CR STRIPS AWAY PUBLIC SAFETY FUNDING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

(Mr. MRVAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MRVAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to state that should now the House-approved full-year continuing resolution become law, it will be a legislative tragedy for northwest Indiana that will strip away specific funding for public safety and economic development.

By not including community project funding requests approved by this institution in the House Appropriations Committee just last year, Indiana's First Congressional District loses $4 million in approved funds to support equipment and resources for law enforcement agencies and $7 million in approved economic development projects. It reduces health benefits for veterans and puts at risk healthcare for seniors and children with complex medical conditions.

The House majority has made northwest Indiana less safe, jeopardized our potential for economic growth and the ability to create more work and wealth, and put veteran healthcare and those veterans who were exposed to toxic burn pits, Agent Orange, and radiation at risk.

It is shameful that we have misled our local law enforcement agencies, local units of government, veterans, and seniors. I encourage my Senate colleagues to reject this harmful measure.

HONORING HAZEL DUKES

(Ms. MENG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MENG. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in honor of Dr. Hazel Dukes, a lifelong activist, a champion for civil rights, and the president of the NAACP New York State Conference.

Dr. Dukes' fierce commitment to fighting for equality and justice is simply unmatched. She was a trailblazer in New York State and across the country, a renowned community organizer, and a leading voice at the NAACP for nearly 40 years. She worked tirelessly for equity in housing, healthcare, and education.

I remember sitting next to Dr. Dukes at a long meeting where we were standing for hours, clapping and cheering. I was so tired and kept trying to sit down, but she reminded me that it was a privilege to be there, and I stood right back up.

Dr. Dukes' strength came from her compassion and love for our communities. The legacy that she leaves behind will inspire women, girls, and advocates across New York for generations to come.

It was an honor to have known Dr. Dukes. May she rest in power.

ENSURING VETERANS HAVE ACCESS TO FOOD ASSISTANCE

(Mrs. HAYES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, in recognition of National Nutrition Month, I introduced the Feed Hungry Veterans Act, legislation to permanently remove barriers to SNAP often faced by veterans with work-limiting disabilities.

According to the 2023 RAND report, 1.4 million veterans are food insecure. That is in part because many disabled veterans do not meet all the qualifications for Federal nutrition programs like SNAP.

My legislation amends the definition of ''elderly or disabled'' for SNAP to include veterans with one service-connected disability rated at 60 percent or higher or two or more service-connected disabilities, at least one of which is rated 40 percent or higher.

With more than one third of disabled veterans in the United States facing food insecurity, we must do more to support those who have honorably served our Nation. The Feed Hungry Veterans Act is a critical step to ensuring veterans have long-term access to critical food assistance.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ONDER) laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 11, 2025.

I hereby designate the period from Tuesday, March 11, 2025, through Sunday, March 23, 2025, as a ''district work period'' under clause 13 of Rule 1.

MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DATA IS THE SOLUTION

(Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, Mr. SCHWEIKERT of Arizona was recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.)

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. FISCHBACH).

CONGRATULATING MOORHEAD SPUDS BOYS' HOCKEY TEAM

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona, my fellow member of Ways and Means, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Moorhead boys' hockey team on their first State championship, defeating Stillwater 7–6 at the Xcel Energy Center over the weekend. The 2A championship win was led by this year's Mr. Hockey, Mason Kraft.

The team dedicated the game to their teammate Ethan, who passed away unexpectedly last year at the age of 16. Holding up his jersey throughout the game and bringing the jersey through the handshake line, the Moorhead Spuds have made their families, community, and the whole Seventh District proud. I congratulate the Spuds.

CONGRATULATING EAST GRAND FORKS ON HOCKEY CHAMPIONSHIP

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the East Grand Forks boys' hockey team on their incredible Class 1A championship win.

With what sounded like the entire community of East Grand Forks in the stands, the team defeated Saint Cloud Cathedral 2–1 in overtime.

The East Grand Forks Green Wave has made their families, communities, and the entire Seventh District so very proud, and I am excited for them all to hoist that championship banner back at home.

