

In answers to written questions, Mr. Bluestone refused to admit that President Biden won the 2020 election, but he had no issue agreeing that President Trump won the 2016 and 2024 elections. The only reason is that Mr. Bluestone is loyal to President Trump, not the Constitution, nor the rule of law.

As such, I will vote against Mr. Bluestone's confirmation. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing his nomination.

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

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I notice no further debate on the nomination. I request we move to the vote.

VOTE ON BLUESTONE NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

If not, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Bluestone nomination?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL), and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN).

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 430 Ex.]

YEAS—49

Banks	Grassley	Murkowski
Barrasso	Hagerty	Paul
Blackburn	Hawley	Ricketts
Boozman	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
Curtis	Marshall	Tuberville
Daines	McCormick	Wicker
Ernst	Moody	Young
Fischer	Moran	
Graham	Moreno	

NAYS—47

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

NOT VOTING—4

Britt	McConnell	Mullin
Cruz		

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to re-

consider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 50, Aaron Szabo, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

John Thune, Tim Scott of South Carolina, Mike Crapo, Lindsey Graham, Tim Sheehy, John Kennedy, John Barrasso, Markwayne Mullin, Roger Marshall, Rick Scott of Florida, Mike Rounds, Tommy Tuberville, Steve Daines, Bernie Moreno, Eric Schmitt, Chuck Grassley, Jon A. Husted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Aaron Szabo, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 48, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 431 Ex.]

YEAS—48

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

NAYS—47

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

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

NOT VOTING—5

Britt	Mullin	Paul
McConnell	Murkowski	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas are 48, the nays are 47. The motion is agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Aaron Szabo, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JUSTICE). The Senator from Louisiana.

ONE BIG BEAUTIFUL BILL ACT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I want to speak briefly about two subjects. They are different. They are both important, but they are different.

Let me start with the reconciliation bill, which President Trump and others called the One Big Beautiful Bill. I continue to go through the bill, and every time I do, I am impressed.

This is a breathtaking bill in the sense that it covers so many subjects. I think each of us could spend hours talking about this bill. I will just hit the highlights. This is one of the most far-reaching pieces of legislation that this body will ever pass.

We extended the 2017 tax cuts—no small feat in itself. Had we not done that, the American people would have suffered under a \$4.3 trillion tax increase. So we stopped that tax increase.

Some of my friends and colleagues talk about, well, all you did was stop the tax increase on billionaires.

That is nonsense. That is nonsense on a stick. Unless your soup of the day is gin, you know that that is a lie.

Half of that tax increase would have hit working men and working women and working families in this country. The other half would have hit our small businesses, and, yes, some of our large businesses. We stopped that.

We made some of those tax cuts permanent. We cut taxes on tips. In this bill, we cut taxes on overtime. We cut taxes on Social Security. We cut taxes on car loans. We expanded a tax credit for childcare to help moms and dads pay for the childcare so they can work. We increased the child tax credit. We increased the standard deduction, and that is going to take effect immediately.

We funded school choice. For years and years and years, I have tried—we all have tried, many of us have tried—to provide the American people—moms and dads—with school choice. This bill did it. I went to a public school. I am proud of that. But competition makes all of us better. I can go to my overpriced Capitol Hill apartment or Capitol Hill grocery store and choose from

six or seven types of mayonnaise. Why shouldn't we give parents—moms and dads—choices for their kids' education? We are doing that with the school choice portion of this bill.

We increase money for the border, and we increase money for defense.

We also address the problem in Medicaid. And I have been very disappointed because some commentators have said that we are going to throw off from the Medicaid rolls, I have read, anywhere from 10 to 12 million people. The implication in some of these articles and some of these comments is that we are just going to look at the Medicaid rolls and go through and say: You are gone. We can't afford you.

That is not what this bill does. The first thing you have to realize is that, actually, Medicaid is not going to be cut at all under this bill. Under our bill that we just passed, our spending on Medicaid over the next 10 years is going to go up 20 percent, so nobody is cutting Medicaid.

There are some people, as a result of the new provisions that we have put into law, who will no longer be eligible for Medicaid and will no longer get Medicaid. But they weren't entitled to get it in the first place. So when you say: Well, you are throwing people off of Medicaid—they weren't entitled to it in the first place. You are not entitled to Medicaid if you are making \$200,000 a year and you didn't tell the truth when you signed up for Medicaid in your State and your State didn't verify your status.

But let me give you one example. CMS just put out a report. Our bill is going to change the law so that 2.8 million Americans—the CBO says, like, we are throwing 10 or 12 million Americans off of Medicaid. I will just give you this one example: 2.8 million of those Americans who will lose Medicaid are doubledippers. They signed up twice. We have 1.2 million people on the Medicaid rolls who are signed up in two States, and the American taxpayer is paying twice.

