

floor again and asked the Republicans who were remaining in the Senate Chamber to allow me unanimous consent that nominees for U.S. attorneys will not go through this rollcall process. Unfortunately, a number of now-sitting U.S. Senators on the Republican side came to the floor and objected. They wanted to keep the VANCE rule in place. I warned them that the obstacles they were creating under President Biden that were unprecedented and had not been seen under President Trump in his first term would come back to haunt all of us, and now they have.

This requires us to sit down at some point and have an understanding moving forward not just on nominees and whether there are rollcalls on the floor but on fundamental and basic questions as to whether or not a minority position, for example, on an important Agency or council is going to be respected.

What the Trump administration has done, for example, in many places on commissions and in Agencies is to eliminate the Democrats—to fire them from their jobs—and leave vacancies unfilled. Then the Republicans come to us and say: Well, we have Republican nominees for the spots, the Republican spots.

And we say: What about the Democratic nominees?

They say: We are not going to allow you to call any of those.

There has got to be some understanding and comity, and we think that grown-ups should be able to resolve this issue, but the representation of what our problem is this morning did not include those two elements and many others. I hope we can resolve this in a favorable way for the benefit of the American people, but there is a history behind it. Fundamentally, we are in the minority now on the Democratic side, and we don't believe that the rules that the Republicans insist on should be to their benefit only; they should benefit both political parties. Unfortunately, we are in a position where that is not happening.

#### ONE BIG BEAUTIFUL BILL ACT

Mr. President, on a separate issue, with the recess looming, my Republican colleagues are itching to get out of Washington and return to their home States. Why are they so eager? I will tell you. They have some explaining to do. That is why they want to get home. As soon as they get out of Washington, they plan to fan out across the country and try to explain the so-called Big Beautiful Bill of President Trump.

Until then, Senate Republicans are taking to the Senate floor to say good things about this bad bill. This includes the junior Senator from Louisiana, who several times came to the Senate floor claiming that Medicaid spending was not cut in the Big Beautiful Bill.

Sorry. That is false. Let me remind folks this Trump budget bill reduces

spending on healthcare programs by \$1 trillion. Louisiana is expected to lose \$27 billion in Federal Medicaid funding over the next decades alone. It removes 10 million Americans from insurance coverage and threatens hospitals and nursing homes, and he waved away the millions of Americans who will lose their healthcare coverage, writing it off as simply going after double dip-pers, which has been explained at length by the Senator from Louisiana as people who are ineligible in the first place for receiving medical coverage.

The Senator held up a press release from CMS, the Federal Medicaid Agency, with a splashy, deceiving headline, claiming that 2.8 million Americans are signed up for Medicaid in two different States. Well, if fraud on that scale does exist, then I want to join the effort to put an end to it. Unfortunately, the statement is not accurate. That is not what is happening. The CMS press release provided zero evidence of that claim about massive scale fraud. It is like the President's statement after the State of the Union Address that people 120 years old were drawing Social Security. Not true.

He claimed that stopping duplicated enrollment has the "potential to save taxpayers approximately \$14 billion annually." That is a large number. How did they arrive at that conclusion with no report, no findings, and no data underpinning its sensational headline? That was the point. The supposed smoking gun that the junior Senator from Louisiana touted but failed to mention was that, if someone is enrolled in both States, it can be explained in some of the basics, like they moved or that their name was found on two Federal health programs. Fraud? Maybe. They could have lost their job and no longer could pay health premiums, so they enrolled in Medicaid. That is not fraud. Even CMS had the caveat of the word "potential" when talking about whether people were actually receiving benefits from two different programs. CMS used "potential" again when talking about the cost to taxpayers.

It fits the Republican narrative to tell half the story. It is an effort to cover their tracks when it comes to retroactivity to justify the massive devastation that was caused by the Big Beautiful Bill.

What the junior Senator from Louisiana wants you to believe is that the only way to root out waste, fraud, and abuse in Medicaid is by passing the single largest healthcare cut in American history. I think he is just wrong. My colleague ignored a warning from the Louisiana Hospital Association and the Louisiana Rural Hospital Coalition, which wrote that cuts in the Big Beautiful Bill will be "historic in their devastation" and "force consolidation of services, staffing reductions, and closures." That is the reality in Louisiana of the Big Beautiful Bill.

His fears were echoed in the trip I took last weekend to southern Illinois,

to Springfield. Doctors and nurses there warned that Medicaid cuts will force rural-based providers to scale back services and push patients into overcrowded emergency rooms, straining the entire system.

I heard the same story at Roseland Community Hospital in Chicago, which relies on Medicaid for 63 percent of their patients. A hospital that has served its community for 100 years is facing what the CEO said was a "game over" situation.

To the junior Senator from Louisiana who believes this budget bill is merely stopping cheaters from enrolling in Medicaid, he can sing that tune to 33 rural hospitals in his home State which are now at risk of closing. That is what this awful bill does.

