

[Rollcall Vote No. 593 Ex.]

YEAS—53

Banks	Graham	Moreno
Barrasso	Grassley	Mullin
Blackburn	Hagerty	Murkowski
Boozman	Hawley	Paul
Britt	Hoeben	Ricketts
Budd	Husted	Risch
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Cassidy	Johnson	Schmitt
Collins	Justice	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Lankford	Sheehy
Cramer	Lee	Sullivan
Crapo	Lummis	Thune
Cruz	Marshall	Tillis
Curtis	McConnell	Tuberville
Daines	McCormick	Wicker
Ernst	Moody	Young
Fischer	Moran	

NAYS—46

Alsobrooks	Hickenlooper	Sanders
Baldwin	Hirono	Schatz
Bennet	Kaine	Schiff
Blumenthal	Kelly	Schumer
Blunt Rochester	Kim	Shaheen
Booker	King	Slotkin
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Smith
Coons	Lujan	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Markey	Warner
Duckworth	Merkley	Warnock
Durbin	Murphy	Warren
Fetterman	Murray	Welch
Galleo	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Peters	Wyden
Hassan	Reed	
Heinrich	Rosen	

NOT VOTING—1

Padilla

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 53, the nays are 46. The motion is agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edmund G. LaCour, Jr., of Alabama, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Alabama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding rule XXII, all postcloture time be expired and the Senate vote on the confirmation of the LaCour nomination at a time to be determined by the majority leader, in consultation with the Democratic leader, no earlier than Wednesday, October 29; further, that if confirmed, the motion 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.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

TERMINATING THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY DECLARED TO IMPOSE DUTIES ON ARTICLES IMPORTED FROM BRAZIL

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. I ask the Chair to execute the order of October 7 with respect to S.J. Res. 81.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session, and the Committee on Finance is discharged of S.J. Res. 81, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 81) terminating the national emergency declared to impose duties on articles imported from Brazil.

Thereupon, the committee was discharged and the Senate proceeded to consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 29

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about my Sunshine Protection Act—a bipartisan, bicameral bill that returns power to each State and its citizens and that will end the twice-yearly time change and make daylight saving time the national, year-round standard.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the Sunshine Protection Act, which is at the desk; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I do object to the legislation, and I will outline my reasons a bit more later. But I defer to my good friends from Florida, Alabama, and Rhode Island to speak on behalf of that bill before I explain my opposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. First, I want to recognize the Senator from Rhode Island to speak about the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, each November, we fall back into darkness very literally. If we pass my Sunshine Protection Act and make daylight saving time permanent, we would gain an hour of afternoon sunlight in the winter months for families to soak up after work and after school.

This measure has been so bipartisan that it has previously passed this body by unanimous consent.

Here is what President Trump said about it:

The House and Senate should push hard for more Daylight at the end of a day. Very popular and, most importantly, no more changing of the clocks, a big inconvenience and, for our government, A VERY COSTLY EVENT!!!

My cosponsor before Senator SCOTT came here was his predecessor from Florida, Senator Rubio, who is now our Secretary of State, who said that we should “stop enduring the ridiculous and antiquated practice of switching our clocks back and forth. Let’s . . . end the need to ‘fall back’ and ‘spring forward’ for good.”

I don’t always agree with President Trump and with former-Senator, now-Secretary Rubio, but I sure do agree about this.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. I would like to recognize my cosponsor from Alabama, Senator TUBERVILLE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to once again talk about the outdated practice of changing our clocks twice a year.

This weekend, my constituents back home in Alabama and across America will be forced to change their clocks. As a result, it will be dark in Washington, DC, at 5 p.m. next week. In the 5 years I have served here in the Senate, making daylight saving time permanent is the No. 1 issue that I hear about back home.

I am proud to have joined my colleague RICK SCOTT earlier this year in reintroducing the Sunshine Protection Act to make daylight saving time permanent on the Federal level. Unfortunately, it hasn’t been brought to the floor for a vote. So here I am advocating once again to make the outdated practice of changing our clock a thing of the past.

For nearly 60 years, Americans have changed their clocks back and forth twice a year, but the roots of daylight saving time trace back much further. Daylight saving time was introduced during World War I and then reused again during World War II as a temporary way to help conserve fuel and energy. Following the ends of both wars, the decision to spring forward and fall back was returned to individual States. It wasn’t until 1966 that the system of changing our clocks twice a year that we use now was made permanent.

Changing our clocks twice a year might have made sense in the 1960s, but it doesn’t make sense anymore. The twice-a-year time change doesn’t make sense today.

We know the devastating impact the disruption from so-called standard time has on Americans’ health. Studies have suggested that disruption of sleep patterns due to time changes increases the risk of cardiovascular disease and physical injury. Northwestern Medicine found that “fall back” and “spring forward” are connected to a 6-percent spike in fatal car accidents and a 24-percent higher risk of heart attacks. Think about that. Additionally, the long-term health effects linked to changing our clocks include weight gain, cluster headaches, and depression. You would think we would listen to all of that.

The bottom line is that shifting our clocks disrupts sleep patterns, and it has been proven time and time again to be harmful to our health.

Thanks to R.F.K., Jr.’s, great work at HHS, a lot of Americans are taking

their health more seriously by trying to eat healthier and to get more sleep. Switching the clock back and forth is the exact opposite of the Make America Healthy Again movement that R.F.K., Jr., has championed. It is bad for sleep, it is bad for nutrition, and it is bad for overall health.

For that reason, I push back and try to get this on the floor sooner rather than later.

I yield back to my colleague RICK SCOTT.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. I want to thank Senators WHITEHOUSE and TUBERVILLE for their support.

Our Sunshine Protection Act is a bipartisan, bicameral bill that will allow States to end the twice-yearly time change and make daylight saving time the national, year-round standard.

In 2018, when I was Governor of Florida, I signed legislation that would allow the State of Florida to stop the practice of changing the clocks. I have been working to get this passed since I have been in the Senate so the people of Florida, not the Federal Government, can make this choice for the families of Florida.

Nearly two dozen other States have joined Florida in choosing to lock the clock, pending the Federal approval that will come by passing the Sunshine Protection Act, while still allowing other States to opt out if they wish.

This bill is about States' rights. It allows the people of each State to choose what best fits their needs and the needs of their families. In Florida, that is permanent daylight saving time. I hear from Floridians on this constantly. I am sure many of you have heard from your constituents as well. The American people are sick and tired of changing their clocks twice a year. It is confusing, unnecessary, and completely outdated.

It is an understatement to say that our Nation has changed since the United States began changing the clocks over a century ago.

For example, American households have electricity now. We also have self-driving cars, computers, and cell phones. Now, changing the clocks twice a year proves more of an annoyance to families than a benefit to them. The American people love having an extra hour of sunlight, especially in my State of Florida. That means more time to enjoy the outdoors and activities with families.

Studies also show the potential for reduced cardiac issues, stroke, seasonal depression, reduced robberies, and benefits to the agricultural and general economies with an extra hour of sunlight.

With President Trump committed to finally "lock the clock," we can finally get this done for the American people. This bill is completely about individual States having the right to make their own decisions. I ask my colleagues to support the passage of the Sunshine

Protection Act to make a common-sense change that will simply benefit the lives of Americans and allow people of each State to choose what is best for themselves and their families.

I yield to my colleague from Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. In January of 1974, billions of Americans traveled to work and school in darkness. Commuter trains were delayed, schoolchildren carried flash lights. Tragically, some of these kids were struck by cars and killed while walking to school in the dark.

One woman from Long Island, speaking to the New York Times, summed up the black mood of the Nation: "It's the end," she said. "I can't cope any more . . . I'm just staying in bed."

What calamity had befallen our Nation? Had Soviet Russia finally attacked America? Had we suffered a nationwide power outage? Were the heavens conspiring to plunge our Nation into darkness?

No. As it turns out, the answer was more mundane and foolish. A few months earlier, Congress, in its eternal wisdom, had imposed a top-down change on every Americans' daily life, eliminating standard time and adopting daylight saving time year-round. Such a change to the Nation's clocks had never happened before, except as an emergency rationing measure during wartime.

While briefly popular, it proved deeply unpopular when reality set in. According to opinion polls, support for permanent daylight saving time fell by 30 percentage points in just 3 months. Only a few weeks after it was implemented, it was underwater. Congress beat a hasty retreat, repealing the law and changing the clocks back in October. What was supposed to be a 2-year experiment ended in abject failure after less than 1 year.

It is said that those who don't learn from history are doomed to repeat it. That is what would happen if Congress passes the so-called Sunshine Protection Act, once again ending standard time and imposing daylight saving time year-round.

If permanent, daylight saving time becomes the law of the land. It will again make winter a dark and dismal time for millions of Americans. By moving the clock back an hour in winter, permanent daylight saving time would push winter sunrises to an absurdly late hour, depriving Americans of morning sunshine that is essential for our safety and well-being.

For many Arkansans, permanent daylight saving time would mean the Sun wouldn't rise until after 8 o'clock or even 8:30 a.m. during the dead of winter. Three months out of the year, kids in towns like Bentonville, Fayetteville, and Fort Smith would start school ahead of the Sun.

Americans in northern States and on the western side of time zones would be

even worse off. For instance, the Sun wouldn't rise until nearly 9 o'clock during winter in Seattle. In Grand Rapids, the Sun would rise as late as 9:15 a.m., and in Williston, ND, they would not see the Sun until almost 9:45 a.m.

The darkness of permanent daylight saving time would be especially harmful for schoolchildren and working Americans. As we saw in 1974, kids would either walk to school in the pitch black or schools would have to push back start times. The choice would be between danger on the one hand and disruption on the other.

Meanwhile, construction workers, farmers, and others who rise before the Sun or who need the Sun to work would be penalized. These workers might go 3, 4 or even 5 hours in morning without seeing the Sun, which would hurt their quality of life and, potentially, their safety in the workplace.

Then, of course, there are the health consequences of permanent daylight saving time. The Senators from Alabama and Florida correctly indicated that clock changes can be bad for health. But the best evidence suggests that the natural rhythms of our internal body clocks align more closely with standard time than daylight saving time. A shift to permanent daylight saving time would make it harder to go to sleep at night and harder to wake up in the morning.

Some of the Nation's top medical associations, including the American Academy of Sleep Medicine, the American Medical Association, the American Academy of Neurology, and the American College of Chest Physicians have called for daylight saving time to be abolished, not extended. As one sleep scientist put it, of all the options available to us, "permanent [daylight saving time] is the worst solution."

Of course, the advocates for permanent daylight saving time try to put, well, a sunny face on this bill. Back in 2022, the Senator from Massachusetts argued that it would be mean "more daylight hours" and "more smiles."

