

be able to find new jobs if there are no new jobs to find? It is one thing to talk about telling a truckdriver who loses his job to go into computer programming, but what happens if that computer programming job no longer exists? If AI and robotics eliminate millions of jobs and create massive unemployment, how will people survive if they have no income? How will they feed their families or pay for housing or healthcare?

I have to be honest and say that I am not aware that anyone in the U.S. Congress, which is supposed to be representing the American people, is even talking about this issue in a serious way.

Further, I am concerned not only about the economic impact of AI, which will be enormously profound, I am talking about the impact of AI on our humanity and how we relate to each other.

Work, in many instances, gives our lives meaning and purpose. We all, whether we are doctors or scientists or janitors or truckdrivers or snowplow operators, feel a basic need to serve our community, to be useful, to be productive members of society. In other words, work is what gives us meaning, and it is also how we connect to each other. We have our family. We have our friends. But we also work in an environment where we get to know each other and relate to each other. Well, what happens when millions of people lose their jobs and their source of connection to other human beings?

I am also deeply concerned about the impact that AI will have on the emotional well-being of our kids—in fact, all people but especially the children.

According to a recent poll by Common Sense Media, 72 percent of U.S. teenagers say they have used AI for companionship and more than half do so regularly. What does it mean for young people to form friendships with AI and become increasingly isolated from other human beings? Does anyone in our country think that the past 20 years of social media have been good for children's mental health and cognitive capabilities? Does anyone think we should now entrust these very same companies with even more power over our children's well-being and development?

This is an issue that needs an enormous amount of discussion that we have not begun in a serious way.

Let me also say that I am deeply concerned about the existential threat posed by AI. I recently met with researchers in California who told me that the AI companies are building this plane—this AI plane, if you like—as they are flying it. They are building it on the tail, and nobody knows what the end result will look like. In other words, they are feverishly going ahead, and every day, we read about another breakthrough, but they do not know what the end result will be.

Now, I know this may sound like science fiction, but many experts, in-

cluding the godfather of AI, Dr. Geoffrey Hinton, have told me that there is a real chance that human beings could lose control to AI. Now, why is that? AI is moving so quickly that experts who make AI acknowledge—they acknowledge—that they do not fully understand how AI makes decisions.

Now, I am not a computer scientist—in fact, I failed physics in college, if truth be told—but here is what experts have told me: AI is trained on a massive amount of data and calculations. The scale of the data is almost beyond comprehension. Training the most advanced AI models is expected to soon require an octillion calculations—that is 1 followed by 27 zeroes; that is a lot of zeroes—or the estimated total number of grains of sand on planet Earth. Think about that for a moment. That is the amount of data in calculations involved in creating a most advanced AI.

We are, at this moment, creating an extraordinarily complex and powerful technology that is not fully understood even by the people who are building it. How insane is that and how dangerous is that?

AI already does weird stuff. It can lie. It can cheat. It can even blackmail. Left unchecked, what will AI be able to do in a decade from now, when it will be far, far, far smarter than it is today?

I am also concerned about the impact of AI on our environment. AI requires zillions of calculations. Those calculations require huge data centers, which, in turn, require a massive amount of electricity and water.

For example, Meta is building a data center, in Louisiana, the size of Manhattan—size of Manhattan—that will use as much electricity as 1.2 million homes. One data center the size of Manhattan will use as much electricity as over a million homes.

Mr. President, these are just some of the questions that we should be asking. And yet, instead of a global conversation about these serious issues, we are letting a handful of billionaires race forward to develop AI for power and for profit.

Let me be clear. In my view, we should not be racing with China or anyone else to see who is the first to eliminate millions of jobs or the first to build an AI that destroys the planet. That is not a race anyone should win.

What we need is a serious conversation in our community, in our country, and around the world about the role of AI and how we make it beneficial to all humanity. AI can do a lot of good things, but it has to be beneficial to all humanity and not just the billionaires who currently own it. In other words, we need to take a deep breath.

