

cookie cakes, and to fulfill other duties that come along with being indisputably the heart and soul of the office.

I know my entire team is grateful to occupy a small part of Erica's heart. The rest rightly belongs to her family—her mother Suri and her late father Roger—whom she continues to make so very, very proud.

Erica, thank you.

TRIBUTE TO TERRY VAN DOREN

Mr. President, Terry Van Doren has told me before about the awe he felt as a farm kid from downstate Illinois visiting the Harry Truman Presidential Library and seeing a replica of a bust that stands in the hall outside this Chamber here in the Capitol. The thought of seeing the real thing, let alone passing it by every day at work, was a thrill.

What says the most about Terry—or, as we call him, TVD—is that after 12 years on my team, I am certain he still feels the thrill of service here in the Capitol. That is not to say the Senate hasn't tried mightily to grind it out of him.

For more than a decade, Terry has juggled a uniquely challenging portfolio that encompasses agriculture, transportation, energy, and a laundry list of niche constituencies in between.

With massive implications for Federal spending and issues that matter deeply to Kentucky, Terry inevitably finds himself in the thick of every vote-arama, every government funding fight, and every last-dash legislative effort right before the holidays. With a steady hand, deep expertise, and unwavering loyalty to me and the folks I represent, Terry has been an extraordinarily effective workhorse—even if, in one instance, it meant becoming an expert on racehorses.

From spearheading the CRA process in defense against harmful overregulation to shepherding massive, bipartisan accomplishments on infrastructure and agriculture, he has exercised his talents with a mild manner, with self-effacing humility, and with undaunted optimism that this might be the year that the Senate's schedule doesn't spoil his hunting season travel plans.

So I am grateful to Terry's family—his wife Lisa and their kids Amelia and Bobby—for letting us lean on him literally at all hours.

Thanks again, Terry.

TRIBUTE TO JODY WRIGHT

Mr. President, now, if personnel is policy, I have been fortunate to have outstanding personnel on my team, but if you want to make a lasting impact, you need good personnel in every corner of the government. To do that, you need somebody like my nominations counsel, Jody Wright.

For starters, Jody has the institutional credentials of a Senate thoroughbred. From the whip's office under Don Nickles to the Republican Cloakroom, Jody knows as well as anyone just what it takes to make this place tick. She is well-versed in the Senate's

written rules and, just as importantly, in the unwritten ones. Trust me, when you are trying to clear last-minute logjams on the floor, it helps to have someone who speaks these languages fluently.

Of course, nominations don't start here in the Senate. Jody's work necessarily involves a hefty dose of executive branch procedure. To further complicate matters, the nature of the job changes significantly depending on which party is in the White House. These days, Jody has excelled at identifying and claiming rare opportunities for Republican appointees to influence policy in meaningful ways.

Jody's work is a delicate balancing act on the best of days, but it also requires the sort of people skills and undaunted optimism that this proud Texan has in spades. Her sunny disposition isn't reserved for meetings with candidates from public office; it is doled out around my office and the entire Senate, wherever and whenever it is needed most. And it speaks to the pride I know Jody feels to work right here in the Capitol. That is second only to Jody's pride in her family—in her husband Glenn's own service in the Navy and in the joys of raising their daughter Grace, whom I know Jody's colleagues have enjoyed watching grow up.

So, Jody, thank you so much.

Mr. President, if you can believe it, the work of thanking the incredible staff of my Republican leader office is still unfinished. I will still need to brag on a few more outstanding leaders who have made so much of our success possible, and I look forward to doing that sometime soon.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant executive clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HANSAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, let me tell you two brief stories.

A high schooler takes from the internet a picture of a female classmate, then uses artificial intelligence to "nudify" that young girl, and shares this deepfake sexually explicit image with the rest of the school on social media. The classmate—mortified and humiliated—doesn't want to show her face at school. She is afraid. She spends a week begging her parents not to force her to go back. Her parents, futilely, report the images to the social media company, but they never hear even a word back. Meanwhile, everyone at the school knows who distributed this sexually explicit image of this 14-year-old girl, but he faces no consequences.

Here is the second story: A teenage boy begins a relationship online with a young girl. He is smitten, and they de-

cide to swap explicit photos with each other, but it turns out the teenage girl is a scammer, and he has just fallen prey to sextortion. The scammer repeatedly messages the young man, demanding payment or the explicit photos will be sent to his friends via a social media network. The young man—embarrassed, mortified, thinking there is no way out—dies by suicide. His name was Gavin Guffey.

His father is here today advocating to hold Big Tech accountable. On my lapel, I am wearing the heart emoji that Gavin texted his family moments before he took his own life.