By the way, since the Senator from Rhode Island mentioned it, let me say a word about what happened in 2022. We heard from him that the Senate "unanimously passed" this bill. It is true, as far as it goes, but the story is a little more complicated than that. To let you in on how things operate, when Senators want to seek unanimous consent to pass a bill without a recorded vote, as my friends are doing today, an email goes out to all other Senate offices asking if a Senator objects. I didn't personally object in 2022 for two reasons. First, I hadn't adequately communicated to the staff the depth of my opposition to this bill. Second, because of a miscommunication, I expected another Senator who also opposed the bill to object. I take full responsibility for this mistake—though the search for someone else to blame is actively ongoing. A chief suspect, as usual, may be the Republican floor Secretary.

In any case, it is only a mistake if you don't have time to fix it. Fortunately, I fixed it later that year with like-minded friends in the House.

Despite that setback, the proponents of permanent daylight saving time refused to, if you will, let the Sun set on this bill. They allege, as we heard, that the change would stimulate the economy and even save the environment by reducing energy use. On the contrary, permanent daylight saving time would have negligible effects on energy use, as indicated by most studies and plain common sense. Any reduction in electricity use in the afternoon will be counterbalanced, of course, by increased uses in the morning. It is, largely, six in one hand and half a dozen in the other.

As to the supposed economic benefits, no doubt that a handful of industries would gain from the bill. That is why they lobbied so hard for it over the years. This bill would benefit, for example, outdoor entertainment venues, seaside resorts, and bars. My good friends from Alabama and Florida sponsor this legislation, and they are representing their States well by doing so. An extra hour in the winter for the resorts in South Florida, the beautiful golf courses in southern Alabama and across the State of Florida, or deep-sea fishing in the Gulf of America or the Atlantic would be welcome by many of the residents of those communities.

As for my friends in Massachusetts and Rhode Island, have you ever spent a winter in Boston or Providence? The Sun disappears there barely after 4 p.m. Little wonder they have joined the effort. These Senators represent States that overwhelmingly benefit from year-round daylight saving time because of their latitude and longitude. I understand, and I respect their positions.

But as is often the case, these highly concentrated benefits for a few industries and a few regions are offset by widely distributed costs across many more industries throughout the entire country, that is to say nothing of moms sending their kids to school in the dark of night.

So why should we repeat history? It is probably because we have forgotten it. Most people don't remember the permanent daylight saving time debacle of 1974. Just about everyone hates to "spring forward and fall back," as the saying goes. I don't like the biannual clock changes any more than the rest of you do. But unless we are willing to adopt permanent standard time and sacrifice the extra hour of evening light in the spring and summer for Little League ball games and summer vacations across the country, there is just not much to be done, which is, when you think about it, a fundamentally conservative outlook.

Not every human problem has a legislative solution. Sometimes we have to live with an uneasy compromise between competing priorities and interests. That is doubly true when consid-

ering how the movement of the stars and the planets affects the lives of 350 million souls spread across our vast continental Nation.

It brings to mind the story of King Cnut, who wanted to teach sycophants a lesson about the limits of mankind's power. He famously set his throne on the seashore and forbade the tide from coming in. Of course, the tide, nonetheless, came in and, as one historian recounted, "disrespectfully drenched the King's feet and shins."

The moral of the story, the King reminded his fawning court, is that "the power of kings is empty and worthless, and there is no king worthy of name save Him by whose will heaven, earth, and sea obey eternal laws."

Good King Cnut's wise words are as true now as they were then. No earthy ruler—not even this Congress—can alter the movements of the heavens, not today, not 1974, not ever.

Therefore, I oppose the Sunshine Protection Act and will always oppose any effort to adopt daylight saving time year-round.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic whip.

OPERATION MIDWAY BLITZ

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, for the last 2 months, the people of Illinois have been living under President Trump's so-called Operation Midway Blitz. I have watched it up close. I have seen its victims, and I have seen its methods. I want to tell you that this Operation Midway Blitz is trampling over Illinois residents' constitutional rights and civil liberties. This reckless campaign is not aimed at public safety; it is a calculated show of political theater and force that is designed to spread fear and terror in our communities.

Every weekend since this operation began, I have returned to Chicago to visit these communities and to meet with members and leaders who have been targeted by Donald Trump with Federal, militarized agents. I have reported back on what I have seen and heard on this floor for weeks now.

What I see time and time again are good people whose only desire is to raise their children, go to work, and contribute to their communities. These same people are now afraid to leave their homes, to walk to school, to church, to the grocery store, or to a restaurant out of fear of being caught in one of these cruel raids.

The President insists his immigrant enforcement operations focus on the worst of the worst. Oh, you have heard him over and over again. At his rallies, he would give the speeches, and he would rail about the rapists, the murderers, the terrorists, the criminally insane: These immigrants, we have got to stop them.

Well, I can tell you this: More than 70 percent of the people who have been detained have no criminal records whatsoever. They are American citizens—some—and they are workers and par-

ents with clean records. They are peaceful protesters and community members who are carrying whistles. They are even children.

Federal agents have been sweeping up anyone they encounter, including bystanders who pause to record their activities. Then they scramble later to justify the detentions.

When you ask what happens to an individual who disappears from one of these scenes, you wait—sometimes for hours, sometimes for days—to find out where they have been taken. These actions violate due process—full stop. A democracy cannot survive with a law enforcement strategy of "arrest now and ask questions later."

The reach of these actions is only growing more brazen. Federal agents have confronted people outside of childcare centers and schools. Some Head Start Programs have moved online to protect families. Children have been zip-tied and yanked away from their families. In many cases, peaceful protesters have been met with tear gas. At Funston Elementary School near Logan Square, an entire playground had to be evacuated. Residents who locked arms to protect their neighbors were gassed in their own streets.

U.S. district court judge Sara Ellis issued a temporary restraining order earlier this month that prohibits agents from using tear gas indiscriminately on peaceful protesters, journalists, or anyone else not posing an immediate threat to law enforcement.

The orders of the court for these people—for these law enforcement agents sent in by President Trump—to wear video cameras, like so many police do every day, routinely, have been largely ignored. It is time for this court order to be enforced.

Just this weekend, chemical canisters were thrown into a crowd of residents who had gathered in the Old Irving Park neighborhood of Chicago. For what reason? Was it a terrorist meeting? No. It was a children's Halloween block party, and they threw in tear gas canisters.

Concerned onlookers and their children watched as Border Patrol agents tackled a landscaper to the ground and arrested him on a resident's front lawn. Agents then deployed multiple tear gas canisters at the neighbors without warning and even arrested one unsuspecting resident in his late sixties who had just returned from a morning run. The video footage shows the agents' recklessness, their seemingly disregard for the court order, and their ongoing violations of due process.

It is hard to describe what is happening here, but I don't have to; it is all captured on videotape.

Our Armed Forces are banned from using tear gas on the battlefield, but ICE and the CBP have no problem using it on Main Street in Chicago, IL. Recent footage even shows Gregory Bovino, the Border Patrol commander-at-large, who has been tasked with leading Operation Midway Blitz, deploying a tear gas canister on a crowd

of peaceful protesters in Little Village with no advance warning—despite a court order, with no advance warning.

DHS was quick to publish statements on social media regarding the incident. They stated that a “mob of rioters” provoked the attack, but the video shows that was a lie.

Judge Ellis called Mr. Bovino to court this morning to answer for the Federal agents’ continued indiscriminate use of tear gas in the streets of Chicago, pepper spray, and other excessive force. She opened the hearing by reading her previous order out loud. Given recent events, she wondered whether her order wasn’t clear. Immigration agents didn’t bother to read it, or if they read it and understood it, they decided to ignore it and challenge the authority of the court.

Judge Ellis said:

[K]ids dressed in Halloween costumes, walking to a parade, do not illicit an immediate threat to the safety of a law enforcement officer. They just don’t.

At the hearing, she instructed Bovino to appear before the court to provide daily reports moving forward. Bovino also agreed to undergo training for body cameras and begin wearing one as soon as Friday.

In light of these alarming abuses, I am working to fulfill my role under the Constitution as a Member of Congress with the authority to conduct oversight of the executive branch. The Trump administration claims to be the most transparent in American history, but when Senator DUCKWORTH and I recently arrived at the Broadview ICE processing center to provide oversight, we were barred from viewing it.

If this were truly a lawful operation targeted on public safety threats—the rapists, the murderers, the terrorists, and the criminally insane—they wouldn’t stop us from seeing who was being held. DHS would welcome the oversight. Instead, they hide. What do they not want us, the American people, to see?

The Trump administration has turned Federal Agencies into tools of political intimidation. They have targeted cities and States run by Democrats who didn’t vote for the President in the last election.

Operation Midway Blitz is a desecration of all the basic liberties guaranteed by the Constitution. But Chicagoans and Illinoisans are not backing down. We have survived a flood; we have survived a fire; we have survived disco night in Comiskey Park, and we will survive this as well. They are linking arms and demanding accountability, and they are refusing to be silent in the face of intimidation and injustice. I am going to continue to be part of that effort.

There is a guarantee under this Constitution of freedom of speech. As long as we are engaged in nonviolent activity, that Constitution protects us. The people of Chicago and Illinois deserve so much better. They deserve a Federal Government that honors one of its

highest duties, the duties to defend the rights and freedoms of all people.

I will continue to do everything I can to try and ensure our government once again lives up to their promise, and I hope my colleagues will join me.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. RES. 466

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, American families are struggling to pay for groceries and rent. Federal workers are missing paychecks. Americans across the country are watching as their health insurance premiums skyrocket.

But what is President Donald Trump focused on? He has pardoned a convicted crypto billionaire who helped the Trump family get even richer.

Changpeng Zhao, known as CZ, founded Binance—a giant crypto exchange that became a home for terrorists, child abusers, and other criminals. Both Republican and Democratic policymakers have been ringing the alarm on Binance for years. Two years ago, several of my Republican colleagues warned that this crypto platform was facilitating “significant illicit finance activity” and that it could “be providing material support to entities engaged in terrorism under Federal law, or being willfully blind to the fact that it may be doing so.” Another one of my Republican colleagues warned that CZ was misleading the public about Binance’s operations in China.

Republicans and Democrats were right to be worried. Binance facilitated financing for terrorist organizations like ISIS, Hamas, and al-Qaida. It opened the spigot for Iran. Binance made it easier to finance child sexual abuse. One Binance employee even wrote that they needed a banner that said:

[I]s washing drug money too hard these days? Come to Binance, we got cake for you.

