

If you are in business, we have also provided for full expensing of research and development, full expensing of new equipment and machinery. Why does that matter? That means you can buy new equipment to grow your business and deduct it from your income tax, which lowers your taxes.

This is a major piece of legislation, and it is taking effect now. It is not going to solve the problem completely, but it is going to go a long way because the best way to deal with inflation is to grow your way out of it. If prices are going up between 2 and 3 percent, rather than suffering 10, 8, 12 percent unemployment to get prices down, to have deflation, you are better off increasing income so people's wages and income will go up faster than prices. And that is what the One Big Beautiful Bill is going to do.

So don't think we are not doing something. We are. We have. And that bill is just starting to take effect right now.

The second thing we have done—and I am not going to talk about all of them. We have a problem with housing in America. You don't have to be an astrophysicist to figure that one out. You don't have to be able to explain the law of special relativity to know that the cost of a home is breathtaking or to know that rents have gone up. Why is that? It is because of the lack of supply. Duh. It is because of a lack of supply.

So what do you do to make a new home or a used home more affordable? What do you do to make rents go down? You increase the supply. And that is what we are trying to do.

I sit on the Banking Committee. We have passed—the Senate has—twice, a housing bill. It is right in front of the House of Representatives right now, and I hope my friends in the House pass it.

I will tell you one of the things it will do. It will increase housing starts. If you don't think this works, just go read an article about what is going on in Austin. They increased the housing supply in Austin. You know, rents are dropping in Austin like a fat guy on a seesaw. They are going down. Why? Because they increased supply.

Our bill I hope the House will pass will offer local governments—local governments control the supply of housing. It is not the Federal Government. It is not the State government. It is local government. Do you know why? Because they have control of the zoning office, and they have to give you—the contractors—the permits to build. If they want to restrict the supply of housing, they just make it very difficult to build a new home. If they want to expand the supply of housing, they make it easy.

For a variety of reasons I won't go into, many local governments have been restricting the supply of housing. So what our bill does—we say: Look, that is up to you, local government. It is your call. We don't want to be in

charge of zoning laws in America. We don't want to be in charge, at the Federal level, of permitting. But you do rely on us for money.

Every year, we send about \$3.3 billion—\$3.3 billion every year like clockwork—to local governments, called community development block grants. They love it. It is free money, and they can pretty much spend that \$3.3 billion—these local governments can—on anything within reason that they want to. They love this free money.

So what we did—this is in the housing bill, among other things that we passed—we said: Look, this \$3.3 billion, you like it?

Yeah.

Well, if you will increase your housing starts—here is the good news. We started out with the sugar. We said: If you will increase your housing starts—you don't have to, but if you will increase housing starts in your city or local area, we will give you an extra dose of that community development block grant money.

Here is the bad news for them. And we also said: Now, you don't have to increase housing starts, but if you don't, we are going to pay the cities that did increase their housing starts with the money that we were giving you that you don't get because you chose not to.

So this bill isn't going to cost the American taxpayer any more money. The \$3.3 billion is going to remain the same. But those cities that do a better job of increasing housing are going to get more money. Where is that money going to come from? It is going to come from the cities that didn't want to increase housing starts. And it will work. All you have to do is go look and see what is going on in Austin.

I have two more topics I want to talk about.

(Mr. MORENO assumed the Chair.)

IRAN

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, look, everybody has got an opinion about Iran. I get it. That is good. Americans are entitled to have an opinion. Every Member of the Senate has an opinion. Every Member of the House has an opinion. Obviously, the President has an opinion. The Pope has an opinion. Everybody has an opinion, and that is a good thing.

I can tell you why I think we did the right thing by going into Iran. First of all, the people of Iran are wonderful people. I am not talking about the people; I am talking about their government, which is run by their Supreme Leader. Now, the old Supreme Leader is now as dead as Woodrow Wilson, but they have a new Supreme Leader. It is the son of the old Supreme Leader, and he is just as crazy as his daddy was.

