

Justice	Moran	Scott (SC)
Kelly	Moreno	Sheehy
Kennedy	Mullin	Slotkin
Kim	Murkowski	Sullivan
Lankford	Padilla	Thune
Lee	Ricketts	Tillis
Lujan	Risch	Tuberville
Lummis	Rosen	Warner
Marshall	Rounds	Warnock
McConnell	Schiff	Wicker
McCormick	Schmitt	Young
Moody	Scott (FL)	

NAYS—30

Baldwin	Kaine	Sanders
Bennet	King	Schatz
Blumenthal	Klobuchar	Schumer
Blunt Rochester	Markey	Shaheen
Cantwell	Merkley	Smith
Coons	Murphy	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murray	Warren
Durbin	Paul	Welch
Hawley	Peters	Whitehouse
Hirono	Reed	Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Blackburn	Ossoff
-----------	--------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 68, the nays are 30.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

GUIDING AND ESTABLISHING NATIONAL INNOVATION FOR U.S. STABLECOINS ACT

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1582) to provide for the regulation of payment stablecoins, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Thune (for Hagerty-Gillibrand) amendment No. 2307, in the nature of a substitute.

Thune amendment No. 2308 (to amendment No. 2307), to change the enactment date.

Thune amendment No. 2309 (to amendment No. 2308), to change the enactment date.

Thune amendment No. 2310 (to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 2307), to change the enactment date.

Thune amendment No. 2311 (to amendment No. 2310), to change the enactment date.

Thune motion to commit the bill to the Committee on the Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, with instructions, Thune amendment No. 2312, to change the enactment date.

Thune amendment No. 2313 (to (the instructions) amendment No. 2312), to change the enactment date.

Thune amendment No. 2314 (to amendment No. 2313), to change the enactment date.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Cloture having been invoked, the motion to commit with instruction is rejected.

RECESS

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate stand in recess until 3:30 p.m. today.

Without objection, the Senate, at 2:42 p.m., recessed until 3:30 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. BANKS).

GUIDING AND ESTABLISHING NATIONAL INNOVATION FOR U.S. STABLECOINS ACT—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

MOTION TO DISCHARGE—S.J. Res. 53

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, pursuant to section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act, I move to discharge the Committee on Foreign Relations from further consideration of S.J. Res. 53, as provided under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to discharge from the Committee on Foreign Relations, S. J. Res. 53, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the Government of Qatar of certain defense articles and services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

MOTION TO DISCHARGE—S.J. RES. 54

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, pursuant to section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act, I move to discharge the Committee on Foreign Relations from further consideration of S.J. Res. 54, as provided under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to discharge from the Committee on Foreign Relations, S.J. Res. 54, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the Government of the United Arab Emirates of certain defense articles and services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I am bringing before the Senate an opportunity for us to take a stand, to take a stand against the corruption of American foreign policy.

The Senate will take a vote in just a moment to deny the President the ability to move forward with two arms sales—one to Qatar and one to the United Arab Emirates.

I believe that this Senate should join Republicans and Democrats together in saying that any country that is willing to pay the President personally, to enrich our President personally, in order to receive favorable treatment from the United States of America in its foreign policy or to receive national security secrets from the United States of America shouldn't be able to do business as usual with this Congress or with this country.

I want to tell you a story that is as heartbreaking as it is aggravating. We give the American President enormous power, and particularly we give the President enormous power when it comes to managing the foreign relations of this country. The President decides where we send arms. The Presi-

dent gets to negotiate peace treaties. The President decides how millions of troops are deployed all around the world. We trust that the President is going to use those powers for good, that the President is going to use those authorities to protect the United States of America.

But they are vast powers. They are immense powers. So there is always the potential that those powers are going to be used for corrupt purposes, that instead of using those authorities in order to gain concessions from other nations that benefit the broad American public or benefit American national security, the President may use those powers in order to enrich himself personally.

Our Founding Fathers actually thought a lot about this problem because they had watched their monarch. They had watched the King of England use the powers that he had in order—not to protect the British people but to amass enormous wealth. He used those powers both to control dissents and protests domestically, but he also used those powers in order to compel other nations and actors inside the empire to pay him tribute.

President Trump has decided that he is going to use the powers that we have given him to demand the same kind of tribute that Kings and monarchs demanded.

The reason we have to stand together today to vote against these arm sales to Qatar and UAE is because unfortunately these two countries, who are admittedly often allies, important allies of the United States, have decided to comply with President Trump's request to pay him that tribute.

Shortly before the President went to the Middle East, he did not dispense to the region his Secretary of State. Instead, he dispensed to the region his business partners. Just before the President made his first major foreign trip to the UAE, Saudi Arabia, and to Qatar, he sent his son and their business partner—who, not coincidentally, happens to be the son of Trump's Middle East Envoy—to the United Arab Emirates.

Their request was pretty simple. Their request was not that the UAE do something that would be in the interest of collective American security; their request was that the UAE invest \$2 billion in Trump's new crypto business—in particular, his stablecoin venture. This is the President of the United States going to the UAE and asking a foreign government to invest \$2 billion in his personal business. The company is called World Liberty Financial. On World Liberty Financial's website, it says the majority of the company is owned by Donald J. Trump.

This was a pretty exceptional request to make because his crypto business was brand new. At the time, it was a pretty minor player. So a \$2 billion investment from a country like UAE would vault World Liberty Financial into the stratosphere. And, in fact, it

did. When the UAE complied with that corrupt request, World Liberty Financial—the stablecoin that it issues became the fifth biggest stablecoin in the world overnight.

Now, the UAE felt like it had to comply with the President's request because they had things they wanted from the United States.

First, they wanted a continuation of arm sales, including the sale of Chinook helicopters that we will be voting on today. But they wanted something more specific, something that they weren't able to get from the first Trump administration or from the Biden administration. They wanted some of our most vital, most significant national security secrets. They wanted to be able to get their hands on computer chip technology, the kind of technology that will power the next generation of AI.

