and there should be some governmental policy that helps our industry. And I do agree that the President should have some power. What I do not believe is that the Congress should be powerless. And that is what we have become, ceding our article I authority to a Chief Executive. And I don't care whether it is a Republican or a Democrat. The most important branch is the article I branch because we are the closest to the people.

And how is it that we have, in this bill, a billion dollars—a billion dollars—that goes to an Executive to be spent in ways we have no input as to how it will be spent? We have no accountability; we have no way to tell the people we represent how this money is being spent and why.

Mr. President, I believe that the biggest threat we have to this democracy is the failure of this Congress to assert its authority and accept its responsibility to make the decisions that the Constitution says is our obligation to do, and that starts with the power of the purse.

I support the man from Louisiana in his amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

Mr. SCHUMER. Six months.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, my esteemed colleague and I—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has 30 seconds, and the Senator from South Carolina has 4 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Thank you, Scooter—I mean, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I appreciate my colleagues' support. I don't mean any disrespect to anybody.

This town operates on two wrongs don't make it right, but they do make it even. It is time that Congress have a say in how the money is being spent. It doesn't say the money can't be spent; it just says Congress gets to approve it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. President, I really like my good friend from the great State of Louisiana, and Scooter's cousin Bubba called me recently. I got to tell you that there is no doubt in my mind that the importance of the Defense Production Act is undeniable and specificity is a necessary component for us to have our oversight, and that is why this administration—unlike the last administration—has committed to making sure that we understand how the resources in the DPA will be spent.

We have that commitment on a quarterly basis to receive the necessary information so that we understand, with great clarity and transparency, how the dollars within the DPA will be spent.

But here is what we also know, that we remain reliant on China for critical minerals. Here is what we know, that the United States of America, the "City on the Hill," remains dependent on foreign powers for our necessary resources. We are not self-reliant in areas that matter the most to the American people and, frankly, to America's future.

Now, you can think of this as just hyperbole, but the fact of the matter is clear when you look back to recent issues like COVID and PPE. We were begging China to help the American people. We were begging China for medicine, masks.

We cannot allow this great Nation to be dependent on other nations. We must become more self-reliant. And in the spirit of self-reliance, this administration—whom I will say I trust President Trump. I trust his word to produce the results we need for this Nation to make sure that we are self-reliant, and I trust the President to produce the information that will satisfy my good friend Senator KENNEDY.

But let me close with this. We need the DPA, and we need the funding at the levels requested. We must make sure we always have the resources to produce for ourselves if there is another COVID.

In the same way that we used the DPA to build levies and floodwalls after Hurricane Katrina, we need to make sure we have the resources in place for natural emergencies. In the same way that the DPA was used to help protect servicemembers who were deployed overseas from IEDs, we need the DPA.

So I ask my colleagues to vote no on this amendment. The pending amendment does not produce a change in outlays of revenues.

POINT OF ORDER

I raise a point of order under section 313(b)(1)(A) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. KENNEDY. Excuse me, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Take your time.

MOTION TO WAIVE

Mr. KENNEDY. Thank you, sir.

Pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I move to waive the point of order, reminding the body that I am not striking the spending—reminding the body that I am not striking the spending. I am just asking Congress to approve it.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

VOTE ON MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 42, nays 58, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 352 Leg.]

YEAS—42

Alsobrooks	Hassan	Padilla
Baldwin	Heinrich	Paul
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Reed
Blunt Rochester	Kaine	Sanders
Booker	Kennedy	Schiff
Cantwell	King	Schumer
Cassidy	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Collins	Luján	Smith
Coons	McConnell	Tillis
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Van Hollen
Durbin	Murkowski	Warner
Fetterman	Murphy	Warmock
Gallego	Murray	Welch
Grassley	Ossoff	Wyden

NAYS—58

Banks	Hagerty	Peters
Barrasso	Hawley	Ricketts
Blackburn	Hirono	Risch
Blumenthal	Hoeben	Rosen
Boozman	Husted	Rounds
Britt	Hyde-Smith	Schatz
Budd	Johnson	Schmitt
Capito	Justice	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Kelly	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Kim	Sheehy
Cramer	Lankford	Slotkin
Crapo	Lee	Sullivan
Cruz	Lummis	Thune
Curtis	Markey	Tuberville
Daines	Marshall	Warren
Duckworth	McCormick	Whitehouse
Ernst	Moody	Wicker
Fischer	Moran	Young
Gillibrand	Moreno	
Graham	Mullin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHEEHY). On this vote, the yeas are 42, the nays are 58.

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

The motion was rejected.

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

(Disturbance in the Galleries.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

MOTION TO COMMIT

Ms. ALSOBROOKS. Mr. President, I have a motion to commit at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant executive clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maryland [Ms. ALSOBROOKS] moves to commit the bill H.R. 1 to the Committee on Finance, with instructions.

Ms. ALSOBROOKS. I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the motion be dispensed with.

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

The motion is as follows:

Ms. ALSOBROOKS moves to commit the bill H.R. 1 to the Committee on Finance of the Senate with instructions to report the same back to the Senate in 3 days, not counting any day on which the Senate is not in session, with changes that—

(1) are within the jurisdiction of such committee; and

(2) would strike any provision which reduces the average tax liability of individual taxpayers with income in excess of \$10,000,000.

Ms. ALSOBROOKS. Mr. President, I want to know if my colleagues on the other side of the aisle believe that there are some Americans who are so wealthy that perhaps they don't need a tax break so we can save healthcare and food for our most vulnerable constituents.

So I will kick off this dialogue by raising a commonsense idea: We can save healthcare for millions of Americans if we strip out tax giveaways for individuals making more than \$10 million—yes or no?

President Trump claims to fight for the working class. Yet we have before us a bill that gives tax breaks to the top 1 percent that would be paid in cuts to Medicaid, SNAP, and more—programs that serve hard-working Americans.

So I ask, do you want community hospitals or another giant mansion for a billionaire? Should we save healthcare and nutrition assistance for millions of Americans by stopping giant tax giveaways of \$10 million?

If my colleagues on the other side want to put their money where their mouths are, then they will say yes.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, Senator KENNEDY talked about Scooter, and Senator SCOTT talked about Bubba. I want to talk about Jelly Roll.

It turns out, in a committee hearing with Jelly Roll—the country music rock singer—he grew up in Antioch, TN.

I said: Do you remember Countryside Village?

He said: Well, they call it Countryside Meadow.

I said: I used to live there.

He said: I did, too.

It is a trailer park that is still standing on Richards Road in Nashville, TN.

Back in the late seventies and early eighties, I was living in that trailer park, and I was living with a family in the economic bubble. I remember back then when President Reagan came in and he offered tax cuts that everybody characterized as tax cuts for the rich. But let me tell you all, when we saw those tax cuts implemented, THOM TILLIS and Jelly Roll ended up finding opportunities beyond our wildest imagination.

So it turns out that those so-called tax cuts for the rich back then lifted me out of that situation into a high-

tech career and now standing here before you in the U.S. Senate.

This and several other amendments are amendments that are standing in the way of other people getting lifted out of that same trailer park. So, ladies and gentlemen on our side of the aisle and those over there, I hope you will join us.

Shout loudly “no.”

VOTE ON MOTION TO COMMIT

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

MOTION TO COMMIT

Mr. KELLY. Mr. President, I have a motion to commit at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant executive clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. KELLY] moves to commit the bill H.R. 1 to the Committee on Finance, with instructions.

Mr. KELLY. Mr. President, I ask that further reading of the motion be dispensed with.

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

The motion is as follows:

Mr. KELLY moves to commit the bill H.R. 1 to the Committee on Finance of the Senate with instructions to report the same back to the Senate in 3 days, not counting any day on which the Senate is not in session, with changes that—

(1) are within the jurisdiction of such committee; and

(2) would strike any provision which reduces the average tax liability of individual taxpayers with income in excess of \$100,000,000.

Mr. KELLY. Mr. President, I don't think we are looking to take any money out of Jelly Roll's pocket here, but giving a tax break to the richest people and most profitable corporations is a choice, and paying for it by kicking 17 million Americans off of their health insurance is a choice.

None of this is set in stone. Every one of us gets a vote here—a choice. We can help parents be able to take their kids to the doctor, we can keep seniors in their nursing homes, or some rich guy—not Jelly Roll—can get another private jet.

We can save healthcare for millions of Americans if we strip out tax giveaways for individuals who are making more than \$100 million a year—yes or no.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, the reality is, let's fast-forward now to 2017. I was in this Chamber when we passed the TCJA. After we passed this, again, everybody was arguing this was all tax policy for the rich, but we unleashed an American economy that we had not seen in our history. In fact, it was better than the tax cuts of the Reagan era.

Ladies and gentlemen, we need to get every bit of what we did in 2017 back on the books because people are not understanding the pro-growth nature of this tax policy.

I hope my colleagues will vote loudly yes once again—no—no once again.

Mr. KELLY. Mr. President, do I have any time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

VOTE ON MOTION

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion is not agreed to.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

MOTION TO COMMIT

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I have a motion to commit at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MURPHY] moves to commit the bill, H.R. 1, to the Committee on Finance of the Senate with instructions to report back forthwith.

Mr. MURPHY. I ask that further reading of the motion be dispensed with.

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

The motion is as follows:

Mr. MURPHY moves to commit the bill H.R. 1 to the Committee on Finance of the Senate with instructions to report the same back to the Senate in 3 days, not counting any day on which the Senate is not in session, with changes that—

(1) are within the jurisdiction of such committee; and

(2) would strike any provision which reduces the average tax liability of individual taxpayers with income in excess of \$500,000,000.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, at the foundation of this bill is something very simple: the most massive transfer of wealth from the poor to the rich in the history of the country. That is essentially what we are talking about here. That is locally bad policy, but, just as importantly, it is also deeply, deeply immoral.

This bill is going to ruin people's lives. There are going to be moms who will watch their kids go hungry because of the cuts in SNAP. People are going to die when 17 million people lose their healthcare; and for what? To give an average quarter-million-dollar tax cut to the wealthiest families in America.

We have tried to convince our colleagues to throw less people off their healthcare or to make the nutritional cuts a little bit easier to stomach, but they won't do it. So now we are just trying to address the other side of the immorality.

This amendment would just say: no tax cuts for people making over \$500 million a year.

If you are going to ruin people's lives by kicking them off their healthcare or cutting their food stamps, don't make the moral injury even worse by padding the pockets of the richest people in the country—tax cuts for people making over \$500 million a year, while you throw 17 million people off their healthcare, yes or no?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I am guessing, while they are probably focused a little bit less on me because I have made an announcement this weekend, but you can already tell that this narrative is about how we are all about the wealthy.

I have already stipulated that I have concerns with the Medicaid bill. You all know where I am on that. But we were talking about the tax bill, and there is nothing in this tax bill that I think falls short of an extraordinary opportunity for economic growth that lifts up the very people whom I grew up with. For that reason, once again, I hope you will vote loudly no.

VOTE ON MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion is not agreed to.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

MOTION TO COMMIT

Mr. KING. Mr. President, first, I want to respond. We can solve this problem and solve the problem of people in trailer parks by limiting the tax cuts to people making \$400,000 a year and less. That would cut the cost of this bill by 60 percent. It would also obviate the necessity of kicking 17 million people off of healthcare and thousands and thousands of young people and people across the country from SNAP. You can do this and give tax relief to the middle class without the unnecessary tax relief in this bill that goes to the richest people in our country.

