

When you are asking us for votes—when you are asking for Democratic votes—you can't just demand whatever you want and say: If you don't do it, then we are going to sit here—which is what the Republicans have done.

I would ask the Republican leader, as I have done so many times: Talk to the Democratic leader. Bring the President in the room.

I have been here many, many times when we have had to find a way out of a challenging situation. And you know who has always been at the table? The President, the majority leader, and the Speaker of the House, and the minority leaders—on both sides of the aisle. And that has not happened yet.

And that is why we are sitting where we are, where, today, my constituents who are hurting are saying to me: Where are the Republicans, and why are they not talking to you about how we solve this issue?

The majority leader said: Well, there are problems with it.

They could have done this months ago. And they say: Oh, now, we can open up the government, and we will talk about it.

What does "talk about it" do to my constituents? Because, last week, window shopping for next year's health plans actually started in my home State, and, this week, open enrollment begins nationwide. I am hearing from families in my State today who are panicked.

While Republicans are refusing to act on this and saying they are going to talk about it, their premiums—their family's premiums—are going through the roof, and their healthcare coverage is slipping out of reach.

There are so many stories. I have talked to small business owners. I have talked to patients, and I have talked to parents. And I have lifted up their concerns here on the Senate floor, and I am going to keep doing everything I can to shout out these stories from the rooftops, because, right now, Republicans are doing everything they can to ignore this and to say: Deal with it later.

And what is "later"? Well, later never comes.

Why do I know that? Because we brought up this issue, time and time again, throughout the summer, when the Republicans were giving away tax breaks to billionaires, and saying: This is an issue that is confronting us.

And it was "later" then. It is "later" now, and "later" is way too late.

There are many stories about this, too awful to ignore, and there are millions of families that are facing absolutely catastrophic price increases. I have heard from seniors whose premiums are increasing eightfold.

So in order to make the scope and scale of the problem that Republicans want to ignore and talk about later, I thought I would share a list—just the top lines—of what I am hearing from my constituents about how their healthcare costs are going to sky-

rocket if Republicans refuse to work with us, or even talk to us, about this issue and help us find a solution so we can all move on by saving the healthcare tax credits.

I am going to share some of those stories today.

There is Kathleen. She lives in Bel-lingham. Now, if Republicans refuse to act, she is going to see her monthly premium triple.

Sharon, in Thurston County, in my State—if Republicans refuse to act, her premium is going to double, increasing by over \$100 a month.

And we are just getting started, because if Republicans refuse to act, Nannette in Tumwater and Stacya in Seattle are both going to see their premiums increase by \$400 a month—not a year, a month.

If Republicans refuse to act, Leslie's husband in Brewster is going to see his premiums increase by \$780 a month. Tom will see his premiums increase by over \$800 a month. Jennifer will see her premium go up by at least \$890 a month.

And, I have to emphasize, we are talking about families, seniors, small business owners, people who cannot afford that kind of increase.

And yet if Republicans refuse to act, Jason in Seattle is going to see his premium increase by over \$900 a month; Maya in Woodinville, \$1,000 more a month. I can't even imagine that.

But if you think that is outrageous, well, Republicans don't think it is worth talking about—or talk about it later, when it is way too late, or pretend that they are going to do something about it, but not really.

Talk about a gun to their head, if we do not act, Diane in Wenatchee is going to see her premium increase by over \$1,400 a month.

Leighann told me \$1,500 a month that her premium will increase; Terry, a \$1,600-a-month increase; and the Banergee family told me they are going to see their premium go up by more than \$1,600 every single month.

The Republican plan: talk about it; do nothing. For all of us who have been here, we have been waiting for the plan for a long time and have never seen it—have never seen it. It is always just a plan.

Rebecca in Seattle will see her premium increase by more than \$1,700 a month.

By the way, that plan is not in writing. It is a thought in somebody's head that has never been told to anybody. What do we have here today? Republican silence.

James and his wife are going to see their premium go up by a completely unreasonable \$1,800 a month. Damian said his is going to go up \$2,000 a month. Why? Because Republicans are refusing to act. That is whom we are fighting for here today.

I could go on and on, but those cases I just told you about all came from Washington State. That is a drop in the bucket. There are several million

more examples just like this in red States across the country.

Bob in Idaho told me his premium will jump by nearly \$1,900 a month; Nancy in Florida, \$1,000 a month; Cheri in Tennessee will see her monthly costs go from \$10 to \$1,140.

I mean, we could do this all day. Yet Republicans can't be bothered to do it at all. These are their constituents. Nearly 4 million people in Texas rely on these tax credits. Republicans don't want to save over 4 million in Florida.

The increases they are going to face are unthinkable. In five States—all red States—families who rely on these tax credits are going to see prices more than quadruple. That is on average.

It is unthinkable, it is unconscionable, and totally untethered from reality for Republican leaders to think they can just ignore this tsunami or this price hike.

So I say to my Republican friends: You have to get your heads out of the sand. This is a real problem for families. Later is way too late, and I don't think it exists.

The majority leader just said that families don't know that they get this. There is something wrong with that? They find out that their healthcare—that they are being helped by their neighbors and their friends and the people in this country who say it is important for all of us to make sure our healthcare premiums are lowered? I would say to my Republican colleagues: Listen to your constituents. It is their health. It is their lives. They are telling you that. They want action. Open enrollment for this country starts Saturday. The time to act is now. So I hope they start listening.

Please join us at a negotiating table, not out here on the floor just throwing things around. Join us. The majority leader can call the minority leader and the President and get them in the room, which is what we always do when we have a challenge in front of us. That has not happened. That is unconscionable because people in this country are hurting.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

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

Mr. WELCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate execute the order of October 7 in relationship to S.J. Res. 77.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Committee on Finance is discharged and the Senate will proceed to the consideration of S.J. Res. 77, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 77) terminating the national emergency declared to impose duties on articles imported from Canada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. President, I want to speak on two topics, one after the other, healthcare and then tariffs.

#### HEALTHCARE

Mr. President, open enrollment will begin across the country on Saturday. Many have already received notice of new sky-high premiums, including, by the way, notices that went out to my fellow Vermonters. Many across the country will log on to the Marketplace on Saturday. It is a scary day for them because they will be checking to see what it will cost them next year to purchase the same healthcare that they have this year. Twenty-four million Americans are going to be doing that this Saturday.

Folks across the country are going to get some bad news; that without the tax credits that are in place now and are set to expire by the end of the year, their healthcare premiums are going to double, triple, and, in some cases, quadruple and even worse.

What Vermonters are finding—our website went up on October 15—is truly a shocking increase in premiums, and it is not affordable. By the way, these are folks, some of whom voted for Trump, some of whom didn't, but all of whom deeply care about their families and their small businesses and their farmers. I will give you an example.

A family of four making \$130,000 a year—a very good income in Vermont—would have paid \$1,200 a month in 2025. Next year, they are going to have to pay \$3,035. That is a \$22,000 increase. A family of four making about \$64,000 a year is going to pay 920 percent more for healthcare premiums. Obviously, that is going to mean they have to decide whether they are going to go without or somehow, some way, try to find a way to pay that, which they really won't be able to do.

Let me give some starters to make it very concrete about Vermonters. A woman named Sarah is going to see her premium go from \$217 a month to \$1,200 a month. This is a person who is 63, self-employed, and might have to go without healthcare for the first time in her life.

Cara, also self-employed, has had the same income for 20 years, really scraping by. She pays about \$100 a month for healthcare through the Marketplace. Her premium goes up to \$1,200.

Erica is paying \$1,166 for her family. The deductible for her family of three is \$15,000. This is barely insurance. Erica and her family make this premium work somehow, but I am sure it is not easy. Without the tax credits, her monthly premium goes to \$2,650.

Maria and her husband run a small food business in Vermont. He spends half the year fishing in Alaska. They pay just under \$240 a month, but they are looking at \$1,740 per month unless the Senate acts. That is for bronze plan, which you know is the lowest level plan. They will be paying about \$21,000 per year with a deductible of \$7,700 per person.

The examples I gave of Vermonters are going to be true in Indiana; they are going to be true in Louisiana; they are going to be true all across the country. We have been having this debate about a shutdown, but what we haven't been having is a negotiation about how to protect families from a rate shot that they can't afford that means they are really going to lose healthcare.

I do urge us and I urge the President to act aggressively to resolve this. It will help folks. Whether they are in a red State or a blue State, whether they identify as a Republican or Democrat or Independent, it just doesn't matter. We have a healthcare system that is too, too expensive—beyond reach—and it is crippling to our small businesses, our farmers, and our families.

#### TARIFFS

Mr. President, I want to address another topic, and that is the topic of tariffs. They are doing incredible harm to our economy in Vermont. In my view, they are doing long-term damage to our economy here in the United States.

I want to commend my colleagues Senator PAUL, Senator KAINE, and others, Senator SHAHEEN, Ranking Member WYDEN, and Leader SCHUMER for sponsoring the bipartisan legislation we voted on yesterday suspending the emergency authority on which the President was acting to impose a tariff on Brazil, a country, by the way, with whom we have a trade surplus.

We are 9 months into this trade war with tariffs at the forefront. It is a war with Canada. It sort of started with them. That is a big deal for Vermont. We are a border State. But it is a big deal for all of our States because Vermont is 1 of 34 States whose major trading partner is Canada.

For Vermont, Canada has been our largest export market and the largest source of imports. Trade with Canada accounted for 35 percent of our State exports and 67 percent of Vermont's imports and 56 percent of its total trade.

We have small businesses now that are really struggling to keep their lights on. We have farmers across the country but also farmers in Vermont who are incredibly worried about whether they are going to be able to make it into the next harvest. We had a drought. We had early floods. And now we have these tariffs that are increasing the input costs. I know, Mr. President, as a Senator from Indiana, you are very sensitive to the challenges that our agriculture economy and our farmers face.

Things were bumping along, and then President Trump just recently announced an additional 10-percent tariff on Canada, which already had a 35-percent effective rate. We don't even know what that applies to. Is that 10 percent on top of 35 percent or on specific products? Of course, all of that was done because the President was irritated about an ad that was run, apparently, by the

Province of Ontario that was quoting a speech that President Reagan made some years ago about how destructive tariffs are. Maybe that does irritate the President. But the constant changing of what a tariff is from day to day creates havoc for our businesses that are trying to plan and control their expenses and deal with all the other uncertainties that they face.

These tariffs are hurting our farmers. Just think about this. Fertilizers—those costs are up 16 percent and in some cases, 39 percent. The effective rate on tractors and other farming machinery is 16 percent and 13 percent, respectively.

We have also had, as a result of the tariffs that are seen by our trading partner in Canada that was the participant in the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Trade Agreement—negotiated, by the way, by President Trump, an agreement he bragged about as being really effective and the best trade agreement—that is getting ripped up in many ways. And then when you add to it the insults that were hurled at Canada—the “51st State,” the “Governor of Canada”—it has had a catastrophic impact on the tourism Vermont has depended on from our Canadian neighbors with whom we have enormous respect.

That is not just true for Vermont. New Hampshire, Maine, Montana are seeing an incredible drop in tourism that is related to this tariff battle and the rhetoric associated with it.

Also, in Vermont, just as in Indiana, our small businesses are really a big deal. I have been hearing from them. I am hearing from bed and breakfasts, hotels, brewers, distillers—any industry. I will give a few stories, a few quotes.

Simon Perkins at Orvis in Manchester:

The reality is that, in a rapidly changing tariff environment, one that's forced on companies too quickly, it's really hard for a business to respond quick enough to make it work.

Orvis, which was founded in 1856, announced the closure of 31 stores and five outlet locations by 2026. Orvis had to lay off 50 employees, citing tariffs.