We as a nation—again, based on bipartisan consensus—had been unwilling to give UAE that technology because it is a fairly open secret that the UAE has a very close, very cozy relationship with China, and there was a very real worry—there still is a real worry—that that technology, if transferred to the UAE, would be quickly transferred to China, allowing China to be able to outpace us, to outrun us in the race to advanced AI.

But the UAE knew that there was a way to get what they wanted, that there was a way to change the policy of the United States, and it was a \$2 billion investment in Trump's business.

Not coincidentally, just weeks after they announced they were putting \$2 billion into Trump's crypto business, his father—who, again not coincidentally, is Trump's Middle East Envoy—went back to the region and announced that they would be moving forward with the transfer of these computer chips to the UAE—\$2 billion into the Trump family's pockets and the most sensitive American technology that had been previously banned from going to the UAE, being sent to the UAE.

Apparently, we didn't make any demands that the UAE divest itself from its security relationship with China. Instead, what we demanded was that the UAE make a \$2 billion investment in Donald Trump's business.

As you can imagine, once the word was out that the Trump administration was for sale, other countries decided to get into the mix. Donald Trump barely had taken a look at a luxury plane that the country of Qatar owned—reportedly the most luxurious plane in the world: gold plating, a spiral staircase designed by a famed French designer—and the President wanted it personally. So he dispensed the Department of Defense, apparently, to go to the Qataris and asked them to give him the plane, just like he had asked the UAE for a \$2 billion investment in his business—a \$2 billion investment that nobody else was going to give him except for a foreign power over which Donald Trump had leverage because of his role as President of the United States.

He went to the Qataris and asked them to give him this jet because he liked it, because it was fancy, because he thought he deserved it, and he knew they couldn't say no. Why? Because the Qataris also have specific asks of the United States. More broadly, they were burned during Trump's first term. When the Saudis and the Emiratis ganged up on the Qataris and effectively implemented an economic and political blockade on Qatar, the Trump administration, in the first term, effectively took the side of the Emiratis and the Saudis. That was devastating for the Qataris.

So first and foremost, they wanted to make sure that never again would Trump abandon them if there was a contest like that in the Middle East. So when he asked for the plane, just based upon their desire to make sure they did not get abandoned again, they felt they had to say yes.

But they also wanted an arms sale, and the arms sale they wanted was a groundbreaking arms sale. Never before has the United States been willing to send our most sensitive drone technology into the Middle East, weren't willing to transfer our most sensitive computer chips. We also weren't willing to send our most sensitive drone technology.

Qatar wanted that drone technology and once again, just like the UAE knew that they could get our most sensitive computer chip technology if they sent \$2 billion to Donald Trump's business ventures, Qatar, having learned that lesson, realized that if they gave a massive gift to the President, maybe he would break with a bipartisan precedent not to send this sensitive drone technology into the Middle East.

Guess what. They got what they wanted. The President has agreed to move forward with sending our most sensitive drone technology, the Predator drones, into the Middle East, selling them to Qatar. It is not a coincidence that they are also willing to send him this jet.

I had the chance this morning to talk to the Secretary of Defense about this jet because one of the claims the administration has made is that the jet is actually being sent to the U.S. Government. But we learned some important facts this morning. It is true that right now the U.S. Government is buying two new Air Force Ones, and it is true that this contract is expensive and it is taking a little bit longer than both Republicans and Democrats had hoped, but both those planes from Boeing are due for delivery sometime at the end of Trump's term.

What we learned today is that this plane that is being gifted temporarily to the U.S. Government is going to take several years to retrofit and will become available essentially at the exact same time that the two Boeing planes are made available.

So we don't actually need this plane as a new Air Force One because the Boeings are still under contract, and

they are going to be ready simultaneously. But the Secretary of Defense is committed to accepting the gift of this plane and then spending upwards of \$1 billion of taxpayer money in order to retrofit this plane—\$1 billion that we don't need because we are already spending \$4 billion on the two Boeings.

So now, instead of having two Air Force Ones, we are going to have three Air Force Ones. We don't need three Air Force Ones. But Trump is solving this problem because what he has said is that, when he leaves office, he is taking this Air Force One with him.

Now, that has never ever happened before. We have never just given a President of the United States a gift on the way out the door. But we are going to spend \$1 billion getting this plane ready. It, effectively, will not be used as an actual Air Force One because it won't be completed until the very end of his term. And then Trump is taking the plane, apparently, to his Presidential library, but who knows.

And so this gift is actually going to Donald Trump, not to the American taxpayers. The Department of Defense is, effectively, a straw purchaser. It will hold the plane for a couple years; it will spend your taxpayer dollars to retrofit the plane; and then the plane will just be given to Donald Trump to take with him in his post-Presidency.

So \$2 billion from the UAE into the President's crypto venture, a plane that, when all is said and done, is probably going to be worth about \$1.5 billion, straight transferred to Donald Trump personally—this is unprecedented in the history of the United States of America. Never has a President of the United States, while in office, solicited, sought, and accepted billions of dollars' worth of investments in his private companies or gifts to him and his family.

Remember, our Founding Fathers thought about this problem. They worried about this exact situation: a President using the vast power of the article II authorities he is given in order to trade favorable American treatment for foreign countries in exchange for personal enrichment of the President. They literally wrote a clause into the Constitution which, clear as day, says that a President of the United States cannot accept gifts from a foreign Prince, King, or nation. That is exactly what the President is doing. This plane is a gift. He advertises it as a gift—a gift that will be in the American public's hands for a nanosecond before it goes into his private hands.

If we don't take a stand, if we don't act together against this unconstitutional corruption of our foreign policy, I don't know that we can ever get this genie back in the bottle.

I understand that it is difficult for my Republican colleagues to stand up to this President, but we have an independent responsibility, as a coequal branch of government charged with upholding the Constitution, to call out

wrong when we see it, to call out illegality when we see it. This is wildly unconstitutional. This is wildly illegal.

So we have a chance today, with these resolutions, in order to make clear that we are not going to accept or make normal this kind of corruption of American foreign policy.

Now, Mr. President, I will finish with this because my colleague from Maryland is going to add some remarks.