As you know, Mr. President, well—you were a great Governor; you were a Governor and a damn good one—most States use managed care, and they pay per Medicaid person. So if a State is paying, let's say—I will pick a number—\$8,000 per Medicaid patient per year to the healthcare organization to provide their care, and that person is signed up in two States, they are doubledipping, and it is costing the American taxpayer two \$8,000 payments a year. That is cheating. So from one perspective, you are throwing these people off of Medicaid—they weren't entitled to doubledip in the first place.

CMS also came out with a report. By "CMS," I mean the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, which is the Federal Agency that administers Medicare and Medicaid. CMS has also found that there are 1.6 million people who are on Medicaid today who are receiving both Medicaid and ObamaCare.

Well, what is ObamaCare? I will refresh everyone's memory.

Medicaid is supposed to be for the poor and disabled, and Medicare is for the elderly, and a lot of other Americans have health insurance through their job. But there are a certain number of Americans who don't have health insurance because they are not old enough for Medicare, they are not poor enough for Medicaid, and maybe their employer doesn't offer health insurance. So they can go to an exchange—we call them the ObamaCare exchange—and buy health insurance.

Now, President Obama and some of my colleagues—I wasn't here then, but when we passed the ObamaCare, the ObamaCare exchanges, the Affordable Care Act, we were told that health insurance would be cheaper, and we were told it would be more accessible. It has been neither. We were also told if you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. That wasn't true either.

But the point is that we have a number of Americans who, if they don't qualify for Medicare, they don't qualify for Medicaid, they don't get insurance through their employer, they go to the ObamaCare exchanges. CMS found we have got 1.6 million people who are getting both health insurance through the ObamaCare exchanges—which we subsidize, taxpayers do—and through Medicaid. That is called doubledipping. It is illegal.

CBO can put out all the reports that they want to saying: Oh, you are throwing all these people off Medicaid. And technically, they are right, but they are not eligible to be on Medicaid. I just gave you an example, 2.8 million people who are doubledipping. It is illegal to doubledip. It is immoral to doubledip. It is unfair to taxpayers to doubledip. All our bill does is say you can't doubledip. Cheating is wrong.

Is that throwing people off of Medicaid? Technically, yes. But, once again, as the other provisions in this bill also do, we are taking people off Medicaid who weren't eligible for it in the first place.

As a result of these 2.8 million people, I think CMS—I am looking for their figure. I think it cost the American taxpayer, because of these 2.8 million folks who are doubledipping, \$14 billion a year—\$14 billion a year over a 10-year window, which is the horizon that we use. That is \$140 billion that we are going to save, and that savings is going to go back into Medicaid to make it even stronger.

That is just one example of how much of—not much, but—well, yes, much of the reporting on our bill is misleading.

TRIBUTE TO JIMMY GRAHAM

Mr. President, the second thing I want to talk about: I just want to briefly thank Jimmy Graham.

Who is Jimmy Graham? I know the Presiding Officer knows who Jimmy Graham is. He was one of the best tight ends who ever played the game.

Now, he was a New Orleans Saint I think for six, seven seasons. He played

elsewhere. I looked it up. He played for the Seahawks. He played for the Packers. He played for the Bears. But he was a total beast in the best sense of the word playing for the New Orleans Saints.

And he has retired. After 13 years in the NFL, Jimmy has decided to retire. He was a big boy; he is a big boy. But he started out as a basketball player. He didn't play football; he played basketball. And he transformed himself.

The numbers that Jimmy put up are just out of this world. They are otherworldly. He is clearly one of the most prolific pass-catching tight ends in the history of the game. As the Presiding Officer knows, many tight ends just block. That is their job. Jimmy not only blocked, but he caught passes. And he caught a bunch of them.

He is No. 7 in NFL history in receptions at 719. He ranks No. 8 in receiving yards at 8,545. He ranks 4th in touchdowns at 89.

When he was with the Saints—I was looking at this, this afternoon—in 6 seasons, Jimmy Graham caught 392 passes for 4,791 yards and 55 touchdowns. And he was a tight end. He was a tight end. His first job was to block. He also caught a few balls.

And he gave my people from Louisiana a lot of joy at the time they really needed it, and I just wanted to thank Mr. Graham for the joy that he brought to anybody and everybody who watched him play football but especially when he played for the New Orleans Saints. And I want to wish him well, and I want him to end on some good news tonight.

I thank the Presiding Officer for his attention.

I will yield to my colleague or colleagues if they would like to speak.

I will yield to my legal-eagle friend Senator BLUMENTHAL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I am here with a number of colleagues on probably one of the most important decisions we are going to make with respect to the future of justice in America: the nomination of Emil Bove to be a judge on the court of appeals for the Third Circuit, the second highest panel in our judiciary.

And he is about as unfit and unqualified as any judicial nominee to come before this body in my 15 years here. And I say that with sadness as well as anger, as someone who still proudly would call myself a litigator, a trial lawyer, and a member of the Judiciary Committee, where I am proud to serve with my great colleague, the ranking member now, Senator DURBIN.

And he and others from that committee will come before us tonight. We are here not only on the merits of Mr. Bove but also because we were denied an opportunity in the committee to present fairly and fully our case against Mr. Bove based on the record, and we were denied an opportunity to