

know why they make it to Heaven. I am going to ask. But there are some people in this world, they are not sick; they are not misunderstood; they are not mixed up. It is not really that their mom or dad didn't love them enough. They are just bad people. They are. And some of them run countries, and one of them is Vladimir Putin. So let's go do what we have to do.

ONE BIG BEAUTIFUL BILL ACT

Mr. President, let me say another word quickly about the reconciliation bill.

You are going to hear so much about this, and I have already heard a lot—it is the reconciliation bill that Congress passed—which is that it is going to kill people. People are going to die. It is only going to help rich people. None of that is true. None of that is true.

The bill that we just passed is primarily a tax cut. Taxes are not terribly complicated. When you tax something, you get less of it, right?

If you want to stop people from wearing wristwatches—I love wristwatches. I have had this one for like 30 years. But do you want to stop people from buying wristwatches? Just pass a bill that says: Every time you buy a wrist watch, you have to pay a \$200 tax. Boy, that is going to be the end of wristwatches.

Business is the same way. Do you want businesses not to expand? Tax the hell out of them so they don't have any money to reinvest in their business.

Do you want people to work less? Tax them. Take all their money. People are rational. They will go: Well, why do I want to work an extra 10 hours this week? They are taxing me. The government is going to take all of my money.

So our bill was a tax cut. That is all it was. We passed a tax cut back in 2017, as the Presiding Officer knows. Those tax cuts would have expired at the end of this year if we hadn't passed this bill. Taxes on the American people would have gone up \$4.3 trillion—not billion—\$4.3 trillion. It would have tanked our economy. Our economy would have gone down like a fat guy on a seesaw.

Some of my friends say: Oh, you only cut taxes on the rich.

That is not true. That is just a lie. I mean, well over half of the tax cuts that we extended go to ordinary Americans, to working people, working moms, working dads. So the first thing we did was extend the tax cuts. We avoided \$4.3 trillion worth of taxes. Frankly, everybody who voted against our bill voted to raise taxes on the American people in the amount of \$4.3 trillion. That is just a fact.

Our bill did some other things, though. We added some new tax cuts.

We cut taxes on tips. Now, not everybody who works for tips is going to get a tax cut, but most people are. We cut taxes on overtime. Most ordinary Americans work overtime. We cut their taxes on overtime. We cut taxes on Social Security income. We cut taxes on some car loans. We extended the child

tax credit—\$2,200 for every child. That is important for most Americans. We increased the standard deduction.

We strengthened Medicaid. One of the things we did—this rhetoric is really a lie, but I will call it rhetoric that is going around: Well, they destroyed Medicaid. Medicaid is going to grow under our bill.

It is just not going to grow as fast as it was, but 10 years from now, we will be spending a minimum of 20 percent more on Medicaid, not less—more.

Do you know the biggest change we made to Medicaid? The work requirement.

Now, the American people are the most compassionate people in the world. If you are hungry, we will feed you. If you are homeless, we will house you. If you are too poor to be sick, we will pay for your doctor. We are a generous people, but those who can work should work, and we have got some people on Medicaid who are perfectly healthy. They are not disabled. They don't have young kids at home. I am not talking about a mom with a sick child in her arms. They don't have minor children at home. They just don't want to work. They want to get Medicaid, but they don't want to work. Those who can work should work.

All our bill does is say: Look, you can still keep your Medicaid, but if you can work—not if you are disabled, not if you are elderly, not if you are in a nursing home—and if you are a healthy adult at home, playing video games, you have got to go look for a job, and you have got to work at least 20 hours a week, not 40 hours a week—20 hours a week.

What is unreasonable about that?

The other change—major change—we made to Medicaid was that some people, not most people but some people, when they sign up for Medicaid, they lie. They say: Oh, I am only making \$25,000 a year. Well, in fact, they might be making \$75,000 or \$100,000 a year. I am not exaggerating. I have seen that happen.

What we have told the States is: Twice a year, for all of our folks on Medicaid, you have got to check their eligibility—make sure that they are not making more than they are supposed to—because Medicaid is not for everybody.

What is wrong with that? What is wrong with saying to people: You are not entitled to Medicaid if you are not eligible. What is unreasonable about that? We are not killing people. We are trying to save Medicaid so that we can afford it for people who really need it.

The other two things this bill did—and then I will move on quickly to my other subject—is it provided more money for border enforcement. Now, I know there are many people in America and there are many people in the Senate who believe in open borders. I respect that. They may not say it, but they do; they just think the border ought to be wide open. And they think that if you believe in secure borders, you are a racist.

