

time Americans see the skyrocketing costs on their electric bill or at the gas station, they know who to blame: Donald Trump and his Big Oil billionaire cronies.

Trump's greed isn't just costing Americans more for energy; it is costing them their health. A report found that the pollution from Trump's Big Oil blitz is driving up Americans' healthcare costs too.

I want to salute **SHELDON WHITEHOUSE**, who had a strong hand in putting together this report. He has been steadfast, brilliant, and hard-nosed on fighting this corruption, and I salute him again. Americans—all Americans—should salute him for his efforts.

Trump may think he can hide his corruption in the shadows, but we, Democrats in the Senate, will continue turning over every rock to expose how his greed is costing the American people.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **BARRASSO**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

The majority whip.

MOTION TO TABLE AMENDMENT NO. 6779

Mr. **BARRASSO**. I move to table Senate amendment No. 6779.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

MOTION TO TABLE AMENDMENT NO. 6777

Mr. **BARRASSO**. I move to table Senate amendment No. 6777.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

WAIVING QUORUM CALL

Mr. **BARRASSO**. I ask unanimous consent to waive the mandatory quorum call with respect to the cloture motion on S. 4668.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H. CON. RES. 89

Mr. **BARRASSO**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that if the order with respect to H. Con Res. 89 is executed following the cloture vote on S. 4668, the Senate vote on adoption of H. Con. Res. 89 at 1:45 p.m. today.

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

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 6776

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question now occurs on adoption of the amendment.

Mr. **BARRASSO**. 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 senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 77, nays 23, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 242 Leg.]

YEAS—77

|              |              |            |
|--------------|--------------|------------|
| Armstrong    | Gallego      | Murray     |
| Baldwin      | Graham       | Ossoff     |
| Banks        | Grassley     | Padilla    |
| Barrasso     | Hagerty      | Peters     |
| Bennet       | Hassan       | Ricketts   |
| Blackburn    | Hawley       | Risch      |
| Boozman      | Heinrich     | Rosen      |
| Britt        | Hickenlooper | Rounds     |
| Budd         | Hoeben       | Schatz     |
| Cantwell     | Husted       | Schmitt    |
| Capito       | Hyde-Smith   | Scott (SC) |
| Cassidy      | Johnson      | Shaheen    |
| Collins      | Justice      | Sheehy     |
| Coons        | Kennedy      | Slotkin    |
| Cornyn       | King         | Smith      |
| Cortez Masto | Klobuchar    | Sullivan   |
| Cotton       | Lankford     | Thune      |
| Cramer       | Lee          | Tillis     |
| Crapo        | Lujan        | Tuberville |
| Cruz         | Lummis       | Warner     |
| Curtis       | Marshall     | Welch      |
| Daines       | McConnell    | Whitehouse |
| Durbin       | McCormick    | Wicker     |
| Ernst        | Moran        | Wyden      |
| Fetterman    | Moreno       | Young      |
| Fischer      | Murkowski    |            |

NAYS—23

|                 |         |            |
|-----------------|---------|------------|
| Alsobrooks      | Kelly   | Sanders    |
| Blumenthal      | Kim     | Schiff     |
| Blunt Rochester | Markey  | Schumer    |
| Booker          | Merkley | Scott (FL) |
| Duckworth       | Moody   | Van Hollen |
| Gillibrand      | Murphy  | Warnock    |
| Hirono          | Paul    | Warren     |
| Kaine           | Reed    |            |

The amendment (No. 6776) was agreed to.

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 senior assistant executive 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 Calendar No. 449, S. 4668, a bill to protect the name, image, and likeness rights of, and provide protections for, student athletes and to promote fair competition among intercollegiate athletics, and for other purposes.

John Thune, Ted Cruz, Eric Schmitt, Chuck Grassley, Tim Sheehy, John Barrasso, Steve Daines, Pete Ricketts, John Cornyn, John R. Curtis, Alan Armstrong, Ted Budd, James Lankford, Bernie Moreno, Cindy Hyde-Smith, James E. Risch, Mike Crapo.

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 S. 4668, a bill to protect the name, image, and likeness rights of, and provide protections for, student athletes and to promote fair competition among intercollegiate athletics, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant executive clerk called the roll.

Mr. **BARRASSO**. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. **TILLIS**).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 74, nays 25, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 243 Leg.]

YEAS—74

|              |              |            |
|--------------|--------------|------------|
| Armstrong    | Fischer      | Moreno     |
| Baldwin      | Gallego      | Murkowski  |
| Banks        | Graham       | Murray     |
| Barrasso     | Grassley     | Ossoff     |
| Bennet       | Hagerty      | Padilla    |
| Blackburn    | Hassan       | Peters     |
| Boozman      | Hawley       | Ricketts   |
| Britt        | Heinrich     | Risch      |
| Budd         | Hickenlooper | Rosen      |
| Cantwell     | Hoeben       | Rounds     |
| Capito       | Husted       | Schatz     |
| Cassidy      | Hyde-Smith   | Schmitt    |
| Collins      | Johnson      | Scott (SC) |
| Coons        | Justice      | Shaheen    |
| Cornyn       | Kennedy      | Sheehy     |
| Cortez Masto | King         | Slotkin    |
| Cotton       | Klobuchar    | Smith      |
| Cramer       | Lankford     | Sullivan   |
| Crapo        | Lee          | Thune      |
| Cruz         | Lujan        | Tuberville |
| Curtis       | Lummis       | Warner     |
| Daines       | Marshall     | Welch      |
| Durbin       | McConnell    | Wicker     |
| Ernst        | McCormick    | Young      |
| Fetterman    | Moran        |            |

NAYS—25

|                 |         |            |
|-----------------|---------|------------|
| Alsobrooks      | Kim     | Schumer    |
| Blumenthal      | Markey  | Scott (FL) |
| Blunt Rochester | Merkley | Van Hollen |
| Booker          | Moody   | Warnock    |
| Duckworth       | Murphy  | Warren     |
| Gillibrand      | Paul    | Whitehouse |
| Hirono          | Reed    | Wyden      |
| Kaine           | Sanders |            |
| Kelly           | Schiff  |            |

NOT VOTING—1

Tillis

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. **HAGERTY**). On this vote the yeas are 74, the nays are 25. The motion is agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The majority leader.

MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. **THUNE**. Mr. President, I move to table the committee-reported substitute amendment.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion is agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The Senator from New Jersey.

**DIRECTING THE PRESIDENT, PURSUANT TO SECTION 5(c) OF THE WAR POWERS RESOLUTION, TO REMOVE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM HOSTILITIES WITH IRAN**

Mr. **KIM**. Mr. President, on behalf of the two leaders, I ask the Chair to execute the order of August 8, 2026, with respect to H. Con. Res 89.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Under the previous order, the Committee on Foreign Relations is discharged from further consideration of H. Con. Res. 89, and the Senate will proceed to its immediate consideration.

The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 89) directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove United States Armed Forces from hostilities with Iran.

Thereupon, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. KIM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following Senators be permitted to speak: KIM for up to 8 minutes, SCHIFF for up to 8 minutes, MORENO for up to 20 minutes, SLOTKIN for up to 5 minutes, MERKLEY for up to 10 minutes, MURPHY for up to 8 minutes, BALDWIN for up to 5 minutes, WELCH for up to 2 minutes, KAINE for up to 5 minutes, and KLOBUCHAR for up to 5 minutes.

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

Mr. KIM. Mr. President, I rise today as Donald Trump continues to wage a war in Iran in our name, on our dime, but without our say—a war that is nearly 7 months old, a war that has cost Americans billions, a war that seemingly has no end in sight but that Congress has the authority to end.

The Senate has just returned to the Capitol after over a month back home, and in that time, Americans have continued to be loud and clear at town-halls, at protests, and in letters and phone calls to our offices. They are sick and tired of this reckless and expensive war. They are sick and tired of this war, and they expect us to do something about it.

This is a moment for us to step up and show the American people that we are listening and we are ready to take action.

Democrats have taken action. We have come to this Chamber 11 times, in the past 208 days, to try to bring this war to an end.

I have been encouraged to see some of my colleagues join from across the aisle to do the right thing and join us.

It is not just the right thing to do; it is the right thing to do right now. It is about standing up for our Constitution—that this war, which Donald Trump said would end in about a month, has lasted over six times as long; this war, which Donald Trump wouldn't even admit to being a war, has resulted in damage done to our national security and the spread of chaos across the Middle East and the world; and this war, which Donald Trump said was worth the cost, keeps costing the American people more and more.

So what has it cost us? It has cost us American lives. We have lost at least 19 servicemembers, brave men and women; over 750 injured. It has cost us economic security. Inflation is up—gas prices, just filling up the grocery carts as well.

These are costs that Donald Trump is bearing upon the American people. It is costing each and every one of our American families hard-earned taxpayer dollars.

A report last week by the Congressional Budget Office showed that the war has cost nearly \$40 billion in the first 4 months alone.

It has cost us our readiness and our ability to keep Americans safe from global threats. These are the things

that we are seeing that are making us weaker and why it is that we need to end this now.

So with this vote today, we can alleviate the cost of the war. I want to talk a little bit more about why alleviating this cost is so important to the people we represent, to our national security, and to our future.

When we hear from so many of our constituents, when I hear from a woman back home in New Jersey, she is talking about just the challenges that she is facing raising her family, about the challenges that she is seeing as gas prices continue to skyrocket, as mortgage rates are hitting higher and higher. She paused and she looked at me, she said—all of this that is happening, the Iran war, all these different actions—she said: But what about us? What are we supposed to do?

And her question is one that all of us should be considering here in the Chamber. What about the American people? What are they getting out of this? Well, they are getting footed the bill. They are getting footed the sacrifice. They are the ones that are bearing this brunt.

When we have a third of Americans already unable to handle a \$400 emergency, that is not theoretical, that is their life right now. We see it as we see estimates already of gas prices going up so much that it is—what?—over \$115 billion more than American families have had to bear, nearly \$900 per household more since the start of this war.