So my amendment is really simple. If you think people making \$1 billion a year need and deserve a tax break, and also, if you want to give a really good ad to these guys in November of 2026, vote no on the amendment and say that billionaires—no, not billionaires, people earning \$1 billion—need and deserve a tax break.

I urge a “yes” vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator wish to call up his motion?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I have a motion to commit to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maine [Mr. KING] moves to commit the bill, H.R. 1, to the Committee on Finance of the Senate with Instructions to report back forthwith.

Mr. KING. I ask that further reading of the motion be dispensed with.

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

The motion is as follows:

Mr. KING moves to commit the bill H.R. 1 to the Committee on Finance of the Senate with instructions to report the same back to the Senate in 3 days, not counting any day on which the Senate is not in session, with changes that—

(1) are within the jurisdiction of such committee; and

(2) would strike any provision which reduces the average tax liability of individual taxpayers with income in excess of \$1,000,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, in truth, you can see this sort of upping of the ante. These are the gimmicks that we play when we want to get a show vote, especially with somebody who may be running for reelection. We know that this isn't going to materially change things.

My friend from Maine knows where I am on healthcare, and I hope that we get things fixed. But this exercise, by virtue of its being a voice vote, tells you all you need to know about this process. And for that reason, I would suggest just one more loud “no” vote.

VOTE ON MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion is not agreed to.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

MOTION TO COMMIT

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I have a motion to commit to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California [Mr. PADILLA] moves to commit the bill, H.R. 1, to the Committee on Finance of the Senate with instructions to report back forthwith.

Mr. PADILLA. I ask that further reading of the motion be dispensed with.

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

The motion is as follows:

Mr. PADILLA moves to commit the bill H.R. 1 to the Committee on Finance of the Senate with instructions to report the same back to the Senate in 3 days, not counting any day on which the Senate is not in session, with changes that—

(1) are within the jurisdiction of such committee; and

(2) would cause the bill to not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2025 through 2034, relative to the current law baseline.

Mr. PADILLA. Colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I know that you take great pleasure in criticizing the Federal deficit under Democratic administrations. But the numbers don't lie. The biggest driver of the ballooning national debt has been Republican tax cuts for the wealthy and large corporations.

Despite the parliamentary gymnastics that are being played here, our Republican colleagues know that this bill is adding an additional \$3.5 trillion to the deficit over the next 10 years. Why else would they have included a piece of the bill to raise the debt limit by \$5 trillion if this bill saved money, as they claim?

So if Republicans really do want to balance the budget or reduce the deficit, let's start by guaranteeing that this measure is at least deficit neutral.

That is exactly what this amendment would do.

I ask for your “aye” vote, and I reserve my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, CBO tells us that if we adopt current policy for taxes, we will save \$507 billion. The deficit will go down by \$507 billion if we do this.

In 2012, I was here. The Bush tax cuts were going to expire in December of 2012. President Obama sat down with Republicans, and they came up with a way to extend those tax cuts by not passing them into law. They called it the alternative fiscal scenario that CBO said is based on the current policy. So “alternative fiscal scenario” in Latin means current policy.

So we are doing what they did then. We are just doing it without any help from you all because you all will never do anything to make sure taxes go down. So we are going to make sure they go down forever.

Current policy is good tax policy. Stick with the bill you wrote. You are going to be happy to reduce the deficit and make sure people's taxes don't go up tomorrow, the next day, forever. It is good policy. Current policy is good tax policy.

I am done.

Mr. PADILLA. How much time do I have left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

VOTE ON MOTION

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

Mr. PADILLA. 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 47, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 353 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
Gallego	Ossoff	Welch
Gillibrand	Padilla	Whitehouse
Hassan	Peters	Wyden
Heinrich	Reed	

NAYS—53

Banks	Cornyn	Graham
Barrasso	Cotton	Grassley
Blackburn	Cramer	Hagerty
Boozman	Crapo	Hawley
Britt	Cruz	Hoeben
Budd	Curtis	Husted
Capito	Daines	Hyde-Smith
Cassidy	Ernst	Johnson
Collins	Fischer	Justice

Kennedy	Moreno	Scott (SC)
Lankford	Mullin	Sheehy
Lee	Murkowski	Sullivan
Lummis	Paul	Thune
Marshall	Ricketts	Tillis
McConnell	Risch	Tuberville
McCormick	Rounds	Wicker
Moody	Schmitt	Young
Moran	Scott (FL)	

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

MOTION TO COMMIT

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I have a motion to commit at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. BENNET] moves to commit the bill H.R. 1 to the Committee on Finance of the Senate with instructions to report.

Mr. BENNET. I ask the reading of the motion be dispensed with.

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

The motion is as follows:

Mr. BENNET moves to commit the bill H.R. 1 to the Committee on Finance of the Senate with instructions to report the same back to the Senate in 3 days, not counting any day on which the Senate is not in session, with changes that—

(1) are within the jurisdiction of such committee; and

(2) would increase the amount and availability of the Child Tax Credit to match levels of the expanded Child Tax Credit, adjusted for inflation, by ensuring big corporations and the ultra-wealthy pay a fair share.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, the legislation we are debating today would modestly increase the size of the child tax credit while leaving out more than 17 million children from the full credit.

America's poorest children, whose families are struggling to make ends meet, receive nothing from this bill. Everywhere I go in Colorado, I meet parents who are working hard—often two and three jobs—just to keep their family's heads above water, like Americans all across this country.

They are wrestling with the legacy of 50 years of trickle-down economics that have benefited the wealthiest Americans while leaving working and middle-class families behind, which this bill does again.

Today, the United States boasts one of the highest childhood poverty rates in the industrialized world. This is a moral disgrace, but we know how to end childhood poverty in this country.

In 2021, we expanded the child tax credit and cut childhood poverty nearly in half and cut hunger by a quarter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, we should refuse to pass a bill that adds millions to our debt in order to cut taxes for the wealthiest while doing nothing for our kids. I urge my colleagues to support this motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, Democrats contend that they want to increase and extend the child tax credit

and ensure that big corporations and the ultrawealthy pay their fair share.

Despite the rhetoric behind these claims, I remind my colleagues that Republicans created the child tax credit, expanded its availability, and doubled the amount of the credit in the TCJA, which we are working on tonight.

This bill not only makes that doubled child tax credit permanent but also increases it, providing significant relief for families. In addition, as a result of the TCJA cutting taxes for, overwhelmingly, the majority of Americans, with the middle class receiving the largest proportional benefit of these cuts, Republicans made the Tax Code more progressive, not less. The legislation before us makes those tax provisions permanent.

Americans deserve more than empty platitudes. They deserve meaningful tax relief and meaningful results.

VOTE ON MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs on agreeing to the Bennett motion to commit.

Mr. BENNET. 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 called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 354 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
Gallego	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 motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHMITT). The Senator from Maine.

AMENDMENT NO. 2812 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2360

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 2812 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 Maine [Ms. COLLINS] proposes an amendment numbered 2812 to amendment No. 2360.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to apply a 39.6 percent individual income tax rate, and to provide additional funding and specify eligible providers under the Rural Health Transformation Program)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. **39.6 PERCENT INCOME TAX RATE BRACKET.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1(j)(2) is amended by redesignating subparagraph (F) as subparagraph (G) and by inserting after subparagraph (E) the following new subparagraph:

“(F) 39.6 PERCENT RATE BRACKET.—Notwithstanding subparagraphs (A) through (E), in prescribing the tables under this subsection for purposes of paragraph (3)(B)—

“(i) the excess, if any, of taxable income over—

“(I) \$50,000,000, in the case of married individuals filing joint returns and surviving spouses, and

“(II) \$25,000,000, in any other case, shall be taxed at a rate of 39.6 percent, and

“(ii) paragraph (3)(B)(i) shall be applied with respect to such \$50,000,000 and \$25,000,000 amounts by substituting ‘2025’ for ‘2017.’”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2025.

SEC. _____. **MODIFICATIONS TO RURAL HEALTH TRANSFORMATION PROGRAM.**

(a) ADDITIONAL FUNDING.—Section 2105(h)(1)(A) of the Social Security Act, as added by section 71401(a), is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking “\$10,000,000,000” and inserting

“\$22,500,000,000”; and

(2) in clause (ii), by striking “\$10,000,000,000” and inserting “\$22,500,000,000”.

(b) HEALTH CARE PROVIDERS.—Section 2105(h) of the Social Security Act, as added by section 71401(a) and amended by subsection (a), is amended—

(1) in paragraph (6)(B), by striking “health care providers,” and inserting “rural health facilities (as defined in paragraph (3)(D)) or health care providers described in paragraph (7), or”;

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (7) and (8) as paragraphs (8) and (9), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

“(7) HEALTH CARE PROVIDERS.—The following health care providers are described in this paragraph:

“(A) A hospital classified as a rural referral center under section 1886(d)(5)(C).

“(B) A long-term care hospital (as defined in section 1861(ccc)).

“(C) A hospital operated by an Indian Tribe or the Indian Health Service.

“(D) A provider of ambulance services.

“(E) A community health center.

“(F) A provider or supplier that is enrolled with a State Medicaid plan under title XIX (or a waiver of such plan) in accordance with subsections (a)(77) and (kk) of section 1902 (including enrolled pursuant to section 1902(a)(78) or section 1932(d)(6)) that received funds as a rural provider under the Phase Four distribution of the Provider Relief Fund established in the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act (Public Law 116-136).

“(G) A provider or supplier that is enrolled with a State Medicaid plan under title XIX

(or a waiver of such plan) in accordance with subsections (a)(77) and (kk) of section 1902 (including enrolled pursuant to section 1902(a)(78) or section 1932(d)(6)) that received funds under section 1150C.

“(H) A hospital that—
“(i) is located in an urban area (as defined in section 1886(d)(2)(D)); and

“(ii) operates 1 or more approved medical residency training program under section 1886(h).

“(I) A not-for-profit hospital that is located in an urban area (as defined in section 1886(d)(2)(D)).

“(J) A hospital described in section 1886(d)(1)(B)(ii).

“(K) A hospital described in section 1886(d)(1)(B)(v).

“(L) A hospital that is defined or deemed to be a disproportionate share hospital for purposes of receiving a payment adjustment under section 1923 for the most recent fiscal year for which such payment adjustments are made.

“(M) A facility that provides inpatient or outpatient rehabilitation services that is enrolled with a State Medicaid plan under title XIX (or a waiver of such plan) in accordance with subsections (a)(77) and (kk) of section 1902 (including enrolled pursuant to section 1902(a)(78) or section 1932(d)(6)).

“(N) A facility that provides inpatient or outpatient psychiatric services (including an inpatient psychiatric hospital for individuals under age 21 (as described in section 1905(h)) or an institution for mental diseases providing medical assistance under a State Medicaid plan under title XIX (or a waiver of such plan) to individuals 65 years of age or older) that is enrolled with a State Medicaid plan under title XIX (or a waiver of such plan) in accordance with subsections (a)(77) and (kk) of section 1902 (including enrolled pursuant to section 1902(a)(78) or section 1932(d)(6)).

“(O) A facility described in section 1905(d).

“(P) A facility that provides for individuals with intellectual or developmental disabilities—

“(i) services described in section 433.56(a)(4) of title 42, Code of Federal Regulations; or

“(ii) home and community-based services authorized under subsections (b), (c), (i), (j), or (k) of section 1915, section 1115, or a State plan amendment under title XIX that supports individuals with intellectual or developmental disabilities who are eligible for such services through meeting an institutional level of care.