I admit that these are imperfect vehicles. It is all part of the same story. Trump would not be moving forward with these arms sales if he wasn't getting what he wanted personally from these two countries. But I also admit that the UAE and, most especially, Qatar have been allies of the United States. We have worked together in our efforts, for instance, to combat terrorism in the region. Qatar specifically has, at times, been a heroic partner of the United States. We would never have been able to rescue thousands of Americans and American allies from Afghanistan without Qatar's help.

Qatar has consistently acted as an interlocutor between warring and conflicting factions in the region. Qatar has taken risks on behalf of the United States. We, of course, have thousands of American troops and soldiers and airmen in Qatar today.

And so what we need to say here is not that we are going to permanently pause our military relationships with these countries, but for the time being, while these two nations are willing to pay the President tribute, we cannot endorse or condone business as usual.

These are important partners of the United States in the region. They will be important partners in the future. But this is an exceptional moment where the corruption and our effort to stop the corruption has to take priority and has to take precedent. And so I am going to vote for both of these resolutions while also still believing that we are going to have a continued, important bilateral relationship with Qatar and with the UAE.

But if we start to endorse and grease the wheels of this kind of corruption, then there will be no end because once it becomes accepted, once it becomes implicitly endorsed by the U.S. Senate that foreign governments can put money into the personal treasury of the President in order to gain favorable treatment from the United States of America, that becomes the way our foreign policy works.

So I appreciate my colleagues' time and attention to this matter, and I encourage them to support these motions when they come up for a vote later this afternoon.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I want to start by thanking my friend and colleague Senator MURPHY for shining a light on this issue of corruption because the corruption that we are seeing from President Trump is unprec-

edented in scale and scope in our Nation's history. It is infecting our democracy here at home, and it is corrupting our foreign policy around the world.

We will soon be debating here in the U.S. Senate what President Trump calls his Big Beautiful Bill. Well, it is a big bill, but it is only beautiful if you are a billionaire or a very wealthy American because he gives those big tax breaks to very wealthy people at the expense of everybody else in America.

We have heard of the cuts to the Medicaid and the food and nutrition programs and the fact that, even after that, it will drive a huge upward hole in our deficit.

But there is one billionaire that President Trump is especially focused on making sure does well, and that is himself and his family and his family's business. And we have seen a great example of that corruption here at home with the meme coin, right? This is the coin that Trump put together, and he said that he is going to reward the people who buy the most of this meme coin by meeting with them personally at his golf course in Virginia.

And so people all over the world scurried to purchase that meme coin in order to get an audience with the President because having an audience with the President means you get a chance to influence the President. And many people from around the world, including China, purchased those meme coins to buy that influence.

And people should understand that the President's business makes money whether the value of that meme coin goes up or whether it goes down. Every time there is a transaction to buy or sell that meme coin, the Trump business makes money. So other people can get totally hosed, but it is a win-win for President Trump and his family. In fact, it is estimated that in the early days of launching this, they made about \$350 million. So that is the meme coin here at home.

What brings us to the floor today is how this personal corruption is infecting the foreign policy of the United States—because all of us hope and expect that, when the President of the United States goes overseas to conduct American foreign policy, they have the interests of America first. Donald Trump says it himself: America first.

That is not what President Trump has foremost in his mind when he travels overseas. What he has foremost in his mind right now is the bottom line for his personal profit—literally selling the office of the Presidency. He might as well open the White House and make it an Airbnb.

So let's talk about the details of how this is unfolding and how it is hurting the United States of America.

On his first major overseas trip, Donald Trump went to three countries in the Middle East, Gulf countries. He went to Saudi Arabia; he went to the United Arab Emirates, the UAE; and he

went to Qatar. Now, normally, before the President of the United States takes one of these important overseas trips, they send out the diplomats to help work out important U.S. foreign policy objectives and goals with these countries to make sure that the interests of the United States of America are put first.

In the case of this trip to these three Gulf countries—again, the first major overseas trip that President Trump took—it was his son Eric Trump who went out to the region 2 weeks in advance. And what did Eric Trump do when he was there? Was he talking about foreign policy? No. He was talking about doing deals for the Trump family business. So let's zero in on some of the deals that he worked on.

Let's start by what happened in Qatar, because it was about 2 weeks before President Trump arrived there that Eric Trump worked with Qatar to partner the Trump Organization on a \$5.5 billion Trump-branded golf course and real estate development deal.

It should be pointed out that Qatar has also invested over \$1 billion in a private equity fund for Trump's son-in-law Jared Kushner in a deal announced in 2024 after Donald Trump's most recent election victory.

And now, as Senator MURPHY pointed out, then Trump asked Qatar to give him, as a gift, this jumbo jet plane to use as Air Force One and potentially to keep for later on as part of his Presidential library.

And so Qatar, for the reasons that Senator MURPHY indicated, felt apparently compelled to comply with this wish from the President of the United States. The President of the United States has a lot of influence in the region, and Qatar has been on the losing end of that influence in the first Trump administration. And so Qatar gave Donald Trump, at Donald Trump's request, a \$400 million jumbo jet, what the President calls the palace in the sky. It is complete with a 55-inch TV, leather sofas, wood paneling—the works.

And during this whole period of time, Qatar has also wanted to make sure it establishes a solid relationship with the United States and, specifically, with the Trump administration, and the Trump administration had noticed a major arms sale to Qatar, a \$1.9 billion weapon package, complete with Predator drones, 500-pound bombs, and Hellfire 2 missiles.

So all of this gets caught up together in the major corrupt deals that are being put forth in order to enrich the Trump family, not advance the national security interests of the United States.

Now let me turn to the United Arab Emirates, the UAE, because in this case, the corruption is at least as bad—probably more so.

So, once again, in the case of the UAE, before President Trump went to the region, it wasn't the State Department emissaries that went out. It was

Eric Trump on behalf of the Trump family businesses. In this case, it was a new cryptocurrency stablecoin enterprise launched by the Trump family called World Liberty Financial.

Now, World Liberty Financial is 60 percent owned by the Trump family. As Senator MURPHY pointed out, one of the cofounders is actually Zach Witkoff—a last name that you might know because his dad Steve Witkoff is Donald Trump's—President Trump's—major Middle East envoy, going to places like Qatar as part of the Middle East negotiations with both respect to Iran and Gaza.