For all of these reasons, I will soon be introducing legislation to ban the development of new AI data centers. We need to slow down the development of AI to give democracy a chance to catch up. A moratorium will give us the chance to figure out how to make sure AI benefits workers, not just a

handful of billionaires. A moratorium will give us time to figure out how to ensure AI is safe and effective and prevent dangerous outcomes. A moratorium will give us time to figure out how to make sure AI does not harm our environment or jack up the cost of electricity.

Bottom line: A moratorium will give the American people the time to determine how AI impacts their lives. It will give the global community the time to work together to address the risks posed by AI.

This is an enormously important issue. The time is long overdue for Congress to begin the serious discussion that it deserves.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JUSTICE). The Senator from Ohio.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MORENO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session and be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

TRIBUTE TO ADAM VINATIERI

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize the selection of South Dakota's Adam Vinatieri as a member of the Pro Football Hall of Fame's Class of 2026. He is widely regarded as one of the greatest kickers in NFL history, scoring 2,673 career points and winning four Super Bowls during his 24-year career. He is the third kicker and the second South Dakota State University—SDSU—Jackrabbit to be enshrined in the Hall of Fame.

Adam's rise to fame began in my home State of South Dakota. He was born in Yankton, SD, and attended Rapid City Central High School where he earned All-State honors in football in 1989 and 1990. Continuing his punting and kicking career, he then attended SDSU in Brookings, SD, where he finished his collegiate career as the school's alltime leading scorer. In his senior year at SDSU, Vinatieri earned NCAA Division II All-America recognition after setting the school's single-season punting record of 43.5 yards per attempt. Additionally, he set SDSU's then-record for career field goals, 27; extra points, 104; points by a kicker, 195; and longest field goal, 51 yards.

Adam initially went undrafted by the NFL, but he did not let the adversity stop his passion and love for the game. He spent a season playing internationally with the Amsterdam Admirals, and the New England Patriots signed Adam in 1996 as a free agent. He set a rookie franchise record at the time with 120 points. He went on to play 10 consecutive seasons with the Patriots,

and he helped the Patriots claim three Super Bowl Championships in four seasons—2001, 2003, and 2004—kicking off one of the longest dynasties in NFL history. He had a long list of accomplishments during his run with the Patriots, and perhaps his most notable was kicking the NFL's first-ever Super Bowl winning field goal in Super Bowl XXXVI and returning to do it again in Super Bowl XXXVIII.

As a free agent in 2006, Adam signed with the Indianapolis Colts, where he went on to play for another 14 seasons, win Super Bowl XLI, and establish records for the franchise, including 44 consecutive field goals and 37 field goals made from 50 yards or beyond. Both of these records have yet to be broken.

Adam holds the NFL's record for career points, 2,673; career field goals, 599; postseason points, 238; consecutive field goals made, 44; most seasons with more than 100 points, 21; and overtime field goals made, 12. His four Super Bowl wins are the most of any NFL kicker. Additionally, he was a member of the NFL 100th Anniversary All-Time Team and the NFL All-Decade Team for the 2000s.

I congratulate Adam for his remarkable career as a professional athlete and applaud his well-deserved induction into the Pro Football Hall of Fame. He represents the best of South Dakota's values: grit, determination, humility, and fortitude. He defined excellence in the game, overcoming unimaginable pressures and delivering record-breaking accomplishments. From his start as a Rapid City Central Cobler to helping two NFL franchises to Super Bowl victories, Adam's leadership and legacy will continue to inspire generations of South Dakotans to come.

NOMINATION OF LTG JOSHUA M. RUDD

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I oppose the nomination of Joshua Rudd to be Director of the NSA. His responses to questions posed to him at his confirmation hearing, as well as to written questions, reveal a lack of familiarity with basic constitutional rights that is incompatible with the position for which he has been nominated.

The NSA's surveillance authorities are vast and, if anything, underappreciated by the American people. The Agency plays a central role in executing the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, but also conducts extensive operations outside of FISA and pursuant only to Executive order. The potential for abuse is enormous, as we saw when the Agency secretly conducted an illegal, warrantless surveillance program that it hid not only from the public but from Congress.

