Background

Special Committee Motions:

There will be a few differences from the traditional MUN conference within this committee to provide a more immersive experience.

- 1. **Motion to Proceed** this motion is used to begin debate on a bill
- 2. **Motion for Cloture** will force an end to debate and must have % of committee a 16% of the committee as sponsors. Will force an end to debate in thirty minutes
- 3. **Motion to table** This motion is used to end debate on a matter and prevent it from being further discussed. It can effectively kill a bill or amendment with a simple majority
- 4. **Motion for a Recess** will allow Senators to get up and discuss important matter for a set amount of time
- 5. **Motion to Reconside**r can reverse a previously tabled decision, must be made by someone who supported the tabling of said thing being reconsidered. This motion may be tabled.
- 6. **Points of Parliamentary Inquiry** to ask a question about procedure
- 7. Unanimous Consent Request & Unanimous Consent Agreement (informal agreement about how much time each speaker gets or which amendments should be debated)

It should also be noted that resolutions will be renamed to bills as we are simulating the Senate.

Senators:

This section provides a brief overview of your senator, though not in depth.

Democratic Senators

Cory Booker – New Jersey

Cory Booker has served as the senior United States Senator from New Jersey since 2013, becoming the first African American to represent the state in the U.S. Senate. He is known for advocating criminal justice reform, affordable healthcare, and environmental protection.

Tammy Baldwin – Wisconsin

Tammy Suzanne Green Baldwin has served as the junior United States senator from Wisconsin since 2013. As a member of the Democratic Party, she has also served as the secretary of the Senate Democratic Caucus since 2017.

Alex Padilla - California

Alex Padilla has served as the junior United States Senator from California since 2021, becoming the first Latino to represent the state in the U.S. Senate. Though he was first appointed to fill Vice President Kamala Harris's vacant seat, he has since become a strong advocate for immigration reform, voting rights, climate action, and equitable access to education and healthcare.

John Fetterman – Pennsylvania

John Fetterman has served as the junior United States Senator from Pennsylvania since 2023. Known for his plainspoken, working-class appeal and unconventional style, Fetterman rose to prominence as the former Lieutenant Governor of Pennsylvania and mayor of Braddock. In the Senate, he has focused on issues like labor rights, mental health care, infrastructure investment, and revitalizing struggling industrial communities.

Mazie Hirono – Hawaii

Mazie Keiko Hirono has served as the junior United States senator from Hawaii since 2013. A member of the Democratic Party, Hirono previously served as a member of the United States House of Representatives for Hawaii's 2nd congressional district from 2007 to 2013.

Amy Klobuchar – Minnesota

Amy Klobuchar has served as the senior U.S. Senator from Minnesota since 2007 and was the first woman elected to represent the state in the Senate. Known for her bipartisan approach, she has focused on infrastructure, antitrust reform, and expanding rural broadband access. Klobuchar is widely recognized for her pragmatic leadership and commitment to Midwestern priorities.

Jon Ossoff – Georgia

Jon Ossoff has served as a U.S. Senator from Georgia since January 2021 and is the youngest millennial ever elected to the Senate. He has focused on infrastructure and clean energy investment in Georgia, expanding broadband access, ports, rail, and road development through the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law. Ossoff is also known for championing voting rights and anti-corruption reforms, including fielding bipartisan legislation to ban corporate PACs and prohibit stock trading by members of Congress.

Kirsten Gillibrand – New York

Kirsten Gillibrand has served as a U.S. Senator from New York since 2009 and was the second woman to hold that seat. She is especially known for her leadership on military justice reform, working to remove sexual assault cases from the military chain of command and improve support for survivors. Gillibrand has also prioritized affordable health care, paid family leave, equal pay, and economic opportunity for working families.

Michael Bennet – Colorado

Michael Farrand Bennet is an American attorney, businessman, and politician serving as the senior United States senator from Colorado, a seat he has held since 2009. A member of the Democratic Party, he was appointed to the seat when Senator Ken Salazar became Secretary of the Interior.

