

ratification to implement complex voter ID policy that is generally administered at the State level in time for this election. Well, it can't be implemented on day one, right? South Dakota actually starts voting 46 days before the election.

No. 1, you have got to go back and tell these 10,000 different entities: We don't know what the timing is. We have got to implement this stuff.

So your early voting, your absentee ballot voting, the people that requested ballots, the military members overseas that are actually getting teed up with the current laws—that is all off the books, and we are going to get you something new in 60 days.

Folks, I have done implementation work. The math doesn't work. I have to believe that these people who are Ivy League educated, qualified to go to the Supreme Court, can do basic math.

It can't be done. It can't be a serious effort. And if it is a serious effort, I would suggest that they engage somebody who has actually implemented it before, instead of assuming that they can because they simply can't.

And so when I have somebody put a microphone up in my face and say: Why are you against voter ID? I would say: First, do your homework. I ratified it. I fulfilled a promise. We have solid elections in North Carolina.

I am against it because people are selling you a bill of goods. When I had this discussion with the senior Senator from Utah, it was like: Well, you know, I understand that it doesn't work in practice, but it should work in theory.

He didn't say that, but that is effectively how he responded to it. I don't work in a theoretical world. I grew up in a trailer park. I worked as a management consultant. I work in a practical world. And in a practical world, I don't care how much you want voter ID done, the only thing you are going to have in this election is 72 Members of the Senate who already have voter ID in their States—did you know that? You would think that we didn't have any.

Mr. President, 36 States already have voter ID. You want to sit down here and talk about how you upped the bar, and you give people a year or two to get it implemented, fine. But don't fool the American people into thinking you can implement something of this complexity over 60 days. My God, it needed to happen 2 years ago.

As a matter of fact, the senior Senator from Utah's legislature has recently changed their policy, which I think they should have called for years ago, of mass mailing ballots to everybody, right? This should be fairly simple. You are only going from mass mailing ballots to saying: Hey, we have got to request it, right? They decided to take 3 years to implement that.

I would ask the senior Senator from Utah: Why don't we speed it up? Why don't we do it this year? If we can do something as expansive as all this that they have tried to do in the three dif-

ferent sequels to the SAVE Act, you can certainly do that in Utah, can't you? Because the effect of this bill would be to eliminate it anyway. So get 'er done. Do it now. Or let's start being honest with the American people.

We should figure out a way to get every State to get to voter ID. We should put in grants that say: If you hit this threshold, we will help you with the implementation; and if you don't, we are going to spend that money to audit your elections.

That is fine. That is good governance. And that is giving the States the option to decide whether or not they want to up the ante and increase the integrity of their elections or expect an audit from the Federal Government if they don't.

That is what I would be advising my client. This is what I am advising my client right now—the President of the United States—like CEOs that I have advised before: Mr. President, these people are misleading you if they are telling you that this can be implemented by November. The only thing that will occur is an undermining of the integrity of our elections right now.

So, folks from North Carolina, our State motto is "Esse quam videri"—"To be, rather than to seem." This seems like a legit proposal, but it isn't, and it hasn't been for the last year because you couldn't have gotten it done with 10,000 election entities if we had passed it last July.

So let's be honest with the American people. Let's focus on getting every State to have voter ID. Let's provide funding that lets the States opt into it and have a consequence if they don't in terms of audit. But let's stop the charade. Let's stop the distraction. Let's get the government funded. Let's use reconciliation if we need to, but let's not clog it up with another piece of policy airdropped by a Member of this Senate or the White House that will undermine this bill, undermine what we need to get done before the election.

So the fact is, we are not going to have 10,000 people doing things radically by election day. What we are going to do if we continue down this path is to convince the American people that you can't count on your election results. And that is dangerous. That is irresponsible.

If you see voting improprieties in your State, report it. There are tools right now to investigate them. But don't further undermine the confidence of the American people by saying: My goodness, they can't get this implemented? The election must be invalid.

That is not an America that anybody should sign up for. We ought to do it right, and we have to do the work. So if I see a reconciliation bill come from the House with another failed attempt to confuse this election, I will use every device I have available to slow down the wheels of government until people cop a clue and do the math.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana.

INTEL

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I have a friend in Louisiana. He is the former State speaker of the house. And Charlie invented a new word in English. The word is "winky-doo." When the then-speaker of the statehouse wanted to describe someone acting dishonestly or denigrating your position or double-crossing you, the speaker would say: He tried to winky-doo me. He tried to winky-doo me.

I have always loved that word.

Intel, a fine American company, may be trying to winky-doo the American taxpayer. Last year—and let me say that again. Intel is a fine company. They have to compete in the market to manufacture chips like everybody else. I believe in free enterprise. I don't believe in state-supported capitalism, government-run capitalism.

But Intel was not doing a very good job competing, and so the Federal Government decided to bail them out. The Federal Government—the Department of Commerce—gave Intel \$8.9 billion cash, bought 10 percent of the company—not \$8.9 million, \$8.9 billion cash.

Now, a fairminded person, when the Department of Commerce did this, could have said: Well, why Intel? Why not some other company?

So that gave me pause. Fair point. I didn't like seeing the Federal Government picking and choosing among American companies about which should get \$8.9 billion of American taxpayer money. I didn't like that. I still don't like it. If there is a fair competition, fine. And I get that manufacturing chips are important to America. I get all that. But the government is still playing favorites.

When the government buys 10 percent of a company—\$8.9 billion. Did I mention that is how much money Intel got? When the Federal Government takes a 10-percent equity position in a company, you can bet that the politicians, of which I include myself, are going to give a whole lot of advice to Intel—or any other company they buy the stock in. Sometimes that will be sound business advice, but sometimes it will just be raw gut politics. I don't like it. I don't like it.

