

But as I shared in committee yesterday morning, I also believe that the story of the American Latino and the fight for equality by American women should also be enshrined on the National Mall. So we have an amendment that would add the text of those bills to S. 858 to also allow the Latino and women's museums to build on the National Mall.

My colleague from West Virginia was very eloquent, very passionate, and I share his conviction. The effort to approve the placement language, the location language for the Latino museum and the women's museum has been held up far too long. So I hope the Senator from West Virginia will join me in trying to do away with—what was it that he said?—the “silly, silly politics” because when you look at the history of Latinos in America, it includes 60 Medal of Honor recipients, beginning with Phil Bazaar and John Ortega for their service in the Civil War.

Latino contributions, including paying the ultimate sacrifice, is nothing new. And it includes, by the way, David M. Gonzales from my hometown of Pacoima for his bravery during World War II. The history of women in America includes the story of Dr. Mary Edwards Walker, also a Medal of Honor recipient. All these stories deserve to be told in a location of prominence.

As I said yesterday morning when the Energy and Natural Resources Committee marked up and approved S. 858—I made remarks at the time clearly announcing my intention to offer this amendment when the Medal of Honor bill came up for consideration on the floor of the Senate, so here I am. It shouldn't be a surprise to anybody.

I would urge my colleagues to agree to include my amendment so that all three of these bills can finally move forward after years and years of hard work and bipartisan support.

Therefore, I would ask the Senator to modify his request so my amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to; that the Justice substitute amendment, as amended, be considered and agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modification?

The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. JUSTICE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, my bill has gone through all the steps. The great Senator who is here speaking—his bill has not gone through the steps, and it being held up is surely not my fault, and of everything in the world, it is not these great recipients' fault.

I may have missed one person that could possibly be in our Gallery, and that is Marine Corps Capt. Raymond Murphy of Colorado.

But I want to just tell you this, sir: We have gone through every step the right way. We have gone through the

hearings, the markups, the unanimous passage by the ENR Committee. Therefore, I absolutely object in every single way. His bills have not gone through the committee. His bills have not had a hearing and been passed out of committee. This is absolutely skipping the proper steps. I may be new, but we have done it right.

And absolutely what we are doing is we are turning our backs on the greatest of the greatest of the greatest. This is the very thing—the very, very thing—I support the museums that he speaks of. We all would. But absolutely this act right here is the very root of what is wrong with us.

For God sakes-a-living, how do you absolutely look at those great people, how do you look at what they have given all of us and turn your back on them? I don't get it.

I absolutely object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there an objection to the original request?

The Senator from California.

Mr. PADILLA. Reserving the right to object, I want to set the record straight. The museum efforts that I talked about have gone through all the proper steps. There have been committee hearings. They have been approved by committee. They have been approved in prior Congresses separately by both Chambers, so they are ready to move.

I am disappointed, frankly—not surprised—that the amendment is not accepted.

Therefore, I object and would look forward to working with my colleague from West Virginia and anybody else to advance all three of these proposals as expeditiously as possible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. JUSTICE. Mr. President, I am not going to volley back and forth. Use the Rules Committee, not this Congress.

Like I said before, I absolutely object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

HONORING SERGEANT EDGAR BRIAN TORRES-TOVAR, SERGEANT WILLIAM NATHANIEL HOWARD, AND AYAD MANSOOR SAKAT

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I rise to speak briefly in gratitude today.

Yesterday, Dover Air Force Base once again had the honor of receiving the remains of three Americans who died in service to our Nation: SGT Edgar Brian Torres-Tovar, of Des Moines, and SGT William Nathaniel Howard, of Marshalltown—both Iowans, both servicing in the Iowa National Guard—and Ayad Mansoor Sakat, a resident of Michigan, originally an Iraqi, who served alongside American troops for 4 years during the war in Iraq and who has become a nationalized American citizen. All three were killed in a tragic incident in Syria. All three served bravely. And all

three were welcomed home with the dignity and respect that all who serve our Nation and fall in service to our Nation deserve.

DIGNIFIED TRANSFERS AT DOVER AIR FORCE BASE

Mr. President, I appreciate the forbearance of my colleague from Virginia. I just wanted to briefly thank my colleagues from Iowa.