CONGRATULATING WARROAD WOMEN'S HOCKEY TEAM

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Warroad girls' hockey team, the Lady Warriors, on their 10-year streak as section champions.

These women, from a small town in northernmost Minnesota, are part of one of the best girls' hockey teams in the last 20 years. They have made their families and communities proud.

CONGRATULATING PRAISE LIVE ON 40 YEARS OF BROADCASTING

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Praise Live in Osakis, Minnesota, on 40 wonderful years of broadcasting.

For 40 years, Praise Live has been bringing hope and faith to people across central and western Minnesota. They have even partnered with stations in Ghana and Uganda and as far-reaching as war-torn Sudan to spread the Gospel and its message of encouragement, faith, and hope across Africa.

I thank Praise Live for connecting with, praying for, and strengthening the Christian communities they are committed to serving. I pray for a successful next 40 years.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I am going to try something this evening. The thesis I am going to try to sell tonight is that data is substantially a solution for us. What? I am going to walk through a number of things that just came out in the new Med Pack report. I have only just started reading it, but there are a couple of interesting things.

□ 1830

I am going to try to walk through the reality of what drives debt and deficits like I do every week. I am going to try to walk folks through some of the actual math instead of some of the hysteria that is modern politics where we make crap up because we don't tell the total details, and let's see if we can actually make any progress here on sort of the intellectual capital of this place.

So just off the top of my head, Mr. Speaker, you have seen the stories of the butchering of Federal employees.

Okay, let's walk through just some of the math. You have got 3 million Federal employees. If 77,000 have decided to take the early retirement offer, let's see, that is, dear heaven, I should have calculated this before, is 3 percent, 3 percent of the Federal population.

I have a chart we are working on, it did not make my stack, to show the growth in the number of Federal employees in the last decade. It is a little rich how many folks run around here and they want more spending for their projects, so they don't want this or they don't want that, but at the same time, they are lined up at our doors and want more spending.

Mr. Speaker, if I could come to you and say: Guys, we are going to try to find a way to make the way we deliver services much more efficient and much more rational. So let's actually sort of walk through a couple of the boards.

This is one we start with a lot. The number now is a bit more dour. This board is 1 year out of date, but I didn't want to spend the money to reprint it.

Mr. Speaker, do you see the blue portion?

This fiscal year, about 25 percent of all the spending is in the blue. That is what we get to vote on. That is military. That is what we call nondefense discretionary.

We borrow about, let's see, last year for every dollar we took in in taxes, we borrowed or we spent $1.39.

So functionally, 39 cents this year, it will be a little better, we think it will only be about 36 cents for every dollar we take in in taxes. So what that basically means is everything you and I as Members of Congress vote on is borrowed.

However, we have this reconciliation budget. It is one of the few times where we actually get to talk a little bit about what is in the red, but we don't get to touch net interest. Interest is interest, and some of the math coming in right now says that interest this year, this fiscal year, could be about 1.1 to 1.2. I actually am a bit more dour, $1 trillion, making interest functionally the second highest expense in the Federal Government.

Until this reconciliation budget makes it through, defense is like number four on spending, so Social Security, interest, Medicare, Defense.

Take a look at what we are even allowed to talk about, Mr. Speaker, in a reconciliation budget. You know why we do the reconciliation budget, it is so we can get around the 60-vote rule in the Senate. So we are doing all this dancing and stuff because of the Senate rules, but we can't touch net interest and we are not allowed to go near Social Security.

So think about that, Mr. Speaker. That area on that last chart I just showed you that was red, the majority of it we are not even allowed to talk about it. We can't touch it, and we can't do anything about it. So when you see the authorization, Mr. Speaker, that is actually why committees like Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce have such a lift.

So what happens if I come to you, Mr. Speaker, and start to say: You have this country that is binging on debt.

We are in extraordinary measures right now, so some of the daily debt calculations are a little screwed up, but before we went through extraordinary measures, we were in the 60, $70,000 per second, every day, every second. If my math is correct and we come in about $2.2 trillion, maybe $2.3 trillion of borrowing this year, then we have to start thinking about that.