And over and over again, is this making us safer and more secure? Very clearly, no. And we see that just with the continued attacks, the continued violence, the spread of this now with Saudi Arabia, the Houthis. We are seeing this all over the place through the Middle East. I have worked in war zones; I have worked in the Middle East as a State Department officer, as a diplomat; and I have seen where this heads.

Chaos is not a negotiating tactic. Trump is simply in over his head here. The entire administration is in over their head, and, again, the American people are the ones bearing this cost.

As we talk about that cost to our future, the war has cost a lot of money. I have shared with you the costs at the gas pump. We see how much we have had to pay in the past for the previous wars of Iraq and Afghanistan. We do not want that going forward.

I literally just yesterday celebrated the birthday of one of my sons. I do not want him and his generation to bear the burdens of these reckless decisions made by Trump.

This is something we need to make sure we are pushing forward on. I think a lot about that woman in New Jersey that I mentioned. I wonder how she is holding up since I last talked to her, how she is bearing the cost of this war.

And when we recess here shortly, I want to be able to go back to her and tell her what I heard, tell her what I tried to do, tell her what we tried to do

here in the Senate. I wanted to tell her that I did everything that I could so she could breathe a little easier, be able to support her family in the way that she wants, that we—Democrats and Republicans—were able to come together and recognize that the cost to the American people is too great and that we need to work together to stop this war.

So please, I ask my colleagues here at the Senate: Join me. Let's pass this resolution and do the right thing for the American people; do the right thing for our Constitution; do the right thing for our servicemembers in harm's way; do the right thing by ending this war.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. President, ever since the USS *Abraham Lincoln* was commissioned in the waning days of the Cold War, it has been known for many things. After a volcano erupted in the Philippines in 1991, the *Lincoln* led the largest peacetime evacuation of United States military personnel and their families. A baby was even born on board during the evacuation and named Abraham Lincoln.

In 1993, the *Lincoln* became the first carrier in the Pacific fleet to integrate female aviators. But today, as a result of the President's war with Iran, the *Lincoln* has achieved another distinction, one it neither sought nor wished to claim. And that is for more than 300 days, over 5,000 sailors and marines aboard the *Lincoln* were at sea, without visits to their family or their loved ones, without visits to friends apart from fellow servicemembers.

In fact, the *Lincoln* set a modern-day record for consecutive days at sea without a port visit and a record away from its home port of San Diego. And even now, just recently, after stopping in Thailand for its first regular port call in nearly 9 months, hull rusted, paint peeling, the *Lincoln* and its crew were still a long way from home. As the President's senseless war has dragged on, it has taken a heavier toll on the lives and well-being of our servicemembers and their families, many of whom are in California.

So how does the Commander in Chief respond when asked last month if carriers like the *Lincoln* had been deployed too long? Donald Trump said, and this is a direct quote:

No, no, no. Not nearly long enough.

Not nearly long enough?

It was long enough that our sailors had been working 12- to 16-hour shifts, at times facing the danger of enemy missiles. It was long enough that they were forced to ration food and water, shortages that have reportedly caused severe weight loss and health impacts.

It was long enough that crew members have had severe mental health crises, which created significant distress for their families as well to the point where some servicemembers sought to jump off the carrier into the sea. It was

long enough that servicemembers had to deal with black mold that drips, as one servicemember described “onto your face, shoulders, arms, or head while standing in line for a meal or even walking out of the shower.”

Doug, a constituent from California, wrote a letter to me expressing his deep concerns over his son’s service on the *Lincoln*. His son had to be medically evacuated from the ship after suffering a collapsed lung, which Doug believes was connected to malnutrition and overexertion.

The crew went about 4 weeks without hot water or laundry. They were on rations for 2 to 3 months while working 12- to 16-hour days.

During that time his family spent thousands of dollars sending him food, but only about half of it arrived.

Doug went on:

After time in the ICU, he returned home to us as a shell of the son who had left. He is 6’5 and left weighing 210 pounds, and he returned closer to 180 pounds. He resembled a starved prisoner of war.

What he told me as a father and veteran turns my stomach and must be brought to light.

Another constituent of mine, Annabelle from San Diego, shared her story about her husband attempting to jump overboard from the *Lincoln* during his deployment. “He is scared” she said. “He thinks he will get a dishonorable discharge.” And just because he was burned out, his 13-year career was ruined just like that.

That is not fair. That is not right. That is not what he should be worrying about right now. But this is what Annabelle and her three kids are now living with.

Shelby, a high schooler whose mom is deployed on the *Lincoln*, spoke about how hard it is to start her senior year without her mom. She asked “Will she be back before homecoming? my birthday? Christmas?”

I have no idea, and that is all that I think about.

This week, we learned from the Acting Secretary of the Navy that eight U.S. Navy personnel assigned to the *Lincoln*’s carrier strike group attempted suicide during the prolonged time at sea.

The Navy also confirmed that one sailor went overboard from the ship this summer, while another attempted to go overboard. After months of denials, the Defense Department confirmed what has been reported for months, and that is deteriorating mental health aboard the *Lincoln* and multiple attempts by sailors to jump overboard.

These are just some of the alarming, dangerous, and shameful conditions our sailors and marines have endured aboard the *Lincoln* and also what our families are going through while Pete Hegseth posts workout videos and Donald Trump renames lakes and pores over blueprints for the gilded ballroom.

For Donald Trump and his billionaire cronies, events in black tie; for our servicemembers aboard the *Lincoln*,

showers and meals with black mold. Could there be a clearer encapsulation of this administration’s misplaced priorities?

So the American people were told that the war would be over very soon. That was March 9–10 days after the war started. Now the United States is more than 6 months into this disastrous war. Months of negotiations to end the conflict have failed, but the President promises us that the war will soon come to an end after the election.

And what have we achieved in this war that has cost the lives of 19 U.S. servicemembers? Prices at the pump and grocery checkout have skyrocketed. Diesel prices, fertilizer prices are crushing farmers while resultant food prices are crushing the rest of America. Utility and medical bills are out of control. Everyone but the President and his buddies are painfully aware that we are experiencing an affordability crisis in America while the President says “not long enough.”

In the closing days of the Mexican-American War, our 16th President, whose name the *Lincoln* proudly carries, was a freshman here in Congress. He wrote to his law partner:

The provision of the Constitution giving the war-making power to Congress, was dictated, as I understand it, by the following reasons—

Lincoln wrote—

Kings had always been involving and impoverishing their people in wars, pretending generally, if not always, that the good of the people was the object. This, our convention understood to be the most oppressive of all Kingly oppressions; and they resolved to so frame the Constitution that no one man should hold the power of bringing this oppression upon us.

But your view—

Lincoln wrote—

destroys the whole matter, and places our President where Kings have always stood.

We need to take Lincoln’s words to heart. This Congress is not a royal court to do the bidding and bow and scrape before an all-powerful sovereign. We are a coequal branch of government, and 250 years into this experiment in self-governance, we should show Lincoln’s resolve.

Will we continue to place the President where Kings have stood, or will we say at long last, “enough”?

Will we make it clear that this war, illegal from the start, has gone on too long?

Will we insist on the removal and return of our troops?

I pray that we will, and I urge support on this resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. MORENO. Mr. President, I am going to yield my time to my colleague from Michigan to start first—5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

CONNECTED VEHICLE SECURITY ACT

Ms. SLOTKIN. Mr. President, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support the Connected Vehicle Security Act.

I want to acknowledge what a rare thing this is as we sit on the floor, myself and Senator MORENO, a Democrat and a Republican, working together on an issue of common cause.

It is a bipartisan bill that would protect America’s auto industry and would protect our manufacturing base and protect our national security above all else. Now, I am completely biased. I am the junior Senator from Michigan. The auto industry helped build America, helped invent the middle class.

Millions of workers in the State of Michigan work in some way associated with the auto industry. And that is why I feel very strongly that we must ban Chinese cars from ever being sold in the United States.

Now, on our national security, I am a former CIA officer and Pentagon official. This is my bread and butter. I just want to be clear that Chinese cars—with their high-end video, with their LiDAR, with their geolocation, with their ability to collect on our important infrastructure sites, our military bases, the ability to track where an individual leader is driving, the ability for these cars to be hacked and remotely piloted—it does provide a threat to the everyday American and our national security.

It is literally a driving spy machine on wheels. All of that data and all of that information goes back to Beijing. It is not held in the United States. These cars connect to the internet. They take videos of our kids. They track individual movements.

Now, we all know that as the Senator from Michigan, I am going to care about our economic security. A million plus jobs are associated in the State of Michigan with the auto industry. But the advantage that I think the Chinese are trying to get is to get a foothold into the country, start bringing those cars over our borders, over our bridges and our tunnels, set up shop here in the United States so that they can get access to the extremely lucrative market in the United States.

What this bill does is it bans vehicle hardware and software that are designed, developed, or manufactured in China by Chinese companies. That means they can’t be imported, manufactured, or sold here.

This is not a partisan issue. We have sent out the bill to all of our colleagues, and by a very, very strong majority, they have come back and said yes. That doesn’t happen every single day. It is supported by our automakers, by organized labor—a broad coalition of individuals and institutions that know that if we threaten our American auto establishment and we threaten our manufacturing base, we threaten our ability to be a powerhouse in manufacturing across the world. It is co-sponsored by more than 50 Senators on both sides of the aisle.

I want to thank Senator MORENO for his cooperation and his team’s cooperation. We have worked this painstakingly over months to keep stakeholders

involved. He and I don't agree on everything, but we certainly agree that letting in these cars subsidized by the Chinese Communist Party would be the end of the American auto industry. That is not going to happen on my watch. I know that is not going to happen on his watch.

I want to thank everybody who came and worked hard in this partisan environment to send a very strong message that Chinese cars are banned here in the United States.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. MORENO. Mr. President, I would like to acknowledge my colleague from Michigan for working so well together on this bill. We don't agree on a lot. We do agree 100 percent that Ohio State has a better football team.