Another business, Peter Case of Burrows Sports in Brattleboro:

We love what we do and it's under attack! For 90 years, Burrows Sports has proudly served Brattleboro, growing with our community through good times and hard ones. Today's economic pressures, rising costs, and shrinking margins are testing small local businesses like never before.

Jim Hall from Vermont Country Store:

This is the lull before the storm. . . . Do they realize this is a tax on Christmas?

These tariffs are a tax. They are paid for by our businesses. They disrupt our businesses. They are passed on to consumers, and there is nothing but a downside, especially when you add the fact that these tariffs are a tax. They are imposed and implemented in a totally arbitrary way, wherein a person who is running a business has to contend with all the uncertainties of a

volatile marketplace and has to deal with the constant uncertainties that are the result of an ever-changing tariff policy.

I urge all of us in the Senate to reassert our own authority under article I, which gives to the Congress the power to tax, the power to impose tariffs or not, and to not have us continue to relinquish the authority and responsibility to the Executive that we have as the U.S. Senate.

This is our responsibility, and part of the reason is that we are close to people who are affected by these policies. It is a shirking of our responsibility for the U.S. Senate to essentially cede that authority to a President, particularly when we are seeing in every single State the harmful impacts on folks in our States—on the businesses in our States, on the farmers and ranchers in our States—who are working hard to try to pull things together and keep their businesses going, our economy going, and contributing to the well-being of our country.

I call on the President to reconsider what these tariffs are doing.

I call on our U.S. Senate to reassert its authority and be the decider of what the tariff policy shall be in this country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

S.J. RES. 80

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I have come to the floor to join my colleague from Alaska Senator SULLIVAN in support of S.J. Res. 80, as Senator SULLIVAN explained earlier.

This resolution will disapprove the integrated activity planned by the administration, issued back in 2022, to manage the National Petroleum Reserve in northwest Alaska. He sponsored it and I cosponsored it because the Biden administration imposed this management plan over not only our objections but the objections of leaders from across Alaska's North Slope. The third member of our delegation, Congressman BEGICH, has introduced H.J. Res. 124, which is identical and is pending in the House of Representatives.

I think it is important to outline a little bit of the history on this issue, but I don't want to go into all of it.

The National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska—we call it NPR-A—is a 23 million-acre tract of land. It is roughly the size of the State of Indiana. It was specifically—specifically—designated for responsible energy development.

The petroleum reserve dates back a century, to President Harding's withdrawal and initial control by the U.S. Navy.

More recently, Congress has come to understand not only the naval value but the national value of the area. They have directed the Department of the Interior to “conduct an expeditious program of competitive leasing of oil and gas in the Reserve” to help boost our energy security.

What I just shared there is a word-for-word requirement from existing

Federal law, so this is what is in law: “to conduct an expeditious program of competitive leasing of oil and gas in the Reserve.”

The Department is mandated to do that while protecting important values, including sensitive areas, as well as providing for subsistence use for Alaskans. This is generally Alaskan Natives who live in the North Slope area.

Congress really envisioned this as a balance here, where you had responsible exploration and development moving in tandem with strong environmental protection and subsistence rights. The statute is pretty clear. It kind of spells it out. And we are OK with that. We don't have a problem with that. That is kind of the Alaska way.

But, unfortunately, the Biden administration ignored that. Instead of providing for balanced management, the last administration ignored what I think was a good plan that was already in place. They ignored Federal law. They ignored the congressional delegation. They ignored the people who live on the North Slope. I think they also ignored or overlooked our history of responsible production, our energy security, and they instead prioritized conservation over everything else. So that is why we are here.

The 2022 Integrated Activity Plan cut off access, to cut off leasing, to cut off development in our petroleum reserve. That was not an accident. That was the goal here. That was the intent. The 2022 plan admits—they admit—that it will reduce oil and gas activity, which was fine in the eyes of the Biden administration because, right as they were putting sanctions on Alaska, they were taking them off of places like Iran and Venezuela to free up those nations to produce more.

Let me reiterate how the Biden administration went about doing this. The 2022 plan replaced the 2020 plan, which was put in place after an environmental review process that featured public comment and significant consultation with communities and leaders on the North Slope.

Under that 2020 plan, the BLM concluded that 18.6 million acres—this was 82 percent of the NPR-A—should be open for potential leasing, but in the 2022 plan, just 11.8 million acres—52 percent of the petroleum reserve—were left open for that purpose.

Under the 2020 plan, 4.3 million acres were closed to new infrastructure, with development across millions of additional acres subject to requirements for no surface occupancy, seasonal timing, and other sensible protections, but then the 2022 plan rejected that, closing off 8.3 million acres to any new infrastructure.

The 2020 plan was well received by most Alaskans because it was viewed as balanced. BLM crafted a plan that was, as the Agency wrote at the time, “suitably specific for broad-scale management decisions. . . . Additional site-

specific analysis will occur when BLM receives an application to approve an action on the ground. This will be done through subsequent NEPA reviews and analysis, which will be conducted before BLM issues permits or approvals for any ground disturbing activity.”

In other words, what you had was a high-level management framework. No individual projects were approved. Any seeking to advance would still have to go through a separate permitting process before being allowed to do so.

But unfortunately, BLM abandoned that approach after the Biden administration took office. They didn't base their 2022 plan on any new scientific analysis or new environmental review process; they based it on a political agenda and their preference to what they called “keep it in the ground.” They issued a “determination of NEPA adequacy” and then went into the 2020 plan and selected a far more restrictive alternative from it.

So with virtually no public process, no public comment, no consultation with Alaska Natives who call the North Slope home, the Biden administration unilaterally cut off access to 6.8 million acres of our petroleum reserve. That is an area that is larger than the individual States of Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Hawaii. It is clearly not what the delegation wanted. It is not what most Alaskans wanted. And, as I explained when discussing the administrative withdrawals in the Central Yukon plan just a few weeks back, it violates multiple Alaska-specific statutes.

I should add that this was just one plank in the Biden administration's plan to shut down development in our petroleum reserve. In addition to cutting off access, they refused to hold a single lease sale in the NPR-A during their time in office. They dragged the Willow Project through years of additional process, sending a signal that nobody else should dare try to develop there. They issued a management rule that turned the law on its head by establishing a presumption against new development. They initiated another process to expand and designate new special areas where no development would be allowed to occur. Then, just a few days before leaving office, an Acting Deputy Secretary issued a memo with interim management measures to further tilt the balance away from any potential development.

So what you had was an administration that wanted nothing to do with responsible development in Alaska's petroleum reserve, and that was enough to cause some whiplash for those of us who not only know the law but also remember the Obama-Biden administration repeatedly urging companies: Go over there. Go to the National Petroleum Reserve.

This was the big fight over ANWR. They said: Don't go to ANWR; go to NPR-A.

I have kind of outlined the history of this, some of the politics of it, but I

would suggest that folks just shouldn't take the delegation's word for it either. We received a letter from the North Slope trilateral. This is the political leadership on the North Slope consisting of the North Slope Borough, the Iñupiat Community of the Arctic Slope, and the Arctic Slope Regional Corporation. They weighed in with their strong support for this disapproval resolution.

In their words:

The NPR-A lies entirely within the homelands of the North Slope Iñupiat. Congress established the NPR-A with a clear purpose: to ensure energy security for the Nation while respecting the needs of Alaska Natives.

Despite that, the 2022 plan "imposed sweeping restrictions that curtail responsible development, undermine congressional intent, and disregard the well-being of the people who depend on these lands for both subsistence and livelihoods."

The letter then goes on to explain how the impacts of the 2022 plan "are especially severe for the North Slope. Oil and gas development in the NPR-A funds the Borough's schools, emergency services, and infrastructure. It supports jobs for Iñupiaq shareholders and residents. It underwrites the continuation of our communities, even as we maintain our subsistence way of life. By arbitrarily locking away vast portions of the NPR-A, BLM's rule threatens these essential services and imposes disproportionate burdens on our people."

Equally concerning, BLM failed to engage in meaningful government-to-government consultation with ASRC, the Borough, and ICAS. This omission contradicts federal consultation requirements and disregards the voices of the very communities most affected. Our leadership has consistently raised concerns about this process and its outcomes, yet those concerns were ignored.

I think the words from the North Slope trilateral are particularly strong and powerful, and I thank them for their leadership on the issues.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of their letter be added to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately following my remarks.

There is a good chance you will see Senator SULLIVAN and me here on the floor of the Senate seeking to disapprove any administrative action that unreasonably restricts access to public land in our home State. That is exactly what happened in this 2022 plan. Like we saw so much in the Biden administration, it lacked balance, and it failed to adhere to the law.

We feel pretty strongly back home that we don't need Washington, DC, to try to protect Alaska from Alaskans. We need Washington, DC, to understand that no one—no one—cares more about Alaska, our lands, than those who live there and to partner with us on the balanced management of our lands. That is true across our State, and that is true within the NPR-A.

We had a good framework for responsible development in our petroleum reserve back in 2020. Today, we can vote

to nullify the 2022 replacement and go back to it.

I would urge my colleagues, when we have this measure before us tomorrow—I would urge support for the resolution.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 3, 2025.

Re Support for S.J. Res. 80 and H.J. Res. 124—Congressional Review Act Disapproval of the BLM NPR-A Integrated Activity Plan (IAP) Record of Decision (ROD).

Hon. LISA MURKOWSKI,  
*U.S. Senate,*  
*Washington, DC.*

Hon. DAN SULLIVAN,  
*U.S. Senate,*  
*Washington, DC.*

Hon. NICHOLAS BEGICH III,  
*House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR SENATORS MURKOWSKI, SULLIVAN, AND REPRESENTATIVE BEGICH: On behalf of the North Slope Iñupiaq leadership—including Arctic Slope Regional Corporation (ASRC), the North Slope Borough (Borough), and the Iñupiat Community of the Arctic Slope (ICAS)—we write in strong support of S.J. Res. 80, introduced by Senators SULLIVAN and MURKOWSKI, and H.J. Res. 124 in the House, each providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Bureau of Land Management relating to the "National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska Integrated Activity Plan Record of Decision."

#### BACKGROUND

The North Slope Iñupiat have called the Arctic home for over 10,000 years. We are proud of our self-determination efforts to ensure future generations of Iñupiat continue to reside in our communities and have access to essential services. Without a stable economy, our communities will suffer, along with our ability to fully engage in and sustain our Iñupiaq cultural traditions, including our vital subsistence way of life.

The North Slope of Alaska spans an area nearly the size of the state of Minnesota and, within that expansive area, there are eight Iñupiaq communities—Anaktuvuk Pass, Atkasuk, Kaktovik, Nuiqsut, Point Hope, Point Lay, Utqiagvik, and Wainwright. None of our communities are connected by a permanent road system; all supplies must be flown or barged in, making the cost of living extremely high and economic opportunities generally low.

Over fifty years ago, the Federal Government directed Alaska Native people to organize into a new structure of indigenous representation. The Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of 1971 (ANCSA) was a dramatically different and transformative approach by the Federal Government to federal Indian policy. The fact that our ancestral lands were claimed by the Federal Government before our people had a right to settle aboriginal land claims should inform every decision the Federal Government makes in managing those lands.

Unlike the Lower 48 model of indigenous representation where tribal governments typically administer the delivery of services such as healthcare, public safety, education, land management, and economic development, the passage of ANCSA created a shared system of Alaska Native representation and delivery of services. Our region has a multitude of Alaska Native entities that work together to effectively serve, provide for, and enrich the lives of the North Slope Iñupiat we represent. Our three regional en-

tities, the ICAS, the Borough, and ASRC are three of those entities. While our roles differ, our constituencies overlap, which is why we work closely together to protect the cultural and economic interests of the North Slope Iñupiat.