Where do these stories take place—in Texas? New Jersey? South Carolina? Washington? California? Illinois? Florida? Sadly, the answer is all of them.

American high schools are experiencing an explosion of AI-generated sexual images, and in many cases, there is no consequence and no recourse for the teenage girls or boys like Gavin. There have been thousands and thousands of cases of sleazebags using nonconsensual, intimate images to extort victims both sexually and financially.

In fact, the FBI just issued a warning this year about the growing threat of sextortion for minors online. There are dozens of families across the country whose children have taken their own lives because of their fear of these images being released. There are hundreds of high schoolers targeted, often by their own classmates, who are experiencing incredible psychological harms in knowing that these images exist and are still out there.

And your child's images aren't just targeted while they are in middle school or in high school. In New York, a young man right out of high school took images of his former classmates from their social media profiles and used AI to alter the images in a sexually explicit manner. He then posted them for the world to see, along with their personal identifying information, encouraging violence and harassment against those he was victimizing. He was convicted only of a misdemeanor, and he faced zero charges for the deepfake explicit images. I would venture to guess some of the victims tried and failed to get these fake images removed by the tech company.

I have spoken to these victims and their parents, including two 14-year-old girls who were victims in the same month, with the same story, on opposite sides of the country. These girls were scared; they were hopeless; but they also wanted justice and relief from these images so they took action.

Elliston Berry of Texas and Francesca Mani of New Jersey bravely spoke up about their experiences and how the TAKE IT DOWN Act—my bipartisan legislation with Democrat Senator AMY KLOBUCHAR—would have protected them and afforded them justice for these horrific acts. Both Elliston and Francesca testified at a field hearing for the Senate Commerce

Committee, bravely sharing their stories.

There are 29 States that have not criminalized deepfake revenge porn. Thus, law enforcement in those States cannot prosecute the slimeballs who peddle this lifelike, yet fake, smut. That is justice denied for these teenagers and other victims.

The TAKE IT DOWN Act empowers victims across the entire United States. It makes it a felony for these creeps to use AI to create and publish fake, lifelike pornographic images of real people.

Just as importantly, our bipartisan bill requires Big Tech to have a notice and takedown process so that every American—not just the Taylor Swifts of this country who are famous enough that they can get the images taken down but every American and every teenager in junior high and high school who is victimized—like Elliston and Francesca and Gavin—can get these disturbing images taken offline immediately. I don't want to see another family suffer such a fate, which is why I am on the floor today, trying to pass the TAKE IT DOWN Act.

This bill is overwhelmingly bipartisan. There are nearly 20 Republican and Democrat cosponsors of this bill. Over 80 organizations, including victims' advocates, including unions, including law enforcement are backing this bipartisan legislation. The TAKE IT DOWN Act passed the Senate Commerce Committee unanimously. Every Republican, every Democrat on the committee voted for this legislation. The House companion, likewise, has strong bipartisan support.

The Senate acted on parts of this issue earlier this year in having passed two complementary pieces of legislation 11 weeks ago. However, neither of these other bills empowers victims to get their explicit images—real or fake—removed from websites. In a moment, unfortunately, you will be hearing an objection from my colleague, the Senator from New Jersey, who previously supported both of these complementary bills.

One of these bills is the SHIELD Act, authored by Senator KLOBUCHAR—the coauthor of my TAKE IT DOWN Act as well. The SHIELD Act was significantly modified at the request of my colleague from New Jersey before he would allow that to pass. The TAKE IT DOWN Act deliberately adopted the exact same language that the Senator from New Jersey requested in the SHIELD Act—everything he requested—from the same sentencing provisions to the same intent provisions, to the same exceptions to the bill. Now it appears the Senator from New Jersey no longer supports the language he voted for and the language he negotiated and helped draft.

It cannot be that the Senator from New Jersey is concerned about free speech matters, because he has already agreed to pass two bills that deal with this very same issue and using the

same language. I certainly hope that the Senator from New Jersey doesn't actually believe that realistic child pornography, as we have described here today, is somehow protected speech under any of our legal precedents. It is not.

The only difference between the two bills that, perhaps, the Senator from New Jersey can possibly point to is that the TAKE IT DOWN Act criminalizes the publication of deepfake revenge porn—an issue this body has not yet addressed—and that the TAKE IT DOWN Act requires big tech companies to remove these heinous images upon notice from the victims in order to protect the victims. Neither of these positive changes are good reasons to hold up the bill, but they are essential to bringing justice to our constituents from Francesca to Elliston.

