

Now, Americans have to show a photo ID or proof of citizenship on a weekly basis—sometimes on a daily basis. The Presiding Officer and I both fly regularly to Washington, DC, and then back home. You have got to show who you are. You open a bank account, you show a photo ID. You cash a check, you show a photo ID. We mentioned boarding a plane.

To require doing the same thing when you go to polls to vote in a Federal election is merely common sense. It is also not new. It is already a requirement in many States.

The SAVE America Act does not make it harder to vote; it ensures that only American citizens vote in American elections, and that is constitutional.

By the way, this is incredibly popular with the American people. Madam President, 71 percent of Democrats and 95 percent of Republicans agree you should have to show a photo ID when you go to vote, so why hasn't it passed? Why isn't it popular in Congress? Because Senate Democrats are dead set on pleasing, appeasing a small leftwing base of the 16 percent of the American people who oppose, so they come up with reasons not to pass the SAVE America Act, but these concerns have been addressed.

As an example, what about people who have lost their documents and cannot prove citizenship? Well, the legislation says that if you are a citizen and you have lost your documents, or never had them, you can go to a State election official, swear to the details of your birth date and location or naturalization details, and register to vote. We have that option in Louisiana. That alternative process is built into the SAVE America Act so lack of documentation is not an issue.

But rather than accepting that, Senate Democrats ignore the solution and get back to work finding another reason to oppose it, ignoring the fact that 70 percent of their party wants the SAVE America Act passed into law.

We should be here to serve the will of the American people, and folks are asking for the assurance of a secure election. The SAVE America Act helps get that done. We should pass it.

Now, some have said we need to go to a talking filibuster in order to get this done. I have supported the talking filibuster since my first day as a Senator in 2015, drawing inspiration from "Mr. Smith Goes to Washington"—watching that movie when I was a child and seeing just kind of that, wow, when somebody gets up here and talks for 36 hours and everybody else is inconvenienced, somehow you come to a solution faster. I support using it now to pass the SAVE America Act to restore trust in our elections and carry out the will of the people.

#### HEALTHCARE

MR. CASSIDY. Madam President, wherever I go in Louisiana, people are

asking about the affordability of groceries, gasoline, and healthcare.

So most families in my State don't have a thousand dollars in their bank account. And yet they have insurance plans with a multithousand-dollar deductible. So when a patient says: I am on this infusion for my arthritis and my deductible is \$6,000 and I have got to pay that much almost for my first dose, it resonates. And it resonates because we know, in many cases, there are middlemen—insurance companies—increasing the price of that drug so that families with 1,000 bucks and a big deductible cannot afford that medication.

Now, maybe it is more personal to me. I practiced medicine in a hospital for the uninsured and poorly insured for two decades. I saw middle-income families who couldn't afford insurance and came to the hospital for the uninsured.

Now, at the root of this problem is a healthcare system that treats the patient as an excuse for the bill and not as a reason for the care. And the status quo sends billions of taxpayer dollars to insurance companies, and those companies take 20 percent off for profit and overhead.

So has healthcare become more affordable for someone living in Acadia Parish, as an example? Has the quality of care improved in Natchitoches Parish? Well, Natchitoches Parish has pretty good quality of care at their local hospital, but for the family—if they can't afford it—it is as if that care is not there at all.

We need a system which supports the family directly, not channeling the dollars through the insurance company. And I said that because those insurance companies—they serve a purpose. They are not evil, but they are there to make a profit, and they are increasing their margins so they have a better return to their shareholder. Our shareholder is the American people. We should think of a plan that speaks to them.

Now, part of the problem is that there is no price transparency. Families can't say: The prescription is cheaper here or more expensive there. They don't have those tools yet. So they end up getting stuck with the more expensive option oftentimes with extra costs hidden in the pricetag.

Now, I will go back to when I practiced medicine. If the patient has the power—if the patient is the reason for the care and not an excuse for the bill, prices tend to come down. So we need a different approach: a healthcare system giving power to the patient—not to the shareholder, not to the CEO, not to the bureaucrat but to the patient.

Last week, I unveiled the Money and Value for Patients—or the MVP agenda—to put money directly into an account for the American family, directly into their pocket to pay for their out-of-pocket.

This is advance money in a health savings account so a family in Bossier

Parish with a \$6,000 deductible is not forced to choose between going to the doctor or pumping gas in their truck or putting food on the table. Under this system, a family of four may get \$2,000—\$2,000—to pay for those upfront costs.

Now, we also strengthen price transparency. So the mom whose child has an earache could pull out her phone—take their phone like I am—say: Urgent care centers near me and what is their pricing quality for a routine earache? And it would pop up on the map: Five choices: \$100 here. \$500 there. She, with the money going straight into her account, could then go and have her daughter seen and have that visit paid for by the money in the account.

The doctor writes a prescription: Pharmacies near me and what is the price for this particular drug? It pops up: Five pharmacies. This is the best price. She can go there and with that money in her account—the money in her pocket for her out-of-pocket—get the best value—the money and the value—for the patient, her daughter. The MVP agenda.