Ms. SLOTKIN. No.

Mr. MORENO. But, look, I think, for the people watching, Americans ultimately—whether you are a Democrat or a Republican or an Independent, you just want a government that works for you. You want a government that functions, that isn't chaotic, that is actually laser-targeted on not only fixing problems but avoiding problems. This is a huge problem that is coming up.

If you were to go back in a time machine about 26 years, in this Chamber, they passed a bill called the China Normalization Act. The idea was that if we could normalize relations with China, China would enter the World Trade Organization, and it would be absolutely phenomenal for the United States because we would get a place to make things really inexpensively. But what has happened over 25 years, 26 years is that China has built a massive military machine.

We go into meeting after meeting, and whether it is election integrity and the assault on that, whether it is the assault on our critical infrastructure, whether it is the fact that they have blatantly stolen our intellectual property—you were the Ambassador to Japan. You dealt with this every day, with the Japanese saying: Look, the threats from China are real; they are ever present.

If we only could have avoided that vote 26 years ago. I can tell you that what we are talking about here today is even more existential.

As my colleague from Michigan mentioned, it was the auto industry uniquely that built the middle class in this country.

I believe that in a future time, a future Congress, we are going to unite, Republicans and Democrats, around one simple concept: that our job here collectively is to make certain that an American citizen can graduate from high school and get a good enough paying job that they can afford a home, afford to get married, afford to start a family, be able to live in a safe community, and most importantly, retire with dignity. It seems to me that is actually the essence of the American dream.

But these jobs are few and far between. They are hard to get. The auto industry can do that.

Let me show just a little chart here for my colleagues. It shows just how important the auto industry is to America—963,000 factory jobs, direct factory jobs.

In your State, I don't have to tell you—I can only imagine how many auto plants you have visited, whether it is Nissan in Smyrna, GM in Spring Hill, or Volkswagen in Chattanooga. You have autos all over your State. These are really, really good jobs. The people who work in those factories meet the definition I just said. We have to make certain, as policymakers, that we do everything possible to make certain those jobs are protected.

If you look at the entire auto industry, when you look at the supply chain—because there are a lot of pieces and parts that go into a car. It is the second largest purchase somebody will make after their home. Mr. President, 2.4 million good, high-paying jobs—these are not minimum-wage jobs; these are family-sustaining wages—and 11 million jobs when you think about the effects. In Chattanooga, TN, the fact that Volkswagen is there, you have all kinds of businesses that exist because of the employment there, because of those wages that allow people to buy homes, spend money.

Now, what is the counter? What is the threat here? What are we really doing? China understands this, I think, better than we do, honestly—the importance of building their middle class—so what they have done over the last two decades is targeted the auto industry, not to compete in the auto industry but to conquer the auto industry, to create what I have dubbed “automotive fentanyl” where they create these predators that go out and don't just compete—because General Motors, Ford, Toyota—you name it—can compete with any car company on Earth. They can't compete with a country that is hell-bent on total conquest.

They now make almost four times as many cars as we do here in America. They export almost as many cars as we make here in America. While their domestic market is dropping, they are producing ever more cars. They need to feed that beast. They need to feed that machine. So what do they do? They go into countries like Germany where, when you are born, the first words from your parents are “You have to buy a German car.” Thirty-four percent of hybrids sold in Germany last month were Chinese—in a country that is culturally inclined to buy German vehicles. You look at countries like Ecuador. Fifty-seven percent of the new cars sold in Ecuador are Chinese vehicles. Mexico and Canada are starting to go there. All over the world, you are starting to see this total domination.

In the case of Germany again, Volkswagen Group, which is partially owned by a government entity in Germany,

for the first time in their history had to lay off 150,000 workers. Why? Because they can't compete with the nation of China that is hell-bent on destroying their industries.

This is the reality of what we are talking about—\$1.2 trillion in GDP. This is what is at stake.

So I will conclude with this. It is really hard to pass legislation. We know that. Our Founders wanted it that way. They wanted to make certain that two Senators from every State, big or small, would have to come together to figure out how to get to a compromise. That requires enormous effort. Introducing bills that will never pass—that is easy. We keep the clerks very busy with papers for bills that will never pass. This is a bill that has almost 100 out of 100 Senators on board. People have totally different ideological points of view, but on this, we have united, which is we cannot allow this threat to happen.

I am confident and hopeful that I can come back to you, Mr. President, next week with my colleague from Michigan and that we can pass the Connected Vehicle Security Act and that when the House comes back on November 8, that the House take up an identical version of this bill that Congressman MOOLENAAR and Congresswoman DINGELL have been working on and that we can get this bill in the hands of the President.

I know that he feels the same way I do, which is that we are not going to let these cars into our market; we are going to make certain that we defend the U.S. auto industry.

So thank you again to my colleague for the hard work. Thank you to all of my colleagues in the U.S. Senate that have provided input and have gotten us to the point where we have a phenomenal piece of legislation. I am very, very hopeful that we will absolutely get this done next week.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. RES. 226

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, the Chinese Government will do anything, at any cost, anywhere in the world to silence its critics.

Freedom House has documented hundreds of cases of the Chinese Government stalking, intimidating, even assaulting people outside of China, people all around the world—a lot of people right here in our United States of America. This stalking and intimidation of people on our soil is absolutely unacceptable.

This goes by the term “transnational repression.” It is China taking its tactics of suppressing dissent and extending them right here where we have freedom of speech in the United States of America. Thus, while President Xi is here in Washington, we need to send a message that says that this is unacceptable, that our Constitution guarantees that every person here in the United States has the right to speak

freely, including the right to criticize our government and certainly the right to criticize foreign governments without fear of retaliation. That is what freedom of speech is.

So I am calling on the Senate today to affirm our belief in and commitment to this principle of free speech. That is why this resolution is a bipartisan resolution, with Senator DAN SULLIVAN and Senator JOHN CURTIS bringing it forward, to say that these Chinese tactics to suppress freedom of speech in the United States and intimidate our citizens are unacceptable.

We have seen what China has done at home. We have seen what they have done to enslave the Uighurs with facial recognition technology. We have seen what they have done to force Tibetan children into boarding schools. We have seen what they have done in Hong Kong to arrest and imprison those who criticize the Chinese Government. We have seen their journalists jailed for reporting the truth.

But it hasn't been enough for China simply to conduct these practices on Chinese soil; they are exporting those practices here to the United States of America. Freedom House calls this "the long arm of authoritarianism." It is stretching beyond the borders of China, all around the world—countless stories of how China has intimidated people on our soil into silence.

I was struck by a woman in California who said: This individual walked up to me, said "We know where your family is located in China," and walked away.

Why did that happen? Because she had expressed disagreement with some of the policies of China, particularly their oppressive strategies back home.

Last week, I spoke with a woman who told me that a member of her family had criticized the Chinese Government, and in retaliation, the Chinese Government had arrested dozens of her family members, not one or two—it should be zero—but dozens.

I spoke with journalists from Radio Free Asia. More than 70 relatives of Radio Free Asia's Uighur news service have been imprisoned or harassed in China in retaliation for reporting done here in the United States by American journalists.

Beijing has been abusing international institutions, like Interpol and the U.N., to smear and stalk people who are testifying to what is happening to the Uighurs, what is happening in Hong Kong, what is happening to the Tibetan children.

In July, Beijing made their long arm of authoritarianism official law. Article 63 of a new Chinese law called the Ethnic Unity and Progress Law claims authority for the Chinese Government to hold people and organizations outside of China legally liable for undermining unity and creating division. That is obviously code for "criticizing the Chinese Government." It is unacceptable that we are allowing this to happen right here.

We want to reinforce President Trump in conveying to Premier Xi that this is not OK or acceptable. There are lots of other discussions taking place about ships, about critical minerals, about trade, but absolutely we should affirm as a Senate that we stand behind freedom of speech and reject China's ability and authority to intimidate, stalk, and oppress people on our soil.

This week, I led my Senate and House colleagues in a letter to Secretary of State Rubio and Homeland Security Secretary Markwayne Mullin and others urging them to protect our freedom of speech here at home.

As noted by the FBI, "If you are in the United States, including a U.S. territory, your freedoms are protected." That sums it up. Your freedoms are protected. And that is why we need to send this message.

Let's send this powerful, bipartisan message that in the United States of America, people are free to speak, that authoritarians don't get to bring their repression onto our American soil.

With that, let us fulfill our oath that we took to our Constitution to defend it, including defending our freedom of speech, and unanimously pass this resolution that says that the long arm of Chinese authoritarianism is unwelcome here in the United States, that it is unacceptable here in the United States.

And to do that, Mr. President, notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consideration of Calendar No. 247, S. Res. 226; further, that the committee-reported substitute amendment to the resolution be agreed to, the resolution be amended as agreed to, the committee-reported substitute amendment to the preamble be agreed to, the preamble as amended be agreed to, and that the motions to be considered be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Kentucky.

MR. PAUL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, as the author of "The Case Against Socialism," I take a backseat to no one in my opposition of socialism, communism, or any other form of collectivism.

In "The Case Against Socialism," I wrote:

This is the story of an evil well documented and yet still somehow enticing, even in America. This is the story of socialism in all its drab and dreary machinelike destruction of individual thought, creativity, and ambition. This is the story of socialism in all its violence, bloodshed, and tyranny. It is a cautionary tale of how America has so far eluded the siren call of something for nothing, of an equality determined and enforced by government—but also of how close we still are to succumbing to socialism.

My concern is far greater that America will succumb to socialism by choice than by foreign invasion. The question is, Will this next generation follow the path of previous generations? Will to-

day's youth emerge from their parents' basements and begin to earn a living, discover that their success depends on their merit and hard work or will they succumb to the allure of something for nothing?

In "The Case Against Socialism," I pull no punches about the tyranny and violence of Mao and the panopticon of China's surveillance state today. But I draw a distinction between articulating the horrors of Chinese authoritarianism and Senate resolutions intended to embarrass Chinese leaders who are visiting our country.

