

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

the memory of a President under fire. President Trump came within a millisecond and a millimeter of losing his life that day.

Our Nation has a painful history with political violence and has mourned Presidents and watched great leaders cut down in their prime. Political violence is never the answer. We resolve our disputes in this country through elections and through free speech.

So today, I am calling for this unanimous consent of a resolution to unequivocally condemn political violence of any kind and honor the victims of these terrible acts.

One year ago at Butler, we lost a great American, Corey Comperatore, a man who, in the blink of an eye, instinctively shielded his family from gunfire, sacrificing his life in an extraordinary act of courage. We also honor David Dutch and James Copenhaver, who survived critical injuries in the same brutal attack.

These men that day came in peace to participate in the civic life of our Republic, never imagining that they would leave either losing their life or fighting for their lives.

All acts of political violence must be met with swift condemnation from all elected officials, Republican or Democrat.

This resolution further honors other law enforcement officers, first responders, medical personnel, and Secret Service agents who answered the call of duty when it mattered the most. They ran towards danger when America was under attack. These brave men and women served their fellow Americans regardless of their party affiliation or race, sex, or nationality.

It shouldn't be difficult to find bipartisan support to stand against political violence. The assassination attempt of former-President and now-President Trump is not a partisan matter. Standing against violence should never be partisan.

So today, we are saying something very simple but important—that we unequivocally stand against political violence in all forms. I urge my colleagues to stand with me today and pass this resolution.

Mr. President, as if in legislative session and notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 363, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 363) 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.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. SCHMITT. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to,

the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 363) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

HEMP

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the original intent of the 2018 farm bill's Federal hemp legislation and the need to restore it.

Earlier this year, a report from the University of Kentucky found that cannabis-related poisonings among Kentuckians under 18 rose by 43 percent between 2023 and 2024. As you can see here, emergency room visits are rising steadily as well: "Cannabis-Related Emergency Department Visits Climb in Kentucky, Especially Among [Young People]."

Calls to poison control centers in Kentucky regarding cannabis have doubled in the last 5 years, and more than 40 percent—listen to this—have been about children under 12.

Children all over the Commonwealth, from Laurel County to Jefferson County, are facing serious health and safety concerns due to THC poisoning from hemp-derived products, and so are children all across the country. It is not just a Kentucky problem.

How did we get here? Let's go back to the beginning.

Back in 2014, I lead the effort to secure pilot programs for industrial hemp, and I led the effort to legalize the crop in 2018. This industry has seen tremendous growth, especially in Kentucky. Hemp is used in food, clothing, paper, plastic, and many of our consumer products. Its versatility gave farmers hope for a new and profitable cash crop.

Unfortunately, some companies looking to make a quick buck have been exploiting a loophole in the 2018 farm bill by taking legal amounts of THC from hemp and turning it into intoxicating substances. They take these synthetic chemicals and use them as ingredients in appealing snack and candylike products and distribute them in familiar packaging.

Here, it gives you an example of how these hemp-related, THC-related factors are packaged in candy that looks very much like candy being consumed by kids all over the country. This is, by definition, a real problem.

Children love candy. They can recognize well-known brands of candy before they can even read. As you can see from the chart that we were just talking about, the packaging on these

snacks is nearly identical to Oreos, Doritos, or Skittles. Little do kids know that these products are laced with intoxicating synthetic chemicals. Young children are consuming these snacks thinking they are candy, not poison.

On top of that, these products are easily accessible and can be purchased at convenience stores. Some of them are even more intoxicating than actually smoking marijuana. Let me repeat that. Products more potent than marijuana can be bought off the shelf of a gas station.

Look, for years, I have called on the FDA to regulate these products. They have not taken the initiative to do so, which has certainly been an ongoing disappointment.

That is why we are here today. The language I recently attempted to secure in the Agriculture appropriations bill would have kept these products out of the hands of children while preserving the hemp industry for farmers.

For the sake of those misguided by my opponents on this issue, let me clarify a few things: You will hear from some that this language would have meant the total destruction of the hemp industry. Well, obviously, that is wrong. Under my language, industrial hemp, and CBD would have remained legal, period. Period.

Some predicted there would be widespread economic downturn to farmers should this language become law. Wrong again.

Hemp makes up less than one-hundredth of 1 percent of all farmed acres in the United States. I want the number to grow and to grow a lot. That is why I secured the legalization of hemp production back in the first place.

As long as I have been a Senator from Kentucky, I have supported our farmers. I am proud to have served on the Agriculture Committee my entire career in the Senate because of its importance to Kentucky. From the tobacco buyout program to tax relief for the sale of farmland, I have made sure our farmers have the tools they need to be successful in volatile markets. My language would not have changed that.

This language would have remained in the appropriations package had one Senator not derailed the process. You know, it is one thing to call yourself an advocate for hemp farmers, but if you didn't support the 2014 pilot program and you didn't support the 2018 farm bill that legalized hemp production and you would have blocked a major step forward on this appropriations package if it had included my language to close the bad-actor loophole, then what does being an advocate actually mean?

This package funds a significant portion of the Federal revenue, from Agencies that provide critical resources to our farmers to law enforcement, military, and our veterans, just to name a few.

We need the appropriations process to function. Congress needs to do its job and fund the government. And I, for