While our leaders over fifty years ago were initially wary of any development on our lands, our Iñupiaq leaders have spent decades prioritizing open communication and transparency in planning with industry. We have exercised true self-determination through a unique framework of Alaska Native governance—a framework that relies on our tribal governments, municipal governments, and Alaska Native corporations established by Congress to serve our indigenous constituents. For millennia, Iñupiaq ingenuity has transformed our relationship with industry into a partnership that has both protected our environment and our way of life and has brought significant economic benefits to the region that would have otherwise been absent. Our North Slope residents are keenly aware that advances in our communities—running water, local schools, health care, public safety, electricity, and more—have come because of the coordination and cooperation of Alaska Native leaders and entities across the region.

#### ICAS

Established in 1971, the Iñupiat Community of the Arctic Slope is the federally recognized regional tribal government for the North Slope and represents over 14,000 Iñupiaq tribal members. The mission of ICAS is to exercise its sovereign rights and powers for the benefit of tribal members, to conserve and retain tribal lands and resources including subsistence. For millennia Iñupiaq ingenuity has transformed our relationship with industry into a partnership that has both protected our environment and our way of life and has brought significant economic benefits to the region that would have otherwise been absent. Our North Slope residents are keenly aware that advances in our communities—running water, local schools, health care, public safety, electricity, and more—have come because of the coordination and cooperation of Alaska Native leaders and entities across the region.

#### Borough

The Borough is a home rule government located above the Arctic Circle that represents roughly 10,000 residents. The Borough's jurisdiction includes the entire National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska (NPR-A) and the eight villages within it. In 1972, the North Slope Iñupiat formed the Borough, in part, to ensure our communities would benefit from oil and gas development on their ancestral homelands. It was the first time Alaska Natives took control of their destiny using a regional municipal government. The Borough exercises its powers of taxation, property assessment, education, and planning and zoning services to serve our communities. Taxes levied on oil and gas infrastructure, not development, have enabled the Borough to invest in public infrastructure and utilities, support education, and provide police, fire, emergency, health, and other services. Elsewhere in rural Alaska, these services are typically provided primarily by the State or Federal Government, or both.

#### ASRC

ASRC is a for-profit, land-owning Alaska Native regional corporation formed pursuant to ANCSA. ASRC represents the same region as the Borough and ICAS, and the same eight villages whose residents are predominantly Iñupiat, and who comprise many of our over 14,000 Alaska Native shareholders. ASRC holds the title to approximately five million acres of land on the North Slope, including

both surface and subsurface lands. These lands—the ancestral lands of the North Slope Inupiat—were conveyed to ASRC by the United States pursuant to ANCSA to provide for the economic and cultural well-being of our Inupiat shareholders.

ASRC is committed to both providing sound financial returns to our shareholders, through jobs and dividends, and to preserving our Inupiat way of life, culture, and traditions, including the ability to maintain a subsistence lifestyle that supports our communities. In furtherance of this congressionally mandated mission to provide benefits to our shareholders, ASFIC conducts and continues to invest in a variety of activities related to infrastructure and natural resource development and other economic initiatives.

ASRC's perspective is based on the dual realities that our Inupiat culture and communities depend on a healthy ecosystem and subsistence resources, as well as infrastructure and resource development as the foundation of sustainable North Slope communities.

#### DISAPPROVAL OF THE 2022 NPR-A IAP ROD

The NPR-A lies entirely within the homelands of the North Slope Inupiat. Congress established the NPR-A with a clear purpose: to ensure energy security for the Nation while respecting the needs of Alaska Natives. Instead, the 2022 Record of Decision (ROD) issued by BLM has imposed sweeping restrictions that curtail responsible development, undermine congressional intent, and disregard the well-being of the people who depend on these lands for both subsistence and livelihoods.

The impacts of the 2022 ROD are especially severe for the North Slope. Oil and gas development in the NPR-A funds the Borough's schools, emergency services, and infrastructure. It supports jobs for Inupiat shareholders and residents. It underwrites the continuation of our communities, even as we maintain our subsistence way of life. By arbitrarily locking away vast portions of the NPR-A, BLM's rule threatens these essential services and imposes disproportionate burdens on our people.

Equally concerning, BLM failed to engage in meaningful government-to-government consultation with ASRC, the Borough, and ICAS. This omission contradicts federal consultation requirements and disregards the voices of the very communities most affected. Our leadership has consistently raised concerns about this process and its outcomes, yet those concerns were ignored.

The 2022 ROD ignores congressional intent under ANCSA, the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act of 1980 (ANILCA), the National Petroleum Reserve Production Act of 1976 (NPRPA), and the Omnibus Appropriations Act of 1980. The 2022 ROD also disregards the economic needs of North Slope communities, and creates unnecessary obstacles to infrastructure, energy, and community health across the North Slope of Alaska.

#### SUPPORT FOR S.J. RES. 80 AND H.J. RES. 124

For these reasons, our trilateral organizations strongly support passage of S.J. Res. 80 and H.J. Res. 124 to disapprove the 2022 NPR-A IAP ROD. Overturning this rule is necessary to restore balance to federal policy, reaffirm Congress's intent for the NPR-A, and uphold the economic, cultural, and subsistence well-being of the North Slope Inupiat.

Our identity, resilience, and survival are deeply rooted in our traditional lands that the NPR-A boundaries encompass. We take great pride in our ongoing efforts toward self-determination, focused on securing a future where future generations of Inupiat can

continue to live in our communities with access to the essential services they need to thrive. We thank you for your leadership on this important resolution and look forward to continued collaboration to ensure that federal policies in the NPR-A reflect both national priorities and the needs of the people who call the Arctic home.

Sincerely,

NICOLE WOJCIECHOWSKI,  
*President, Inupiat  
Community of the  
Arctic Slope.*

JOSHUA PATKOTAK,  
*Mayor, North Slope  
Borough.*

REX A. ROCK, SR.,  
*President and CEO,  
Arctic Slope Re-  
gional Corporation.*

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I yield the floor.  
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHMITT). The Senator from Minnesota.

S.J. RES. 77

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of our bipartisan resolution, which Senator Kaine and I lead, along with our colleagues Rand Paul, Mark Warner, and Leader Schumer.

Our resolution terminates the President's so-called emergency declaration related to the Canadian border and restores stability and common sense to our trade with our close ally and neighbor to the north, Canada.

The administration has used that declaration as a pretext to impose sweeping tariffs on a friend, on a neighbor, on an ally—which are taxes, paid by American consumers and businesses, on Canadian imports.

Back in April, this same resolution passed the Senate with bipartisan support. Under the National Emergencies Act, Congress must review and, if necessary, vote again every 6 months. Because the administration has refused to lift this so-called emergency and instead doubled down by raising tariffs on Canada to 35 percent as of August 1, with a threat of more, we are back on the floor today, and we will be back on the floor until this passes.

Just this past week, the President announced, as I noted, yet another 10 percent tariff hike on Canada—this time in retaliation for an Ontario ad—Ontario, one province. This would be as if the Governor of Texas put out an ad or if the Governor of California put out an ad. But President Trump used this as a pretext for another threat. And that ad accurately used President Ronald Reagan's 1987 remarks criticizing tariffs.

So that is a good way to begin: with President Reagan's remarks. He said, in 1987, though there are economic and national security circumstances during which tariffs are necessary, that, generally, "high tariffs inevitably lead to retaliation by foreign countries and the triggering of fierce trade wars. Then the worst happens: Markets shrink and collapse; businesses and industries shut down; and millions of people lose their jobs."

This new tariff hike isn't about security. It isn't even about our economy.

It is just about the President's personal grievances, and Americans are the ones paying the price.

Since these chaotic, on-again, off-again tariffs began in March, cross-border travel and trade have both fallen precipitously. In Minnesota, we say we can see Canada from our porch. Our people go back and forth all the time—sometimes for jobs, sometimes to visit relatives and friends, and sometimes, of course, for vacations. We welcome Canadians all the time.

I was, in fact, at the Minnesota Frost game in which they played the Charge, a Canadian team, a women's professional hockey team. It was a joyous event with our Canadian neighbors.

You see, we know now, the World Series, one of the most exciting World Series between the Toronto Blue Jays and the Los Angeles Dodgers.

This isn't just some faraway place to us. These are our friends and neighbors. But yet, despite all of this incredible history of friendship and booming economic gains because of all the back-and-forth and travel, trips from Canada to the United States are down roughly 20 percent from last year. Towns in the United States are having to put up signs that say "We love you, Canadians" because they feel so disrespected by this administration.

They are saying: What is happening? We were the first ones on the ground after 9/11 from another country.

The Canadians were there.

We were the ones that stood by your side in so many foreign wars. We are the one that, for so many of our States, is the No. 1 trading partner. How can this be happening?

And, frankly, it pisses them off, and so individual families are making decisions—are deciding: Well, we are not going to go to America. Maybe we will go to Mexico. Maybe we will go to another country. Maybe we will stay in Canada. But we are not going to travel there.

The average foreign visitor spends about \$4,000 when they come to America.

We are not going to eat their food. We are not going to go to their restaurants. We are not going to stay at their hotels. We are not going to fish in their lakes.

You name it, that is what the people in my State are seeing. And everything from manufactured parts to whiskey have dropped sharply. And small businesses, farmers, and manufacturers are losing business.

This is not how our economy was supposed to work, if you believe in capitalism, if you believe in trade, if you believe you just can't put your head in the sand and think, "Well, we are just going to be on our own," when 95 percent of our potential customers, particularly in the agriculture area, are outside of our borders. We should be exporting more goods, and we should be encouraging more trade.

The President shouldn't be able to just wake up one day and see an ad he

doesn't like on TV featuring a Republican President by a province in Canada and decide, "I am just going to hike up another 10 percent"—or something happened in Brazil—and I congratulate Senator KAINE and Senator PAUL on their recent overturning from this body—finally, enough is enough; we are asserting our power. You are not going to be able to just put a 40-percent tariff on Brazil, a country with which we have a trade surplus, simply because the guy is facing a trial there, and the President doesn't like it. No, this is not how this works. It is not how it works under the Constitution. It is not how it works under the law.

This resolution is about drawing a line in the sand and saying you cannot abuse your emergency powers to start an unjustified trade war; you cannot abuse your emergency powers to hurt one of the finest relationships in the world; and you cannot drive up prices, eliminate jobs, and put in place a national sales tax that experts now predict will altogether—the tariff tax—cost the average family nearly \$2,000 per year.

And they are seeing it every day in their grocery bills. They are seeing it when they want to go out and buy tools. They see it when they are going out to buy audio equipment.

Minnesota's No. 1 trading partner, one of our country's top 2 trading partners, and one of our most trusted allies—that is Canada. We export more goods to Canada than we do—in Minnesota—to our second, third, and fourth largest markets combined. In 2024, Minnesota's goods trade with Canada, including ag products, machinery, and medical devices, amounted to roughly \$22 billion—\$22 billion. That is more than a quarter of all the goods that we export, a major hit for our State.

I chair the Canadian-American Inter-parliamentary Group. I frequently meet with our partners in Canada. A number of Senators, including Senator KAINE and Senator SHAHEEN and Senator WELCH and Senator KEVIN CRAMER of North Dakota, a Republican—we went up there together to Ottawa a few months back, met with Prime Minister Carney. And as the Prime Minister said recently, the U.S.-Canada relationship has become "mostly transactional."

That is not the story of our friendship with Canada. Canada, as I mentioned, fought alongside us in two World Wars. They are our partners in NORAD and NATO. They helped us get our supply chain back in order after the pandemic—and, yes, we helped them. Canada is setting historic new goals to contribute to our collective defense, planning to triple defense spending over the next decade—new equipment, new infrastructure, new technology—to strengthen our NATO alliance, which means strengthening our own national security.