Catherine Cortez Masto – Nevada

Catherine Marie Cortez Masto is an American lawyer and politician serving as the senior United States senator from Nevada, a seat she has held since 2017. A member of the Democratic Party, Cortez Masto served as the 32nd attorney general of Nevada from 2007 to 2015.

Bernie Sanders (I) [Independent] – Vermont

Bernie Sanders has served as the junior United States Senator from Vermont since 2007 and is the longest-serving Independent in U.S. congressional history. He's known for his progressive platform, and has confronted issues such as universal healthcare, income inequality, campaign finance reform, and workers' rights. Though he's Independent, he caucuses with the Democratic Party and has played a significant role in shaping its progressive agenda.

Chris Van Hollen – Maryland

Christopher Van Hollen Jr. is an American attorney and politician serving as the senior United States senator from Maryland, a seat he has held since 2017.

Elizabeth Warren – Massachusetts

Elizabeth Ann Warren is an American politician and former law professor who is the senior United States senator from the state of Massachusetts, serving since 2013.

Mark Kelley - Arizona

Mark Edward Kelly is an American politician, retired astronaut, and former naval officer serving as the senior United States senator from Arizona, a seat he has held since 2020.

Republican Senators

Tom Cotton - Arkansas

Tom Cotton has represented Arkansas in the U.S. Senate since 2015. A former Army officer and Harvard Law graduate, Cotton is focused on national defense, strong border security, and

conservative economic policies. He is known for his hawkish views on China and Iran, advocacy for tougher immigration enforcement, and support for law-and-order legislation.

Marsha Blackburn – Tennessee

Marsha Blackburn has represented Tennessee in the U.S. Senate since 2019 and is the first woman ever elected to that seat. She is known for her strong support of military and veterans' policies, including leading the repeal of the Department of Defense's COVID-19 vaccine mandate. Blackburn focuses on conservative priorities such as border security, economic growth, and cultural issues, and she also champions policies related to technology, human trafficking prevention, and law enforcement protections.

Susan Collins - Maine

Susan Collins has represented Maine in the Senate since 1997 and is known for her centrist, independent style. She has played key roles in passing bipartisan legislation, including the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act and recent gun safety reforms. Collins continues to advocate for fisheries sustainability, rural economic development, and pragmatic governance.

Josh Hawley - Missouri

Josh Hawley has served Missouri in the Senate since 2019 and offers a populist conservative voice focused on manufacturing jobs, worker protections, and anti-monopoly legislation. He supports stricter regulation of major tech platforms and trade policies that prioritize American labor. Hawley stresses sovereignty, family values, and a cultural conservatism rooted in working-class concerns.

Tim Scott - South Carolina

Tim Scott has represented South Carolina since 2013 and emphasizes economic empowerment, faith-based initiatives, and community-focused policies. He co-authored the Opportunity Zones provision in the 2017 tax reform law, promoting investment in under-resourced

neighborhoods. Scott also advocates for police reform measures and school choice as pathways to upward mobility.

Cindy Hyde-Smith – Mississippi

Cindy Hyde-Smith has represented Mississippi since 2018 and champions agricultural interests, rural infrastructure, and Second Amendment rights. She draws on her background in state politics to advocate for crop insurance, farm subsidies, and improved access to rural healthcare. Hyde-Smith often emphasizes traditional values and limited federal regulation.

Lisa Murkowski – Alaska

Lisa Murkowski has represented Alaska since 2002 and is known for her moderate, bipartisan approach. She frequently crosses party lines, especially on energy, environmental stewardship, and reproductive rights. Murkowski played a major role in expanding broadband and clean water infrastructure in remote Alaskan communities.

Mitt Romney – Utah

Mitt Romney has served Utah in the Senate since 2019. A former governor and presidential nominee, he supports fiscal conservatism, market-based solutions to climate change like carbon dividends, and constitutional principles. Romney often votes independently and emphasizes disciplined governance alongside pragmatic policy proposals.

Deb Fischer – Nebraska

Deb Fischer has represented Nebraska since 2013 and places high importance on defense readiness, agricultural policy, and rural development. She serves on the Armed Services Committee, where she supports nuclear triad modernization and military family quality-of-life improvements. Fischer also backs ethanol incentives and rural broadband expansion.

