

just stuck in a tear over this. So you have got a judge that says: Oh, no, you have got to send this money out.

Are you kidding me? They don't want to save the taxpayers' money?

Now, I think one that has come up so often with Tennesseans and the reason this issue of these out-of-control leftist judges came up on our telephone town-hall last night—by the way, we had thousands of Tennesseans on that call, and it had to do with deporting these criminal illegal aliens—Tren de Aragua, MS-13.

To my colleagues, I remind you, we have deemed them foreign terrorist organizations. These are not people who are our friends. These are people who are terrorists. They are gangs. They have murdered. They have raped. They have robbed.

But we have some of our friends on the left who are saying: Oh, you can't deport them. You can't send them to the gang prison in El Salvador. You have got to bring them back.

Are you kidding me? Show me somebody that actually wants to have more murderers and rapists and robbers in their community.

I invite anybody: If you want to go out there and protect rapists and murders and robbers, you come on down here, and you explain why you would like to have them come.

If they are for that, I would like to hear why they are.

But what we see happening is these activist judges are undermining our Nation's Constitution. In each of our Nation's 677 district judges, there is no veto power over the President—none. They do not have it. There is nothing—nothing—that gives a Federal district judge veto power over the actions of the President of the United States.

Now, if they did have that power, they would be circumventing the will of the people, and we would no longer be a sovereign nation.

The separation of powers works both ways. Judges must respect the President's authority over the executive branch. That is his jurisdiction.

To ensure that happens, my Republican colleagues and I are introducing the Judicial Relief Clarification Act.

Now, this is being led by Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY, who is chairman of our Judiciary Committee. And it would end this harmful practice of nationwide injunctions, make temporary restraining orders against Federal or State governments immediately appealable, and ensure the courts can only issue relief for the case or the controversy before them.

A district judge in San Francisco or anywhere else should not ever be deciding national policy. That is not something they have the ability to do. Altogether, these provisions would help restore Federal courts to their core purpose, which is administering justice under the rule of law—not deciding nationwide policy.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Madam President, this week, we are moving forward on a budget bill that

will help unleash the Trump agenda that the American people voted for in November. At the top of that agenda is making life more affordable for families across the country, especially after they have lived through 4 full years of what everyone has termed "Bidenflation."

Now, to do that, Congress must extend the first Trump administration's tax cuts. This is the 2017 Tax Cut and Jobs Act, and this will deliver historic tax relief to hard-working Americans, which we did in 2017, and it would make it permanent. When you see it made permanent, this would supercharge small business growth, and provide certainty for our Main Street smalltown businesses.

Another thing that it would do is to restore U.S. global competitiveness, but if we let many of these provisions expire, then at the end of the year, Americans are going to face a \$4 trillion tax hike. Think about that, a \$4 trillion tax hike. The bill that we will bring forward will prevent that from happening by extending these crucial tax cuts.

It will be so important for our families. In Tennessee, families already under Biden are paying \$1,700 more every month because of inflation just to buy the same basket of goods that they were able to buy in April of 2021. This is what Bidenflation has done.

So to support President Trump's agenda and get it across the finish line, it will bolster our Nation's security, help rebuild our military, and restore peace through strength, provide for border security, unleash energy production, provide a path to return Federal spending to pre-pandemic levels.

With this Trump agenda budget bill, we are going to deliver on our promise to the American people to do our part to pass the President's agenda and to make this Nation safe and healthy and prosperous and great again.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUBERVILLE). The Senator from Maine. TERMINATING THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY DECLARED TO IMPOSE DUTIES ON ARTICLES IMPORTED FROM CANADA

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the resolution introduced by my colleague from Virginia, Senator KAINE, to overturn the emergency declaration for the northern border that is being used to impose tariffs on goods imported from Canada.

The Maine economy is integrated with Canada, our most important trading partner. From home heating oil, gasoline, jet fuel, and other refined petroleum products, to Maine's paper mills, forest products businesses, agricultural producers, and lobstermen, the tariffs on Canada would be detrimental to many Maine families and our local economies.

Of course I share the President's goal of stemming the tide of dangerous fentanyl that flows into the United States. I commend him for taking far stronger actions to halt this dangerous

and deadly flow than did the previous administration. I do not, however, agree with his invoking the powers of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act to impose tariffs on Canadian goods and products.