So 2 weeks before Donald Trump goes to the region, his son, Eric Trump, goes on behalf of the family business along with Zach Witkoff, the son of the President's Middle East Special Envoy.

So what happens when Eric Trump, the President's son, goes to the UAE? Well they soon after announced that MGX, which is a UAE Government-backed investment firm, would use Trump's new stablecoin—his new stablecoin—called USD1, dollar one, to close a new \$2 billion investment in the cryptocurrency exchange Binance.

So by putting \$2 billion into the Trump stablecoin enterprise—putting that into circulation—the UAE turned an unknown stablecoin company into one of the biggest players in the world overnight. Overnight, the value of that company shot up with the action that the UAE took with the \$2 billion.

And the Trump family stands to make tens of millions of dollars every year from that deal alone.

Now, I doubt that the Emirati investment firm went with a Trump-branded cryptocurrency for its \$2 billion investment because Eric Trump put together the best slide deck for the pitch meeting. Somehow, I think it is because he was the son of the President of the United States who was going to be arriving in the UAE 2 weeks later.

So I want everybody to hold that deal in their head, just put a pin in it for a minute. Eric Trump, the President's son, goes to the UAE 2 weeks before President Trump arrives and does this crypto deal—\$2 billion crypto deal.

So 2 weeks later, the President of the United States arrives in the UAE. And what happens? President Trump gives away some of the most sensitive advanced American technology—in fact, the crown jewels of American AI technology in semiconductors.

The previous administration, President Biden, had restricted the flow of this very sensitive AI technology to places like the UAE because of the fear of what is known as diversion; that that technology would not be safe in the hands of the UAE without really important safeguards in place because the UAE has a partnership with the United States, but it also has very close relations with China, the PRC.

So there has been well-documented concern about the real risk that very sensitive American AI technology would go to China.

I would also point out that the UAE has made it its ambition to become one of the AI leaders in the world. So they obviously will benefit greatly from getting the very best technology, the highest compute power that the United States can provide them.

Now, interestingly, it was the day before President Trump departed to the UAE and Qatar and Saudi Arabia that the Trump administration rolled back the important safeguards the Biden administration had placed on the transfer of this very sensitive AI technology. They rolled it back as the President was about to take off to go visit the UAE.

Now, this deal—this deal—that was cut where the United States agreed to lift its limitations on the transfer of this technology really does compromise the national security interests of the United States.

A group of us wrote a letter led by Senator WARREN. It was signed by Leader SCHUMER, also by the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee Senator REED, the ranking member of the Intelligence Committee Senator WARNER, Senator COONS, and others.

Here is what we wrote:

These deals greenlight the sale of sensitive U.S. technology in exchange for illusory promises of foreign investment. If completed, they will present an immediate threat to U.S. national security, and over the long term, may irreversibly erode U.S. leadership in artificial intelligence (AI) by offshoring American jobs.

So that is what the President did just 2 weeks after the UAE said it would invest \$2 billion in the Trump family business crypto exchange, letting that skyrocket to very valuable levels.

I will point out that it wasn't only Democrats who have expressed concern about the risks of transferring this sensitive AI technology to the UAE. In fact, during the Biden administration, the Republican chairman of the House Select Committee on China wrote to the President—actually wrote to the President's then-National Security Advisor Jake Sullivan expressing exactly these kinds of concerns.

It was a letter dated July 10, 2024. It is a short letter.

(Mr. MULLIN assumed the Chair.)

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 10, 2024.

Hon. JAKE SULLIVAN,
National Security Advisor,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SULLIVAN, On April 15, 2024, Microsoft announced a major partnership with Group 42 Holding Ltd. (G42), the United Arab Emirates' (UAE's) artificial intelligence holding company chaired by national security advisor His Highness Sheikh Tahnoun bin Zayed Al Nahyan. According to Microsoft, this \$1.5 billion partnership will "help enhance the UAE's position as a global AI hub," furthering the UAE's ambition of becoming "the world leader in AI by 2031."

This deal may be one of the most consequential investments by a U.S. technology firm in the Middle East in decades, and as such, deserves continued special scrutiny by both the Executive Branch and our Committees to ensure that our strategic and national security interests are protected. Our Committees share the overarching goals of limiting the People's Republic of China's (PRC) influence, but we remain deeply concerned by attempts to move quickly to advance a partnership that involves the unprecedented transfer of highly sensitive, U.S.-origin technology, without Congressional consultation or clearly defined regulations in place.

It is vital we do all we can to limit the PRC's malign influence around the world, including in the Middle East. Should this deal proceed further, we must be clear eyed about the risks. It is important to note that, just earlier this month, UAE president and ruler of Abu Dhabi His Highness Sheikh Mohamed bin Zayed Al Nahyan traveled to Beijing and reportedly discussed UAE-PRC cooperation in "artificial intelligence"—the same technology the United States is now considering transferring to the UAE.

Concerns around G42's links to the PRC are not new. Earlier this year, then Chairman of the Select Committee on the Chinese Communist Party, Mike Gallagher, wrote to Secretary Raimondo highlighting G42's ties to the PRC, citing, in part, G42's CEO Peng Xiao and G42's ongoing affiliations to problematic PRC-linked entities. G42 and its affiliates furthermore maintain active ties to PRC-linked entities, including ones working to evade U.S. sanctions and export controls. Since then, we have had numerous productive conversations with Microsoft regarding the need to take steps to mitigate these concerns, as well as others related to G42 activity in areas including digital surveillance, defense, and biotechnology.

We recognize that Microsoft will restrict the transfer of sensitive technology to G42 during the first phase of the agreement and understand negotiations regarding the second phase involving the export of sensitive U.S.-origin technology to the UAE are now underway. If this second phase is to proceed, it will require significantly more robust national security guardrails than those included in Phase 1.