“(Q) A skilled nursing facility (as defined in section 1819(a)).

“(R) A nursing facility (as defined in section 1919(a)).

“(S) An assisted living or residential care facility that is enrolled with a State Medicaid plan under title XIX (or a waiver of such plan) in accordance with subsections (a)(77) and (kk) of section 1902 (including enrolled pursuant to section 1902(a)(78) or section 1932(d)(6)).

“(T) A provider of home health care services.

“(U) A provider of hospice care.

“(V) An institution for mental diseases (as defined in section 1905(i)).

“(W) A subsection (d) hospital (as defined in paragraph (1)(B) of section 1886(d)) that receives or is eligible to receive disproportionate share hospital payments under paragraph (5)(F) of such section.

“(X) A hospital participating in the Rural Community Hospital (RCH) demonstration program under section 410A of the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003.

“(Y) A community behavioral health provider who relies heavily on payments pro-

vided under a State Medicaid plan under title XIX or a waiver of such plan.”.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, my amendment would increase funding for the Rural Healthcare Provider Fund to \$50 billion and expand the list of eligible providers to include not only rural hospitals but also community health centers, nursing homes, ambulance services, skilled nursing facilities, and others.

Rural providers, especially our rural hospitals and nursing homes, are under great financial strain right now with many having recently closed and others being at risk of closing.

When these facilities close their doors, the people they serve are often left behind without access to healthcare. This amendment would help keep them open and caring for those who live in these rural communities.

The additional funding is fully offset through a modest increase in the top marginal tax rate equal to the pre-2017 rate for individuals with income of about \$25 million and married couples with income of about \$50 million.

I urge support for this amendment to provide the additional funding for rural and Medicaid providers who desperately need it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President and colleagues, here is how flawed this plan is. The danger Senate Republicans are causing for rural hospitals is so great, Republicans have had to create a rural hospital relief fund so they can look like they are fixing the problem they are causing.

It is a bandaid on an amputation. It provides just a tiny fraction of the nearly \$1 trillion in cuts the bill makes to Medicaid. It would be much more logical to simply not cut \$1 trillion from Medicaid in the first place.

This amendment doubles down on that flawed plan that is going to set rural hospitals adrift.

I urge opposition to the amendment. I yield the floor.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. President, I make a point of order that the pending measure violates section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

MOTION TO WAIVE

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I move to waive, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

VOYE 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 bill clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 22, nays 78, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 355 Leg.]

YEAS—22

Capito	Hyde-Smith	Ossoff
Cassidy	Kennedy	Sullivan
Collins	King	Warner
Curtis	Marshall	Warnock
Fischer	McConnell	Wicker
Graham	Moran	Young
Hawley	Moreno	
Husted	Murkowski	

NAYS—78

Alsobrooks	Gillibrand	Paul
Baldwin	Grassley	Peters
Banks	Hagerty	Reed
Barrasso	Hassan	Ricketts
Bennet	Heinrich	Risch
Blackburn	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Blumenthal	Hirono	Rounds
Blunt Rochester	Hoeben	Sanders
Booker	Johnson	Schatz
Boozman	Justice	Schiff
Britt	Kaine	Schmitt
Budd	Kelly	Schumer
Cantwell	Kim	Scott (FL)
Coons	Klobuchar	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Lankford	Shaheen
Cortez Masto	Lee	Sheehy
Cotton	Lujan	Slotkin
Cramer	Lummis	Smith
Crapo	Markey	Thune
Cruz	McCormick	Tillis
Daines	Merkley	Tuberville
Duckworth	Moody	Van Hollen
Durbin	Mullin	Warren
Ernst	Murphy	Welch
Fetterman	Murray	Whitehouse
Gallego	Padilla	Wyden

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). On this vote, the yeas are 22, the nays are 78.

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.

AMENDMENT NO. 2775 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2360

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 2775 on behalf of Senator KENNEDY 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 South Dakota [Mr. THUNE], for Mr. KENNEDY, proposes an amendment numbered 2775 to amendment No. 2360.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a deduction for expenses of home educators)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEDUCTION FOR CERTAIN EXPENSES OF ELIGIBLE EDUCATORS.

(a) INCREASE IN LIMITATION FOR ELIGIBLE EDUCATORS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 62(a)(2)(D) is amended—

(A) by striking “ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS” in the heading and inserting “ELIGIBLE EDUCATORS”, and

(B) by striking “\$250” and inserting “\$600”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 62(d)(3) is amended—

(A) by striking “2015” and inserting “2025”,

(B) by striking “\$250” and inserting “\$600”, and

(C) by striking “calendar year 2014” and inserting “calendar year 2024”.

(b) APPLICATION TO HOME EDUCATORS.—

(1) DEDUCTION ALLOWED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Part VII of subchapter A of chapter 1, as amended by sections 70201

and 70202, is further amended by redesignating section 226 as section 227 and by inserting after section 225 the following new section:

“SEC. 226. DEDUCTION FOR CERTAIN EXPENSES OF HOME EDUCATORS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an eligible home educator, there shall be allowed as a deduction an amount equal to the expenses paid or incurred by the eligible home educator—

“(1) by reason of the participation of the eligible home educator in courses related to—

“(A) the curriculum in which the eligible home educator provides instruction, or

“(B) such eligible educator’s children, and

“(2) in connection with books, supplies (other than nonathletic supplies for courses of instruction in health or physical education), computer equipment (including related software and services) and other equipment, and supplementary materials used by the eligible home educator at the location where the educator teaches such individual’s children.

“(b) LIMITATION.—The amount allowed as a deduction under this section for any taxable year shall not exceed the amount in effect under section 62(a)(2)(D).

“(c) ELIGIBLE HOME EDUCATOR.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘eligible home educator’ means any individual who teaches such individual’s children at a home school which—

“(1) provides elementary or secondary education (kindergarten through grade 12), as determined under State law, and

“(2) is treated as a home school or a private school under State law.”

(B) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for part VII of subchapter A of chapter 1, as amended by sections 70201 and 70202, is further amended by redesignating the item relating to section 226 as relating to section 227 and by inserting after the item relating to section 225 the following new item:

“Sec. 226. Deduction for certain expenses of home educators.”

(2) DEDUCTION ALLOWED IN COMPUTING ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME.—Section 62(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after paragraph (21) the following new paragraph:

“(22) EXPENSES OF HOME EDUCATORS.—The deduction allowed by section 226.”

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2024.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, as you know, as we all know, many of our teachers in America come out-of-pocket to pay for school supplies.

In 2002, 23 years ago, we allowed teachers to deduct \$250 when they come out-of-pocket. My amendment would raise that deduction from \$250 to \$600. Teachers, right now, spend an average of \$650 out of their own pockets, so we would allow them to deduct that instead of the amount we set in 2002.

I ask a favorable consideration of my amendment. This will just let teachers break even for coming out-of-pocket.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I wouldn’t have much dispute for subsidizing the out-of-pocket expenses of our public school teachers. When I was a child, my dad, the mechanic, said:

Son, because we are so fortunate to live in America, if you go through the doors of that public school and you study hard, you can do just about anything.

So I am certainly a lifetime fan of public education.

But in addition to expanding this for public school teachers, it has a new policy of expanding it to homeschool teachers. Well, that is quite a new policy to put into a reconciliation bill. It really should be in the Education Committee and debated and bring people to bear.

I am not immediately struck that that is a great idea, but certainly, as a new policy, it should go through committee. For that reason—for that reason—I think I will do a point of order on this particular amendment.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. President, I raise a point of order that the amendment violates section 4106 of the fiscal year 2018 Budget Resolution, H. Con. Res. 71, of the 115th Congress, known as the Senate pay-as-you-go point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. KENNEDY. Do I have any time left, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No.

MOTION TO WAIVE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, and on behalf of all of the teachers in America and the waiver provisions of applicable budget resolutions, I move, on behalf of all the teachers in America, to waive all applicable sections of that act and applicable budget resolutions for purposes of the pending amendment—and, once again, on behalf of our teachers—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 legislative clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 54, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 356 Leg.]

YEAS—54

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
Collins	Justice	Schmitt
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cotton	King	Scott (SC)
Cramer	Lankford	Sheehy
Crapo	Lee	Sullivan
Cruz	Lummis	Thune
Curtis	Marshall	Tillis
Daines	McConnell	Tuberville
Ernst	McCormick	Wicker
Fischer	Moody	Young

NAYS—46

Alsobrooks	Blumenthal	Cantwell
Baldwin	Blunt Rochester	Coons
Bennet	Booker	Cortez Masto

Duckworth	Lujan	Schumer
Durbin	Markey	Shaheen
Fetterman	Merkley	Slotkin
Gallo	Murphy	Smith
Gillibrand	Murray	Van Hollen
Hassan	Ossoff	Warner
Heinrich	Padilla	Warnock
Hickenlooper	Peters	Warren
Hirono	Reed	Welch
Kaine	Rosen	Whitehouse
Kelly	Sanders	Wyden
Kim	Schatz	
Klobuchar	Schiff	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 54, the nays are 46.

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 it be in order for the following Senators to be recognized to offer amendments, motions or points of order; that the amendments be reported by number, with no amendments in order prior to a vote in relation to the amendments or motions.

Wyden, motion to commit; Hirono, No. 2382; Warnock, motion to commit; Lee, No. 2745; Kim, No. 2817; Ernst, No. 2372; Sanders, No. 2435, with 60 affirmative votes required.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I would suggest to my colleagues that we get this vote started and that, when we get it, we are going to start voting in our seats, and we are going to start doing 10-minute votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

MOTION TO COMMIT

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I have a motion to commit at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN] moves to commit the bill to the Committee on Finance of the Senate with instructions to report the same back to the Senate in 3 days.

Mr. WYDEN. I ask that further reading of the motion be dispensed with.

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

The motion is as follows:

Mr. WYDEN moves to commit the bill H.R. 1 to the Committee on Finance of the Senate with instructions to report the same back to the Senate in 3 days, not counting any day on which the Senate is not in session, with changes that—

(1) are within the jurisdiction of such committee; and

(2) would prevent changes in policy that will lead to increased electricity prices for American families and small businesses, while protecting American energy jobs.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President and colleagues, Republicans started out planning to repeal the tax credits that Finance Democrats wrote for wind and solar energy. Then it got a whole lot worse.

The Republican plan actually taxes clean energy. Taxes raise energy bills. The Republican plan will raise your energy bills. If this passes, it is a death sentence for the wind and solar industries and hundreds of thousands of American jobs. It is a surrender to China on clean energy manufacturing.

Leader SCHUMER and my colleagues on our side all support this effort. If you are for all-of-the-above energy, something I have heard my Republican colleagues say, you will support my motion to commit the bill back to the Finance Committee to strike the cuts to clean energy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I respect my friend and colleague from Oregon, but I disagree with every word he just uttered including “but,” “and,” and “the.”

Look, the energy and natural resources title of this bill is one of the most consequential pieces of energy legislation we have had in decades. It increases production on Federal lands. It eliminates wasteful spending at both the Interior and Energy Departments that have prioritized intermittent, nonreliable, nonbaseload sources of power, ultimately driving up the cost of living and the cost of power.

We can and do reduce energy prices by increasing development of our vast energy natural resources.

