

But then the article goes on to say that it has been discovered that a similar version of the toolkit—this oversight—was published in the newsletter in the prior month. It was in the October-November 2024 newsletter. That document called on all the teachers and all the students in the New York public schools and everybody else reading the newsletter—it called on them to participate in “rage week” and “resist genocide” by mobilizing on Saturday, October 5, for a “day of action” ahead of the anniversary of Hamas on October 7, 2023. That was the date of the terrorist attack on Israel, which apparently the administration of the public schools wants to celebrate.

Here is what one of the teachers in the public school system said when she discovered this: It is systemic rot.

“It’s the systemic rot,” said Karen Feldman, an educator of over 26 years, who resigned. She resigned.

It should not go unnoticed that in addition to this oversight—we know it wasn’t an oversight; I mean, pigs may fly someday, but I doubt it; this wasn’t an oversight—now we find out recently that New York State education officials have rejected President Trump’s administration’s demand to do away with certain diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts that call for quotas, racial quotas, which are illegal in the United States of America under recent Supreme Court precedent. These State officials wrote President Trump, and this is what they said:

[T]here are no federal or state laws prohibiting the principles of D.E.I.

I don’t understand that. Racial quotas are illegal. You can’t use race in America, according to well-settled law, to hurt a person or to help a person. But these officials at the State level—not the local level—they said no State or Federal laws prohibit the principles of DEI, and they said that they are aware of no jurisdiction—no jurisdiction—that the Federal Government has to withdraw funding.

Well, you know what, I hope we find out. I hope we find out. This kind of stuff makes me want to jump out of a moving car, and this is the kind of, in the words of the teacher who resigned, systemic rot, rank anti-Semitism, that in New York they are sending to our teachers and to our kids and to the world.

#### PUBLIC BROADCASTING

Let me talk about a second subject quickly.

Take that one down, John, and put up the next one.

I have talked—and I am not going to repeat—I have talked a lot about the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and its two cousins: National Public Radio and PBS. U.S. taxpayers spend \$500 million a year subsidizing these media organizations. I have talked about that.

There was a time when maybe we needed to do that. Back in the 1940s and 1950s when we only had three TV stations and a handful of radio sta-

tions, it might have been necessary for the government to get in the TV and radio business, particularly to help our citizens in rural areas, but those days are gone. Now there are all kinds of forms of media. We have TV, newspapers, radio. We have the internet. We have Facebook. We have blogs. We have podcasts. We have cable TV. We have streaming TV. Yet the government continues to spend \$500 million a year to subsidize the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, National Public Radio, and PBS. It ought to stop. It ought to stop.

President Trump has talked about it. Many Members of Congress have talked about it. I have talked about it on the floor of this Senate.

Now, some of my colleagues say the reason all this ought to stop is because the so-called journalism being published by NPR and PBS, which get their money from the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, which gets its money from you, out of your pocket—\$500 million a year—some of my colleagues say: Well, we ought to stop it because the reporting is biased. And they have marshaled a persuasive argument to that effect.

I have talked about some of the articles that have appeared, paid for with the American people’s tax dollars. I am not going to go through all of them, but I will just mention a couple.

Here is one: “How racism became a marketing tool for country music.” That is pretty fair and balanced, huh?

Here is another one: “The hidden racism of young white Americans.”

“AP FACT CHECK: Trump seeds race animus with COVID falsehood.”

Here is another one: “Biden trumpets economic gains, but struggles to get credit.”

Here is another one: “Democracy on Trial, Part One: A Blueprint For the Case Against Trump.”

This is paid for with your tax dollars. This is opinion journalism. But it is not just at the national level; it is in my State too. It is in Louisiana. Louisiana has 318 radio stations. Only 10 of them get money from Federal taxpayers through the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. So the folks who are publishing the articles I just referenced—pick 10 out of 138, and Louisiana said: We are going to favor you and give you money.

My State also has 48 TV stations. Eight of them get Federal money—your dollars.

I don’t know what the others did not to get Federal money, but clearly this is a case of the Federal Government picking and choosing.

Let’s see what they have done with the money. I will just read you a couple of the headlines paid for with your dollars in my local public media organization:

“How illegitimate [critical race theory] concerns shaped Louisiana’s new social studies standards.” No bias there.