I am the senior Senator from Delaware. For 15 years, I have invited home State Senators to join me in dignified transfers at Dover Air Force Base. And I understand it is logistically very demanding. But this year has been the first time. In the last year, the two Senators from Georgia joined for the dignified transfer of three Georgians—reservists who died in an incident at Tower 22 in Jordan. More recently, the two Senators from Illinois joined when four soldiers died in a tragic training accident in Lithuania.

Yesterday, the State of Iowa and its delegation really showed up: the Governor of Iowa, Kim Reynolds; of course, the Adjutant General, Stephen Osborn—MG Stephen Osborn of the Iowa National Guard—three Members of the House delegation: Congresswoman ASHLEY HINSON, Congressman ZACH NUNN, Congressman RANDY FEENSTRA, and our two Senators—Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY and Senator JONI ERNST. Senator ERNST served as a colonel and deployed with the Iowa National Guard. Senator ERNST accompanied the remains of the two fallen members of the Iowa National Guard all the way from Ramstein, and it was our honor in Delaware to welcome them to our State.

It is my honor to rise briefly in thanks for the service of the men and women of AFMAO, which is the Armed Forces Mortuary Affairs unit, and Dover Air Force Base. This is a solemn duty and one that the men and women of Dover Air Force Base carry out with exceptional grace, care, and skill.

I want to close by thanking all of the volunteers from our community in Dover, DE, who dedicate their time to making sure that the families of the fallen are welcomed, are supported, are prayed over, and know that our Nation is grateful for their service and their sacrifice.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President, prior to my remarks, I would ask permission that, upon the conclusion of my remarks, Senator SHAHEEN be allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes before the initiation of the scheduled vote.

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

NVIDIA

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President, I rise today to express deep concern and frustration over President Trump's decision to approve the sale of advanced Nvidia H200 AI chips to the People's Republic of China.

I appreciate the fact that my colleague Senator COONS is on the floor

because I will conclude with a discussion of a bipartisan bill that Senator RICKETTS and Senator COONS have introduced in the Senate that, I think, is a very important piece of legislation.

I am worried that the transfer of these chips will compromise U.S. security and enable the People's Republic of China to catch up in one area where the United States has a significant and a very qualitative advantage over the PRC.

For decades, under administrations of both parties, the United States has adhered to a simple principle: We do not sell our most advanced security-critical technology to adversaries. That principle exists for a reason. Advanced semiconductors, like Nvidia's H200 chip, are not consumer gadgets. They are matters of national security. They are the foundation of the future of warfare. They are our edge—the United States' edge—in the development of the technologies of the future. Right now, that future is up for grabs. We protect our chips because they preserve America's advantage in space, cyberspace, and, importantly, as a nuclear deterrent.

During President Trump's first term, the administration clearly understood this, and they expanded export controls on semiconductor technologies to China, placing strict controls on firms like Huawei. At the start of this administration, again, President Trump publicly embraced the longstanding policy: that export controls were treated as national security decisions, as they should be.

But that consensus, apparently, has not lasted. It was challenged very aggressively by corporate interests, most notably by Nvidia's CEO, Jensen Huang, who is a frequent presence at the White House.

The status quo was also challenged by President Trump's sort of self-proclaimed AI and crypto czar, billionaire David Sacks, who argued that the United States should give sensitive articles to China in order to make China dependent upon American technology.

That argument sounds clever, but it isn't. By that logic, should we sell China F-35 fighter jets, advanced missile systems, top-tier satellite technologies? Of course, we shouldn't. We don't preserve our leverage by handing our rivals the very tools that they need to close the gap they have with us. We preserve leverage by maintaining advantages that they can't replicate quickly or cheaply.

And they are attempting to close this gap by cheating. The Justice Department just announced, within the last few days—within the last few days—a dismantling of a major China-linked AI smuggling network, Operation Gatekeeper, seizing more than \$50 million worth of these Nvidia chips illegally exported to China. They are trying to steal this technology, reverse engineer, and take the intellectual property to eliminate this edge that we have.