Finally, we need to empower patients to stay healthy. That begins with knowing what is in the food we eat. For example, a mother in Terrebonne Parish shouldn't be wondering whether her shrimp is from the gulf or whether it is radioactive, pumped with chemicals, imported from an East Asian seafood farm. I am not making that up. Some of the shrimp from elsewhere is radioactive.

Mothers in Livingston Parish shouldn't be wondering if there is added ingredients to the food in the grocery store which are unsafe for their children.

So let's summarize. People in Louisiana are concerned about affordability. The cost of living—the cost of healthcare as part of that—is too high. They are looking for folks here in Washington to do our part to better enable them to do their part.

We have a responsibility to deliver and make life better for our constituents. The Money and Value for Patients—or the MVP agenda—is a way to do that. Let's give power to the patient. Let's make healthcare affordable again.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BANKS). The Democratic leader.

#### RECONCILIATION

MR. SCHUMER. Mr. President, earlier today, we caught our first glimpse of the Senate Republicans' budget resolution. Forget being on the same page; Republicans aren't even on the same planet as the American people. They want to give \$140 billion for ICE and Border Patrol without any reforms but zero dollars to lower Americans' costs.

Let me say that again: \$140 billion for ICE and Border Patrol—no reforms, no accountability, no strings attached; zero dollars to lower Americans' costs.

That is their priority. That is why they are dragging the Senate through an arduous, convoluted reconciliation process—to put money in the coffers of Trump's rogue Agencies rather than in Americans' pockets.

Democrats want to lower Americans' grocery, gas, healthcare, and housing costs. Senate Republicans want to appease Donald Trump and Stephen Miller by giving ICE and Border Patrol tens of billions of dollars to continue spreading violence in our streets.

Democrats are going to make sure that the contrast is on open display during reconciliation. If Senate Republicans would rather acquiesce to Donald Trump and Stephen Miller than stand up for the American people, so be it. We are going to make them own that decision amendment after amendment, vote after vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

#### RECONCILIATION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, in a moment here, I am going to move to proceed to a budget resolution, but let me just say before I do that that we are in this spot because we tried to appropriate. We tried to fund the DHS Agencies ICE and CBP through the regular order, normal appropriations process—a process which had concluded in a bipartisan deal with Democrats and Republicans both having agreed to fund DHS, an outcome that was walked away from by the Senate Democrats.

Then, because they wanted reforms, we sat down for 45 days, I think it was, and went through a process where Democrats kept coming up with new ideas. The White House kept meeting them. There were a number of reforms that were made by the White House.

Then, subsequent to that, in the negotiation with the Democrats, Republicans here in the Senate and in the House and the White House worked together to try to accommodate more requests for reforms—all of which were met with a resounding no from the Democrats, so much so at one point that there was one offer made by the White House, and the Democrats didn't even respond for 18 days. Eighteen days suggests a lack of seriousness about this issue.

Ultimately, I think what has happened here is the far-left Democrat base in this country has insisted that their leadership not fund the Agencies that are responsible for law enforcement in this country, whether that is the Border Patrol, which has responsibility for ensuring that our border is secure, or ICE, which is responsible for ensuring that illegals who commit criminal acts in this country are deported. Enforcing the laws of this land—that is the job these two Agencies have been charged with, and the Democrats have determined they are not going to fund them.

So essentially, when the Democrat leader talks about Republicans owning

something, I will tell you what the Democrats own. The Democrats own the position which they have tried before and failed, and that is open borders, wide-open borders, millions of people coming into this country illegally over the past four years, and defunding the police.

Open borders and defunding the police—that is what the Democrats own. Because of that and their unwillingness to work with us on an appropriations process that provides reforms and funding for those two Agencies, Republicans have been forced to use the budget reconciliation process to ensure that those two Agencies are funded not only for today but in the future because I don't see a universe in which the far-left Democrat base is ever going to let their leaders fund these Agencies that are responsible for law enforcement in this country.

This is defund-the-police. That is simply what it is. So we are going to move to budget reconciliation to ensure that those two Agencies are funded not only for today but for the balance of this administration's term in office.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 376, S. Con. Res. 33.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 376, S. Con. Res. 33, 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 TO PROCEED

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

Mr. THUNE. 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.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY).

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

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 87 Leg.]

#### YEAS—52

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

#### NAYS—46

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	Warnock
Durbin	Murphy	Warren
Fetterman	Murray	Welch
Gallego	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Padilla	Wyden
Hassan	Peters	
Heinrich	Reed	

#### NOT VOTING—2

Grassley Warner

The motion was agreed to.

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

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS). The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 33) 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I defer to Senator GRAHAM.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I have a unanimous consent request.

I ask unanimous consent that for the duration of the S. Con. Res. 33, the budget resolution for fiscal year 2026, the majority and the Democratic managers of the resolution, while seated or standing at the managers' desk, be permitted to deliver floor remarks, retrieve, review, and edit documents, and send email and other data communications from text displayed on wireless personal assistant devices and tablet devices.

I further ask unanimous consent that the use of calculators be permitted on the floor during consideration of the