The people in charge in Iran—they are a theocracy. That means, unlike America, where we separate church and state, in there, they marry their church to their state. And the Supreme Leader, who rules Iran, thinks that he

is speaking for God. He really thinks God is telling him to do all this stuff. The Supreme Leader believes that if you disagree with his version of his religion, you should die.

They hate America, and they hate Israel. They do. They want to kill us and hurt us the entire time we are dying.

They are trying to get a nuclear weapon. This isn't like China having a nuclear weapon or Russia or India or Pakistan.

Let me ask you a question. Would you give Charles Manson a nuclear weapon? That is what we are talking about here. Charles Manson is also as dead as Woodrow Wilson. But would you give a Charles Manson-type person a nuclear weapon? No. That is why we can't let the Supreme Leader and his minions in Iran have them.

Now, how do we stop them? Well, this is what Iran was up to. First of all, President Trump and Israel went in in June and bombed the living daylights out of their nuclear facilities, destroyed them substantially.

To develop a nuclear weapon, you have to have fissile material, enriched uranium. We hit their production facilities so hard that a lot of that uranium is buried underneath the ground, but it is still there, OK. We bombed the hell out of it, and we set them way back in terms of their nuclear ability, but it still exists.

We received intelligence saying that Iran has started to take some baby steps to restart their nuclear program that we bombed to hell and back last June. But that is not really why we went in. We also received intelligence that said Iran has a new game plan. The Supreme Leader—nutty as a fruitcake—the Supreme Leader has decided—here is his game plan—he is going to double and triple missile production.

Ballistic missiles, cruise missiles, also drones—they were producing those things at anywhere from 200 to 600 a month, maybe more, and the Supreme Leader was going to stockpile all these new missiles and these new drones, and then he was going to turn to America and Israel and the rest of the world and say: I am restarting the nuclear program. You can bomb me, you can bomb us if you want to, but we have got all these missiles, and some of these missiles can reach Berlin and Paris and London and Türkiye, and we are going to use them. The first thing we are going to do is destroy the Middle East. We don't care. We are Charles Manson. We are going to destroy the Middle East, and then we are going to start on anybody else that we are mad at.

We couldn't let that happen. We couldn't. So Israel and the President attacked. Now, whether you think it was a good idea or a bad idea, that is up to you. I can tell you the effect of it, though, because this—the media won't report it, but this is undeniable. We hit Iran so hard, they are coughing up bones. The public sector but also

the private sector today in Iran—it doesn't give me any joy to say this. We had no choice. I don't know how they are standing. They are held together with duct tape and spit.

Israel and America ran 21,000 bombings. We bombed seaports, airports, the electrical grid, railroads, the petrochemical industry, the farm industry, their steel industry.

Six out of ten Iranians of adult age don't have a job and don't have any prospect of getting a job. Many parts of the country don't even have electricity.

We knocked out two-thirds of the Supreme Leader's missile launchers. Does he still have some left? Yeah. They are buried underground. He has to dig them out. You probably saw pictures on TV of the bulldozers. We think we have knocked out half of their cruise missiles and ballistic missiles. We are not sure how many drones.

They don't have an air force anymore in Iran. They don't have a navy either. They still have some small boats that the Revolutionary Guard, which is part of their military, runs, but they don't have a navy. We sunk all their ships. We attacked virtually every single building we know of which is run by the Revolutionary Guard, which is part of their military.

I don't think the American people, because the press hasn't reported it, have a full appreciation for the damage that we did and had to do. I have seen estimates as high as a trillion dollars for them to rebuild.

I know the press glibly reports: Oh, you know, China and Russia will help them build back. What is the point of the war?

Well, the point of the war: They are not going to have a nuclear weapon anytime soon. Charles Manson may be able to find a knife, but he is not going to have a nuclear weapon.

And in order to rebuild Iran, it is going to take 20 to 25 years. And I don't know if we will be able to recover all of the enriched uranium. Some of my Democratic colleagues and some of our colleagues in the media are saying: It is a failure because you didn't get their enriched uranium.

I never figured we would get it.

And a lot of my colleagues are saying: Well, it is a failure because you didn't effect regime change; that nutjobs are still in charge.