The administration initially claimed it would only permit the sales of infe-

rior chips, such as the Nvidia H20, not the H200, which is hardware explicitly described as degraded and limited, but China declined. They waited, believing that President Trump would fold, and that is what happened. President Trump, within the last week, has announced that he plans to approve the sale of the H200, one of Nvidia's most powerful AI chips, second only to the very top of its product line.

Let's be clear in what this chip is. The H200 is used to train and deploy frontier AI systems—systems that U.S. national security Agencies have long warned have numerous military and intelligence applications.

Previous administrations, working with allies, imposed export controls precisely—precisely—because they worked. China fell behind. Even the CEO of China's leading AI firm has admitted publicly that the access to advanced chips is their biggest bottleneck.

President Trump is now solving this problem for China. The administration claims that, in exchange—in exchange—the United States will receive a share of the revenue—25 percent of the sales is what we are being told—but that admission should alarm us. Decisions that were once made purely on our national security priorities are now apparently up for sale, and the administration's justification that this will somehow keep China hooked on U.S. technology doesn't withstand normal scrutiny.

We have got decades of evidence that China basically steals foreign technology as fast as it can. They won't be hooked on these chips. They will take these chips, reverse engineer them, produce their own, and wipe out the edge that we now have with China in this critical defense technology.

Now, in less than a week after President Trump's announcement, one of the deal's leading proponents, David Sacks, is already starting to backtrack on his theory that we should give these articles to China. Let's look at the facts surrounding the timing of this announcement.

Nvidia's CEO has attended \$1 million-a-plate fundraisers for the President. His company donated to build the President's ballroom, and now, after months of lobbying and contributions, Nvidia got what it wanted.

I am very, very nervous that the President is bartering away this edge and may barter away other edges to those who are lobbying and contributing to him. This is a pattern that we have seen of transactional politics jeopardizing our security.

China is reaping the rewards of this. They are already leading or are rapidly catching up in so many critical industries. Why would we give up an edge on this one?

The American people are watching this play out, and they are particularly concerned about China, about China's advances, and about giving up the edge we have over China in this key area.

That is why I have signed on, with many in this body—I think there are now 10 cosponsors, equally divided between Democrats and Republicans—to Senators RICKETTS and COONS' SAFE CHIPS Act, which would insist upon rigorous export controls over these chips, particularly as they might be transferred to China, the People's Republic of North Korea, Iran, and Russia. The number of bipartisan cosponsors of this legislation and of some similar legislation that is offered by other Members, by Senator BANKS and Senator COLLINS, is growing.

I urge my colleagues to get on board with this legislation and make sure that we don't harm our national security by transferring technologies of such incredible importance to our country.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2918

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, my colleague from Virginia was very persuasive, I think, in pointing out the threat to national security that providing Nvidia's chips to China presents.

Unfortunately, another area that has the potential to significantly undermine our national security is that of the efforts by this administration to try and negotiate an end to the war in Ukraine.

Now, don't get me wrong. I support ending the war in Ukraine. I think it would be in America's interests, in Europe's interests, and in Ukraine's interests to do that. But to do it in a way that undermines Ukraine for the long term—that gives Vladimir Putin access to the Ukrainian army, which is the largest army in Europe now and is the most technologically advanced—and to do that in a way that would further undermine the future security of Ukraine is not in America's interest.

But, to continue his war in Ukraine, Vladimir Putin needs two things. He needs money, and he needs weapons.

Russia has hundreds of billions of dollars in assets that are frozen overseas, some of which are subject to U.S. jurisdiction. Moscow is fighting hard to regain access to that money because it would help sustain its war effort.

But, as we know, money alone is not going to be enough. Sanctions have significantly degraded Russia's defense industry, and to keep building weapons, Russia relies on outside supply chains. Much of that support now comes from Chinese entities that are providing the materials and the technologies that are keeping Russia's war machine running.

So, if President Trump is really serious about ending this war, those are the pressure points to put against Vladimir Putin.

The good news is that the tools we need to apply that pressure already exist. The United States can deny Russia access to its frozen sovereign assets, and we can disrupt the supply chains that enable Russia to keep fighting. The Foreign Relations Committee has already reported out two