But rather than supporting a thriving Canadian economy that would enable the government to fulfill those

goals, the tariffs that the President keeps slapping on this great ally will hinder our potential and Canada's. These tariffs also undercut the very trade deal the President himself once called the most "modern and balanced agreement in history"—that is, the USMCA, the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement.

I supported that agreement. I was one of the first Democrats—in fact, the first one during that election, the 2020 election—that actually came out and said I supported that trade agreement on the debate stage because I felt it was so important.

So why would the President take this jewel of a trade agreement—that albeit needs to be changed as we go forward and reviewed, which is mandatory this coming year, for things like dairy and other things—that has been acknowledged. We would like to see some changes to it. But why would he take this incredibly important agreement and just say it doesn't matter?

The kind of uncertainty that we are seeing with these tariffs shakes business confidence across North America. These tariffs are paid by families: groceries, clothes, housing. Homebuilders say higher material costs from tariffs are adding as much as \$10,000 to the cost of a new home. Americans looking for a new car are paying more than \$3,000 more for an American-made vehicle. And of course it is increasing the cost of cars made in America because parts come from Canada.

And this is an important point: The tariffs are not just about raising the prices on the goods that we import; they are also driving up prices across the board on all types of goods and services—electricity costs. If we continue down this path, as I noted, the average family will likely see a \$2,000 increase per year.

This might not mean a lot to some of the President's friends and family members, billionaires on his Cabinet. They are not going to care about this \$2,000 a year. That is true. They are not going to care. But people right now, that are already faced with all these problems with healthcare, which is a fight that is raging right now, about this budget, they can't handle it.

Tariffs, as I noted, can be an important tool for countering other countries' unfair trade practices. I supported some of the steel tariffs that were more narrow from the former Trump administration and the Obama administration and the Biden administration in order to make sure that our iron ore—very key to my past and our future—mined in northern Minnesota—my grandpa was an iron ore miner—that that continue.

But that is not what we are talking about with the President's action here. The broad emergency power statute enacted from 1977 that the President has used to justify these across-the-board tariffs didn't even mention the word "tariff."

My colleagues and I have filed an amicus brief to the Supreme Court.

That case is going to be heard next week. But it is not the only answer. The answer should be that Congress asserts its power, even though I believe that the use of the statute is clearly illegal and I believe, as the underlying court—which was made up of the initial trade court: a Trump judge, an Obama judge, and a Reagan judge—yes, they still exist. They unanimously, the three of them, said that this was an illegal use of the statute.

But this, today, is about something else. It is about us asserting our own power, stopping the chaos with changes over 100 times in these tariffs: small brewers paying for aluminum cans that can't afford them, furniture makers paying more for lumber, and family-owned tourism businesses in my State suffering.

If the Trump administration wants to address trade disputes with Canada—and the Prime Minister is clearly open to that—it should work in good faith with our neighbors to strengthen the USMCA trade agreement that the President himself originally negotiated.

Our bipartisan group of cosponsors understands this. This isn't about politics. It is about jobs, economic stability, and respect for the successful agreement that we committed to in the past. It is why this resolution has support from the United Steelworkers, the International Association of Machinists, North America's Building Trades Unions, and the AFL-CIO. The Chamber of Commerce, the National Taxpayers Union, and the National Retail Federation have all endorsed this resolution.

These are voices from every corner of the political spectrum, every part of our economy. Maybe we should be listening to them and not be a rubberstamp, I say to my colleagues. It is time to stand up. Otherwise, why are you here?

I yield the floor, and I see that my friend from Virginia, who has been such a leader on this, is here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I rise to thank my colleague from Minnesota Senator KLOBUCHAR for her hard work on this effort and her work over many years in leading the U.S.-Canada inter-parliamentary dialogue. That is a dialogue that we have with some nations, nations that are longstanding allies of the United States, and I maintain that the U.S.-Canada relationship is really the model for what a relationship between two neighboring nations should be.

I primarily object to the Canada tariffs because I don't think there is an emergency that should trigger the use of this statute, but there are many other reasons I object to them, and the fracturing of this longstanding, powerful relationship is one of them.

I spoke yesterday with respect to the Brazil tariffs, and I talked about the wrecking ball that Donald Trump is



taking to the American economy. There have been three academic studies of the Virginia economy in recent months, and they were recently summarized by a publication called *Cardinal News* in Virginia earlier this month. The takeaway line about how Virginia is faring under Donald Trump's economic mismanagement is this: fewer jobs, higher prices, slower growth.

The firing of Federal employees, the cancellation of celebrated economic development projects, the imposition of tariffs in a chaotic on-again, off-again, pause-again, give-you-an-exception, we-will-renegotiate regime—all of these things are deeply hurting the Virginia economy, and I know my colleagues around the country are experiencing the same thing.

That economic wrecking ball composes many elements beyond the tariffs, but the tariffs are really the central item that is causing damage to our economy right now.

The tariffs that have been imposed by President Trump on Canada, like the Brazil tariffs we discussed yesterday or the "Liberation Day" tariffs we will talk about tomorrow, are proposed under the statute IEEPA.

Yesterday on the floor, as I talked about the Brazilian tariffs, I told everyone what IEEPA was meant to do. It was meant to give the President power to take action in the event of an international emergency.

An international emergency is defined in a pretty significant way so as to not be used in minor instances. The definition under IEEPA says that a President may take certain actions when there is an extraordinary and unusual threat to the national security, foreign policy, or economy of the United States—an extraordinary and unusual threat.

Before President Trump, what kind of emergencies have been triggered under IEEPA by Democratic and Republican Presidents? The existence and activities of transnational criminal organizations, malicious cyber-enabled activities that target the United States, human rights violations that affect the United States, corruption that affects the United States, pervasive strategies by foreign nations to evade sanctions imposed by the United States, foreign interference in U.S. elections.

These are the kinds of unusual and extraordinary actions originating in whole or substantially in part outside the United States that have been labeled by Presidents an "international emergency" under IEEPA to enable a President to take certain action. President Trump has stretched this notion of emergency far beyond the language of the statute and far beyond what anyone contemplated when this statute was written.

You have heard me talk about the President declaring an energy emergency when the United States is producing more energy than at any time

in our history. You have heard us talk about the President declaring the prosecution of a friend of his in Brazil a national security emergency. If President Trump can define anything as an emergency, then so can any President henceforth. That is why my colleagues should be pretty careful in striking down overuse of emergency power.

So what is the emergency with respect to Canada that has inspired the President to impose these tariffs on Canada and then add to the tariffs because he saw a television advertisement he didn't like? The emergency the President has cited is the challenge of fentanyl.

Now, fentanyl is an emergency. I am not standing here on the floor of the Senate to deny that it is so. The President has used the fentanyl emergency to impose tariffs on Canada and Mexico, and I haven't challenged those uses of emergency power. I have questions about whether tariffs are the right solution to the declared emergency. But I would not stand here on the floor of the Senate and claim that fentanyl is not an emergency that had significant origin in China and Mexico. But fentanyl is not an emergency from Canada.

In the most recent year that we had statistics, the United States seized nearly 40,000 pounds of fentanyl on the southern border of the United States coming from Mexico. That is an emergency. How much fentanyl was seized on or near the Canadian border during the same year? The answer is 21 pounds—21 pounds.

Much of that fentanyl was not necessarily seized at the border; it was seized near the border. It may have been coming from Canada, but in all likelihood, it was actually on its way to Canada because more fentanyl goes from the United States into Canada than vice versa.

So this claim that Canada is responsible for a fentanyl emergency and thus we need to punish both Canada but more especially American consumers is completely without factual basis, and it is completely illogical.

What is the emergency? The emergency apparently got augmented in the past weekend. The President saw an advertisement, as my colleague said, with a direct quote from President Ronald Reagan about why tariffs are bad, and he said: We caught the Canadians redhanded, and so we are going to add another 10-percent tariff on top of what I have already done, and we are going to stop any trade negotiations with Canada because I have such thin skin that an ad on television quoting Ronald Reagan hurts my feelings.

How about that as a rationale for trade policy? How about that? There is no emergency in this situation, and that is the reason this resolution should be supported.

But while there is no emergency, there are consequences. There are consequences to what President Trump has done with Canada.

In the economic space, my colleague talked about visitation. "Canadian Visitors To U.S. Plummet 33% In June—Sixth Straight Month Of Steep Declines."

Canadian visitors are the most common foreign visitors to the Commonwealth of Virginia. They tend to love Virginia Beach, and we love Canadians coming to Virginia Beach. But we have seen Canadian visitation drop. All States in the country have seen Canadian visitation drop.

There are so many other stories that I hear out on the road. I was with a baker in Virginia who has three pie shops—Mom's Apple Pie. We were talking about this back in the spring after the tariffs had been announced but before they had really bit.

She had seen tariffs in Trump's first term, and she said to me on behalf of Mom's Apple Pie—I mean, this is almost too good a story to be true—Mom's Apple Pie, for gosh sake.

She said: Senator Kaine, you have got to do something about these tariffs.

I said: Tariffs? You have three bakeries—one in Occoquan, one in Purcellville, one in Leesburg. How do tariffs affect you?

Pie tins. Pie tins. All pie tins are made of aluminum, and they all come from Canada. If you jack up the cost of aluminum with aluminum tariffs by 25 percent, apple pie gets more expensive. Nobody has to buy apple pie. If it gets more expensive, people will choose not to buy apple pie, and I got to lay people off. I saw it in Trump term 1. I am going to see in Trump term 2.

Farmers. Farmers have seen commodities be pretty darn flat. Commodity prices have not been going up. They have been getting a lot more for agricultural commodities, but the inputs aren't stable. They are getting more expensive.

One of the most significant inputs for any farmer of an agricultural vegetable or grain product is fertilizer. One of the key ingredients in fertilizer is potash, and about 80 percent of potash that goes into fertilizer used by American farmers comes from Canada.

So the initial effect of these tariffs is to raise the cost of these inputs—building supplies, food, fertilizer, pie tins. The input costs go up. And then there is never a one-way trade war, so a nation will say: Well, then, we are going to retaliate against you. We are not going to take this sitting down.

So Canada doesn't want to, but after Trump imposed the tariff, Canada retaliates on products in the ag sector, and suddenly it becomes harder for American businesses to sell products in Canada.

One of the products that is an important one in Southern States like mine is whiskey. "The U.S. Alcohol Industry Is Reeling From Canada's Booze Boycott. Trade fight prompts pullback in purchases by the biggest export market for U.S.-made wines, costing American brands tens of millions in sales."

Virginia is one of the top 10 States in the country in the volume of wine production. We also produce a lot of whiskey and other spirits. And Canadians like to buy American products. But the retaliation and the anger at the United States has caused many to decide to pull all American products off their shelves—all American products off their shelves. And I speak with a number of businesses in Virginia who would face this.

So the consequences are very real. My colleague from Minnesota talked about estimates that this could be already costing American families on average between \$1,800 and \$2,000 a year.

But it has consequences bigger than that. Canada is an ally. We are trying to convince Canada to increase their NATO expenditure up to 2 percent of GDP and related expenditures on infrastructure up to 5 percent of GDP. The new Prime Minister, Mark Carney, has gone to the Parliament and gotten their commitment to do so.

We are asking Canada to participate with us in one of President Trump's most significant military priorities, called Golden Dome. In Canada, they call it Continental Shield. They have a different name for it, but it is the same thing; it is missile defense for North America. And we are trying to get Canada to heavily invest, as they should, to try to provide missile defense in North America. It is much harder to convince an ally to spend hundreds of millions, if not billions of dollars on a joint defense platform when you are punishing their economy and when we are punishing our own citizens.

