

Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mr. GALLEG0, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HEINREICH, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KANE, Mr. KELLY, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. OSSOFF, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SLOTKIN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WARNOCK, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 42

Resolved, That the Senate disapproves of any pardons for individuals who were found guilty of assaulting Capitol Police officers.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 95. Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 23, to impose sanctions with respect to the International Criminal Court engaged in any effort to investigate, arrest, detain, or prosecute any protected person of the United States and its allies; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 96. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 97. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 95. Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 23, to impose sanctions with respect to the International Criminal Court engaged in any effort to investigate, arrest, detain, or prosecute any protected person of the United States and its allies; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 4, insert the following:

SEC. 5. REPORTS ON FOREIGN BOYCOTTS OF ISRAEL.

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the head of the Office of Antiboycott Compliance of the Bureau of Industry and Security of the Department of Commerce shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on foreign boycotts described in section 1773(a) of the Anti-Boycott Act of 2018 (50 U.S.C. 4842(a)) targeted at the State of Israel.

(B) ELEMENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include a description of—

(1) the foreign boycotts; and

(2) the steps taken by the Secretary of Commerce to enforce the provisions of the Anti-Boycott Act of 2018 (50 U.S.C. 4841 et seq.) with respect to such boycotts.

(C) TERMINATION.—The requirement to submit reports under subsection (a) shall terminate on the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 96. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 23, to impose sanctions with respect to the International Criminal Court engaged in

any effort to investigate, arrest, detain, or prosecute any protected person of the United States and its allies; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 4, strike line 21 and all that follows through page 5, line 5, and insert the following:

(3) the sanctions described in subsection (b)(1) with respect to the International Criminal Court; and

(4) a prohibition on the opening or the maintaining in the United States of a correspondent or payable-through account by any foreign financial institution determined by the President to have knowingly conducted or facilitated a significant transaction or transactions on behalf of the International Criminal Court or any person whose property is blocked under subsection (b)(1).

(B) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The sanctions described in this subsection with respect to a foreign person described in subsection (a) are the following:

(1) PROPERTY BLOCKING.—The President shall exercise all of the powers granted by the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of any foreign person described in paragraph (1) or (3) of subsection (a) if such property and interests in

SA 97. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 23, to impose sanctions with respect to the International Criminal Court engaged in any effort to investigate, arrest, detain, or prosecute any protected person of the United States and its allies; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 10, strike lines 9 through 16 and insert the following:

(2) ALLY OF THE UNITED STATES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “ally of the United States” means—

(i) a government of a member country of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; or
(ii) a government of a major non-NATO ally, as that term is defined by section 2013(7) of the American Service-Members' Protection Act (22 U.S.C. 7432(7)).

(B) EXCLUSIONS.—The term “ally of the United States” does not include—

- (i) Bahrain;
- (ii) Qatar;
- (iii) Pakistan;
- (iv) Egypt; or
- (v) Türkiye.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I have four requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet in open session during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, January 28, 2025, at 9:30 a.m., to receive testimony.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, January 28, 2025, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the ses-

sion of the Senate on Tuesday, January 28, 2025, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, January 28, 2025, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a closed briefing.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 29, 2025

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 12 noon on Wednesday, January 29; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, morning business be closed, and the Senate proceed to executive session and resume Executive Calendar No. 8, LEE ZELDIN; further, that if any nominations are confirmed during Wednesday's session, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator KENNEDY and my Democratic colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

TRUMP EXECUTIVE ORDERS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, with me this evening is Mr. Nick Ayers, who is one of my colleagues in my office on whose judgment, counsel, and advice I rely regularly.

As you know, on any given day, the halls of the Senate office buildings and the Capitol itself are teaming with people. We have a lot of visitors, which is a great thing. We have a lot of staff members, very able. We, obviously, have a hundred Senators, and we have many, many, many—did I mention many?—members of the press.

And today many of those folks—not the tourists, not the members of the public, our visitors, our people who are visiting us—but some staff members, some Senators, and some members of the media have been catatonic—catatonic. They have been foaming at the mouth, and it all has to do with a simple memorandum issued by the Office of Management and Budget dealing with spending, and I want to talk about that for a few minutes and try to put it in perspective.

I thought about starting my talk today off by saying: If it weren't for double standards around this place, there wouldn't be any standards at all. And, actually, that is true, but that is

too cynical for the point I want to make today.

