

[Rollcall Vote No. 462 Ex.]

## YEAS—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	

## NAYS—44

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

## NOT VOTING—3

Duckworth	Gallego	Kelly
-----------	---------	-------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 53, the nays are 44.

The motion is agreed to.

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Andrea Lucas, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for a term expiring July 1, 2030. (Reappointment)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that at 7 p.m. today, the Senate vote on confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 254, Andrea Lucas, and following disposition of the Lucas nomination, the Senate vote on the motions to invoke cloture on Executive Calendar Nos. 59, 118, 165, and mandatory quorum calls be waived; further, if cloture is invoked on the nominations individually, all postcloture time be expired and the Senate vote on confirmation of the nominations at a time to be determined by the majority leader in consultation with the Democrat leader no earlier than August 1; finally, if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

Mr. THUNE. I also ask unanimous consent that all votes after the first vote this evening be 10 minutes in length.

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

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Matthew Kozma, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis, Department of Homeland Security.

## VOTE ON KOZMA NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Kozma nomination?

Mrs. BRITT. 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. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGO), and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 463 Ex.]

## YEAS—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	

## NAYS—44

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

## NOT VOTING—3

Duckworth	Gallego	Kelly
-----------	---------	-------

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUSTED). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, with me today is one of my colleagues from my office, Mr. Nick Ayers, whose good judgment and counsel I depend on.

## MEDICAID

Mr. President, I want to talk about the Medicaid portion of our reconciliation bill, which the President calls our One Big Beautiful Bill, and I want to talk about the rest of the story.

The Congressional Budget Office is a bipartisan entity, as you know, that advises us on fiscal and financial matters. I appreciate their good work—a lot of smart people over there. The CBO, as we call it, has issued a report that says that as a result of our reconciliation bill, the so-called One Big Beautiful Bill, that 10½ million Americans are going to be thrown off of Medicaid. Let me say that again. The CBO says that as a result of the One Big Beautiful Bill, 10½ million Americans are going to be thrown off the Medicaid rolls as a result of our bill.

I don't want to be unfair to CBO, but sometimes CBO makes these statements, and they don't give you the context in which they are making the statements. If you say we are going to throw 10½ million people off of Medicaid and don't explain in detail why they have come to that conclusion, that is not fair. You are not getting the full story. You are not getting reliable information. That would be like asking a nun for advice about sex. So let me tell you the other half of the story.

I talked about this last week a little bit. The 10½ million people who CBO says we are throwing off of Medicaid—they weren't eligible for Medicaid in the first place. Let me say that again. CBO says we are throwing 10½ million people off of Medicaid. They weren't eligible for Medicaid in the first place.

I talked about this a little bit last week. For example, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services just came out with a report that of those 10½ million people we are throwing off of Medicaid, 2.8 million of them are double-dipping. They are double-dipping. That is illegal. That is a violation of the rules. I am from Louisiana. That means that some people are signed up in both Louisiana and Mississippi, for example. You can't double-dip.

The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services also found that of that 2½ million people, 1.6 million of them are double-dipping by joining Medicaid and ObamaCare. So, yes, they are going to lose their Medicaid. They should.

That double-dipping costs us \$14 billion a year, \$140 billion over 10 years. We think in 10-year cycles. That is money that we could use to help people who really deserve Medicaid.

So, yes, my friends at CBO, those people are going to lose their Medicaid. Did I mention that they weren't entitled to it in the first place?

Point 2, the main determinant for Medicaid is income. That is not the only one, but the main determinant is income. States are not supposed to sign up people for Medicaid who make too much money. I regret to say this—I don't know why, but it is human nature—but some people don't tell the truth.

Under President Biden, he encouraged the States not to check income eligibility; just take everybody's word for it. Well, you know, you have probably heard me say this before. I trust people, but I also—when I play poker, I play with friends. They are good friends of mine, but I always cut the cards. I believe in the old adage "Trust in God, but tie up your camel anyway."

If the President sends the message to the States "Don't worry about checking if people are making too much money," guess what—some people are going to cheat, and they do. I wish they didn't, but they do.

Back in my State of Louisiana, our legislative auditor, Louisiana's legislative auditor, which audits all the spending in the State, found—they did an exhaustive audit of our Medicaid Program. They found back in 2019 that 1,600 people had been signed up for Medicaid who were making over \$100,000 a year—1,600 people making over 100 grand a year.

Yes, CBO, they are going to lose their Medicaid. They weren't entitled to it in the first place.

The legislative auditor went on to point out that Louisiana paid \$85.5 million in Medicaid payments for patients who weren't eligible for coverage because they made too much money.

My legislative auditor in Louisiana—we have a lot of people on Medicaid. He couldn't go through the numbers for each and every one of them, so he had to do a statistical sample. He listed—I won't show you the list of all of them; you could stand on the thing and paint the ceiling. But he found, for example, on our Medicaid rolls in Louisiana, someone making \$111,785. Here is another person on Medicaid making \$126,284 and another making \$104,921 and another making \$114,797. This is Louisiana. Our median family income is only \$56,000. These folks aren't qualified for Medicaid. They are taking money away from people who deserve it.