So that is why we need to vote for this resolution.

There is a right way to resolve this, and my colleague mentioned it: the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement. It was one of the highlights, the stellar achievements of Donald Trump's first term. NAFTA was 20 years old; it needed to be renegotiated.

Donald Trump said: We are going to renegotiate it and make it a lot better.

Guess what. He did. He and his team did make it better.

So when it came to the Senate, my recollection is it came to the Senate, and it passed by about 89 to 10. We can't get that vote on a Mother's Day resolution here. Donald Trump should be proud of USMCA.

USMCA had a provision that, in 2026, we would look at the first 5 years of its history and then make it better. Those discussions had just started when I was in Ontario about a month and a half ago. The Canadian Government felt really good about sitting around the table with the United States and Mexico and making this deal better. Donald Trump has stopped the discussions because a TV ad hurt his feelings.

The right answer to the U.S.-Canada relationship on trade is to go back to the table on USMCA, find anything that hasn't worked, anything that can be made better, negotiate it, and make it better.

Tariffs are hurting our economy, hurting our citizens, hurting our businesses. Let's terminate this bogus emergency and let our households and businesses save some money.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise today to express my support for this resolution, and, indeed, the full series of tariff resolutions my colleagues Senators KAINE and WYDEN and others have put forth. And I want to take this opportunity to personally commend Senator KAINE for his leadership and for his understanding of the complexities of the issues we face.

Our resolution would overturn President Trump's tariff taxes on American consumers. These tariffs are part of the President's effort to use trade policies to benefit his friends and himself at the expense of American families.

He has used trade to prop up Argentina's President before a key election because that country's President has said nice things about President Trump, hardly the basis for a fundamental economic decision affecting the life of every American.

And he has used trade to punish the entire country of Brazil for the prosecution of its former leader, another friend and political ally of Trump.

These are not economically based decisions. These are purely personal, whimsical decisions that harm American families.

The hope is that any Chief Executive is going to look thoughtfully and rationally, measure benefits and costs, and make decisions that benefit this country. That is not the case with President Trump.

And while he is cutting these special-interest trade deals, President Trump is really whacking households with more than \$15 billion in additional costs each month. This includes the tariffs on Brazil, one of the main sources of coffee for the United States of America. And, you know, we are just waiting for our constituents to roll up to their Dunkin' Donuts, if you are in Rhode Island, and order a small coffee: That will be \$15, please.

That is where we are headed. And it is going to hurt our constituents, particularly the most vulnerable, and working families that are struggling to get by.

Grocery prices continue to climb with essentials like coffee and beef, with a 19-percent increase and 15 percent increase, respectively, more expensive than they were a year ago.

The average new car price just crossed \$50,000 for the first time in our Nation's history. Investment bank UBS reports that tariffs have increased home construction costs by \$9,000, and we have an affordable housing crisis in the United States in every State.

And Ashley Furniture, the largest U.S. and, indeed, global furniture manufacturer, announced this month it was raising prices by as much as 12 percent

due to the President's tariffs, and that was before new 25-percent furniture-specific tariff came into force.

In total, researchers at Yale report that tariffs are costing families \$1,800 this year. The President has essentially claimed these costs are a figment of our imagination, repeatedly claiming that foreign companies—not Americans—pay his tariffs. But his claims don't match Americans' reality or the economic data.

A recent Goldman Sachs report found that foreign exporters have been paying only about 9 percent of tariff costs.

In fact, Goldman, the nonprofit Peterson Institute, and investment bank Morgan Stanley have all reported that most of the President's tariffs are being absorbed by American companies, small businesses, and consumers.

Indeed, our Nation's two largest auto manufacturers, General Motors and Ford, have each reported billions of dollars in new tariff-related costs. Nike told its investors it will pay \$1.5 billion in tariff costs this fiscal year, and defense manufacturer Raytheon announced \$220 million in tariff costs in the third quarter alone.

Make no mistake, businesses, large and small, in every corner of our country, are paying these costs but with much tighter margins—much, much tighter margins—than previously.

Many of the Main Street businesses may not survive because of it. And, increasingly, companies are passing the costs of these tariff taxes on to American consumers. It is not just higher costs. When companies shoulder new costs, they hire fewer workers. And we are seeing that in many parts of the country. We are seeing it in Rhode Island.

Unsurprisingly, job growth, as a result, has stagnated under President Trump. Payroll company ADP found the private sector actually lost 32,000 jobs last month, while those Yale researchers estimate that Trump tariffs will eliminate half a million jobs this year.

It used to be the chief responsibility of the President of the United States to create economic programs and policies that stimulated employment—not eliminated employment.

And while President Trump wants to demonize any dissent toward his policies as political or the work of his enemies, data and economic warnings around his tariffs are coming from every corner of our country.

I will close by noting that I do not want to be on the floor delivering this speech. I do not want to have to criticize the President for his economic decision making, but instead of pursuing thoughtful, impactful, and cost-reducing policies, President Trump has decided to take a whack at American small business and families with billions and billions in new costs.

And as a Member of the Senate, I cannot sit by quietly while our President makes Americans suffer simply because their needs do not match his priorities.



I was hopeful that President Trump would come to his senses before Congress and the courts act, but he has not, and that is why we are on the floor. And that is why we must pass this resolution, which is one of the first steps to eliminating these Trump-induced costs on households and businesses.

Passage today would signal to Americans that Congress's priority is their financial well-being, not the well-being of the wealthy, the well-connected, and Donald Trump's personal pals.

Most importantly, it would start the process of eliminating over \$15 billion in new monthly costs for families.

I urge my colleagues to prioritize hard-working Americans, not Donald Trump and friends, by passing this resolution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Rhode Island, as well as Senator KLOBUCHAR and Senator KAINE. We have all been teaming up to terminate Donald Trump's blanket tariffs on products Americans buy from Canada.

Once again, we have an opportunity to cancel a Trump trade tax and put money back into the pockets of the American people.

This is a chance for Senators to show our constituents that we are going to act for them, not for special interests or some new Presidential obsession.

Unlike many of the nations Trump has slapped with taxes, there is already a comprehensive trade deal between the United States and Canada. It was written with input from the Senate Finance Committee, and it was bipartisan. USMCA was a trade deal negotiated by Donald Trump himself, and it got a significant bipartisan vote.

Congress approved the deal, put it into black-letter law, and we made sure—with Senator Brown, in particular, leading the fight—to have a bill with tough enforcement—enforcement teeth—to make sure the United States could hold Canada and Mexico to their commitments.

This is the only way to ensure that farmers, workers, and businesses get the full benefit.

But Trump's trade taxes aren't addressing enforcement issues with Mexico and Canada, or making the USMCA work better. Instead, he is unilaterally undermining supply chains across the board.

He has imposed new tariffs on scores of products we buy from Canada, making groceries, housing, energy, and cars more expensive.

He put a 50-percent tariff on steel and aluminum, a singularly bad idea. Beer, appliances, auto parts—all of them—are getting hammered by that tax.

There are 8 million American jobs that depend on trade with Canada. Canada is the biggest export market for 32 American States.

With this trade war, Trump is destroying jobs and harming America and making our people poorer.

Since national security was one of the rationales for the Trump trade taxes on Canada, I have to point out that his trade war against our close ally is making American allies and us less safe.

For one, Canada is a reliable source of energy, raw materials, and critical minerals that China has repeatedly used as a bargaining chip in trade talks. Critical minerals are essential to manufacturing in the high-tech and defense industries. The Trump administration has invested millions in developing the Canadian critical minerals industry as an alternative to China's near monopoly.

But here is a key point: instead of developing Canada as an alternative to China for raw materials, Donald Trump is driving our closest ally straight into the arms of China.

The Canadian Prime Minister said last week that his country is looking to reengage with India and China to find new markets and new allies that are more reliable than the United States. America would get better results on trade by buying spells from an Etsy witch.

Trump's stated reason for blowing up commerce is fentanyl trafficking. Now, I don't take a backseat to anybody when it comes to cracking down on the scourge of fentanyl. Oregon is no stranger to the devastating effects it has wreaked in our communities.

But, in reality, there is no crisis at the northern border. Less than 0.2 percent of fentanyl entering the United States comes from Canada.

Some of my colleagues on the other side have voiced concerns about tariffs but said they want to give Donald Trump more time to strike a deal. I would ask: what in the past 6 months makes you think that this is somehow magically going to get better?

Instead of negotiating, Donald Trump spends his energy having tantrums about TV ads that accurately quote Ronald Reagan's position on tariffs. He has already increased these tariffs on Canada once. He is now threatening to jack up Canada tariffs by another 10 percent because one of their provinces—just one—took out the Reagan ad.

Who would make a deal with a person who acts like this, who ignores a deal that was made just a few years ago and who constantly threatens to annex their country?

That is what Donald Trump has done with Canada.

These tariffs are doing nothing to help Americans. They are unrelated to trade disputes.

I hope every Senator will vote to repeal the taxes on Canadian goods and help lower costs for our constituents.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I want to thank Senator KAINE for his leadership on this issue, highlighting it, meeting on it, bringing it to the atten-

tion of the American public. The same thing is true for Senator WYDEN and Senator KLOBUCHAR.

Thank you so much for your leadership.

And I rise to join them in highlighting the devastating impact President Trump's economic policies are having on small businesses across our country. Small business owners are struggling in President Trump's economy.

Let me just say this: 97 percent of all the companies in America that engage in trade are small businesses, and those small businesses represent one-third of all trade that our country engages in.

They are not big companies. They can't buy a year or 2 years' inventory in advance. They live week to week. They live month to month. And that is pretty much where they have been since April. They have been trying to survive. They have been trying just to make it through this hectic, unpredictable, roller coaster of tariffs, which the President has been imposing.

And these small businesses, they are unbelievably struggling in this economy right now. Thanks to President Trump, just this year, electricity costs are up 11 percent. Food prices are up. The cost of coffee is up 19 percent this year. Bananas are up 7 percent. Beef is up 13 percent. The cost of healthcare for millions of small business owners will increase by an average of 114 percent.

This is going to be a massive hit on small businesses and small business workers if the Affordable Care Act tax premiums expire. It is going to be 10 million small businesses and small business employees in our country that are going to see a spike that is going to be dramatic for their healthcare.

And 42,000 jobs we have lost in manufacturing this year—42,000 down, not up—not as promised. And that is supposed to be at the center of his tariff policy? We are losing manufacturing jobs at an accelerated rate after Joe Biden increased manufacturing jobs.

And I would like to, again, really point out what a great job you have been doing, Senator KAINE, on this in putting a great big spotlight on all of this, because this is absolutely central to the economic well-being of our country.

So back in May, I introduced and tried to pass my Small Business Liberation Act, a bill that would have protected small businesses from Trump's tariff chaos, just saying: Get those 97 percent of all the businesses engaged in trade—the small businesses—get them out of this war. They can't survive that war. Big businesses, maybe, but not little businesses. They just can't do it. But the Senate Republicans blocked that proposal.

Then I did it again. Republicans blocked my proposal just to spare the small businesses, and, unfortunately, Republicans have not shown the courage yet on Trump's tariffs, just capitulation, as they do on so many other issues.

By opposing my bill and preventing those sensible resolutions from moving forward in the House, Republicans are allowing Trump to tax any good from any country for any reason—no rules. And the only reason is Trump doesn't have the legal authority to do that. He doesn't have the legal authority to do what he is doing right now.

Trump claims to have authority under a 1977 law signed by Jimmy Carter, the International Emergency Economic Powers Act. This law was so uncontroversial in 1977 that it was passed on a voice vote.