The point I want to make today is that, in Congress, we are headed for a multiple-vehicle pileup—a multiple-vehicle pileup, which I will describe in a moment. And it is going to be messy, and dealing with it is going to be messy, and we have got to deal with it in accordance with the Constitution and our law, as passed by Congress.

But we are also going to have to try to do some things a different way, and it is not going to be altogether pretty.

Now, we can all debate—I haven't met a dummy yet in the U.S. Senate. Some people would disagree with that, but that has been my experience. Every single Member of this body is very clever, and they can get us bogged down in procedure and debate forever about how many lawyers can dance on the head of a pin. And all of that is important. I have done that myself before. But we are also dealing with reality.

Did I mention we are dealing with a multiple-vehicle pileup?

I remember back when President Obama was President. He repeatedly refused to enforce laws that he didn't like. When certain provisions—I remember it like it was yesterday—when certain provisions of the Affordable Care Act proved to be controversial—it was law, but some of those provisions of law that he passed were controversial. I will give you an example of a mandate that large employers provide insurance to their employees or else pay a big penalty. President Obama just unilaterally delayed implementation; said: I am not going to enforce it.

Nobody went catatonic around here. Nobody started foaming at the mouth. Maybe everybody had taken their meds that day. I don't know. But there was no hue and cry, like we have heard today as a result of that OMB memorandum.

I remember also when Congress took up the issue, at President Obama's suggestion, of Dreamers. Remember the DREAM Act? Congress wouldn't pass it. Dreamers are children brought to the United States of America illegally by their parents who have come here illegally. But the children are children; they don't know better.

President Obama proposed the DREAM Act. Congress didn't pass it. So President Obama just ignored the law. He protected them from deportation through Executive action. It is called the 2012 Deferred Action For Childhood Arrivals Program.

It broke the law. Nobody around here foamed at the mouth. Nobody around here went catatonic, including but not limited to the media.

I remember when President Biden did a very similar thing. He sought to preserve and fortify DACA, as we called it. And he also took a number of steps unilaterally to weaken immigration enforcement.

We know that. That is why the border under President Biden was an open,

bleeding wound. He didn't—he refused to follow the law. Nobody foamed at the mouth around here. Members of the press didn't become catatonic.

I don't remember anyone, Democrat or Republican, calling for President Obama's impeachment after a Federal court criticized his administration for spending money unlawfully. You remember that? President Obama decided to pay subsidies to health insurers in 2014, decided to give them money. There is just one problem: Congress hadn't appropriated the money. The GOP House, the Republican-controlled House, sued him. A Federal judge ruled against President Obama. But the money was spent.

I remember when the GAO concluded that the Obama Health and Human Services Department in 2016 illegally spent money—Congress didn't appropriate it—by paying insurers instead of sending the money to the Department of Treasury.

Nobody around here foamed at the mouth, including members of the press. Nobody around here went catatonic.

Now, I didn't come here today to debate the “take Care” clause of the U.S. Constitution. We are all familiar with it. The President has a constitutional duty to “take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed.” That is the law. It is in our Constitution, bigger than Dallas, right there. And I believe in it. I didn't come here today to debate it.

I didn't come here today to debate the 1974 Impoundment Control Act, which the courts have ruled to be constitutional, which says that Congress gets to appropriate the money and the President has to spend it. I don't want to get into all of that.

But I guess my point, in light of this OMB memorandum—which I will talk about in a moment. My point is that having embraced nonenforcement when they like the results under President Biden and President Obama, my Democratic friends have very little standing—in fact, none, zero, zilch, nada—no standing to complain when President Trump employs the same legal theory for different purposes. I am not saying—I am not suggesting that we ought to follow the rule: Two wrongs don't make it right, but they do make it even.

I am just gently suggesting that maybe I should have started this speech with: If it weren't for double standards around this place, there wouldn't be any standards at all.

Let me say it again. I support the “take Care” clause in the Constitution, and I can read the law. I know a law-book from a J.Crew catalog. I know what the Impoundment Act says, and I can read the court opinions holding that it is constitutional.

Why am I talking about all this stuff? As you know, since he has been President—I don't know, a week, 10 days—President Trump has issued about a squillion Executive orders. I think it is the most Executive orders issued by a President in this short pe-

riod of time, in the history of ever. I am still trying to read them.