I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

VOTE ON MOTION TO COMMIT

Mr. WYDEN. 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 47, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 357 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
Gallogo	Ossoff	Welch
Gillibrand	Padilla	Whitehouse
Hassan	Peters	Wyden
Heinrich	Reed	

NAYS—53

Banks	Crapo	Hyde-Smith
Barrasso	Cruz	Johnson
Blackburn	Curtis	Justice
Boozman	Daines	Kennedy
Britt	Ernst	Lankford
Budd	Fischer	Lee
Capito	Graham	Lummis
Cassidy	Grassley	Marshall
Collins	Hagerty	McConnell
Cornyn	Hawley	McCormick
Cotton	Hoeven	Moody
Cramer	Husted	Moran

Moreno	Rounds	Thune
Mullin	Schmitt	Tillis
Murkowski	Scott (FL)	Tuberville
Paul	Scott (SC)	Wicker
Ricketts	Sheehy	Young
Risch	Sullivan	

The motion was rejected.
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). The Senator from Hawaii.

AMENDMENT NO. 2382 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2360

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 2382 and ask that it be reported by number.

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

The senior assistant executive clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Hawaii [Ms. HIRONO], for herself and others, proposes an amendment numbered 2382 to amendment No. 2360.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To eliminate a program of qualified elementary and secondary education scholarships for public, private, or religious schools)

Strike section 70411.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, nearly 90 percent of K through 12 students attend public schools. Yet Republicans are pushing a plan in this bill to undermine support for public schools through the first-ever nationwide Public-Private School Voucher Program.

Republicans claim vouchers are about expanding school choice, but evidence shows these kinds of programs do little to meaningfully increase choice for families, especially low-income families and those who live in rural communities.

When it comes down to it, this plan does not help students. It does not promote choice. It does not support public schools. We should be investing in public education for all Americans, not diverting tax dollars to private schools. That is why my amendment with Senator VAN HOLLEN would strip this provision from this bill.

Stand up for our Nation’s students, teachers, and families by rejecting this provision and supporting our amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. There are many important elements to One Big Beautiful Bill, but none over time is likely to have as big an impact as this specific provision that the Democrats are trying to strike tonight.

Across America, millions of children, especially low-income, African-American, and Hispanic children are trapped in failing schools. They face crime and violence and despair. Without the ability to learn and prosper, they are denied a fair shot at the American dream.

School choice is the civil rights issue of the 21st century. Every child, regardless of race or wealth or ethnicity, deserves access to an excellent education. This tax credit provision will unleash billions of dollars every single year for scholarships for kids to attend the K through 12 school of their choice.

Sadly, every Democrat in this body will oppose these scholarships because they are more beholden to teacher union bosses than they are dedicated to fighting for kids.

Dr. King’s dream will take a major step forward tonight as every kid in America will have a chance at an excellent education.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, do I have time left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no time remaining.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2382

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on the adoption of the amendment.

Ms. HIRONO. 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 50, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 358 Leg.]

YEAS—50

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	Murkowski	Warnock
Fetterman	Murphy	Warren
Fischer	Murray	Welch
Gallogo	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Padilla	Wyden
Hassan	Peters	

NAYS—50

Banks	Grassley	Moreno
Barrasso	Hagerty	Mullin
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
Graham	Moran	

The amendment (No. 2382) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

MOTION TO COMMIT

Mr. WARNOCK. Mr. President, I have a motion to commit at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant executive clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. WARNOCK] moves to commit the bill H.R. 1 to the Committee on Finance with instructions.

Mr. WARNOCK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the motion be dispensed with.

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

The motion is as follows:

Mr. WARNOCK moves to commit the bill H.R. 1 to the Committee on Finance of the Senate with instructions to report the same back to the Senate in 3 days, not counting any day on which the Senate is not in session, with changes that—

(1) are within the jurisdiction of such committee; and

(2) would protect clean energy manufacturing jobs in the United States.

Mr. WARNOCK. Mr. President, I rise to protect pro-business, pro-worker tax credits that are creating hundreds of thousands of American clean energy manufacturing jobs, many of which don't require a college degree.

Put simply, these tax credits are working. I know firsthand because, in Georgia, businesses invested \$4.50 for every dollar we spent in tax credits. They helped create 42,000 new manufacturing and construction jobs, many in rural parts of our State that are too often left behind by Washington politicians. Those 42,000 Georgia jobs and hundreds of thousands of jobs nationwide are at risk if Republicans have their way and roll back these tax credits. That is why North America's building trade unions—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. WARNOCK. Really?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has been a minute and 10 seconds.

Mr. WARNOCK. Those 42,000 Georgia jobs and hundreds of thousands of jobs nationwide are at risk. That is why North America's building trade unions call this bill the biggest job-killing bill in the history of this country.

I urge my colleagues to vote for America's workers and vote yes on my motion to commit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, energy manufacturing jobs survive and thrive when there is less Federal intrusion, not more, to my friend and colleague from Georgia. What is more, the American people want less. The American people understand that, with the Federal Government out of the way by cutting redtape, innovation thrives, and the American people do better.

I urge all within the sound of my voice to oppose this motion.

Mr. WARNOCK. Mr. President, how much time do I have left?

For every \$1 we have invested—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no more time remaining.

VOTE ON MOTION TO COMMIT

Mr. WARNOCK. Mr. President, 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.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senator is necessarily absent. The Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY).

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 359]

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
Gallego	Ossoff	Welch
Gillibrand	Padilla	Whitehouse
Hassan	Peters	Wyden

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

NOT VOTING—1

Hawley

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

AMENDMENT NO. 2745 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2360

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, Lee amendment No. 2745.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant executive clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Utah [Mr. LEE] proposes an amendment numbered 2745 to amendment No. 2360.

Mr. LEE. I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To terminate wind and solar credits)

At the appropriate place in chapter 5 of subtitle A of title VII, insert the following:

SEC. _____ TERMINATION FOR WIND AND SOLAR FACILITIES.

(a) CLEAN ELECTRICITY PRODUCTION CREDIT.—Section 45Y(d)(4)(A), as added by this Act, is amended to read as follows:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—This section shall not apply with respect to any applicable facility which—

“(i) begins construction after the date which is 60 days after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, or

“(ii) is placed in service after December 31, 2027.”

(b) CLEAN ELECTRICITY INVESTMENT CREDIT.—Section 48E(e)(4)(A), as added by this Act, is amended to read as follows:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—This section shall not apply to any qualified property—

“(i) which is part of an applicable facility, and

“(ii) which—

“(I) begins construction after the date which is 60 days after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, or

“(II) is placed in service after December 31, 2027.”

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, this amendment completes the half-baked task performed by the House of Representatives on these subsidies.

Now, remember, the “green new scam” was adopted in 2022 without a single Republican vote. Not one Republican in the House, not one Republican in the Senate voted for the “green new scam” subsidies.

This language would complete the circle of repeal on these subsidies by echoing exactly what the House of Representatives did. We can save more money for the American taxpayer if we adopt this. Not one Republican voted for it. Not one Republican should oppose this.

I implore all within the sound of my voice to adopt this amendment, save the American people money, and allow for the American energy revolution to begin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I am going to speak very briefly, and then I think my colleagues would like a voice vote.

I rise in opposition to the Lee amendment. The Lee amendment repeals important technology-neutral electricity credits. Tech-neutral allows all energy sources to compete on a level playing field.

Wind and solar are an essential part of American energy. These sources keep prices from skyrocketing as demand soars and keep the AC on during historic heat waves. U.S. manufacturing in wind and solar rely on the deployment of these technologies.

Reversing course on 21st-century energy sources wipes out American jobs.

I urge a “no” vote when we vote on a voice vote.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2745

Mr. LEE. I call 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 executive clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 79, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 360]

YEAS—21

Banks	Cruz	Lummis
Barrasso	Hagerty	Moreno
Blackburn	Hawley	Paul
Britt	Johnson	Risch
Budd	Kennedy	Schmitt
Cornyn	Lankford	Scott (FL)
Crapo	Lee	Tuberville

NAYS—79

Alsobrooks	Cantwell	Cramer
Baldwin	Capito	Curtis
Bennet	Cassidy	Daines
Blumenthal	Collins	Duckworth
Blunt Rochester	Coons	Durbin
Booker	Cortez Masto	Ernst
Boozman	Cotton	Fetterman

Fischer	Marshall	Schumer
Gallego	McConnell	Scott (SC)
Gillibrand	McCormick	Shaheen
Graham	Merkley	Sheehy
Grassley	Moody	Slotkin
Hassan	Moran	Smith
Heinrich	Mullin	Sullivan
Hickenlooper	Murkowski	Thune
Hirono	Murphy	Tillis
Hoeben	Murray	Van Hollen
Husted	Ossoff	Warner
Hyde-Smith	Padilla	Warnock
Justice	Peters	Warren
Kaine	Reed	Welch
Kelly	Ricketts	Whitehouse
Kim	Rosen	Wicker
King	Rounds	Wyden
Klobuchar	Sanders	Young
Luján	Schatz	
Markey	Schiff	

I yield the floor.
 The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SCHMITT. Mr. President, I am proud that this breakthrough provision has been included in the Big Beautiful Bill. This will provide much needed relief for individuals with disabilities who have waited far too long to be on the waiting list to receive services. There has been a backlog, and this will help clear it up, to the tune of billions of dollars.

My colleague's amendment would completely undermine this very important effort. Ripping out important transparency and accountability provisions will divert intended resources for those who need it most in order to pay off public sector unions along the way. That is all it is.

Medicaid exists to serve our patients. I have heard a lot from my Democratic colleagues about cutting benefits. It is all a lie. They are about to vote to cut off important benefits for the most vulnerable among us.

I am tired of the lectures. This is actually a provision that does it. They are about to vote no. I encourage my colleagues to vote no on this amendment, which, again, is nothing more than a political payoff for public sector unions and takes money away from the most vulnerable among us.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2817

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on adoption of the amendment.

Mr. KIM. 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 48, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 361 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	Daines	Lummis
Barrasso	Ernst	Marshall
Blackburn	Fischer	McConnell
Boozman	Graham	McCormick
Britt	Grassley	Moody
Budd	Hagerty	Moran
Capito	Hawley	Moreno
Cassidy	Hoeben	Mullin
Collins	Husted	Paul
Cornyn	Hyde-Smith	Ricketts
Cotton	Johnson	Risch
Cramer	Justice	Rounds
Crapo	Kennedy	Schmitt
Cruz	Lankford	Scott (FL)
Curtis	Lee	Scott (SC)

Sheehy	Tillis	Young
Sullivan	Tuberville	
Thune	Wicker	

The amendment (No. 2817) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

AMENDMENT NO. 2372 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2360

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 2372 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 Iowa [Ms. ERNST] proposes an amendment numbered 2372 to amendment No. 2360.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To end unemployment payments to jobless millionaires)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. —. ENDING UNEMPLOYMENT PAYMENTS TO JOBLESS MILLIONAIRES.

(a) PROHIBITION ON USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—No Federal funds may be used—

(A) to make payments of unemployment compensation benefits under an unemployment compensation program of the United States in a year to an individual whose wages during the individual's base period are equal to or exceed \$1,000,000; or

(B) for any administrative costs associated with making payments described in subparagraph (A).

(2) COMPLIANCE.—

(A) SELF-CERTIFICATION.—Any application for unemployment compensation under an unemployment compensation program of the United States shall include a form or procedure for an individual applicant to certify that such individual's wages during the individual's base period do not equal or exceed \$1,000,000.

(B) VERIFICATION.—Each State agency that is responsible for administering any unemployment compensation program of the United States shall utilize available systems to verify wage eligibility by assessing claimant income to the degree possible.

