

about serving 10 or 12 or even 16 years. He has floated the notion of repealing the 22nd Amendment. His supporters have worn T-shirts reading "Trump 2028." His allies have spread the baseless notion that he was "owed" extra years because of supposed injustices against him.

Each time, when confronted, his defenders—Members of this very body—have dismissed it as a big joke. But the man himself has now made it clear: He was not joking. So why are congressional Republicans still pretending that he was joking?

Let's review what the Constitution actually says. The 22nd Amendment, ratified in 1951, states unequivocally:

No person shall be elected to the office of the President more than twice.

No exceptions. No loopholes.

The 12th Amendment makes clear that no one who is constitutionally ineligible to serve as President may be elected as Vice President, closing the door on any scheme where a President resigns to elevate an unelected successor. The law is settled. The case is closed.

The reason we have these protections is simple: America is a republic, not a monarchy. The people's power is enshrined in the peaceful transition of leadership.

George Washington set the precedent of serving only two terms, and after Franklin Roosevelt's unprecedented four terms, both parties, Democrat and Republican, came together to enshrine term limits into law—the George Washington tradition into law. Every President since, Democrats and Republicans alike, has respected this safeguard until right now.

What we are witnessing is the continued erosion of constitutional order, met not with outrage from Republicans but with shrugs and chuckles and excuses. And those who claimed he was joking before now claim he is joking still after he says he is not. That is in violation of his own explicit statement that he is telling the truth. They are not just enabling a man's delusions of infinite power; they are setting the stage for something far more dangerous: The normalization of sedition.

Let me say this plainly: There is nothing funny about sedition. There is nothing amusing about a former President who incited an attack on this Capitol now openly fantasizing about defying the Constitution to remain in office. There is nothing humorous about Members of Congress excusing, enabling, and covering for a man who has already demonstrated his willingness to subvert democracy for his own personal gain.

So, at this moment, I will ask the Senate to take up and pass by unanimous consent my resolution making clear what should already be obvious: That under the 22nd and 12th Amendments to the Constitution, Donald Trump is ineligible in any future election to be elected as Vice President or President of the United States or to

serve as President beyond the conclusion of his current term.

This resolution is incredibly simple. It says that "the Twelfth amendment to the Constitution States that 'No person constitutionally ineligible to the office of President shall be eligible to that of Vice-President of the United States'. . . . [T]he Twenty-second amendment . . . states that 'No person shall be elected to the office of the President more than twice, and no person who has held the office of President, or acted as President, for more than two years of a term to which some other person was elected President shall be elected to the office of President more than once.'"

So, therefore, President "Trump is ineligible in any future elections to be elected Vice-President or President, or to serve as President beyond the conclusion of his current term."

That is it. That is the totality of what it says.

This is not a partisan statement; it is a constitutional one. Every Member of this Chamber, regardless of party, should be able to agree: No President is above the law. No President is entitled to more than two terms.

If my colleagues truly believe that it is all in jest, then let's put this to the test. Let's pass the resolution now because if they won't, the cost will be nothing less than the future of our Republic. And that is not a joke.

With that, as if in legislative session and notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 154, which is at the desk; further I ask that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

#### NOMINATION OF MEHMET OZ

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, ahead of the Senate's final vote on the nomination of Dr. Mehmet Oz to head up the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, I want to take a couple minutes to describe what is at stake with this vote.

Dr. Oz is the second Trump nominee to pass through the Senate Finance Committee with a record of dodging Medicare and Social Security taxes. That means, if confirmed, the person running the Medicare Program thinks it is acceptable to not pay the taxes he owes into the programs he is running.

Let me repeat that: If confirmed, the person running the Medicare Program thinks it is acceptable to not pay the taxes he owes into the program he is running.

Now, in addition, during the consideration of this nominee, I pressed Dr. Oz on whether he believes nursing

homes ought to be staffed with a registered nurse 24/7. Once again, Dr. Oz refused to answer my question. He claimed it was a complicated question.