Now, can you imagine? Jimmy Carter is President. There is a bill that is going to allow Jimmy Carter to become a dictator, to impose tariffs on any country in the world, to jack up the price anywhere they want on any product, at any time; anything that ticks him off, including some little commercial about Ronald Reagan, and all of a sudden, boom, we are smashing you, Canada.

Does anyone here really think the Republicans and the Congress, in 1977, at the height of Jimmy Carterism, were giving him unlimited authority to be able to impose tariffs?

You know that did not happen. He doesn't have the legal authority to do this, and I can tell you because I was there on the floor of Congress when it happened in 1977. I know there was no debate on this.

And so that is what we are talking about right now. The Congress did not give Jimmy Carter King-like powers—I can guarantee you that—on a voice vote. But Trump, he thinks he can exercise these emergency powers and tax any import for any reason. Our latest emergency? It is a television ad, a Canadian-produced and featured audio of former President Ronald Reagan denouncing the tariffs. And, in retaliation, President Trump decided everyday Americans and small businesses should pay 10 percent more on imports from Canada.

It is very clear, Trump is just making all of this up. He is making it up as he goes along.

And, for Massachusetts, it is very important. Every fifth grader—when I was in the fifth grade and all fifth graders in Massachusetts—in the geography book there is one chapter entitled: "Our Friends the Canadians." And why is that? Because they are our leading trading partner. It is only like a 3- or 4-hour ride to get up to Canada. It is who we are. We trade with them every single day. We do \$10 billion of trade with Canada. That is whom we do business with.

And this 10 percent additional tariff, you know who it cascades down onto? The small businesses of Massachusetts. Ordinary citizens, they are going to be further crushed. That is whom we partner with.

And he knows he doesn't have this trade authority. Small businesses have had enough of Trump's illegal actions and have successfully challenged the

tariff authority twice already. He lost in the district court. He lost in the circuit court. And next week, this case is going to be heard in the Supreme Court. So small businesses have already won twice, and now they are going for the final round in the Supreme Court, hoping that they won't engage in creative legislative history reinterpretation of that Republican unanimous vote in 1977 that allowed Jimmy Carter to become a King on tariffs.

So the President says it is "enemies of the country" who are suing him. If that is how you view Main Street in America—Kiwansians, Rotarians, small business, chambers of commerce all across the country—they are the ones bringing the suit and have already won twice and are now heading for the showdown on the Supreme Court.

For small businesses, this isn't about politics; it is about survival. And right now, Trump's tariffs are taxes for them. So far, it is \$30 billion coming from small businesses that Trump then transfers into tax breaks for the wealthiest people in our country or for the Argentine Government, but it is not staying on Main Street. They are not getting the rewards for the work which they have done.

A small business in Massachusetts that designs and manufactures and sells outdoor recreation equipment told me that they have paid an extra \$500,000 this year because of Trump's tariff taxes. Earlier this week, they received a \$40,000 bill from imports from Taiwan. It is just a small business.

And, meanwhile, big businesses have CEOs meeting directly with the President and receiving generous exemptions.

It is Robin Hood in reverse. Trump is taking from hard-working, regular people, and he is transferring the wealth to the millionaires and billionaires in our country. It is absolutely economic craziness that the President is engaging in. He is punishing Main Street. He is turning Main Street into "Pain Street" in every single State in our country.

And that extra increase in the tariffs from Canada puts a special burden on Massachusetts and our small businesses, our workers.

So it is very clear this tax is not being paid by other countries. American small businesses pay the tax. Main Street is paying this tax. And President Trump is taxing food and clothing and toys and even tea. And as a small business owner reminded me, the last time there was a tax on tea, there was a revolution in our country that began in Boston.

Small businesses have no lobbyists, no Mar-a-Lago, no golden gifts for President Trump, no margin for error. There will be no invitations to the new ballroom, but I am not going to back down. I am going to continue to stand up for small businesses across the country, across Massachusetts, from red States to blue States, who are bear-

ing the burden of these tariffs, and I hope that our Republican colleagues will join us today by voting to pass this resolution.

And, again, I thank you, Senator KAINE, for your leadership, and the same to you, Senator WYDEN and to Senator KLOBUCHAR. This is a very important moment in the economic history of our country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORENO). The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to S.J. Res. 77, which would terminate the fentanyl national emergency declared with respect to Canada.

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

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

It is equally as important that enforcement guidance provides the clarity that U.S. companies need to comply with the tariffs and to 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 to helping American families and businesses of all sizes.

What my colleagues across the aisle have not discussed is the ubiquitous tariffs and nontariff trade barriers that our small businesses and large businesses alike face across this globe from countries that are not allowing fair trade to happen with the United States, and the cost of that is being borne by the American people—small businesses and large businesses alike.

The President's historic trade negotiations recognize that this cannot continue, and nations across the globe need to reduce their tariff barriers and their nontariff trade barriers to American companies and American citizens.

The President's negotiations are bearing fruit. President Trump already announced new trade deals with major trading partners, including the United Kingdom, Japan, and the European Union. Other such announcements we expect to be forthcoming.

And I urge other trading partners of the United States to reach similar deals.

Consequently, S.J. Res. 77 is counterproductive to the progress already made by the President and to new gains he can still achieve in the ongoing negotiations with our trading partners. Let's truly get a balanced, fair playing field in trade.

On April 30, the Senate rejected the joint resolution of disapproval of IEEPA-based reciprocal tariffs for the same reasons. I recommend we do the same thing today and reject this resolution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, in conclusion, I want to say this: One, thank you to Senator Kaine and Senator Warner, the two Senators from Virginia, for their leadership on this important resolution; Senator Wyden for all of his work; Senator Rand Paul and others who have stood with us, who have stood with capitalism, who have stood with this idea that trade matters and that our country is stronger when we do business and sell our goods across the seas and to our friendly neighbors like Canada.

Let me start with Canada. As the head of the Inter-Parliamentary Group with Canada, I spent a lot of time working with the Canadians. It was one Embassy, years ago, when America was disliked by a lot of countries, that displayed on their Embassy huge banners that said: "Friend, Ally, Partner."

For so many of our States, they are our biggest trading partner. They fought alongside us in two World Wars. They are our partners in NORAD and in NATO. They worked with us together on supply chains and getting them back working after the pandemic. They are setting new historic goals, Canada is, to contribute to our collective defense, planning to triple defense spending over the next decade.

So what does this administration do? Slap them with a 35-percent tariff. And then, just because the President woke up in the morning and didn't like an ad that quoted a beloved Republican President, Ronald Reagan, didn't like it, he said: Well, I am going to give them 10 percent more.

Yet this is a country with which we share a trade agreement that this President negotiated with Mexico and Canada. If you want to make changes, like for dairy or other things, do it in the review of that agreement. Don't do it like this to a neighbor and friend.

Secondly, what do these tariffs mean to America? mean to the people in our country? Combined, they have been changed over 100 times—total chaos. Inflation is up. Manufacturing jobs are down. Small farm bankruptcies are at their highest levels in 5 years, and every Senator in this Chamber has heard from their beef producers or heard from their soybean farmers. What is happening right now, as one of my farmers called it, is a "perfect storm of ugly."

For an individual family right now, these tariffs mean a \$2,000 tax per family. Tools are up. Audio equipment costs more. This is the effect of this tariff policy on individual families in America.

So we can have high-ended debates here, but at home, they are looking at their grocery prices. They are looking at their markets, their family farms—that they spent a century there, they are next in line to take it over—drying up. That is what these tariffs are about.

Then, finally, this President cannot keep abusing his power like this. There is a reason, when you look at the numbers, who supports this resolution: United Steelworkers, International Association of Machinists, North America's Building Trades Unions, the AFL-CIO, the Chamber of Commerce, the National Taxpayers Union, the National Retail Federation have all endorsed this resolution.

But, unfortunately, with a few exceptions, our friends on the other side of the aisle are just rubberstamping what this President wants.

Well, it is time for us to stand up. This vote is about reasserting Congress's constitutional role, article I, section 8, of the Constitution gives Congress—not the President—the power to impose tariffs and regulate commerce with foreign nations. We must stand up for American workers, businesses, and consumers and remind our allies and ourselves that America keeps its word.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first, I want to thank our great Senators Klobuchar and Kaine and Wyden for leading the charge here on the Senate floor against Donald Trump's destructive, self-defeating, and often utterly juvenile trade war.

Today, the Senate will vote to end Donald Trump's national emergency declaration against Canada and put a stop to the asinine trade war with our neighbors to the north. This has been the most peaceful relationship over the centuries, and Donald Trump seems to throw a hand grenade to undo that relationship. We need to put a stop to this asinine trade war with our neighbors to the north.

And if Americans want proof that Donald Trump's trade war has been a catastrophe, consider this: While he capitulates to Beijing, he is raising tariffs on Canada.

How nonsensical. How stupid. How thoughtless.

Canada—one of our strongest allies, one of our most important trading partners. I don't know of two large economies that are more entwined than America's and Canada's. And after a year and a half of failed trade war, Americans have not gotten liberation. Instead, Americans have been saddled with a national sales tax. That is what Trump's tariffs are, a national sales tax on Americans.

The average family—America, listen to this—the average family, American family, is paying \$2,000 more a year thanks to Trump's tariffs. Our farmers are taking a beating.

In New York, Donald Trump's 35 percent tariffs on Canada have been devastating. We depend on tourism. More than a quarter of the tourists who visit Niagara Falls and the wine country in the Finger Lakes region are from Canada. So many from Canada flood New York City every year. And yet, this

year, tourism and border crossings are down 20 percent. Western New York and Buffalo depend on those border crossings all the time.

Trade between our Nations has been hurt. Jobs have been squandered. The economy of every northern border State—as with Minnesota—has suffered.

And now Donald Trump wants to add another 10 percent tariff on Canada because his feelings were hurt over an ad featuring Ronald Reagan. Can you imagine what an infantile leader we have in America? He sees an ad and then hurts the American people with these tariffs.

Yes, that is right. Donald Trump's pride has become so fragile that he is threatening to increase tariffs on Canada by another 10 percent, from 35 percent to 45 percent. Why? Simply because the government of Ontario released an ad that included a radio address from President Reagan, warning about the danger of tariffs, and, apparently, that got Donald Trump's feelings all hurt.

Trump is letting his delicate little ego drive U.S. trade, whether it is with Brazil, Argentina, or with Canada. The consequence is that Americans are paying more.

This isn't a laughing matter, really—no. Struggling families have to pay thousands of dollars more each year because Donald Trump doesn't like the internal goings on in Canada or Argentina or Brazil. That hurts Americans, and we pay more for construction materials, for aluminum, for paper, and so much more.

But do you know what? The truth hurts. What President Reagan said, back in those years, about the danger of tariffs was true back then and remains true today. And I know my colleagues on both sides of the aisle disagree.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the radio address delivered by President Reagan on free trade and on the harms of tariffs on the economy, on April 25, 1987, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RADIO ADDRESS TO THE NATION ON FREE AND FAIR TRADE  
(April 25, 1987)

My fellow Americans: Prime Minister Nakasone of Japan will be visiting me here at the White House next week. It's an important visit, because while I expect to take up our relations with our good friend Japan, which overall remain excellent, recent disagreements between our two countries on the issue of trade will also be high on our agenda.

As perhaps you've heard, last week I placed new duties on some Japanese products in response to Japan's inability to enforce their trade agreement with us on electronic devices called semiconductors. Now, imposing such tariffs or trade barriers and restrictions of any kind are steps that I am loath to take. And in a moment I'll mention the sound economic reasons for this: that over the long run such trade barriers hurt every American

worker and consumer. But the Japanese semiconductors were a special case. We had clear evidence that Japanese companies were engaging in unfair trade practices that violated an agreement between Japan and the United States. We expect our trading partners to live up to their agreements. As I've often said: Our commitment to free trade is also a commitment to fair trade.

