

dwelling unit. It is like the big mansion is the ballroom, and you have this little, tiny house one-fourth the size that is the White House. That is this gilded project the President was undertaking to put his Louis XIV “I am a monarch” stamp on the President’s grounds. But we took an oath to a Constitution that doesn’t have a monarch, and it doesn’t have a King, and Trump is not Louis XIV, so I have a number of concerns about this.

First, my colleague mentioned that it is going to be paid for by private donations; however, a number of his colleagues have been advocating fiercely that it be paid for out of our Treasury.

Certainly \$400 million buys a lot of support for education and housing and healthcare—24,000 kids going to Head Start, 52,000 children being able to benefit from childcare, and the list goes on.

The argument has been made that this would be a great place for State dinners, but we already have a great place for State dinners. We have the State Dining Room at the White House that seats 140. We have the East Room that seats 200. And State dinners are intimate affairs—appropriately so—a conversation between leaders of our House and Senate and the executive branch, along with the leaders visiting from overseas—not a massive “Let’s turn out 1,000 people or more” because of the size of this. Recognize that this is a 3.6 million-cubic-foot ballroom—about four times the volume of the White House. So State dinners certainly aren’t a justification for this.

When it comes to security—well, the judge that took a look at the legality issues found that there wasn’t authority for the President—in fact, this very bill being proposed by my well-intentioned colleague from Montana creates the legal authority that is lacking, and that is why it is being proposed—to be able to create that framework that makes it possible to overrule the court’s ruling. But that judge did find that the security work being done below level could proceed because that part was related to the President’s security.

This project is also about, in the President’s mind, holding inaugurations. I am going to tell you that is probably one of the worst ideas President Trump has ever come up with—hide away the inauguration in a ballroom as opposed to doing it on The Mall.

I know that President Trump is very sensitive about the fact that a whole lot more people attended Obama’s inauguration than his inauguration, so maybe he wants to see those moved inside to avoid any future embarrassment as he ponders whether he is running for a third term, which is not allowed under our Constitution. But what this type of ballroom does do—it is a massive fundraising scheme—a massive fundraising scheme. You can seat 1,000 people at once, all those people who make those massive donations

and all of their friends, all those people who donate to campaigns. Oh, let’s invite them to come be at this massive ballroom. But that is not a great idea.

Philip Kennicott put it this way:

Trump has previously been unable to convince the American public that the White House needs an ornate entertainment venue that would dwarf the historic mansion. Now he seeks to convince them he can’t be safe without it. This suggests he plans to leave behind not just a radically transformed White House complex but a different conception of the presidency.

And what is that conception? That conception is the President has the powers of an authoritarian ruler—of a King. They have a fancy name for it; it is called a unitary executive. And the President has proceeded to utilize 10 different strategies to undermine the checks and balances of our Constitution.

But building this Louis XIV, gilded ballroom for fundraising and to symbolize that the President is a King—hell no.

Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Ohio.

AMENDING RULE XXXVII OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE TO PROHIBIT SENATORS FROM TRADING ON PREDICTION MARKETS

Mr. MORENO. Mr. President, as you know as somebody who led an incredibly distinguished business career, integrity and confidence are the key building blocks in any institution.

We take a solemn oath here to our Constitution and to represent our constituents free of any conflicts of interest whatsoever. When we come here on the Senate floor, our constituents have to know that our only guiding light is what is best for our States, what is best for the people of our States, and what is best for the United States of America.

Engaging in any way in a prediction market or trying to place bets where we might have insider information deteriorates the confidence our constituents have in us. So it is extremely important that the public know that from this day forward, there is no chance that any Member of Congress—Member of the Senate in this case, in this resolution I am going to propose—will be involved in any prediction market whatsoever. I am presenting a resolution that makes that crystal clear.

By changing the standing rules of the Senate, what we are doing is allowing our constituents to know once and for all that no Member of the U.S. Senate, no Member of the staff of the U.S. Senate can ever use that inside information as a way to monetize this job whatsoever.