Binance put its profits ahead of following the law and ahead of America’s national security. This was criminal activity. Binance pleaded guilty to multiple criminal charges and was required to pay a penalty of more than \$4 billion. CZ pleaded guilty to criminal charges and went to prison for willfully failing to maintain an effective anti-money laundering program that could have prevented financing these terrorist and drug traffickers.

Oh, but CZ got a lucky break. A month after he was released from prison, Donald Trump was elected President, and CZ had bet on the right horse. Remember, CZ is still the biggest shareholder in Binance, and right before the election, Binance reportedly offered to strike a crypto business deal with the Trump family. When Trump launched his own crypto venture, Binance allegedly wrote the code. And now, all of this is paying off big time for CZ, Binance, and the Trump family.

In May, a United Arab Emirates investment firm used the Trump family’s stablecoin to buy a \$2 billion stake in Binance, and President Trump and his

family will make millions of dollars in fees and interest off just that one deal. In the middle of all of this, CZ applies for a pardon. And last Friday, Donald Trump gave it to him.

When asked about his pardon of CZ, the President said that “a lot of people say he wasn’t guilty of anything.” But one of my Republican colleagues rightly said:

He was convicted. He’s not innocent.

Once again, President Trump has shown the American people that he is willing to turn a blind eye to money flowing to terrorists and child abusers so long as it lines his own pockets. Pardoning convicted crypto billionaires sends a message: If you have money and the right connections, you don’t have to follow the law. You get a special deal after you have broken the law.

Congress needs to stop this kind of corruption. Today, we can send a message, a message that President Trump’s pardon is wrong. We also have an opportunity to head off more corruption as Congress considers crypto market structure legislation. If Senate Republicans don’t let us fix this, then the Senate Republicans own this corruption and lawlessness.

I yield the floor to my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. President, I rise today in support of Senator WARREN’s resolution condemning President Trump’s decision to pardon Changpeng Zhao.

Last week, President Trump once again put his wealthy allies, family members, and business partners ahead of the public trust when he granted a pardon to the founder of Binance.

In 2023, Mr. Zhao was sentenced to prison after his company pleaded guilty to serious crimes, including failing to prevent money laundering and letting billions of dollars flow through Binance to sanctioned regimes and criminals, to facilitate child sex abuse, drug trafficking, and terrorism.

At the time, the Treasury Department estimated that Binance had allowed over 1½ million currency trades that violated American sanctions, including hundreds of millions of dollars that shirked sanctions against Iran, against Syria, against Cuba, and against Russia. For these crimes, Binance paid one of the largest fines in U.S. history: \$4.3 billion in fines. Yet, after serving only a fraction of his sentence, President Trump stepped in to grant Zhao a pardon and wiped his slate clean.

Why? Why do such a thing? Because Mr. Zhao is part of a wide web of financial interests tied to the President and his allies—that is why—including a crypto venture that poured billions into Binance.

The President’s pardon came after a stablecoin from World Liberty Financial—the Trump family crypto venture—was used to purchase a \$2 billion stake in Binance, marking the most

significant use to date of that Trump Binance stablecoin and once again increasing the value of the Trump family holdings.

That is not the use of a pardon to correct an injustice; that is the use of a pardon to commit an injustice. That is corruption of the most blatant kind, and it is illustrative of the same message Donald Trump continues to send donors and friends: If you have got enough money or the right political connections, the law simply doesn't apply to you.

The President isn't using the power of his office to ensure hungry families have access to food next month. He is not using the power of his office to make sure that Americans can afford to pay for their healthcare. He is using the power of his office to pardon a convicted billionaire and one who just happens to be doing business with the Trump family crypto platform, World Liberty Financial.

We have seen this story before. And this is just the latest example of the President's use, abuse of the pardon power as a means of rewarding wealthy donors, family members, allies, and benefiting himself personally.

We saw it when Trump pardoned corporate executives convicted of bribery and campaign finance crimes as a thank-you for donating millions to his campaign. We saw it in his first term when he pardoned operatives like Roger Stone, Paul Manafort, and Steve Bannon who helped him or his allies evade accountability. And we saw it when he issued sweeping "unconditional" pardons for 1,500 individuals involved in the January 6 attack on this Capitol, including many who were convicted of violent crimes, violent acts, against law enforcement.

In fact, the President even stacked the offices tasked with reviewing pardon applications with his allies, installing Ed Martin as pardon attorney at the Justice Department after his failed nomination to be U.S. attorney for DC.

In case after case after case, the message has been clear: Loyalty to Donald Trump is more important than the rule of law; it is more important than anything in the public interest.

This is not what the Framers intended when they gave the President the authority to grant clemency. And they certainly never envisioned it as a "get out of jail free" card for political allies, campaign donors, and business partners.

But this administration has turned the pardon power into a tool for corruption and self-dealing, which is why Senator WARREN and I have introduced this resolution to shine a light on the rampant corruption of this administration and to hold those responsible accountable.

I urge my colleagues to join us in sending a clear, bipartisan message that the U.S. Government should act in the public interest, not the financial interest of the President, and that the pardon power must not be for sale.

With that, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 466; further, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Wyoming.

Ms. LUMMIS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, article II, section 2, clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution gives the President complete discretion to issue executive clemency. In *Ex parte Garland* in 1866, the Supreme Court even said that the President has "unlimited powers in respect to pardons, extending to every offense under the law."

Congress must be mindful of its proper role as part of our constitutional separation of powers. For those constitutional reasons alone, I cannot support this resolution.

With respect to Binance in particular and the individual who was the subject of this pardon specifically, I continue to have concerns with their past activity that may have facilitated illicit finance. In October 2023, House Financial Services Committee Chairman FRENCH HILL and I wrote a letter to the Department of Justice urging that prosecutors take a close look at whether Binance was willfully blind to bad actors using their digital asset exchange for illicit purposes and whether Binance may have facilitated fundraising relating to the October 7 attacks on Israel. I continue to stand by my letter today.

This is why I am working day and night on bipartisan digital asset market structure legislation which will ensure that commonsense illicit finance rules apply to digital asset exchanges and that bad actors that use digital assets are rooted out.

There is a renewed sense of optimism and energy around market structure talks today, and I am hopeful that we will have legislation on the Senate floor before the end of this year.

I want to make one final note, the hypocrisy that is patently obvious here. Where was the outrage from my colleagues when President Biden brazenly pardoned his own son for crimes he absolutely committed? And don't forget, President Biden repeatedly told the American people before an election that he would not use his constitutional pardon power to pardon his son.

That hypocrisy is staggering. The American people delivered a decisive mandate for President Trump, and that includes his constitutional authority to issue pardons. Democrats need to accept the election results and stop their partisan theatrics every time this President exercises his legitimate powers.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I am noticing that the Senator, rightly, points out that the President has the power to pardon. There is nothing in our proposed resolution that tries to take that away from the President. We understand that.

But we do think it is time for Congress to use its voice for this U.S. Senate to stand up and say: Pardoning a convicted criminal who has facilitated child trafficking, who has facilitated drug trafficking, who has facilitated terrorism around the world is a really bad idea.

That is what this resolution is all about. So I understand that the Senator has concerns, but those concerns could be registered by the Republicans by simply signing on to a resolution that says we do not believe it is right to pardon someone under these circumstances.

I am glad to hear that the Senator is working on a market structure bill that will presumably avert this kind of problem and deal with the corruption of the Trump family as it relates to cryptocurrency. So I look forward to seeing that and just can't wait to see what the provisions are that stop Donald Trump from this kind of self-dealing and from what appears to be bribery right out in the open for the entire world to see.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. President, I just want to join in raising a few points in response to our colleague. First, the pardon power is not absolute. If the pardon power were absolute, a President could order vast branches of the U.S. Government to break an infinite number of laws and then simply pardon all of the offenders.

The Constitution is not interpreted as a matter of constitutional law so as to negate all other sections of the Constitution. If it were absolute, it would negate all other sections of the Constitution. It is not absolute.

But we are not contesting whether the President has the power to grant this particular pardon. What we are contesting is the morality of doing it. What we are contesting is whether we should sit blindly while the pardon is used in such a corrupt fashion toward friends and allies and to enrich the President's family.

The fact that he may have the power to do it doesn't make it right to do and the fact that he may have the power to do it doesn't prevent us from condemning it.

And by the way, vis-a-vis President Biden, I did condemn the use of his pardon, but that certainly does not justify the use of the pardon here.

It simply cannot be, should not be the case that a President gives a pardon to a convicted criminal who has helped launder money to avoid sanctions on our adversaries and that we

simply shrug and say: He has the power to do it, and we shall not condemn it.

We should condemn it. And the absence of condemnation, I think, will only be an encouragement for the President to continue abusing the pardon power.

Mr. President, I urge support for the resolution, and I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for offering it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Ms. LUMMIS. Mr. President, I renew my objection as someone who was spied on by the Biden Justice Department—one of eight Senators to be spied on—in violation of the separation of powers.

I respect the separation of powers. And in this case, the separation of powers protects the President of the United States' pardon power. We need to protect it as well.

For those reasons, I further object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I ask permission to display on my colleague's desk my office supply of ground coffee.

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

TARIFFS

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I rise to speak about a vote that we will cast in a few hours with respect to President Trump's imposition of a 50-percent tariff on all goods coming from Brazil.

President Trump's tariff regime—global tariffs, Brazilian tariffs, Canadian tariffs, tariff deals announced then paused, tariff deals negotiated, exceptions granted and, in some cases, not granted—has created huge chaos in the national economy.

Three universities looked at the Virginia economy in the last month, and a summary of those three universities' reports was published in a Virginia publication last week titled "Virginia's GDP Growth Drops 6.2% to 1.7%."

And the analysis of this precipitous decline—a 75-percent decline, nearly—in the Virginia GDP in the first year of Donald Trump's Presidency cited a number of factors: mass layoffs of Federal employees and contractors, cancelation of highly valued economic development projects, clawback of research funding and other programmatic funding.

But, importantly, a key component affecting the Virginia economy and the national economy right now is the President's chaotic tariff regime.

Tariffs are attacks on American consumers; tariffs are attacks on American businesses; and they are attacks that are imposed by a single person: Donald J. Trump.

In Virginia, we are seeing it nationally. We are seeing the effects of the Trump economy, and it is well-summarized in the reports I referenced: fewer jobs, jobs declining; higher prices, whether it is food, building supplies, energy, healthcare higher prices; and slower growth.

I want to talk about one aspect of this economic malpractice, the imposition of tariffs, and, in particular, the imposition of tariffs on Brazil.