You might be wondering: What are we going to do with the \$1 trillion in healthcare cut money? It is going to go to tax cuts for billionaires. Goodness gracious. Give Elon Musk a \$250,000 tax cut, and I am sorry to say he won't even notice it. That is the reality. But these hospitals, particularly rural hospitals, will notice it, and many of them will be forced to close. The same thing will be true for nursing homes, which provide valuable, lifesaving services to senior citizens. They face cutbacks because of the Big Beautiful Bill, and families are going to have to sacrifice as a result.

While in Ohio, Vice President VANCE said: "If that Big, Beautiful Bill hadn't passed, you all would have gotten a tax increase to the tune of thousands of dollars," and "we happen to believe that you all work very hard for your money. You ought to keep it."

A great sentiment, but it is not true. The truth is that working families will see more of their hard-earned money gone for higher personal healthcare costs. Hang on tight. The cost of health insurance premiums and the cost of healthcare itself is going to continue to increase, at the expense of American families. We estimate they will lose \$2,400 a year.

What is the tax break that comes out of the Big Beautiful Bill? If you are making \$35,000 or less in annual income, \$13 a month—\$13 a month versus \$2,400 a year. Do the math. Working families will be the losers in that respect.

Coupled with the costs of losing healthcare coverage, grocery benefits, and higher prices on clothing, prescriptions, and groceries due to tariffs, that translates into huge losses for working families.

The Vice President says you "ought to keep" your hard-earned money, but the Republican bill only gives crumbs to working Americans. So while millionaires, billionaires, and big corporations rake in the dough, working families are left with scraps. And Donald Trump, JD VANCE, and congressional Republicans are hoping you don't notice.

I also want to take a moment to discuss the energy provisions in this bill.

In 2022, the Inflation Reduction Act unleashed billions of dollars in investments in solar and clean energy projects, creating hundreds of thousands of jobs with it—primarily in red districts. But that didn't matter to congressional Republicans who voted to dismantle the law's tax credits for wind, solar, and electric cars.

More than \$22 billion worth of clean energy projects have now been canceled this year, and with those cancellations, hundreds of thousands of jobs will be lost and energy bills will shoot up. But upon the bill's passage, Interior Secretary Doug Burgum said:

The One Big Beautiful Bill . . . will restore energy independence and make life more affordable for American families.

That is false: the bill kneecaps wind and solar energy—the fastest-growing sources of clean, cheap power. And our working families will pay the price—literally.

Illinois residents will see their electric bills rise as much as \$400 annually, thanks to this bill. So much for those tax breaks.

So while this administration and their lackeys preach the supposed benefits of this bill, Democrats will be there to push back and remind the public what this bill really does. And we Democrats will remind these reeling communities who allowed this to happen: Donald Trump, JD VANCE, and Republicans in Congress.

I yield the floor.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant 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. 90, Brian Nesvik, of Wyoming, to be Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

John Thune, Tommy Tuberville, Bernie Moreno, Tim Sheehy, John Barrasso, John R. Curtis, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Mike Rounds, Katie Boyd Britt, Roger Marshall, Pete Ricketts, John Boozman, David McCormick, Tim Scott of South Carolina, Rick Scott of Florida, Eric Schmitt, Lindsey Graham.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the mandatory quorum call under rule XXII has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Brian Nesvik, of Wyoming, to be Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

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 Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGOS), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 55, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 468 Ex.]

#### YEAS—55

Banks	Grassley	Mullin
Barrasso	Hagerty	Murkowski
Blackburn	Hawley	Paul
Boozman	Heinrich	Ricketts
Britt	Hoeven	Risch
Budd	Husted	Rosen
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Collins	Johnson	Schmitt
Coons	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	

#### NAYS—41

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

#### NOT VOTING—4

Cassidy	Welch
Gallego	Duckworth

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 55, the nays are 41, and the motion is agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Casey Mulligan, of Illinois, to be Chief Counsel for Advocacy, Small Business Administration.

#### VOTE ON MULLIGAN NOMINATION

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

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. 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 Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGOS), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 469 Ex.]

#### YEAS—52

Banks	Grassley	Mullin
Barrasso	Hagerty	Murkowski
Blackburn	Hawley	Paul
Boozman	Hoeven	Ricketts
Britt	Husted	Risch
Budd	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Capito	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	
Graham	Moreno	

#### NAYS—44

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

#### NOT VOTING—4

Cassidy	Welch
Gallego	Duckworth

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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 majority leader.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that at 2:15 today, the Senate vote on confirmation of the Nesvik nomination and that following disposition of the nomination, the Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the Rinaldi nomination.

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

The Senator from Missouri.

SOLEMNLY MARKING THE ONE-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF THE ATTEMPTED ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT DONALD J. TRUMP, CONDEMNING THE MULTIPLE ATTEMPTS AGAINST THE PRESIDENT'S LIFE, CONDEMNING THOSE WHO INCITE VIOLENCE AGAINST POLITICAL OFFICIALS, AND HONORING THE VICTIMS OF THE SHOOTING

Mr. SCHMITT. Mr. President, a little over a year ago, the unthinkable happened: A former President of the United States was shot on American soil. A patriotic father was killed in cold blood, and two others were left critically injured. This all happened at a peaceful campaign rally in the heart of Pennsylvania.

For the first time in 40 years, a new generation of Americans now carries