

Why? To fund tax breaks for billionaires. Kicking 15 million Americans off their health insurance to fund tax breaks for billionaires. Slashing nutrition assistance for millions of children. Why? In order to give tax breaks to billionaires. Running up \$30 trillion in additional national debt over the next 30 years. Why? To fund tax breaks for billionaires. It is pretty astounding that a single Member of this body would have voted for that bill running up \$30 trillion in debt.

Every single person who gave speeches back home that said "I am all about being fiscally responsible"—what could possibly be more irresponsible than cutting nutrition for children and cutting healthcare for 15 million Americans in order to make the richest Americans even richer? It is like the worst possible reason for a deficit or a debt.

Families lose; billionaires win.

Now Senator PAUL has introduced a budget resolution that compounds that. He says that over the next 10 years, we should cut an additional \$22 trillion out of the programs that serve Americans.

Now, if he had come to the floor and said "We just passed a bill that runs up \$30 trillion in debt to fund tax breaks for billionaires, and we are going to take away those tax breaks for billionaires in order to not run up \$30 trillion," I would be right with him because that would be wise. But cutting fundamental programs for families and our national security?

Now, any responsible budget plan is going to tell you when its cuts are going to happen. So where does Senator PAUL, my good friend from Kentucky—where does he say those spending cuts will happen? Where will that \$22 trillion come from that he is eliminating over the next 10 years? Well, he doesn't answer the question. He says: I am going to create a new category in the budget called "New Efficiencies, Consolidations, and Other Savings." Not one damn detail. How convenient that is.

I am just going to magically cut \$22 trillion out of the spending over the next 10 years and not say a word about the damage it is going to do.

This is kind of a replay of what we saw in the reconciliation debate when our Republican colleagues used magic math and budget gimmicks and smoke and mirrors to slash programs for families and explode the debt.

Don't we owe it to our constituents, don't we owe it to Americans to be honest about what is being proposed? So I will tell you where those cuts are going to come from, something of that size. Well, they are going to come from Medicare. They are going to come from Medicaid. They are going to come from child nutrition. They are going to come from border security. They are going to come from law enforcement. They are going to come from national defense. They are going to come from veterans' care. They are going to come from en-

vironmental protection and investments in infrastructure.

Now, if you spread those cuts evenly over the discretionary budget lines over those 10 years, it cuts 38 percent of what we spend—38 percent. I am pretty sure some of my colleagues will say: Well, whatever you do, don't cut national defense and certainly don't cut support for our veterans.

So then what are we talking about? We are talking about a 48-percent cut in everything else.

OK. So voting for this RAND PAUL budget, you are voting for essentially a 50-percent cut in Medicare, a 50-percent cut in Medicaid, a 50-percent cut in cancer research, a 50-percent cut on top of the cuts already made in child nutrition, and a 50-percent cut on investments in infrastructure. That is what you are voting for, and that is really beyond damaging to our Nation.

You want to cut Medicare in half? Well, then, put that in the line, explain what it is, and then vote for it. That would show some courage. If you really want Medicare cut in half, tell the American people that. Have the courage of your convictions. Don't hide it behind this funny line called "New Efficiencies" or something of that nature.

Well, there are obviously all these things you can find in the budget that need to be cut, and there have been some examples given. I am sure you can find some scientific research that most Americans would look at, even with full information, and they would say: Oh, yeah, we don't need to research that.

But, you know, sometimes the insights in science come from the most unexpected places. For example, there has been some commentary about silly-sounding Federal grants like studying Gila monster venom. Why would you study that? Well, then you find out that what was learned there helped create the drug Ozempic. Well, that is pretty big medical insight that has huge applications in terms of a variety of diseases but also in terms of addiction and in terms of weight loss.

You might say: Why would you study bird songs? Well, it turns out that the study of bird songs led to advances in hearing aid technology, allows people to distinguish sounds they want to hear from background noise so they can have a conversation in a crowded room.

I am just saying that I am sure there are individual items that could be found that sound absurd, but you know what—those are little tiny pennies. It is not cutting Medicare by 50 percent; it is not cutting Medicaid by 50 percent.

If you want to cut \$22 trillion, cut it out of the tax breaks for billionaires. That is the real crime done by the families lose; billionaires win, big, ugly betrayal of a bill. Maybe that is the budget we should be voting on.

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

SETTING FORTH THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET FOR THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2026 AND SETTING FORTH THE APPROPRIATE BUDGETARY LEVELS FOR FISCAL YEARS 2027 THROUGH 2035—
Motion to Proceed

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a budget that balances over 5 years. My budget, the Six Penny Plan, the Six Penny Plan budget, cuts 6 percent of all spending to rebalance in just 5 years.

