

oversight and guardrails and trampled on the rights of the American people. They have attacked and killed protesters and observers, seized the records of journalists, and gone after political enemies, including Members of Congress.

There are many ways in which 702 can be abused by the administration, including warrantless searches of Americans' communications in 702 data. The fact is, there are alarm bells pointing to administration abuses. What kind of abuses? Month after month, Trump administration officials have been trotting out conspiracy theories about elections and voting. These theories include accusations of foreign involvement. The Director of National Intelligence even showed up at the FBI's ballot-seizing raid in Fulton, GA. And one of her excuses: She was there to protect against foreign interference. These conspiracy theories open the door for more warrantless 702 searches, all to try to discredit American elections.

The Trump administration has also been abusing its authorities to go after journalists whose stories they don't like. All it takes is an accusation of a foreign connection and they can be subjected to 702 searches. Then there are protesters who the administration could accuse of being connected to antifa groups.

When the guardrails are gone and the abuses are clear, there is only one solution: Congress must require court-ordered warrants to conduct searches on Americans. There ought to be exceptions, but only for emergencies.

I am going to close with one last important issue that colleagues are approaching all of us to ask about, and that is the role of AI in supercharging surveillance abuses. The Trump administration is going full speed ahead on AI, and Americans are rightly concerned about how artificial intelligence is going to affect their privacy rights.

In the case of section 702, the government could use artificial intelligence to process huge amounts of data to identify Americans for warrantless searches. These technological advances are happening so fast, and Congress needs to step up and protect Americans. New tools require new rules, and it really applies to artificial intelligence.

So when the Senate returns to vote on government surveillance, I am here to say another effort to jam this bill through without reforms is also going to be dead as a doornail.

I urge all Members to come forward and work in a bipartisan way because security and liberty are not mutually exclusive. Smart policies get you both; not so smart policies get you neither.

I urge my colleagues to recognize that at this moment it is right for the Senate to postpone the vote. It is the second time we have postponed a vote because the country doesn't buy this argument that we should sacrifice our liberty in order to have security. We can find both.

I urge my colleagues to use this interim period to make sure that actually happens, and I intend to be on the floor objecting at every opportunity if it doesn't.

I yield the floor.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further objection?

The majority leader.
Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, let me just say to my colleague from Oregon that, obviously, there are, I think, constructive conversations going on right now about how to address some of the concerns that he has raised on this. But I would also say that, by midnight on Thursday, this authority goes dark. It is authority that our military leadership and intelligence leadership rely on heavily to keep the United States safe, and so I hope we can find a way to proceed with this in a fashion that doesn't allow this authority to go dark at midnight on Thursday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, just so we are clear, there is authority to continue the protections for the American people already. We will have that debate. I am eager to work with colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

We have to recognize that the only path forward for the American people is actual reform and not just cliché's.

I yield the floor.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Motion to Proceed

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Executive Calendar No. 5, S. Res. 690.

VOTE ON MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

Mr. WYDEN. 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 Alabama (Mr. TUBERVILLE).

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 107 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Armstrong	Cotton	Hawley
Banks	Cramer	Hoeven
Barrasso	Crapo	Husted
Blackburn	Cruz	Hyde-Smith
Boozman	Curtis	Johnson
Britt	Daines	Justice
Budd	Ernst	Kennedy
Capito	Fischer	Lankford
Cassidy	Graham	Lee
Collins	Grassley	Lummis
Cornyn	Hagerty	Marshall

McConnell	Ricketts	Sullivan
McCormick	Risch	Thune
Moody	Rounds	Tillis
Moran	Schmitt	Wicker
Moreno	Scott (FL)	Young
Murkowski	Scott (SC)	
Paul	Sheehy	

NAYS—47

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

NOT VOTING—1

Tuberville

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EN BLOC NOMINATIONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ARMSTRONG). The clerk will report the executive resolution.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

An executive resolution (S. Res. 690) authorizing the en bloc consideration in Executive Session of certain nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Executive Calendar No. 5, S. Res. 690, an executive resolution authorizing the en bloc consideration in Executive Session of certain nominations on the Executive Calendar.

John Thune, Ted Budd, Mike Crapo, Mike Rounds, Kevin Cramer, Bill Cassidy, Katie Boyd Britt, Ashley B. Moody, John Boozman, Jon Husted, Roger F. Wicker, Tom Cotton, John Barrasso, James E. Risch, James Lankford, Steve Daines, John Hoeven.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session.

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

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES—ADDRESS BY HIS MAJESTY KING CHARLES III

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed as a body to the Hall of the House

of Representatives to receive a message from His Majesty King Charles III.

Thereupon, the Senate, preceded by the Deputy Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, Jason Bell; the Secretary of the Senate, Jackie Barber; and the Vice President of the United States, JD VANCE, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives to hear the address by His Majesty King Charles III.

(The address delivered by His Majesty King Charles III to the joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress is printed in the proceedings of the House of Representatives in today's RECORD.)

RECESS UNTIL 4 P.M.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the scheduled recess begin immediately.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senate stands in recess until 4 p.m.

There being no objection, at the conclusion of the joint session, the Senate, at 12:16 p.m., recessed until 4 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. BANKS).