I don't agree with them. But this is America. They are entitled to their opinion.

Most Americans don't think that. Most Americans want the border to be secure; they want to know who is coming in and out of their country. And this bill is going to provide the money to do that.

The other part of our bill, as the Presiding Officer knows, provides much needed money for our military because we are living in a dangerous world. And I wish we didn't, but we do. And weakness invites the wolves.

RESCISSION

Mr. President, the final thing I want to say is, next week, President Trump is going to send us over what is called a rescission bill.

What does that mean?

Well, we have got a \$7 trillion budget. I don't know how much of that \$7 trillion is waste, but every fairminded person would have to agree that there is some money being spent in that \$7 trillion that shouldn't be spent. It just shouldn't. It is wasted money. And so President Trump and this Congress made one of its objectives trying to reduce spending—not spending that we need but spending that needs to be reduced. I call it spending porn.

And the President has sent us a bill. He is saying to Congress: I want you to reduce spending in the current budget by \$9.1 billion, and let me tell you what constitutes the spending I want to reduce.

Well, first, \$9.1 billion out of a \$7 trillion budget—we are not talking about a lot of money here. We are talking about one-tenth of 1 percent; that is all. That is point one.

Point two: You need to look at what the President is asking us to cut out. I will just give you a couple of examples. I didn't make this up. The President is saying: We are giving \$3 million to Iraq to produce "Sesame Street." Maybe we could use that money for something else.

The President is saying: We are giving \$3 million to Zambia for circumcisions and vasectomies. The President is saying: We don't need to do that. We have got other priorities.

We are giving \$500,000 to Rwanda to buy electric buses. The President is saying to us: Congress, we don't need to be spending the money on that. There are more important things.

We are spending \$67,000 to give insect powder to kids in Madagascar. I don't even know what insect powder is, but the President is asking us to cut it out.

We are giving \$3.6 million to Haiti for pastry cooking classes, for cyber cafes, for dance focus groups, for male prostitutes. The President is saying: I don't think so. I don't think the American people support giving their hard-earned money to male prostitutes in Haiti. So he is asking us to cut it out.

He is asking us to reduce the budget by \$833,000 because some of President Biden's bureaucrats gave a contract to transgender people, sex workers, and

their clients in Nepal. The President is saying: I don't want to do that. And he is right.

That is enough. You get the idea. That is why I call it spending porn. It triggers your gag reflex. You look at this stuff, and you go: What in God's name? Who decided to do this?

Well, Congress didn't. The bureaucrats did. It is money we appropriated, but we didn't tell them to go spend money—\$833,000—and give it to the sex workers in Nepal. They just took the money we appropriated and used it for that. And so the President is asking us to do what is called rescission, cancel the spending.

Now, I have been here 8 years, and I have listened to a whole bunch of people talk about the need to reduce spending. But you have to watch what people do, not what they say, because talk is cheap. And around here I have learned pretty quickly that reducing spending is like going to Heaven. I want to go to Heaven. I will bet the Presiding Officer wants to go to Heaven. I bet our guests in the Gallery want to go to Heaven. Everybody wants to go to Heaven.

Raise your hand if you are ready to take the trip today. Most people—you are, sir, and I admire that, but most people want to live a little longer. And that is the way it is with reducing spending around here: I want to reduce spending—I support it—but not just yet because I have this project.

And I have listened to that, and I have especially listened to it for the past 100 days: Go get them, President Trump. Reduce that spending. We are behind you 1,000 percent.

Well, he has. He has. One-tenth of 1 percent he is asking us to reduce. And I am not saying Senators shouldn't ask questions and make some changes if they need to be made. But here is the bottom line: It is gut-check time. It is gut-check time. You either believe in reducing spending, or you don't. And if you talk the game and say "let's reduce spending" and you vote against this bill, in my opinion, you ought to hide your head in a bag because you will be able to cut the hypocrisy with a knife. It is real, real hard to preach temperance from a barstool.

It is gut-check time. We need to pass this bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAGERTY). The Senator from Washington.

TARIFFS

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I rise to speak about President Trump's costly trade policies and the damage that it is causing American manufacturers, businesses, and a family budget. Tariffs will cost an average household at least \$2,300 in the year 2025. And according to an analysis by the Syracuse Post Standard newspaper, ground beef, chicken breast, butter, milk, and more products are being made more expensive this year than last year.