Ted Cruz - Texas

Ted Cruz has served as a Senator from Texas since 2013 and is known for his constitutional conservative stance and advocacy for limited federal government. He champions strong border enforcement, judicial restraint, and reductions in federal spending. Cruz is vocal on energy independence, religious liberty, and pro-business policy.

Rick Scott – Florida

Rick Scott has represented Florida since 2019 and promotes conservative fiscal policies, including lowered taxes and reduced federal deficits. He is also focused on issues affecting retirees and veterans, and has prioritized disaster resilience and coastal protection—critical concerns for Florida. Scott often leads the Senate's Republican Policy Committee, shaping party strategy.

Mike Lee - Utah

Mike Lee has served Utah in the Senate since 2011. He is known for his constitutional conservative approach, emphasizing limited government, judicial restraint, and adherence to the Constitution. Lee advocates for tax reform, privacy rights, and checks on federal power.

Tommy Tuberville - Alabama

Tommy Tuberville has represented Alabama in the Senate since 2021 and is a former college football coach. He is known for conservative views on education, economic policy, and register-based Syrian refugee restrictions. Tuberville has drawn attention by blocking Pentagon promotions to protest military abortion policy, reflecting his emphasis on social and religious values.

John Kennedy – Louisiana

John Kennedy has served Louisiana in the Senate since 2017. A former state treasurer and attorney general, he stands out for his conservative fiscal positions, support for agriculture and energy industries, and direct rhetorical style. Kennedy often speaks out on budget discipline, tax reform, and Gulf Coast disaster preparedness.

Mike Crapo – Idaho

Mike Crapo has represented Idaho since 1999. He serves on the Banking, Finance, and Tax committees and is a strong advocate for rural economic development, energy independence, and fiscal conservatism. Crapo consistently supports balanced budgets, agricultural funding, and policies to enhance Idaho's water and land stewardship.





Key Vocabulary and Acronyms:

Conscription: compulsory enlistment for state service, typically into the armed forces. **Selective Service System (SSS)**: A U.S. government agency that keeps a database of individuals who could be called up for military service if a draft is ever reinstated. It's not an active draft, but a standby system that would be used only if the all-volunteer military can't meet the country's defense needs during a national emergency.

VAWA – Violence Against Women Act: A federal law first passed in 1994 that provides funding and legal protections to prevent domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking. Although not directly related to the draft, VAWA is often referenced in broader discussions about gender equity and women's treatment under federal law.

Topic Background:

The United States has historically required only men to register for the Selective Service. Currently, all male citizens and residents between the ages of 18 and 25 must register, while women do not. Women currently serve in the military on a voluntary basis. This male-only draft policy has been in place since the creation of the Selective Service System during World War I. However, as the role of women in the military has expanded over the past century, the question of whether women should also be required to register has come up multiple times. These debates focus on equality under the law, the needs of the military, and public opinion, but are ultimately shaped by clear changes in U.S. policy and legal precedent.

A key reason that women have been excluded from the draft was the restriction on women in combat roles. In the past, women's military service was largely limited to non-combat positions (ex/ Nurse Corps).

Key Historic Events:

1917 - Selective Service Act

President Woodrow Wilson signed the Selective Service Act on May 18, 1917, creating the

modern draft system to build an army for WW1. The law required men (initially ages 21–30, later expanded to 18–45) to register. Women **were not included**. This established the tradition of male only drafts.

1945 – World War II Nurse Draft Proposal

After heavy casualties in WW2, PResident Roosevelt asked Congress to authorize drafting women nurses to meet the medical needs of the army. In March 1945, the House passed a nurse draft bill (which would have been the first U.S. law conscripting women), except the bill was stalled by the Senate, and Germany's surrender in May 1945 removed the immediate need. This is the closest instance the U.S came to drafting women.

