

The Impoundment Control Act is not ambiguous. It says that a President cannot decide what they spend based on a policy preference. If it is in the law, it is in the law; they have to execute on it.

Their opportunity to exercise their leverage as a separate and coequal branch is to threaten to veto a bill if it has something they don't want to spend money on, but once that law is enacted, their discretion is gone.

The appropriations bills for State and foreign ops, which, among other things, set minimum funding levels, prohibit the creation of new programs, the suspension or elimination of existing programs, and changes to Agencies without prior consultation with and notification to Congress—nobody did that.

You can love these cuts. I assume some people love these cuts. You can hate these cuts. I hate these cuts. But one thing you cannot say is that this administration is following the law and fulfilling its duties in consulting with Congress. In the meantime, millions of people will die. Millions of people will die.

Our sudden withdrawal has pushed people in Syria, Sudan, South Africa, and so many other places to the verge of starvation, disease, and death.

I learned when I was 28 that when you are an elected officer, you better be very careful what you say. I said some casual words one time. I still remember what I said. I won't repeat them. I was on Hawaii News Now, and someone asked me a question, and I was tired. It was the morning show. And I said something just overly casually, and it really hurt people. So ever since then, I have tried to be as precise as I can be. Now that I am in the Senate, even more so do I have an obligation to not say anything that is untrue but also just to be careful not to be too provocative.

So I say this advisedly: Millions of people will die because of the U.S. Government executive branch. This is a global humanitarian catastrophe about to happen on America's watch.

When I became ranking member of the subcommittee, one of the first things I talked to Chairman LINDSEY GRAHAM about was: How do we make things work better? Where can we better align our priorities?

I am open for business if the enterprise is lawmaking, and I am absolutely opposed if the enterprise is lawbreaking.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHMITT). The Senator from Vermont.

TARIFFS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. President, I want to speak about the reckless tariffs that the Trump administration, Donald Trump, is inflicting on the American consumer, the American worker, American businesses—especially with respect to Canada.

Canada is Vermont's largest trading partner. We are not alone. Thirty-four

States count Canada as its largest trading partner. We regard Canada as an independent friend, not as a prospective 51st State. And the reason we have that view toward Canada is because of the incredibly constructive and positive relationships we have had with that wonderful country for years.

But with respect to these tariffs, last year, trade with Canada accounted for 35 percent of Vermont exports and 67 percent of our imports and 56 percent of our total trade. One in four businesses in Vermont relies on trade with Canada. Vermont's economy is almost entirely made up of small businesses. They operate on the tightest of margins. Ninety-nine percent of Vermont's businesses, 76,878, are considered small. They support 60 percent of Vermont employees, that is 156,000, and these businesses cannot—they cannot—afford to absorb a 25-percent hike on imports from our largest trading partner.

Take maple syrup, for example. Vermont produces 51 percent of the maple syrup consumed in the United States. And by the way, these are small farmers or small land owners. For farmers, it supplements their income in a very difficult margin business when they are having a dairy operation as well. But Vermont's maple syrup industry expects millions of dollars in losses if the tariffs go through.

And that may surprise some, but Vermont imports \$408 million in maple products, primarily maple syrup, from Canada, and we reprocess it and sell it. The four largest maple syrup equipment manufacturers are located in Canada. Tariffs will make it far more expensive for our Vermont sugar producers, maple sugar producers, to buy that equipment.

This is an industry that has grown almost 500 percent in production over the past 20 years, and we are about to let all of that growth go down the drain with these reckless tariffs.

Vermont's maple syrup producers are also concerned that the loss in market share will result in people turning to other products instead of Vermont's liquid gold, with customers possibly turning to far inferior but more affordable products like corn syrup or agave if the price of syrup is too high.

These tariffs will also smash our farmers. Vermont farmers rely on organic grains and seeds and fertilizers that are imported from Canada. In that respect, all of our States on the northern tier are especially connected to potash and grains from Canada. And Trump's tariffs will raise prices on fertilizers, grains, and seeds, on lumber products, and machinery equipment from Canada that Vermont farmers rely on.

And, understandably, Canada—as are other countries that are subject to the Trump tariffs—is imposing retaliatory tariffs on the United States, and that includes, of course, Vermont. That is going to make our sales much more difficult. Nearly half of the farmers polled in February said U.S. agricultural tar-

iffs would result in the decrease in exports.