“Trump’s anti-trans effort is an agenda cornerstone with echoes in his-

tory.” No bias there. That came from NPR and one of my local stations.

Here is another one: “What It’s Like To Choose Transgender Sex Reassignment Surgery.”

Here is another one: “Transgender Boy Tells Mom ‘It Shouldn’t Be Scary To Be Who You Are.’”

Here is another one. This came from WRKF, which also gets—it is 1 of the 10 out of 138 radio stations that the bureaucrats at CPB look with favor on: “‘Kids will end their lives’: Anti-trans legislation is impacting mental health in the Gulf South.” No bias there.

“Biography examines how systemic racism shaped the troubled life of George Floyd.” Nobody has to take responsibility; it is systemic racism.

Here is another one that came from WRKF: “Christian nationalism’s support is strongest in rural conservative states.”

Another one: “Dr. Rachel Levine focused on her job at HHS. Still, anti-trans politics followed her.”

Here is another one by WRKF, another example of opinion journalism paid for with your tax dollars: “These far-right media figures are getting center stage under Trump.”

But there is more, as they say on “The Price Is Right” or something like that.

Here is another one. This one came from Louisiana Public Broadcasting: “Becoming Papa: Father’s Key to Gender Justice.” I can tell you, every mom and dad in Louisiana, when they lie down to sleep at night and they can’t, they are lying there worrying about gender justice.

Not.

I mean, the title of the article suggests what you ought to believe. That is not fair or balanced.

Here is another one: “Transgender athletes seek protections to play sports.”

Let me see the next one, John.

This is John Lowery, who works with me. He is a fine American.

Here is—I love this one. This is from one of my local radio stations in Louisiana: “Arguments that trans athletes have an unfair advantage lack evidence to support.” What planet did this reporter parachute in from? He or she really believes that men don’t have a physical advantage over a woman in sports?

Here is another headline: “Trump ‘Embodies Nearly Every Aspect Of A Racist,’ Author Says.”

Another: “The Nation: Confronting Trump’s Coded Racism.”

These are coming from my local TV and radio stations that get money from the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

Here is another one: “Sexism Is Out In The Open In The 2016 Campaign. That May Have Been Inevitable.” I wonder who the author of this piece voted for.

Another one: “Is Trump Really That Racist?” I wonder who that reporter voted for.

Here is the final one I am going to mention. I don't want to put too fine a point on this: "Scientists Start To Tease Out The Subtler Ways Racism Hurts Health."

Now, look, you don't have to be a Latin scholar to see that these articles are biased—every single one of them—at the Federal level and at the State and local level in Louisiana. And you know what, that is the right of these State and local television stations. They have the right to say this stuff, but they don't have to say it with your money. They don't have the right to say it with your money.

Some of my colleagues are angry at the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and NPR and PBS because of their obviously biased reporting. Now, that is just a fact. No fairminded American can look at these headlines and say that those aren't biased. And some of my colleagues are mad about that.

That is not what concerns me the most. I am sorry they are mad, but that is not what concerns me the most. My question is this: What in God's name—what on God's green Earth are we doing with a \$36 trillion deficit and \$36 trillion worth of debt, which is just accumulated deficits—why are we giving certain TV stations and certain radio stations in America but not others \$500 million a year? Why? They don't need it, and even if they did need it, they shouldn't get the money to the exclusion of every other media organization. What happened to treating all people and all entities similarly situated similarly?

So that is why I support abolishing the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

I want to say it again: The people who wrote these articles and the people who published these articles have every right to do that. I mean, I am a firm believer in the First Amendment. Without the First Amendment, how are we supposed to know who the idiots are? I support the First Amendment. These folks have the right to publish that, but they do not have the right to publish it with taxpayer money—\$500 million a year. And we know how—I think you know how I feel. We know how President Trump feels. But I hope the U.S. Congress, in our reconciliation package, abolishes the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and no longer gives them or any media organization in this country a single solitary dime of taxpayer money. That is not the role of the Federal Government. And, given these kinds of articles, to do so incites the anger of at least half of our country, and that is not right.

Mr. President, I suggest—well, I have a few minutes. Shoot, I am going to take them.