The art of diplomacy is the art of pulling punches, avoiding insult, attempting to find common ground. Diplomacy creates a space to refer to someone as "President" even though the world knows they were elected by a small group in a single-party state.

The leadership between the United States and China is the most consequential of the 21st century. As such, we should strive to at least have decent working relations with one another. That is why I fully support President Trump's overture to meet with President Xi.

We should not advance symbolic condemnation that unnecessarily undermines United States-China diplomacy with no tangible benefit to United States' interests. Instead, we should encourage more United States-China dialogue given the consequences of a hostile relationship, not symbolically poke them in the eye before the first state visit in 10 years.

Diplomacy is fast becoming a lost art. I, for one, hope that President Trump's diplomacy will lessen the tensions between the United States and China.

I, therefore, object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection was heard.

MR. MERKLEY. Mr. President, this resolution says the Senate condemns China for a systematic campaign of transnational repression, affirms that all individuals residing in the United States have the right to live free from foreign government intimidation, coercion, and surveillance. I do not understand—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time is expired.

MR. MERKLEY. I do not understand why any Member of the Senate would object to defending freedom of speech here in the United States of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

H. CON. RES. 89

MS. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise today to urge the Senate to assert its constitutional authority and to demand accountability for the grave costs that servicemembers, their families, and the American people have shouldered because of the President's war in Iran.

After more than 6 months—6 months—it is clear that the President had no plan when the war started and has no plan for how to end it.

To be clear, Iran is a terrorist state and should never have a nuclear weapon, and the regime's aggression in the region and repression of Iranian citizens must end. That is why I have long supported sanctions against Iran as well as the Iran nuclear agreement negotiated by President Obama and our allies. And I opposed President Trump's decision to take us out of that agreement.

Our ultimate goal must be peace in the region. But more than 6 months into this conflict, American service-members have been killed, including my constituent MSG Nicole Amor, who was among those killed by an Iranian strike on a United States facility in Kuwait on March 1. Innocent civilians across the region have also been killed, and the costs keep mounting.

Beyond the toll on human life, the costs of the war to taxpayers is staggering. The Pentagon recently estimated that it has already spent \$42 billion on this unauthorized war so far—\$42 billion.

This is money that could be used to expand childcare or to restore healthcare premium tax credits to help millions of Americans who have seen their healthcare premiums double or triple this year or how about the 8 million people who, just this last year, have given up coverage entirely? That \$40 billion, that could have extended the tax credits to help people afford their insurance premiums for over a year. And now the President is asking for \$70 billion more. That is 2 more years of those tax credits.

As a result of this war, American families continue to face spiking gas prices, costing consumers more than \$800 per family in higher gas and diesel costs. American people, outside of what I just outlined that the Pentagon has spent of its taxpayer money, have spent over \$100 billion on this war in higher prices.

In Minnesota, gas prices are up more than a \$1.50 since the day before the war started. Diesel prices—right as farmers are going to harvest—have doubled across the country.

These higher fuel prices also make trucking, in addition to farming and freight, more expensive, hitting families and small businesses over and over again when you add to that the tariffs.

That is why Congress must step up and assert our authority under the Constitution. Congress did not authorize this war. And more than 6 months in, Congress still has not authorized this war—6 months in. And our colleagues on the other side of the aisle keep just giving up their authority.

Why even come here? Why even take this job if you are going to just let one President run over you and be able to make his own calls and just say: Hey, we are going to a war. It is going to cost the American people over \$100 billion. It is going to spike up prices across the country. Innocent people are going to be killed, and then we are going to lose soldiers at the same time.

In fact, both Houses of Congress have passed resolutions to stop this unauthorized war. I have voted a dozen times to stop this war, unless Congress passes an authorization, and I will continue to vote that way until Congress restores its role in decisions of war and peace.

The American people are asking what this war has accomplished:

Are we closer to a strong and strict agreement to curtail Iran's nuclear ambitions? The answer is no.

Are we now dealing with Iranian leaders who are less hardline? The answer is no.

Have we preserved open shipping routes that are so important for trade? Answer, no.

It is time for the President to end this war. It is time for the work to bring costs down for the American people and foster lasting peace in the region. This is our moment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I am on the floor today to support yet another resolution to end the war in Iran.

Here is the latest poll regarding public support or approval. Eighteen percent of respondents—this latest CNN poll—say that President Trump's decisions around the war in Iran are helping the United States. Seventy percent of Americans say that his decisions around the Iran war are hurting Americans. That is a stunning number.

Basically, it is only the hard-core MAGA supporters that still believe this war is a good idea. Everybody else—Independents, Democrats, independent-thinking Republicans—have all decided that this body needs to vote to end this war. And it is not hard to figure out why.

Here is a chart that is familiar to my colleagues. This is the unreal spike in gas and diesel prices that has occurred solely because of this war.

If you are in Indiana right now, diesel is \$7 a gallon. That is why farms are going bankrupt right now in the Midwest at record rates; the tariffs and the high price of diesel. But for American consumers who are just filling up their tank with gasoline, the same disaster: in California, above \$6 a gallon; in many States, above \$5 a gallon. And it is just going up and up and up.

But Americans also see this has been a national security disaster for the country. It has obviously been an economic nightmare. Mortgage rates are at 7 percent again, by the way, if you hadn't noticed. That is because of the war, primarily; the tariffs as well.

But Americans oppose this war 70 to 18 in the current poll because they know that it is hurting our national security. We have not had a resolution on the floor in a number of weeks.

So I just want to talk about four things that have happened in the last few weeks that show how this war is spiraling and spiraling out of control. Every single day, this war becomes

more dangerous for the region, more of a disaster for the United States.

One of the things that the administration said that was a motivating factor for the war was getting rid of Iran's missiles. I don't know how many times we heard Secretary Hegseth tell us that the goal was to destroy Iran's missiles and missile capacity. And back in April, he claimed that they had functionally destroyed—that is his word—“functionally” destroyed Iran's ability to make new missiles.

Well, the Wall Street Journal just reported that Iran is producing ballistic missiles again at scale. And we only were able to eliminate around 30 percent of the missiles. They have most of their stockpiles from before the war, and now they are producing missiles. Again, satellite imagery shows that Iran is rebuilding bridges and roads to production sites; they are restoring tunnel entrances; and they are building capacity again.

Iran is building missiles again. This is the whole reason we were going into the war—a total failure—to eliminate Iran's missile capacity.

What is the strain on our service-members? Well, we just learned this week that eight Navy sailors aboard the USS *Abraham Lincoln* have attempted suicide. Two of those sailors, as we all know, tried to jump overboard to end their lives. This is a ship that has been without a port call—was without a port call for 286 days. That is abdication of leadership, an abdication of the responsibility to care about our troops' safety by our Department of Defense leadership.

We have sailors and soldiers and airmen that are in crisis right now because we have put them in harm's way for far longer—for far longer—than any brave man or woman who has signed up to defend this Nation deserves to be in harm's way.

We have a new war that has broken out. A new war has broken out in the last 2 weeks. This was totally predictable.

Everybody said: If you go to war with Iran, the Houthis are not going to stand put. They are going to start firing inside Yemen and at the Saudis, and that is exactly what has happened.

Drone strikes from the Houthis have knocked out Saudi Arabia's bypass pipeline earlier this month. They have seized control of routes along the Red Sea. And, functionally, the Red Sea is now shut down as a means for the Saudis to move oil out of the region. This is part of the reason why gas prices continue to go up.

The Strait of Hormuz is partially open again, but at what expense? Pre-war, it cost a supertanker \$200,000 to move through the strait. Today, it costs—this is a per-day cost. Today, it costs \$1 million per day for a supertanker to move through the strait, five times the cost before the war. That alone adds \$26 to the cost of each barrel of oil. So, even though we are moving some transit through the Strait of

Hormuz, it is at a cost that consumers can't afford.

Finally, there has been satellite imagery in the last few weeks that has shown new construction inside Iran around a complex called Pickaxe Mountain. This is probably their new, most important nuclear site. It looks as if they are digging a very deep bunker—deeper than Fordow—to restart their nuclear research program. As one expert said, the window to strike Pickaxe Mountain has already expired because the regime has dug so far underground that we can now not hit it.

So they are restarting the nuclear program. They are restarting their missile production program. We have not eliminated their drone capability. We are leading up to a mass suicide and self-harm crisis amongst our service-members. Costs are spiraling out of control for consumers and for farms. A new war is breaking out in the region that threatens the stability of the Middle East and further drives up gas prices.

That is why support for this war is at 18 percent in this country. We are supposed to be a democratic body that listens to the will of the people. The people—whether they are Republicans, Independents, or Democrats—are telling us loudly and unequivocally: End this war.

And it is not like we can't. This resolution is a chance for this body to end the war. So we are pleading, once again—it is the tenth time that we have had a resolution like this—for our colleagues to join us. The American public is making it clear: They can't handle the costs of this war, and they can't stand for the national security harm it is doing to the United States. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, today, I rise, once again, in strong opposition to Donald Trump's illegal war in Iran.

For more than 6 months now, American families have paid the price for this President's war of choice. This conflict has cost the lives of 18 of our servicemembers. It has cost American taxpayers \$43 billion, and it has cost families, small businesses, and manufacturers, as the price of just about everything has skyrocketed.

I have been traveling across Wisconsin to hear from my constituents as to just what this war has cost them.

In Milwaukee, I have heard from veterans about the cost of war on our soldiers, their families, and their communities.

In Madison, I have heard from parents who are seeing a 20-percent increase in the cost of back-to-school essentials, like lunch boxes and notebooks and paper.

In La Crosse, I heard from a hardware store owner about the impact of the rising costs on goods in his store and what that means for his customers.

In Green Bay, one manufacturer told me that his supplier of raw aluminum

in the Middle East—a product that he can only get overseas—was literally bombed. That is on top of the hundreds of thousands of dollars in increased costs from tariffs and the war generally.