Given the ties between the PRC and G42, as well as the PRC's continued interests in the UAE, we ask that the National Intelligence Council prepare an official Intelligence Community assessment on the ties between G42, including its subsidiaries and affiliates, to the Chinese Communist Party, the People's Liberation Army, or any part of the PRC's apparatus, before this partnership proceeds further. This assessment should also assess the risk of sensitive U.S. technology, including but not limited to hardware, as well as so-called intangibles such as research and engineering advancements, being transferred directly or indirectly to the PRC or PRC-linked companies because of this partnership. We request that the results of this review be shared with the undersigned Committees before any technology, services, or research is transferred to G42 or its affiliates.

As you have rightly emphasized, we are in the early years of a "decisive decade" that will shape the terms of great power competition for years to come. To ensure U.S. interests are protected, there must be close coordination between the public and private sector, leveraging the full suite of national resources. In this, we support your efforts to work hand in glove with U.S. companies like Microsoft to strengthen our dominance in AI; however, we must also be clear-eyed about the risks posed by transferring our

most critical AI technology particularly when it comes to countries where the PRC is active.

Lastly, it is clear that model weights and GPUs are technologies coveted by our partners and adversaries alike. As such, the U.S. must develop a framework for if, when, how and with whom these technologies are shared. Given the extensive national security ramifications, the criteria and conditions for the international transfer of key U.S. artificial intelligence systems must involve Congress working in close bipartisan collaboration with Executive Branch agencies and the private sector. As the Microsoft-G42 deal moves toward Phase II, our Committee members intend to play a proactive and constructive role.

With this in mind, we ask that the appropriate Executive Branch officials brief the undersigned Committees on underlying intelligence assessments related to the G42-Microsoft deal prior to approving the deal's transition to Phase II as well as the safeguards that will be in place to protect U.S.-origin goods and technology, and other areas of ongoing national security concern. Thank you for your ongoing attention and assistance.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman, House Foreign Affairs Committee.

JOHN MOOLENAAR,
Chairman, Committee on Strategic Competition with the CCP.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, here is an important thing for everybody to understand. When Eric Trump went 2 weeks before Donald Trump's trip and when he did that deal where a UAE-owned company put \$2 billion into the Trump family stablecoin business, that was with a company called MGX.

The chairman of that company is a member of the royal family. His name is Sheikh Tahnoun. He is also known as TBZ. He is a real entrepreneur, and he does look out for the interests of the UAE.

So he does this deal with Eric Trump, but guess what else he is the chairman of. He is the chairman of G42, which is the, again, Emirati state-owned business that cut the AI deal with the Trump administration.

So the guy who is the chairman of the company that put \$2 billion into the Trump family stablecoin business is also the chairman of the company G42 that was the beneficiary of Donald Trump's giveaway of very sensitive U.S. AI technology.

Now look, when it comes to Sheikh Tahnoun, you know, I have met him. He is a good businessman. He was looking out for the interests of the UAE when he got that deal when the U.S. Government will give the UAE all this AI technology. So he was looking out for the interests of the UAE.

The problem is that it was President Trump who wasn't looking out for the interests of the United States of America. He was looking out for the interest of his family business and literally gave away the sensitive technology 2 weeks after the UAE invested \$2 billion in the Trump family's newly launched stablecoin.

At the same time, like in the Qatar situation, this was accompanied by a request from President Trump for a \$1.3 billion dollar arms sale to the UAE. Now, that arms sale is part of the overall corrupt bargain that the Trump administration struck with the UAE.

It also ignores what the UAE is doing right now, as we speak, with respect to the terrible war and conflict in Sudan because the UAE has been sending weapons to an organization—a murderous organization—called the Rapid Support Forces.

The Rapid Support Forces have been engaged in all sorts of atrocities. And during the Biden administration, President Biden met with the UAE leaders and asked for assurances that they would no longer be providing weapons to this murderous group and thought he received those assurances.

But the reality is, right at the end of the Biden administration, at my request, I asked for a briefing. And it turns out the United States has determined that the UAE is continuing to provide weapons to this murderous group, which the U.S. Government has found is committing genocide in Darfur, as we speak.

So on top of all the corruption that is part of this deal, we have the Trump administration green-lighting an arms transfer to the UAE. At the same time, the UAE is transferring weapons to a murderous group in Sudan that is committing genocide.

Here is what the State Department's own assessment says:

The [Rapid Support Forces] and allied militias have systematically murdered men and boys—even infants—on an ethnic basis, and deliberately targeted women and girls from certain ethnic groups for rape and other forms of brutal sexual violence. Those same militias have targeted fleeing civilians, murdering innocent people escaping conflict, and prevented remaining civilians from accessing lifesaving supplies.

So there are lots of reasons we shouldn't go forward with this arms sale—partly because it is part of an overall corrupt deal with the Trump administration but also because of the UAE's ongoing actions.

Let me close with this. We do expect the President of the United States, when he travels overseas, to be looking out for American interests. In this case, it is very clear President Trump was going out to look out for his own interests.

In the case of the Middle East, it doesn't even seem that he raised the issue of the genocide in Sudan during his trip to the UAE while he was following up on the corrupt deals. And the President also—I think people remember—said he was going to end the war in Gaza on day one, that he was going to bring back the hostages, and end the absolutely awful humanitarian disaster we are witnessing right now with literally hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of innocent Palestinians dying of starvation—civilians.

But instead of looking at working the Gaza issue or these other foreign

policy priorities, the President was there for himself. And it is sending a terrible message. Other countries are getting that message. Reports say that Vietnam is making way for a Trump golf complex to get lower tariffs and that Serbia is demolishing a historic building to fast-track a Trump hotel in Belgrade.

We cannot allow our foreign policy to be corrupted in this way. And the one way we can send that signal and that message right now is by voting yes on these joint resolutions of disapproval on these arms sales because they are part of the overall corrupt package.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to vote yes, and I now yield the floor to my friend the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Let me thank Senator VAN HOLLEN for his leadership on this issue, as well as Senators MURPHY, KAINE, MERKLEY, and SCHATZ, who are leading the effort to make sure that we pass these joint resolutions of disapproval.

Joint resolutions of disapproval are about denying military assistance to countries that break U.S. and international law. That is all they are about: Respect the law; don't break the law.

These resolutions before us today would prevent multibillion-dollar arm sales to both the UAE and Qatar, precisely because both of these countries have violated U.S. and international law, and allowing these sales to go forward would be a dereliction in the duties of the U.S. Senate.