The President has imposed a tariff on Brazil of 50 percent on all the products that the United States imports from Brazil. I want to get to Brazil and the tariffs and the effect it is having on American consumers in a minute, but first, what is the power that the President cites enabling him to put such a sizable tariff on Brazilian products?

What he cites is a statute called IEEPA dealing with international economic emergencies. And that is a statute that was passed by Congress, signed into law decades ago, allowing the President, under some circumstances, to take actions following the declaration of an international emergency.

What is an international emergency?

The IEEPA statute 50 U.S.C. section 1701 says that the emergency that a President must declare is "any unusual and extraordinary threat, which has its source in whole or substantial part outside the United States"—the threat being to the "national security foreign policy or economy of the United States, if the President declares a national emergency with respect to such threat."

So the 50-percent tariff on all products from Brazil is justified by President Trump declaring that Brazil represents a national security threat.

The 50-percent tariff was imposed in two actions: The President imposed global tariffs on most nations in the world in April and imposed a 10-percent tariff on Brazil in that action, but then added an additional 40 percent in a ruling from the White House at the end of July, combining to be a 50-percent tariff.

Now, Mr. President, you have followed President Trump's logic on tariffs. The global tariffs that were imposed were imposed because he claims other nations are ripping America off in trade—other nations are ripping America off in trade.

They are selling us more of their stuff and not buying enough of our stuff, and the President says that is a rip-off.

I disagree with him on whether or not that is a rip-off, but you would have a hard time making a case that Brazil is ripping off the United States in trade. We have a trade surplus with Brazil. Many of the other nations that the President has imposed tariffs on, there is a trade deficit as measured by goods. The President usually doesn't look at the deficit in goods and services. If you look at both, the picture actually looks much better for the United States.

But Brazil, we have a trade surplus with Brazil of nearly \$7 billion in goods and nearly \$23 billion in services annually. Last year, the trade surplus we had with Brazil was \$30 billion. They buy 30 billion more of our stuff than we buy of their stuff.

So that makes Brazil a very unusual—a very unusual—subject or tar-

get of a tariff regime designed to stop other nations from ripping us off.

So if that is not the emergency—if we are in trade surplus with Brazil, if that is not the emergency—why is the President declaring that there is an emergency with Brazil that warrants taxing American consumers by raising the price of any goods brought in from Brazil by 50 percent?

This has got to be the most unusual use of IEEPA in American history. It is the most extreme and illogical declaration of an emergency in American history, and that is saying a lot because President Trump declared an energy emergency on day one of his tenure, even though America was producing more energy than at any time in the history of the United States. Oil, gas, wind, solar, battery storage, we are the leaders in the world in energy production, but President Trump declared an energy emergency so he could get an E-ZPass lane around environmental regulations to oil, gas, and coal projects.

So I thought that emergency declaration was pretty extreme, but I have a more extreme one: President Trump is unhappy that Brazil is prosecuting a friend of his.

The former President of Brazil, on his way out the door, inspired a lot of people to try to protest and even overturn the peaceful transfer of power when he lost an election. So Brazil is prosecuting him under Brazilian laws. When the President heard that former President Bolsonaro was being prosecuted, he threatened 50-percent tariffs if you don't stop the Bolsonaro "witch hunt" trial.

How is that trial an emergency for the United States? How is that trial a threat to American national security or our economy?

The President is mad that a friend of his is being prosecuted. How is that an emergency?

We went on. As the trial got underway in the middle of July, FOX News: "Trump calls for immediate end to 'unjust' trial of former Brazilian President Jair Bolsonaro."

"Unjust trial."

I don't think President Trump is a lawyer, and I know he is not a Brazilian lawyer. I doubt he has an expertise in Brazilian law. By what right would he call that trial unjust? By what right would he claim that the trial of this President for trying to inspire the overturn of power—by what right would he claim that that is an emergency for the United States?

President Trump wasn't done. By making these demands and threatening tariffs, he had his administration take another step—highly unusual: "US sanctions Brazilian judge for prosecuting Trump ally Bolsonaro" until the end of July.

I am threatening tariffs; I am claiming that the prosecution is unjust. The United States even used sanctions power that Donald Trump has the unilateral ability to use to sanction the judge presiding over the case.

Go back to the definition that I read you earlier.

How is a prosecution of a potential Brazilian lawbreaker an “unusual [or] extraordinary threat . . . to the national security, foreign policy, or economy of the United States”?

I would assert, if we allow President Trump to declare this prosecution an emergency, we will have given any President a completely blank check to invent an emergency and do whatever they want and bypass Congress for doing so.

This is not an emergency, and that is why I have filed, with other Senators, a resolution to terminate President Trump’s emergency.

But this isn’t just about a misuse of Executive power. It has real-life consequences. Let me just bring up one that, I have to admit, I am really biased about, which is coffee.

Like a lot of people in this Chamber, I drink too much coffee. Americans drink just about more coffee per capita than any country in the world, and coffee imports are the most significant agricultural import we bring into the United States.

I lived in a great coffee-producing country when I was a missionary, in Honduras. They produce a lot of coffee. The United States doesn’t produce so much. I think the President knows that in the United States the only places where coffee is grown are Hawaii and Puerto Rico. Nowhere else in the United States are there conditions that allow for the growth of coffee.

Sometimes, we put tariffs on products coming in from other nations to grow and inspire a domestic industry. If we make Brazilian steel more expensive, maybe we will make more steel in the United States.

I am here to tell you there is no amount of tariff that would turn the United States into a nation that could produce a lot of coffee. And if every bit of coffee that could be produced in Puerto Rico and Hawaii were produced, it would meet precisely 1 percent of the coffee that Americans drink.

So we bring in coffee, and our single largest source of coffee is Brazil. And 35 percent of American coffee comes from Brazil. The next source is Colombia, at 27 percent, and then other nations. Vietnam produces a good bit of coffee, and other nations in Central America produce a good bit of coffee. But the real powerhouse—and I can be sure that in my office’s supply of ground coffee that we use to make coffee every morning, there is a lot of Brazilian coffee in there. The real powerhouse is Brazil.

After the President announced that he was going to do these tariffs, the news started up right away. The prediction: U.S. coffee drinkers and businesses will pay the price for Trump’s Brazil tariffs.

Sometimes, the President likes to say that other nations pay them. No, this is a sales tax directly on those that consume the product, and that was the prediction.

And the prediction turned out to be true. The tariffs went into effect at the end of July. By September 12, 6 weeks later, CNN Business reported:

Coffee prices haven’t surged this much in decades.

“Haven’t surged this much in decades”—and the surging is very, very noticeable.

By the end of July, coffee prices kept surging, and it is likely to get worse. By the end of July—remember, at the end of July, there was only the 10 percent imposed on Brazil in April. The extra 40 percent didn’t kick in until the end of July. But coffee had already surged 14 percent at the end of July, from July a year before.

I don’t have the chart to show you today. The statistics just came out about September. The price of coffee, a staple in virtually every American household, has increased by 40 percent between September 2024 and September 2025. And every American experiences it at the grocery store when they are buying coffee, and every American experiences it when they are in coffee shops purchasing coffee.

I held a roundtable with small businesses in Northern Virginia, two Fridays ago, at a tea shop out near Reston called Eldon Street Tea Shop. And I had tea shops—they are getting hit by tariffs because tea comes from nations like India, China, and Vietnam. And I had coffee shops, and I had chocolate shops. All of these are products that are being imported, and they are all being dramatically affected.

And these small businesses said: If you have a chance, Senator, please do something. Please do something to stop this tariff madness.

And so that is why I am on the floor today. I have used coffee as an example because I didn’t want to bring a side of beef in and put it on the desk. We get a lot of beef from Brazil. Fifty percent tariffs have dramatically driven up the price of ground beef in supermarkets all over this country.

People are paying more for coffee. They are paying more for beef. They are paying more for fruits and vegetables that come from nations that have been socked by Trump tariffs.

People are paying more for building supplies. People are paying more for energy. People are paying more for healthcare.

That is why the economist who looked at the Virginia economy said the Trump economy is one of higher prices, fewer jobs, and slower growth.

It is my hope that my colleagues will stand up for their constituents and say: Enough is enough.

No President, Democrat or Republican, should be able to declare a national emergency, justifying the imposition of 50 percent tariffs, because a friend of theirs is being prosecuted for breaking the law in another country. If this body allows that, this body will be opening the door for untold mischief committed by future Presidents who will decide: I can declare anything an

emergency, and the Senate will just lay down and let me walk over them and not speak out against it.

And it also is important for us to acknowledge that this isn’t just about an abuse of Presidential power. It is about abuse of Presidential power that people are feeling every time they walk down a grocery store aisle to buy coffee for their families, to buy ground beef for their families.

I hope my colleagues will join me in an effort to reverse the declaration of a national emergency and save everyday people and businesses some money.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, you know, President Trump has single-handedly raised taxes more than any President in my lifetime. He has, without any consultation or approval from Congress, imposed billions of dollars in new tariffs.

These are taxes. They are paid for by the American people. They hurt small business owners who need raw materials that just aren’t available here in the United States.

They cut off crucial export markets for our farmers when other nations inevitably retaliate, and they are sending prices soaring across the board, from big things like cars to everyday essentials like groceries.

Trump’s tariffs have already raised retail prices for families by 5 percent—5 percent—and this year alone, his tariffs are expected to cost American households an average of \$1,800. That is staggering.

Still, nearly every Senate Republican has refused to vote with us to end this chaos. I will say it another way: Republicans are refusing to stop President Trump from raising taxes on working families.

Now, we all saw Republicans move Heaven and Earth this year to shovel more tax breaks at billionaires. But you know, when it comes to taxes on working families, well, they are downright eager to force families to pay more every time they go to the supermarket.

I am not going to let this get swept under the rug, especially not when Trump shows us every day that his tariffs are not about any sort of economic strategy or any real emergency. Trump’s tariff policy is as strategic as a toddler who plays with a light switch.

Last week, we saw Trump raise taxes on Americans. Why? Because he was mad that Canada ran an ad quoting Ronald Reagan. That is about as ridiculous as it gets.

My State shares a border with Canada. There are countless families and businesses that span our northern border, people who have built businesses that rely on strong trade relationships, from farmers who send their crops north to shops that bring in products, to towns that serve tourists and visitors that come down from our neighbors. And these Washington business

owners are all having their livelihoods completely turned upside down on a whim by President Trump.

And, again, let's be clear. All Canada did to unleash more blind fury and boneheaded tariffs from President Trump was quote President Ronald Reagan.

Now, for all the policies I disagree with, Reagan at least had enough sense to understand that we, the American people, are the ones who pay those tariffs.