Our Wisconsin farmers are just getting hammered. They had higher fertilizer costs at the planting season, higher fuel costs just to run their equipment, and because of Trump's trade wars, they have fewer places to sell their produce. During this year's planting season alone, Wisconsin farmers spent nearly \$44 million more on diesel fuel than they did last year. As of today, the price of diesel in Wisconsin is a whopping \$6.59 a gallon for our farmers and our truckers.

The devastating impact of this war cannot be overstated. These families are trying to put food on the table. Small business owners are trying to stay afloat. Farmers are just trying to break even.

Wisconsinites never wanted this war. Yet they continue to pay for it every day. They are paying more at the pump, more at the grocery store, and more to keep their businesses and farms running.

The American people deserve better than an endless war that is costing American lives and making it harder for them to get by at home.

I urge my Republican colleagues to join us in bringing an end to this war of choice and vote yes on this resolution. With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. President, this war in Iran absolutely, immediately must end, and it will only end if the person who started it with the unilateral decision to go to war decides to end the war.

We in the Senate have voted numerous times to end this war. We can't do it unless we get votes from the other side of the aisle, but it is absolutely disgraceful that the United States is in this war.

It was a decision of two men, not of two legislative bodies and not of two votes of the American people, but of two men—Donald Trump and Binyamin Netanyahu. Netanyahu was in the Situation Room, making his case that we should go to war with Iran. Any of the advisers to the President said it was a bogus claim that it would be done overnight, which is essentially what the assertion was.

So our President made a decision—and it was a unilateral decision by him, a unilateral decision—that we go to war. He told the American people it would be over in a couple of days, just like in Venezuela, and that the people of Iran would rise up and take out the Ayatollah. Many Iranians did rise up, and they got slaughtered.

The President bragged about the military might—and we do have a strong military—but his strategic thinking was totally flawed and foolish. He thought bombing could resolve

something that it couldn't. So, yes, we bombed. Yes, the leadership in Iran was wiped out.

But then Iran did what military advisers knew it would do, but the President could not listen. They used an asymmetric response—drones—to close the Strait of Hormuz. The impact here has been going on for over 6 months, and the only way we can assess what has happened is to come to the conclusion that the President's policy was a complete failure. It is not working.

The President continues to promote a nonpolicy and to assert we are putting the squeeze on Iran.

Mr. President, you are putting the squeeze on farmers in Iowa. You are putting the squeeze on the tourist industry in Vermont. You are putting the squeeze on manufacturers in Wisconsin. You are putting the squeeze on the American people.

You know, for a farmer in the Midwest who wants to fill up his combine with diesel, it is 1,500 extra dollars a day. And for what? For what? For the ego of a man who capitulated to the pressures of Binyamin Netanyahu—and that is what he did—and who does not have the leadership ability or the character to assess what has happened in these past 6 months and acknowledge that it is time for a change?

This is a day-to-day catastrophe, and the man who started this must end it. But we, as U.S. Senators, with the responsibility and the trust given to us by the people who elected us, have a say, and it is time for us to say: End this war. End this war now. Arrogance is not a substitute for good judgment. Arrogance is not an expression of toughness and resolve.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. WELCH. It is time to end this war.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President, President Trump's war against Iran has been deeply unpopular—from the very first day—in Virginia and among Americans, and it is growing more and more unpopular with each passing day.

It is unpopular because Americans don't want to see 18 troops lose their lives. They don't want to see the Pentagon undercounting troop deaths.

It is unpopular because the American people don't want to see hundreds of combat casualties for no legitimate purpose and a concern that the Pentagon is undercounting combat casualties.

It is unpopular because Americans—and Virginians, in particular—don't want to see extended deployments of carrier strike groups and their loved ones away from home. A report came out yesterday that there were eight attempted suicides in the Lincoln Carrier Strike Group because of the extended deployment.

It is unpopular because having your sons and daughters deployed overseas,

as 1,200 Virginia Guard members were last Saturday, in a war of choice and with no clear plan or strategy, leaves families uncertain about the future.

It is unpopular because diesel prices are going up, and other prices are going up.

It is unpopular because Americans don't want to see a U.S. missile hit a school and kill hundreds of kids.

It is unpopular because Americans don't appreciate a leader who would tear up a diplomatic deal that was working and, instead, prefer a war that is not working.

It is unpopular because it is depleting our munitions.

It is unpopular because it is adding to our debt.

It is unpopular because Americans have spent now more than 100 billion extra dollars in fuel costs than they would have without this war.

The good news is that we can do something about it. We don't have to stand back and just say: Wow, the President has decided, for silly reasons, to start an illegal war, and I guess we just have to go along.

And that is what this vote is about.

We have taken an oath to support and defend the Constitution. The Constitution says the President cannot declare war, only Congress can. There has been no congressional declaration of war. The President is violating the Constitution with this war.

There is a statute that allows the President to defend the country for 60 days without Congress, but it requires that that military action expire at the end of 60 days. We are well past 60 days. The President is not only not following the Constitution, he is not following the War Powers Act.

Third, we have passed a concurrent resolution—Congress, both Houses, under a Republican majority—declaring the war illegal. The President has ignored that.

We directed him: Withdraw troops or get an authorization.

He has done neither, and it is not likely he will do either.

But the American public is speaking loud and clear and saying: You in the Senate—you can do something about it.

And that is what this resolution is about.

The House, for the second time, has passed a concurrent resolution provided under the War Powers Act. We will now vote, and it is my hope we will vote with them to declare, yet again, that this is an illegal war and that the President should stop it.

In closing, I will just say this: The President appeared at the U.N. earlier this week and said it was his decision as to whether to annihilate the nation of Iran. We have never had a President who talks like this, and we never should again. But it is not his decision; it is our decision.

The time to make a decision to end this war is upon us. I urge a "yes" vote on the concurrent resolution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we start the vote scheduled for 1:45 now.

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

VOTE ON H. CON. RES. 89

The question occurs on adoption of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. PETERS. 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. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Maryland (Ms. ALSOBROOKS) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 244 Leg.]

YEAS—49

|                 |           |            |
|-----------------|-----------|------------|
| Baldwin         | Kaine     | Sanders    |
| Bennet          | Kelly     | Schatz     |
| Blumenthal      | Kim       | Schiff     |
| Blunt Rochester | King      | Schumer    |
| Booker          | Klobuchar | Shaheen    |
| Cantwell        | Lujan     | Slotkin    |
| Collins         | Markey    | Smith      |
| Cooms           | Merkley   | Tillis     |
| Cortez Masto    | Murkowski | Van Hollen |
| Duckworth       | Murphy    | Warner     |
| Durbin          | Murray    | Warnock    |
| Gallago         | Ossoff    | Warren     |
| Gillibrand      | Padilla   | Welch      |
| Hassan          | Paul      | Whitehouse |
| Heinrich        | Peters    | Wyden      |
| Hickenlooper    | Reed      |            |
| Hirono          | Rosen     |            |

NAYS—50

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

NOT VOTING—1

Alsobrooks

The concurrent resolution (H. Con Res. 89) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORENO). The Senator from Nebraska.

FARM BILL

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, the last time that Congress passed a full farm bill was in 2018; that was 8 years ago, and that law expired in 2023. We should have passed a new bill by then, but Congress has only passed short-term extensions. A lot has changed over the past 8 years, and the farm economy looks vastly different.

To be frank, America's farmers and ranchers are struggling. Drought, high input costs and low yields have made it a very trying time.

I heard some of these concerns firsthand in August during a livestock

roundtable in Crawford, NE. I also heard this at our State fair where I listened to ag producers from across our State.

These producers are in dire need of a modern farm bill, and we owe it to them—the people who feed, fuel, and clothe us all—to enact policies that promote stability and markets to sell their products.

I keep this goal front and center as a member of the Senate Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Committee. And I am proud to say that last week, we advanced the farm bill out of committee. We are one step closer to giving America's farmers and ranchers the long-term certainty that they need.

But I am disappointed in how long it took us to get there. You know, we first tried to move the farm bill in July. The Agriculture Committee took a vote, but it failed. Every Republican voted yes. Every single Democrat voted no. This was particularly disappointing given that this year's farm bill includes numerous priorities led by Democrats.

Republicans worked in good faith to include their legislation to help the producers in their States. I am proud of those bipartisan priorities in this bill. I worked with Chairman BOOZMAN to build policies that support a safe, steady supply of food, fuel, and fiber.

Importantly, our bill also includes locking in permanent year-round E15. This is one of the most direct ways that Congress can provide relief without subsidies, by strengthening domestic demand for corn and ethanol.

We cannot continue to operate on the current waiver system. For 8 years now, we have needed a Presidential waiver for E15 to be sold during the summertime. And these waivers, they have been granted every year. But this uncertainty makes it harder for producers and retailers to invest and plan.

Permanent year-round E15, well, that would create a consistent, predictable market. It would allow farmers, ethanol plants, and fuel stations to operate with confidence.

Our biofuels producers and our retailers need that certainty. They deserve a stable market 12 months out of the year, and I have been fighting for this for over a decade. It is long overdue.

Unfortunately, there is a lot of misinformation out there circulating around E15. Let me be clear: This bill is not a government mandate. It simply gives fuel retailers the choice if they want to sell E15 at their gas station. And it also gives consumers a choice to fill up with E15 at the gas pump and to save some money.

The Environmental Protection Agency confirmed that E15 is completely safe in cars made in 2001 or later.

Let me repeat that. If you have a vehicle manufactured in 2001 or later, E15 can be used in your car. It does not hurt your engine.

So please, colleagues, public, quit saying that.

E15 expands domestic fuel options using American-grown corn. This reduces vulnerability to global supply

shocks. A more diverse energy mix of oil, gas, renewables, nuclear, and biofuels makes the United States harder to pressure, and it makes us more resilient in times of conflict and disruption.

In addition to E15, this year's farm bill includes my precision ag package, three bills that will help America's producers harness the full potential of precision agriculture. We need to make it more affordable for our farmers and ranchers to be able to access these cutting-edge tools.

In turn, we can help their operations become more productive, more efficient, and less resource intensive.