So I am very proud that we have unanimous support, hopefully, from every single Member of the Senate to do that.

So I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consideration of S. Res. 708, which is at the desk.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 708) amending rule XXXVII of the Standing Rules of the Senate to prohibit Senators from trading on prediction markets.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MORENO. I ask unanimous consent that the Padilla amendment at the desk be agreed to; that the resolution, as amended, be agreed to; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

I point out that the amendment goes broader for us as Members of the Senate. It is not intended to change the definitions of any of the types of contracts that we are talking about. This is about making certain that we have the integrity we need to show our constituents.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 5442) was agreed to as follows:

(Purpose: To improve the bill)

On page 2, line 1, strike “No Member” and insert “No Member, officer, or employee”.

On page 2, line 2, insert “swap,” after “contract.”

On page 2, line 3, insert “of an excluded commodity, as defined in section 1a of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 1a),” after “delivery”.

On page 2, line 5, insert “or contingency. Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to apply to insurance for which the insured holds a lawful insurable interest” after “event”.

SEC. 2. SENSE OF THE SENATE.

It is the sense of the Senate that the House of Representatives, executive branch, and judicial branch should establish restrictions similar to those under section 1 relating to participation in prediction markets.

The resolution (S. Res. 708), as amended, was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, is as follows:

S. RES. 708

Resolved,

SECTION 1. PROHIBITION ON PREDICTION MARKET TRADING BY SENATORS.

Rule XXXVII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph 15 as paragraph 16; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph 14 the following:

“15. No Member, officer, or employee of the Senate may enter into, or offer to enter into, an agreement, contract, swap, or transaction that provides for any purchase, sale, payment, or delivery of an excluded commodity, as defined in section 1a of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 1a), that is dependent on the occurrence, nonoccurrence, or the extent of the occurrence of a specific event or contingency. Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to apply to insurance for which the insured holds a lawful insurable interest.”

SEC. 2. SENSE OF THE SENATE.

It is the sense of the Senate that the House of Representatives, executive branch, and judicial branch should establish restrictions similar to those under section 1 relating to participation in prediction markets.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first, I appreciate what the Senator from Ohio has done. It is a good thing that the Senate is moving swiftly to prohibit Senators and staff from playing around in prediction markets.

Since this is a resolution, it is immediately going into effect for Senators. That is a great thing. Speaker JOHNSON should immediately do the same thing in the House and prohibit House Members from playing around in prediction markets as well.

We must never allow Congress to turn into a casino where Members representing the public can gamble on wars or economic crises or elections. That would destroy the very principle of representative government. Just the possibility that Members could have their votes influenced because of betting is reason enough to prohibit Members from meddling in the prediction markets.

Of all the issues we debate in Washington, this falls squarely in the category of a no-brainer. Then we should go further. This is a good start but not enough. The administration and its employees must apply these very same rules too—particularly this administration, which shows such a troubling affinity to corruption and self-dealing.

When we come back in May, I will work with my colleagues to ensure that the administration can't get rich off betting markets. But today's resolution is a very good first step, and I thank my colleague the Senator from Ohio and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for working quickly to approve this legislation, which I am proud to support.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I know the Senate is running behind, and I wanted to jump in, but I do invite the pages to bring a podium for me when they are ready.

The pages so rarely get recognition, but without them, where would we be? I am grateful.

WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I am grateful to have this opportunity, and it really is about the fact that very soon, my colleague from California ADAM SCHIFF will be bringing another War Powers Resolution to the floor.

This is the sixth time that a group of us has said every single week we are going to continue to bring these War Powers Resolutions to the floor. And why? Clearly, we know the outcome of the vote. Why are we doing this? Well, we are doing this because it has almost

been a month now that this Nation has been at war. In fact, we are coming up to that very 60-day mark. And we are a nation that has now pledged tens of billions of dollars we have spent in an overseas war where 14 servicemembers have died, where hundreds more have been injured, where our President has given multiple different reasons for going into this war, and none of them have been achieved. In other words, there has been no regime change—the regime is more extreme; their incredible race towards highly enriched fissile material is still there in their country; and we are seeing a nation that is still showing military capabilities.

