

America is serious about peace through strength.

But to be clear, we cannot confuse the current momentum we see on the battlefield with victory—two very different things. Putin is still betting on one thing: that he can outlast us, that our attention will drift, that our resolve will soften and his oil revenues will fund this war machine long enough to exhaust Ukraine's defenses.

Our job, the job of this body, is to prove him wrong, and that means striking at the one thing—the one thing—that keeps the Kremlin's war going: money. Money is what keeps the Kremlin's war going. That is why I am proud to support two strong bipartisan bills that would give President Trump additional tools to leverage in the pursuit of peace.

The first is the appropriately named Lindsey O. Graham Sanctioning Russia Act. Senator Graham championed a foreign policy rooted in American strength, from the defense of Ukraine to the cause of freedom everywhere. As you see on chart 3, this legislation would authorize sweeping sanctions on Russian officials, oligarchs, banks, state-controlled entities, and the shadow fleet that Putin has used to evade sanctions. It would give our President the authority to impose tariffs of up to 100 percent on the top importers of Russian crude oil or natural gas and the top five countries facilitating Russian oil sanctions evasion. Finally, it would cut Russia off from U.S. capital and energy markets by prohibiting U.S. investment in Russia, purchases of Russian sovereign debt, and broker-dealer funded transfers involving the Russian Government.

The message is simple: If you bankroll Putin's war, you will pay a price in the American capital markets.

The second bill is bipartisan legislation that I have introduced with my colleagues here in the Senate—Senator COONS, Senator HUSTED, and Senator WARREN—the Decreasing Russian Oil Profits Act. As you see on chart 4, the DROP Act targets the single most important source of revenue propping up the Kremlin's war machine: oil. This legislation fills a gap in our sanctions posture by requiring targeted sanctions on anyone, anywhere, dealing in Russian-of-origin oil—the purchasers, the shippers, the financiers, and the executives who profit from them.

Now is the time to move on these Russia sanctions bills to give the President the tools and the leverage he needs to end this conflict, and now is the time to increase the pressure on Putin's unbridled aggression.

This is a bipartisan cause because it is an American cause.

Peace comes through strength—never through weakness, never through wishful thinking. And the tide is turning. Ukraine is doing its part on the battlefield, and now—now—the United States must capitalize on this strategic opportunity to weaken Putin's Russia.

I urge my colleagues to pass the Lindsey O. Graham Sanctioning Russia

Act and the DROP Act without delay. Give our President—give our President—the tools he needs to bring this conflict to a peaceful resolution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, a couple of years ago, as you may recall, there was a movie—a film—that came out called “Don't Look Up,” starring Jennifer Lawrence and Leonardo DiCaprio. The film was about a large comet heading to Earth that would destroy the entire planet, and the astronomers who discovered the comet kept trying to gain the attention of people and explain to them what was happening and the need for immediate and bold action to save the planet.

In that movie, they failed, and the planet was destroyed. That was a movie.

Now, let me tell you about something that is not a movie, not fiction but reality. I fear that we are living through the same scenario that existed in the movie. People, especially their elected representatives, are not paying attention, and the results could be catastrophic.

This time, we are not talking about a fictional comet. What we are talking about is artificial intelligence which will almost certainly be the most transformational technology in the history of humanity. It will profoundly impact the life of every man, woman, and child in our country. The scale, scope, and speed of this transformation will be unprecedented.

Nearly every day, there is a news story about how AI is already transforming the world—from our economy to its impact on our kids, to our privacy rights, to our political institutions, to the existential threat that it poses to the entire world.

Let us take a deep breath. When we think about AI, the first question that we have to ask ourselves is a pretty simple one: Who is pushing this revolutionary transformation of society? Who is going to benefit from it? And who is going to get hurt by it?

And the answers to those questions are not complicated. At a time in American history when we have more income and wealth inequality than we have ever had before, the AI revolution is being pushed by the very wealthiest people in our country, including Elon Musk, Jeff Bezos, Mark Zuckerberg, Peter Thiel, and Larry Ellison.