The fact is, the vast majority of fentanyl in America comes from the southern border. In fiscal year 2024, less than 1 percent of fentanyl seizures occurred at our northern border. And our Canadian neighbors are working collaboratively and cooperatively with our government to stop that trafficking.

One of the best examples of the intertwined relationship between Maine's economy and Canada can be seen at the Twin Rivers Paper mill in Madawaska, ME, way in the north on the Canadian border. Twin Rivers produces lightweight specialty paper for packaging materials, for our Nation's newspapers and our retailers' catalogs, for food and environmentally safe papers used in restaurants, and for a wide variety of other paper goods that are used all over the country.

The raw pulp for this paper mill in Maine is piped across the St. John River from Edmundston, New Brunswick, to Madawaska, ME. There literally is a pipeline through which the pulp travels between these two sister mills. A tariff placed on this pulp would jeopardize the financial well-being of this vital paper mill, which employs more than 500 people in rural northern Maine. There is not another big employer in that area that could possibly compensate for the loss of those 510 direct jobs, and that doesn't include the indirect jobs—the truck-drivers, the loggers, the restaurant owners who would be harmed by the closure or reduction in the operation of this vitally important mill. The tariff would not only devastate Twin Rivers but also harm hundreds of Maine families.

Another example of our integration with Canada is in energy. Ninety-five percent of the heating oil that is used by most Mainers to heat their homes comes from refineries in Canada.

Irving Oil, a Canadian-based company, has 150 gas stations in Maine and supplies two-thirds of the State's gas, diesel, and heating oil. This includes 100 percent of the jet fuel that is used by the Air National Guard base in Bangor. Maine consumers, Maine businesses, and the U.S. Department of Defense—our own Department of Defense—would bear the cost of that Canadian energy tariff.

Canadian tariffs would also harm many Maine farmers, lobstermen, and fishermen. According to the Maine Potato Board, 90 percent of the potash, which is the fertilizer used for growing potatoes, is imported from Canada. Fertilizer accounts for 11 percent of total input cost to grow our great Maine potatoes. Tariffs on imports like fertilizer will only hurt Maine potato growers.

I grew up in Aroostook County. I know these potato growers. I picked

potatoes as a schoolchild when I was growing up.

Just recently, a farmer from Mars Hill, ME, told me that just the threat of tariffs is causing a price increase on seed and equipment. This farmer supplies potatoes to a Canadian company with facilities on both sides of the border. The different facilities have specialized equipment to process potatoes for different uses—hash browns in one plant, curly fries in another. A tariff on potatoes as they cross back and forth between Maine and Canada would cause terrible harm to this and other growers.

Other products are processed back and forth across the border as well. For example, many Maine blueberries are processed in Prince Edward Island.

Maine also sends between \$200 million and \$400 million worth of lobster to Canada each year for processing. There are 240 lobster processing plants in Canada but only 15 in the United States.

I share the President's goal of getting more of that manufacturing done in the State of Maine, done in the United States, but the fact is that if we impose these tariffs on Canadian processing, it is going to be our Maine lobstermen who will bear the cost; it is going to be consumers who bear the cost.

I would like to make mention of another industry that would be affected as well, and that is the aquaculture industry. In Washington County in far eastern Maine, Cooke Aquaculture is one of the largest employers, with more than 200 direct jobs throughout the State. While they have a processing plant in Machias, ME, the first step of their salmon processing occurs in Canada before reentering the United States for finishing.

At a time when the Maine aquaculture industry is growing, these tariffs on Canada would jeopardize current jobs and also block future ones.

Close relationships between and among families on both sides of the border are very common in the State of Maine. It is typical of communities, ranging from Calais in the east, Fort Kent in the north, and Jackman in the west. You see it all across the northern, eastern, and western parts of our State because our communities are so integrated.

It is not surprising to me that I had a conversation with members of the tourism industry in Maine just this morning who told me that they are seeing cancellations by Canadian tourists who had come for years to vacation in Maine. Old Orchard Beach, for example, is known for the number of Canadian tourists. We don't want to discourage these Canadian tourists, who are so vital to Maine's economy, from vacationing in Maine because they are so angry at what has happened.