This farm bill also includes my legislation to prevent future food shortages in our Tribal nutrition programs. By incorporating input from Tribes on contracting decisions, we can strengthen this important resource for communities that depend upon it. And I was very, very happy to work with my Tribes in making sure that we got that included in this bill.

Additionally, I secured a provision to safeguard Federal conservation funds from being exploited by America's adversaries. This is going to protect U.S. taxpayers and our domestic manufacturers from being taken advantage of.

And, finally, I am very pleased to see my colleague Senator RICKETTS' FENCE Act included, a bill that I cosponsored. Senator RICKETTS' bill will give farmers and ranchers an opportunity to use virtual fencing as they build and recover from natural disasters, and this is especially helpful after the historic and devastating wildfires that blazed across Nebraska earlier this year.

All of these provisions are needed. Together, they make a 2026 farm bill a strong bipartisan legislation that truly serves our farmers, our ranchers, and rural Americans.

As a committee, we did the work. We agreed to include good bills from both Democrats and Republicans. We built strong bipartisan support for year-round E15. We offered a fair compromise on SNAP cost-share concerns.

We compromised on many items, and now we need to get this done. Let's pass the farm bill. Let's give America's farmers and ranchers the stability that they need.

To my colleagues, please, join me, and let's get this over the finish line.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

TRIBUTE TO KALINA THOMPSON

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to honor someone who has changed the lives of millions of Americans, though until this moment, they may have never heard her name: Kalina Thompson, my chief of staff, who is leaving our office at the end of the month, after more than a decade by my side.

Kalina and I did not meet as kids. We met when I was already a Congresswoman. But in a way, it still feels that

we grew up together, as we learned from each other and leaned on one another from my early days in the House, finding out what it truly means to serve this great Nation, to lead, to not just get through long workdays in order to simply make it until tomorrow, but to make sure that tomorrow is even better than yesterday for the good of those coming up behind you.

Kalina is someone whose passion for public service is matched only by her compassion for others. And don't be fooled by her soft voice; when she believes in something she will fight harder than you can imagine to transform a pipedream into a reality, to do some good, to do right by a constituent who is desperate for someone, somewhere to lend them an ear or a hand.

You know, it is rare to find someone whose North Star so closely aligns with your own, but that is what I found in Kalina; a kindred public servant, a trusted sounding board, a truth teller who will call me out when I am wrong. She somehow stays unshakable, even in moments of chaos, and beyond it all, a fiercely loyal friend.

We were there for one another as we each became mothers, and we were there for one another as we worked day and night to make sure that other new moms would have an easier time than we did.

It is thanks in large part to Kalina that my FAM Act became law, helping ensure that nursing moms traveling through airports would have access to private, clean, and accessible breastfeeding rooms.

She recognized that we would never expect a traveler to eat lunch in an airport bathroom stall. Yet, for so many new moms, they had no choice but to breast-feed in one. She saw a wrong, and she righted it.

It took 5 years, but in doing so, whether they know it or not, she bettered the lives of countless women across this country. So every time you are heading to your airport gate and see one of those breast-feeding pods, think of and thank Kalina. I know I do. That is just who she is.

She is someone who so thoroughly and thoughtfully thinks of others that sometimes she does forget to think about herself.

So it doesn't matter that folks in question are halfway down the block or halfway across the world, if she hears of someone in need, she will go sleepless until she exhausts every avenue of service.

I have watched her sacrifice time with her own family to do everything possible to help families escape war-torn countries in the Middle East. She has made calls to fellow moms across the globe just to let them know they are not alone, that we are fighting for them, that we would never stop fighting for them.

She has redefined the word "compassion" with every call she made, every ounce of hard work she put in, every time she went the extra mile for a stranger thousands of miles away.

Kalina is also a leader who has taken the lessons she has learned along her own career journey, and she used them not just for herself but for all of those climbing the ladder rungs of success behind her.

As legislative director, then as deputy chief of staff, and now as chief of staff, she has made sure that the women in our office always—always—know and fight for their worth.

Now, because of her, there is a whole generation of female staffers that believe in themselves more fully, and Congress is a better place because of it, because of Kalina.

I could go on and on about the constituents Kalina has helped, the bills she has helped to pass, the lives she has changed, the lives that she has saved, starting with her own work fighting to pass the Affordable Care Act; but let me just tell one more story.

As Democrats, we like to say that we are the party of middle-class families, which is true. But Kalina took it upon herself to make sure our office didn't just offer the standard family Senate policies for staffers, when it came to things like FMLA or parental leave. No, she wanted to set a new bar for congressional offices.

She said to me: If we want our constituents to truly believe that we would fight for their families, then we have to fight for the families of those who come to work for us every day as well.

And it wasn't simple. At first, it seemed like it would be too big of a resource hit to actually go through with the plan she was proposing. Could our budget afford it? Could our workforce afford it?

It would have been easy to just scrap the idea, to backtrack, to stick with the status quo. But Kalina refused, arguing that if we want to actually live up to our policy ideas, to our political party's ideals, it starts with us in our own backyard.

And you know what? She was right. So we became the first office in either the House or Senate to grant 16 weeks of paid leave to new parents. And then we extended our family leave policy. We made sure that we didn't just talk the talk as Democrats, but that we also walked the walk as employers. And because of her, staffers have been able to go care for their fathers battling cancer; because of her, new moms have had the time necessary to look after themselves and their little ones in those precious all-important first few months after birth. Because of Kalina, no one in our office has had to make the impossible choice between earning the paycheck that puts food on their table and being there for an ailing mom, sister, child, or spouse.

Try as hard as she might, Kalina could not singlehandedly change family leave policy for the entire country. But this was a proof point, making it clear that it is possible for an office to be there for its staffers and do its work without missing a beat, because it actually benefited our office in the long

run to provide those 16 weeks of leave, as staff members have served longer than they otherwise would have, sticking with us for long tenures, knowing that we will be there for them when it matters most during their toughest, most trying times.

And I will say, she and I don't agree on everything. There are some differences that have divided even our office right down the middle. For instance, Kalina and our former legislative director Steph would literally sit in our office in those cubes in Cannon and horrify the rest of us by happily digging into a giant mason jar of sauerkraut, eating sauerkraut right out of that jar, for instance.

But on nearly everything else, I just feel beyond fortunate to have found a partner so courageous in everything that she takes on, from learning English in America after moving from Bulgaria as a little girl to her "Love Story" karaoke performances to going head to head with the Senate Rules Committees to help me change our Chamber's bylaws to let parents take newborns onto the Senate floor.

No challenge has been too daunting for her and no task too small. She simply cares. It is who she is, and it is why I am endlessly grateful to have been able to have her by my side for so long through so much.

Let me finish by saying thank you to Kalina, of course, but also her family—Sandy, Wills, and Sofie—for lending your wife, your mom to us for those countless late nights and weekends.

Kalina, I will miss you more than I could ever say, but just know how proud all of us are of you and how lucky I feel that I got to watch you grow into the force for good that you are today.

Bon voyage, my friend. I know you are going to continue to do good for the rest of the world.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. GRAHAM). The Senator from Georgia.

TRIBUTE TO MARK LIBELL

Mr. WARNOCK. Madam President, it is my honor to rise today and give somebody gratitude for my first and, so far, only chief of staff, Mark Libell. Mark was with me from my first days in the Senate.

I have spent my entire adult life in ministry. This was my first public office. So as I made my way to the Senate, I knew that I needed someone who knew his way around here—you can relate—someone who knew where the bathrooms were and who knew how to get things done around here.

Mark was a Senate veteran and well respected by everyone who knew him, and it didn't take me long to understand why. He came to DC as an intern in 2003, and he decided he would intern until he found a job or ran out of money. He clearly was hooked. And if he ran out of money, he planned to pack up his car and return home to Alabama.

Well, luckily for all of us, Mark did not stay an intern for long. He went on

to work for my friend Senator Debbie Stabenow, Representatives Bart Gordon and LINDA SÁNCHEZ, and Senator Jay Rockefeller.

After 10 years working on Capitol Hill, Mark took his talents to the Federal Reserve Board but returned to the Senate a few years later to serve his beloved home State of Alabama as deputy chief of staff and legislative director for my friend Senator Doug Jones.

So when I say Mark knows the Senate, I mean he really knows the Senate. Although he hails from Alabama and everybody knows how serious that rivalry is between Georgia and Alabama football, we have never held that against him. He has seen this place from every angle, he has done just about every job there is to do in a Senator's office, and he has been a major asset to my mission and my work.

That is part of what makes Mark so special, because he saw so many roles. He sees himself in every staffer. He has a deep respect in every role that a person plays in a Senate office no matter their title.

Staff assistants and senior staff alike know that Mark's door is always open. He will make time to offer career advice or to solve a problem. And when staffers walk out of his office, they feel respected, and they feel heard. Most importantly, they feel like someone is in their corner rooting for them to succeed. And on more than one occasion, he has been a confidante and trusted counsel to me.

Mark has the heart of a public servant. He wrote his thesis on Bobby Kennedy. Even in a place as cynical as Washington, DC, Mark is leaving the Senate as much of an idealist as when he arrived over two decades ago. He has always believed in this institution's ability to make a difference in people's lives, and that is why Mark fought for me to keep on the entire caseworker team from my Republican predecessor and friend, the late Senator Johnny Isakson. That casework team that Mark advocated for has gone on to help nearly 68,000 constituents and is nationally recognized as one of the best casework teams in Congress. They get great things done for Georgians all the time. Because my name is on the door, I get the credit, but they do the work under Mark's leadership.

Mark believed that we could cut child poverty in half, and he helped me to do that when we passed the expanded child tax credit. He believed we could ban private equity from mass-purchasing homes, and we did just that. He believed that we could come together and lower the cost of insulin, and we did just that.

But what I most appreciate about Mark is that he always believes in this country's ability to do better, to be better. That idealism he saw in Bobby Kennedy is very much alive in him.