But you know, in imposing these tariffs we were just trying to deal with a particular problem, not begin a trade war. So, next week I'll be giving Prime Minister Nakasone this same message: We want to continue to work cooperatively on trade problems and want very much to lift these trade restrictions as soon as evidence permits. We want to do this, because we feel both Japan and the United States have an obligation to promote the prosperity and economic development that only free trade can bring.

Now, that message of free trade is one I conveyed to Canada's leaders a few weeks ago, and it was warmly received there. Indeed, throughout the world there's a growing realization that the way to prosperity for all nations is rejecting protectionist legislation and promoting fair and free competition. Now, there are sound historical reasons for this. For those of us who lived through the Great Depression, the memory of the suffering it caused is deep and searing. And today many economic analysts and historians argue that high tariff legislation passed back in that period called the Smoot-Hawley tariff greatly deepened the depression and prevented economic recovery.

You see, at first, when someone says, "Let's impose tariffs on foreign imports," it looks like they're doing the patriotic thing by protecting American products and jobs. And sometimes for a short while it works—but only for a short time. What eventually occurs is: First, homegrown industries start relying on government protection in the form of high tariffs. They stop competing and stop making the innovative management and technological changes they need to succeed in world markets. And then, while all this is going on, something even worse occurs. High tariffs inevitably lead to retaliation by foreign countries and the triggering of fierce trade wars. The result is more and more tariffs, higher and higher trade barriers, and less and less competition. So, soon, because of the prices made artificially high by tariffs that subsidize inefficiency and poor management, people stop buying. Then the worst happens: Markets shrink and collapse; businesses and industries shut down; and millions of people lose their jobs.

The memory of all this occurring back in the thirties made me determined when I came to Washington to spare the American people the protectionist legislation that destroys prosperity. Now, it hasn't always been easy. There are those in this Congress, just as there were back in the thirties, who want to go for the quick political advantage, who will risk America's prosperity for the sake of a short-term appeal to some special interest group, who forget that more than 5 million American jobs are directly tied to the foreign export business and additional millions are tied to imports. Well, I've never forgotten those jobs. And on trade issues, by and large, we've done well. In certain select cases, like the Japanese semiconductors, we've taken steps to stop unfair practices against American products, but we've still maintained our basic, long-term commitment to free trade and economic growth.

So, with my meeting with Prime Minister Nakasone and the Venice economic summit coming up, it's terribly important not to restrict a President's options in such trade dealings with foreign governments. Unfortunately, some in the Congress are trying to do

exactly that. I'll keep you informed on this dangerous legislation, because it's just another form of protectionism and I may need your help to stop it. Remember, America's jobs and growth are at stake.

Until next week, thanks for listening, and God bless you.

Mr. SCHUMER. Yesterday, the Senate came together in a bipartisan way to pass legislation to end Donald Trump's bogus emergency declaration in Brazil, under the leadership of Senator KAINE. Today, we can take the next step to reverse Trump's trade war on one of America's most important allies, under the leadership of Senator KLOBUCHAR. I urge—I urge—my Republican colleagues to join Democrats once again to think about the families back home that are hurt by Trump's tariffs and put an end to Trump's tariff war on Canada.

Enough is enough.

I ask unanimous consent to yield back the remaining time.

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

Under the previous order, the clerk will read the title of the joint resolution for 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. 77

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

Mr. SCHUMER. 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 legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY), and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGO) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 598 Leg.]

#### YEAS—50

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

#### NAYS—46

Banks	Britt	Cornyn
Barrasso	Budd	Cotton
Blackburn	Capito	Cramer
Boozman	Cassidy	Crapo

Cruz	Justice	Rounds
Curtis	Lankford	Schmitt
Daines	Lee	Scott (FL)
Ernst	Lummis	Scott (SC)
Fischer	Marshall	Sheehy
Graham	McCormick	Sullivan
Grassley	Moody	Thune
Hagerty	Moran	Tillis
Hawley	Moreno	Tuberville
Hoeben	Mullin	Young
Husted	Ricketts	
Johnson	Risch	

#### NOT VOTING—4

Gallego	Kennedy	Wicker
Hyde-Smith		

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 77) was passed, as follows:

#### S.J. RES. 77

*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 February 1, 2025, by the President in Executive Order 14193 (90 Fed. Reg. 9113) is terminated.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

#### VOTER SUPPRESSION

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, what has always separated America from other nations around the world is the right to vote. It is a right that everybody in this body cherishes, as do the American people. Every person who approaches the ballot box generally has confidence that their votes are going to be counted and their voice will be heard.

But, as we stand here, this cherished right is coming under attack because, in 2026, we can expect a continuation of what is happening in these last 9 months: that the Trump administration is doing everything it can to undermine the confidence in elections and sow distrust in the election process.

It is like a spider weaving a web. The Trump administration has crafted multiple strands that, when combined together, attack and change the voting landscape in a way that America will not recognize.

Trump is attempting to strip power from the States, consolidate it for himself, and subvert the will of the people. It is systematic, it is strategic, and it is deeply and urgently serious.

Today, I am beginning an extended effort to elevate this issue and sound the alarm—because voters will go to the polls this Tuesday, and my fear is that it could be the last free and fair election, unless we rise up and we act. And this fear is not mine alone. I have heard it all around Connecticut and from my colleagues all around the country, and it is well founded.

President Trump's crusade of voter suppression and election subversion started on day one of the administration, when he pardoned the individuals who participated in the violent attack on the Capitol on January 6. That January 6 attack was not a protest or even just a riot. It was an assault on the very heart of our democracy. In attempting to stop Congress from certifying the results of the 2020 election,

the January 6 insurrectionists sought to nullify the votes and shatter the peaceful transfer of power that has characterized our democracy for nearly 250 years.

President Trump provided a blanket pardon to the January 6 attackers and thereby endorsed and placed the Presidential seal of approval on their actions and their direction and goal of seeking to overturn the will of the people. So it was no accident that these pardons were one of President Trump's very first acts in office. It was an unmistakable signal that his administration would be obsessed with suppressing votes and undermining free and fair elections.

And since that very first day in office, President Trump and his administration have been praising and hiring into leadership positions the very people who attempted to subvert our democracy. In fact, just this past month, the White House reportedly hired Kurt Olsen, a lawyer who attempted to overturn the 2020 election results, and he is working officially as a "special government employee" tasked with looking into the 2020 election and current voting machines.

But rewriting the history of January 6 was only the beginning of a relentless, purposeful campaign to stoke fear among voters and sow seeds of distrust in American elections. They have employed Federal Agencies to help do some of the dirty work. In fact, President Trump has weaponized several Federal Agencies against you, the voters. He is using these Agencies as instruments to suppress your vote.

The Department of Homeland Security and the Department of Justice have both taken alarming actions in recent months targeting the vote. At DHS, a senior Department leader, Heather Honey, an election denier and conspiracy theorist in her own right, reportedly told State and local election officials that the administration could declare a "national emergency" based on the claim that the 2020 election was stolen to obtain "additional powers that don't exist right now" and act "without Congress" to "mandate that States" adopt her preferred, radical election rules.

In addition, the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, known as CISA, a critical Agency within DHS that works with State and local officials to protect the security of our elections, has been gutted. CISA has been instrumental in protecting our elections from cyber attacks and threats by foreign and domestic actors. These attacks are growing, not diminishing.

I don't have to reveal any classified information for the American people to know that attacks by our adversaries on our election system are an increasing threat, but instead of bolstering CISA, President Trump has placed on administrative leave or reassigned nearly all of its election experts. In their place, President Trump has in-

stalled inexperienced political activists who sought to overturn the results of the 2020 election.

Marci McCarthy, named director of public affairs at CISA, was responsible for spreading false claims about faulty voting machines in Georgia.

This past July, Sean Plankey, the nominee to head CISA, refused to answer me when I asked him in a hearing if he believed that the 2020 election was stolen.

President Trump has also chosen to attack CISA officials. In April, President Trump issued an Executive order directing the Department of Justice and DHS to investigate Chris Krebs, the former head of CISA, calling him a "bad-faith actor" who "weaponized and abused" his authority—all because Krebs refused to lie and say Trump's 2020 election was rigged. And because Krebs said there was no evidence in 2020 that "any voting system deleted or lost votes, changed votes, or was in any way compromised," he was attacked, and that Executive order asked DHS to target him.

At the same time, President Trump has dismantled CISA's election security programs, including by terminating initiatives that monitor foreign disinformation and cutting the funding of systems that detect, deter, and alert States and localities about cyber and physical attacks on election infrastructure.

This dismantling of CISA is fundamental and deeply alarming, but at the Department of Justice, things are no better. President Trump took an ax to the Department of Justice's Voting Section within the Civil Rights Division, that historic section established to protect and uplift the vote.

First, he decimated the Voting Section staff. In January, it was estimated that the section had 30 attorneys on staff to enforce voting rights laws. Today, it is three. Then he decimated its mission, transforming the section from a bulwark against voting suppression into its opposite: a mechanism to suppress voters and stoke fears of voter fraud.

So instead of lifting up the work of voting rights and serving as a staunch defender of voters in the courts, the section has withdrawn its engagement in seven active voting cases. Where it does remain involved, in redistricting cases such as *Louisiana v. Callais*, it has taken a sudden and staunch anti-voter stance.

The Department of Justice has decided to make a mockery of poll monitoring as well. The Trump DOJ will now use poll monitoring—which began as an effort to secure minorities' votes when they were denied it following passage of the Voting Rights Act—to potentially intimidate and surveil voters and officials alike at polling sites in California and New Jersey. He is doing it at the request of the Republican Party officials in those States, ahead of the November 4 election.

Those anti-voter campaigns are coupled with efforts to distort the elec-

toral maps. Since President Trump took office, he has pressured Republican State legislators to ignore the will of their voters and effectively elect representatives through extreme and unabashedly partisan gerrymandering. This flagrantly abusive redistricting occurred in States like Texas, representing a top-down campaign directed by President Trump to eradicate as many congressional districts as possible that could conceivably elect a Democrat.

For example, the new Texas redistricting seeks to gift Republicans 80 percent of its House seats in a State where Democrats routinely receive between 40 and 50 percent of the vote in congressional districts. It is plainly a move designed to target minority voters.

The same playbook follows in Missouri and North Carolina. These are the actions of desperate politicians—desperate because they know how deeply unpopular their policies are with voters, policies of stripping people of their healthcare, cutting taxes for the rich, and sending the military into American streets. Instead of changing those policies to win over voters, the Trump administration is seeking to disenfranchise the voters, suppress votes, and rig these elections by shamelessly moving voters to new districts.

President Trump and Republicans have started a tit-for-tat redistricting arms race where Democrats are forced to fight fire with fire and play catchup to undo Republicans' damage and restore balanced representation. And the ones who suffer are the voters. Their voices are ignored and often silenced by frightened partisan politicians.

But it isn't just the voters who are undermined; it is our States as well. Under the Constitution, it is the States that have the power to oversee the time, place, and manner of their elections, subject only to legislation enacted by Congress. The President is given no role—zero—in that process. States are not agents for the Federal Government, hamstrung to Presidential orders when it comes to elections. In this space of elections, they have their own independent, sovereign authority. Yet President Trump believes he can dictate the rules over our elections and seize power from the States for himself, and he has sought to do it in a number of important ways that ought to concern this body, especially because we represent our States.

Foremost among his tactics, he wants to supplant States in determining the means, methods, and mechanisms for placing our votes. Those mechanisms vary. For example, some States use more mail-in voting than others, and States don't always have the same approach to early voting. Rather than the States making those calls, he wants to be Big Brother himself, watching how elections must be run, dictating how it is done.