(3) RECOVERY OF OVERPAYMENTS.—Each State agency that is responsible for administering any unemployment compensation program of the United States shall require individuals who have received amounts of unemployment compensation under such a program to which they were not entitled to repay such amounts.

(4) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The prohibition under paragraph (1) shall apply to weeks of unemployment beginning on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PROGRAM OF THE UNITED STATES DEFINED.—In this section, the term "unemployment compensation program of the United States" means—

(1) unemployment compensation for Federal civilian employees under subchapter I of chapter 85 of title 5, United States Code;

(2) unemployment compensation for ex-servicemembers under subchapter II of chapter 85 of title 5, United States Code;

(3) extended benefits under the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 (26 U.S.C. 3304 note);

(4) any Federal temporary extension of unemployment compensation;

(5) any Federal program that increases the weekly amount of unemployment compensation payable to individuals; and

(6) any other Federal program providing for the payment of unemployment compensation, as determined by the Secretary of Labor.

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, too many of the idle rich are living high off the hog, collecting government checks for not working, while at the same time earning a million dollars or more from some other side venture. Thousands of out-of-work millionaires were paid more than \$271 million in unemployment assistance during just the first 2 years of the Biden administration.

In 2022, the most recent year data is available, nearly 6,000 millionaires were paid almost \$58 million in jobless benefits. That is \$10,000 each for each millionaire not work. The question is, Why?

Able-bodied millionaires shouldn't expect handouts made possible by the overtaxed and overworked Americans. My amendment ends freebees for free-loading fat cats by disqualifying anyone making a million dollars or more from being eligible for unemployment income support.

The Senate previously approved a similar proposal by a vote of 100 to 0 that unfortunately never became a law.

We can't afford to miss this opportunity to save as much as \$100 million by passing my amendment. So let's show some bipartisan unity for reducing the deficit by getting millionaires back to work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I am happy to have a voice vote. Let me just speak briefly on this.

This amendment is a backdoor way to undermine unemployment insurance. The fact is, Republicans have turned down numerous opportunities to ensure the wealthy pay their fair share of taxes. That is not what this amendment is about.

This is about turning a social insurance program that everyone pays into, a program built on earned benefits, into something Republicans can cut until it disappears. If it happens to unemployment insurance, it can happen to other parts of the safety net.

I oppose the amendment.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. President, I raise a point of order that the pending measure violates section 313(b)(1)(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 because it reduces revenues over the budget window.

And I am happy to have a—I ask for the yeas and nays.

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President—

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I withdraw my—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, I am happy to take a voice vote.

Mr. WYDEN. I am happy as well. I withdraw my point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has withdrawn his point of order.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2372

The question occurs on adoption of the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2372) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

AMENDMENT NO. 2435 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2360

(Purpose: To cut the price of prescription drugs under Medicare in half and expand Medicare to cover dental, vision, and hearing.)

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 2435 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] proposes an amendment numbered 2435 to amendment No. 2360.

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of June 29, 2025, under "Text of Amendments.")

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, this amendment accomplishes two goals that poll after poll shows that the American people overwhelmingly want. No. 1, it cuts prescription drug costs in this country by half by having Medicare negotiate prices consistent with what other major countries around the world are doing—something similar to what Trump has been talking about.

It uses \$395 billion in savings to do something else the American people desperately want: expand Medicare to cover dental, hearing, and vision. In Vermont and all over this country, you have a lot of seniors who cannot afford to go to the dentist, cannot afford dentures, cannot afford hearing aids, cannot afford eyeglasses.

Poll after poll shows that over 80 percent of the American people support both of these provisions.

I ask for the support of my colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Anyone speaking in opposition?

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2435

Mr. COTTON. 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 legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 362]

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
Gallego	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 (Mr. MORENO). On this vote, the yeas are 47, the nays are 53.

The 60-vote threshold having not been achieved, the amendment is rejected.

The amendment (No. 2435) was rejected.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for the following Senators to be recognized to offer amendments, motions, or points of order; that the amendment be reported by number with no amendments in order prior to a vote in relation to the amendments or motions: BLACKBURN-CRUZ No. 2602, BLACKBURN No. 2814, ROSEN No. 2717, KENNEDY No. 2790, HICKENLOOPER No. 2719, and SHAHEEN No. 2564.

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

The Senator from Texas.

AMENDMENT NO. 2602 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2360

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 2602 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 Texas [Mr. CRUZ], for Mrs. BLACKBURN and himself, proposes an amendment numbered 2602 to amendment No. 2360.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To improve the section providing support for artificial intelligence under the Broadband Equity, Access, and Deployment Program)

Strike section 40012 and insert the following:

SEC. 40012. SUPPORT FOR ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE UNDER THE BROADBAND EQUITY, ACCESS, AND DEPLOYMENT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 60102 of division F of Public Law 117–58 (47 U.S.C. 1702) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) through (N) as subparagraphs (F) through (R), respectively;

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (A) as subparagraph (D);

(C) by inserting before subparagraph (D), as so redesignated, the following:

“(A) ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE.—The term ‘artificial intelligence’ has the meaning given the term in section 5002 of the National Artificial Intelligence Initiative Act of 2020 (15 U.S.C. 9401).

“(B) ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE MODEL.—The term ‘artificial intelligence model’ means a

software component of an information system that implements artificial intelligence technology and uses computational, statistical, or machine-learning techniques to produce outputs from a defined set of inputs.

“(C) ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM.—The term ‘artificial intelligence system’ means any data system, software, hardware, application, tool, or utility that operates, in whole or in part, using artificial intelligence.”;

(D) by inserting after subparagraph (D), as so redesignated, the following:

“(E) AUTOMATED DECISION SYSTEM.—The term ‘automated decision system’ means any computational process derived from machine learning, statistical modeling, data analytics, or artificial intelligence that issues a simplified output, including a score, classification, or recommendation, to materially influence or replace human decision making.”; and

(E) by striking subparagraph (O), as so redesignated, and inserting the following:

“(O) PROJECT.—The term ‘project’ means an undertaking by a subgrantee under this section to construct and deploy infrastructure for the provision of—

“(i) broadband service; or

“(ii) artificial intelligence models, artificial intelligence systems, or automated decision systems.”;

(2) in subsection (b), by adding at the end the following:

“(5) APPROPRIATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 2025.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In addition to any amounts otherwise appropriated to the Program, there is appropriated to the Assistant Secretary for fiscal year 2025, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, \$500,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2030, to carry out the Program.

“(B) SET-ASIDE FOR ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE INFRASTRUCTURE MASTER SERVICES AGREEMENTS.—Of the amount appropriated under subparagraph (A), \$25,000,000 shall be used by the Assistant Secretary for the purpose of negotiating master services agreements on behalf of subgrantees of an eligible entity or political subdivision to enable access to quantity purchasing and licensing discounts for the construction, acquisition, and deployment of infrastructure for the provision of artificial intelligence models, artificial intelligence systems, or automated decision systems funded under this section.”;

(3) in subsection (f)—

(A) in paragraph (5), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) by redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (7); and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (5) the following:

“(6) the construction and deployment of infrastructure for the provision of artificial intelligence models, artificial intelligence systems, or automated decision systems; and”;

(4) in subsection (g)(3), by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) may, in addition to other authority under applicable law, deobligate grant funds awarded to an eligible entity that—

“(i) violates paragraph (2);

“(ii) demonstrates an insufficient level of performance, or wasteful or fraudulent spending, as defined in advance by the Assistant Secretary; or

“(iii) if obligated any funds made available under subsection (b)(5)(A), is not in compliance with subsection (q) or (r); and”;

(5) in subsection (j)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in clause (iii), by striking “and” at the end;

(ii) by redesignating clause (iv) as clause (v); and

(iii) by inserting after clause (iii) the following:

“(iv) certifies that the eligible entity, if obligated any funds made available under subsection (b)(5)(A), is in compliance with subsections (q) and (r); and”;

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in clause (iii), by striking “and” at the end;

(ii) by redesignating clause (iv) as clause (v); and

(iii) by inserting after clause (iii) the following:

“(iv) certifies that the eligible entity, if obligated any funds made available under subsection (b)(5)(A), is in compliance with subsections (q) and (r); and”;

(C) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) by redesignating clauses (iv) and (v) as clauses (v) and (vi), respectively; and

(ii) by inserting after clause (iii) the following:

“(iv) certifies that the eligible entity, if obligated any funds made available under subsection (b)(5)(A), is in compliance with subsections (q) and (r);”;

(6) by adding at the end the following:

“(p) RECEIPT OF FUNDS CONDITIONED ON TEMPORARY PAUSE AND EFFICIENCIES.—On and after the date of enactment of this subsection, no funds made available under subsection (b)(5)(A) may be obligated to an eligible entity or a political subdivision thereof that is not in compliance with subsections (q) and (r).

“(q) TEMPORARY PAUSE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), no eligible entity or political subdivision thereof to which funds made available under subsection (b)(5)(A) are obligated on or after the date of enactment of this subsection may enforce, during the 5-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this subsection, any law or regulation of that eligible entity or a political subdivision thereof limiting, restricting, or otherwise regulating artificial intelligence models, artificial intelligence systems, or automated decision systems entered into interstate commerce.

“(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Paragraph (1) may not be construed to prohibit the enforcement of any law or regulation—

“(A)(i) the primary purpose and effect of which is to—

“(I) remove legal impediments to, or facilitate the deployment or operation of, an artificial intelligence model, artificial intelligence system, or automated decision system; or

“(II) streamline licensing, permitting, routing, zoning, procurement, or reporting procedures related to the adoption or deployment of artificial intelligence models, artificial intelligence systems, or automated decision systems; or

“(ii) that does not impose any substantive design, performance, data-handling, documentation, civil liability, taxation, fee, or other requirement on artificial intelligence models, artificial intelligence systems, or automated decision systems unless that requirement is imposed under—

“(I) Federal law; or

“(II) a generally applicable law or regulation, such as a law or regulation pertaining to unfair or deceptive acts or practices, child online safety, child sexual abuse material, rights of publicity, protection of a person’s name, image, voice, or likeness and any necessary documentation for enforcement, or a body of common law, that may address, without undue or disproportionate burden, artificial intelligence models, artificial intelligence systems, or automated decision systems to reasonably effectuate the broader underlying purposes of the law or regulation; and

“(B) that does not impose a fee or bond unless—

“(i) the fee or bond is reasonable and cost-based; and

“(ii) under the fee or bond, artificial intelligence models, artificial intelligence systems, and automated decision systems are treated in the same manner as other models and systems that perform comparable functions.

“(r) MASTER SERVICES AGREEMENTS.—An eligible entity, or political subdivision thereof, to which funds made available under subsection (b)(5)(A) are obligated on or after the date of enactment of this subsection shall certify to the Assistant Secretary either that—

“(1) each subgrantee of the eligible entity or political subdivision is utilizing applicable master services agreements negotiated using amounts made available under subsection (b)(5)(B); or

“(2) each contract, license, purchase order, or services agreement entered into, procured, or made by a subgrantee of the eligible entity or political subdivision for purposes described in subsection (b)(5)(B) is at least as cost-effective as the terms of executable master services agreements, as applicable, negotiated by the Assistant Secretary using amounts made available under subsection (b)(5)(B).”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 60102(a)(1) of division F of Public Law 117-58 (47 U.S.C. 1702(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking “a project” and inserting “a project described in subsection (a)(2)(O)(1)”;

(2) in subparagraph (D), by striking “a project” and inserting “a project described in subsection (a)(2)(O)(1)”.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, a few hours ago, we had an agreement. Blackburn-Cruz was set to pass. It was a compromise that would have imposed a 5-year moratorium on State regulation of artificial intelligence.