So we take in about $5 trillion in tax receipts, we are going to spend about $7 trillion, meaning about 7.25 percent of the entire economy is borrowed this year, and if we don't get our act together, in 9 budget years it could be 9.2 percent of the entire economy is borrowed.

I just wanted to make the point because I have come here in the past, interest rates have fallen dramatically in the last couple of weeks which, remember the seesaw, we have talked about the seesaw, when the economy is really strong or there is a shortage of capital to borrow, interest rates go up meaning United States pays a lot more in debt servicing. When interest rates go down, it typically means the expectations of the economy are slowing down meaning our tax receipts fall. So the middle of the seesaw stays the same.

I saw some people getting giddy: Look, interest rates are down.

It also means actually some of our modeling in the future quarters of tax receipts also are starting to fall now. So there is no free option anymore. However, Mr. Speaker, you have seen some of the discussions. Ray Dalio has been out there talking about the heart attack of debt and what happens to other countries and the history of that going back, I think in his book he is going back a couple thousand years.

Here is functionally the world borrowing. China is borrowing about 17 percent of what we call the available capital for sovereign borrowing. Japan is borrowing about 10 percent. We are borrowing 40 percent. We are about 25 percent of the world's GDP, but we are borrowing 40 percent of the money that goes to sovereigns. Mr. Speaker, you have to understand the scale, the binging on debt.

Mr. Speaker, when I get to the very last board, I am going to show again the chart that just seems to upset people, but it is math. Over from today through the next 30 years, discretionary spending, according to the CBO's 30-year model, actually ends up with a growth slower than tax receipts, but it is Social Security and Medicare. It is demographics. It is not Republican, and it is not Democrat, it is demographics.

Where it becomes partisan is where it is the unwillingness to tell the truth about the math and then actually the creativity of how we disrupt the cost.

How do you actually find some of these things?

This chart is a little awkward. I would have designed it a little differently, but sometimes you are running around.

The point we are trying to make is here was the effective interest in 2014 to the United States. Now all of a sudden we are up here, and the actual market rate we expect in the future to actually continue to consume, meaning interest is our great fragility in this country.

I have told the comment many times that at our current rate of borrowing, we have almost put the bond market in charge of this country because, Mr. Speaker, if you have to bring hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of billions of dollars to market every month, you screw with your banker. In many ways that bond market now is our banker.

For my brothers and sisters on the left who often want to attack the tax reform of 2017, attack tax receipts, I have done presentation after presentation behind this microphone using the stuff from the Manhattan Institute that basically shows if we do all the Democrats' tax hikes and then do the economic adjustments, often from Democrat groups, you get about 1.5 percent of GDP in new tax receipts.

Okay, maybe we are going to be pushed against the wall and have to do that, but we are borrowing over 7 percent of GDP. So it is like on Social Security, it is common that the refrain is we will just raise the cap. Okay, in 2033, the Social Security trust fund is empty.

Our brothers and sisters on Social Security will take a 17 to 20 percent cut. We double senior poverty in America. When someone says: Well, just raise the cap, our model is in that next year, 2034, raising the cap only covers about 38 percent of the shortfall, Mr. Speaker, and you have wiped out the cash and other things you actually need to also save Medicare, which actually that trust fund runs out 3 years later.

So one of the reasons for this chart is trying to demonstrate something very simple that back when before TCJA, the 2017 tax reform, the actual projection of what tax receipts would be, so before the tax changes, we are right on track.

Do you see the weird blip there, Mr. Speaker? That was a remarkable amount of spending that happened during the pandemic. We actually just went back to nominal.

So what happens here? What happens when there is this intense hunger to play this weird blame game instead of being willing to tell our voters the truth?

The vast majority of debt this decade will be interest and healthcare costs, mostly Medicare.

So one more contribution to the increase in spending from 2024 to 2035, interest, so remember why this chart is important. Let's put it in perspective.

Baseline, this is actually with the taxes going up at the end of this year, just baseline. So sort of following current law, not the clowns who actually run around and say: Let's just avoid the law and let's just pretend what we spend we spend.