So, if the Senator from New Jersey objects, teenage girls like Francesca Mani of New Jersey, like Elliston Berry of Texas, or teenage boys like Gavin Guffey will have no protection from sextortion or from having fake sexual abuse materials—images and videos, literal child pornography—being publicly shared by predators and sex offenders. If he objects, the next Francesca, the next Elliston, the next Gavin won't be able to force Snapchat or Instagram or TikTok to step up and take down this abusive content.

For the folks at home, I want you to listen very carefully. Sometimes Senate procedure can be confusing. I want you to listen for two words from the Senator from New Jersey: “I object.” Let me tell you how this works. If he doesn't say those two words, this legislation will, right now, this evening, pass the U.S. Senate 100 to nothing.

And understand, this legislation—99 Senators have already indicated they have no objections to this legislation. All the Senator from New Jersey has to do is not say those two words, “I object,” and this law is passing the Senate unanimously. On the other hand, if you hear those two words, “I object,” the result is going to be that this legislation is defeated on the floor of the Senate.

On behalf of Elliston Berry, on behalf of Francesca Mani, on behalf of the memory of Gavin Guffey and his family who still grieves his loss, on behalf of the countless teenagers and others who have been victimized by real and by deepfake explicit images, on behalf of the thousands more teenagers and women who are likely to be victims of this abuse in the future, I urge my colleagues to come together with a simple, bipartisan, commonsense step and pass the TAKE IT DOWN Act.

Therefore, Madam President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be discharged from further consideration of S. 4569 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, that the Cruz-Klobuchar substitute amendment at the desk be agreed to; that the

bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BOOKER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. I have to tell you, I am saddened that the Senator from New Jersey chose to give no explanation for his objection; chose to give no reason to Francesca, why she is being denied; no reason to Elliston; no reason to Gavin.

He had an opportunity to explain his objections. Do you know what he said? Nothing.

Nearly 2 weeks ago was when I circulated this amendment to both sides of the aisle, and it cleared 99 Senators. He had a week and a half to object. Yesterday, this legislation was about to pass, and an hour before it was going to pass, the Senator from New Jersey raised his objection. He said last night: TED, I haven't had time to read the bill.

It had been circulated to his office 2 weeks earlier, but he said he hadn't had time to read the bill.

I said: Great. I will delay this for a day so you can read the bill. The language in the bill is word for word verbatim the language you agreed to, you have voted for, and you negotiated.

He said he had numerous substantive objections. If he does, we heard none of them, not a word of it.

It makes me sad that he doesn't feel his constituents deserve any explanation for blocking legislation as important as this.

Madam President, it is not lost on anyone that this is an election year. And I will say, absent a single substantive objection, the obvious inference is that this objection is being made because we have got an election in less than 6 weeks.

I consider the Senator from New Jersey a friend. I sure hope he is not standing up here denying victims of this abuse relief simply to score partisan political points. I would like to think he wouldn't do such a thing.

But in order for me to believe he wouldn't do such a thing, he needs to actually explain some reason for his objection, which at least, so far, he has not bothered to do.

I will tell you, we had an agreement negotiated with the majority leader to pass an entire package of bills—Republican bills and Democrat bills—that have passed the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation. All of that package was going to pass yesterday until, at the last minute, the Senator from New Jersey came with his midnight objection and no reasoning whatsoever.

So I am now going to give this body the opportunity to pass the package that had been negotiated in a bipartisan manner, that had been agreed to,

and we are going to find out if the Senator from New Jersey will not only object to providing relief to the victims of this abuse but will object to multiple other bills that are bipartisan bills supported by Members of this body, because he wants to play partisan politics instead. I hope he does not.

Madam President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the following bills en bloc: S. 4569, the TAKE IT DOWN Act, Cruz-Klobuchar; Calendar No. 473, S. 275, the Rural Broadband Protection Act of 2024, Capito-Klobuchar; Calendar No. 474, S. 1570, the Bottles and Breastfeeding Equipment Screening Enhancement Act, Duckworth and Daines; Calendar No. 285, S. 1153, the National Manufacturing Advisory Council for the 21st Century Act, Peters and Rubio; Calendar No. 480, S. 3475, Strengthening the Commercial Driver's License Information System Act, Peters and Young; Calendar No. 479, S. 3277, the Marine Debris reauthorization, Sullivan and Whitehouse; Calendar No. 513, S. 4212, the American Music Tourism Act of 2024, Blackburn and Hickenlooper; and Calendar No. 485, S. 4107, the Think Differently Transportation Act, Duckworth and Capito; further, that S. 4569 be discharged from the Committee on Commerce; that the committee-reported amendments, where applicable, be agreed to; that the Cruz-Klobuchar amendment to S. 4569, which is at the desk, be considered and agreed to; that the bills, as amended, if amended, be considered read a third time and passed en bloc; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BOOKER. I object.