So, yes, CBO, which on this issue is giving us their advice—I am going to say it again: It is like asking a nun for advice on sex.

CBO is not telling us the full story. Yes, they are going to lose their Medicaid. They are not qualified for Medicaid. They are cheating.

Let me talk about a third way that CBO is misleading us. And I am not saying CBO is doing it intentionally. Some may say otherwise, but I am not saying that. I am just saying they need to explain their answer.

If you say we are throwing 10½ million people off of Medicaid, you know, you have got to give us the rest of the story. It is not fair to just take that out of context.

Technically, they may be right, but did I mention—I can't remember if I mentioned this—these 10½ million people weren't qualified to get Medicaid in the first place.

We also put in our reconciliation bill—the President calls it the Big

Beautiful Bill—a work requirement. Sometimes—not always but sometimes—the best way to get back on your feet is to get off your ass.

The American people are the most generous people in the world. We spend trillions of dollars helping our neighbors. In our country, if you are hungry, we will feed you. If you are homeless, we will house you. If you are too poor to be sick, we will pay for your doctor. That is why we have Medicaid. That is why we have Medicare. But those who can work should work.

Our social programs were not meant to be parking lots; they were meant to be bridges. Sometimes. It is not always. If you are disabled, you should be on Medicaid. If you are too poor, you should be on Medicaid. But we have a lot of people on Medicaid—we are not sure exactly how many—who could work. They choose not to.

So when we passed this bill, my Democratic friends opposed us every step of the way, but we passed, over their objections, a work requirement.

Now if you are on Medicaid, the expansion part of Medicaid—I don't want to digress here, but if you signed up on the expansion part of Medicaid, if you are 19 to 64 years old, if you are not disabled—so I am not talking about a mother with a sick child in her arms—if you are 19 to 64, if you are not disabled, if you are healthy, and you don't have a child at home under 14, we are saying: We will give you Medicaid, but you have got to work—not 40 hours a week; 80 hours a month. For 80 hours a month, in return for the free medical care, you have to go try to get a job, get a job. You can go to worker training or you can do community service. Hopefully, you will become gainfully employed and you won't need Medicaid, because a person without a job is not healthy, he is not happy, and he is not free.

We don't know exactly how many people are on the Medicaid expansion who can work and aren't working. There have been some estimates. I have seen them all over the map. I was looking at one in *The Economist* recently. They estimate that 6 percent of the 71 million people on Medicaid are able-bodied and could work but choose not to. That is 6 million people. That is 6 million people.

The average amount spent per person on Medicaid was \$9,000 a year. So if we could ask—get—all of those 6 million people to work—and we will help them find a job—we would save \$64 billion a year. That is a half a trillion dollars a year over a 10-year period.

So, yes, CBO, it is true that if someone is covered by the work requirement and they say, I don't want to work; I choose not to work, then they are going to lose their Medicaid. And again, we are not talking about somebody disabled or somebody pregnant. We are not talking about a mother with three young children. We are talking about able-bodied adults 19 to 64; they are healthy, and they don't have

kids at home. All we are saying is: Come join the American dream and get a job. So, yes, CBO, they will lose their Medicaid. They weren't eligible for it in the first place.

So I just want to say to my friends at CBO—I don't mean any disrespect. I don't. They are really smart people. But when you are going to throw these numbers around like 10½ million people are going to be thrown off Medicaid, you ought to explain why. So the CBO report, as far as I am concerned, is all salt and no tequila. They don't tell us why 10½ million people are going to lose their Medicaid. And unless you have an opium habit, you will see, if you drill down and understand and try to understand, that those 10½ million people—God bless them, but they weren't eligible for Medicaid in the first place.

And these reforms we are making to Medicaid are going to be able to provide much more money for the disabled Americans, the truly impoverished Americans, the truly sick Americans, the children who are too poor to be sick in our country. We are going to take this money that we are saving and give them the quality healthcare they deserve.

And even after all these reforms, guess what—and I hope you are listening, CBO—we aren't cutting Medicaid. Even after all these reforms, Medicaid is going to go up 20 percent over the next 10 years. And that is the rest of the story.

My work here is done.

I yield the floor to my good friend, Harvard graduate—he went to Harvard; smart as a whip, mind like a steel trap—Senator TOM COTTON.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

GAZA

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, well, here we go again. Hamas is on the verge of defeat, so it has cranked up the propaganda machine once again. Now Hamas wants the world to believe that Israel has undertaken a campaign of deliberate starvation of the Gazan population, and as usual, Hamas can count on an international media and political chorus to fight their battles for them and try to bully Israel into submission. So I would like to set the record straight.

First, let me observe that no decent person wants to see innocent children caught in the crosshairs of war and suffering and hunger and malnutrition. Israel agrees, of course. That is why, since Hamas started this war with its brutal atrocities, Israel has helped bring into Gaza approximately 96,000 trucks containing nearly 1.5 million tons of food, 46,000 tons of medical supplies, 60,000 tons of water, and around 170,000 tons of shelter equipment.

Put simply, children in Gaza aren't going hungry because of lack of supplies from Israel; they are suffering because Hamas uses food and humanitarian aid as a weapon to stay in power.