And most of his Executive orders—this is a general statement, but I think it is fairly accurate—intend, as is his right, to reverse many of the policies implemented by President Biden.

I think it was yesterday that the Office of Management and Budget, under President Trump—under an Acting Director—issued a memorandum. And the memorandum went out to all Agencies of the Federal Government, and it said: Look, you have seen the President's Executive orders changing Federal policy, which he has the right to issue. So hold up spending any money—OBM said to the various Agencies—that would implement President Biden's policies as have been changed by President Trump.

And OMB was very careful in its initial memorandum and in its explanation later to say: Look, we are not talking about direct payments to people. We are not talking about Medicaid. We are not talking about Medicare. We are not talking about Social Security. We are not talking about SNAP benefits. Very careful.

Well, people around here, today, have been screaming like they are part of a prison riot: Oh, my God, the President is not following the law—like this had not happened before.

Again, I am not saying that two wrongs don't make it right, but they do make it even. I am just trying to give you a little context for this.

My good friend Senator SCHUMER—and he is my good friend. I went on a trip with CHUCK to China. I don't want to personalize this about CHUCK. Let me put it another way. Some of my Democratic friends have and some of my friends in the media have been running around like a 5-year-old in a Batman T-shirt screaming that the world is coming to an end and the Impoundment Act is being violated and the “take Care” clause of the Constitution has been thrown into the garbage bin, as if this sort of hesitation to spend money has never happened before in Washington, DC.

Why is the Trump administration doing this? Look, I don't know. I don't talk to the Trump administration every day. People have a multitude of reasons for doing what they do. But I can see what is going on and what is going to be going on over the next 6 months to a year.

Did I mention we are headed to a multiple-vehicle pileup?

Here is the problem. We have to extend the tax cuts from the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017. We don't have a choice. Like it or hate it, if we don't extend those tax cuts when they expire shortly, taxes are going to go up \$4.3 trillion on the American people—not \$4.3 million, not \$4.3 billion; \$4.3 trillion. And 60 percent of that tax increase is going to impact middle-class and lower income Americans. And that is just a natural fact. If we don't extend those tax cuts, it is going to drive

our GDP and our economy on a journey to the center of the Earth. Even my Democratic friends know those tax cuts have to be extended.

But we have other things we have to do too. We are deficit spending. We are spending money around here like it was pond water, like it was ditch water.

I don't want to blame it all on President Biden. But if the shoe fits, wear it, Cinderella.

This is what President Biden spent. He didn't spend this from tax revenues; he borrowed it: \$1.9 trillion on the American Rescue Plan; \$1.2 trillion on the Green New Deal, which they called an infrastructure act; \$1 trillion on the Inflation Reduction Act; the Chips Act, where we gave money to some of the biggest companies in America—Big Tech—because they said they needed it. We gave them \$280 billion for semiconductor manufacturing.

It was just announced yesterday: China just kicked our ass on artificial intelligence.

I don't know if I can say "ass" on the Senate floor, but by God, I just did.

They did—I don't know how else to describe it—after we spent \$280 billion? This is just under President Biden—\$4.380 trillion on money we didn't have.

We are deficit spending every nanosecond. I don't know how many millions we have had to borrow since I have been talking. We are taking in about \$4.5 trillion, give or take. We are spending about \$6.5 trillion.

When we deficit spend, that money doesn't fall from Heaven. We thank Heaven for it, but we have to borrow it, and we have to pay it back. And those annual deficits—daily deficits, monthly deficits—roll over into national debt, and we have \$36 trillion worth of national debt. We are going to run out of digits. That is the most debt we have ever had, well over 100 percent of GDP.

So we have to renew the tax cuts, which is going to cause short-term—before it stimulates the economy—short-term loss of revenue. And we have to stop the deficit spending, and we have to reduce our debt.

But there is more. There is more.

We have to increase defense spending because President Xi is working with President Putin, who is working with the Ayatollah in Iran. And their goal is to have Putin dominate Eastern and Central Europe, to have Iran dominate the Middle East, to have China dominate the Indo-Pacific and the South China Sea and be free to roam in Sub-Saharan Africa and Latin America and South America.