For my colleagues, these are the words that Donald Trump does not want you to hear. This is what Reagan had to say about tariffs, verbatim:

Over the long run, such trade barriers hurt every American worker and consumer.

Then the worst happens: markets shrink and collapse; businesses and industries shut down; and millions of people lose their jobs.

But do you know what? If Republicans don't want to listen to Reagan this time, well, then how about they start listening to American families and farmers and small businesses back in their own home States, because as someone who has had countless discussions about tariffs with the people that I represent back home, I have no doubt Republicans' own constituents will tell them firsthand just how painful Trump's trade war has been for them.

I have heard from businesses across my home State of Washington that are getting crushed by Trump's tariffs: an Asian grocery store that sells goods you simply have to source from abroad, like green tea; coffee shops that are getting hit, as the Senator just talked about, since most of our country can't grow coffee beans; clothing stores that tell me they are struggling with higher prices for cotton canvas, or zippers, threads, and buckles.

And then there are farmers—across my State and, really, across the country—that are getting boxed out of key markets by these trade wars Trump is starting left and right for no reason.

And there are the jobs at our ports that are threatened as every new chaotic tariff Trump decides to tweet out whittles away at imports and exports alike. It grinds our really busy, bustling ports to an absolute standstill, and that puts thousands of jobs in jeopardy.

Foreign imports are now down by a third at our ports in Seattle and Tacoma—a third. The reality of Trump's tariffs is painfully obvious to families and business owners who are bearing the brunt of this ham-fisted trade war.

You can't just "make it in America" when the "it" in question is fruits and vegetables we can't grow at scale here in the United States. You can't just "make it in America" when even making something here requires parts and raw materials from across the globe. There are just higher prices for working families, tighter margins for our struggling businesses, and even more worry for our families and our businesses who are being pushed to the edge.

Families are feeling those price hikes every single day. Small businesses in my State and across the country are facing very difficult decisions right now in trying to decide whether they can even keep their doors open. Right now, people across America, across party lines, across economic backgrounds, and across nearly every divide imaginable are now speaking out.

The time has come now for Republicans to actually listen. The time has come to hold President Trump accountable for raising prices on families across the board. The time has come to end President Trump's new taxes on everything. And the time has come for Congress, us, to start asserting our authority on tariffs, instead of ceding every single part of our jobs to a President who is joking he is the Speaker of the House.

Is he going to start calling himself majority leader too?

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in voting for this resolution so we can start rolling back Trump's taxes on Americans and take some pressure off our families and small businesses in the States that we are all here to represent.

I yield the floor.

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

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I rise to support my colleagues Senator Kaine and Senator Paul on their joint resolution to terminate Donald Trump's order placing blanket tariffs on products Americans buy from Brazil. I am going to start with the impact on Americans.

Donald Trump's unilateral tariff spree is an unprecedented tax on American families who are already struggling. The tariffs on Brazil are no different. We get lots of coffee from Brazil, and coffee prices are up 21 percent from a year ago. Ground beef is up 13 percent from last year—that is according to FOX News—and Brazil is a major supplier. But instead of getting rid of these tariffs, Donald Trump is sending \$40 billion to subsidize ranchers in Argentina.

I recently held townhall meetings at home, and surprisingly not a single Oregonian told me they wanted to pay more for their morning coffee, or more for a hamburger.

In all, Donald Trump's tariffs are going to cost the average American family more than \$2,000 this year, according to the Yale Budget Lab.

That, Mr. President, is the what—higher prices on coffee, beef, and building materials Americans get from Brazil. Now I am going to talk about why.

Donald Trump didn't unilaterally slap those 40 percent tariffs on things we buy from Brazil to help the American worker. No, America had a \$7 billion trade surplus with Brazil last year. And while food prices in the United States are shooting up, Trump's tariffs have lowered food prices in Mexico and Brazil.

The real reason—and this is what is crucial—the real reason Donald Trump is imposing these tariffs, by his own words, is to settle personal scores, and pressure the Brazilian Government to let their corrupt former President off the hook. In his letter announcing the tariffs, Donald Trump called the prosecution of former President Bolsonaro "a witch hunt." Colleagues, Mr. Bolsonaro was convicted of masterminding a failed coup.

There is no way that taking money out of Americans' wallets to protect one corrupt politician in South America makes even a bit of sense.

This is a brazenly illegal and corrupt effort by Donald Trump that, in my view, is directly hurting the American people. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote yes on the Kaine-Paul resolution to end the Brazil tariffs.

This body is going to vote on more of these resolutions in coming weeks. I see my friend from Kentucky here, who is joining me in a crucial one of those. My legislation with Senator Paul would repeal all of Donald Trump's global tariffs.

I am committed to seizing back Congress's constitutional role over trade, which is spelled out in the Constitution. It is my hope that colleagues on both sides of the aisle will exercise their best judgment on these crucial, key tariff issues, listen to constituents, and vote for Americans instead of for Donald Trump and corrupt foreign strongmen.

I yield and look forward to hearing my colleagues talk further today on this issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, "Taxation without representation is tyranny." This was the rallying cry of our Founding Fathers. This was the rallying cry of American patriots in the years leading up to the American Revolution. It was the rallying cry of militiamen at the Battles of Lexington and Concord. And it still should be the rallying cry of Congress. "No taxation without representation" is embedded in our Constitution. The Constitution forbids any one man or woman from raising taxes.

Revenue is not only a question for Congress, but the Constitution commands that taxation legislation originate in the House of Representatives. This is the only issue that specifically has to originate not only in Congress but in one specific House. Our Founders thought that the House of Representatives, elected every 2 years, was closer to the people, and the things they feared the most were big taxes and big government. They said taxes must originate in the House. Yet these taxes are originating with the White House.

The idea that no one should have taxes imposed on them without their consent is central to the ancient concept of what constitutes a free people. That principle is enshrined in the Magna Carta, that taxation should be

imposed only after obtaining the common counsel of the kingdom. It was reaffirmed in the 1689 English Bill of Rights when it declared that there shall be no taxation without the consent of Parliament.

In 1765, the American patriot who helped formulate the grievances against the British crown, James Otis, called for a defense of this principle by popularizing the phrase "Taxation without representation is tyranny." This principle was said by many to have been the principle—the spark—that sparked our Revolution.

Yet, today, the Senate is compelled to act because one person in our country wishes to raise taxes without the approval of the Senate, without the approval of the House, and without the approval of the Constitution.

The idea that one person can raise taxes is contrary to our founding principles. The Constitution forbids it.

As Montesquieu wrote in "The Spirit of the Laws":

When the legislative and the executive are combined and united in [one] person . . . there can be no liberty.

Our Founders took that lesson to heart and embedded that in the Constitution—the principle of the separation of powers as well as a system of checks and balances. They knew that combining the legislative and executive powers would lead the country down a path to tyranny.

Allowing taxes to be levied, doubled, tripled, and then one day perhaps forgiven is a recipe for chaos. The tariffs are implemented. The tariffs are canceled. The tariffs are delayed. The tariff rate changes daily. Just this week, the President added a special 10-percent import tax on Canada because he was mad about the nation's Ronald Reagan ad—an ad, by the way, which was showing Ronald Reagan verbatim speaking.

News flash to the administration: Reagan was a free trader. Reagan believed "that protectionism costs consumers billions of dollars, damages the overall economy, and destroys jobs."

Ronald Reagan's vision for America can be seen in our trading relationship with Canada. In 1986, President Reagan said that "our trade policy rests firmly on the foundation of free and open markets." Further, he said, "I recognize . . . the inescapable conclusion that all of history is taught: The freer the flow of world trade, the stronger the tides of human progress and peace among nations."

It was Bastiat, who wrote: When trade and when goods don't cross borders, armies will.

It is not a guarantee of peace, but one way to achieve peace is to attempt to have good relations and trade with all nations.

No country, no business, no family can plan a budget when the tax rates—the import tax rates—and the costs of every commodity are determined by the whims of one man. There are now tariffs on steel; there are tariffs on alu-

minum; there are tariffs on lumber, and they change day to day. But not one of these tariffs was voted on by the people's elected representatives in Congress. These tariffs are simply announced by Presidential proclamation.

Perhaps more fundamental than a debate over what these tariffs are, what the rates are, and what they do to our economy is the question of whether Americans ought to perpetually live under emergency rule. This administration has declared emergencies with over 100 nations. With these emergency declarations, the President claims the unilateral right to levy import taxes.

Think about this. What do you think of when you think of an emergency? You think of a war, a tornado, a famine. You don't think of trade policy that all of a sudden we have to give up on all of our constitutional prerogatives, all the separation of powers, all that is embedded in the Constitution because there is an emergency in trade policy. If that were true, imagine what emergencies might come forward; imagine where we would be and what lack of restraint would happen. And for Republicans, imagine what it is going to be like when someone from the other party is elected and they declare an emergency over the climate and ban cars and whatever might happen. We shouldn't be living this way.

People say Congress is messy; Congress goes to gridlock. It is called debate. It is called discussion. The only way we typically get somewhere is we have to agree with some people on the other side. That is one of the things we are trying to overcome now.

Our Founding Fathers anticipated a President might attempt someday to usurp the powers—the constitutional powers—of the legislature. Madison wrote that our constitutional government would pit ambition against ambition; the ambition of a President or ambition of a Congress to usurp power be checked by the other guarding their power; that we would limit the power of any one branch through checks and balances and prevent abuses of power.

Madison, if he were here today, would be aghast to witness today's Congress that seems to lack any ambition to defend the constitutional separation of power.

Emergency rule rejects the premise of a constitutional republic with limited powers and full accountability. Emergency rule is rule by one person.

We will perpetuate emergency rule that provides the President extraordinary powers to tax us without our consent. Is that what we are going to allow or will we restore constitutional government in which taxes are debated and voted on by the people's representatives? I, for one, still believe in the principle of no taxation without representation and will vote to terminate this contrived emergency and end these unconstitutional import taxes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the United States is stuck in the painful throes of one of the worst, longest government shutdowns in our history. Americans are calling out for leaders in the White House and Congress who will cut through the chaos and begin to restore order.

Last week, our President played his "Trump" card. In the middle of the shutdown with healthcare for 35 million Americans on the line, the President gave a green-light to a \$40 billion bailout—\$40 billion bailout; I had to read that twice—to Argentina. You heard me right. President Trump decided to prop up the far-right agenda in Argentina right before their elections and leave Americans nervous that they are going to be able to afford their healthcare. It doesn't make a lot of sense.

The real gut punch, he did it right as 20 million Americans are bracing for their healthcare costs to, in many cases, double or more when the ACA premium tax credits expire. If you think about that for just a moment, instead of spending \$40 billion to lower healthcare costs for 20 million Americans, President Trump decided that \$40 billion should go to Argentina. That is certainly not "America First."