And, of course, we saw that that happened big time in the first Trump administration, particularly hammering our Midwest grain and soybean farmers. Those markets have not come back. The markets now are for Argentina and Brazil. What is the point of our own government doing something that so hurts our farmers for no benefit for the United States? This was a bad deal for our farmers during the first Trump administration.

And a USDA study from 2022 found that retaliatory tariffs led to a significant reduction in U.S. agricultural exports to the retaliating partners. The study found that export losses from 2018 to 2019 amounted to more than \$27 billion.

And if you remember what happened then is, Trump wanted to get right with the farmers so he took away their market, \$27 billion in sales, and then went to the taxpayer to make up the difference for those farmers. Every farmer I know, they would rather be selling what they grow rather than getting a government Trump subsidy.

The tariffs are also going to hurt consumers. There is no question about that. Grocery prices will be up. The price of eggs is up 19 percent from the end of the year and could climb to 41 percent this year.

Meanwhile, the President is reposting articles on social media telling people to shut up—shut up about the price of eggs. Did he talk about anything else during his campaign?

His tariffs on Canada, Mexico, and China would directly cost the typical U.S. household over \$1,200 in purchasing power. And people in Vermont—and I know in your State, Mr. President—they are struggling at the end of the month to make that checkbook balance. They can't afford that \$1,200 hit. And some economists are estimating it could be an increase as much as 3,900 for the average American household.

Jobs and homes, the trade war could cost 400,000 good-paying, blue-collar jobs. The trade war will increase the cost of a home. You know, in Vermont we have a wood products industry. We export timber to Canada. It is milled in Canada, reimported to the United States, to Vermont, to help us build homes. A 25-percent increase on that imported lumber is going to go straight to the cost of an already unaffordable home. What sense does that make?

Trump's tariffs will raise gas prices for us in Vermont 25 to 40 cents a gallon. We get a lot of our petroleum products from Canada.

It is going to cost more in home heating fuel, and that is a tough expense for Vermonters. And it is going to cost more in electricity. We, for years, imported electricity from Hydro-Quebec and other sources of power in Canada. So folks who have high electric bills, they are going to get higher; who are paying more than

they can afford for gas, they are going to pay more; and that home heating bill is going to hammer them once again—all for no constructive, positive reason.

You know, there is another aspect to this. It is not just the tariffs in our argument about the policy and the bizarre assertion that the Trump administration is making that these tariffs will make us rich, everybody knows—except, apparently, President Trump—that the people who pay the tariffs are the people who buy the products. You have a Canadian product that you have to, as a manufacturer, pay a tariff. That has to be added onto the price of the product—let's say to the sugarmaker, that farmer who is paying it. There is a price on electricity, a tariff. The consumer is going to pay that. We all know that.

But aside from that, it is so chaotic, so disorganized, so hit-or-miss, so random in the rollout of these tariffs: on again, off again, on again, 25 percent, 50 percent, 10 percent. It is like the President wakes up and throws something at a dart board, and that is the new policy for the day. You cannot have an orderly expectation for your business. You cannot have the confidence that a consumer needs who is trying to really pay close attention to how she is spending the family budget with chaos. You can't do it, and you don't need it.

So why in the world is the President doing it? He seems to think chaos is a good policy.

You know what we saw—and we are seeing—and it is getting worse and it is not going to stop. The stock market had its worst week in 6 months. What does Donald Trump say? The stock markets are literally crashing. There was no reason for this, all self-inflicted. He said that in 2022. He is right today. It is all self-inflicted. The last 72 hours we have seen a wild ride.

And Trump is ready to send the United States into a recession in order to implement his disastrous economic agenda, and that boastful confidence that he always asserts: Everything is going to work out. It is going to be beautiful. He is saying: A recession, who knows, we may have to pay that as a price.

Well, you know what. We don't have to pay that as a price for foolish policies that only hurt us and hurt our allies.

Nearly half of all U.S. imports, more than \$1.3 trillion, come from Canada, China, and Mexico. And it is estimated that Trump's tariffs could reduce overall U.S. imports by 15 percent as well as increase prices.

And Trump's last attempt at a trade war was passed on entirely to U.S. importers and consumers, leading to a loss of 245,000 U.S. jobs and higher consumer prices.

And I note that the unemployment rate ticked up last week.