Let me take a moment to say a few words about these countries—countries that would receive billions of dollars in military aid. As it happens, both of these countries have strongly authoritarian, anti-democratic governments that repress any forms of dissent.

We talk a lot about protests here in the United States. Well, they don't have protests in Qatar. They don't have protests in the UAE. You protest; you go to jail.

These are countries that exploit migrant labor, and these are countries that treat women as third-class citizens.

In the UAE and Qatar, where the ruling families are worth many hundreds of billions of dollars, there are no elections, there is no freedom of the press, and there is no freedom of speech. The ruling families of both of these countries are among the wealthiest and most powerful oligarchs in the entire world.

In the UAE's case, in recent years, they have provided extensive military assistance to the so-called Rapid Support Forces in Sudan, or the RSF. This paramilitary group started the bloody civil war in that country and is responsible for numerous horrific atrocities that, among other things, have contributed to the famine and starvation that is currently taking place in that country.

In January, the U.S. State Department concluded that the RSF, supported by the UAE—the country that would get weapons, if we are not successful in opposing that—has committed ethnic cleansing. I am not quite sure why we would support arms to a country involved in ethnic cleansing.

Clearly, the actions of the UAE are in violation of U.S. and international law. There is no reason, therefore, that we should be providing billions more in arms sales to this country.

The other arms sale we are objecting to today would go to Qatar, a country which has also broken U.S. and international law.

Qatar has channeled hundreds of millions of dollars into a wide variety of political organizations in the Middle East, including the Hamas terrorist organization. And I have no understanding as to why anybody in the U.S. Senate would be voting to support a nation—providing military aid to a nation—that has provided financial assistance to Hamas.

And while Qatar deserves credit for attempting to facilitate a cease-fire in Gaza, it should also be noted that the political leaders of Hamas have resided in Qatar for many years.

But there is another very serious problem regarding military aid to both Qatar and the UAE. Both of these countries, in a variety of ways, have attempted to corrupt our political system and the President of the United States in violation of the emoluments clause of the Constitution and U.S. anti-corruption laws.

I find it interesting, as I am sure millions of Americans do, that President Trump's first major foreign policy trip was not to Europe to reaffirm our longstanding alliances with other democratic countries. It was not to visit our neighbors in Canada or Mexico. No, instead, he chose, on his very first foreign trip, to go to Saudi Arabia, Qatar, and the UAE.

Now, why was that? Why would the President of the United States go to visit countries that are run by oligarchs, that are strongly anti-democratic and oppress the rights of women?

They are kind of funny places for a President—the so-called leader of the free world—to visit on his first foreign policy trip.

Well, I think we now know the answer to that question. Trump went for the money and to secure business deals for himself, his family, and his cronies.

Shortly before Trump's visit to the Gulf, an investment firm owned by the UAE announced that it would use the so-called stablecoin issued by World Liberty Financial to facilitate a \$2 billion cryptocurrency deal. World Liberty Financial just happens to be 60 percent owned by Trump and his family. So by making this deal, the UAE was effectively giving the Trump family \$2 billion in cash to invest as it wishes and keep the proceeds.

Even conservative estimates of such a sum would generate somewhere

around \$85 million in profit a year for the Trump family. Think about that. The UAE is directly giving the Trump family some \$85 million a year.

Now, what did the UAE get in return? They don't give away \$85 million for nothing.

In Qatar's case, that government announced, during Trump's visit, that they would give him a \$400 million luxury jet for use as Air Force One, which he plans to keep for personal use after he leaves office.

Necessary security and communications updates will cost the taxpayers of our country millions of dollars and take several years. So if this plane is actually ever used by the U.S. Government, it will only be for a year or two. But that is really not Donald Trump's concern because he gets to keep this flying palace—this \$400 million plane—for use for himself and his family forever—not a bad gift, a \$400 million plane.

Once again, it is pretty obvious what Trump gets from this deal. It is not quite so clear how the American people benefit.

Qatar also announced that it was just, coincidentally, financing a \$5.5 billion Trump-branded golf course and invested another billion dollars in Trump's son-in-law Jared Kushner's company, just for good measure.

Now, what are these authoritarian governments getting in return for the many hundreds of millions of dollars they are funneling to Trump and his family?

Well, it could be the arms sales we are talking about today. It could be other policy priorities of these governments.

For example, just 10 days after the UAE crypto deal with Trump, he lifted restrictions on the export of advanced AI microchips to the UAE, which had previously been limited over security concerns. That delivered on a long-standing UAE priority worth billions of dollars to its leaders.

But the deeper truth is we really don't know what these authoritarian foreign powers are getting for their bribes. But we shouldn't have to be asking these questions. This is precisely why the Constitution of the United States and U.S. law make it illegal for Presidents to accept gifts from foreign powers.

The truth is that the autocratic leaders of Saudi Arabia, the UAE, and Qatar have perfected the art of channeling money to Trump and his family as a way to buy influence and get what they want. Our job is to say no, to say no to providing military aid to one country which is involved in horrific policies which are resulting in famine and starvation and another country which is making huge amounts of money from side deals with the President.

Let us support these resolutions.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS—AMENDMENT
NOS. 2349 AND 2350

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, President Trump is engaged in massive corruption. There is a "government for sale" sign flashing its lights on the lawn of the White House. He is selling access and influence through two types of cryptocurrencies: a meme coin which is a digital baseball card, and he invited the 220 people who gave him the most money for these digital baseball cards called a meme coin to come to a dinner where he would feed them at his fancy Virginia golf club, held 2 weeks ago.

And he said: Oh, and the top 25 buyers of my meme coin, those buyers will get some other special access and special tour.

And 220 people gave the President \$148 million, approximately, and they didn't give him \$148 million in order to have a digital baseball card. They gave it because he was conveying that this would give you access and influence.

As the president of Freight Technologies, Inc., said, I bought \$2 million of these coins. I am hoping to buy \$20 million of these coins because I want the President to change a policy related to freight transportation between Mexico and the United States of America.

That CEO was saying out loud what everyone else understood: that the President was selling access and influence.