And why are these multibillionaires investing many hundreds and hundreds of billions of dollars into AI and robotics? Is it because they want to improve human life? Is it because they want to address the economic struggles facing the 60 percent of our people who are living paycheck to paycheck—Americans who are struggling to pay for groceries, healthcare, housing, and education? Is it because they want to make sure that all Americans have access to healthcare as a human right

and that we successfully address the crises we face in housing, education, and so many other areas?

Is that why these multibillionaires are pushing this revolution? Maybe, but I doubt it. I think the answer is quite obvious, and everybody in America knows it. These multibillionaires are investing in AI and robotics because they want to become even wealthier and even more powerful than they are today. That is what is motivating these investments.

I think it is enormously important that we take a hard look at what an uncontrolled AI push by the wealthiest people in our country will mean to ordinary Americans.

Over the past year, I have spoken with workers and union leaders, computer scientists, psychologists, religious leaders, environmentalists, and privacy experts about AI and robotics. And while each of these people may be focusing on a different aspect of the overall situation, they all agree that the unregulated race to develop more and more powerful AI represents a profound threat to humanity.

This is exactly what the average American today is telling us. Recently, a poll came out from the publication Heatmap which expresses an enormous change in sentiment with regard to data centers. Whereas, a year ago, Americans were evenly split on whether they supported building a data center near where they live, there is now a 50-point gap, with 71 percent of Americans opposed to building a data center near where they live.

And it is not just data centers. When pollsters ask how people feel about AI, there is enormous and growing apprehension. A recent Quinnipiac poll found 55 percent of Americans think AI will do more harm than good, and only 5 percent think AI development is being led by people and organizations that represent their interests.

Let me give you some of the reasons—just some—as to why the overwhelming majority of Americans are deeply concerned about the rapid development of AI and robotics. The American people feel, with 70 percent numbers in a recent poll, that AI will lead to fewer jobs, and they are quite right about their concerns.

Elon Musk, who has invested hundreds and billions in AI and robotics, recently said that “AI and robots will replace all jobs.”

Bill Gates, who has also made huge investments in these technologies, predicted that humans “won't be needed for most things.”

Mustafa Suleyman, the CEO of Microsoft AI, said most white-collar work “will be fully automated by an AI within the next 12 to 18 months.”

And it is not just white-collar jobs that we are talking about. Earlier this year, the Wall Street Journal reported that Jeff Bezos is seeking to raise \$100 billion to purchase factories all over America. His goal? Replace the millions of workers who are employed in these plants with robots.

Recently, I took a trip in a self-driving Waymo car in San Francisco. There was nobody behind the wheel. Waymo is already operating self-driving cars in 10 major cities and, along with other driverless car companies, intends to expand rapidly.

What does that mean? Well, say goodbye to taxicab drivers, Uber drivers, truckdrivers, and busdrivers all across the country—those jobs, gone.

As the ranking member of the U.S. Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, I released a well-researched report finding that AI automation and robotics could replace nearly 100 million American jobs over the next decade, including 40 percent of truckdrivers, 64 percent of accountants, and 89 percent of fast-food workers, among many other occupations.

These are not just theoretical concerns. We are already starting to see the impact of AI and robotics on workers. Amazon and Oracle have laid off 30,000 workers each. Microsoft has laid off 20,000 workers. Meta has laid off 18,000—et cetera, et cetera.

Researchers have found that new companies using AI have about 25 percent fewer employees than comparable companies. In other words, the AI revolution is already making it harder for people to find decent-paying jobs, and we are only in the beginning stage of this revolution.

Let me be clear. The AI oligarchs do not want to just replace specific jobs. They want to replace workers. That is the goal.

According to OpenAI's charter, its mission is to build "highly autonomous systems that outperform humans at most economically valuable work."

If OpenAI is successful in building "highly autonomous systems that outperform humans at most economically valuable work," I have a very simple question: What happens to those workers who are replaced? How will they be able to find new jobs if there are no jobs to find?

If AI and robotics eliminate millions of jobs and create massive unemployment, how will people survive if they have no income?

If people are not employed and if they are not paying taxes, what happens to Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and other essential government services funded by these taxes?

But it is not just employment that I am worried about and that the American people are worried about. AI and robotics threaten our emotional well-being, who we are as human beings, how we relate to each other. In many cases, work is one of the ways that we connect to each other. Whether we are doctors or taxicab drivers, we all want to serve our community, and we want to be productive members of society. That gives our lives purpose.