1948 – The Women's Armed Services Integration ActThe Women's Armed Services Integration Act (1948) officially permitted women to serve as regular members of the armed forces in peacetime

1973 – End of the Draft

The military draft was ended as the United States transitioned to an all-volunteer force because of widespread

public opposition and social unrest due to controversy surrounding the Vietnam War.

1980 – Draft Registration Revived (Men Only)



In 1980, after the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan, President Carter brought back draft registration and tried to include women. Congress pushed back, especially the Senate Armed Services Committee, and made it clear early on that they did not support registering women. Ultimately, Carter went forward with a men only registration plan.

2013-2015 - Women Allowed in Combat

The removal of all combat restrictions on women, a process that relatively recently happened from 2013-2015, is a significant event, as it eliminated the legal basis for excluding them from the draft and challenged long-held assumptions about their capability to serve equally in all military roles.

2020 - Commission Recommends Drafting Women

The National Commission in March 2020 concluded that including women in draft registration is in the national interest. This is the first official U.S. government recommendation in history that women should be required to register for the Selective Service

2021 – Congress Considers Change, then Delays

Key Statistics

- Approximately 15 million men ages 18–25 are currently registered with the Selective Service System (~84% of eligible men, not all comply). Zero women are registered, if draft registration were expanded to women, the army could potentially double in size.
- Women today make up around 17% of the active-duty U.S. military (over 230,000 women in 2021). In the reserve components, women make up about 21%. This is a significant increase from past decades . For example, in 1973 women were only about 2% of the force. As of 2023, women serve in every role, including combat arms, special operations, and leadership positions.
- While the U.S. has not yet chosen to draft women, a few other countries have moved to gender-neutral conscription. For instance, Norway and Sweden both updated their laws in the 2010s to require both men and women to serve if called (Norway's universal draft began in 2016, Sweden's in 2017). Israel has conscripted Jewish women alongside men since its founding in 1948 (with some exemptions, such as for married or religious women)

Questions to Consider:

- 1. What does the Constitution directly say about the draft?
- 2. How would the draft apply to individuals who identify as female or another gender? If registration only applies to men, what prevents someone from changing their gender identification to avoid being drafted?
- 3. Should the United States maintain the Selective Service System at all?
- 4. What can we learn from the conscription systems of other nations?

5. How might including women in Selective Service registration impact military readiness, recruitment strategies, and public perception of national defense obligations?

References/Works Cited

- 1. "About Selective Service." Selective Service System, n.d., https://www.sss.gov/about/.
- Chen, Henry. "The National Commission on Military, National, and Public Service: Background,
 Findings, and Prospects." Mason Veterans and Servicemembers Legal Clinic, 29 Mar. 2021,
 https://mvets.law.gmu.edu/2021/03/29/the-national-commission-on-military-national-and-public-service-background-findings-and-prospects/.
- 4. Connor, Joseph. "Drafting Women?" *HistoryNet*, 6 Aug. 2016, updated 19 Oct. 2016, https://www.historynet.com/drafting-women/.
- 5. Gittleman, Idit Shafran. "Women's Service in the IDF: Between a 'People's Army' and Gender Equality." *Israel Democracy Institute*, 3 Mar. 2022, https://en.idi.org.il/articles/24554.
- National Archives Foundation. "Mobilizing for War: The Selective Service Act in World War I."
 National Archives Foundation, last modified 22 Aug. 2024,
 https://archivesfoundation.org/documents/mobilizing-war-selective-service-act-world-war/.
- Oltermann, Philip. "Sweden to Reintroduce Conscription amid Rising Baltic Tensions." *The Guardian*, 2 Mar. 2017,
 https://www.theguardian.com/world/2017/mar/02/sweden-reintroduce-conscription-amid-rising-baltic-tensions.
- 8. Rostker v. Goldberg. *Supreme Court of the United States*, 453 U.S. 57, decided 25 June 1981. *Justia U.S. Supreme Court Center*, https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/453/57/.