LEGISLATIVE SESSION—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I rise to speak on a War Powers Resolution that will be called up for a vote in the 5 o'clock hour, I believe, and I expect a number of other colleagues might take the floor. This is a resolution that I filed together with Senators GALLEGRO and SCHIFF, and it is like other resolutions that I have filed in recent weeks to challenge the President's authority to take the United States to war without a vote of Congress.

In this instance, this resolution deals with the country of Cuba. The United States has had a long, long history with Cuba that I needn't recount here, but suffice it to say, as a member of the Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees, I have never heard the suggestion that Cuba poses an imminent security threat to the United States, and I think it is an accepted fact that there is currently no war authorization passed by Congress that would authorize military actions against Cuba.

And so using the privileged provision of the War Powers Resolution, I have filed this, together with my colleagues, to say we should not be at war—we should not be engaged in hostilities with Cuba unless there is a congressional debate and vote.

My argument is that, under the terms of the resolution, we are already engaged in hostilities with Cuba because we are using American force—primarily the Coast Guard but other assets as well—to engage in a very devastating economic blockade of the nation. If anyone were doing to the

United States what we are doing to Cuba, we would definitely consider it an act of war.

Let me describe what United States actions with respect to Cuba now mean to Cuban citizens. The blockade which went into effect and is using United States assets to block energy from being delivered to the island—because it does not have its own energy sources—has led to severe humanitarian crises across Cuba. Between January and March, nearly 100,000 scheduled surgical procedures were not carried out in hospitals in the country due to power limitations—power limitations brought on by the fuel blockade. More than 11,000 of these procedures were procedures that had been scheduled for children.

Hospitals in Cuba are facing a particularly severe shortage of fuel since Cuban hospitals are run by the Cuban Government and President Trump has focused on curtailing shipments of energy destined for governmental use, and that governmental use includes hospitals and other healthcare providers. There has been significant press reporting about the humanitarian impact of this energy blockade upon the healthcare sector and medical shortages in Cuba.

In addition to the canceling of hospital procedures, the shortage of energy and particularly the blocking of energy to the Cuban Government has meant the cutoff of running water in many urban areas because the water supply systems in Cuba rely upon electric pumps. More than a third of the Cuban population does not currently have access to clean water. Eighty-seven percent of the national water system's pumps rely on grid electricity to function. Trash has piled up because of lack of gas to run garbage trucks, and doctors say preventable deaths are rising as equipment fails, including the refrigeration that is necessary to maintain certain medications at appropriately low temperatures.

In Cuba, daily power cuts in urban and rural areas have been lasting between 12 and 20 hours and, in some cases, exceeding 48 to 72 hours. Cuba has experienced multiple national blackouts in the months of March and April. Cuba is a nation that is very rural, and these cuts fall particularly heavily upon rural Cuba.

In late March, the United States Coast Guard did allow a single Russian oil tanker carrying about 730,000 barrels of oil to pass through the blockade, providing Cuba with a few weeks of fuel. But in a country where the average monthly wage is about \$15, gas is now nearly \$40 a gallon. If you can find it, you probably can't afford it.

The blockade of energy also affects food prices. They have risen more than 13 percent. Restrictions in rural electrical supply are projected to cause a 40-percent reduction in short-cycle crop yields—crops like vegetables, beans, and potatoes. Cold chain disruption has led to significant rates of spoilage for perishable foods.

These are the kinds of things that happen when the United States decides, for no reason other than a desire to change the Cuban regime, that we will impose an energy blockade upon them. And again, if another country was doing this to the United States and causing the cancellation of medical procedures, especially for kids; the blackouts; the shutting down of municipality water supplies; and other significant challenges in the United States, we would consider it a hostility and even an act of war.

It is interesting that there has not yet been a clear justification for what the United States is doing to Cuba other than a desire to change its regime. There is no argument that they have nuclear weapons or a ballistic missile program. There is no argument that they pose an imminent threat to the United States.

Now, could we stand here and debate at some length and find some significant bipartisan support for the notion that the Cuban regime is a gross violator of human rights? I think we could. It has been a source of sadness that as the United States took some steps toward normalization of Cuba, that did not lead the Cuban Government to necessarily open up human rights or freedoms for its population. So, sure, we could have a debate about what we thought about the Cuban regime, but a desire to change the regime of another nation is not a sufficient reason for the United States to threaten and carry out military action that is devastating to the population.

So given that regime change should not be a reason for war unless it is debated upon and embraced by Congress—and if we were going to say the regime change of a bad regime is a reason for the United States to go to war, we would have an awful lot of countries in the world where we would be debating about going to war. But given that there isn't an imminent threat to the United States from Cuba, I am glad to join with my colleagues and call up this War Powers Resolution.

We just heard a powerful speech from King Charles III. We took the break to walk down to the House to hear the speech, and it was a powerful one. And one of the lines in the speech that got a lot of applause on all sides of the aisle—and I even noticed members of the President's own Cabinet standing to applaud a line—was his assertion that part of the origin of the American Declaration of Independence and the American independence project was to form a government whereby the legislature would have the power, as the article I branch, to stand up against overreaches by an Executive.

An overreaching Executive, even in matters of war, is not something that is new to the United States. It is not something that is partisan. Executives of both parties, Whigs and Federalists, before there were Democrats and Republicans, often attempted to overreach. But what the Framers put into