I am able to introduce this budget because neither Republicans nor Democrats introduced a budget this year. So we are running a \$7 trillion government without a budget this year. So I think it is important that we have at least some debate and vote on a budget.

Most Republicans say they are for a balanced budget amendment. Most of them have voted for it at some point in time. Yet most of the budgets and most of the spending that go through here seem to be adding to the debt, not canceling it out.

Since I was elected, Congress has passed a budget less than half of the time. For almost five decades, Congress has passed all required annual appropriations bills only four times. So four times in 50 years has Congress actually gone through and individually passed the appropriations bills. As a consequence, the looting of the American taxpayer continues.

By promising yet another so-called clean continuing resolution, Republicans are doubling down on embracing what they once considered to be reckless spending levels.

Today, I propose a clear path back towards fiscal responsibility. I urge the Senate to adopt my Six Penny Plan that will balance the Federal budget.

This year, the United States will spend \$6.7 trillion while bringing in about \$4.7 trillion. That is \$2 trillion more being spent than what is coming in. A deficit of this magnitude should be concerning enough even on its own merits. But to add insult to injury, Congress passed a budget just 5 months ago which set a spending cap of almost \$6 trillion for the year. So 5 months ago, Congress did actually pass a budget—halfway through the year we were already in—to spend \$6 trillion this year. Turns out, though, we have spent \$6.6 trillion. So we couldn't even get it right 6 months ago when the vast majority of Republicans voted for a budget that said they were going to spend \$6 trillion in a year that was half over, and now they have spent \$6.6 trillion.

Next year, it is going to be even worse. The budget that was passed in the spring said we would spend \$6.3 trillion next year, but it turns out it is going to be \$7.2 trillion next year.

What is going on here? We keep passing budgets. We keep saying we are going to get better. We keep saying the bills we are passing are making the deficit less. Yet the deficit keeps getting worse.

So even when Congress passes a budget, they seem to immediately renege on the deal they just passed. The numbers in the budget end up not being of consequence because the spending goes on unabated.

This week, Congress will likely vote on locking in spending levels. The spending levels will be the same spending levels that Republicans criticized as the Biden spending levels last December. So when there was a Democrat in the White House, when President Biden was there, all the Republicans were unified in saying “We despise the Biden spending levels. We are against spending in deficit and deficit spending. We are against all of that”—until the Republicans got in charge, and 3 months later, they voted for the exact same levels.

The continuing resolution from March of this year is the exact same levels as the Biden spending levels. What are we going to vote for in a couple of days here? The Biden spending levels again. What does that lead to? Two trillion dollars in deficit.

So every time we vote for a continuing resolution, for continuing the spending at the same level, we are voting for a level of spending that is \$2 trillion short of what comes in.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, enacting a yearlong CR—continuing resolution—will result in blowing through next year’s spending target by nearly \$1 trillion.

So the target that was passed last spring was 6.3, but the spending is actually going to be 7.2. How can you be off a trillion dollars? How can you with a straight face go home and say: Oh, well, we were just off a trillion.

And this year, we don’t have a budget because—I don’t know—maybe our math was so bad last year, we decided not to do it. But the deficit next year is going to be \$2.1 trillion.

It is getting worse, not better. Next year’s deficit will be \$100 billion more than the deficit this year.

It was not that long ago that Republicans were castigating the Biden administration and saying they were reckless. Now we are doing the same thing.

It was not that long ago that Republicans argued to the American people that Biden’s overspending inevitably was causing inflation; it was to blame for the rise in the cost of goods. Anybody remember Bidenomics? Anybody remember Biden inflation? It was accurate because it was based on debt, and debt causes inflation. When the Federal Reserve buys the debt and monetizes the debt, that recreates inflation.

But the same thing is happening. Nothing has changed. A new party in charge, and the same spending and the same debt.

It wasn’t that long ago that conservatives were staunchly opposed to raising the debt ceiling, and only the unholy alliance between Democrats and Big Government Republicans would get the spending bills through, would get the debt ceiling through.

But now it has evaporated. Virtually the entire Republican Party now supports this debt. On an inauspicious day, March 15 of this year, the Republican continuing resolution was signed into law. On the Ides of March, Republicans took ownership of the Biden spending levels. The Biden spending levels are now Republican spending levels.