And what happens when millions of people lose their jobs, their meaning, and their purpose, and their source of connection to each other?

And work is just one aspect of what we are talking about.

What happens when people live through their screens? Their major form of social interaction is not with other people but with screens and artificial intelligence, talking to chatbots, instead of other people.

Further, AI and robotics are threatening the very well-being of our kids. Let us be frank: Even before the widespread deployment of AI, children in our country are struggling. There are a lot of reasons for that, but the evidence is clear. They are struggling.

Today, high school kids have the lowest reading scores in 30 years. The writing skills of our children are in decline, as are their cognitive capabilities. College professors tell us their students cannot do middle school math or read long texts.

That is where we are now. What got us here? Where are we going in the future?

Experts increasingly point to the role of screens and technology. In America today—this is really—I keep questioning my staff about this, but they tell me that this is accurate. In America today, about 40 percent of children have a tablet by age 2. Forty percent of children have a tablet by age 2. The typical 5-year-old spends over 3½ hours per day on screens. Nearly all schools now provide devices in classrooms.

What is going on here?

Let us be clear: The extraordinary amount of time our young people spend on screens and the impact that that time on screens is having on them, all of this is not an accident.

We have testimony from employees at the major Big Tech companies—like Meta, which owns Facebook and Instagram—that the algorithms they developed were designed to addict kids to screens—addict kids to screens.

A senior researcher at Meta, for example, called Instagram "a drug." In other words, the Big Tech oligarchs are addicting our kids to screens so that they can make more and more money. They are sacrificing the health and well-being of our children for their increased wealth. And now, Big Tech companies are pushing AI and robots to replace teachers in our classrooms.

Apparently, it is not good enough for them to addict our kids to screens, now they want to push AI and robots to replace teachers in classrooms.

Do we, as a nation, really want AI robots teaching our kids? Does anyone have any evidence whatsoever that this new technology will help our kids learn better?

And it is not just the intellectual abilities of our kids that we should worry about; AI is also impacting their mental health. It is no great secret that millions of our children are struggling emotionally, and loneliness and depression are on the rise. There are many kids in America today whose best friends are not other children they know but AI bots.

What does it mean for young people to form friendships with AI and become increasingly isolated from other

human beings? Does anyone in America think the past 20 years of social media have been good for children's mental health and cognitive capabilities?

Does anyone really think we should now entrust these same companies with even more power over our children's well-being and development? But it is not only our kids' health; it is not only the economy. AI is threatening the very concept of privacy rights.

You know, we hear on the floor of the Senate, time and time again: We are a free country; we are a free people. Well, let me give you the bad news. We are not quite as free as people think we are. For decades, companies have been collecting our personal information, what we search for online, where we visit, who we talk to, what we buy.

Now AI-powered surveillance companies like Palantir make it possible for someone to quickly analyze all that information, find patterns, and create profiles of us.

And by the way, it is not just the economy; it is not just our mental health; it is not just what is happening to our kids. AI is threatening our democracy. We are back to the film "Don't Look Up." Well, maybe we should look at what is going on on the internet right now—right now—this minute.

The rise of deepfakes, convincing fake images, videos and audio, make it possible for bad actors to distort what elected officials and candidates are saying. And I suspect this is personal for many Members of the Senate who have had experience with this issue.

And let me tell you, if you don't think this will ever happen to you, you are very mistaken.

In a recent Republican congressional primary in Kentucky, a super PAC opposing THOMAS MASSIE released an ad with deepfakes depicting him in a romantic relationship with female Members of Congress. It was a lie, but there were voters in Kentucky who believed that.

Bottom line, it is becoming increasingly difficult for people to differentiate truth from fiction. How can people make informed political decisions if that occurs?

As we speak, all over this country, people are rising up against data centers in their own communities. They don't want to pay higher electric rates. They are worried about the impact of water. They are worried about the impact of noise and heat.

And we are seeing people, whether they are Republicans, Democrats, Conservatives, Progressives saying no to these data centers.

I hope very much we don't do what people did in that movie "Don't Look Up." I hope while this massive revolution is taking place, which is going to transform our lives, I hope that we look up. I hope that people in Congress have the guts to say that the future of humanity should not be determined by a handful of the wealthiest people on Earth. Maybe in a democratic society,

the people should determine where we want to go.