Maine families benefit from more than \$900 billion in goods and services that are exchanged between our two countries every year. It is crucial that

we remain a dependent and vibrant global trading partner, particularly with Canada.

Now, I want to distinguish that I think there is a strong case to be made for tariffs on Mexico, on our adversary China, but I don't see the case for Canada.

There are areas where Canada does need to do better, and the dairy industry is one, and I hope we will see that resolved.

Let me conclude my remarks by reaffirming my support for ensuring that the Department of Homeland Security has every tool at its disposal to stem the flow of fentanyl into our Nation, but, unlike Mexico and China, Canada is not complicit in this crisis.

And we should continue working with our Canadian allies to secure the northern border, not unfairly penalize them. Our consumers, our manufacturers, our lobstermen, our blueberry growers, our potato farmers will pay the price.

Mr. President, the price hikes that will happen for Maine families every time they go to the grocery store, they fill their gas tank, they fill their heating oil tank, if these tariffs go into effect, will be so harmful. And as price hikes always do, they will hurt those the most who can afford them the least. Therefore, I will support this resolution, and I urge my colleagues to do so likewise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I rise today, following my colleague from Maine, to talk about S.J. Res. 37, which we believe will come up for a vote later this afternoon, possibly somewhere between 6 and 7 o'clock.

I am proud to have introduced this resolution a few weeks back, together with a group of bipartisan Senators, many of whom will take the floor this afternoon to speak about it.

Let me just first talk about the fact that this resolution is a little bit unusual in terms of Senate procedure. There are not many things that a single Senator can file and then be guaranteed a floor vote. In fact, there are only three or four such procedures. This resolution is filed pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, which was the act used by Trump to declare the Canadian emergency that is the subject of my resolution.

The IEEPA statute is an old statute. It has been around for quite a while. I will just state, at the outset, that IEEPA, the act that the President has used to declare an emergency and impose tariffs, is an act that was designed to be used against adversaries. Congress wanted to give the President tools to deal with adversaries—nations that were enemies, cartels, rogue states, and dictators.

IEEPA was not designed to be used against allies. IEEPA says nothing about tariffs. It does not say that the President's actions against adversaries should include tariffs.

The administration's use of this Emergency Powers Act to go against an ally is pretty unusual. It is not unprecedented. The President did it in the first term when he imposed IEEPA tariffs against both Canada and the EU. But it is important to know that this is generally a statute that was designed to counter adversaries.

I stand here strongly in the belief that Canada is not an adversary; they are an ally. Canada is not the 51st State; they are a sovereign nation. And Canada is not an emergency for the United States.

Are there differences of opinion between the United States and Canada? Sure, there are. It just so happens, in the trade space, we have a state-of-the-art trade deal negotiated by President Trump and his team, the USMCA, which was adopted by nearly a 90-to-10 vote in this body, that gives us the ability, when we have differences with this friend and ally, Canada, to work them out.

And it is unfortunate, in my view, that instead of going through the USMCA, we are using an act designed to counter adversaries to impose these tariffs.

I want to talk about tariffs. I want to talk about the President's rationale for imposing the tariffs, and then I want to talk about the importance of this resolution and the many stakeholders outside this body who are supporting S.J. Res. 37.

First, on tariffs, President Trump's aides have basically admitted that this is a sales tax—a new sales tax. The tariff revenue will hit everyday people by making the cost of their goods go up.

This is a CNN headline from a couple of days ago: "Trump aide says tariffs will raise \$6 trillion"—that is a reference to Peter Navarro—"which would be the largest tax hike in US history."

To be fair, this is the total tariff effect, not just the Canada effect—Canada, China, Mexico, and potentially other nations. But what we are likely to see today with the tariff announcement is that it will be the largest tax hike in U.S. history.

Many have been writing about the challenges of tariffs and this tax hike.

From CNBC:

Consumer confidence in where the economy is headed hits a 12-year low.