To make matters worse, this summer, Republicans voted to raise the debt ceiling by \$5 trillion. We have never ever voted to raise the debt ceiling that much. It used to be the conservative line that we held the line and said: We are not doing that or, if we are going to raise the debt ceiling, we are going to do it in a small amount for a short period of time in order that we would discuss this again and again and again until we get it right.

But Republicans now own the spending problem. Republicans now own the debt expansion. Republicans must rediscover our principles of fiscal responsibility. Our country’s future depends on it.

Our national debt now stands at \$37 trillion and grows with each passing second. If you have ever seen the usdebtclock.org, the website, the numbers are spinning literally out of control. To put this debt in perspective, every American household is on the hook for over \$238,000 to cover Uncle Sam’s reckless spending spree.

To put it bluntly, the state of our Nation’s fiscal health is bleak. The government now spends over a trillion dollars just on interest. This is more than we spend on our national defense.

We should heed this fact as a warning. As Hoover Institution Historian Niall Ferguson points out, “Any great power that spends more on debt service than on defense will not stay great for very long.”

We must act now if America is to, once again, be a rising nation, but we are currently on a path toward decline. If we continue down this unsustainable path, American families will be forced to deal with even higher inflation, confiscatory tax rates, rising interest, and a weak economy. It will be harder to find a job and provide for your family because the deals made in the Halls of Congress always stick the taxpayers with the bill. You either are going to have to pay for it through taxes—the debt will always be paid either through taxes or through inflation and high prices at the grocery store.

Government spending and fiscal malfeasance have not only weakened every American family’s purchasing power, but our national economy is weaker as well. At \$37 trillion, the Federal debt is nearly twice what it was 10 years ago. The Federal debt is now larger than the entire economy. Our economy is about \$29 trillion; the debt is at \$37 trillion or, to put it in more tangible terms, the U.S. debt is large enough to fill 34 NFL stadiums with \$100 bills.

Government spending is so out of control that even if every bank account in the United States were

emptied to pay down our debt, it would only cover just about half of what Washington owes. So if everybody’s bank account was liquidated in the whole country, it only would pay for half of the debt.

This is an amazing problem. This is an extraordinary problem. Something must be done.

America is in a historic state of financial disarray. Right after the end of World War II, the world’s most expensive war, our accumulated debt was 18 percent larger than the entire economy. We are now 20 percent. So we have now exceeded even the debt of World War II.

America’s leading financial minds have already sounded the alarm. The Chairman of the Federal Reserve said that Federal spending is on an unsustainable path, and it is past time for Congress to correct it.

The CEO of JPMorgan Chase, America’s largest bank, warned that the Federal Government must reduce its deficits before lenders finally say enough and stop loaning the government money.

Just this week, the Director of the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office suggested that the U.S. economy is weakening. The people who rank our credit have downgraded the U.S. credit rating.

As interest payments on the national debt crowd out the rest of the government’s budget, entitlement cuts, inflation, and eventually default on the debt are what lie ahead for the American economy.

Unfortunately, a debt crisis will not just stop with our economy. A threat to our financial security is also a threat to our national security. We must remember that the surest path to peace is leaving no doubt in your adversary’s mind about your ability to respond with aggression.

With increasingly dubious financial health and a larger share of resources devoted to interest payments, the United States is sending a message of weakness.

Yet Congress has reportedly chosen to ignore the deficit, raise the debt ceiling, and continue to fund foreign wars. Instead of budgeting, Congress decided to kick the difficult decisions down the road. Unfortunately, continuing spending at the Biden administration levels is a path that is not sustainable and will further our fiscal decay with \$2 trillion annual deficits as far as the eye can see.

Since entering the Senate, I have introduced several proposals to lead us back to a balanced Federal budget. In 2017, I introduced a budget that would freeze spending. In 2017, if you simply froze spending—you didn’t cut one penny from anything, but you froze spending for 5 years—we would have balanced in 5 years just by freezing spending.

I introduced a budget a few years later, and it would have taken one penny—1 percent across the board

would balance in 5 years. A few years later, I introduced it again; it was a two-penny plan. Then came the pandemic. We spent so much money. We closed the economy down. We did such terrible things to the country, and now it is a six-penny plan. It takes a 6-percent cut.

How can we possibly survive a 6-percent cut?