The law says we are going to borrow $22 trillion over the next 10 years. That is baseline.

Here is the mix of that borrowing: 24 percent of that will be interest of the additional borrowing; old-age, survivors, Social Security will be 31 percent; discretionary 13; other mandatory 4 percent; and Medicare 28 percent.

Now, the fact of the matter is old-age, survivors, and Medicare have their own trust funds except for the fact that within that 10-year window, at least, this trust fund is now empty.

Are we allowed to talk about it? Are we allowed to do the moral thing here and maybe stop the doubling of senior poverty?

Yet, the fact of the matter is maybe I am an idiot for getting behind the microphone and actually mentioning the word Social Security because there is someone writing an attack ad on me right now for trying to save it. It is just the sickness of this place.

So let's actually walk through a little bit.

I saw a number of folks who actually have been attacking DOGE and the attempts to use data.

Understand, Mr. Speaker, that some of the communication skills are haphazard, but if I came to you today and said: Let's strip any partisanship, we need to find waste, fraud, and abuse modeling issues where we are doing things the wrong way, where we have models that are sometimes decades and decades out of date, would you hire an army of auditors, an army of lawyers, or would you hire data scientists, Mr. Speaker?

It turns out several years ago Congress started requiring agencies that send out payments that cover healthcare costs, that send out checks, these things, start telling us your error reports.

Okay, so for 2023, the reports come back at $236 billion of improper payments. Okay, that is a stunning amount of money, but that doesn't mean there is $236 billion of improper payments that have been stolen. There is a bunch of it that has been, but it is more complex. An army of auditors it would take years to grind through this. That is why actually the miracle of technology right now—hire some data scientists. They are really expensive. Most of them actually I have met recently are bathing, that is both funny and shockingly true. I met one who is an MIT dropout. Apparently MIT wasn't hard enough for him, but that is actually what he does.

The failure to access data information, well, it turns out a whole bunch of what we label as improper payments we lacked data on understanding.

So what happens when it is the data scientists who will help us grind through?

I just grabbed this one because Treasury itself, not just CMS and all the other agencies, Treasury itself has $21 billion of improper payments. When you walk through what those were, Mr. Speaker, and why they are improper, they didn't verify household size, they didn't verify the qualifications. They didn't verify these things that is basically data.

So let's actually have a little more fun here. Types of improper payments. Okay, we actually estimate of that $236 billion—and actually this was for 2024, the other chart was for 2023—$135 billion are overpayments.

Now, understand for a lot of those that maybe come through CMS, a Medicare reimbursement. CMS has the ability months and months, a year later, to try to recapture those moneys. We are trying to get the data scientists to build us models to understand, okay, if there is $135 billion of overpayments, how much of that comes back to us and how much is we will call it leakage, even those leakage is with a b. Then we have 12 billion unknown payments, we know payments went out but there wasn't enough data telling us what they were.

□ 1845

We had almost $8 billion of underpayments, where we underpaid people.

Mr. Speaker, what I am trying to provide here is that we know that we have a problem. We have known that we have had this problem for decades. For the last decade, we have been tracking the problem, and it has only been the last couple of months where we are beginning to tackle the problem and try to use technology to dive into what these categories are and to understand.

Mr. Speaker, some of this, you will notice the huge spike in improper payment amounts. That is actually mostly from the pandemic when we were pushing money and shoveling money out of this place like crazy, but we have been tracking this since 2014.

It has taken until now to find the technology and to find the talent to start diving into this math. Why is this just so important?

If you are someone like me, who believes that there are trillions of dollars over the next 10 years that we can save by just modernizing the way we deliver services, you first have to identify the outliers and identify what is going on.

Why is this so incredibly important? You have to understand what we are up against.

Outlays of the largest mandatory programs are projected to massively increase.

A moment of brutal honesty: This is 2025. This is 2034, so functionally 9 budget years. Social Security will have a 61 percent increase in spending. These are our demographics. I am going to try to explain these numbers a little bit more.