When I spoke to President Trump last night, he said it was a terrific agreement.

The agreement protected kids, protected the rights of creative artists. But outside interests opposed that deal. Communist China, which desperately wants to beat the United States in the race for AI, hated the deal. Liberal politicians, like Gavin Newsom and Mayor Karen Bass and “Comrade” Mamdani, who are all eager to aggressively regulate AI, all hated the moratorium. Randi Weingarten spoke out against the moratorium. So did transgender groups and radical left-wing groups that want to use blue State regulations to mandate woke AI.

In this body, your word is your currency. Our deal would have passed easily. But a couple of hours ago, the other side backed out.

I recognize that many of my colleagues would prefer not to vote on this matter. Therefore, I withdraw the Blackburn-Cruz amendment, and I would suggest that Blackburn No. 2814, the motion to strike, be adopted by voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

The amendment (No. 2602) was withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

AMENDMENT NO. 2814 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2360

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, yes, indeed, there were problems with the language in this amendment. And I regret that we weren't able to come to a compromise that would protect our Governors, our legislators, State legislators, our attorneys general, and, of course, House Members who have expressed concern over this language.

I appreciate that we are going to withdraw this one, and I would like to be recognized on my amendment No. 2814 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 Tennessee [Mrs. BLACKBURN], for herself and Ms. CANTWELL, proposes an amendment numbered 2814 to amendment No. 2360.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To strike the section relating to support for artificial intelligence)

Strike section 40012.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I do want to thank Senator CRUZ for the work and the time that he put in trying to find a resolution to this issue. I do appreciate that.

But what we know is this: This body has proven that they cannot legislate on emerging technology. It is frustrating. We have not passed online privacy. We have not passed the NO FAKES Act, the COPIED Act. There are all of these pieces of legislation dealing with AI that we haven't passed.

But do you know who has passed it? It is our States. They are the ones that are protecting children in the virtual space. They are the ones that are out here protecting our entertainers' name, image, likeness—of broadcasters, podcasters, authors. And it is appropriate that we approach this issue with the seriousness that it deserves.

We have not reached a resolution on this. So, therefore, I ask my colleagues to join me in striking section 40012.

Vote yes. Let's pass this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Let's get everybody off to the Fourth of July and a happy Independence Day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time expired.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2814

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on adoption of the amendment.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 99, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 363 Leg.]

YEAS—99

Alsobrooks	Grassley	Murray
Baldwin	Hagerty	Ossoff
Banks	Hassan	Padilla
Barrasso	Hawley	Paul
Bennet	Heinrich	Peters
Blackburn	Hickenlooper	Reed
Blumenthal	Hirono	Ricketts
Blunt Rochester	Hoeven	Risch
Booker	Husted	Rosen
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Britt	Johnson	Sanders
Budd	Justice	Schatz
Cantwell	Kaine	Schiff
Capito	Kelly	Schmitt
Cassidy	Kennedy	Schumer
Collins	Kim	Scott (FL)
Coons	King	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cortez Masto	Lankford	Sheehy
Cotton	Lee	Slotkin
Cramer	Lujan	Smith
Crapo	Lummis	Sullivan
Cruz	Markey	Thune
Curtis	Marshall	Tuberville
Daines	McConnell	Van Hollen
Duckworth	McCormick	Warner
Durbin	Merkley	Warnock
Ernst	Moody	Warren
Fetterman	Moran	Welch
Fischer	Moreno	Whitehouse
Gallego	Mullin	Wicker
Gillibrand	Murkowski	Wyden
Graham	Murphy	Young

NAYS—1

Tillis

The amendment (No. 2814) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

AMENDMENT NO. 2717 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2360

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 2717, and I 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 Nevada [Ms. ROSEN], for herself and others, proposes an amendment numbered 2717 to amendment No. 2360.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To maintain parity for wind and solar facilities under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986)

At the end of subtitle A of title VII, insert the following:

CHAPTER 7—ADDITIONAL TAX PROVISIONS

SEC. 70701. MAINTAINING PARITY FOR WIND AND SOLAR FACILITIES.

(a) CLEAN ELECTRICITY PRODUCTION CREDIT.—Section 45Y, as amended by subsections (a) and (d) of section 70512 of this Act, is amended—

(1) in subsection (d), by striking paragraph (4), and

(2) by striking subsection (h).

(b) CLEAN ELECTRICITY INVESTMENT CREDIT.—Section 48E(e), as amended by subsections (a) and (c)(1) of section 70513 of this Act, is amended—

(1) in subsection (e), by striking paragraph (4), and

(2) by striking subsection (i).

SEC. 70702. ESTABLISHMENT OF 39.6 PERCENT INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX RATE BRACKET.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1(j)(2) is amended by redesignating subparagraph (F) as subparagraph (G) and by inserting after subparagraph (E) the following new subparagraph:

“(F) 39.6 PERCENT RATE BRACKET.—Notwithstanding subparagraphs (A) through (E), in prescribing the tables under this subsection for purposes of paragraph (3)(B)—

“(i) the excess of taxable income over \$1,000,000 (\$1,500,000 in the case of married individuals filing jointly), if any, shall be taxed at a rate of 39.6 percent, and

“(ii) paragraph (3)(B)(i) shall be applied with respect to such dollar amounts described in clause (i) by substituting ‘2024’ for ‘2017’.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2025.

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, I rise today to call for a vote on my amendment to protect critical investment and production tax credits for solar and wind projects.

For our Nation to be truly energy independent and to be able to compete with China, we must be a global leader on the energy sources of the future, like solar and wind. But these projects just don't happen overnight. By the time many of these projects are ready to come online, the tax credits to help make them financially viable will have expired because of this bill.

This bill will kill the clean energy industry, costing thousands of good-paying jobs, and will raise energy costs for hard-working families. My amendment gives these industries the runway they need. I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, going back to endless subsidies is not sensible energy tax policy. Allowing adversarial nations and the industries that have been fairly industrialized to benefit from incentives intended to benefit Americans is doubly unfair. I urge my colleagues to vote no.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2717

Ms. ROSEN. 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 47, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 364 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
Gallego	Ossoff	Welch
Gillibrand	Padilla	Whitehouse
Hassan	Peters	Wyden
Heinrich	Reed	

NAYS—53

Banks	Capito	Crapo
Barrasso	Cassidy	Cruz
Blackburn	Collins	Curtis
Boozman	Cornyn	Daines
Britt	Cotton	Ernst
Budd	Cramer	Fischer

Graham	Lummis	Rounds
Grassley	Marshall	Schmitt
Hagerty	McConnell	Scott (FL)
Hawley	McCormick	Scott (SC)
Hoeben	Moody	Sheehy
Husted	Moran	Sullivan
Hyde-Smith	Moreno	Thune
Johnson	Mullin	Tillis
Justice	Murkowski	Tuberville
Kennedy	Paul	Wicker
Lankford	Ricketts	Young
Lee	Risch	

The amendment (No. 2717) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

AMENDMENT NO. 2790 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2360

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 2790 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. KENNEDY] proposes an amendment numbered 2790 to amendment No. 2360.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To advance the effective date of the eligibility verification requirements from January 1, 2028, to January 1, 2027)

At the end of 71104, add the following:

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE CHANGE.—Section 1902(ww)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(ww)(1)), as added by this section, is amended, in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “January 1, 2028” and inserting “January 1, 2027”.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the Federal Government has a list of dead people. This bill would require those who administer Medicaid to check the Federal Government’s dead people list before they pay the Medicaid payment out—duh.

This bill, unfortunately, says that those who administer Medicaid don’t have to check before they cut a check to see if the dead person is dead until January 1, 2028—duh. My amendment would move it up to January 1, 2027. So we would pay fewer dead people who keep cashing the checks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, why would anybody vote against this? Duh. We can accept—

Mr. KENNEDY. They wouldn’t—duh.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Order. Order. Order in the Chamber.

Mr. WYDEN. We can accept a voice vote on this amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY. I accept a voice vote. Duh.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2790

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

The amendment is agreed to—duh.

The amendment (No. 2790) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

AMENDMENT NO. 2719 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2360

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 2719 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. HICKENLOOPER], for himself and others, proposes an amendment numbered 2719 to amendment No. 2360.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To modify the provision terminating the residential clean energy credit, and for other purposes)

Strike section 70506 and insert the following:

SEC. 70506. TERMINATION OF RESIDENTIAL CLEAN ENERGY CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 25D is amended by striking subsection (h) and inserting the following new subsection:

“(h) TERMINATION.—The credit allowed under this section shall not apply with respect to any expenditures made after December 31, 2026.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 25D(g) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by inserting “and” after the comma at the end,

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking “ and before January 1, 2033, 30 percent,” and inserting “30 percent.”, and

(3) by striking paragraphs (4) and (5).

(c) ESTABLISHMENT OF 39.6 PERCENT INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX RATE BRACKET.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1(j)(2) is amended by redesignating subparagraph (F) as subparagraph (G) and by inserting after subparagraph (E) the following new subparagraph:

“(F) 39.6 PERCENT RATE BRACKET.—Notwithstanding subparagraphs (A) through (E), in prescribing the tables under this subsection for purposes of paragraph (3)(B)—

“(i) the excess of taxable income over \$100,000,000 (\$50,000,000 in the case of married individuals filing separate returns), if any, shall be taxed at a rate of 39.6 percent, and

“(ii) paragraph (3)(B)(i) shall be applied with respect to each of such dollar amounts by substituting ‘2024’ for ‘2017’.”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2025.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, Coloradans are already worried about keeping their lights on and their homes cool. My God, has it been hot. This budget bill makes it worse, actually increasing energy costs while killing over 2 million Americans jobs.

Republicans want to gut the residential clean energy credits that help millions of Americans power their homes and save on electricity. They will shut down the better part of an entire industry—85,000 jobs—in 18 months. It is just like running into a brick wall. They are also taxing clean energy and cutting larger energy credits, which will create more expensive energy and more blackouts. We should create jobs, cut costs, and boost energy production, not sacrifice working families so that the richest Americans pay less taxes.

That is why we have introduced our simple amendment to extend the residential clean energy credit to the end of next year, giving small businesses a runway to weather this storm—just 18 months to give a valuable industry a fighting chance. Please vote to give them that chance.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, supporting an all-of-the-above energy policy does not require excess subsidies to certain technologies, as has been the case in the years since the misnamed Inflation Reduction Act.

This bill ends the mistake of endless subsidies for favored energy sources. Phasing out subsidies from mature industries is prudent and responsible.

Americans have been paying for these subsidies for decades, and it is time these industries compete on a level playing field.

This bill provides American businesses of all kinds broad-based incentives to grow and hire, including businesses that generate energy and produce the products that help them to do that.

I urge a “no” vote.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2719

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. 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 48, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 365 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
Gallego	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	McCormick	Tuberville
Daines	McCormick	Wicker
Ernst	Moody	Young
Fischer	Moran	
Graham	Moreno	

The amendment (No. 2719) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

AMENDMENT NO. 2564 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2360

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 2564 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 New Hampshire [Mrs. SHAHEEN], for herself and others, proposes an amendment numbered 2564 to amendment No. 2360.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To repeal amendments that terminate certain clean energy credits, and for other purposes)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

CHAPTER 7—ADDITIONAL TAX PROVISIONS

SEC. 70701. REPEAL OF TERMINATION OF CERTAIN CLEAN ENERGY CREDITS.