This was an economy that was extremely strong just 2 months ago, on President Trump's Inauguration Day. It was a very, very strong economy, not a perfect economy. But since that time, we have seen volatility in the stock market. We have seen growing inflation. We have seen reducing consumer confidence. We have seen some suggestions of slowing economic growth—even negative economic growth from some. And that is due, in large part, to the prospect of this national sales tax—tariffs to the degree of \$6 trillion—but also somewhat to the chaos about whether and when and how they will be implemented.

Other economists have also written. A recent article in the Washington

Post talks about the stock markets' grim view of tariff shenanigans:

Markets have plummeted since Trump announced new levies on Canada, Mexico, and China, erasing all gains since his election.

The tariffs are still likely to be economically destructive: They will snarl global supply chains, raise costs to consumers and cause layoffs in industries that depend on imported inputs like steel.

This means more than just the additional pain for consumers whipsawed by inflation, higher prices on imports and, now, the possibility of recession.

Tariff shenanigans are shaking up the American economy, creating huge anxiety and hurting consumers and businesses.

A recent article in the Wall Street Journal called the Trump tariff effort "The Dumbest Trade War in History."

The Wall Street Journal's point was a point I made earlier. Why use IEEPA, a statute designed to go after enemies, when we have a trade deal that President Trump negotiated with Canada and Mexico? None of this is supposed to happen under the U.S.-Mexico-Canada trade agreement that Mr. Trump negotiated and signed in his first term.

Again, I give the President huge credit for this. I believe the USMCA vote in the first term got 89 votes in this Chamber. That is hard on anything, much less a trade deal—what an accomplishment.

But the USMCA created dispute resolution mechanisms that would make imposition of tariffs unnecessary.

The U.S. willingness to ignore its treaty obligations, even with friends, won't make other countries eager to do deals. Maybe Mr. Trump will claim victory and pull back if he wins some token concessions. But if a North American trade war persists, it will qualify as one of the dumbest in history.

I have given you challenges in the global economy and in the American economy that are happening because of the trade war. Let me now get specific on Virginia. I heard my colleague from Maine talk about who is affected in Maine.

In Virginia, I have been traveling around the State, talking to Virginians, and they are very, very worried about these Canadian tariffs. They are not worried in the abstract. They saw them in 2017, 2018, 2019. They know what happens with tariffs.

It is an unusual group of businesses in that it is big, small, medium size—it is everybody.

I have a bakery in Northern Virginia, Mom's Apple Pie. They have three locations. The owner, April—I see some nods. There are people who are Mom's Apple Pie fans. It is a great small business bakery. Their operations are in Leesburg, Occoquan, and Purcellville.

I was meeting recently with the owner, and she said: You have to do something about these Canadian tariffs.

I said: April, you have three small bakeries. Tell me how the Canadian tariffs hit you.

She said: Pie tins. All our aluminum pie tins come from Canada.

If you raise the price of a pie tin by 25 percent, the price of a pie goes up a bit. Nobody has to buy apple pies. When the price goes up, a whole lot of people will decide they are not going to buy apple pies. This is a classic small business that is affected by Canadian tariffs.

Let's go to the largest businesses.

We are experts at ship and sub building in Virginia. We manufacture the most sophisticated items that are made on the planet Earth—nuclear carriers and nuclear subs. Thirty-five percent of the steel that goes into ships and subs made for our Navy, for our military, comes from Canada. Sixty-five percent of the aluminum steel comes from the United States, but 35 percent comes from Canada.

I serve with the Presiding Officer on the Armed Services Committee. We already are having a hard time producing ships and subs on time, on budget. Take aluminum and steel and ratchet them up by 20 percent, and it is going to get even harder to defend the Nation and produce the ships and subs that we need.

Like Senator COLLINS talking about her ag sector, ag and forestry is still the biggest industry in Virginia. People think of it as high-tech. No, ag and forestry is still No. 1, and it is my farmers and foresters that are most concerned about the Canadian tariffs because they saw what happened last time.

The first thing that happens, you put a tariff on Canadian exports. Potash, the ingredient in agriculture fertilizer—80 percent of potash comes as an import into the United States. So that immediately goes up by 25 percent, according to what the President has said he is going to do. That hurts farmers very, very badly.

Second, there has never been a one-sided trade war in the history of the world. When one party puts a tariff on, the other side retaliates. In the first Trump administration, the retaliation was heavily against the ag sector.