I know the new thing is neosocialism. I have watched new Members of Congress get elected, all of whom can—they all know the words to the Cuban national anthem, and they are all for socialism. I would ask them to take a look at the history of Cuba and the former USSR and China and Argentina and Venezuela—and I could continue going—and they should try to show me a country where socialism has worked. They can't.

But I digress. The reason I didn't like this idea of buying 10 percent of the stock of Intel was because, as far as I was concerned, it was in the foothills of socialism. If a company needs help and we decide as a government that company is vital to America, God made these things called loans that are

collateralized so that the company has to pay it back. But my wishes were not followed. The Department of Commerce gave Intel \$8.9 billion cash in return for 10 percent of the company.

Well, here is why I think Intel might have winky-dooded us. Intel just announced they were taking \$5 billion of that, and do you know what they are doing with it? They are building a chip manufacturing plant in Ireland—in Ireland. I mean, I don't get it. And I know Intel is going to say: Oh, it wasn't the \$8.9 billion that the American taxpayers gave us that we took and helped the Irish economy.

Money is fungible, folks. Money is fungible. And they can say all they want "Oh, it wasn't American taxpayer money; it came from a different pot of money."

Now, if this is true—and I saw it announced publicly that they are building a \$5 billion chip manufacturing plant in Ireland—after \$8.9 billion of American taxpayer money was given to them, as far as I am concerned, this deal is a breech birth; it is a total cockup. And somebody from the Department of Commerce or from Intel needs to explain this to the American people, because I don't like it.

I didn't like it when we started giving money to particular companies going: Yeah, we like you, but we don't like you. You don't get any money, but you get money.

If that decision will be made, it ought to be made by Congress, folks—your elected representatives. But it was done.

But right after we did it, Intel took the money and invested it in Ireland. It triggers my gag reflex. I hope I am wrong.

Intel, if you are listening, I hope you will explain all of this.

Department of Commerce, if you are listening, I hope you will explain all of this.

The Department of Commerce, I think, is going to say: Oh, Intel has outside investors in building this plant.

That, to me, is a distinction without a difference. As far as I am concerned, the way it looks to me right now, we gave them \$8.9 billion of American taxpayer money, and they said "Thank you very much" and went and decided to spend it in Ireland. And where I come from, we call that a three-wheeled shopping cart.

So Intel needs to build that manufacturing plant in America or they need to give the American people their money back, and they need to do it now. And they need to explain it to the American people.

Mr. President, we have to vote, but I have still got 5 minutes. That is a dangerous combination, but I am going to do it in 5 minutes.

FOOD STAMPS

Mr. President, last year, we passed the One Big Beautiful Bill. One of the provisions of the One Big Beautiful Bill was that, in America, if you are hungry, we are going to feed you. We are

going to give you food stamps. We don't want you to be hungry. But in return for those food stamps, if you are able-bodied, if you are not disabled and you don't have kids at home, you have to go get a job. You have to work 20 hours a week or go to school for 20 hours a week or do community service for 20 hours a week—a fair trade.

We said: We don't want to take food stamps away from people who need them; we want fewer people to need food stamps.

And it is working. The full provision of the law is not even implemented, but so far, we have had 4 million people who were on food stamps—in those States that have implemented the work requirement, we have 4 million people who have either decided they don't need food stamps because they didn't want to work or they have gone to work for a living and they no longer need food stamps.

Now, those are the only two possibilities. When you say "You have to work to get food stamps," and 4 million people say "We are off the food stamp rolls," one of two things has happened: You either really didn't need the food stamps or you went to work and you didn't need the food stamps.

It is going to have an even more meaningful impact as more and more States implement the work requirement. It was long overdue. We ought to extend it to every social program in America.

I am not talking about and we weren't talking about taking food away from a mother with a sick child in her arms. This rule just applies to able-bodied people who aren't disabled, who aren't elderly, and who don't have kids at home. And all we require is that they work 20 hours a week or go to school for 20 hours a week and get job training or do community service. It is working.

Some of my colleagues in this Chamber are going to try to roll it back. We need to fight them tooth and nail.

I made it. I am done. Peace out.

CLOTURE MOTION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The 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 the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 738, Kara Marie Westercamp, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Court of International Trade.

John Thune, Ted Budd, Thom Tillis, John Barrasso, Tim Sheehy, Joni Ernst, Jon A. Husted, Katie Boyd Britt, David McCormick, Mike Rounds, John Boozman, Bill Cassidy, Rick Scott of Florida, Josh Hawley, Cynthia M. Lummis, Kevin Cramer, Steve Daines.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the mandatory quorum call under rule XXII has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Kara Marie Westercamp, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Court of International Trade, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. McCONNELL).

Further, if present and voting: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY) would have voted "Yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) is necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 49, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 198 Ex.]

YEAS—49

Armstrong	Fischer	Moreno
Banks	Graham	Murkowski
Barrasso	Grassley	Ricketts
Blackburn	Hawley	Risch
Boozman	Hoeven	Rounds
Britt	Husted	Schmitt
Budd	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Capito	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Justice	Sheehy
Cornyn	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Thune
Cramer	Lee	Tillis
Crapo	Lummis	Tuberville
Cruz	Marshall	Wicker
Curtis	McCormick	Young
Daines	Moody	
Ernst	Moran	

NAYS—48

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

NOT VOTING—3

Hagerty	McConnell	Murphy
---------	-----------	--------

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUDD). On this vote, the yeas are 49, the nays are 48, and the motion is agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

MAIDEN SPEECH

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. President, for generations, Americans understood that building our critical infrastructure was not a partisan cause; it was a national responsibility.

Previous generations built the powerplants, pipelines, highways, transmission lines, and mines that raised our standard of living, enabled the