In fact, ground beef alone is 20 percent more expensive, an average of

\$5.98 per pound. The Joint Economic Committee found that ground beef is at the highest price point since the data first became available in the 1980s.

A recent survey of the Association of Washington Businesses found that 48 percent of businesses in my State have experienced the impact from tariffs.

Mr. President, I would like to enter the survey into the RECORD: <https://www.awb.org/wp-content/uploads/AWB-Employer-Survey-041725.pdf>.

Of those businesses' studies and analysis, 76 percent say tariffs have raised their costs. Forty-five percent say tariffs have disrupted their supply chain. Twenty-one percent have had customers cancel orders. More than 1/3 of the companies already raised prices for customers. Fifteen percent are laying off people and making plans to do so more.

So, Mr. President, I rise to say that this important information needs to be considered by my colleagues. We need to be more involved in this trade debate.

American manufacturers are also seeing higher input prices, driving up the cost of production. More than half of all goods imported into the United States are manufacturing inputs, and they have highly integrated supply chains—supply chains that now are being made weaker. Tariffs are a tax on those products in your supply chain—think about aluminum or steel or other components—a tax that economists will tell you is ultimately going to be borne by the consumers.

Take one company, a Japanese-based parts manufacturer that filed for bankruptcy in June, Marelli. It was hit with an additional burden of 25-percent tariffs on the auto parts. Why should you care in the United States about this Japanese company? Because it is a major supplier of car interiors, lighting parts for various cars, like Chrysler and Dodge and Jeep vehicles built in the United States of America.

So automakers are on a roller coaster, and major car companies have reported the tariffs are expected to reduce their annual earnings by billions of dollars. And then what happens? Would you see the rise of costs domestically? Experts are predicting \$3,000 per domestic vehicle and potentially \$10,000 more for an imported vehicle.

It is not just autos; the Wall Street Journal reported that John Deere is considering production changes and price increases for farm equipment because of an additional \$500 million cost in tariffs. And according to the Copper Development Association, copper consumption for AI data centers is expected to jump to an outlandish demand, but building AI centers will cost more in the United States than any other country because of the Trump tariffs. So we know that we are building an AI infrastructure, but why are we making tariffs put that at risk? And just yesterday, the President threatened more tariffs on pharmaceutical products.

So, Mr. President, it has been 170 days since President Trump took office promising to bring back U.S. manufacturing by imposing steep tariffs, and it has been 90 days since the President promised we would see 90 deals in 90 days. I am not sure where those deals are. I am not sure whose deals he is talking about, but I know this: We are now 90 days later, and it seems that we have had all the pain of higher prices, and it seems that we haven't seen any comprehensive trade deals.

So we cannot have an endless summer of tariffs and price increases. We need, as a body here, to make sure that we are holding the President accountable on the trade turmoil that is hurting small businesses. Every day, families face higher grocery prices trying to buy a new or a used car or a new home.

And yesterday, the President also sent a letter to 14 countries. Today, he sent seven letters and basically threatened higher tariffs. In fact, one of those countries, South Korea, is a country that we have had a close partnership and been an ally with for decades. I visited them and our American troops in South Korea and have seen them guarding the demilitarized zone—DMZ—with North Korea. And most of the U.S. tariffs on South Korea were eliminated or significantly reduced under a trade agreement passed by this body: the U.S. free trade agreement with South Korea.

So the KORUS agreement was concluded in 2007 and ratified by the Senate in 2011. So why are we overturning with an ally that we work together to defend our interests in the region? Why are we tariffing them when we passed a free trade agreement here in the U.S. Senate?

So I know the President thinks he is going to get comprehensive trade agreements. We haven't seen them, but we have seen the costs go up. It is time to say no more extensions. It is time for Congress to get involved in this issue. It is time for all of us to say the tariff chaos is hurting small business.

That is the issue. According to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, 97 percent of U.S. importers are small businesses with fewer than 500 employees. They deserve to have this chaos stopped.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

ONE BIG BEAUTIFUL BILL ACT

Mrs. BRITT. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about a number of topics. I first want to start with how thrilled I am that childcare was addressed in the bill that we passed last week. The affordability and accessibility has hung over so many Americans coast to coast that want or need the opportunity to reengage in the workforce. And we took action to make a difference—to make it easier for parents to keep more of their hard-earned money to be able to do just that.

It wouldn't have been possible, obviously, without that bill and the Republican conference coming together and