Medicare will have almost a 78 percent increase in spending over those next 9 budget years. There is a little more for this because this has none of the offsets, so I will try to provide a level of brutal honesty.

Remember, on Medicare, on some things, you have a portion of copay, those things. Yet, it is still a 75 percent increase, but it goes from $2 trillion of spending. In 9 budget years, Medicare itself will be a couple trillion dollars, just the spending on that. If you do the offset, the payments that the senior makes, that is about $400 billion. That is still a 75 percent increase in spending.

What would happen if I could come to you and say: If we would use technology, if we would modernize—here is the MedPAC report that came out in the last couple of days. I haven't read the whole thing. I read part of it.

Here is last year's MedPAC report. We read all of it, highlighted it, and we actually make our staff read it.

Well, it turns out, around here, actually reading the actual math and the concepts—if I came to you right now and said: In here, there is a whole paragraph that is saying there is something wrong in Medicare Advantage data.

Mr. Speaker, the MedPAC report says that Medicare Advantage is a really important program. We need to keep it, but we are going to have to dive in on how to modernize how it works. They made the adjustments for coding intensity, but it basically translates into a projected $84 billion, or 17 percent, of total payments. Meaning, Medicare Advantage is coming in at $84 billion this year. That is more than fee for service. That is with the adjustments for renal failure and other things.

I am already starting to have the MedPAC report fall apart, so if any of you talk to the MedPAC folks, ask them for better binding on their reports.

What would happen if I came to you right now and said: By changing the incentives, we can do things to fix these outliers and costs and never cut a service? Instead of the incentives that the MedPAC report talks about of scoring people as sicker and sicker and taking that additional spiff, spending, how about a system that says: Why don't we incentivize the providers in this program to help our brothers and sisters who are seniors be healthier? And that helping your population be healthier is actually your profit.

Is that heresy? I would argue that it is just good design.

We don't have a choice because, last week, the Joint Economic Committee published a report. I chair the Joint Economic Committee, and I appreciate that we have remarkably hardworking economists. We are trying very hard, but we are willing to go to places that are politically dangerous but mathematically honest, which is something that rarely happens around here.

Yet, we tried to touch on things like how fragile is U.S. debt to higher interest rates? The fact of the matter is I did a chart a couple of weeks ago that showed if the United States went back to a 6 percent handle on U.S. sovereign debt—you would say that is a lot higher than we are at today. Yeah, but go back to the early 2000s, we were right up against 6 percent. We have to realize, in 9 budget years, if we are at 6 percent, it would mean that 45 percent of all U.S. tax collections go just to interest.

We do a chapter here on the effects of obesity on our society, on spending, on longevity, and on family formation. Last year's report came in over $9 trillion. This year, we even define it more to understand what happens when the single biggest spend in our society could actually be mitigated by helping our brothers and sisters in the country be healthier.

Are we allowed to talk about that, or is that just heresy? Once again, I have to tell the truth.

Over the next 30 years, Social Security and Medicare represent all of the borrowing. It is about $116 trillion of borrowing.

Discretionary, which we talk about a lot because that is where you find some of the really stupid spending, the shiny objects, is projected to grow slower than tax receipts.

My point is, for everyone out there who wants to be enraged by the White House, enraged by those of us who are trying to find solutions, bring us ideas. Bring us actual math. Stop making crap up. However, if you are going to give us ideas, actually maybe read your subject area first.

You would be amazed how many things we get where, if we just didn't have foreign aid, and then we show the chart that it is a week of borrowing. Understand that you have a country where our baseline is going to be borrowing about $6 billion a day. How long do you think we can do that?

First, if we can find ways to do it better, faster, and cheaper, read the actual reports that we have been given for a decade that actually have ideas for this and be willing now to do the hard work of just using technology and data and modernizing.

Mr. Speaker, one of the insane things around here, when you meet many of the folks who are in our hallways and demanding more spending, demanding more regulations, demanding more barriers to entry to protect their business model or their bureaucracy, they actually hate the discussion of modernizing.

You are a medical professional. You know what you are doing. The fact of the matter is that there is hope. I don't think there are a lot more years that we can wait. There are ways to do this.