Instead of spending \$40 billion to make sure that seniors can afford their insulin, cancer patients can continue their chemo, sick kids can see a doctor, President Trump is sending \$40 billion to Argentina. Twenty billion of that bailout is backed by all of you, the American taxpayer.

Trump promised to lower costs for working families, but food prices are up, electric bills are up, and now healthcare prices are going to be exploding. It is all because of what the MAGA Republicans and the President are doing.

Here is the reality. In July, Republicans passed their budget bill that is going to strip roughly \$1 trillion out of Medicaid and the Affordable Care Act. It is the largest cut to healthcare in the history of this country—the largest cut to healthcare in American history. It is exploding our national debt by trillions, and it gives pretty lavish tax breaks to some of our largest corporations and some of our wealthiest individuals.

As if working families needed another hit, 20 million Americans are going to see their healthcare premiums double when ACA tax credits expire at the start of the year. On this Saturday, every single American can log online and see the new cost of their premium if they are on the exchange. In Colorado, the Denver Post reported today that premiums will double—will double—and for far too many, this is going to be financially devastating. We are trying to get our arms around the increase that we are going to see in medical bankruptcies.

In Colorado, a family of four making a combined \$128,000 is going to have to

pay \$14,000 more for their healthcare. They are making \$128,000 and at the end of the month, they are still trying to make sure they balance the household budget and now they are going to have to spend \$14,000 more just on healthcare. If that family lives on the Western Slope in Colorado, west of the Rocky Mountain divide, or whether it is out on the Eastern Plains, they will pay even more, somewhere between \$16,000 and \$21,000 in additional premiums. Nobody has that kind of money.

I am not sure why the President doesn't understand that. Small businesses, some with very tight margins already, are going to be forced to choose between insurance or layoffs. Roughly 225,000 Coloradans are in that group that are going to see their premiums double—double. It is so much more expensive, that an estimated 4 million Americans will be priced out of their healthcare next year, including roughly 75,000 Coloradans.

And for those people with preexisting conditions, boy, that is taking a dangerous hit. If you think you are safe because you receive insurance through your employer, think again. People are going to continue to get sick regardless of whether or not they have healthcare. The fact is, of course, that more Americans get sick when they can't afford basic preventive care. That is why they call it preventive care.

Here is a startling fact that came out of a Harvard study in 2009. Americans without health insurance in any given year have a 40-percent higher risk of death than those with insurance in that same given year. I am going to repeat that. Americans without health insurance have a 40-percent higher possibility of dying than those with insurance in any given year.

The result? Where there are fewer insured Americans in the entire system, insurance companies raise premiums on those who do have insurance to make up the shortfall. That means we are all in the same leaky ship.

A little over a week ago, I spoke with one of the many Americans who will be impacted, a young woman named Mercedes who lives in Commerce City, CO. Mercedes and her family, U.S. citizens, live in a district represented by Congressman GABE EVANS, who has been a vocal advocate of Trump's budget bill, the same budget bill that is going to cut \$1 trillion from Medicaid and the Affordable Care Act. In Representative EVANS' district, one in four Coloradans are on Medicaid, including 86,000 children—86,000 children—one in four people on Medicaid.

Just over 7 weeks ago, Mercedes's family of three became a family of four. She gave birth earlier than expected to a baby girl. Her newborn spent 49 days in the intensive care unit, the NICU, before they were finally able to bring her home last Friday. Doctors diagnosed their baby with a rare disorder that is going to require some level of specialized care for life.

Even now at home, their baby still depends on a home health nurse and a feeding tube. So when Mercedes recently opened a letter informing her that her insurance premiums are going to skyrocket once the ACA tax credits expire, it wasn't a function of being frustrated; for her, it was terrifying. Mercedes's premium is already more than \$1,000 a month and is about to jump even higher. In addition to running their business, caring for their newborn with a fragile health condition, and raising their 7-year-old daughter, Mercedes and her husband now have to worry about their ability to be able to afford healthcare, to be able to stay on the healthcare that they have. They have a baby who is fully dependent on expensive hospital care. If their premiums go up, how are they going to afford the NICU bills? What will they have to sacrifice? Will food take a cut? Will rent go into arrears? Will they afford their medications?

Mercedes doesn't have to go through this. No American should have to go through this. Mercedes isn't alone. There are 20 million Americans bracing for these types of cuts—20 million more people just like Mercedes who depend on their healthcare to afford their prescriptions, to keep a roof over their heads, and, importantly, to stay out of the hospital.

It doesn't have to be this way. All the President and MAGA Republicans have to do is extend the healthcare tax credits. If they can find \$40 billion to send to Argentina, they can almost assuredly find \$40 billion to begin to stop premiums from doubling for Mercedes and 20 million Americans.

I think we have lost our bearings. We lost our North Star in this. Healthcare isn't political. It impacts every single one of us, Republican or Democrat, urban or rural. And it often interrupts our lives when we least expect it, especially when we are most unable to afford it.

This problem is easy to solve. Republicans and Democrats can reopen the government today and fix this healthcare crisis. We need to start talking together and having a discussion, but we can work together and reopen the government.

Working families want us to take leadership on this. They want us to get back to the issues they sent us to Congress to solve to make life better for them and their communities and for us to hold down the costs that are making their lives more difficult. I think we need to listen to Americans. I don't think it is too late, but it is long overdue.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to display three charts during my remarks.

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

S.J. RES. 69

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, with me today is Mr. James Shea, one of my colleagues from my Senate office.

Mr. President, I want to talk today about the owls. There are 19 species—or kinds of owls—in the United States. Did you know that? There are 19, and I want to talk about two of them: the spotted owl and the barred owl. That is “barred,” B-A-R-R-E-D. Both of them are God's creatures.

I also want to talk today—and the Presiding Officer will understand what I mean in a moment—about the Federal Government's proclivity—repeated proclivity—to do the dumbest thing possible that won't work.

Now, the Federal Government, which can't even deliver the mail when it has the address right there on the front, and, more specifically, the Department of the Interior have promulgated a rule. This rule says that unless Congress stops them, they are going to hire hunters—right here—to kill 453,000 barred owls. There are only 4 million in the United States, but the Department of the Interior wants to kill 453,000 mama barred owls, daddy barred owls, and baby barred owls because the Department of the Interior thinks—says—that the barred owl is a better hunter than the spotted owl.

The Department of the Interior is not saying the barred owl is eating the spotted owl. The Department of the Interior isn't saying that the barred owl is hurting the spotted owl. The Department of the Interior says it wants to kill over 10 percent of the barred owl population because the barred owl is a better hunter than the spotted owl, and they want to tip the scales of nature in favor of the spotted owl even though the spotted owl is not on the endangered species list.

My resolution, which will be voted on tomorrow, will stop this nonsense.

First, I want to talk a little bit more about the barred owl. In doing so, I will talk a little bit about its cousin, the spotted owl. As I said, they are both God's creatures.

This is a barred owl. It is beautiful. If you have ever seen a barred owl, it has very, very soulful eyes. Their feathers are incredibly soft. It is called barred, B-A-R-R-E-D, because of the bars that run across here, as opposed to a spotted owl.

The barred owl—10 percent of which our brainiacs at the Department of the Interior want to kill—has been around for 11,000 years. Sometimes the barred owl is called a hoot owl. That may be the term you know it by best. The barred owl is about 2 feet long. It has incredible eyes. Man, it can see. It is like superman or superwoman. It has incredible eyes and incredible hearing.

The barred owl, like the spotted owl, is nocturnal. They come out at night. They hide during the day, and they come out at night.

The barred owl is a great hunter—a great hunter. The barred owl eats mice. The barred owl eats squirrels. The

barred owl eats snakes. The barred owl eats lizards. The barred owl eats spiders. The barred owl even eats bats.

The barred owl lives—as does the spotted owl, for that matter—in old-growth forests. In fact, I have a pair of barred owls that lives in the forest behind my house. They are great. They always come in pairs, about which I will talk in a second. In fact, you can attract barred owls—many people do—by building what is called a nest box, and you can have barred owls come and live if you live near a forest. If you are not handy like me and you want to know how to build a nest box, just go to YouTube.

Barred owls marry for life, and they mate for life. When a male barred owl is courting a female barred owl—I have seen videos; it is really cool—the male barred owl courts a female by bowing. The male barred owl bows, and it opens its wings up a little bit—it doesn't want to be intimidating to the female, so not full out, but it opens its wings up a little bit—and the barred owl wobbles its head back and forth, back and forth, side to side. If the female is impressed, the female says “I do,” and they stay married the rest of their lives together. That is why you see them in pairs.

They have babies once a year, generally two to five babies.

These are two of the babies that the Department of the Interior wants to kill. They are going to pay the same price, by the way, to the hunter to kill the babies as they are to kill the mama. They don't care. They just want to kill them all.

When the babies are little, little bitty, when they are born, they are not covered in feathers. Little babies are covered in soft, white down. They don't start getting feathers until about 2 weeks.

The mama barred owl stays with the babies for the first few weeks. Sometimes the babies, like Senators, fall out of the nest as they start exploring around, and the mama or the daddy barred owl—unless the daddy is out hunting for food—has to get them back into the nest.

The babies learn to fly after about 10 weeks.

Now, what does this have to do with the spotted owl, which is also one of God's creatures?

The barred owl is native. It is originally from the Eastern United States and southeastern Canada. It has existed there for 11,000 years. But over the past 100 years—100 years is just the blink of an eye in time—over the past 100 years, the Northeast has gotten more and more crowded, and the old-growth forests that the barred owl lives in have been cut down, and subdivisions have been built. So the barred owl, as happens all the time in nature, has started moving west, and it is moving west, and it is moving west. Now the barred owl is entering Washington State, Oregon, Northern California, and British Columbia in Canada.

Well, that is where the spotted owl lives. The spotted owl also lives in old-growth forests but not exactly in the old-growth forests in the West as the same place as the barred owl. The spotted owl prefers an old-growth forest at a higher elevation.

The barred owl is a better hunter. It is slightly bigger than the spotted owl. The barred owl is a better hunter than the spotted owl.

Let me say it again because there has been a lot of confusion about this. The barred owl doesn't hunt the spotted owl. In fact, many times, a barred owl and a spotted owl will get married. I know they are cousins, but that doesn't matter as they are distant cousins. Sometimes they get married, and they interbreed. So this isn't a question of one animal killing another. The Department of the Interior is mad at the barred owl because the barred owl is a better hunter. The barred owl is just a better hunter. That is just the way it is.