Not really, I told him. An AI chatbot paid for by private equity isn't going to take your mom to the bathroom or bring your grandpa his meals every day. I don't think it is at all complicated whether there ought to be a nurse on staff at every single nursing home.

Dr. Oz is certainly very able on television, but he seems to have no understanding that technology is no replacement for real nurses and real medical staff. That attitude is going to have a real impact as Donald Trump and Republicans in Congress pursue nearly \$1 trillion in Medicaid cuts to achieve their billionaire tax breaks, which House Republicans have already passed.

Several weeks ago, Senate Republicans confirmed one of Trump's most unqualified and dangerous nominees to date, RFK Jr., who will be heading up America's healthcare at HHS. He was confirmed as well.

Now our country is facing the biggest measles outbreak in decades, while the Trump administration touts the benefits of cod liver oil and convinces parents not to vaccinate their kids.

The country has heard tragic tales of families following RFK Jr.'s advice on unproven alternative treatments for measles that end up sending kids to hospitals.

Just this week, he abruptly fired more than 10,000 public health workers, many of whom reportedly helped seniors navigate insurance claims when they were denied care or provided oversight over nursing homes.

Everything this administration is doing is an effort to make you and your family less safe.

Dr. Oz, unfortunately, has been out there peddling, over the years, unproven cures and treatments and encouraging people to ignore proven facts and science.

The dangers of promoting unqualified wellness grifters to be in charge of healthcare in our country is not just a talking point. These are real and deadly matters.

This week, Donald Trump and Senate Republicans are gearing up to pass their massive tax giveaway to billionaires and corporations. They are paying for it by gutting Medicaid and cutting off the services that millions of Americans rely on. Food stamps, Meals on Wheels, and Head Start are all on the chopping block, just so billionaires can go out and buy things like more yachts. These cuts to Medicaid are going to be devastating for kids and people with disabilities. It can destroy care in nursing homes as we know it. It will rip basic care away from seniors and kids.

Dr. Oz will be responsible for executing the destruction brought down on the Medicaid Program by the cuts Republicans are preparing to make.

And there would be premium hikes—let me mention that: premium hikes—for everybody else who gets their insurance through the marketplace when Republicans take away the tax credits that lower their premiums.

During his confirmation hearing, I gave Dr. Oz the opportunity to go on the record and reassure the American people he wouldn't go along with the Republican scheme to rip away healthcare. He refused. So, I also asked Dr. Oz: If he was confirmed, would he travel to Malheur County in my home State? It is an overwhelmingly rural and red county and also has the most recipients of Medicaid in any county in Oregon.

Dr. Oz agreed to come to Malheur County and explain Trump's catastrophic cuts, face-to-face, with Oregonians. I am going to hold him to that. He is going to have to answer to the people of Oregon and Malheur County about these inhumane policies.

Republicans are full steam ahead with their plans to gut Americans' healthcare and put for-profit insurance companies and private equity firms in charge of America's health.

So here is the real question with respect to this vote that will be coming up: What is at stake on the Mehmet Oz vote?

What is at stake is whether your aging parents can be safe in their nursing home. What is at stake is whether your kids can go see a doctor. What is at stake is the very health and well-being of your family.

By supporting the Oz nomination, Republicans are sending a very clear message that they are a lot more afraid of Donald Trump than having to answer to their own constituents.

Every Member of this body that votes to confirm Dr. Oz is going to own the consequences of this decision, those consequences that I spelled out. I urge the Senate to oppose this nomination when we vote later.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

ISRAEL

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, since October 7, when Hamas launched the deadliest terrorist attack in Israel's history, Israel has continued to face a barrage of threats from Iran and its terrorist proxies in the region. Attacks on Israel, they didn't just happen on October 7. That is when it started.

The resolutions we are debating today will hurt Israel's ability to defend itself against these attacks. These resolutions would block weapons that are critical to restocking Israel's defenses and deterring Iran, Hamas, Hezbollah, the Houthis, and others.

Just this weekend, the Houthis launched a ballistic missile attack on Israel.