My soybean farmers that were exporting soybeans couldn't export to markets that they were previously able to. My apple farmers who export apples to Canada couldn't do it to the same degree, and their exports dropped and their revenues dropped. And this is already a low-margin business.

My distillers and wineries and breweries—many of which find an important part of their revenue might be 10 percent or 15 percent or 25 percent in export markets to the EU, to Canada, to Mexico—suddenly find that retaliatory tariffs price their products out of business.

I was with Dave Cuttino, the founder of Reservoir Distillery in Richmond, yesterday. He talked about the fact that, even before these tariffs have gone into effect, because President Trump announced them but then delayed them, there is an anger in the Canadian consumer: We don't want to buy American products if you are going to treat us this way.

He has been told by his distributors in the Alberta Province that there will be no American product put on any more shelves because: We are so furious at the way we are being treated in this.

Big Businesses, small businesses. Volvo Trucks is one of the largest manufacturers in Appalachian Virginia—in Dublin, VA. They manufacture all of the Volvo over-the-road trucks that you see anywhere in North America. They export significantly—significantly—to Canada and Mexico. They also import source materials from Canada and Mexico. The tariffs will increase the cost of their inputs, driving the price of their trucks up, making those trucks less competitive.

We have a lot of businesses in Virginia that have operations on both sides of the border. BWXT in Lynchburg is the Nation's premier producer of nuclear reactors for ships and subs, as well as nuclear reactors for other possibilities. They have operations in Canada, and they shift product back and forth across the line in ways where the tariffs will make it more expensive.

So the Virginia effect—and let's be clear, there is another one the Senator talked about: tourism. We rely on tourism in Virginia. We are a Top Ten tourism State, and we have a lot of Canadian tourists. In fact, Canadians are among the most frequent visitors to Virginia Beach. To our pristine, wonderful beachfront community, Canada tourism is strong. Canadian tourism to the United States—air reservations from Canadians coming to the United States are down by 75 percent because of the feeling that they are not being treated fairly. They are looking at the United States, an ally, and they are saying: Why us?

So there is an effect on the economy—the big picture—on the stock market, inflation, at the kitchen table, the cost of groceries. Building supplies come from Canada—a lot of lumber. Housing is already too expensive. A tariff on lumber coming in from Canada is just going to drive up the cost of any home renovation project or new home construction. There are tariffs on Canadian automobiles. A lot of the U.S.-plated automobiles are made—or at least products are significantly made—in Canada. Those prices will go up. So, from the kitchen table of a family to our Nation's larger shipbuilders, these tariff shenanigans pose a huge economic risk.

I go back to a point that was raised in the Wall Street Journal article: Why not use the USMCA? Why not use the USMCA? President Trump negotiated it. It was a success. It was something that succeeded in a bipartisan way. There have been discussions about whether, after 5 or 6 years, the USMCA should be renegotiated. I think that is fine. We renegotiated NAFTA. President Trump made it better. If 5 or 6 years of operating under USMCA has taught us ways it can be made better, that is fine, too, but when you establish a treaty with an ally that includes

a dispute resolution mechanism, why not use that mechanism instead of reaching for a statute that was designed to punish an adversary and putting massive sales taxes on goods that will make it harder for Americans to economically thrive?

So that does raise the question, If the USMCA is available and if there are differences of opinion on trade, why is the President imposing tariffs and using an emergency declaration rather than using the USMCA? I want to get to that next.

The President has said there is one reason he is doing this. There is one reason for the emergency, for labeling Canada through this use of emergency power as an “adversary,” and the reason is fentanyl—fentanyl. No one in this Chamber and no one here now or any of the 100 Senators would dispute that fentanyl is a massive problem and, indeed, an emergency. The opioid overdose deaths in my State and in Alabama—in all States—heartbreaking; the stories of families who lost their loved ones—heartbreaking. I was in Roanoke earlier this morning with an ESPN reporter who was a gymnast and now works at ESPN, Lauren Keller. Lauren is from Roanoke, VA. She was in her freshman year at Rutgers when she got the call that her mother, at age 45, had died. Her dad called her. She went to the airport. She flew home. By the time she landed in Roanoke, her dad had died as well. Both overdosed on OxyContin, an opioid-based pain medication.