And that is not all. There is another type of Trump coin—cryptocurrency—that is inducing these corrupt practices. It is called a stablecoin. And a company associated with the United Arab Emirates said: You know, we are going to buy \$2 billion of your coins. And guess what. You get to keep the value of everything earned on that \$2 billion deposit.

Even at 4 percent, that is \$80 million a year.

And what did the UAE want?

The UAE wanted advanced AI chips in order to have an advanced AI center in the United Arab Emirates.

Well, what did we see transpire?

The UAE repeatedly advocated for having access to these chips that the United States had previously said were a security risk.

Then a company closely associated with the UAE buys \$2 billion of Trump's USD1 stablecoin. And then President Trump says: Oh, do you know what? You can have these AI chips after all. We will help you establish an advanced AI processing—artificial intelligence—center in Abu Dhabi, one of the UAE Emirates. That is corruption laid out as black and white as you could ever see it. This is incredible. This is what we expect of very poor, impoverished countries with dictators running the place, taking a cut of everything, but instead it is the President of the United States doing it.

Our Founders said this should never be allowed. Hamilton noted the reason that there is an emoluments clause in the Constitution. In Federalist 22, he

said “many mortifying examples of the prevalence of foreign corruption in republican governments.”

So here were our Founders, putting together this series of checks and balances, separation of powers between a judiciary, an executive, and a legislative branch, but they knew it could all be corrupted if you had an Executive—that is, a President—who could be bought.

Well, folks, we have a President who is being bought, who is advertising it to the world, and we haven't acted to stop it. Our Founders acted. They put a clause into the Constitution that said that “no Person holding any Office of Profit or Trust under them”—that, of course, included the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, all of us here who are elected—“shall, without the Consent of the Congress, accept of any present, Emolument, Office, or Title, of any kind whatever, from any King, Prince, or foreign State.”

Well, the head of MGX is the National Security Advisor of the United Arab Emirates. This company is absolutely intertwined with this foreign government. Our Constitution forbids this type of gift to a President or a Vice President or any one of us.

So here is the fact: We are right now debating a bill dealing with cryptocurrencies, so this is the time to debate and vote on an amendment that bans these corrupt practices.

For that reason, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate resumes consideration of amendment No. 2307 postcloture, that the pending amendment No. 2310 be set aside so I may offer my amendment No. 2349, which would stop the corruption in stablecoins for any elected Federal official of the United States of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I think it is pretty rich for the party of President Biden to talk about improprieties.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I hear an objection from my friend and colleague, the head of the Banking Committee. Would my friend and colleague explain why we shouldn't, while we are on a cryptocurrency bill, consider and debate an amendment to honor the emoluments clause of the U.S. Constitution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. President, I think it is pretty clear that the underlying assumption is that there is already something nefarious going on, and I simply object to casting aspersions toward the President of the United States, particularly given the fact that this is the party—not Jeff but the party—that had cocaine in the

White House, that had a problem with Hunter Biden's laptop.

My point is, I am not going to cast aspersions on the President of the United States without any clear evidence that any law has been broken, and I do not believe that there has been.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask to be recognized. We are in the middle of a series of presentations here.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. He recognized you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I recognized you.

Mr. MERKLEY. Thank you.

I could understand if my colleague was objecting because that amendment only covers one type of cryptocurrency that is being used in this fashion, and therefore I will present a different option, which is to say we should address both the sale of meme coins as a way to profit from people wanting to give us money and we should also cover the stablecoins as well.

So this broader amendment is a more comprehensive way, regardless of what conclusions you might have about President Trump currently, a broader way to ensure as we go forward that this body and the executive branch, the House down the Hall, will not be corrupted by us making personal money by selling something like a stablecoin or a meme coin, a digital baseball card—a way for people to essentially channel us cash, pretending to buy digital baseball cards.

So I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate resumes consideration of amendment No. 2307 postcloture, that the pending amendment No. 2308 be set aside so that I may offer my amendment No. 2350, which more broadly covers the set of corrupting risks that we would be addressing not just for the executive branch but for the legislative branch as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I am disappointed. I was very present when the majority leader said that on this bill, there will be an open amendment process, and we made it very clear that this was one of the issues that we felt we should be debating while we are on a cryptocurrency bill.

There are other amendments that should be considered as well. One of them is to stop a form of scam that bypasses a bank teller by getting older folks to think they are wiring money to perhaps a nephew or grandchild in distress, but instead of wiring the funds, they go and get digital coins at an ATM as instructed, but, in fact, they are just giving the money to crooks overseas. That amendment should be considered.

There are other amendments that address creating more sideboards so that this bill, which purports to regulate an industry, actually regulates it in an effective fashion rather than essentially endorsing an unregulated industry, which is what, in sum, this bill is currently.

So I am disappointed. I would, as I asked earlier, ask for the majority leader to honor his previous commitment to have an open amendment process so that we can pursue the people's work, fighting for a better America, including ending corruption in cryptocurrencies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

S.J. RES. 53 AND S.J. RES. 54

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to oppose the two resolutions we are about to vote on. What they are is they have to do with arms sales to Qatar and UAE.

These flawed resolutions aren't really about arms sales to our allies in Qatar and UAE. If they were, the discussion would be about how Qatar is one of our designated, major non-NATO allies, how it hosts the largest U.S. military base in the Middle East, and how it is our 12th largest foreign military sales customer. It would be about how the UAE has fought alongside the United States in Afghanistan and Iraq, is a participant in the Global Coalition to Defeat ISIS, and is working against Iran and its terror proxies. The debate would mention that the UAE was the first Arab state to join the Abraham Accords when it normalized relations with Israel in 2020. The discussion would be about how these proposed sales will support the national security objectives of the United States by improving the security of two allies that continue to be important forces for stability in the Middle East. We would talk about how these agreements will lay the foundation for investment, innovation, and good-paying U.S. jobs that will boost our economy.

But, no, these joint resolutions do not conduct oversight or provide congressional disapproval. Instead, they make arms sales to some of our closest allies in the Middle East about partisan politics. As such, I would urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, and I object to the resolutions and urge a “no” vote.