If passed, these resolutions would embolden more attacks like these from Iran and, again, its terrorist proxies. It would send a disastrous statement to the world, emboldening terrorism and

potentially prolonging wars in the region.

Now, I know some on my side of the aisle are considering supporting these resolutions because they may disagree with the current Israeli Government. But let's be clear. Support for the U.S.-Israel relationship is not an endorsement of all the actions of any one Israeli Government, in the same way that other nations' support for America does not equal an endorsement of all the actions, well, by the Trump administration.

So I urge my colleagues to stand with and stand for our historic and mutually beneficial relationship with Israel and the Israeli people.

As the only democracy in the Middle East, Israel has been our strongest ally in the region, and the passage of these resolutions, well, it would damage our bond for years to come.

Government leaders, politicians, well, they come and go, but our commitment to Israel's security must be ironclad.

Restricting much needed arms to Israel because you don't agree with everything the current government is doing will leave our ally vulnerable, not only to current threats of terrorism but to future threats of terrorism.

While Israel has an absolute right to defend itself and the aid provided to Israel is critical to its defense, I do share the concerns of many of my colleagues about the need to limit civilian casualties during these conflicts. That is an important reason why I oppose these resolutions.

The joint direct attack munitions, or JDAMs—the very same guidance kits that would be restricted by one of these resolutions—would actually help convert unguided, dumb bombs into more accurate ones. These save civilian lives by enabling the Israeli Air Force to hit military targets more precisely than they would without JDAMs.

By providing Israel with JDAMs, which make weapons more precise and more accurate, we are helping Israel to defend itself, while also working to minimize civilian casualties.

The munitions these resolutions would block are also critical because Israel continues to face threats from both above and below the ground. For this reason, it is essential that Israel be able to reach all their military targets, including reinforced concrete structures like terror tunnels, weapons depots, factories, and rocket missile sites.

These resolutions would undermine these capabilities.

I know many of you here are torn. You want to do what is right for Israel, the United States, and the region. And I believe that we all share a goal of ending the war between Hamas and Israel, and we all look forward to a future without hostilities where the hostages taken by Hamas are finally all freed.

Right now, 59 hostages—only about half of whom are still believed to be alive, including a living American hostage—still are in Hamas captivity. They are still in Hamas captivity. And I think we can all agree that freeing all of these hostages is a fundamental piece to ending the war.

Passing these resolutions could threaten that goal. We have seen Hamas harden their stances on negotiations when they perceive gaps between the United States and Israel. After almost 550 days—550 days—the hostages cannot afford to have Hamas delay one day longer.

So to best ensure the safety and security of Israel and the Palestinian people, to end civilian casualties on both sides, and to ensure we never ever have another October 7 again, Hamas cannot be allowed to remain in power in Gaza in any capacity.

I still hold hope for a future where two states live side by side in peace—a future that is free from Hamas, which has devastated countless lives in the region, of both Israelis and Palestinians.

And the key component of making this a reality is to make sure that Israel maintains its qualitative military edge to push Hamas out of Gaza for good.

Passing these resolutions would do the opposite. It would allow Hamas to entrench even further in Gaza, believing Israel's stockpiles are decimated, allowing them to expand their foothold, emboldening their current and future assault of Israelis and oppression of the Palestinians.

Blocking these arms sales will hurt Israel. It will send the wrong message to Hamas, to Iran, and to all of its terrorist proxies that America is abandoning our ally.

So I want to be clear. I want to repeat this: The message to terrorists, if these bills are passed—the message to terrorists—will be that they can continue without impunity.

If we are serious about preventing another atrocity like October 7, if we are serious about limiting civilian casualties, if we are serious about ensuring that Israel can defend itself, if we are serious about sending a message to terrorists around the globe, if we are serious about a stable path forward, and if we are serious about stability in the region and a safe and secure State of Israel, someday living alongside a peaceful, independent Palestinian State, I urge all of my colleagues to vote no on these resolutions.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to resume legislative session.

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