- 9. Selective Service System. "Frequently Asked Questions." *Selective Service System*, n.d., https://www.sss.gov/faq/.
- 10. "Department of Defense Releases Annual Demographics Report Upward Trend in Number of Women Serving Continues." *U.S. Department of War*, 14 Dec. 2022, https://www.defense.gov/News/Releases/Releases/Releases/Article/3246268/department-of-defense-releases-annual-demographics-report-upward-trend-in-numbe/.
- Sutton-Deangelico, Toni. "Women and the Draft, a Decades-Old Debate." New Jersey State Bar Foundation, 16 Oct. 2019,
 https://njsbf.org/2019/10/16/women-and-the-draft-a-decades-old-debate/.
- 12. "Women's Service in the Israel Defense Forces." *Jewish Women's Archive*, n.d., https://jwa.org/encyclopedia/article/israel-defense-forces.
- 13. "A Look at Norway's Approach to Gender-Neutral Conscription." *SecurityWomen*, 22 Oct. 2021, https://www.securitywomen.org/post/a-look-at-norways-approach-to-gender-neutral-conscription
- 14. "The Military Draft During the Vietnam War." *Resistance and Revolution: The Anti-Vietnam War Movement at the University of Michigan, 1965–1972, University of Michigan,* n.d., https://michiganintheworld.history.lsa.umich.edu/antivietnamwar/exhibits/show/exhibit/draft_protests/the-military-draft-during-the-.

Bill B: Regulation of Artificial Intelligence in Data Privacy and Consent



Key Vocabulary and Acronyms

- 1. **Artificial Intelligence (AI)**: A broad field of computer science focused on creating systems capable of performing tasks that typically require human intelligence, such as learning or decision making. Modern AI often relies on analyzing large datasets to detect patterns and make predictions.
- 2. **Machine Learning (ML)**: The use and development of computer systems that are able to learn and adapt without following explicit instructions, by using algorithms and statistical models to analyze and draw inferences from patterns in data.
- 3. **Data Privacy**: The right to control how your personal information is collected, stored, and shared. It involves setting rules for how organizations handle sensitive data, ensuring it is protected from unauthorized access and misuse.
- 4. **Personal Data / Personally Identifiable Information (PII)**: Data that can be used to identify a specific individual, either on its own or when combined with other information. Examples include a person's full name, Social Security number, driver's license number, financial information, and email address.
- 5. **FTC (Federal Trade Commission)**: The Federal Trade Commission is an independent agency of the United States government whose principal mission is the enforcement of civil antitrust law and the promotion of consumer protection.

Background:

The rapid growth of AI technologies, particularly data intensive techniques such as machine learning, has exposed a tension between technological advancement and personal data privacy. Current AI development relies on very large datasets, reflecting a "belief that larger datasets translate into stronger AI systems" Pechnology companies often repurpose or scrape user information to train algorithms without individuals' knowledge or explicit consent. This demand for personal data has provoked public outcry and attracted regulatory scrutiny whenever privacy norms are breached, a landmark example of this backlash was the scandal involving Facebook and Cambridge Analytica in 2018. In that incident, a political consulting firm collected personal data from as many as 87 million Facebook users without their consent. It then used this trove of information to profile and microtarget voters, an abuse that heightened global awareness of how personal information could be exploited for political or commercial ends. The fallout from the Cambridge Analytica case emphasized that users often lose control once their data is harvested and galvanized calls for stronger privacy protections in an era of analytics driven by AI.

Critical to these issues is the principle of consent and the question of whether individuals should have the right to know and decide how their personal data is used, even for new purposes such as training AI models. Privacy advocates maintain that informed consent is fundamental to the ethical use of data, as it enables individuals to determine how their personal information is used. They caution that without adequate consent and oversight, AI systems could invade privacy in unprecedented ways. For example, algorithms might aggregate different datasets to infer sensitive personal traits, or they could enable new forms of mass surveillance. On the other hand, industry representatives and some policymakers underscore the broad societal benefits that AI can provide (from advances in medical research to economic growth) and warn that overly strict consent rules might hamper innovation and impede the free flow of data. This debate often reflects differing cultural and legal perspectives.