How do we get this body, both our brothers and sisters on the Democratic side—if they would be willing to work with us—saying let's modernize, let's embrace the technology, let's do the things we know that, if we were actually caring—it may not be great politics, but it is really good economics and really good for the future of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

TARIFFS HURT EVERYONE

(Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, Mr. FOSTER of Illinois was recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.)

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material for the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I will first thank my colleagues on the Democratic Rapid Response Task Force and Litigation Working Group for helping us with these various Special Order hours discussing the Trump administration's various reckless actions.

Tonight, I rise to bring attention to an issue that really should have all Americans on alert, which are President Trump's tariff policies.

Since the beginning of this administration, American businesses, manufacturers, and families have been stuck in limbo as the Trump administration has repeatedly threatened, then implemented, then paused, then restarted tariffs, creating uncertainty and instability.

The most recent policy shift to a 25 percent tariff on goods from Canada and Mexico has been fraught with delays and exemptions, leaving American businesses, manufacturers, and consumers just stuck in limbo, not knowing how to react and how to make their plans.

In fact, just this morning, Trump doubled planned tariffs on steel and aluminum from Canada to 50 percent. Then, a mere couple hours ago, a spokesman from the White House said that the tariffs on Canada were back down to 25 percent. Who knows?

In true Trump administration fashion, this is complete and utter chaos. Yet, the truth is that these tariffs, no matter if and when they go into full effect, whether it is this week or next month, they will all ultimately have the same result: higher prices for everyday goods and a less competitive U.S. manufacturing sector.

In fact, a business in my district, which makes precision-form steel tubing components, told me that the price of hot rolled steel is up 33 percent since Trump's inauguration in anticipation of these tariffs, and there is just no way that they are going to be able to avoid passing these inflationary price increases on to their customers.

According to an analysis from the Yale Budget Lab, if implemented fully, these tariffs would cost the average American family between $1,600 and $2,000 a year, with working-class families, who can least afford it, being hit the hardest.

Prices would spike across the board. Electronics, like computers, phones, and TVs, could rise by 11 percent; clothing, up by 7.5 percent; cars and auto parts, up by 6 percent; groceries, up 2 percent with fresh produce rising nearly 3 percent. Oil and other energy costs will rise over 1.6 percent, making it more expensive for families to fill up their gas tanks and heat their homes.

Mr. Speaker, Trump is trying to spin these tariffs as something that is solely attacks on foreign companies, but history and macroeconomic facts tell us otherwise. When Trump first imposed tariffs during his first administration, it was not other countries that paid, but it was American consumers and businesses.

Importers passed these cost increases on to their consumers, and domestic producers hiked their own prices in response. This made U.S. manufacturers less competitive worldwide. In fact, in the last administration, Trump's policies put us into a manufacturing recession well before COVID hit.

Beyond hurting hardworking American families, these tariffs threatened the stability of our economy. Analysts from across the political spectrum warned that they could slash 2.3 percent from GDP by 2026, wiping out a lot of projected growth.

Markets also reacted with great uncertainty, as they should. The stocks have dropped, and consumer confidence is cratering.

For American farmers, many of whom are already facing mounting economic challenges, the situation is even more dire. The costs of critical supplies, such as fertilizer, fuel, and equipment, will skyrocket, making it harder for farmers to maintain their operations.

Mr. Speaker, I was just at an event earlier today with corn farmers from the Midwest. For example, according to the U.S. Geological Survey, Canada supplies over 80 percent of our potash imports, which are an essential component for agricultural fertilizer. Guess who the next leading producers are after Canada? Russia, China, and Belarus.

Wouldn't it be better if we could import from our friends in Canada instead of Russia, China, and Belarus, or does our President feel differently?

□ 1900

In any case, with increased costs, farmers will be forced to either raise prices or absorb the losses, neither of which is sustainable in the long run.

Besides rising costs, farmers are already facing devastating losses in international markets. China, the largest export market for U.S. food products, has already announced retaliatory tariffs on key American agricultural goods, including wheat, corn, soybeans, pork, and dairy products.