You know, it is just like the Senate's Presiding Officer. The Presiding Officer is better looking than me. I accept that. That is the way God made us.

God just made the barred owl a better hunter, and the Department of the Interior is all up in arms. They say this is threatening the spotted owl. Now, the spotted owl isn't on the endangered species list, but they say: This isn't fair. The barred owl is a better hunter than the spotted owl, and that is causing the spotted owl's population to decrease.

So the Department of the Interior, in its infinite wisdom, has come up with DEI for owls. They have come up with quotas for owls.

The barred owl, because nature, God—whatever you believe in—made them better hunters, now has to give up its rights—has to give up its life because the spotted owl is not as good of a hunter.

As I mentioned, the spotted owl and the barred owl don't always live in the same place. Out West, the spotted owl prefers higher elevations than the barred owl. But they do—it is undeniable—they compete for food, and they both live in old-growth forests.

Let me tell you something—and the Department of the Interior doesn't like to admit this. The spotted owl population was declining even before the barred owl decided to move. Do you know why? It had nothing to do with food. It had nothing to do with the barred owl. It had to do with the same thing happening on the west coast that has happened on the east coast. Many of the old-growth forests have been cut down to make way for more people. You might have noticed we have had a few forest fires, and they have been causing the population of the spotted owl to be reduced but not to the point of endangerment. The Interior Department just says they are threatened. That is the problem for the spotted owl. It is not the barred owl.

This regulation that I am trying to overturn was promulgated under Presi-

dent Biden's Department of the Interior, OK? Yet the Department of the Interior—I want to make this clear—under President Trump has embraced this rule. They think that this is the greatest rule—this is the greatest idea—they have ever heard of. It tastes like pumpkin pie to them.

In fact, I got a call from Secretary Burgum, whom I love and respect. He was as mad as a mama wasp. “Pull down that regulation.” He accused me of slandering the Trump administration.

I am not slandering the Trump administration. This was a President Biden regulation.

Now, I was polite with the Secretary, but I told him that he was confused and that he needed to call somebody. He had the wrong person on the line. The Secretary needed to call somebody who cared what he thought, because I think he is wrong. I think he is wrong. I think he and the other members of the administration and the Department of the Interior have decided to play God, and they are wrong for at least five reasons.

No. 1, their plan—their brainiac plan—which looks like it was designed by a heroin addict with a socket wrench, won't work. It won't work.

Now, let me tell you what they are going to do. They want to hire hunters—they want to hire Elmer here—to go out at night with a flashlight and shoot the barred owls. Now, this is at night, OK? The barred owl lives about 40 feet up off the ground and in a tree. Do you know what else lives about 40 feet up off the ground and in a tree? The spotted owl. Do you think that these cowboys, who are going disco because they have a Federal contract, are going to be able to always tell the difference between a barred owl and a spotted owl? They are going to shoot them both and let God sort them out because they are being paid.

Look, I am a duck hunter. I am not a big hunter, but I like to duck hunt and dove hunt. I eat what I kill. But, a lot of times, when I am duck hunting, there are different points for different species of duck. I can't tell which duck is which. I have passed up shots before because I thought it might be a mallard, when I can't kill any more mallard. Do you think these cowboys that they are going to hire from the private sector are going out there with their little flashlights—old Elmer here, with his little red hat—in the middle of the night with a flashlight are going to tell the difference or care about the difference between a barred owl and a spotted owl? No. They are going to shoot them both.

No. 2, the other reason it won't work is that spotted owls are not stupid. Once you start shooting at them, they are going to move up into Canada. The Canadians aren't dumb enough to do something like this. They are going to move up into Canada. They are going to wait until the shooting stops, and then they are going to come back

down. So what have we accomplished? Have we done anything for the spotted owl? No.

No. 3, I have been through this reg stem to stern. I can't find out whether this regulation prohibits Elmer Fudd from going out there and using lead shots. When we hunt ducks, you can't use lead shots. You use steel shots. Do you know why? Because a lot of times other birds and other animals will eat the lead shot and they die from it.

So these cowboys are going to go out, if they are not prohibited from using lead shots. Yes, they are going to kill some barred owls and spotted owls. They are going to end up killing eagles and hawks and other wildlife using their lead shots.

The second reason this won't work—let me say it again—the barred owls aren't the problem. The problem is that we are losing old-growth forests in the West, which is the habitat of the spotted owl. And where it is naturally occurring is where more people have moved—to Washington and North Carolina and Oregon—and we have wildfires that have burned our forests.

Don't go pick on the barred owl. You can kill every barred owl there is, and it is not going to help the spotted owl if you don't maintain the appropriate habitat.

No. 4, this is going to be incredibly expensive. This comes under the theme of "let's do the dumbest thing possible that won't work."

Our Department of the Interior has already issued one contract. I don't know how they got the authority to do it. But back in 2004, they issued a contract to a private vendor—Elmer here—to go kill 1,500 barred owls. I guess they wanted to test it out. Do you know what they paid? It was \$3,000 a bird—\$3,000 for a mama barred owl, \$3,000 for a daddy barred owl, and \$3,000 for a baby barred owl. Give me a break. And now they are going to go out and kill 453,000, over a billion dollars—over a billion dollars. It is not their money, but it is taxpayer money—on a plan that won't even work.

Here is what one person from the Department of the Interior said, in a rare moment of candor. He might have gotten fired. But he is a Wildlife and Fisheries agent. He told the press:

I think all we can really do is try our best to provide a habitat for spotted owls, and in the long run, we're just going to have to let the two species work it out.

The final reason this is a bad reg—and then I am going to wrap this up. I know that the bureaucrats at the Department of the Interior—I realize this—they are smarter, and they are more virtuous than you and I. I get that. But who appointed them God? Who appointed them God?

Barred owls are expanding their habitat because the forests in the East have been cut down. That is called adaptive range expansion. And do you know what? Whether you believe in God or nature or whatever, that happens every single day in our ecosystem. It is a nat-

urally occurring ecological phenomenon. It is a core behavioral characteristic of mammals.

All the barred owls are doing—they are not hurting anybody. They are just doing what nature teaches them to do.

We are going to change nature? We are going to control our environment to this extent? We are going to pass DEI for owls? We are going to pass quotas for owls? Spotted owls, good; barred owls bad. But the barred owls won't lose their constitutional rights. They will kill them. They are going to kill 453 of them, dead as Jimmy Hoffa. Give me a break.

This is foolish. This is reckless. This is expensive. It is unsupported by evidence. It is unnecessary, and it won't work. I cannot think—I cannot think—of a better example of the arrogance, the hubris of the Federal administrative state. If we let them go through with this, this will rank right up there with those \$10,000 Department of Defense toilet seats, except part of God's creation will already be dead.

Ecosystems are like markets. They regulate themselves. Trying to change nature is like trying to have a Federal Government direct a free enterprise system. It won't work. It never has, and it never will.

I don't mean any disrespect to anybody. I don't. I am not—well, I guess I am calling somebody Elmer Fudd. I don't know who they are going to hire, but I know they hired a bunch of Elmers and gave them \$3,000 a bird, and it didn't work. But this, to me, is just bone-deep, down-to-marrow stupid. I have rocks in my driveway that are smarter than this. I do.

Here is my advice to my friends at the Department of the Interior—and full disclosure: This thing is supported by President Biden's people, and it is supported by President Trump's people. Secretary Burgum loves this thing. He loves this idea like the Devil loves sin. He has a right to his opinion, but here is my advice: Life is hard—life is hard—but it is a lot harder when you are stupid. Don't do it. Pass my resolution, and let's stop this.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

S.J. RES. 81

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to S.J. Res. 81, which would terminate the rule of law national emergency declared with respect to Brazil.

I agree with my colleagues that tariffs should be more targeted to avoid harm to Americans. I have made precisely that point at the Finance Committee meeting in May.

We should consider more exemptions, whether for unavailable natural resources, capital equipment, or other key inputs.

It is equally important that enforcement guidance provides the clarity U.S. companies need to comply with tariffs and make critical business decisions.

Similarly, as the administration continues to negotiate with our trading

partners, I appreciate that my colleagues, as well as our constituents, may be nervous about what comes next. However, at this juncture, this resolution is counterproductive—counterproductive to helping American families and businesses of all sizes.

The President's historic trade negotiations are bearing fruit. President Trump already announced new deals—trade deals—with major trading partners, including, most recently, Cambodia and Malaysia. Other such announcements may still be forthcoming. I urge other trading partners to reach similar trading deals.

Consequently, S.J. Res. 81 is counterproductive to the progress already made by President Trump and to new gains that he can still achieve in the ongoing negotiations with our trading partners.

On April 30, the Senate rejected the joint resolution of disapproval on IEEPA-based reciprocal tariffs for the same reasons. And for these reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the Brazilian tariff resolution that is before the body, and I will speak briefly since I spoke about 4:30 about it.

The first point to mention is, this is a Presidential invocation of a very rare emergency power. The IEEPA statute says that it has to be an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security foreign policy or economy of the United States, and the President has to find the existence of such a threat.

What has the President said about the threat posed by Brazil? What is that threat posed to the economy, national security, or foreign policy of the United States?

The President has said it is Brazil's decision to prosecute its former President.

If you surveyed the American public and asked them about the Brazilian prosecution of former President Bolsonaro, 99 percent of the American public wouldn't even know about it.

How can this be a national emergency allowing the President to unilaterally impose a 50-percent tariff on goods from Brazil? We have a trade surplus with Brazil; \$7 billion a year in goods; \$23 billion in services. We have a trade surplus from Brazil.

This President has said that their prosecution of a disgraced former politician is a national emergency for the United States. How could that be?

If this is a national emergency for the United States, any President of any party could say that anything is a national emergency for the United States. So the first reason that I asked my colleagues to support this resolution is to not allow the President to end-run Congress and create a bogus emergency to unilaterally claim powers—in this case, trade powers—that are given to Congress in the Constitution.

And the second reason that I ask my colleagues to support this is that people are suffering—people are suffering. They are paying more for ground beef. A lot of ground beef comes from Brazil. They are paying more for coffee. Americans are the biggest coffee drinkers in the world. Coffee is the biggest imported product—agricultural—that we bring into this Nation.

Coffee prices have gone up by 40 percent in 1 year from the end of September of 2024 to the end of September of 2025 because of President Trump's tariffs. Thirty-five percent of our coffee comes from Brazil. Twenty-seven percent of our coffee comes from Colombia, being heavily tariffed right now. The third nation that grows coffee that comes to the United States is Vietnam, heavily affected by U.S. tariffs.

People are suffering. They are paying more for food, more for clothes, more for healthcare, more for energy, more for building supplies because of President Trump's tariff policy.