And I know that AI is spending tens of millions of dollars on campaign contributions, and if you speak up against them, hey, they are going to put millions of dollars of 30-second ads against you.

But maybe just now in this moment in American history we have the guts to tell AI where they should go, stand up for our kids, stand up for democracy, stand up for privacy, stand up for workers, and utilize AI and robotics to benefit all of us, not just to make a handful of billionaires even richer.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Antonio M. Pozos, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

VOTE ON POZOS NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Pozos nomination?

Ms. ERNST. 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 senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. McCONNELL), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. TUBERVILLE).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 209 Ex.]

YEAS—49

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

NAYS—44

Alsobrooks	Blunt Rochester	Cortez Masto
Baldwin	Booker	Duckworth
Bennet	Cantwell	Gallagher
Blumenthal	Coons	Gillibrand

Hassan	Merkley	Schumer
Heinrich	Murphy	Slotkin
Hickenlooper	Murray	Smith
Hirono	Ossoff	Van Hollen
Kaine	Padilla	Warner
Kelly	Peters	Warnock
Kim	Reed	Warren
King	Rosen	Welch
Klobuchar	Sanders	Whitehouse
Lujan	Schatz	Wyden
Markley	Schiff	

NOT VOTING—7

Britt	Paul	Tuberville
McConnell	Scott (SC)	
Murkowski	Shaheen	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BANKS). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

The Senator from Utah.

(The remarks of Mr. CURTIS pertaining to the submission of S. Res. 812 are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

Mr. CURTIS. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I withdraw my motion to proceed to Calendar No. 436, S. 4784.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The leader has that right.

SUPPORTING EARLY-CHILDHOOD EDUCATORS' DEDUCTIONS ACT—Motion to Proceed

Mr. THUNE. I move to proceed to Calendar No. 454, H.R. 5334.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion to proceed.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 454, H.R. 5334, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow early childhood educators to take the educator expense deduction, and for other purposes.

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 legislative 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 motion to proceed to Calendar No. 454, H.R. 5334, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow early childhood educators to take the educator expense deduction, and for other purposes.

John Thune, Darline Graham, John Barrasso, Tim Sheehy, John Cornyn, John Hoeven, Mike Crapo, James Lankford, Kevin Cramer, Steve Daines, Tim Scott of South Carolina, Tom Cotton, Roger Marshall, Thom Tillis, John R. Curtis, Jon Husted, Pete Ricketts

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

CORRUPTION

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. President, more than a year and a half ago, when Donald Trump placed his hand on a Bible and took the oath of office for the second time, he swore to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution. In the time since, he has failed to live up to that basic promise. Instead, he has focused laser-like on a very different priority: to preserve, protect, and expand his family's wealth.

The payments to the President and his family have been massive. The self-dealing and profiteering have been absolutely breathtaking in their scope. And you don't have to take my word for it. Two weeks ago, the President filed his annual financial disclosure, signed under penalty of law. It shows more than \$2.3 billion in income last year alone—\$2.3 billion made by the President in the last year alone. Wow. That is 3½ times what he reported the year before. So either he has just become a much better businessman since he became President, or he is corruptly using his office to enrich himself.

The same can be said for much of the rest of his family.

Exposing this corruption is the first necessary step to stopping it. This is important in its own right. Public servants should not be enriching themselves at public expense. But it is even more crucial to root out corruption for another reason, and that is because the cost of corruption is an economy that does not meet the basic needs of the American people—an economy that does not produce housing that average families can afford or a college education that young people can obtain without mortgaging their future or quality healthcare that is accessible or groceries that don't break the family budget.

When the President is fixated only on his family's personal wealth, on money he can make by abusing the power of his position, on his own vanity projects—gilding the White House, gilding statues, and gilding a ballroom—he has very little time or inclination to address the problems facing ordinary Americans. They are mere afterthoughts, and the country suffers. That is the true cost of corruption.

So, today, I am going to walk you through the top 10 ways this President has turned the Oval Office into a personal revenue stream, the settlements he has collected, the gifts he has pocketed, the money he and his family have extracted from anyone with the misfortune of needing something from this government, and the pet causes he has extorted money to fund.