Trump's stated goal is using tariffs to achieve unrelated goals of curbing

fantanyl—we all want to do that—and illegal immigration. We all want a secure border. But the southern border has about 1,000 times the amount of fentanyl that comes through the miniscule amount on the northern border. So what the President has is this indiscriminate policy where he is using—I would say abusing—the delegation of national security powers by this Congress decades ago, when it was expected that they would be used for a real national security military threat, to meet his whims to negotiate this way and that on whatever strikes his fancy that particular day.

And I also note that in the House bill that has been sent over here, the continuing resolution, the House has included a provision that can only be described as outrageous and cowardly. It said—the House stripped itself of the authority to vote on these tariffs that have been invoked by Trump's emergency authority.

How can a legislative body do that, literally vote to say we can't vote on whether we believe that these tariffs have any merit or are going to be good or bad for the people we represent? The House did that, and that is in the CR.

We have got a long history with tariffs. And we saw in the 1930s, the Smoot-Hawley tariffs led to a trade war, led to a depression, hurt jobs, hurt consumers. It is really, really stupid.

This is going to hurt Vermont. I call on all of us to speak out against these tariffs that are going to hurt us in every State of this United States of America.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

HAMAS

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, since Hamas's barbaric attack on Israel on October 7 of last year, many of our Nation's top universities have abandoned their Jewish students. Instead of providing a place to learn, they have become hotbeds of anti-Semitism, anti-American hatred, and open support for terrorism.

Here are some examples. At Princeton, students have waved the flags of terror groups like Hezbollah. At UCLA, activists set up barricades across campus and blocked Jewish students from attending class. At George Washington University, a pro-Hamas demonstrator walked around campus with a sign calling for a "Final Solution" against the Jewish people. At Columbia University, students chanted "We are Hamas" and "Long Live Hamas."

In recent weeks, pro-Hamas activists at Barnard College occupied an academic building, allegedly assaulted a school employee, and handed out fliers produced by the Hamas Media Office. These fliers glorified "Operation Al-Aqsa Flood." That is Hamas's term for its kidnapping, rape, and murder of more than 1,200 Israelis.

These are not isolated cases. To many Americans and, certainly, many Tennesseans, it seems impossible that

this would be happening right here. But according to Hillel International, there were more than 1,800 anti-Semitic incidents on college campuses during the 2023–2024 school year. Think about that—1,800 anti-Semitic incidents. The thing that is so upsetting about this is that is an increase of more than 500 percent from the year before. This shows you the organization and the intensity of these events.

What we do know is Jewish students have faced harassment and intimidation on their university campuses. And we also know that the Biden administration sat on their hands, and they chose to do nothing about this. Instead, they sided with the radical activists who turned our campuses into cesspools of hatred.

Now, with President Trump back in the Oval Office, pro-Hamas students and the colleges that enable them are being put on notice. Recently, Secretary of State Rubio vowed to revoke visas and green cards for any foreign students who support terror groups like Hamas and Hezbollah. This is something that I have called for and supported, which is why I am so pleased to see this administration—the Trump administration—actually taking action.

What we do know is that ICE arrested a former Columbia University student who is from Syria. That is Mahmoud Khalil. This was a ring leader for Columbia's anti-Israel encampment—as I said, a former student.

As I said, pro-Hamas activists spat on Jewish students. They chanted "F—the Jews," and they held signs next to Jewish students claiming that they would be Hamas's next target. Think about this—if you are a 19-year-old Jewish college student, and you were there on Columbia's campus, and you have a protester holding a sign against your head saying you should be the next target.

In many ways, Khalil was the perfect leader for this anti-Semitic, pro-terror movement. What we know is this: Before he enrolled at Columbia University, he allegedly served as a political affairs officer for UNRWA. That is right, the U.N. Relief and Works Agency there in Gaza. This person was a political affairs officer for UNRWA.

This is the same UNRWA that we now know indoctrinated Palestinian children to hate the Jews and stored Hamas's weapons in its facilities in Gaza. They actually put ammunition and weapons in the schools—the U.N. schools—there in Gaza. We know that they had people affiliated with Hamas on their payroll, and we know they provided support and aid to the terrorists.

There is no reason why someone like this should be allowed in our country to support terrorism and to promote anti-Jewish bigotry. That is why Secretary Rubio is intending to deport Khalil, which this administration has the full authority to do under our Federal immigration laws. And under this