Mark believed in a country where a State in the old Confederacy could elect its first African-American Senator and first Jewish Senator in one

fell swoop and where a kid from Florence, AL, could go on to become one of the most influential staffers serving today in the U.S. Senate.

Because no one achieves anything alone, I would also like to thank Mark's wonderful wife Carrie for the support she has shown to Mark and my entire operation through early mornings and late nights. I would also like to thank his mother Lynn and his brother Adam. I know his father, who about a year ago passed into the light, smiles from someplace in eternity.

While Mark may be leaving the Senate tomorrow, he leaves behind dozens of staffers whom he has inspired with his patriotic idealism that a career in public service is worth it, is worth the sacrifice, that the small wins add up, that they make the difference in the lives of ordinary people, and that our future is brighter when we choose to have faith in one another.

So, Mark, from me, from my staff, and from the people of Georgia, thank you so very much. God bless you and your future endeavors. Keep the faith, and keep looking up.

(Applause.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I think we would all probably agree that we are living through in realtime the biggest technological transformation in generations.

I was lucky enough to be involved in the beginnings of the wireless industry. As an investor, I invested in companies in the internet. As significant as both of those are, they pale in comparison to what we are facing now with this transformation, and there is a lot of good that will come out of artificial intelligence. We all know that AI is already changing the way Americans work, the way businesses compete, the way scientists conduct our research, and, frankly, as to what our government should do to protect our country. Let me be clear at the outset, America has got to continue to lead this transformation.

I am down, today, with two of my colleagues—the Senator from Hawaii and the Senator from New Jersey—to say that we can't dawdle at this moment. Each of us has got a whole series of AI legislative items. I have got ideas about data centers, about kids' safety, about liability for AI agents, national security. Senator ROUNDS and I, for example, today, talked about a workforce transformation.

But we have been at a moment in time, over the last few weeks, where the AI companies themselves have acknowledged that they are creating tools and entities that they may not even be able to control. We have seen one company, OpenAI, launch a series of 3,000 AI agents that jumped over the security barriers, attacked a different company, Hugging Face, came back and tried to attack their own company—these AI agents together. The

remarkable thing is, these 3,000 agents talked to each other, communicated, tried to hide from humans, and literally left little bits of code on their paths so that subsequent groups of AI agents might come and discover those.

I have met, over the last couple of weeks, with business leaders from finance and from across corporate America who all say: What are you guys doing?

This is the issue of our time. Yes, I have got frustrations on data centers, but this is the issue of our time. This is going to be the biggest transformation of our lifetimes, and we don't have even de minimis safety protocols. We are completely relying on the good will of these large AI frontier tech companies to kind of do the right thing. That is irresponsible. You know, I am proud of the role I play in the national security domain. I have been chair or vice chair of the Intel Committee for the last decade.

Another company—not OpenAI. That was the Hugging Face incident. Anthropic created a new model called Mythos, and our head of cyber security—CYBERCOM—and the National Security Agency, General Rudd, said, basically, that Mythos is going to change warfare almost as much as drones. Luckily, we got a first look at that but only because the one company was willing to give that forward.

So we ought to have a time to have a fulsome debate about data centers, kids' safety, liability, and other issues, but right now—and we were going to do this today, but we are going to come back on Monday because the Senate has left. We are, kind of, the three of us—and we are talking to other colleagues on both sides of the aisle—saying: Let's strip back all of our personal ideas, and let's just put a marker down that potentially we could act on because we hear from some of the technology leaders that we might lose, you know, the ability to control some of these tools not in years or months, but some folks say—and I am not fully believing them—in weeks. I don't believe—I am not a “doomer” on AI—I don't think the robots are going to take over the world—but I do think, if we had an event where an AI tool went out and took over a hospital or took over a water system or shut down a power system—and Americans are already concerned about the rate of this technology change—they could shut down this innovation, and that would be the worst for our country. We need to lead this in terms of some of our competitors like China.

So what we are going to be proposing is, I think, as simple as possible. Before any AI model coming out of these frontier labs is released to the public, it ought to be tested to make sure it is safe. A lot of these big companies also do some self-testing, but they do it in what is called a sandbox, where they are supposed to protect it. Well, we have seen that some of these sandboxes are pretty sloppy. We ought to create

basic cyber security standards for that sandbox. When you start at the very beginning of how an AI model is developed, we ought to make sure that company has some basic safety protocol in place. Then, God forbid, if there is an incident, there ought to be an incident reporting so we know what is happening because the difference is, in past innovation, you could have a mistake, but it might—the amount of damage that could happen would be fairly limited. Potentially, this could be so much greater, and we literally are having the companies themselves say: Help us.

Now, Lord knows we have got to make sure this is not an effort to simply ensconce the four or five biggest companies. We have got to make sure smaller tech—VC—has a place on this safety panel, but we need national security.

We need our top scientists. We propose NIST. We are open on how to do it better, but it needs to be a public-private relationship that has a safety board. We wouldn't climb on an airplane or you wouldn't get in a car or you wouldn't get a new financial product without some regulatory oversight. With something that is as big as this, we should not miss the moment. God forbid, you know, we go away for our campaign season, and in the interim, something happens, and we have no safety in place. I spent a career in technology before I got involved in politics, but I never felt a moment like this. So I hope that we will act.

With that, Madam President, I yield the floor to my friend from Hawaii.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. SCHATZ. Madam President, I want to thank the Senator from Virginia and ranking member of the Intelligence Committee and also thank Senator KIM, the Senator from New Jersey, both of whom have real expertise in this area and as it intersects with public policy.

This is really about one simple thing, and that is, humans in control of the code and not the code in control of the humans.

We are at a seminal moment in world history, not just in American history, where it is possible for this code to escape human control. That is not an apocalyptic statement from a person who wants to make a point in a political context; that is a fact that is new to all of us. This code is capable of escaping our control, and it is potentially capable of something they call recursive self-improvement, which means the code can write its own code and that humans would find the code that was written by AI so inscrutable as to not be able to control it at all.

So what we are proposing—and I want to reiterate what Senator WARNER said. When we were in private conversation, he said: Nobody can bring their pet rock to this conversation.

What do I mean by “pet rock”?

Everybody has got a bill on AI. By the way, they are really important

things—energy use, the safety of children, the future of work, the future of intellectual property—but we are not going to solve that in a 10-day period. So what we sat down on a bipartisan basis to do with AI safety groups, with companies that are in the business—with experts—is to say: How do we reduce the acute risk now, not the societal risk over the long run, not to balance the equities between whatever it may be 2, 3, 4 years from now. How do we take down what some people are calling civilizational risk? Some people find that too apocalyptic. Fine. Let's not call it risk of extinction. Let's not call it civilizational risk. Let's just call it a high risk of something very terrible happening, and that should be enough for us to be on the floor to say: Well, why don't we try to take down that risk?

There is a very straightforward pathway. First of all, it is predeployment testing, but one of the things, I think, we have all learned is that, by the time a company is ready to deploy what they call a frontier model, it has been through some testing. So it is important to test it before it is commercially available, but the truth is that the Hugging Face incident, in particular—that thing jumped the fence way, way earlier than when you would do the predeployment testing. So we need third-party review from the jump.

And the thing about a sandbox—and I was taught this term of art about 10 years ago, and I remember talking to my tech expert in my office: What is a sandbox?

And they said: You should think of it like an actual sandbox, sort of where you experiment, where there are no wrong answers, where it may get a little messy.

So the configuration of these sandboxes has been like that—for experimentation, almost casual, very entrepreneurial.

But the problem is, these things can escape control at the sandbox level so it is not enough for predeployment testing. We also need third-party review of the process at every stage because we don't know at which point an agent—an AI—or a swarm of agents could escape human control. Then, at the end of it, we need postdeployment breach notification, analysis, transparency so that, if there are big, dangerous events, we know how to prevent them from happening in the future.

So that is all this bill does. It says: Let's get third-party review all the way through the process and then all the way up to predeployment testing. Then, if something goes badly, we have transparency on the back end. We threw out all of our “pet rocks”—nothing partisan, nothing like my longtime priority on AI, but rather the very narrow question, which is: Don't we have an obligation, if there is any risk of a power grid going down, if there is any risk of a financial system buckling, if there is any risk at all, don't we have an obligation to take down that risk

and fight about the rest of the stuff at some other time?

The kind of ironic thing about this Congress right now is that the private sector is begging to enshrine what they are starting to promise to do in Federal statutory law because they are about to say: Here are all of the safety measures we are doing. But there is a reason you don't regulate toxic chemicals or biomedical research or aviation by voluntary agreement. You need a Federal statute, and then the private sector can work toward compliance on that Federal statutory standard.

But you don't want 90 percent of the AI companies—the frontier models, the hyperscalers—complying and then the other 10 percent saying: Wait, I don't have to do that, do I? I don't have to do that, do I?

So all we are asking is that this bipartisan proposal—and it is bipartisan. We are working on it in very, very good faith to try to narrow the scope of disagreement but not narrow it to the point that we pass nothing but, rather, narrow it to the point where we pass something that takes down the immediate risk and allows us to look our constituents in the eye and say: We did something on this very, very serious and urgent matter.

With that, with the permission of the ranking member, I want to bring in the Senator from New Jersey, who has a background in tech and has a background in national security that I think adds a lot to this conversation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. KIM. Madam President, I want to thank my colleagues Senator WARNER and Senator SCHATZ for working with me and working on this project going forward.

I actually find this experience here being on the Senate floor right now really important because we are here because this is what the American people want. The American people want their elected leaders to be focused on the concerns and the threats that they worry about, that keep them up at night.

As mentioned by my colleague from Hawaii, I come to this Chamber as somebody who served in national security, someone who served under both Republican and Democratic Presidents, in war zones in Afghanistan to the Situation Room at the White House. This path of mine started just a little over 25 years ago when I saw from my own home State of New Jersey the threats that we faced on national security because of September 11.

I was not someone who thought I was going into national security until that day, but by 6 p.m. on September 11, I said that I am going to do and dedicate the rest of my life to doing everything I can to try to keep this country safe. Yes, that led to a lot of work in war zones and on counterterrorism, but it was always about this broader goal of, how do we ensure that safety?