#### TARIFFS

Mr. President, I am going to talk about tariffs. I know there has been a lot going on about tariffs. I am not happy with what is happening in the stock market. None of us are. It has

been painful. I get it. But you know the stock market is just a reflection of the U.S. economy, and the American economy is the strongest economy in all of human history.

At this moment today, the current state of our economy is the best in the world vis-a-vis the other 195 countries in the world. You want to trade places with China? Not me. Not me. China's property market imploded. Their youth unemployment is over 20 percent. Consumer expectations in China are on a journey to the center of the Earth. They are reporting 5 percent growth, which is not true. They have a deflation. Their prices are going down. Do you know why? Because their economy is so bad.

I wouldn't trade places with the European Union. America's economy is much stronger than theirs.

I wouldn't trade places with Canada. I am not saying I am happy that the Canadian economy is in the doldrums; I am just saying that today, the American economy, despite the stock market, is the strongest right now in the world.

Still, I am not happy with what has happened in the market. It has been very, very painful. But if you believe in the American economy, then you have to believe in the stock market and you have to believe the stock market will recover. And I think it will. That is point one.

Point two, any fairminded person—any fairminded person would have to conclude that Donald J. Trump is tough as a boot. Whether you like him or not, the man is tough as a boot. Whether you agree with him or disagree with him, we would not be in the position that we in America are right now but for him. And what is that position?

There are 195 countries in the world; 70 percent of them are begging the President to negotiate the deal through which they can lower their trade barriers.

Now, we know—this is another thing every fairminded person knows—that many foreign nations have used trade barriers to hurt Americans and to hurt the American economy.

God created the world, but everything else was made in China. Where do you think that expression came from? It came from China cheating through its tariff barriers and its trade barriers. President Trump, whether you agree with him or not, has said: I am going to do something about it.

And he did. He did. And boy, did he get the attention of every other country, including, but not limited to, those countries that have been cheating. They are now coming to the table. In Louisiana, we say they have come to the lick-log. Do you know what a lick-log is? A lick-log is a tree, a fallen tree that farmers and ranchers used to go to, and they would hollow out a trough, and they would put salt and other minerals in that trough in the fallen tree that cattle and horses like to lick. And

it makes the cattle and horses healthy. That is what a lick-log is.

And an expression is when you get somebody to the table, you say they have come to the lick-log. Well, President Trump has got these countries, 70 out of 195 have already come to the table and said they want to lower their tariffs. And I think that is a good thing.

I have been preaching on this Senate floor for 2 weeks that what Prime Minister Carney in Canada and President Trump in America ought to do is turn to each other and say: Let's have zero tariffs. Zero Canadian tariffs on American goods and zero American tariffs on Canadian goods. Get government out of it. Let good Canadian companies and good American companies compete. Competition makes us better. May the best product at the lowest price win. I want to see that happen all over the world, and we have the opportunity to help make that happen in the world thanks to Donald Trump.

And I know some people are mad at him. But we wouldn't be in this position with this kind of leverage without him doing what he did. He is a pit bull. He is a Rottweiler. We know that. Tough as a boot.

But he is the pit bull that caught the car. And the issue before America right now, and I don't know the answer to it, what is President Trump going to do with that car? I don't know. I listened to his aides on television this weekend. They were all over the place.

Here is what I hope he does. Here is what I would do. I would sit down with each one of those countries that want to lower its trade barriers—some go to zero tariffs—and I would say: I will take a dozen. I will take a dozen. And we will do the same. That is what free trade is. And both economies would boom. I will take a dozen.

And that is what I hope President Trump does. Vietnam is offering zero tariffs. Taiwan is offering zero tariffs. The European Union is talking about it. China is all bowed up, but they will make a deal. And the only reason they are at the table lowering tariffs is because of President Trump.

Take the deal, Mr. President, please with—pretty please with sugar on top. Take the deal. Our economy will roar. It will be better for the world economy. I would be lying to you if I told you I knew what the President was going to do. I don't know what is in his head right now. I think I know what is in his heart.

But I am not going to try to feign omnipotence here in terms of what the future is going to hold.

I don't know what President Trump is going to do, but I believe as much as I am standing here that he ought to take these zero tariff deals. It will be good for America. It will be good for the world. He will have won.

So, Mr. President, if you are listening—you are probably not. But if you are, once again, pretty please with sugar on top. You have won. Please,