Mr. President, I yield back all time and request to proceed to the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

VOTE ON MOTION TO DISCHARGE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to discharge S.J. Res. 53.

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 senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GALLEG0), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF), and the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 56, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 306 Leg.]

YEAS—39

Alsobrooks	Hickenlooper	Sanders
Baldwin	Hirono	Schatz
Bennet	Kaine	Schiff
Blumenthal	Kelly	Schumer
Blunt Rochester	King	Shaheen
Booker	Klobuchar	Smith
Cantwell	Lujan	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Markey	Warner
Durbin	Merkley	Warnock
Fetterman	Murphy	Warren
Gillibrand	Murray	Welch
Hassan	Peters	Whitehouse
Heinrich	Reed	Wyden

NAYS—56

Banks	Graham	Moreno
Barrasso	Grassley	Mullin
Boozman	Hagerty	Murkowski
Britt	Hawley	Ricketts
Budd	Hoeben	Risch
Capito	Husted	Rosen
Cassidy	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Collins	Johnson	Schmitt
Coons	Justice	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cortez Masto	Kim	Sheehy
Cotton	Lankford	Slotkin
Cramer	Lee	Sullivan
Crapo	Lummis	Thune
Cruz	Marshall	Tillis
Curtis	McConnell	Tuberville
Daines	McCormick	Wicker
Ernst	Moody	Young
Fischer	Moran	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Paul

NOT VOTING—4

Blackburn	Ossoff
Gallago	Padilla

The motion was rejected.

VOTE ON MOTION TO DISCHARGE

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. MOODY). Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to the motion to discharge S.J. Res. 54.

Mr. MURPHY. 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 legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GALLEG0), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF), and the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 56, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 307 Leg.]

YEAS—39

Alsobrooks	Blunt Rochester	Durbin
Baldwin	Booker	Fetterman
Bennet	Cantwell	Gillibrand
Blumenthal	Duckworth	Hassan

Heinrich
Hickenlooper
Hirono
Kaine
Kelly
King
Klobuchar
Lujan
Markey

Merkley
Murphy
Murray
Peters
Reed
Sanders
Schatz
Schiff
Schumer

Shaheen
Smith
Van Hollen
Warner
Warnock
Warren
Welch
Whitehouse
Wyden

NAYS—56

Banks
Barrasso
Boozman
Britt
Budd
Capito
Cassidy
Collins
Coons
Cornyn
Cortez Masto
Cotton
Cramer
Crapo
Cruz
Curtis
Daines
Ernst
Fischer

Graham
Grassley
Hagerty
Hawley
Hoeben
Husted
Hyde-Smith
Johnson
Justice
Kennedy
Kim
Lankford
Lee
Lummis
Marshall
McConnell
McCormick
Moody
Moran

Moreno
Mullin
Murkowski
Ricketts
Risch
Rosen
Rounds
Schmitt
Scott (FL)
Scott (SC)
Sheehy
Slotkin
Sullivan
Thune
Tillis
Tuberville
Wicker
Young

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Paul

NOT VOTING—4

Blackburn
Gallago

Ossoff
Padilla

The motion was rejected.

(Mr. MORENO assumed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JUSTICE).

The Senator from Ohio.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MORENO. Mr. 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.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, on May 22, I missed rollcall vote No. 277, passage of H. J. Res. 88. Had I been present, I would have voted no. Overturning California's Clean Air Act waivers is a climate setback of massive proportions that will delay much-needed actions to abate climate chaos. By expanding the scope of the Congressional Review Act to accomplish this, the Senate has created a new process to undermine the ability of States to innovate and invites politicization and corruption of routine administrative actions.

TRIBUTE TO ALECIA WEBB-EDGINGTON

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a driven and highly accomplished Kentuckian Alecia Webb-Edgington. Alecia was recently named 2025 Person of the Year by the Covington Education Foundation in honor of her work impacting the northern Kentucky community as president of the Life Learning Center. I ask my colleagues to please join me in applauding Alecia on her award and

recognizing her outstanding career of public service to the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

Alecia spent the bulk of her career on the frontlines of our communities with the Kentucky State Police, where she served for 15 years. The Governor's security detail and undercover narcotics were just two of Alecia's many assignments as a trooper. It was during this period when she met her husband and greatest supporter Ted. She finished her time with KSP working in the role of chief information officer. After her retirement, Governor Ernie Fletcher appointed Alecia to be executive director of the Kentucky Office of Homeland Security, making her the first woman to hold the office.

When her political appointment came to an end, Alecia knew her call to serve was far from over. From 2009 to 2013, Alecia represented the 63rd District in the Kentucky House of Representatives, climbing the ranks and eventually becoming vice-chair of the Education Committee. As the daughter of a career educator, Alecia values and prioritizes the advancement of education. Her passion is abundantly evident in her work. Alecia's success in Frankfort pushed her to run for Congress, and although her campaign fell short, she knew there was more she could do to serve the public.

An opportunity was presented to Alecia that would take her to Washington, DC, to serve at the State Department as a senior police adviser in the Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement. With excitement for the job and an enthusiastic push from Ted, Alecia made the jump, commuting back and forth to DC in this new adventure. Within the old Yugoslavia and North Africa portfolio, she specialized in issues of trafficking and rule of law in post-conflict countries. She worked with folks who had suffered through tremendous conflict, striving to turn their lives around. While the position was a complete mystery to Alecia when she started, the work was fascinating and very rewarding. She eventually decided to put her newly developed skills from the State Department to use helping Kentuckians at the Life Learning Center.

Since 2016, Alecia has been the president of the Life Learning Center in Covington, KY, leading a team focused on helping the at-risk population receive the education and skills necessary to succeed in the workforce and in life. Her work has made a significant impact on the northern Kentucky community and has won her many well-deserved awards, including the Covington Education Foundation's 2025 Person of the Year. Along with her two Kentucky State Police commendations, Alecia has received several other significant distinctions like the Kenton County Pioneer Award and the Northern Kentucky Chamber of Commerce Community Award.

Alecia also serves on the board of Notre Dame Academy and the Northern Kentucky Workforce Investment