I come at this now not just as someone who is concerned about national

security but as a father of two little boys, one of whom just celebrated his 11th birthday yesterday. And as excited as I am about seeing these two little boys grow up, I will be honest with you, I worry about what kind of world they are growing up in, the level of anxiety that I have as I see the type of technology that will define their generation. It will define not just their jobs and their education but so much about their security. So I think about them because it is not just us here in this Chamber; we are here because we are trying to answer the call of the American people.

I just did a townhall the other week. Overwhelmingly, people are calling upon us, saying that they want urgency; they want this Chamber to move with the speed of urgency that they feel.

So what I appreciate here is that we are engaged in this effort right now to do one simple thing, which is meet the moment. That has a lot of implications, but one is just the fact that no Senator in this Chamber is going to have all the answers. There is not a single one of us that knows all the answers. Neither do all the tech leaders. They don't know all the answers either. But that cannot be an excuse for inaction; that, instead, we should channel that humility and that urgency to be able to move forward and recognize we do not have time to be able to design something that will handle the entirety of all the concerns we face when it comes to AI and this technology we are concerned about but just say: Look, we need to be able to move forward, to show some progress, to show some responsiveness to the concerns raised by the American people.

I think this legislation is that effort to try to come up with tangible things that will move the needle. It is not going to solve all the problems, but that is the point. It is about trying to build up that muscle memory in this Chamber that we need to find. It is a muscle memory that this Chamber has found in the past when it has confronted different national security challenges in the past. We need to find that yet again at a time of great division in this country but setting it aside for us to be able to, again, meet this moment.

So I am just grateful, again, for the leadership of Senator WARNER, Senator SCHATZ, and other Senators that we are engaged with. This is an invitation to others to join this effort to stand up and say: Let's get something done. Let's not get totally bogged down in just the divisions that we see stalling progress on so many other fronts. The American people are demanding of us to act. Now is our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I will wrap it up here. I have been in Virginia talking about this for a while. We have a lot of data centers, which is of some concern. But, boy oh boy, there

was a seismic change starting as the companies themselves started to say: Holy heck. And just think about that. Mythos came out in March. National security and others said: This is going to change warfare. The OpenAI Hugging Face incident happened in July. That was 3,000 agents working together. In August, OpenAI got 10,000 agents to work together. It was on a different problem; they solved a math problem. But the idea is that there is kind of an exponential increase in sophistication, as these agents work together to cover their tracks, that, as Senator SCHATZ said, potentially could move beyond human control.

If we just say "Well, that is still hypothetical," let me give you two last comments.

Just today, we found that actually a model had already been released from OpenAI that attacked the Australian healthcare system. If it attacked our system, I think we would be pretty upset.

Even more compelling—some of us have written a letter to both the folks on the intel side and on the defense side—there was a ship from China sailing towards the Middle East, and we got very close to bombing that ship because the AI tool and the intel said there might be weapons on that. Thank goodness that at some point, somebody did a little more checking, and we didn't do that, but we were close to a geopolitical event that could have been catastrophic.

These tools are already built into our systems, and clearly, you know, the way our military executed on Maduro—you may not agree with the greatness of it, but it was brilliant. But we don't have safety protocols.

So we are not asking for the world. Let's do the testing early. Let's make sure that you have a safety standard in all of these companies. Let's make sure we do the sandbox right, report on the incident.

We could discuss, you know, who is on that panel. It needs to be mandatory. It needs to have government. It needs to have national security. And Lord knows we need to have researchers, scientists. All of these individuals are asking for this. Who are we to turn that down?

I am going to go back to where we started. This will be the most significant technology innovation in our lifetimes. It will make wireless and the internet and the cloud small in comparison. There could be enormous positives coming out of this. There are also going to be disruptions. But if we don't do this in a safe manner, then shame on us.

Again, I come back. You wouldn't climb on an airplane that hadn't been checked. We are just saying let's do those basic safety checks.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I wanted to add one last thing. I want to acknowledge the great work that Senator KLOBUCHAR and Leader THUNE are doing on this and Senator CANTWELL and Senator CRUZ. There are a number of other Republican Members.

This has a sense of urgency. We need to come together. We could put everybody's name on it. But history will not judge us well if, God forbid, we have an incident and we put no protections in place, for our country and for this innovation.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. HUSTED. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

#### TRIBUTE TO MAJOR GENERAL GREGORY C. PORTER

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I rise today to honor MG Gregory Porter and his 40 years of service to our country, State, and the Wyoming National Guard.

After graduating from the University of Wyoming, General Porter began his service in the Wyoming Army National Guard as an aerial observer in the 115th Field Artillery Brigade. At the start of Gov. Mark Gordon's administration, Greg was selected to lead the Wyoming National Guard as the Adjutant General.

Throughout his time as the Adjutant General, Greg has led the Wyoming Army and Air National Guard through many deployments overseas to the Middle East and Africa. Most notably, under his command, the Wyoming Army Guard 2-300th Field Artillery Regiment completed their first full battalion deployment for a field artillery mission in over 70 years. The 2-300th were also under the command and control of the 115th Field Artillery Brigade Headquarters, another first. I have had the honor to visit many of these Wyoming soldiers and airmen overseas on Thanksgiving.

Over the years, we worked shoulder-to-shoulder to secure eight C-130J Super Hercules aircraft for the 153rd Airlift Wing. This effort stands as a testament to the determination of the hard-working Wyoming servicemen and women who serve our State and Nation every day.

Through the State Partnership Program, General Porter deepened and broadened cooperation between Wyoming and Tunisia. These of military-

to-military and civilian-to-civilian exchanges include education, agriculture, and tourism. The Wyoming National Guard has been in partnership with Tunisia for over 20 years and General Porter is leaving the relationship stronger than ever.

General Porter coordinated the successful Exercise Agile Chariot with the U.S. Air Force Special Operations Command and the Wyoming Department of Transportation, WYDOT. Landing a MC-130J with a payload of MH-60 Little Birds, A-10 Thunderbolts, and a MQ-9 Reaper drone on a Wyoming highway is a first. Agile Chariot proved that Wyoming can support multi-domain operations and exercises. This exercise was a preview of the daring rescue mission to recover the two F-15 aviators downed in the mountains of Iran.

From second lieutenant to the Adjutant General, Greg Porter's leadership and dedication have equipped our National Guard with operational prowess.

I want to thank General Porter for his unwavering commitment to the Wyoming National Guard and to our Nation.

#### RECOGNIZING THE UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING FAMILY MEDICINE RESIDENCY PROGRAMS

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I rise today in celebration of the 50th anniversary of the University of Wyoming Family Medicine Residency Programs.

On Saturday, October 10, 2026, at the Wyoming Primary Care Symposium, the Wyoming medical community will gather to celebrate this significant milestone. The UW Family Medicine Residency Programs are tailored to Wyoming and our unique healthcare needs. With two separate residencies in Casper and Cheyenne, these graduate medical education programs ensure residents are well-prepared to treat patients with professionalism, skill, and compassion.

In the 1970s, the Wyoming Legislature, the University of Wyoming, and other stakeholders recognized the need for additional physicians. After exploring options to expand medical education in the State, in 1976, the Wyoming Legislature founded the UW Family Medicine Residency Programs. The programs, affiliated with the University of Wyoming's then College of Human Medicine, were intended to meet the needs of underserved communities and provide quality medical education for the next generation of Wyoming doctors.

Wyoming physicians John Corbett, MD; Charlie Huff, MD; David Driggers, MD; and Arnold Krause, MD, were instrumental in launching the residency programs. As the chair of the Wyoming State Health Care Coordinating Council, Dr. Corbett championed the cause of graduate medical education in the State. As the residency program got off the ground, he served as the acting

dean of the UW College of Human Medicine. Dr. Huff advocated for a Wyoming-focused solution as the director of the Office of Rural and Community Health. Dr. Driggers went on to serve as the associate professor, acting program director, and associate dean of the residency program. Dr. Krause served as the Cheyenne residency program director, recruiting faculty and physicians as the site grew.

In crafting the family medicine residencies, Wyoming took a unique approach. The programs were 100 percent State-funded when they were established. The Casper program was established in 1976, received its provisional accreditation in 1977, and graduated its first residents in 1979. The Cheyenne program followed, earning provisional accreditation in 1979, accepting its first residents in 1980, and receiving full accreditation in 1982.

True to the goal of providing quality medical access to the State, the UW Family Medicine Residency in Casper is a 3-year program, with 8 recent medical school graduates accepted each year. Residents perform clinical rotations in a wide range of specialties, including orthopaedic surgery, behavioral medicine, pediatrics, emergency medicine, geriatrics and advanced family medicine. The program offers five specialty tracks, including a rural and underserved global health track, a hospitalist track, and an osteopathic-focused track. Physicians who are interested in exploring the complexities of aging may pursue the program's geriatric fellowship.

The UW Family Medicine Residency in Cheyenne accepts six residents each year. These residents rotate in general surgery, community medicine, and women's health. Over the 3-year program, their opportunities include working with local patients in pediatric, dermatology, and sports medicine disciplines. The Cheyenne faculty prioritize experiences with rural medicine and treatment of patients of all ages and backgrounds. Residents also serve the local community at Cheyenne Regional Medical Center. Many program graduates go on to practice in Cheyenne and across Wyoming.

Both the Cheyenne and Casper Residency Programs offer a supportive, wellness-focused environment offering future doctors a comprehensive training program tailored with rural and frontier communities in mind. Staying true to the original goal of increasing the physician pipeline in Wyoming, there are approximately 100 UW Family Medicine Residency Program graduates practicing in the State.

The leadership of the UW Family Medicine Residency Programs embodies the values of professionalism, education, service, and excellence. They equip residents to provide comprehensive care to all, including the underserved.

The Casper program is led by:

Program Director Brian Veauthier, MD  
Associate Program Director Blaine Levy, DO