

unleashing chaos, inviting even deeper corruption across the Federal Government.

#### NOMINATION OF EMIL J. BOVE III

Mr. SCHUMER. Now, on Mr. Bove—Emil Bove—last week, Senate Republicans on the Judiciary reported out one of Donald Trump's worst judicial nominees yet, Emil Bove; and that is saying a lot, since there are so many bad ones. Judiciary Republicans were so afraid to talk about Mr. Bove's nomination, in fact, that the Republican chair cut off debate time and refused to let all Democrats speak. And rather than being part of this farce, Judiciary Democrats, led by my friend the ranking member, Senator DURBIN, rightly walked out of the hearing.

I commend my Democratic colleagues for standing up for the integrity of our courts and refusing to participate in a compromised committee process with a deeply compromised nominee.

It is obvious why the Republicans were so eager to cut off debate. They know the arguments against Mr. Bove are telling and so unworthy of anyone nominated to a court of appeals or any judicial position in this government.

Mr. Bove is the perfect example of the type of person Donald Trump wants on the bench: political, aggressive, unprofessional, abusive, and ready and willing to put the Trump agenda over the rule of law. We all know what Donald Trump wants from judges: complete obeisance of whatever he wants, regardless of the rule of law, regardless of precedent, regardless of the Constitution.

Mr. Bove has a long history of defending Donald Trump when he was his personal attorney. He defended the President when the President was accused of inciting the January 6 insurrection, mishandling classified documents, falsifying business records, and more.

So what should that do when someone defends a President who is accused of very serious crimes? It should disqualify them from the bench. But the opposite occurs in the Trump administration. His defense of Trump's indefensible actions earned him a top spot at the DOJ, where he used his power to fire prosecutors who were working on criminal cases for the January 6 insurrectionists.

That is right. Mr. Bove helped the rioters who assaulted law enforcement officers on January 6 get off without any charges.

What is happening to this country? What is happening?

And if that is not enough to disqualify him, one whistleblower testified Mr. Bove repeatedly told DOJ lawyers to ignore court orders and even deliberately mislead judges. Mr. Bove encouraged officials not to tell judges the truth, the same sort of judges he is now nominated to serve alongside.

How can someone who has such disregard for our judges and our courts be

trusted on the bench? Mr. Bove's nomination previews the dark, ominous plan Donald Trump and Republicans have for the Federal Judiciary. They want to fill our courts with partisan operatives who will protect and serve Donald Trump, not protect the rule of law.

Experience doesn't matter. Judicial independence doesn't matter. Understanding the law and applying it without fear or favor doesn't matter at all. In fact, there is fear of Donald Trump among so many of the Republican nominees for judges and so many of our Republican Senators. For Donald Trump, the only thing that matters, when it comes to judges, is unyielding fealty to himself.

We have never seen—never—such a disastrous mandate for our Federal courts in all of American history, and if the Republicans proceed, the damage to our Judiciary will be irreversible.

Mr. Bove's nomination is an insult to every single qualified, independent judge who has ever sat on the Federal courts. He should never have been nominated. He should never have been reported out of committee, and he should never, ever be confirmed by the Senate to such an important job.

#### NVIDIA

Mr. SCHUMER. Finally, on Nvidia and China, Donald Trump's trade war has created a mess for U.S. businesses. Now, he is rushing to clean up that mess, and he is getting played by Beijing.

Last week, the Trump administration handed President Xi and the Chinese Government a major win, approving chipmaker Nvidia to resume selling American H20 chips, used to develop AI, to China.

When these chips were blocked, Americans breathed a sigh of relief. China would not get the basic tool to catch up and even surpass us on AI and so many other important technological advances. Not 4 months ago, for that reason, the administration blocked the sale of these chips.

Now, typical of Donald Trump—there is no consistency, just what he feels is good for himself at the moment—they are making a costly, troubling U-turn. Flip-flops like this show weakness to the Chinese Government, and that is the last thing we can afford.

What is more, the chips are vital in the race to dominate AI. These H20 chips are among the best on the market and were critical for China's development of DeepSeek.

We all wondered: How did China catch up with DeepSeek? Well, by using these chips.