Trade is a power given to Congress in the Constitution that can be delegated to the President, but in statutes like IEEPA, we have retained the right when a President is going the wrong direction and our constituents need someone to stand up for them so they don't pay more than they should for their morning cup of coffee or the hamburger that they are having.

Congress has the power to roll that back and end these tariffs.

So for those two reasons—the fact that this is not an emergency that would have ever been within the contemplation of those who drafted this statute and the second, to save Americans some money, to save them a few bucks when they buy their cup of coffee every day—I ask for support for this resolution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I thank my friend the Senator from Virginia Senator KAINE for his great work not only on this proposal but on so many. He has been a watchdog for the American people, for the American consumer. And when these willy-nilly proposals that come out of Donald Trump's office and his head—whatever pops into his head—does such damage to the American people, Senator KAINE is the watchman at the gate trying to preserve some sanity in our tariff policy and some reduced costs for the American people.

Now, this week, the Democrats are forcing, as you can see, a series of votes here in the Senate to put an end—an end—to Donald Trump's reckless tariffs.

Six months ago, Trump promised liberation. Then he started a disastrous trade war that has brought chaos to the economy, confusion for small businesses, and high costs for American families. A recent analysis showed that Americans are eating 90 percent of the total cost of Trump's tariffs. Ninety percent is going right out of the pockets of the American family.

That is not liberation. It is a national sales tax. That is what these tariffs are. It is a financial nightmare for working and middle-class households. So today, Democrats will present Republicans with a simple vote: Do you want lower costs for families or tie yourself to Donald Trump as he runs our economy into the dirt with his trade war?

First vote happening tonight is to end Trump's tariffs on Brazil. Once again, I thank Senator KAINE for his leadership on this resolution and for speaking so urgently on the floor today.

In July, Trump declared a national emergency to increase tariffs on Brazil to 50 percent, using a totally bogus and ridiculous justification; the tariffs had nothing to do with improving trade relations with Brazil.

We, in fact, have a trade surplus with Brazil. They had nothing to do with trying to lower costs for the American people. This is Trump. This is the kind of bull that comes out of his administration, led by him. These tariffs were simply an attempt to bully Brazil into dropping corruption charges against Trump's MAGA buddy, former President Bolsonaro, and it has hurt Americans. It has hurt Americans.

The price of coffee—and Brazil is our largest importer of coffee. We import more coffee from Brazil than any other place—40 percent higher. Every American that wakes up in the morning to get a cup of java is paying a price for Donald Trump's reckless, ridiculous, and almost childish tariffs.

While Donald Trump uses his trade war to meddle in another country's politics, families at home are paying more and more for goods as commonplace, as I said, for coffee and lots of other produce as well.

Because of Trump's tariffs, everyone is paying more for their morning cup of coffee. But Trump doesn't care that you are paying more for your coffee. He is more interested in helping corrupt foreign leaders get out of jail than he is in helping lower costs for Americans.

And Americans know Donald Trump is stabbing them in the back. He promised lower costs on day one, and instead costs have continued to go up. It is one of the biggest reasons why his trade war is so unpopular.

A recent CNBC poll showed 56 percent of Americans disapprove of Trump's tariffs—56 percent. Today, and

through rest of the week, we will give our Republican colleagues a choice: Stand with Trump's idiotic, disastrous, and often juvenily inspired tariffs or stand with American families and vote to lower costs for people back home because the longer these tariffs are in place, the more damage it will cause for our economy and the more money families back home will pay.

So I urge my colleagues to vote yes on TIM KAINE's fine resolution and end Donald Trump's tariffs on Brazil.

Mr. President, I yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. All time is yielded back.

Under the previous order, the clerk will read the title of the joint resolution a third time.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

VOTE ON S.J. RES. 81

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mr. KAINE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 594 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Alsobrooks	Hirono	Rosen
Baldwin	Kaine	Sanders
Bennet	Kelly	Schatz
Blumenthal	Kim	Schiff
Blunt Rochester	King	Schumer
Booker	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cantwell	Lujan	Slotkin
Collins	Markey	Smith
Coons	McConnell	Tillis
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murkowski	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warnock
Fetterman	Murray	Warren
Gallego	Ossoff	Welch
Gillibrand	Padilla	Whitehouse
Hassan	Paul	Wyden
Heinrich	Peters	
Hickenlooper	Reed	

NAYS—48

Banks	Fischer	Moody
Barrasso	Graham	Moran
Blackburn	Grassley	Moreno
Boozman	Hagerty	Mullin
Britt	Hawley	Ricketts
Budd	Hoeven	Risch
Capito	Husted	Rounds
Cassidy	Hyde-Smith	Schmitt
Cornyn	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Justice	Scott (SC)
Cramer	Kennedy	Sheehy
Crapo	Lankford	Sullivan
Cruz	Lee	Thune
Curtis	Lummis	Tuberville
Daines	Marshall	Wicker
Ernst	McCormick	Young

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 81) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 81

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, pursuant to section 202 of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622), the national emergency declared on July 30, 2025, by the President in

Executive Order 14323 (90 Fed. Reg. 37739) is terminated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Executive Calendar No. 370.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Joshua D. Dunlap, of Maine, to be United States Circuit Judge for the First Circuit.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 370, Joshua D. Dunlap, of Maine, to be United States Circuit Judge for the First Circuit.

John Thune, Bernie Moreno, Katie Boyd Britt, Chuck Grassley, James Lankford, Pete Ricketts, Markwayne Mullin, Tim Sheehy, Jon A. Husted, Eric Schmitt, Jim Justice, James E. Risch, Tom Cotton, Steve Daines, Ted Budd, John R. Curtis, John Boozman.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session and be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

REMEMBERING VERGENE DONOVAN

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today, I pay tribute to a tireless civic leader from northwest Iowa who led a remarkable life of service for more than a century, richly steeped in family, faith, and citizenship.

On this very day, my friend Vergene Donovan will be laid to final rest, joining her parents Harry and Minnie Bleeker, her husband Ed, both siblings, and her eldest son who preceded her in life everlasting.

Vergene Edna Bleeker was born on March 4, 1924, on her parents' farm near Spencer, IA. For the next 101 years,

this outstanding Iowan pursued life with vim and vigor to make her community and our country a better place. Her birth during a late winter blizzard forecasted a gritty resilience that shaped her decades-long devotion to community service and tenacity to overcome adversity. The loss of her father during childhood shaped her tireless work ethic that she put to extraordinary use on the campaign trail for Presidential, congressional, gubernatorial, and local candidates for more than eight decades.

She met Edward Donovan, the love of her life, while working at a defense plant in California during World War II. It was love at first sight for these two Iowa lovebirds from Spencer and Spirit Lake. After getting married, they returned home to Iowa and celebrated their 75th wedding anniversary on August 24, 2017.

Five months after their wedding day, Ed joined the U.S. Armed Forces and served as a staff sergeant 8th Air Force—European Theater of Operations. He loaded eight missions on D-day. After the war, the Donovans settled down in Spirit Lake and raised a loving family rooted in their Lutheran faith. As an empty nester, Vergene's work ethic and special talents jumped into warp speed. She immersed herself into civic life, getting involved in numerous local boards and committees in Iowa's Great Lakes, from the arts to healthcare and politics. She was a charter member of the Lakes Art Center and served on the Okoboji Summer Theatre, Voluntary Action Center, Spirit Lake Centennial, Homestead Retirement, St. Luke's Lutheran Home, the local and State boards of the American Cancer Society, the Lakes Regional Hospital auxiliary board, Lutheran Women's Mission League, and White House Conference on Families, to name a few.

Vergene blazed a bright trail in grassroots politics and served in various leadership roles at the county and district levels. Serving as district and State board member of the Iowa Federation of Republican Women, Vergene edited its newsletter *The Iowa Indicator*. She donated these and other personal papers to the University of Iowa Libraries, Iowa Women's Archives.

By the grace of God, I crossed paths with Vergene in 1980, during my first campaign for the U.S. Senate. From that day forward, she was a loyal and indefatigable grassroots leader who became a trusted friend to Barbara and me. She served as my county chair in each of my eight campaigns for U.S. Senate.

While her political resume speaks volumes, her humility and generosity defined her approach to servant leadership. Over the course of countless campaigns, she met nine U.S. Presidents, including Eisenhower, Carter, Nixon, Ford, Reagan, George H.W. Bush, Clinton, George W. Bush, and Trump and befriended three Iowa Governors: Bob Ray, Terry Branstad, and Kim Reynolds.

Vergene received numerous awards for her life of service, including the State and national Outstanding American Cancer Society Award, 1985 and 1986; Outstanding National Volunteer Award, 1986; Harold Morgan Award, 1985; John McDonald Outstanding Republican in Iowa Award, 1995; honorary colonel in the Iowa Militia; and Republican Service Award in Dickinson County, 2002.

Vergene also was listed in *Who's Who in American Politics*, 18th Edition. That is an understatement. Candidates wanting to win election in northwest Iowa quickly figured out their campaign needed to have Vergene on speed dial if they wanted a successful turnout for events and votes in her neck of the woods.

Although her passion for politics contributed to her vitality and broadened her horizons across northwest Iowa, as well as the State and national political stage, Vergene's love for family, friends, and the Lord are her true legacy. From her treasured classmates of the Spencer High School Class of 1941 to her cherished book and bridge club members, Vergene's charismatic friendship and generosity will be deeply missed.

Each time I was in Vergene's company, she would greet me with a glowing grin and a big hug. We enjoyed many evenings together on the lakes of Dickinson County. Barbara and I are grateful for our decades of friendship with Vergene and Ed and send our deepest condolences to her family and loved ones, including her surviving children Jim, DeEtte, and Scott and her beloved 17 grandchildren, 22 great-grandchildren, and 8 great-great-grandchildren.

May her memory be a blessing. I have no doubt the members of her family tree will carry forward the seeds of civic stewardship planted by their matriarch and embrace Vergene's devotion to her faith.

To my dear friend, may you rest in peace in the Eternal grace of our Lord and Savior.

TRIBUTE TO JAMES GOSSERT

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to James for his hard work as an intern in my Washington, DC, office. I recognize his efforts and contributions to my office, as well as to the State of Wyoming.

James is from Shillington, PA. James is currently enrolled at Susquehanna University, where he is pursuing a bachelor's degree in political science. He has demonstrated a strong work ethic, which has made him an invaluable asset to our office. The quality of his work is reflected in his great efforts over the last several months.

I want to thank James for the dedication he has shown while working for me and my staff. It is a pleasure to have him as part of our team. I know he will have continued success with all