I will tell you how I present it to people. I have people come in. They always have something that seems to be of value for people. I will give you an example. The folks that come in and they are looking for Alzheimer's research. I have family members with Alzheimer's. I have a great deal of sympathy. I look at them and tell them where we are, and I tell them we are a rich country; we ought to have some government money researching Alzheimer's. And I say: You know, we are \$2 trillion short this year. If we cut everybody by 6 percent, we will be able to balance the budget. So the Alzheimer's research, we spend \$100 million on. If next year we spend \$94 million and we did that for everyone, we could balance the budget.

Interestingly, people who are emotionally involved with this—moms, dads, grandparents with Alzheimer's—look at me and say: You know what? For the good of the country, we can do that.

Yet if you talk to people around here, they go: Oh, you hate old people. I don't hate old people. I aspire to be an old person.

The thing is, you have to have a little bit of a haircut for every program up here. If you just cut one program, you will never get through it. You have to cut everything all across the board, not because you don't like the recipients, not because you don't want to help people, but because you don't want to destroy our country.

For just six pennies on the dollar, we can reverse this dismal trajectory. In just 5 years, we can restore trust in the U.S. dollar, the U.S. economy, and steer the U.S. Government away from this fiscal cliff. History will remember who had the courage to stand up to make these hard choices. History will remember those who chose not to leave this enormous bill to their children.

Vote yes on this plan. Vote yes on restoring fiscal sanity. Vote yes on securing the future for our country.

MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 159, S. Con. Res. 22.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 159, S. Con. Res. 22, a concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2026 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2027 through 2035.

VOTE ON MOTION

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE).

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 62, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 521 Leg.]

YEAS—36

Banks	Grassley	Moran
Barrasso	Hagerty	Moreno
Blackburn	Hoeven	Paul
Britt	Husted	Ricketts
Budd	Hyde-Smith	Risch
Cornyn	Johnson	Schmitt
Crapo	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cruz	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Curtis	Lummis	Sheehy
Daines	Marshall	Thune
Ernst	Mc Cormick	Tillis
Fischer	Moody	Tuberville

NAYS—62

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

NOT VOTING—2

Cassidy Lee

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following resolutions which are at the desk: S. Res. 391, S. Res. 392, S. Res. 393, S. Res. 394, and S. Res. 395.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. HOEVEN. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

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

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

MORNING BUSINESS

U.S. SENATE PROFESSIONAL LIABILITY INSURANCE REGULATIONS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the adopted U.S. Senate Professional Liability Insurance Regulations.

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

U.S. SENATE PROFESSIONAL LIABILITY INSURANCE REGULATIONS ADOPTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION ON SEPTEMBER 15, 2025

1.0 Scope and Authority—These regulations establish the policies and procedures regarding the partial reimbursement to Senate Office qualified employees for the cost of professional liability insurance pursuant to the Omnibus Consolidated Appropriations Act of 1997, Public Law No. 104-208, div. A, title VI, sec. 636, as amended by Public Law No. 106-58 (Sept. 29, 1999), reported at 5 U.S.C. prec. §5941 note.

2.0 Definitions—For purposes of these regulations, the following terms shall have the meaning specified.

2.1 *Management official* means an individual employed by a Senate office, for whom the duties and responsibilities of their position require or authorize the individual to formulate, determine, or influence the policies of a Senate office.

2.2 *Supervisor* means an individual employed by a Senate office with the authority in the interest of the Senate office to hire, direct, assign, promote, reward, transfer, furlough, lay off, recall, suspend, discipline, or remove employees, to adjust their grievances, or to effectively recommend such action, if the exercise of the authority is not merely routine or clerical in nature but requires the consistent exercise of independent judgment.

2.3 *Qualified employee* means a current U.S. Senator, the Senate Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, the Secretary of the Senate, and a Senate office employee whose position is that of a supervisor or management official, as determined by the employing U.S. Senator or head of a Senate support office.

2.4 *Senate office* means a Member office, a Committee office, a Leadership office, or a Senate support office.

2.5 *Senate support office* means the Senate Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, the Secretary of the Senate, or any other internal Senate entity, as determined by the U.S. Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, that draws its salaries and expenses from the contingent fund of the Senate.

2.6 *Professional liability insurance* means insurance which provides coverage for—

(A) legal liability for damages due to injuries to other persons, damage to their property, or other damage or loss to such other persons (including the expenses of litigation and settlement) resulting from or arising out of any tortious act, error, or omission of the covered individual (whether common law, statutory, or constitutional) while in the performance of such individual's official duties as a qualified employee; and

(B) the cost of legal representation for the covered individual in connection with any administrative or judicial proceeding (including any investigation or disciplinary proceeding) relating to any act, error, or omission of the covered individual while in the performance of such individual's official duties as a qualified employee, and other