Now, Donald Trump is green-lighting the sale of even more of these chips. If you are worried about allowing China to dominate in AI, with all of the troubling prospects of that domination, then this reversal from the administration is a huge step toward enabling that Chinese dominance. Every chip

Donald Trump allows Nvidia to sell to Chinese competitors is one more boost to Beijing in the race for AI dominance.

The administration's capitulation keeps going. As part of trade talks with Beijing, they are also undermining export controls of U.S. technologies deemed to be critical for our national security. This sends an unmistakable message to adversaries around the world: America's national security is open to negotiation under Donald Trump's government.

The administration should revert to its original decision, in April, to block the sale of these chips to the Chinese Government. Donald Trump should stop giving the Chinese Government leverage in the race for technologies of the future.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic whip.

#### RESCISSIONS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, last week, both the House and the Senate voted to pass what is known as a rescissions bill. That is a term which a lot of people aren't familiar with. What it basically means is that Congress appropriates money, the President signs that appropriations request into law, and it is the policy which is supposed to guide, under the Constitution, the President of the United States and the activity of the executive branch. This is the ordinary course of events.

However, there may come a time when a President decides that we don't need this expenditure, even though it has been approved and it is the law. He then goes through the rescinding of his decision to spend the money. It is called a rescissions bill. In this case, the Trump administration came to Congress and said: The \$9 billion that you appropriated and directed me to spend, I don't want to spend. I want your permission not to spend it—\$9 billion.

That is what we voted on and the House voted on last week. What was in this bill were primarily two major elements. One element was foreign aid, humanitarian assistance around the world paid for by the United States. The other element was public broadcasting—National Public Radio, for example. So \$8 billion was taken out of foreign aid, and \$1 billion was taken away from public broadcasting.

It was a close vote in the Senate. Two Republicans joined the Democrats in opposing it, but there were enough Republicans to support it. It barely passed the Senate and was sent back to the House. After some turmoil in the House, the decision was made also to pass the rescissions bill.

I thought this was a particularly important bill. As a Member of the Senate—I am honored to represent the State of Illinois—I have cast over 9,000 votes. The Presiding Officer from Utah is new to the Senate. It will take him

a few years to catch me, and I am sure he will. But of the 9,000 votes in that period of time, how many do you actually remember? A handful. This vote last week was one of those votes.

Why will I remember this? Because nongovernmental organizations, charities, and humanitarian aid groups around the world have told us that taking \$8 billion out of foreign aid and humanitarian assistance is going to cost us in terms of lives. It will deny people food, clean water to drink, medicine, and the basics of life. In the poorest places on Earth, it will cost us lives.

The original bill eliminated a program called PEPFAR. PEPFAR was created by Republican President George W. Bush. He rallied our government—Democrats and Republicans—to lead a national and international effort to stop HIV/AIDS. For example, if a mother is pregnant again and had HIV, the transmission of that disease to the baby was, unfortunately, very common. We started finding ways to stop it from happening. It has been many years since George W. Bush was President, but we estimate that we have saved 25 million lives with this PEPFAR Program. I am a loyal Democrat and proud of it but was happy to vote with the Republicans and George W. Bush on that program. That program was going to be eliminated by this bill that was considered. It was taken out at the last minute. That is the type of thing that was at stake in that vote.

That decision by the Senate and the House, signed by President Trump over the weekend, is going to cost human lives in the poorest places on Earth. I think that is a tragedy. I have been to some of those places. I have made a point of going to see it and to see our programs.

I remember a dusty village in India where the children were gathered around for what they called lunch. American kids would not have touched what they were being given to eat. They were basically dough bowls. They were grains from the United States that were blended together. They ate these dough bowls gleefully, happily, anxiously. But before they took the first bite, they stopped and said a prayer, and I asked the local people who were leading this effort: What did they say in prayer? They said that they said thank to you the United States of America for the food that they were going to eat that day. They knew that was the case because it was printed on the bags as a gift to their people from America. Those programs are going to be eliminated now because of the vote last week.

But there was another part of it, too, that struck me as really painful. That was the decision to eliminate the Federal support for public broadcasting—National Public Radio and public television. I am a fan. I have been a fan for a long time so I will confess my prejudice.