The amendments made by sections 70505, 70506, 70507, and 70508 are repealed and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall be applied as if such amendments had not been enacted.

SEC. 70702. ESTABLISHMENT OF 39.6 PERCENT INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX RATE BRACKET.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1(j)(2) is amended by redesignating subparagraph (F) as subparagraph (G) and by inserting after subparagraph (E) the following new subparagraph:

“(F) 39.6 PERCENT RATE BRACKET.—Notwithstanding subparagraphs (A) through (E), in prescribing the tables under this subsection for purposes of paragraph (3)(B)—

“(i) the excess of taxable income over \$10,000,000, if any, shall be taxed at a rate of 39.6 percent, and

“(ii) paragraph (3)(B)(i) shall be applied with respect to such \$10,000,000 amount by substituting ‘2024’ for ‘2017’.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2025.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, a vote for this amendment is a vote to make energy and housing more affordable and to support American jobs and businesses.

This amendment simply keeps four bipartisan tax incentives as they are in current law: the energy efficiency home improvement credit, the residential clean energy credit, the new energy efficiency home credit, and the energy efficiency commercial building deduction.

Last year, these credits helped build 350,000 new, efficient homes that saved families about \$450 a year on energy.

Finally, these credits create good jobs in a sector that is growing at twice the rate of jobs in the overall economy. If we vote to adopt this amendment, we can keep that job creation going.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, continuing to subsidize mature industries is wasteful, and this bill, instead, focuses on broad-based incentives for all businesses.

I urge my colleagues to vote no.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2564

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on adoption of the amendment.

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. 366 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
Gallego	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Padilla	Wyden
Hassan	Peters	
Heinrich	Reed	

NAYS—51

Banks	Graham	Moran
Barrasso	Grassley	Moreno
Blackburn	Hagerty	Mullin
Boozman	Hawley	Paul
Britt	Hoeven	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	McCannell	Tuberville
Ernst	McCormick	Wicker
Fischer	Moody	Young

The amendment (No. 2564) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for the following Senators to be recognized to offer amendments, motions, or points of order; that the amendments be reported by number with no amendments in order prior to a vote in relation to the amendments or motions: Warner, No. 2847; Van Hollen, No. 2585; and Kennedy, No. 2723.

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

The Senator from Virginia.

AMENDMENT NO. 2847 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2360

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 2847 and ask it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER] proposes an amendment numbered 2847 to amendment No. 2360.

Mr. WARNER. I ask the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: Use of revenues from lease payments from Metropolitan Washington Airports for aviation safety improvements and other purposes)

At the end of section 40007, insert the following:

SEC. 40007A. USE OF REVENUES FROM LEASE PAYMENTS FROM METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON AIRPORTS FOR AVIATION SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS AND OTHER PURPOSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 49104(b) of title 49, United States Code, as amended by section 40007, is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following new paragraph:

“(2) FUNDING FOR AVIATION SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In order to carry out the purposes described in subparagraph (B), in addition to amounts otherwise made available, there is appropriated to the Secretary of Transportation, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated for fiscal year 2025, \$63,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2029.

“(B) PURPOSES DESCRIBED.—The purposes described in this subparagraph are the following:

“(i) To implement preliminary and final recommendations on any safety measures directed by the National Transportation Safety Board and the Secretary relating to the tragic mid-air collision between American Airlines Flight 5342 and United States Army Aviation Brigade Priority Air Transport 25 on January 29, 2025.

“(ii) To establish a permanent memorial for victims of such tragic mid-air collision and to provide for maintenance of such memorial.

“(iii) Subject to subparagraph (C), to undertake projects directly related to the safety and security of airports under the jurisdiction of the Airports Authority.

“(C) REQUIREMENTS.—In undertaking the projects under subparagraph (B)(iii), the Secretary, working with the Airports Authority, shall prioritize projects that improve safety for all current flight service located at Ronald Reagan Washington Airport, including non-stop Part 121 flight service between Ronald Reagan Washington Airport and the airports primarily serving the following localities:

“(i) Birmingham, AL.
“(ii) Huntsville, AL.
“(iii) Montgomery, AL.
“(iv) Fayetteville, AR.
“(v) Little Rock, AR.
“(vi) Daytona Beach, FL.
“(vii) Orlando, FL.
“(viii) Panama City, FL.
“(ix) Pensacola, FL.
“(x) Sarasota, FL.
“(xi) Tallahassee, FL.
“(xii) Tampa, FL.
“(xiii) West Palm Beach, FL.
“(xiv) Fort Lauderdale, FL.
“(xv) Fort Myers, FL.
“(xvi) Fort Walton, FL.
“(xvii) Jacksonville, FL.
“(xviii) Key West, FL.
“(xix) Miami, FL.
“(xx) Cedar Rapids, IA.
“(xxi) Des Moines, IA.
“(xxii) Indianapolis, IN.
“(xxiii) Wichita, KS.
“(xxiv) Lexington, KY.
“(xxv) Louisville, KY.
“(xxvi) Baton Rouge, LA.
“(xxvii) New Orleans, LA.
“(xxviii) Bangor, ME.
“(xxix) Portland, ME.
“(xxx) Grand Rapids, MI.
“(xxxi) Lansing, MI.
“(xxxii) Traverse City, MI.
“(xxxiii) Kansas City, MO.
“(xxxiv) St. Louis, MO.
“(xxxv) Jackson, MS.
“(xxxvi) Omaha, NE.
“(xxxvii) Asheville, NC.
“(xxxviii) Charlotte, NC.
“(xxxix) Greensboro, NC.”

- “(xI) Raleigh, NC.
- “(xli) Wilmington, NC.
- “(xlii) Newark, NJ.
- “(xliii) Akron/Canton, OH.
- “(xliv) Cincinnati, OH.
- “(xlv) Cleveland, OH.
- “(xlvi) Columbus, OH.
- “(xlvii) Dayton, OH.
- “(xlviii) Oklahoma City, OK.
- “(xlix) Tulsa, OK.
- “(l) Philadelphia, PA.
- “(li) Pittsburgh, PA.
- “(lii) Providence, RI.
- “(liii) Charleston, SC.
- “(liv) Columbia, SC.
- “(lv) Greenville, SC.
- “(lvi) Hilton Head Island, SC.
- “(lvii) Myrtle Beach, SC.
- “(lviii) Memphis, TN.
- “(lix) Chattanooga, TN.
- “(lx) Knoxville, TN.
- “(lxi) Nashville, TN.
- “(lxii) Austin, TX.
- “(lxiii) Dallas/Ft. Worth, TX.
- “(lxiv) Dallas-Love Field, TX.
- “(lxv) Houston-Bush, TX.
- “(lxvi) Houston-Hobby, TX.
- “(lxvii) Salt Lake City, UT.
- “(lxviii) Norfolk, VA.
- “(lxix) Burlington, VT.
- “(lxx) Seattle, WA.
- “(lxxi) Madison, WI.
- “(lxxii) Milwaukee, WI.
- “(lxxiii) Charleston, WV.”

(b) REDUCTION IN OTHER FUNDING.—Section 20306(a) of title 51, United States Code, as added by section 40005(a), is amended—

- (1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “\$9,995,000,000” and inserting “\$9,910,000,000”; and
- (2) in paragraph (6)—
 - (A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “\$1,000,000,000” and inserting “\$915,000,000”; and
 - (B) in subparagraph (F)—
 - (i) by striking “\$85,000,000” and inserting “\$0”; and
 - (ii) by striking “\$5,000,000” and inserting “\$0”.

Mr. WARNER. Colleagues, we all know on January 29 of this year, 67 individuals lost their lives when a military helicopter and a passenger jet collided near Reagan National Airport. This tragedy underscores the need for more safety improvements at National Airport.

The reconciliation bill increases, actually doubles, the amount of rent that National and Dulles pay the government. But it doesn't use any of that money to make those airports safer. And we all use those airports.

There is no good rationale for increasing those rents and not using them for aviation safety.

My amendment would increase aviation safety and security. It also honors the victims of the recent midair collision: first, to implement the NTSB's and FAA's preliminary and final recommendations on any safety measures resulting from the crash at National; second, to establish and maintain a permanent memorial for the victims of the crash of January 29. And the families strongly support this amendment; and, third, to undertake projects directly related to the safety and security of flights from both Dulles and National to other airports across the country.

Some of those airports include Charlotte, NC; Portland, ME; Charleston,

SC; Indianapolis, IN; Wichita, KS; Louisville, KY; Nashville, TN; and Cleveland, OH.

I also want to thank my colleagues Senators KAINE, VAN HOLLEN, and ALSOBROOKS for cosponsoring this amendment. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, Senate Republicans are providing the FAA, in this bill, with \$12.5 billion to transform the air traffic control system—a concept that is incredibly popular with the American people and badly needed.

The January 29 midair collision was a tragedy, and it should never have happened. The Senate Commerce Committee is leading the investigation into what went wrong and how to prevent another accident.

The introduced text updates the rent calculations for the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority, the entity that runs the two airports owned by the Federal Government. The Federal Government originally calculated the rent in 1987 at \$7.5 million, massively below market rates. This bill increases that to \$15 million, still dramatically below market rates. By comparison, the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey is paying over \$100 million in rent annually to New York City.

On top of that, Dulles is about to start subleasing extremely valuable land, and the Federal taxpayers are not going to see a dime of that money.

This amendment is nothing more than an earmark for Northern Virginia, and I urge my colleagues to vote no on this amendment.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, do I have any remaining time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No.

Mr. WARNER. I urge my colleagues to adopt the amendment.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2847

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on adoption of the amendment.

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 assistant bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 367 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Alsobrooks	Gallego	Merkley
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Moran
Bennet	Hassan	Murkowski
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Murphy
Blunt Rochester	Hickenlooper	Murray
Booker	Hirono	Ossoff
Cantwell	Kaine	Padilla
Collins	Kelly	Peters
Coons	Kim	Reed
Cortez Masto	King	Rosen
Duckworth	Klobuchar	Sanders
Durbin	Lujan	Schatz
Fetterman	Markey	Schiff

Schumer	Van Hollen	Welch
Shaheen	Warner	Whitehouse
Slotkin	Warnock	Wyden
Smith	Warren	

NAYS—50

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

The amendment (No. 2847) was rejected.

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

Does the Senator wish to call up his amendment?

AMENDMENT NO. 2585 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2360

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I call up my amendment No. 2585 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 Maryland [Mr. VAN HOLLEN], for himself and others, proposes an amendment numbered 2585 to amendment No. 2360.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To strike the appropriations for the Office of Management and Budget) Strike section 90103.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I know it has been a long day's journey into the night, but I think Senators were surprised to learn that this bill has a \$100 million slush fund directed to OMB. So that would be on top of its existing budget.

This is at a time when FEMA grants to many of our States have been canceled; grants for law enforcement have been frozen; grants for victims of crimes are on hold. That is not efficiency. That is creating chaos and uncertainty, and I ask my colleagues: Why in the world would we want to send another \$100 million to OMB?

They are currently before the Appropriations Committee with their current request for fiscal year 2026. They want a 13-percent increase there; we will consider their request.