So is fentanyl a problem? Yes. Is it an emergency? Yes. Is substance use disorder generally an emergency? Yes, of course it is. That is why we passed the HALT Fentanyl Act just about 2 weeks ago in this Chamber—a big bipartisan vote. That is why we are putting budgetary resources into interdiction technology. That is why Senator ERNST and I got a provision in the Defense bill 2 years ago to require more cooperation between the U.S. and Mexican military on fentanyl interdiction.

It is an emergency, but fentanyl is not a Canadian emergency. Calling it a Canadian emergency and putting the same tariffs on Canadian products as we put on Mexican and Canadian products is an invented emergency, not a real emergency. And guess what. The Trump administration agrees with me on this. Even though the President has declared a Canadian fentanyl emergency, there is a Biblical statement, I think, about the left hand not knowing what the right hand is doing.

One of the President's key intelligence advisers TULSI GABBARD appeared before the Senate Intelligence Committee last week, and she presented to the Intel Committee an annual assessment required of her office. It is called the “Annual Threat Assessment.” It looks at every threat that the United States is under globally. Who is threatening us militarily? Who is threatening us with fentanyl? Who is

threatening us with cyber attacks? Who is threatening us with misinformation?

As she presented the report to the committee, one of my colleagues, Senator HEINRICH of New Mexico, looked through the report and noticed that Canada wasn't in the report. Canada was not even mentioned as a threat in the Trump administration's first “Annual Threat Assessment.” There was even a section in the report specifically about fentanyl, and Canada wasn't mentioned.

So my colleague asked the DNI: I don't see Canada mentioned. Canada is not mentioned as a threat. It is not even mentioned as a threat in fentanyl.

And her testimony at the committee was: You are right. The fentanyl threat is a China and Mexico threat; it is not a Canada threat.

So is there a fentanyl emergency? Yes, there is. Should action be taken to stop it? Yes, there should. Might that action even include looking at tariffs against China for sending precursor chemicals into the United States or into Mexico to be manufactured into fentanyl? It is a fair question. I haven't challenged the China tariffs. Should Mexico be subject to some tough action, possibly including tariffs, because of their role in allowing so much fentanyl to come into the United States? It is a very fair question. That is why I haven't challenged the Mexico tariffs. But even the Trump administration, in their presentation to the Intel Committee, said that Canada was not a fentanyl threat.

This is an article from The Globe and Mail, which is the largest daily newspaper in Canada, published in Toronto from last week:

In the aftermath of Tulsi Gabbard's testimony, Canada not mentioned in U.S. threat assessment summary of fentanyl crisis.

There is a fentanyl emergency, but it is not Canada. So let's dig into this a little bit further.

In 2024, let me tell you how much fentanyl was seized at the southern border of the United States. It is slightly over 21,000 pounds of fentanyl—devastating, devastating. How about fentanyl seized coming from Canada into the United States—half of that? a quarter of that? a 10th of it? It is about 1/2, 000th of it. The estimates have been—although there is a new report that is just coming out, as I am speaking on the floor, from The Globe and Mail, saying even these estimates are high—21,000 pounds from Mexico and 43 pounds from Canada in the entire year of 2024.

The Toronto Globe and Mail is doing an assessment of the 43 pounds, and here is what they found: that the 43 pounds is an overstatement. The 43 pounds includes fentanyl interdicted in some northern cities like Spokane, WA, and those were put on the Canadian interdiction stat even though, when we have dug into it, what we have discovered is, even though Spokane is pretty far north, that fentanyl didn't

come in from Canada; it came in from Mexico, and all the people who were arrested as the fentanyl was interdicted in these northern cities were connected to Mexican cartels.

So this gives some scale: 21,000 to 43 pounds, and the 43 pounds is dramatically overestimated. We think this actual number may be down in a very, very few pounds. It is not an emergency from Canada, and it is certainly not an emergency that would justify treating Canadian products with exactly the same tariff that we would levy on products from Mexico and from China.

I think that allies are really important, and I think it is wrong to call an ally an adversary. Here is an article that appeared in the AP a little bit ago that I just want to read into the RECORD: “A beloved library that united the U.S. and Canada faces new border restrictions” because of the President's emergency declaration. This appeared in the Associated Press on March 26, just last week. Let me just read this into the RECORD.

