

I know we are not supposed to applaud, but I will anyway.

Thank you, Madam President.
(Applause.)

NOMINATION OF MEREDITH A. VACCA

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, today, the Senate will vote to confirm Meredith Vacca to the U.S. District Court for the Western District of New York.

Judge Vacca earned her B.A. from Colgate University and her J.D. from the University at Buffalo School of Law. After completing law school, she began her legal career in private practice as an associate attorney at Hamberger & Weiss LLP, where she focused primarily on workers' compensation insurance defense cases. In 2007, Judge Vacca joined the Monroe County District Attorney's Office as an assistant district attorney, where she tried approximately 60 cases to verdict in her 13-year tenure. Since 2021, Judge Vacca has served as a judge on the Monroe County Court, where she has presided over 21 felony trials that have gone to verdict.

The American Bar Association unanimously rated Judge Vacca "qualified" to serve on the district court, and she has the strong support of Senators SCHUMER and GILLIBRAND.

Judge Vacca's deep ties to the Rochester, NY, legal community, combined with her courtroom experience both on and off the bench, will ensure that she is ready to meet the demands of the Western District of New York from day one.

I urge my colleagues to support her nomination.

VOTE ON THE VACCA NOMINATION

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

Mr. RISCH. 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.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. FETTERMAN), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE), the Senator from Utah (Mr. ROMNEY), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VANCE).

Further, if present and voting: the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) would have voted "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 225 Ex.]

YEAS—50

Baldwin	Hassan	Reed
Bennet	Heinrich	Rosen
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Sanders
Booker	Hirono	Schatz
Brown	Kaine	Schumer
Butler	King	Shaheen
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Sinema
Cardin	Lujan	Smith
Carper	Manchin	Stabenow
Casey	Markey	Tester
Collins	Merkley	Van Hollen
Coons	Murkowski	Warnock
Cortez Masto	Murphy	Warren
Duckworth	Murray	Welch
Durbin	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Padilla	Wyden
Graham	Peters	

NAYS—41

Barrasso	Ernst	Paul
Blackburn	Fischer	Ricketts
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Braun	Hagerty	Rounds
Britt	Hawley	Rubio
Budd	Hyde-Smith	Schmitt
Capito	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lankford	Thune
Cotton	Lummis	Tillis
Cramer	Marshall	Tuberville
Crapo	McConnell	Wicker
Cruz	Moran	Young
Daines	Mullin	

NOT VOTING—9

Fetterman	Lee	Scott (SC)
Hoeven	Menendez	Vance
Kelly	Romney	Warner

The nomination was confirmed.

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

The senior Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute on the next nomination.

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

NOMINATION OF JOSEPH FRANCIS SAPORITO, JR.

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I rise just for 1 minute to talk about Judge Saporito.

Joe Saporito is someone I have known for decades. He is someone who serves currently and has for the last 9 years as a magistrate judge in the U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania.

Prior to his service as a Federal magistrate judge, he served as an assistant public defender over the course of several decades, at the same time doing private practice. So he has broad experience as a magistrate judge, as someone who has been in the courtroom, providing a defense for people, and also serving in private practice.

I have great confidence and I think everyone who has dealt with him has confidence in his integrity, in his judicial temperament, and in his ability to serve with distinction in the Middle District of Pennsylvania.

I would urge a "yes" vote on the cloture vote as well as on his nomination vote.

I yield the floor.

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 legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 709, Joseph Francis Saporito, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Pennsylvania.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Peter Welch, John W. Hickenlooper, Margaret Wood Hassan, Jack Reed, Laphonza R. Butler, Richard Blumenthal, Benjamin L. Cardin, Tammy Baldwin, Christopher Murphy, Chris Van Hollen, Catherine Cortez Masto, Tammy Duckworth, Christopher A. Coons, Brian Schatz, Sheldon Whitehouse.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Joseph Francis Saporito, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Pennsylvania, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. FETTERMAN), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE), the Senator from Utah (Mr. ROMNEY), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VANCE).

Further, if present and voting: the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) would have voted "nay".

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 39, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 226 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Baldwin	Heinrich	Rosen
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Sanders
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schatz
Booker	Kaine	Schumer
Brown	Kennedy	Shaheen
Butler	King	Sinema
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Smith
Cardin	Lujan	Stabenow
Carper	Manchin	Tester
Casey	Markey	Tillis
Collins	Merkley	Van Hollen
Coons	Murkowski	Warnock
Cortez Masto	Murphy	Warren
Duckworth	Murray	Welch
Durbin	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Padilla	Wyden
Graham	Peters	
Hassan	Reed	

NAYS—39

Barrasso	Daines	Mullin
Blackburn	Ernst	Paul
Boozman	Fischer	Ricketts
Braun	Grassley	Risch
Britt	Hagerty	Rounds
Budd	Hawley	Rubio
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Schmitt
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cotton	Lummis	Thune
Cramer	Marshall	Tuberville
Crapo	McConnell	Wicker
Cruz	Moran	Young

NOT VOTING—9

Fetterman	Lee	Scott (SC)
Hoeven	Menendez	Vance
Kelly	Romney	Warner

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BUTLER). On this vote, the yeas are 52, the nays are 39, and the motion is agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph Francis Saporito, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, in a few minutes, Senator KLOBUCHAR, chair of the Rules Committee, will ask for a unanimous consent request on two bills: the Protect Elections from Deceptive AI Act and the AI Transparency in Elections Act.