They, of course, are telling everybody else to do more with less, but they want more. We should get rid of this wasteful spending. They don't need \$100 million. And so I am proposing to strike the \$100 million, reduce the deficit at least by \$100 million.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, this is pretty simple. I don't think anybody can dispute the Office of Management and Budget needs to identify budgeting and accounting inefficiencies in the executive branch. They need the resources to do it, so I ask my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time is expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I would say the best way to save taxpayer money is right now—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Mr. VAN HOLLEN—

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2585

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. 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 executive clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 368 Leg.]

YEAS—50

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

NAYS—50

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

The amendment (No. 2585) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

AMENDMENT NO. 2723 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2360

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 2723 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. KENNEDY] proposes an amendment numbered 2723 to amendment No. 2360.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To permanently extend the limitation on individual deductions for certain state and local taxes)

Strike section 70120 and insert the following:

SEC. 70120. PERMANENT EXTENSION OF LIMITATION ON INDIVIDUAL DEDUCTIONS FOR CERTAIN STATE AND LOCAL TAXES.

Section 164(b)(6) is amended by striking “, and before January 1, 2026”.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, as you know, when we passed the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017, we capped State and local taxes at \$10,000. I liked it then; I like it now.

The bill before us dramatically raises that cap. I think it is a mistake. I think it is bad policy. But I realize that my instincts are not infallible. Some people don't realize that, but mine aren't. And for that reason—I respect this entire body, and I respect everybody in it. I don't think my intellect is superior, and I don't think my instincts are infallible. For that reason, I ask to withdraw my amendment, whatever the hell the number was.

The amendment (No. 2723) was withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. THUNE. 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. TUBERVILLE assumed the Chair.)

(Mr. SHEEHY assumed the Chair.)

(Mr. HAGERTY assumed the Chair.)

(Mr. CURTIS assumed the Chair.)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RICKETTS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from South Carolina.

AMENDMENT NO. 2848 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2360

(Purpose: To improve the bill.)

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 2848 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 South Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] proposes an amendment numbered 2848 to amendment No. 2360.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under “Text of Amendments.”)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

AMENDMENT NO. 2849 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2848

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I call up my amendment with Senator KELLY of Arizona, No. 2849, and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Minnesota [Ms. KLOBUCHAR], for herself and Mr. KELLY, proposes an amendment numbered 2849 to amendment No. 2848.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To strike a provision relating to delayed implementation of the supplemental nutrition assistance program matching funds requirements)

In section 4(a)(2) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (as added by section 10105(a)(2)), strike clause (iii) of subparagraph (B).

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, in addition to the many outrages of this bill—\$4 trillion in debt, millions of peo-

ple off of their healthcare—in the middle of the night, it got worse. It is something that must see the light of day, and that is, we all know it shifts \$64 billion to the States that they can't pay for for food assistance on the backs of veterans, on the backs of kids, on the backs of people with disabilities. But the whole reason we were told that it was shifted over to the States was so that we would incentivize States to reduce errors. In the middle of the night, the biggest hypocrisy of the entire bill, the Republicans have rewarded States that have the highest error rates in the country—10 States with the highest error rates—just to help Alaska, which has the highest error rate.

So the message to the country and the Nation's Governors and the Republican Senators is this: Raise your error rates. Get them up to 10 percent, 20 percent, 30 percent, 40 percent. Make a whole bunch of mistakes when it comes to SNAP because then you will get more money. You won't have your cuts for a year, you won't even have them for the next year. For the rest of us, the States—all the States in the Midwest—that are doing their best, they have got to pay in.

So, Senators, decide: Are you going to go with your States, or are you going to reward waste, fraud, and abuse, because with this provision that you put in there, you have done the opposite.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Strike this fiscal insanity from the bill and vote yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my colleague from Minnesota.

We have amended the State matching funds requirement for SNAP to provide a delay implementation date for States that have extremely high payment error rates. These States will have additional time to plan, to budget, and to adjust. This will help all States be ready for the change. By 2030, all States will have phased in and be subject to the matching funds requirement.

The States involved, if we did fiscal year 2024—again, the key to this is doing it in a fair way. Alaska is one of the States. Maryland is one of the States. Oregon is one of the States. New York is one of the States. Massachusetts, New Jersey, New Mexico, Florida, Georgia, Alaska, and DC—hardly Republican priorities.

As Amy said, I would vote what is important to your State. If you have got a high error rate, this allows you additional time in order to get your house in order so that you will not be penalized.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2849

With that, I ask for the yeas and nays and encourage a positive vote—no vote. A positive vote, meaning a no vote.

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

Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 55, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 369 Leg.]

YEAS—45

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

NAYS—55

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

The amendment (No. 2849) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I raise a point of order against page 1, lines 3 to 5, of the pending amendment, which violates section 313(b)(1)(A) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

The text will be stricken.

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, it has been an extraordinary period here in the Senate—not a good one because it is “families lose and billionaires win.”

We kept advocating: Join us in a better vision for America in which families thrive and billionaires—they pay their fair share for a change.

Thank you so much to the floor staff for your steadfast support through the night. The Parliamentarian team, led by Elizabeth MacDonough, has been amazing. But I want to give particular thanks to the budget team, the revenue team, and the minority leader’s team, who worked so carefully together—competently, expertly.

But the result—the result is bad for America. We need to come back and have a vision in which we lift up opportunity and hope for everyone in America, not this strategy of more wealth

for the best off while cutting the programs of healthcare—16 million people losing healthcare to fund tax breaks for billionaires; 4 million children going hungry to fund tax breaks for billionaires.

This is morally wrong, and we will keep fighting to the very end to say we can put America on a better course for this generation and the next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, the other side of the story. But we agree on this: A lot of people worked very hard on both sides of the aisle. Tensions have been high at times, but we are at the end now. And to all those who have made this possible, thank you for your hard work.

I would like to make five very brief points about what I think is good about this bill. It is the most consequential border security package in the history of our country. It is \$175 billion. It does several things. It hires more ICE agents, it finishes the wall, and it increases detention beds by 100,000.

Let me tell you why that is important. In September of 2022, Mr. Ibarra, who was convicted of killing Laken Riley, the young lady in Georgia not far from where I live, was apprehended but he was paroled. And why was he paroled?

Subject was paroled due to detention capacity at the Central Processing Center in El Paso, Texas.

They didn’t have a bed for him, so they let him go, and 18 months later, approximately, he kills Laken Riley.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator’s time has expired.

Mr. GRAHAM. This bill fixes that and a bunch of other stuff.

Thanks.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2848

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on adoption of the amendment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 370 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Banks	Graham	Moran
Barrasso	Grassley	Moreno
Blackburn	Hagerty	Mullin
Boozman	Hawley	Murkowski
Britt	Hoeven	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	Tuberville
Daines	McConnell	Wicker
Ernst	McCormick	Young
Fischer	Moody	

NAYS—50

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	Tillis
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murphy	Warner
Durbin	Murray	Warnock
Fetterman	Ossoff	Warren
Gallego	Padilla	Welch
Gillibrand	Paul	Whitehouse
Hassan	Peters	Wyden
Heinrich	Reed	

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 50.

The Senate being equally divided, the Vice President votes in the affirmative, and the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 2848) was agreed to.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I know of no further amendments.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2360, AS AMENDED

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there further amendments?

If not, the question occurs on adoption of amendment No. 2360, as amended.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 371 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Banks	Graham	Moran
Barrasso	Grassley	Moreno
Blackburn	Hagerty	Mullin
Boozman	Hawley	Murkowski
Britt	Hoeven	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	Tuberville
Daines	McConnell	Wicker
Ernst	McCormick	Young
Fischer	Moody	

NAYS—50

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	Tillis
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murphy	Warner
Durbin	Murray	Warnock
Fetterman	Ossoff	Warren
Gallego	Padilla	Welch
Gillibrand	Paul	Whitehouse
Hassan	Peters	Wyden
Heinrich	Reed	

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 50.

The Senate being equally divided, the Vice President votes in the affirmative, and the amendment, as amended, is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 2360), in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

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

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

VOTE ON H.R. 1, AS AMENDED

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill, as amended, pass?

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 372 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Banks	Graham	Moran
Barrasso	Grassley	Moreno
Blackburn	Hagerty	Mullin
Boozman	Hawley	Murkowski
Britt	Hoeven	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	Tuberville
Daines	McConnell	Wicker
Ernst	McCormick	Young
Fischer	Moody	

NAYS—50

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	Tillis
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murphy	Warner
Durbin	Murray	Warnock
Fetterman	Ossoff	Warren
Gallego	Padilla	Welch
Gillibrand	Paul	Whitehouse
Hassan	Peters	Wyden
Heinrich	Reed	

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 50.

The Senate being equally divided, the Vice President votes in the affirmative, and the bill, as amended, is passed.

The bill (H.R. 1), as amended, was passed.

(Applause.)

PRAYER

Pursuant to the order for February 29, 1960, the hour of 12 noon having arrived, the Senate having been in continuous session since yesterday, the Senate will suspend for a prayer by the Senate Chaplain.

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal, ever-blessed God, help our Senators to walk on Your path for the glory of Your Name. Help them to walk with humility so that they will strive

to be servants of the people. Help them to walk with forgiveness, so that they will forgive as they desire to be forgiven. Help them to walk with courage, so that nothing will deflect them from the way they ought to take.

Help them to walk with endurance, so that nothing may daunt or discourage them until they reach their goal.

Lord, help them to walk with loyalty, so that nothing will ever seduce their hearts from their devotion to You.

We pray in Your loving Name. Amen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RICKETTS). The majority leader.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, it has been a long road to get to today. More than a year ago, groups of Republican Senators and staff began meeting to lay the groundwork for extending tax relief for hard-working Americans if we were given the opportunity. Voters gave us that opportunity.

Since we took office in January, Republicans have been laser-focused on achieving the bill before us today.

Now we are here passing legislation that will permanently extend tax relief for hard-working Americans; that will spur economic growth and more jobs and opportunities for American workers; that will rebuild our military, secure our borders, unleash American energy, and cut waste, fraud, and abuse in Federal programs. With this legislation, we are fulfilling the mandate we were entrusted with last November and setting our country and the American people up to be safer, stronger, and more prosperous.

No bill of this size comes together without a lot of very hard work, and I want to thank the committee members and the chairmen who worked so long on this legislation. I also want to thank the committee staff and the leadership staff and the Member staff who have put an incredible number of hours in putting this bill together. None of us would be where we are without our staffs. And nowhere is this more true than on this bill, which would not have come together without a lot of very late nights, early mornings, and long afternoons of tireless work from staffers. I hope that they take pride today in what they helped achieve for the American people.

I also want to thank all the individuals who keep the Senate floor running and who worked overtime this weekend during consideration of the bill. That includes the cloakroom staff, the clerks, the doorkeepers, the Capitol Police, and the pages who stayed past the end of their session to help out. I am very, very grateful to all of them. I hope everyone manages to get some sleep.

I look forward to the House taking up and passing this historic legislation and getting it to the President's desk. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The 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.

SIGNING AUTHORITY

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from North Carolina be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills or joint resolutions from July 1 to July 7, 2025.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 106.

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 Preston Griffith, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Energy.

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 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. 106, Preston Griffith, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Energy.

John Thune, Eric Schmitt, John R. Curtis, Tim Scott of South Carolina, Bill Cassidy, Jon A. Husted, Steve Daines, Marsha Blackburn, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Ron Johnson, John Barrasso, Tim Sheehy, Mike Rounds, Bernie Moreno, Pete Ricketts, Jim Justice, Bill Hagerty.

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. 197.

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