Yes, we have degraded their navy and their air force, but now, with low-cost drones, they are still able to inflict a lot of damage to their neighbors, to our allies. And they have closed the Strait of Hormuz—something that was not going on before but has caused a global oil shock that is hurting Americans at home. Tens of billions of taxpayer dollars—Americans spending hundreds, if not thousands of dollars—all to support President Trump's folly—costly, tragic folly.

And what do we do? We are bringing these War Powers Resolutions to the floor to force this body not to treat this like another normal day. American soldiers are in the line of fire. This is not normal that a President for almost 60 days has been able to conduct a war with this body being silent on it. In fact, today, we are having our first ever hearing with the Secretary of Defense, and he is saying that this war is going well. Well, by what account?

The American people are against this war. The American people are paying the price for this war. American soldiers are dying for this war. Hundreds more have been injured for this war. We see a crisis in the Middle East that is growing and not subsiding.

So this is yet another attempt of ours to force this body to confront an ill-gotten war, a war that has pulled us into further and deeper crisis, yet another quagmire in the Middle East.

I want to make a couple of points. The War Powers Act says that a President can act in defense of this Nation if it is an imminent threat. We have not seen that. But many people have been saying that the reason why he doesn't need to come to this body for a declaration of war is because of the War Powers Act.

So let's assume that he actually did have an imminent provocation—which I say it was not there, but let's assume for argument's sake that there was an imminent threat to the United States of America that this President had to act upon. That would have triggered 60 days.

The Senate now should be either acting on a war declaration or the Senate should be waiting for the President to ask for 30 more days. That is one of the two choices according to the legislation, the law of the United States of

America. But just moments ago, in an open hearing, we had the Secretary of Defense say: Well, no, no, no, that 60 days is paused because we are in a cease-fire.

That is illogical and not in alignment with the law of our land. We have an active military blockade going on. That is actually an act of war by our own laws and regulations. We have an area of this nation—the Strait of Hormuz—under a blockade, an act of war. It is demanding aircraft carrier groups. It is demanding thousands of U.S. soldiers engaged and on the front-line.

The cease-fire does not somehow escape his necessity to come to Congress after 60 days. To use that as some kind of escape valve to further escape scrutiny, debate, oversight, accountability to this body is unacceptable.

I have heard some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle—the Senator from Alaska, the Senator from North Carolina, the Senator from Maine, many of my colleagues, the Senator from Utah—say that the 60 days, to them, matters.

So here is a bipartisan conclusion. We are about to go out on a recess. The question is, What will we do as a body when the President has not come forward after 60 days of this military conflict to ask for any kind of authority?

This was not the constitutional demand of our Nation. This is not the law that we have sworn an oath to uphold. This is insanity that we—the most powerful deliberative body in the world that has a constitutional obligation where war powers sit with us—for us to do nothing, not to demand that the President come before us and make his case and let there be a vote of whether we declare war or not. We are at war. Sixty days have passed, and we are still doing nothing.

So I am going to do everything I can with my colleagues to continue to force this body to confront this failing war where we are losing American soldiers; where hundreds have been injured; where we are spending tens of billions of dollars; where the regime is more radical and more extreme; when they still have the highly enriched fissile material in their country; where they have new capabilities that have been exposed, like their ability to cause havoc with low-cost drones; and where they have now choked the Strait of Hormuz, causing shocks around the country. And we are doing nothing? That is unacceptable.

I want to make this last point. Donald Trump has engaged us in this war to stop them from getting a nuclear weapon. But remember that in 2015, we had the JCPOA. We had our NATO allies, European allies, Russia, China, and Iran all agreeing that Iran would, No. 1, ship out of country their highly enriched uranium, which they did; that all of their enrichment facilities, from Natanz to Fordow, would be open to snap inspections and constant surveillance, which it was; that their mining