That is true. We can't dictate regime change. That is up to the Iranian people. The only way we can dictate regime change is sending in troops, and I don't want to do that.

But the fact of the matter is that if you think the theocracy run by the Government of Iran—the Charlie Mansons—who is dangerous to the world—and I do—then the world is a much safer place today, and that is just a fact. That is a fact.

It is going to be a long time before Charlie Manson can rebuild, and it is going to be a hell of a long time before the new Supreme Leader is going to get a nuclear weapon.

Third and final point. I don't know whether I will do this, but I will just do it. I don't hate anybody. I have said that before standing here, I don't. I do not. When I pray, I pray. God, don't let me hate because it is hard up here. It is not worth it.

But if I had a short list of people that I would consider hating, Congressman Eric Swalwell would be on it. He has undermined the confidence of the American people in this body.

Here is my impression of Congressman Eric Swalwell eating an ice cream cone.

You know why I do that? Life is hard, but it is harder when you are stupid. And if you are going to be stupid, by God, you better be tough. This is no country for creepy old men, and Congressman Swalwell, he is about to find that out. Karma may be slow, but it is almost always on time.

I yield to my friend Senator KELLY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. KELLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for Senator SANDERS to make motions to discharge S.J. Res. 32 and S.J. Res. 138 from the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Senate debate the motions to discharge concurrently; further, that the following Senators be permitted to speak on the motions to discharge, and upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote on the motions to discharge in the order in which the motions were made: SANDERS for up to 20 minutes, VAN HOLLEN for up to 10 minutes, MERKLEY for up to 5 minutes, KAINE for up to 5 minutes, MARKEY for up to 5 minutes, and RISCH for up to 5 minutes.

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

WEAPONS SALES

Mr. KELLY. Mr. President, later today, we are going to take a vote on the delivery of bulldozers and 1,000-pound bombs to Israel. First, let me say that I cannot and will not abandon Israel. Israel is one of our closest partners. They have a right to defend themselves, and I will always support Israel's right to exist as a successful and prosperous nation.

As the Israeli people face the threat of missile and rocket attacks from Iran and its proxies, that support continues to be important today. Supporting a partner doesn't mean that we don't ask tough questions, and it doesn't mean that we always agree.

Our support for our allies must always be about what makes us stronger and safer, and we can look at what is happening in the region right now and understand that this is not business as usual, and it is not making us safer.

The United States and Israel are fighting a war against Iran without a clear strategy or goal. I have been

clear that I oppose this war in Iran and the reckless decisions being made by Prime Minister Netanyahu and President Trump.

Under Prime Minister Netanyahu's government, we have seen an expanded war in Lebanon that is putting innocent Lebanese civilians at risk and ongoing violence against Palestinians and their homes being demolished in the West Bank. All of this—all of this—has undermined the path forward for peace.

That matters when we are making decisions about sending these weapons, including bulldozers, that could be used to level more homes and put a two-state solution further at risk.

I flew 39 combat missions in Operation Desert Storm. I have been trusted with the grave responsibility of using deadly force against our enemies. It is not something I take lightly. Neither is the responsibility we have here.

That is the lens I have looked at these two votes through. We are in a moment where we have to ask ourselves: Does this bring us closer to peace and security?

So, today, I have decided to vote yes on these resolutions to stop these transfers. Our partnership matters for Israel and for the United States. I have been clear about that, and I will continue to be.

Israel must maintain the capabilities and means to protect its people. I am confident they can do that today and will be able to do so in the future with our partnership, and I will always support that.

We have to work together toward a future where the Jewish State of Israel is secure and where there is a durable peace in the region.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED FOREIGN MILITARY SALE TO THE GOVERNMENT OF ISRAEL OF CERTAIN DEFENSE ARTICLES AND SERVICES—Motion to Discharge

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, pursuant to section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, I move to discharge the Committee on Foreign Relations from further consideration of S.J. Res. 32.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant executive clerk read as follows:

Motion to discharge from the Committee on Foreign Relations, S.J. Res. 32, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the Government of Israel of certain defense articles and services.