For Allyson Howell, her hometown library is more than just a place to borrow a book; it's also a unique space where different cultures from the U.S. and Canada have mingled and developed ties for more than a century.

Howell and others fear that could change under a new regulation implemented by President Donald Trump's administration as tensions continue to rise between the two countries.

The Haskell Free Library and Opera House straddles the line between Howell's village of Derby Line, VT, and the town of Stanstead, Quebec. The entrance to the imposing [brick-style] and stone building is on the U.S. side, but an informal agreement between the two countries has allowed Canadians to enter [the library] without a passport.

Canadians cross the border on a sidewalk leading directly to the library that is monitored by the [USCBP]. The nearest border checkpoint is not within eyesight of the building.

Inside the library, there is a line on the floor marking the international border, though residents of both countries have been able to move freely among the stacks.

But since Tuesday, the only Canadian visitors able to enter on the U.S. side have been cardholders and library [staff]. All others have had to use an emergency exit on the Canadian side. Starting October 1, all Canadians will have to enter from their side of the border or pass through a security checkpoint on the U.S. side. It's a big change from the honor system arrangement the two countries have always used, users of the library said.

“This feels like . . . one more step of building this chasm between these . . . nations,” said Howell, who described the library as “really special” and a “real symbol” of international cooperation.

Derby Line is a village of . . . 700 people within the town of Derby, located in the rural Northeast Kingdom section of Vermont. Stanstead is a town of about 3,000 residents.

Like many rural border communities in the U.S. and Canada, their economies and cultures are linked. But the ties have become strained under [President] Trump, who has advanced tariffs and tightened border protections in some communities that [rely upon one another].

Why do this? Why do this?

Like President Trump, I think it is right to say, “America first,” but I don’t want America alone. I don’t want an America pushing aside its long-standing allies who have stood with us. Canada stood with us on 9/11. Canada has stood side by side with U.S. troops in every war we have been in. They have fought with our troops. They have bled with our troops. They have died with our troops in every war since the War of 1812. Yet we are going to treat them like an enemy, and we are going to make them go through an emergency exit through a library.

This calls up to my mind memories that I have of a South, when I was born, where a certain kind of people couldn’t go in the same doors as other kinds of people. This is no way to treat an ally. This is no way to treat a friend.

As I conclude—I see other colleagues here, ready to speak—I am happy to say that the S.J. Res. 37 has picked up the support of a whole lot of people who I think are pretty important people outside this Chamber. This morning, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce weighed in, in support of S.J. Res. 37. I am going to read from the letter that they have sent to Senators:

[T]he tariffs being imposed on imports from Canada and Mexico, America’s two top trading partners, are inflicting real harm on American workers, companies, and farmers. Tariffs are taxes—paid by Americans—and they will quickly increase prices at a time when many are struggling with the cost of living. These import taxes are also harming U.S. manufacturers and drawing retaliatory duties, worsening their impact on our economy. [Further], these tariffs are at odds with commitments the United States made in the landmark USMCA, which was negotiated by the first Trump administration.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce supports S.J. Res. 37, and they join a number of other organizations: the AFL-CIO. That is threading a needle when I get the AFL-CIO and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce on the same page on a matter of such importance. We have the United Steelworkers; the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers; the International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers; the National Retail Federation. Retailers don’t want to see costs of products increase; North America’s Building Trades Unions; Sheet Metal Workers; the U.S. Conference of Mayors; Foreign Policy for America; the National Taxpayers Union. Tariffs are a tax; and Advancing American Freedom, a think tank that was established by former Vice President Mike Pence. They all have weighed in to support S.J. Res. 37. Tariffs are a tax. Tariffs will hurt our families. Canada is not an enemy.

Let’s act together to fight fentanyl. We can do that. We have done that. We have shown it with the HALT Fentanyl that we passed 2 weeks ago. Let’s not label an ally as an enemy. Let’s not impose punishing costs on American families at a time they can’t afford it. Let’s not hurt American small busi-

nesses. Let’s not make our national security investments and ships and subs more expensive.