I want to thank Senator KLOBUCHAR for her leadership on these bills and for her committee's bipartisan work to protect our elections from the potential harms of AI. Both of these bills, the Protect Elections from Deceptive AI Act and the AI Transparency in Elections Act, have bipartisan support, so the Senate should support them and pass them without delay.

Madam President, we are less than 100 days out from the first national elections ever held in the age of AI. We all know AI has many incredible benefits, but alongside those benefits come great risks; and the risks of AI for our elections could be severe. If we are not careful, if we fail to install proper guardrails, AI could jaundice and even totally discredit our entire election system as we know it.

Misinformation is already a serious problem in our elections, but AI makes it easier than ever to generate and spread it. It is easier than ever to create deepfakes of candidates. AI already has been used in robocalls to impersonate President Biden for the purposes of misleading voters during the primary. Once that information is out, it is hard—often impossible—to put the genie back in the bottle. Well, we have a chance today to pass precisely the kind of guardrails that would protect our elections from the risks of AI.

We have a chance today to make sure that our democracy is not atrophied or

harmed, discredited, because of these kinds of misleading ads. These bipartisan bills would ban the use of materially misleading AI-generated deepfakes that depict Federal candidates and require disclaimers any time political ads use AI in a substantial way.

Most Americans, I think, would overwhelmingly agree that these are reasonable guardrails and they give voters peace of mind that AI isn't being used against them during election season without their knowledge. These bills have broad support. Democrats support these bills. Republicans support these bills. Over 40 current and former election officials and national security experts support these bills. Everyone recognizes the need to get something done. We are in a new world with AI. It can do a lot of good things, but it can cause some harms; and our job is to maximize the benefits but decrease the harms. One of the harms could be these deepfakes in elections, and we must do something about it.

A few months ago, I worked with the Senate's bipartisan AI working group, which I created a year ago with Senators HEINRICH and YOUNG and ROUNDS to publish the first ever roadmap for AI policy. Our roadmap detailed a swath of proposals the Senate should consider to fortify our democracy in the age of AI. I am very glad to see that some of the good ideas we called for in our AI policy roadmap are reflected in these two bills.

So I, again, greatly thank Senator KLOBUCHAR for championing these bills, for coming to our AI forums and hearing what had to be said and then beginning to take action to make sure the abuses don't occur.

I look forward to working further with Senator KLOBUCHAR, the Rules Committee, other chairs in committees to regulate AI before it is too late.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2770

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I thank the leader for his support for these bills, but also for his bipartisan work on artificial intelligence, including the group that he put together with Senator HEINRICH and Senator ROUNDS and Senator YOUNG to really lead a bipartisan effort. One of the major focuses of that effort has been doing something on the democracy front.

While some of these bills actually passed through the Commerce Committee today on a bipartisan basis to start the initial work of some sensible guardrails on AI, the democracy work actually can't wait because, as the leader pointed out, we are less than 100 days from this election; and we are seeing States act across the country—red States, blue States, purple States—putting some simple rules in place for this new sophisticated technology.

I always believed that our laws have to be as sophisticated as those that are trying to mess with them, and we cannot simply stand by on the Federal

basis for the Federal elections—we are not talking about messing around with their State rules. They are doing their own rules. We are talking about Federal elections when it comes to involvement with AI.

AI, as we know, is set to become one of the most significant technological advances of our time. Like with any emerging technology, it brings tremendous opportunities, but it also brings tremendous risks and uncertainties. I think David Brooks, the columnist, put it well when he wrote:

The people in A.I. seem to be experiencing radically different brain states all at once. I've found it incredibly hard to write about A.I. because it is literally unknowable whether this technology is leading us to heaven or hell.

Well, it is on us right now as the elected representatives of the people of this country to make the decision of what fork are we going to go on. If we put no guardrails in place when it comes to scams, when it comes to messing around with people's intellectual property rights, when it comes to national security, when it comes to democracy—which is our topic today—then we are not going to unleash the potential and the great opportunities of AI because we will not have put the guardrails in place to make it safe.

This means protecting ourselves from the significant risks AI poses without stifling innovation and working to preserve trust in business, government, and our elections, as we all adapt to this rapidly advancing technology.

With this year's election so soon in front of us, we must put in place these commonsense rules. We have heard repeatedly about the potential of AI to upend our election. All of our witnesses from both parties agreed that this was a threat when we had our hearing. And at the bipartisan AI forum that I just mentioned, there was consensus that Federal legislation is necessary; that disclaimers are not enough in some cases; and that it is critical to our national security.

By the way, these AI videos or fake robocalls or videos of people that aren't really the candidates that you don't like or you do like—if you don't know who you are watching, how are you going to be able to make your decision as a citizen in this great democracy?

And, by the way, these could be promoted by foreign governments, by foreign countries. We have seen this in Canada where they just completed an investigation and found that China had meddled in their elections, in their elections for parliament seats.

This is happening right now, and we need the ability to take these things off or at least label them so people know what they are viewing and what they are listening to. This is a hair-on-fire moment.

AI has the potential to turbocharge the spread of disinformation and deceive voters. This is happening to candidates on both sides. In the New