I don't want America to be the world's policeman, but I don't want President Xi or President Putin or the Ayatollah in Iran to be the world's policemen either. Weakness invites the wolves, and we have to start spending more money on defense.

You don't have to be Einstein's cousin to figure out that all the things that I just described that we have to do in the next year to 6 months could be

called competing interests—tax cuts, stop deficit spending, reduce the debt, but find more money for defense. Something has to give.

All this is a long-winded way of saying we are going to have to reduce spending. We are going to have to do it. The numbers are the numbers. Since 2019, the American population has grown 2 percent. We are not having babies. Two percent—and that is after all the illegal immigration.

Do you know what has happened to our budget? It has gone up 55 percent.

I know we had a pandemic. We had to save the economy. Two percent growth in population and a 55-percent increase in spending. Yes, we have had inflation. We didn't have 55-percent worth of inflation.

We are going to have to be able to afford tax cuts and more defense spending and to pay down deficits and to pay down debt. We are going to have to reduce spending to prepandemic levels.

And that is what this OBM memorandum today, which temporarily held up the spending of some money, consistent with President Trump's Executive orders, was the first baby step toward. That is what this is all about. That is what it is all about. The world is not going to spin off its axis.

Again, I support the "take Care" clause of the Constitution. I understand what the Impoundment Act says, but this is reality. And this is what we have to solve over the next year. And we are going to have to solve it together because the debt is \$36 trillion. Our population is 355 million people. That is 102 grand per man, woman, and child, and it has increased. And we are about to extend the tax cuts and start spending more on defense.

There is a lot of excitement around here about the reconciliation bill or bills. I am excited about it. You can write this down and take it home to Mama: Those reconciliation bills, which we have to pass to get through this multiple-vehicle pileup that I just described, are going to contain substantial spending cuts. They are. Because you know what? If they don't, that reconciliation bill or bills will never pass the U.S. Senate. And I know it will not pass the U.S. House of Representatives. Then we will have failed to do what we told the American people that we were going to do, which is to get the Federal Government right-sized, to put the high prices behind us by growing out of them, by stimulating the economy and increasing wages, by making energy cheaper, by paying down our debt. And that is what is going on.

I hope all the folks today will go home and take off their Batman T-shirts, wash them. They are probably a little sweaty. I hope everybody will go home—those who drink, have a cocktail, take their meds, and put this all in perspective. That is what that OBM memorandum was all about.

I am going to say this one final time because maybe some members of the

media are listening. I am not advocating to ignore the Constitution. I am not advocating to ignore the impoundment laws of this Congress. What I am saying is: If you don't believe we are going to have to cut spending substantially in order to get out of this mess that has been created, then you shouldn't be driving it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS). The Senator from Hawaii.

TRUMP EXECUTIVE ORDERS

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, if it weren't for a judge's temporary administrative stay, we would still be in the middle of Trump's pointless and illegal shutdown right now. Federal funding for a whole host of things would be frozen, meaning people all over the country who count on the Federal Government wouldn't get help.

All of us—all 100 of us—got calls from back home, saying: What the heck is going on?

VA home loans are being shut down. The Medicaid portal is being shut down. The Head Start portal is being shut down. Construction projects are being shut down. All because the Trump administration believes that it doesn't have to follow the appropriations law.

Now, lots of us disagree about the size and the scope of the government. Lots of people vote no on the appropriations law. Fine. But once it is the law, the legislative branch sends it to the President of the United States. The President either signs it or vetoes it. In this case, President Biden signed the appropriations law.

There is no provision in the statute and there is no provision in the Constitution that permits a President to pick and choose the spending that he prefers. That just doesn't exist in the law.

The article I branch has one most foundational power in terms of the three branches of government being separate and coequal. "Coequal" is kind of a funny way of saying it, but it is important to think of these three branches as in constant struggle against each other for power. Our power is the power of the purse. Our power is the power to enact appropriations bills, to determine the level of Federal spending on various programs.

But what the Trump White House did today was announce by fiat: We are not going to fund disaster relief. We are not going to fund public housing. We are not going to fund rural health care or foster care or opioid treatment or highway and rail projects or wildfire containment or cancer research or clean energy initiatives—all of it gone in an instant and, in this case, only for an instant because Donald Trump woke up yesterday and decided he no longer wanted to fund some of the most basic things that the Federal Government supports.

Again, this really isn't about arguing about the merits of each individual