But I am also from Downstate Illinois. That is the part of the State out-

side Chicago where the small towns and the rural areas are located. I know what public broadcasting means to those areas. I heard firsthand an example of what it means.

A lady named Heather Norman, who is with the public broadcasting coalition in Illinois, joined me at a press conference, on Friday, in front of the public radio station in the city of Chicago. I asked her to tell me and the press who had gathered an example of why public radio was different than the other radio stations and why it was important. She gave me a very classic example.

She works at the public radio station in Macomb, IL. Macomb is a Downstate community on the western side of our State—a more sparsely populated area than people visualize when they say Chicago, IL. Western Macomb, IL, has Western Illinois University. Thousands of students from all around the State and the area attend college there. A year ago, there was an active shooter in the community. They learned about it through the police notifying the radio station, and they started broadcasting to the people of Macomb to stay in their homes, to shelter in place. Don't go outside until we control the situation. Wait for the police's signal.

Well, there was a lot at stake. We have seen on a lot of our campuses and universities where deranged people take a gun and kill innocent students right and left, and we didn't want that to happen again. So the public broadcasting station, the NPR station, kept the broadcast going all day long to notify the people of Macomb and the McDonough County area of the danger, and they warned them to stay home.

You say: I will bet the other radio station did too. They didn't. Why didn't they do it? Because the four other radio stations are recordings. There is no live person at those radio stations—just equipment. So they are playing their music and whatever programs they wish, but they couldn't send out local news because there was no one there to send it. It was the public broadcasting station—the public radio station—that kept the people of Macomb and McDonough County safe. So, to say that you can eliminate that station, and it won't make any difference whether the warning is about an active shooter or about a tornado or a flood or a flash fire, public broadcasting is there on the scene, doing their job, day in and day out.

Now, what is going to happen with this decision by the Trump administration to eliminate Federal support for these stations? I don't know. I asked Heather. She said there are probably two stations in our State—at least two—that will go out of business. They depend so much on the help from Washington. That is a loss.

Whether you are conservative or liberal, MAGA or progressive—whatever you want to call yourself—how could you want an America with less information and with fewer choices as the sources of that information?

The strength of our democracy is the fact that the American people have access to good, credible information and can make up their own minds. They don't want to be told. They make up their own minds. That is the key to the core of democracy, and we attacked it last week when we eliminated support for public broadcasting.

I don't know what is going to happen next. A lot of people have to think about this. I said to the people who govern public broadcasting and public television and public radio: You will have to think of a plan B because this President wants to put you out of business. You can't do what some law firms have done that he got mad at. He got mad at the law firms and threatened to cut off their Federal business. What did they do? They sued for peace immediately. They said: What can we do? Can we give you thousands and, maybe, hundreds of thousands of free legal services?

When that intimidation is in place, some of them turn to that as an alternative, but a public broadcasting station cannot do that and maintain its credibility. It can't go hat in hand and bent knee to this administration or to any administration and maintain its credibility when it comes to news.

So they have a terrible challenge that they face. I want to help them find a solution. I think America would be poorer and less free, and there would be less information available to people in our country if we allowed this to go forward.

#### JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, on a separate issue, I want to say a word about some nominations that are pending before the Senate this week.

As the ranking Democrat on the Senate Judiciary Committee, I pay closer attention than some when it comes to the nominees who are suggested for Federal positions on the courts. These are positions that are lifetime positions. You take a person and state: We trust you with this responsibility and authority for as long as you live—for as long as you live. So it isn't a question of 2 years or 4 years and replacing someone if they aren't up to the job. We have got to look for people whom we can trust for the long haul.

The Senate will soon vote on the confirmations of Joshua Divine to serve as a judge for the Eastern and Western Districts of Missouri and Judge Cristian Stevens to serve for the Eastern District. I am concerned about these two nominees.

Mr. Divine is 34 years old. He received his law degree only 9 years ago. In addition to a lack of experience, Mr. Divine has taken some extreme positions on issues that are important to people across the United States, such as reproductive rights and ballot access.

Mr. Divine—if you can believe this, in this day and age, 2025—has argued in