Madam President, the sharing of non-consensual intimate images online is harmful and unacceptable. It is a serious problem that is affecting too many Americans. Many times, it is impacting our young people, and we need to do more to ensure that digital platforms are not used to harass and harm.

We need ethical guardrails for emerging technologies including generative AI. This means laws that protect people from harassment and hold wrongdoers accountable, but do not have unintended criminal consequences.

I had hoped the junior Senator from Texas would work with me rather than using Senate procedure to create the false appearance of partisanship. He used personal attacks and half truths to politicize the serious issue of online sexual harassment. I have and will continue to work with my colleagues to combat the issue of online sexual harassment. I look forward to finding solutions to address the proliferation of nonconsensual intimate images online.

Online sexual harassment and so many other issues that impact Ameri-

cans, from public safety to reproductive care to failing power grids, are urgent and it is our duty to address them. However, taking to the Senate floor with veiled threats is not how we should operate in this deliberative body. We are here to work together and to find solutions together.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

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

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

BLOOMBERG FOUNDATION

Mr. KENNEDY. Three quick points, Madam President: No. 1, I rise, first, to thank the Bloomberg Foundation. I had made notes from which I was going to speak, but I lost them. So I am going to kind of wing it here.

Over the past couple of years, the Bloomberg Foundation has spent millions of dollars—I want to say the figure is \$30 to \$40 million—to try to help really smart kids from low-income families access some of our finest colleges in the country. And America does have the best system of higher education in the world, by the way. We have the best quality colleges.

What the Bloomberg Foundation was focusing on was that these were just really smart kids from low-income families who had great grades and great standardized test scores and great extracurricular activities, but many of them just didn't know about the opportunities that were out there in the world for them. The Bloomberg Foundation wasn't concentrating on race or gender or sexuality or a part of the country or any of those things. They were just looking to try to help really smart young women and young men in high school with great grades and great standardized test scores access some of the finest universities in the country. And they spent 40 million bucks doing it, working with some other groups.

Well, it didn't work out like they thought. They just didn't have as much success as they wanted to. But they learned from the experience.

What they learned was, in order to reach these young people, you can't just text them. You can't just call them. You can't send them an email—in part, because today, when all of us receive emails and text messages from people who we don't know, we automatically assume it is some kind of scam. So that is what Bloomberg and its contractors found—that people, including our young people, they are just very suspicious, and so they weren't able to reach that many kids. And those that they didn't reach—and by the way, the folks from Bloomberg contacting them would never meet the

kids. They wanted to reach as many kids as they could, so they were doing it digitally. They just found out it wasn't that effective. But they also learned that the way to reach these kids is to see them in person and, in part, go through the kids' high schools' guidance counselors and placement offices.

So I am hoping that Bloomberg is going to start again. I am not saying that Bloomberg had no success. They had success, but it just wasn't as much success as we all wanted. But, by God, they tried, and they deserve thanks.

This wasn't any taxpayer money; it was the money of the Bloomberg foundation. They tried, and they learned a lot from it, and I wanted to thank them for trying. I hope they won't give up, and I hope they will use what they learned to try to reach these young people again.

TRIBUTE TO KATHERINE FOSTER

Madam President, No. 2, I want to repeat very briefly what I said last week. Katherine Foster is a member of our Cloakroom staff. Katherine is not here. She is in the back doing her job. Today is her last day, and I wanted to thank her again for her service. As I said last time, she has taken a very prestigious job in the private sector, and I wish her well, and I hope she makes bucket loads of money.

To those who don't know, we have—by “we,” I mean the Republicans and the Democrats—what we call Cloakroom staff. These are people who work with us to make this place work. On any given day, the Democratic Cloakroom staff and the Republican Cloakroom staff are the nicest and the smartest people in this building, and they just do an incredible job. They work hard, and they have to be here at all kinds of ungodly hours, and they have to put up with back-sass from U.S. Senators. It is a very hard job. And that is true on both the Democratic side and the Republican side.

But, anyway, Katherine is one of that group, and she is leaving. We are sorry she is leaving, but we are happy that she is leaving because she is going to make more money than the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. So we wish her well.

But I also wanted to use this opportunity to thank our entire teams on both the Democratic and the Republican side for their incredible work.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 8292

Madam President, No. 3, the House passed a bill dealing with the sanctity of taxpayer records.

In another life, I worked in State government. I worked for like, I don't know, 16 or 17 years—I don't remember because it went by in a flash—as State treasurer, which was an elected position. But before that, I was in an appointed position, a position appointed by the Governor. It was a political position called the secretary of the Department of Revenue, and that was a fancy title for “tax collector.” I was the State's tax collector for, I don't