I earnestly request that colleagues support S.J. 37 when we vote on it later today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHEEHY). The Senator from Oregon.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1185

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I rise to support my colleague Senator KAINE’s joint resolution to terminate the Trump order placing blanket tariffs on products Americans buy from Canada.

I am going to start by saying, as the Ranking Democrat on the Senate Finance Committee, I am always struck by how much doubletalk there is about trade. So let’s be clear as we start this part of the discussion.

Tariffs are taxes on things we buy from other countries. The bottom line is, those taxes make it more expensive for Americans to buy those products. No other country pays the tariffs. Let me repeat that. No other country pays the tariffs. The consumer pays the tariff. So if somebody tells you they can do tariffs and do it without raising prices—I am sorry, but anybody who says that with a straight face is basically taking advantage of you.

Every credible economist, every automaker, every business on the record has said that Trump’s trade taxes are going to make things more expensive for Americans.

Ronald Reagan’s favorite economist, Art Laffer, just released a study showing auto tariffs are going to raise car prices by \$4,700. The Yale Budget Lab estimates that the full Trump tariff scheme is going to cost an average family thousands of dollars a year.

It is one thing if tariffs are imposed with a good strategy, like decreasing sales in the United States by raising prices to punish countries that cheat on trade and changing their behavior so that U.S. workers get a fair shake.

I have consistently supported targeted tariffs in the past as a tool to fight back against trade cheating, especially by China. When China was stealing America’s trade secrets, subsidizing cheap solar panels, and then dumping them here to drive U.S. manufacturers out of business, we were shouting from the rooftops for more tariffs on Chinese goods.

But Canada is not China. Canada is America’s closest ally, not a rival. Making everything Americans buy from Canada more expensive for some bogus reason is, in the words of the Wall Street Journal “the dumbest trade war in history.”

There are 8 million American jobs that depend on trade with Canada. Canada is the biggest export market for 32 States. It provides raw materials and potash that so often farmers need to grow their crops. U.S. farmers can’t replace 90 percent of potash that comes from Canada, definitely not overnight. The only choice is higher prices—again, higher prices paid for by Americans.

So the stuff we buy from Canada gets more expensive. And on top of that, in response, Canada has already slapped tariffs on a whole host of crops, ag products, dairy, alcohol, manufactured goods. The list goes on and on.

Canadian grocery stores pulled U.S. products off the shelves. Our small businesses and farmers are losing sales as we speak because of the weird obsession in the Trump administration with attacking our northern neighbor.

Plunging our economy into a recession because of the Trump desire to annex Canada is just bizarre—bizarre even by Washington, DC, standards.

Congress has delegated far too much of its authority to the executive branch, and it is far past time for the Congress to take it back. In 1962 and 1974, Congress passed laws handing the President major portions of our constitutional power over tariffs. It is time to reverse that trend. Those dates I mentioned were before my time, but I want everybody to know, on our watch, I think this has got to be a bipartisan concern. We have got to take these powers back, because if Republicans say it is not their fault that Trump is destroying our economy, why not do something like this to restore the power of Congress to set tariffs?

I am going to close by addressing the bogus claim of the Trump administration that tariffs are actually intended to stop fentanyl trafficking from Canada. Let me be clear. Our immigration system needs reform, and the fentanyl crisis is a serious issue.

Oregon is no stranger to the devastating effects it has wreaked on our economy communities. The reality is, there is no crisis at the northern border. Less than 0.1 percent of fentanyl entering the United States comes from Canada. Fentanyl seizures at the northern border are down over 97 percent from July 2024.

I think almost everybody understands that Canada is not the issue here. Instead of coming up with real solutions to get fentanyl off the streets and out of our communities, Donald Trump has decided he would rather make threats and tariff our closest allies.

My colleague from Alabama is on the floor, and we are going to have a little bit of a discussion. We just talked about how we are going to handle it. But I want to be clear. If Donald Trump and the Republicans wanted to address fentanyl in an effective way, they would pass my bill to limit the millions of low-value packages that come into the United States from China and elsewhere. Getting a handle on these so-called “de minimis” imports will help our border agents detect the illicit imports of things like fentanyl and pill presses before they reach communities in the United States.

So with that, Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be discharged from further consideration of S. 1185 and the Senate