U.S policy has traditionally leaned toward an industry oriented approach that prioritizes innovation, addressing privacy through a patchwork of sector specific laws rather than one overarching law. In contrast the European Union regards privacy as a fundamental right and enforces stricter data protection regulations that sometimes conflict with AI business models reliant on very large datasets¹. These transatlantic differences were highlighted when generative AI systems such as ChatGPT first emerged. U.S.-based companies rolled out these models quickly, whereas European regulators immediately voiced concerns about their compliance with EU privacy laws⁷.

Recognizing that existing privacy frameworks often are not equipped to deal with AI, lawmakers in various regions have begun proposing new rules. In the United States, which still lacks an overarching federal data privacy law, there is growing bipartisan interest in regulating AI's use of personal data. One notable proposal is the AI Consent Act, introduced in March 2024. This bill would authorize the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) to mandate that companies obtain individuals' explicit consent (opt in) before using their personal data to train AI systems. The primary reasoning behind this legislation is that "sustainable AI innovation" shouldn't come at the expense of consumer privacy, and that clear disclosure and consent are essential whenever personal information is fed into AI models. Another proposal, introduced by Senators Josh Hawley and Richard Blumenthal, is the AI Accountability and Personal Data Protection Act, which seeks to create a federal cause of action (a tort claim) if someone's data is collected or exploited without their express prior consent. Taken together, these efforts suggest a shift toward filling the legal vacuum in AI governance by strengthening individual consent rights and increasing corporate accountability.

The European Union has made it clear that its existing data protection laws, such as the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), extend to AI systems. European data protection authorities have already taken enforcement actions against AI services. For example, in 2023 Italy's Data Protection Authority temporarily blocked the ChatGPT service over alleged unlawful handling

of personal data, invoking GDPR and objecting to the "massive collection and storage of personal data" used for AI training without a valid legal basis. The European data Protection Board has established a task force to coordinate investigations of generative AI across EU member states. At the same time, the EU is developing a new AI Act that would complement the GDPR by focusing on AI system design. This draft legislation would require transparency when AI systems use personal information and mandate risk assessments to mitigate privacy harms.

Questions to Consider:

- 1. What constitutes valid consent in the age of AI?
- 2. How can legislation protect privacy without hindering innovation?
- 3. What data should be off-limits or specially protected?
- 4. Which legal or regulatory measures would ensure proper accountability and provide effective solutions?
- 5. In what ways can AI systems and their underlying data be made more transparent or understandable?

References/Works Cited

- 1. Baker McKenzie. "The United Nations Adopts its First Resolution on AI." InsightPlus Client Alert, 15 Apr. 2024, https://insightplus.bakermckenzie.com.
- 2. Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS). "Protecting Data Privacy as a Baseline for Responsible AI." CSIS Critical Questions, Aug. 2023, https://www.csis.org.
- 3. Electronic Privacy Information Center (EPIC). "UN Calls for Moratorium on Harmful AI, Establishment of Data Protection Legislation and AI Regulation." 15 Sept. 2021, https://epic.org.
- 4. Guardian News. "Revealed: 50 Million Facebook Profiles Harvested for Cambridge Analytica in Major Data Breach." The Guardian, 17 Mar. 2018, https://www.theguardian.com.
- 5. Kohn, Miriam. "Clearview AI, TikTok, and the Collection of Facial Images in International Law." Chicago Journal of International Law, vol. 23, no. 1, 2022, https://cjil.uchicago.edu.
- 6. Lapowsky, Issie. "Cambridge Analytica Shuts Down All Offices Amid Ongoing Facebook Crisis." Wired, 2 May 2018, https://www.wired.com.
- Mukherjee, Supantha, et al. "Italy's ChatGPT Ban Attracts EU Privacy Regulators." Reuters, 3
 Apr. 2023,
 https://www.reuters.com/technology/italy-data-protection-agency-opens-chatgpt-probe-privacy-concerns-2023-03-31.
- 8. UNESCO. "Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence." Nov. 2021, https://aicc.co.
- 9. Welch, Peter, et al. "AI CONSENT Act One-Pager." Mar. 2024, https://www.welch.senate.gov/wp-content/uploads/2024/03/AI-CONSENT-Act-One-Pager.pdf.