The DOJ has already unsuccessfully sought access to voting machines in

Missouri, sending a request to “access, physically inspect and perhaps take physical custody of election equipment used in the 2020 November general election.”

In March 2025, President Trump issued an Executive order—another Executive order—that attempted to mandate that the independent, bipartisan Election Assistance Commission rescind all previous certifications of voting equipment and recertify systems under amended guidelines. That order is currently being challenged in court. It is plainly unlawful, it is reckless, it is unfair to the States, and it is a false solution in search of a problem that doesn’t exist.

President Trump has called voting machines “highly inaccurate, very expensive, and seriously controversial.” There is zero evidence—zero—to support these claims. It is all just a pretext to insert Federal control over States’ rights. States do have rights, and President Trump is trying to override them roughshod.

His tactics are similar with mail-in ballots. In the 2024 election, nearly one-third of Americans voted by mail. Mail-in voting is instrumental in helping our troops and making sure that every voice is heard, even when they are overseas.

President Trump has stated that he wants to “lead a movement” to get rid of mail-in voting, and he posted this past week on social media: “No mail-in or ‘Early’ Voting.” He has assigned lawyers to craft another Executive order to stop it.

The irony is not lost on anyone that President Trump himself voted by mail in the 2020 election when he cast his ballot in Florida.

In some States, such as Oregon and Washington, mail-in ballots are the primary mechanism used by voters. Attempting to illegally strip States of this right will decimate the way our citizens are heard and the foundational principle of States’ rights.

By law, by tradition, by history, and sound public policy, States make this call, not the President, and attempting to strip States of these rights is flagrantly illegal and unconstitutional.

President Trump’s lackeys have attempted to bully States into handing over sensitive and personal information contained within State voter rolls. DOJ has requested information or meetings about election administration from States and has demanded 40 States—40 States—provide their full voter registration lists. In a private meeting, Michael Gates, a Deputy Assistant Attorney General in the Department of Justice Civil Rights Division, disclosed that all 50 States will eventually receive these requests. The eight States that so far have refused to turn over that data are now being sued by the Department of Justice.

Trump is attempting to compile the largest list of voter roll data ever in our history in order to bolster unsubstantiated and false claims of illegal

voting by noncitizens, despite the fact that noncitizen voting is essentially nonexistent.

This type of national voter roll collection is totally unprecedented in our history. Nothing like it has ever been done before. Nothing like this invasion of privacy and promises to voters would have been imaginable before January of this year.

The information he is requesting includes your driver’s license number, your Social Security number, your name, your address, your political party, and your voting history. He wants to know who you are and potentially use that information however he pleases. He wants to use that information against States as well—more broadly, to be the judge and jury of whether States are effectively running their own elections, despite the fact that States—and I apologize for repeating it—States are tasked with administering elections under the Constitution.

In case Trump’s DOJ can’t dismantle elections using all of these maligned tactics, the administration is also targeting election officials who seek to run efficient, fair, honest elections and to calculate and certify election results in a nonpartisan way. They are at work in every election. Everybody in this body knows what they do and knows how important they are to free and fair elections.

President Trump’s DOJ has a new weaponization working group with a focus on targeting election officials as a result of supposedly widespread voter fraud. It is the product of fever imagination.

The Department of Justice is also exploring whether they can bring criminal charges against State and local officials if they believe that those officials have not adequately safeguarded their computer systems from harm, despite gutting CISA—the very Agency tasked with assisting them in safeguarding their computers and software.

To instill fear in election workers, the administration is doing everything it can to signal that it will punish anyone who doesn’t bow to them.

Since 2020, Trump has been posting on social media and publicly calling for prosecution against election officials he accuses of working against him. Prosecuting election officials won’t make elections any safer or fairer; it is simply about creating fear and anxiety. It will lead to an exodus of individuals—it already has begun—that we need to rely on to run our elections.

The fearmongering seems to be having its effect ever since Trump began espousing false claims of stolen elections in 2020 and putting this kind of pressure on the dedicated men and women who show up for elections to help run them. Election officials have reported harassment, threats, and abuse locally.

Election officials with institutional knowledge of how local systems run and who are imperative to registering

voters and maintaining voter processes are leaving their roles at an alarming rate. The turnover was especially pronounced in large jurisdictions where the Trump campaign focused its misinformation campaign around 2020 elections.

Now, each of these individual actions of anti-election assault is serious and significant, but each action needs to be seen together as something deeper and broader. It is the sum and substance of totalitarianism—not at some distant point in the future, not a vague storm cloud on the horizon, but the destruction of democracy here and now.

As we approach our democracy’s 250th anniversary, we can’t afford the luxury of defeatism or despair or complacency. We need to join together and sound the alarm across differences of political party, geography, financial interests, personal background, and all the rest. Join in this body—come together because we have a common interest in making sure that elections are free and fair.

More than words, we need action—your action as voters registering to vote and enabling others to do so, volunteering to work at the polls and supporting election officials and administrators, contributing to organizations that defend voting rights in court, demanding that public officials unite against the sabotage of our democracy, and uniting at rallies, townhalls, and every other forum available to make your voice known.

I will be reaching out to colleagues on both sides of the aisle and coming to the floor and reaching out to the American people. Just as we threw off the yoke of monarchy 2½ centuries ago, the American people still have the power to determine their own future. They still have the courage to make “good trouble,” as John Lewis, the historic voting champion, famously said. Most of all, the American people have the will and fortitude to stand up to this assault.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

#### GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, the government has been shut down for nearly a month—the longest full government shutdown in American history. It all began with the Democratic leader’s desire to play politics with people’s lives and paychecks.

Americans, including those in Louisiana, are paying the price. Nationwide, 1.4 million Federal employees—many of whom, of course, are living paycheck to paycheck—are furloughed or working without pay, and 13,000 air traffic controllers have already missed 1 paycheck and will miss another soon.

SNAP, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, and food stamps—these benefits run out November 1 in many States, like mine, and that is just 2 days away. In Louisiana alone, that is 804,000 individuals, including 312,000 children, who rely on SNAP.



Now, this is not an abstract ideological issue; we are literally talking about food on the table. SNAP can be the difference between a child having a full belly, going to sleep, waking up the next morning, and going to school happy and that same child asking their mom when is the next time they will eat a meal, going to bed hungry, and doing poorly the next day.

Republicans are working to extend the program. I want a bill to fund SNAP, but it looks like we will not have Democratic support to pass.

There are a lot of empty dinner tables and a lot of children going to bed hungry. Democrats have voted against reopening our government 13 times. Thirteen times they have voted to deny children food, sending families to food banks instead.

I am told that food banks will not be able to keep up. Federal workers, single parents with young children, walking into empty food banks. That is coming from a party that regularly claims that they are the party of children, families, and vulnerable communities.

Republicans and the Trump administration are working hard to mitigate the worst parts of the shutdown. President Trump found the money to pay our troops through the generosity of a patriotic American. Senate Republicans voted for a bill to pay all Federal employees, including air traffic controllers who are working without pay now. Democrats blocked it.

They are the party of "no." And the bizarre part is no one is quite sure why, until one of their leaders said the quiet part out loud. The House Democratic whip acknowledged that Democrats are allowing people to suffer because of the shutdown but said:

There will be families that are going to suffer . . . but it is one of the few leverage times that we have.

This is the second highest ranking House Democrat openly confirming that working families are being used as political leverage.

This is all about politics, not what is best for the people of our country. Now, they will tell you it is about healthcare, but their position crumbles under scrutiny. If it were about healthcare costs, why would they make people suffer more in order to change healthcare policy rather than reopen the government and negotiate with Republicans on solutions which actually lower healthcare costs?

Republicans have repeatedly said we will negotiate to lower healthcare costs, just not while Americans suffer. Our position is clear: End the shutdown, and then let's talk about healthcare. It seems reasonable.

You might ask why they are still voting against reopening the government. It is because they know that their proposals on healthcare won't actually lower healthcare costs.

Under Democrats' current plan, premiums still go up next year, not to mention their proposed solution is just

aimed at papering over the mess that ObamaCare created because the facts are clear: The Affordable Care Act did not make care affordable.

All of this seems like one elaborate attempt to save face. Well, it is not working, and, more importantly, Americans are suffering. I repeat: Reopen the government, then let's have a conversation about the areas in healthcare we can address to actually lower premium costs and out-of-pocket costs for middle-income Americans.

By the way, the Democrats' current plan will only affect 7 percent of the people on ObamaCare. Their plan ignores 93 percent of Americans who will also see costs go up. We need to help all Americans by fixing our healthcare system, not just paper over the failures of ObamaCare to help a few.

I will add, for as much as they talk about healthcare, the Democrat shutdown is defunding important healthcare programs.

As chairman of the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, I led a bipartisan effort to protect Americans' access to affordable over-the-counter drugs. The members of my committees worked together to remodify the Over-the-counter Monograph Drug User Fee Program, sometimes referred to as OMuFA. This funds the review process to bring over-the-counter drugs to market.

Because of the shutdown, because of my Democratic colleagues refusing to vote to open the government, for the first time in history, a user fee program has expired, meaning patient access to new over-the-counter treatments for common ailments is in jeopardy.

I am a doctor. I want to tackle the numerous issues facing our healthcare system. I spent my whole career fighting for patients. Let's have a conversation about lowering costs for all Americans like those on Medicare, those with employer-sponsored insurance, and small business owners who provide insurance to their workers.

If Democrats are interested in lowering healthcare costs, as they say they are, reopen the government, pay our troops, and stop taking food from children. I am tired of hearing people say there is no off-ramp or way out of the shutdown. Here it is, the way forward: Open the government.

#### NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM

Mr. President, I spoke on this floor a month ago about the consequences of a government shutdown on our country and upon Louisiana, particularly the half million Louisianans enrolled in the National Flood Insurance Program or the NFIP.

I called on Senate Democrats to join me and Republican colleagues in keeping the government open and Congress working. Unfortunately, the Senate minority leader shut the government down nearly a month ago to appease a radical base. That is nearly a month that many people in Louisiana on the NFIP that have gone without the trust,

certainty, and stability that the program is designed to provide.

Families are unable to close on a new house because they can't purchase a new flood insurance policy. Homeowners are vulnerable during hurricane season because they cannot renew existing policies, and that raises a question the American people are asking every day: How can they trust a government that isn't even open?

Now, by the way, NFIP is not perfect. It faces financial challenges. Some reforms are needed. But shutting it down makes the problem worse, not better.

The Democratic leader said that every day the shutdown gets better for them. Well, I can tell you every day the government is shut down, it gets worse for the Americans in my State who are worried about flooding and losing everything.

The American people want solutions. They want a government that works. They want flood insurance that protects their homes, families, and livelihoods. That is why I am working on legislation that would automatically reauthorize the NFIP if there is any lapse in government funding; in other words, prevent any future shutdown from interrupting the NFIP.

It fixes the damage caused by the Schumer shutdown and ensures stability going forward. My colleague JOHN KENNEDY from Louisiana and I have introduced two bills, one to extend NFIP in the short term, another to provide a full year of coverage.

We are also working toward broader reforms that keep premiums affordable and the program sustainable for generations to come.

We must reopen the government immediately. Democrats have voted against doing so 13 times. Thirteen opportunities they have been given to end their shutdown, and they have thrown it back in the face of all Americans.

Government services might be on pause, but hurricane season is not. Reopen the government, restore certainty to the American people, protect homes, protect families, protect livelihoods. Republicans are working to prevent the worst effects of the Schumer shutdown from taking place, but Democrats keep blocking our efforts.

We want to pay the troops. We want to fund SNAP. We want to extend NFIP. The American people deserve better. They deserve more than the Democratic Party is willing to give.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JUSTICE). The Senator from Louisiana.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate 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.