Our country faces a dangerous moment in which constitutional rights are under attack. For example, we recently learned that the administration secretly decided that the government

doesn't need a judicial warrant to break into a private home. In other words, the administration is trying to invalidate the Fourth Amendment.

It was in that context that I asked General Rudd what he would do if directed to target people in the United States for surveillance without a judicial warrant. I offered him the opportunity to answer with a yes or a no. I didn't get an answer. I proposed that he offer general thoughts on the matter, but got nothing of substance. I did everything in my power to allow him to demonstrate some understanding of the basic guardrails of NSA's authorities and got nothing but vague assurances about following the law.

There were other topics on which General Rudd's responses were disappointing. He wouldn't associate himself with NSA's previous commitment not to buy and use Americans' location data. He also refused to say whether the government should be allowed to mandate backdoors into encryption used by Americans.

His responses related to transparency were also troubling. In addition to statutes and the Constitution, NSA is bound by numerous procedures and guardrails which are publicly available. So I asked General Rudd whether, if the NSA were to operate in violation of those procedures and guardrails, he would inform the American people. He refused to make that commitment. He even refused to promise to inform the Senate Intelligence Committee.

The Director of NSA has another job, that of Commander of U.S. Cyber Command. The demands of this job are mind-boggling. The cyber threat to the United States cannot be overstated. And, as SALT TYPHOON demonstrated, our adversaries have succeeded in inflicting serious damage to U.S. national security. The Commander of CYBERCOM needs to have a sophisticated understanding of this threat and how it has evolved over time. He or she needs to be able to see this threat in its geopolitical context and to fully grasp both the technical capabilities and the policy options that might help counter the threat. General Rudd, despite his service, does not have the background that would allow him to immediately step into this role. He is not qualified for this job. And, when it comes to the cybersecurity of this country, there is simply no time for on-the-job learning. The threat is just too urgent for that.

For these reasons, I oppose the nomination.

U.S. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE DECISION

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following decision from the Government Accountability Office be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECISION

Matter of: U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management—Applicability of the Congressional Review Act to the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan

File: B-337705
January 15, 2026

DIGEST

The U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) issued the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan (Grand Staircase RMP). The Grand Staircase RMP designates BLM-administered lands within the decision area as available or unavailable for certain uses.

The Congressional Review Act (CRA) requires that before a rule can take effect, an agency must submit the rule to both the House of Representatives and the Senate, as well as the Comptroller General. CRA adopts the definition of rule under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) but excludes certain categories of rules from coverage. We conclude that the Grand Staircase RMP meets APA's definition of a rule, and that no CRA exception applies. Therefore, the Grand Staircase RMP is a rule subject to CRA's submission requirements.

DECISION

On January 13, 2025, the U.S. Department of the Interior (Interior), Bureau of Land Management (BLM) issued the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan (Grand Staircase RMP). We received a request for a decision about whether the Grand Staircase RMP is a rule for purposes of the Congressional Review Act (CRA). As discussed below, we conclude that the Grand Staircase RMP is a rule for purposes of CRA.

Our practice when issuing decisions is to obtain the legal views of the relevant agency on the subject of the request. Accordingly, we reached out to Interior to obtain the agency's views. We received Interior's response on September 18, 2025.

BACKGROUND

BLM Public Land Management

Under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, as amended (FLPMA), BLM is responsible for developing, maintaining, and, when appropriate, revising "land use plans which provide by tracts or areas for the use of the public lands." BLM land use plans, referred to as "resource management plans" (RMPs), establish goals and objectives to guide future land and resource management actions implemented by BLM. Pursuant to FLPMA, BLM established procedures for the development, revision, and amendment of RMPs.

The objective of resource management planning is to maximize resource values for the public through a rational, consistently applied set of regulations and procedures which promote the concept of multiple use management. An RMP generally establishes land use designations; allowable resource uses; resource conditions, goals, and objectives; program constraints and general management practices; areas to be covered by more specific plans; and other related information.

BLM may amend an RMP to account for, among other things, new data, new or revised policy, or a change in circumstances. Amendments are to be made through an environmental assessment of the proposed change or an environmental impact statement, if needed, and must involve public involvement and interagency coordination.